Carnival, dialogue, and drama, in the study and presentation of a literary and a liturgical text

Baron, John F.

CARNIVAL, DIALOGUE, AND DRAMA,

IN THE STUDY AND PRESENTATION

OF A LITERARY AND A LITURGICAL TEXT.

John F.Baron.

A Thesis submitted for the
Degree of Master of Education
in the University of Durham.

The Department of Education, 1992.

CONTENTS.

ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS.

The thesis considers three pieces of dialogue.

1. Ivan and Alyosha in The Brothers Karamazov by Fyodor Dostoievski.

2 Dorothy Heathcote and some sixth form students in a classroom in Stockton on Tees.

3 A priest and congregation in a church in Carlisle.

In each of these dialogues one factor can be isolated. It is the factor of "jolly relativity". It is a relativizing quality. It diminishes the absolute character of any speech. Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogicality is applied to the classroom drama of Dorothy Heathcote and to the eucharistic prayer said in a church. The thesis claims that what happens in the dialogue of Alyosha and Ivan in the first extract also happens in the other two dialogues.

Summary of the Argument.

State of the Question.

Three general differences between drama and narrative: summary and elaboration, participant and percipient, synchronic and diachronic.

In using drama in the study of narrative, there is a problem of passing written examinations, and the more serious problem of indoctrination.

Chapter One

General Introduction.

establishes that the originality of Mikhail Bakhtin lies in his idea of "the other"

explains that this chapter proceeds by progressive focussing.

Section One.

traces the development of the specific difference between a natural science and a human science, namely, the presence of the other person.

draws a parallel with Dorothy Heathcote's understanding of "the other" in role, and her distinction of human and natural science.

Section Two.

Explains five features of speech which derive from the principle of "the other".

1. The context.

2. Its social nature: the primacy of the other in modern thought.

3. The values which speech derives from the interaction between the speaker and the other person.

4. The listener, the speaker, and what they are talking about. They are related by their social class, by their proximity to the object, and by their mutual differences, on the side of the author against the character, or against the author with the character.

5. Intertextuality or the continuing presence of all the others who have used those words in other contexts.

Section Three.

looks in detail at intertextuality.

applies the theory of "the other" to four specific areas of narrative, identified by Mikhail Bakhtin.

1. Stylization, where the speaker and "the other" both agree.

2. Parody, where the one takes up "the other" in an entirely different sense.

3. Polemic, where the one contradicts "the other".

4. Internal dialogue, where the speech of one and of "the other" coincide yet interact.

Chapter Two. Dialogue in Dorothy Heathcote's Work.

Dorothy Heathcote in Stockton-on-Tees. She works in role as "the other" with the students in stylization, parody, polemic and internal dialogue.

Chapter Three. Mikhail Bakhtin and Carnival.

1. Introduction.

The concept of blurred genre in current thinking.

2. The Nature of Genre.

Literary genre is rooted in speech genres. Mikhail Bakhtin seeks to return them to speech in his analysis of the novel. His application is not adequate, but this does not invalidate his theory of mixed genre.

3. The History of Mixed Genre.

There is a resemblance between the novels of Dostoievski and a drama class, in their contemporary relevance, and intertextuality. This has developed from three different types of literature.

4. The Early History: The Socratic Dialogue.

5. The Menippean Satire.

6. The Medieval Carnival.

Chapter Four. Dorothy Heathcote and Carnival.

1. Introduction. General aspects of carnival in drama work.
2. Four specific examples, of dethronement, parody, the carnival dismemberment, the banquet,
3. Other examples: The Big One.

Chapter Five: Dialogue and Carnival in a Liturgical Text.

Introduction. What this chapter is not about. It is not about drama which is external to liturgy, nor drama which is internal but not essential.

It is not about theological aspects of dialogue nor the philosophical analogy with the Trinity.

It is about dialogue and carnival in the Eucharistic prayer.

The text of the Eucharistic prayer explained in Bakhtinian terms, after the model of the classroom, and the encounter of Alyosha and Ivan in Crime and Punishment by Dostoievski.

Conclusions: Performance.
Fundamental concepts.
A teaching programme.

Chapter Six. Conclusions.

1. Mikahil Bakhtin's ideas of "the other", the "sideways look", the concept of mixed genre, and the significance of the space between people, apply to drama and to liturgy.

2. They explain the specific kind of dialogue which takes place in a classroom and in the Eucharistic prayer.

3. They further explain the kind of activity which is happening in the class and in the church. It is a mixed genre.

4. In describing the difference between narrative and drama as the difference of synchronic and diachronic, it would appear that this is too simple. There is an element of the synchronic in the diachronic. The unique unrepeatable moment associated with drama exists also in dialogical narrative.

5. The dependence of one speech on the other, the primacy of "the other", the centrifugal tendency of speech, and its intertextuality, make dialogue, or more colloquially, conversation, a model for pluralism.

A Note about the Length of Chapter One.

Mikhail Bakhtin constantly returned to his theory of dialogicality. He applied it over a wide range of subjects. It is the underlying conviction of this essay that all his thought is important to the drama teacher and to the presider in a liturgical situation. It is not sufficient to pick out "the other,", "the sideways glance", mixed genre, or even a general notion such as intertextuality. These could well be taken from other sources and applied to drama. But that is not what this essay is doing. It is looking at the totality of the

thought of Mikhail Bakhtin. His thought begins with an instinct, an idea, which is constantly unfolded and rediscovered in the various applications of it. This movement of instinct and thought is as important to the drama teacher as the individual points.

But it remains obscure. We have depended entirely on the two books, The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, and The Life and Times of Rabelais, and on secondary authors. Hence the abundance of explanation, conjecture, digression, example, illustration, and parallel situations. Dorothy Heathcote is introduced in this capacity as parallel situation and illustration. In this chapter, she is an illustration rather than a step in the argument. She is like the pictures in a book. Only subsequently does it become possible to suggest that her work is even more polyphonic than that of Dostoievski.

NARRATIVE AND DRAMA; THE STATE OF THE QUESTION.

There can be no doubt that drama has found a place in the English classroom. Plays are rehearsed and performed. Improvizations are attempted which in practical ways extend language skills. Students take on roles which enable them to understand poems and stories, and to write and read for themselves. From the formal and scripted play to the investigation of life and literature through the medium of drama, drama has an important part in the English classroom. In other subjects, too, drama is at home. In history, religious education, foreign languages, students act out situations, or take roles, which give a fresh look at old texts.(1)

In this work, narrative and drama are together. "Narrative summarizes the drama and drama elaborates the speech". (2). At this preliminary stage, it is enough to understand narrative as what is said, and drama as what is done.

So, for example, I could hold my hand out to you, and, by my posture, demand something. When I say, "Sweets", then you know what I want. The word says very briefly, summarily, what my gesture is. Subsequently, as you shake your head, empty your pockets, shrug your shoulders, turn your back, spread your hands, you elaborate different ways of saying no, you haven't got any sweets. The action elaborates, the narrative summarizes.

Of course, the relationship is more complex.

Narrative turns a participant into a percipient. In other words, it creates a conscious awareness of what the gesture is

about. Students who are within a drama become external to it, by hearing the words. The words enable them to reflect on the action, decide its meaning and what the consequences will be. This happens as soon as words are used in a drama. Take, for instance, the very obvious example of a narrator in a classroom who narrates part of story for the class.

"The guards stand by the gates and allow the scouts one by one to report to the king what they have seen".

The narrative, and the narrator, here controls the drama. A definite stage direction is given. A formal ritual is established for the students to perform, as they bring their news to the king.

The voice of the narrator slows down the action so that the students begin to feel the importance of the king and the uniqueness of the news that each brings.

The narrator has also suggested the place and time, the atmosphere, the reasons and motives, for the scouts, the guards and the king.

Further it has focussed all the action and words into one event, and, as it takes place, it will become a springboard for the next part of the story.

The narrator can also begin to introduce more formal speech, from written texts, for the students to widen their vocabulary.

On the other hand, drama, meaning by this the action of doing something, turns the percipient into a participant. We are all familiar with saying, in the middle of a discussion, "Let's get up and do something". By taking a role, or assuming a character, a text can be seen from a different point of view.

A third way of formulating the difference between narrative and drama is that drama is synchronic and narrative is diachronic.(3). This means that narrative proceeds one word after the other and reveals its message progressively. Drama on the other hand is immediate. It says many things at once. The whole message is there in the action and in the context. Narrative, then, is different from drama. We shall see, from Mikhail Bakhtin's writings that there is an element of the synchronic in the diachronic. There is a way in which dialogue is immediate, unrepeatable and unique. It only exists, like drama, at the moment of its being performed. Subsequent to that performance, it is reported, in another's speech. It is then in linear form and diachronic. But here again in its reporting there is a unique encounter of reporter and the one to whom the report is made.

This is an account of the ways narrative and drama are currently understood. There are two problems. One is the problem of fidelity to what the author intended. Inevitably the role ranges more widely than the carefully selected words of an author may allow. The drama may well go into areas the author never intended. The question is then, -why did an author write this particular text, in this particular way? The pull of orthodoxy counters the pull of anarchy. The narrator is deciding how the story will go. At the same time the story moves away from the author's original intention. The students are no doubt learning something, but are they coming into contact with one of the formative minds of a culture? Do we not, as the professor asks in Iris Murdoch's book, Book and Brotherhood, "Play around with great books, pull them down to

your level, and make simplified versions of your own?"(4)
This is a problem in any classroom. There is what the author intended, and what is happening here in the dramatic presentation of the book. It is summed up in the question, "Will this help my students to pass their G.C.S.E"?
A second problem of drama and narrative is the very topical question of indoctrination by the teacher.
It was to understand this problem that Warwick Dobson introduced the theory of dialogue of Mikhail Bakhtin.(5). He argues that teachers should avoid indoctrinating students, by being clear, when in role, which is teacher's voice and which is the role voice. One of the conclusions of this thesis is that Mikhail Bakhtin, by his preference for blurred genre, and polyphony, is more radical still. The interaction of many voices in dialogue is precisely what prevents the classroom situation from being authoritarian.
Chapter One attempts to present the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin in a schematic form. This depends on Tzvetan Todorov, as does most of this work.(6). The works of Mikhail Bakhtin are only just being translated into English. The form of the first chapter is one of constant magnification. It is like a microfiche, going down to the detail of the date of a book, or a telescope looking first at the heavens, then at one part, then one planet, then one range of hills, then one crater, then one rock! So chapter one begins with the treatment of natural and human science in both our authors, Mikhail Bakhtin and Dorothy Heathcote.(7) The focus narrows to dialogicality, the decisive factor in distinguishing natural and human. Dialogicality, then, is seen to have several features, of

which the last one is intertextuality. Intertextuality is the magnified further, in four areas. The last of these is internal dialogue. With its qualities of the priority of the other, the need for context, the "sideways look", the relativising interaction of words as they encounter each other, and the potential for blurred genre, internal dialogue is the model for the dialogue and the carnival of the drama classroom and the church.

In the following chapters, the notion of dialogue is applied to Dorothy Heathcote's work on text, and to the saying of the Eucharistic prayer in church.

Notes on The State of the Question.

1. Cf. English in the National Curriculum, D.E.S. May 1989. Drama, from 5 to 16. Curriculum Matters, 17. D.E.S. 1989.
2. Byron, Drama in the English Classroom, p.73.
3. Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.131-132.
4. Iris Murdoch, Book and Brotherhood, Chatto and Windus, London, 1987, p.23.
5. Warwick Dobson, Dialogism, polyphony, and the use of teacher in role in the drama classroom. in Theatre and Education Journal, issue no.2. April, 1989, p.31.
6. Le Principe Dialogique, Tzvetan Todorov, Editions du Seuil, Paris, 1981.
7. For a general introduction to Dorothy Heathcote and her work, see chapter two.

CHAPTER ONE.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO MIKHAIL BAKHTIN.

In his book, "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski" (1) are found the two major themes of Mikhail Bakhtin's work: carnival and dialogue. The relationship between the two however is never clear.

The book is divided into three distinct sections. The first section deals with contemporary criticism of Dostoievski. The second part sketches the literary origins of carnival. The third proposes a theory of forms of dialogue in the works of Dostoievski.

The book was published in 1929. In 1963, a revised edition was published. Two years later, "Rabelais and his world" (3) was published. This book was originally written in 1940, eleven years after, "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski".

The sequence of publication is:

1929, "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski", with a section on carnival.

1940, "Rabelais and his world", was written but not published. This book is specifically about carnival.

1963, "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski", was published in a new edition.

1965, "Rabelais and his world", was published.

Hence it is possible that the "Rabelais and his World" is an expansion of the second section of "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski". But there was still no explicit

account of the relationship between the theory of dialogue and the spirit of carnival.

In 1973, it was discovered, in Russia, that Mikhail Bakhtin had been the author of several articles and three books published in the nineteen-twenties under the names of other members of his circle of friends(4). He was now seen to be, in addition to being a literary critic and literary historian, a severe critic of Freudian psychoanalysis, of the linguistics of the structuralists, and of the poetics of the Russian formalists.

Two years later, in the year he died, 1975, he brought together some studies of stylistics which extend the work begun in 1929 on Dostoievski, and which seem to have paved the way for the Rabelais. In these studies he had discussed several aspects of the novel, its use of narrative, its use of time, its relation to epic. In these perhaps are the clues which would link the Rabelais with the Dostoievski, carnival with dialogue, in a more systematic way.(5) They were not available at the time of writing this thesis.

These recently published writings add to his previously known achievements as critic, historian, psychoanalyst, sociologist, linguist, that of existentialist philosopher.

All of this, much only recently translated and published in English, shows the wide range of Mikhail Bakhtin's thinking. Through it all there was a common theme. This was the dialogic nature of language and its relation to the dialogic nature of the world.(6)

Mikhail Bakhtin was never clear about the relationship of carnival and dialogue. He was clear about the nature of

dialogue. In this he was original. He applied to dialogue what is commonly understood as the Marxist understanding of thesis, antithesis and synthesis. It was an explanation of movements in history. Dialogue, similarly, involves the interaction of opposites.

The normal understanding of dialogue is that it is an expression of cooperation between people. They share a common context and background, a common culture. They speak to each other fully aware of the response of the other. The turn of each person must be "shaped to take account of the context of the previous turn and to indicate what is expected in the turn that follows". They make "their conversational contribution such as is required, at the stage at which it occurs by the accepted purpose or direction of the talk exchange in which they are engaged".(7) Harvey Sacks talks of having "particular others in mind" and demonstrates how talk is modified in the light of "significant others". He describes conversations as" recipient designed", and points out that talk by a person in a conversation is constructed in ways that display an "orientation and a sensitivity" towards significant others who are taking part.(8) Hence dialogue is understood to be active, being created here and now, in a way that is unique and unrepeatable. Even if there is a blazing row between two people they still work at maintaining the dialogue. It is a collaborative effort. They maintain the dialogue by the very fact of having the row. The row is the dialogue.

Mikhail Bakhtin would not agree with this. True, there is a context and a shared ideological horizon. But as soon as words are used in this context, against this horizon, between these

people, their difference becomes apparent, and the interaction between the words becomes the main concern of the dialogue. The words of their nature, because of their origin and intention, subvert one another. Even when there is agreement between people, their words carry different voices, have different origins and histories, different intentions. Hence people assuredly speak with an awareness of the response of the other, but it is the contradictory nature of that response they attend to. The conversation is created here and now, by the unprecedented interaction of words from differing contexts. In the blazing row, and in the case of complete agreement, there remains a subversive, relativizing difference which arises from the very nature of speech.

This essential differentiating quality at the heart of speech is the carnival element. It is a quality of all speech. Mikhail Bakhtin's phrase for it is "jolly relativity". But it is not funny and it is not random. A monologue, in Mikhail Bakhtin's understanding, is speech that eliminates the possibility of dialogue. It eliminates criticism. It pays no heed to the presence of the other person. It is precisely the presence of the other person, which prevents the absolute nature of uncriticized speech.

The importance of the other, either as a real person in conversation, or a role, or a fictional person, is the original emphasis in Mikhail Bakhtin's work. I quote from Clarke and Holquist as they discuss the strange question of the disputed authorship of Bakhtin's writings and the reasons for these doubts.

"In a very real sense, then, the problem of answering the apparently naive question of who wrote which of the disputed texts addresses the same set of complexities that Bakhtin placed at the heart of his theories. If, as he maintained early and late, the relation between self and other is the key to all human understanding, and if, "quests for my own word are quests for a word that is not my own" then how can one ever assign responsibility for the acts that words are? If ones "own" word can never be the ultimate word, how is one answerable for what one says? Conversely, how is Bakhtin answerable for the texts that saw the light of day under the names of his friends?"

Clarke and Holquist, op.cit. p.169.

Clark and Holquist follow this line of reasoning to the extent of asking, if Bakhtin is not apparently responsible for what is published in the name of Voloshinov, then are Dante, or Goethe, or Rabelais answerable for what they say in the books of Bakhtin or in any other book which quotes them, for that matter?

They answer that the proportion and ratio of the quotation in the text is to be carefully balanced. That is, one must estimate how much of the quotation is actually in the text, and how much of it is virtually present, and what is the relative influence of the quotation? But Ken Hirschkop points out that this answer still attempts to allot ownership and responsibility.(9) It thus assumes something that Bakhtin firmly rejected. "Verbal discourse is a social phenomenon". This is a much more radical statement than the liberal schema of Clark and Holquist would allow. They seek to preserve the familiar assumption that self and society are in opposition to each other and that the self is primary. Hirschkop understands Bakhtin in a much more radical way. Bakhtin opposed liberalism, even though he never fully transcended it in his theoretical formulations. He would not oppose self and the other in this way.

Todorov puts it another way, perhaps more succinctly. It is important to insist upon this point of Bakhtin's originality from the outset. It is a major change in the way we think. Todorov is comparing with Bakhtin's idea the idea of "the other" in an abandoned preface of The Confessions, of Jean Jacques Rousseau.

"The essential difference is that, in Rousseau's passage, the other intervenes only as the object of comparison with a self that has already been entirely constituted; whereas, for Bakhtin, the other participates in the very constitution of the self. Rousseau sees the other as necessary only in the process of coming to know a preexisting entity; Bakhtin's Christ plays out his role in an interaction that establishes the human. In Rousseau's world,made up of self-sufficient atoms, (as described in this text), the relationship between men is reduced to comparison: Bakhtin's world (and Dostoievski's) is familiar with - and requires- lateral transcendence, in which the inter-human is not merely the void separating two beings.
Now one of these views is not only more generous than the other. It is more true. Sartre said as much in Saint Genet: "For a long time we believed in the social atomism bequeathed to us by the eighteenth century, and it seemed to us that man was by nature a solitary entity who entered into relations with his fellow men afterward ... We now know that this is nonsense. The truth is that "human reality" is "in-society" as it is "in-the-world-".

Todorov calls this the originality of the interpretation of the absolute other which we owe to Mikhail Bakhtin, and perhaps to Dostoievski. The other participates in the very constitution of the self(10).
We will see later how the primacy of "the other" is part of a strand of European thinking. Anthropologists, sociologists novelists, philosophers, have written about it. It features in the writings of Dorothy Heathcote. In her book, she lists thirty-three conventions which operate as "other" in relation to people.(11). Quite simply, role is "the other". It is the element of difference in the other person which enables the

hearer, or audience, to come alive and discover its own nature and existence. In the beginning was the other, the relationship, the other speech, the role. She refers to Martin Buber (12) in his book, "I and Thou".

Dorothy Heathcote underlines the importance of the other by adding that:

"it is much harder for the same shift, or potential for shift, to be brought about by any other means, simply because other objects used in this way cannot enter this especial time".
Collected Writings, p.163.

By shift she refers to the change in oneself that occurs when a role is used. There is something, she is saying, that only role can do, because it has an especial time. That is how she explains it. We will see how Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of "the other" enriches her idea and places it in the main stream of contemporary thinking. At this point it is sufficient to note that "the other" is certainly in her vocabulary and her approach to drama.

In speaking of role, a major technique of her teaching, she refers to "the other". She finds it:

"a fanciful name to give to what might be perceived as just something to deflect the attention of the class".
Collected Writings, p.162.

She goes on to explain how essential that deflection is. Twice in the paragraph she warns against misunderstanding outward appearances.

"Do not mistake what I am saying: I do not mean something which is merely interesting, or entertaining; it may have that outer appearance just as the teacher in role might fool the onlooker that all the role is doing is only acting
Collected Writings, p.162.

And again:

"There is prejudice against using role because it is efficient and looks so showy. It is part of that "improper" behaviour which teachers are not supposed to indulge in"
Collected Writings, p.163.

In other words, it looks like carnival, in its most vulgar and unacceptable form, but;

"Roles must never act in the sense that an actor may, for they have a different job to do. What I am discussing here is that "the other" be the gateway to the full depth of exploration which will follow as the class get involved with the issues. When the role is used it can set "frame" very quickly because the very fact that someone has entered into a full signing system, in drama time, automatically places the rest of the people present into roles themselves, for they must be addressed as if they are so".
Collected Writings, p.162-163.

This especial time is created by dialogical relationship. What happens in role in a classroom drama is what happens in any dialogue in everyday life. That specific quality which makes the especial time is "jolly relativity", a carnival element.

CHAPTER ONE SECTION ~~TWO~~ ONE.

NATURAL AND HUMAN SCIENCE, IN THE THOUGHT OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN, AND DOROTHY HEATHCOTE.

1. MIKHAIL BAKHTIN.

Since the late seventeenth century until the present day, European thought has been dominated by natural sciences.(13) Consequently, as new sciences have developed in this century, for lack of any other method of procedure, they have developed like natural sciences. Sociology, psychology, anthropology, historical sciences, have proceeded by methods of observation and experiment, by inductive and deductive logic, to verifiable conclusions, which have in turn led to future predictions. The human person was treated as any object of the natural sciences.

This was not without its difficulties. Once it is recognized that the object of an investigation is a person, and that the researcher is questioning the language, or the artifacts, of a person, the certainty and validity of their conclusions must be suspect. This has been a major question of this century: in what sense can human science be called a science?(14)

Human sciences are the sciences of man in his specificity, and not of a thing without a voice, and of a natural phenomenon. Man in his human specificity always expresses himself. He speaks. He thinks. That is, he makes a text (even though it is potentially so).
Where man is studied outside his text, and independently of it, there is no longer human science. (e.g. anatomy, physiology.)
Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other human sciences, in Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva, (Aesthetics of Verbal Creation.) Moscow, 1979, (Publisher S.G. Bocharov.)

p.285. Written in 1959-1961, and formerly published in Voprosy Literatury, 10,1976.

In other words, when I ask you about your childhood, or about your dreams, you are making a text. It is difficult to say this is the "object" of human science, because you are a subject and I am a subject. You are telling me something about yourself, and I am joining in the truth, or the hesitancy, or whatever, of what you are saying. In natural science the enquirer, the subject, has a rock, or a piece of bone, which is examined to find its constitutive parts. Sometimes the bone is said to "reveal its secrets", or the natural scientist "questions nature", but this is only by analogy with human science. The bone, the rock, has no voice. The childhood, or the dream, is narrated by a voice, and is a text. That is the difference.

During his life, Mikhail Bakhtin continually came back to this distinction. In the nineteen-twenties, he said it was the difference between things and signs. A sign sends on to something else. It points beyond itself. A thing does not point beyond itself. It is like an intransitive verb. The verbs, I run, or I walk or I fly are sufficient in themselves and need no completion. The verbs, I place, I fix, I have, demand completion. They demand an answer to the question, What do you place, fix, have? The answer is, -a book, a light, a sandwich. They point beyond themselves. Signs may already be in existence. A rose, or a mountain, or a river exist in their own right, before they are used as signs for a human condition. The rose shows my love for someone; the mountain shows my stability; the river, my inconstancy, - you cannot

step into the same one twice. Language, on the other hand, is expressly created for human beings to use. The word "cup" is a human invention, pointing beyond itself to that which holds the tea. Human sciences are a function of semiotic.
In this sense Mikhail Bakhtin used the word ideology. Normally ideology means some more or less dogmatic system of propositions and beliefs about the world. There is a Marxist ideology, a Christian ideology, a capitalist ideology. For Mikhail Bakhtin, ideology is:

" the entirety of reflections and refractions in the human brain of the social and natural reality which it expresses and fixes by a word, a picture, a diagram, or some other semiotic form. Ideologically, - that is, in a sign, a word, a gesture, a drawing, a symbol etc".
Style in Artistic Discourse. Literaturnaja ucheba, 2. 1930. p. 60.

Everything that is perceived by the human person is expressed and understood in an ideology, which is a sign. When two people meet each other and question each other, all is sign and, consequently, interpretation of those signs. The continual work of interpreting the signals of another is the constitutive principle of all dialogue. Mikhail Bakhtin explored the different facets of this principle all his life. Thirty years later, in 1961, the object of human sciences for Mikhail Bakhtin remains the signs, the text, the ideology made and used by human beings.

"The human act is a potential text.
Science of the spirit - the spirit, my own as much as anybody else's, cannot be given as a thing, (like the immediate object of natural science), but only through being expressed by signs, through being realized by texts which are of value for itself and for another".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, 1959-1961. p.286, and p.284.

Another way of expressing what makes human science different from natural science was to distinguish between things and persons.

"Knowledge of a thing, and knowledge of a person. They are like opposite poles. A pure dead thing, which is externality, which exists only for another and which this other, (the knowing subject), by a unilateral act, can bring to light completely and to the very end...
The second pole is the thought of a person in the presence of a person, dialogue, questioning, prayer."
On the Philosophical Foundations of the Human Sciences. in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, Moscow, 1979, p.409. Written in 1941, it was partially published in Kontekst 1974, Moscow, 1975.

The difference here is very acute. The object of a scientific experiment is a pure dead thing. It exists for the researcher, and, by being known unilaterally, it is given existence, and this completely. To say completely is extreme, since no matter how much something is studied, there is always something more to learn about it. It can never be brought to light completely.
The second pole returns to the mystery of dialogue and hints at its most solemn expression in dialogue with God. It is this particular way of thinking about dialogue which is the basis of this dissertation. It suggests a theory of dialogue in the classroom, and in church liturgy
In 1974 Mikhail Bakhtin used the neologisms, thingification and personification, to express the distinction of human and natural science.

"There are two limits to our thought and action, or two types of relationship (to a thing and to a person).The deeper a person is, that is, the nearer one approaches to the limit of the personal, the less applicable are generalizing methods, (methods which proceed by a process of generalization). Generalization and formalization efface the limits between genius and mediocrity... Our thought and our action, (not

technical action but moral, that is, all our responsible acts) take place between two poles, the relationship to things and the relationship to persons: thingification and personification".

On Methodology in Human Sciences, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, p.370. Written in 1974, and published in Kontekst 1974, Moscow, 1975.

This is one of the passages which illustrate the influence of existentialism. Martin Heidegger spoke of closeness to persons and things and openness to their mystery. Every thing is unknowable in its unique existence. All that can be done is gradually to get closer to that which is unknowable in someone's unique existence. This unknowability is the simple effect of existing as a different person. There is a difficulty. Heidegger does not distinguish knowledge of a person from knowledge of a thing as Bakhtin does. His German word "ding" does not exclude persons. What he and Bakhtin agree on is that knowledge of persons is rather an encounter with the unknowable than a process of generalization. Bakhtin is concerned to distinguish two types of knowing, the second type under the influence of existentialism.

"The exact sciences are a monological way of knowing. The intellect contemplates a thing and speaks about it. There is here only one subject, the subject who knows (contemplates) and who speaks (makes speech). Only a thing with no voice faces him. But one cannot perceive and study the subject in itself, as if it were a thing, because it cannot remain a subject, if it has no voice - consequently knowledge of a subject can only be dialogical".

On Methodology in Human Sciences, p.363.

What makes human science distinct from natural science is the element of dialogue. But what happens in dialogue, how do people understand one another?

"All true understanding is active, and already represents the embryo of a reply. Only active understanding can grasp a theme

(the meaning of a speech). It is only with the help of what is coming to be that one can grasp what is coming to be. All understanding is dialogical. Understanding opposes speech as one reply opposes another, in the heart of a dialogue. Understanding seeks a contrary speech for the speech of the speaker."

Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, Leningrad, 1929, pp.122-3.

Every question presupposes an answer. If this were not so there would be no continuity in a conversation. Even before a question is put the speaker must know it can be answered. We have seen from Grice that this is called the "cooperative principle".(cf.note 7.)

Mikhail Bakhtin goes much further. He says it is only with the help of the embryonic answer from the one spoken to that the question can be formulated. Understanding is not something that is said. It is not the same as speech. It opposes speech. It occurs when a speech has been opposed by a reply. It occurs in the meeting, in the collision, of two or more speeches. It is not simultaneous in either of the speakers. It is in the middle, and is subsequently taken up into the speech. It is in the give-and-take of the conversation. This is a radical understanding of the otherness of the other person. The other comes before oneself. In the beginning there was relationship. There was "the other", as Martin Buber says.

In human sciences, understanding is dialogical. Does this mean that it is any the less exact? Can it be exact in the sense of being measured, recorded, predicted? The natural sciences are called the exact sciences. Mikhail Bakhtin says human sciences have their own kind of exactitude. Again, in following his reasoning, we come to a further aspect of his dialogical principle.

"The knowing subject does not ask himself, or a third party, a question before a thing dead. He questions the thing to be known itself. The criterion is not the exactitude of the knowledge but the depth of penetration".
Philosophical Foundations of Human Science. p.409.

This would appear to deny exactitude in any scientific sense. Depth of penetration seems to leave too much to the unverifiable. One could never be sure with another person, another voice, which speaks back.

"The object of human science is the expressive and speaking human being. This being never coincides with itself. That is why it is inexhaustible in its meaning and signification".
Philosophical Foundations of Human Science. p.410.

By the phrase "being which never coincides with itself", is meant that what a person is, and what a person says, or signals, are never quite the same thing. We have seen that an ideology is the "full entirety of reflections and refractions in the human brain which are expressed by a sign". But that is not so straightforward as it seems. The person who receives sense impressions, data through the senses, actively converts those impressions into signs or symbols. But where do those symbols come from? And do they fit the impression received with what might be called truthfulness?
A great work of selecting, comparing, contrasting is engaged upon before any form, or sign, or symbol, can be found and expressed. This activity would occur in the case of any impression, both natural and human. But in human science, where a second subject is also selecting, comparing, contrasting and speaking more or less exact symbols, signs, words, the continual refinement of expression is inexhaustible. "We are inexhaustibly expressing ourselves".

In this continual refinement of the symbols and signs by which we express ourselves, exactness is achieved.

"The importance of the engagement required to approach the creative centre of a person more and more deeply: in the creative centre the person continues to live - it remains immortal. In human sciences, exactitude consists in overcoming the foreigness of the other, without assimilating it entirely to oneself. (Every sort of substitution, modernization, non-recognition of the stranger).
On Method in Modern Science, p.371.

This appears mystically relevant but rationally obtuse. The final bracketed throw-away line is meant to clarify. The three examples should jump off the page with limpid clarity. But Mikhail Bakhtin often merely indicates the lines of such an explanation. The question arises what is the point of these three examples.

When two people meet and speak together both are foreign to each other. The cause of this lies in their existence. They are different. This is not because of their nature. Their nature as human beings is the same. Their essence is the same. But their actual existence, here and now, under these particular circumstances, makes them different. These are the terms of existentialist philosophy. Mikhail Bakhtin goes even further than Sartre would go. In the passage quoted, he identifies the individual with the immortality of each person, at their creative centre, where each lives. Our existence makes us different and foreign.

As questions are asked, and as the relationship develops, into friendship, or utility, or enmity, the foreigness is lessened. An image of the one is formed in the mind of the other. An assimilation happens. One becomes like the other as the knowing proceeds. Words and sentences and speech from the one

are received and welcomed and assimilated by the other. But it does not entirely succeed. There remains the foreigness, the individual existence of the other. No matter how well known someone may become, there is always the tantalizing otherness of that person. So it is true to say that as someone is known, someone is also not known. The more one is known, the more unknowable, different, contradictory, the other becomes.

The reason for this is that knowledge is analogical. In attempting to know someone, the knower, or learner, goes from the known to the unknown. Analogies are used. Examples of what is already known are compared and contrasted with the new data. An analogy is never simple identity. The essence of analogical thinking is similarity and difference. The exactness of any analogy is in the careful comparison of the two analogues. They are always partly the same and partly different.

A metaphor also, while pointing to the similarities of a situation, equally demonstrates the differences. So, when a metaphor or analogy is used as a means of knowing someone, - and it is impossible to know without their means, - a substitution is made for the person or situation which is being observed. Here we come to the word used by Mikhail Bakhtin. When life is called a journey, a substitution is made for something we do not know. Life takes a lot of knowing. In a way, it is a journey. Journeys are well known. From what is known about a journey, we sense something about life. Mikhail Bakhtin calls this substitution.

This, then, is the first way of knowing a person. He hints, in his throw-away line, at two other ways of knowing a person:

modernizations, and non-recognition of the stranger.
A modernization is when modern parallels might be used to understand something in the past, say "The Antigone" of Sophocles, played in the situation of a modern civil war in Peru. Exactitude is achieved by the careful consideration of the points of similarity between ancient Athens and modern Peru, and the points of contrast. Always there is a vivid sense of the differences.
"Non-recognition of the stranger" refers to the many occasions when it is pretended that no differences exist between people. Every generalization does this. It classifies according to similarities. So one might say, "Reds over here, Blues over there". This is a command which gets everyone together. But it omits all the individual and personal differences which exist between each blue and each red. Similarly the proposition "All men are mortal" has a different meaning in each individual person who would be an example of this. Every death is different. This may appear obvious. But Mikhail Bakhtin insists that even such normal and acceptable "non-recognition of the stranger", non-recognition of the differences between people, must be clearly understood. The opposite, the unique difference, the existing individual, is always at least virtually present.

"A meeting of persons is like the meeting of two texts - the text already given and the text which reacts to it in the act of its coming to be. Consequently it is the meeting of two subjects and two authors".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philosophy, and other Human Sciences. p.285.

Mikhail Bakhtin's interest in the difference between natural and human science has brought us to the heart of his thinking.

It is the dialogue which happens between two subjects, two people. Chapter One will continue to look at the words in the dialogue, and the genre of the dialogue.

2. DOROTHY HEATHCOTE.

This thesis compares and contrasts what Mikhail Bakhtin says with what Dorothy Heathcote does in a classroom and with what a Priest does in church. To mark how close the comparison is, it may help, even at this early stage, to make two observations about Dorothy Heathcote.

She has a life-long interest in the difference between scientific and other ways of thinking. At this moment she is developing a drama programme in a Mercedes Benz factory in Germany.

In 1967, she described a class she had led in which the children explained to an Indian peasant the use of a modern highly efficient plough. The peasant, however, was anxious only to work the land of his ancestors in the way his father had before him. "Real and deeper issues were thrown in their faces". (p.45, Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Papers.).

In 1975, she introduced the goddess, Pele, the guardian of volcanoes in Hawaiian literature, to a class of infant children.

"I wanted to make a double thrust into learning about volcanoes because I considered it more efficient to learn, on the one hand that modern humans have a scientific explanation for events and, on the other hand, that in ancient times we had other explanations for the eruptions."
Op. cit. p.100. cf.Wagner Op.cit. p.168.

On another occasion she worked with the Luddite rebellion and built spinning frames in troubled times. The machines would be destroyed by the people who were building them. She brought out the tension between scientific thinking and the human beings who were personally involved in that thinking. (Ibid p.98.)

In 1976, she said a very interesting thing about truth, from the point of view of Bakhtin's theory. She compared two models of knowledge, two trees. One of the strands in the trunk of the tree of knowledge which she preferred was:

"the many faces of truth, the truth of the proven, the truth of the myth, and the truth of the other point of view".
Ibid.p.123.

The truth of the proven would seem to mean the truth of natural science. The truth of myth would seem to be human science. But she would not be thinking of sociology, or psychology, but rather their primitive origins in the stories by which human beings explained natural and psychic phenomena to each other. But where does the third kind of truth come from, the truth of the other point of view? Does it mean that, when someone expresses a point of view, it must be listened to, and weighed, and accepted, or rejected? Or is there actually truth in the "other" view of the other person which is similar to the truth of myth and the truth of measurement? In other words, is there here an awareness that, alongside one point of view, there is always another, and the truth lies in between, and is neither relative nor dogmatic, but dialogical? This is the position of Mikhail Bakhtin.

"It should be noted that both relativism and dogmatism equally exclude all argumentation, all authentic dialogue, by making it either unnecessary (relativism) or impossible (dogmatism)". Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski. p.56.(15)

If truth is dogmatic, either one person has it or the other. They give it to each other. Dialogue in this case means listening and assimilating. It means becoming like one another in that each knows the same thing. On the other hand, if truth is relative, there would be no use in asking another's opinion because it would have no more validity than one's own.
For Mikhail Bakhtin the truth is dialogical. The other person, or the text, is not an object that the hearer comes to know. Rather it is someone who speaks. The discourses of each are in a dialogical relationship. They are seeking a truth, but not one that is given in advance. They are seeking a truth that is an ultimate horizon and a ruling idea, (16). The question is whether Dorothy Heathcote would agree with Mikhail Bakhtin that the search for truth is for something not yet possessed, and the means is that of a familiar discursive form: dialogue. In 1980, with John Carroll, she taught a long drama session which focussed upon Dr Lister. The aim was to look at his scientific achievement and the effect it had on people both then and now. The teacher said, "I want Lister to be seen as having influenced modern medicine and we should honour him".(17) In this work, the natural and human sciences are seen as complementary. The experiments carried out were exactly observed and recorded. They were a part of the science curriculum of the school. At the same time Lister was interviewed. The class spoke to him and he spoke to them. This was historical science, a human science, which collected and

assessed its data in a different way from that of natural science. Dorothy Heathcote summarizes:

"The need may be to understand the objective world, or to understand the meaning of myth-making. To use real objects, or to construct meaning from beliefs of the past. Drama is a universal joint".
Collected Writings, p.137.

Here she compares the making of meaning in the objective world with the making of meaning in myths. For her, this is no more than the difference between the steelworks down the road and the lame Hephaistos in his forge under Mt.Etna. Drama is a way of facing these two expressions of reality both at once. She sees them as complementary. Mikhail Bakhtin insists on the difference between them. "To use real objects" is for him to confront an object which has no voice and which does not speak back. "To use real objects", for Dorothy Heathcote, is one of her greatest artistic problems.

"Come share with me in a situation. A visiting teacher working in a hospital for handicapped people. Nurse watching. On the floor a large man dressed in a furry costume. Children gathered round trying to mend a paw with a large bandage. Nurse. "But if he's supposed to be a proper dog, why does he have one big red velvet ear? and why not two, then they could match?"
This is the kind of question I keep trying to answer".
Collected Writings, p148.

The question Dorothy Heathcote is trying to answer is when to use a real object, correct in all its detail, and when will a makeshift stage-prop do? A stage-prop can become whatever the speaker wants to make it. I can take pieces of paper out of a box, and the class will tell me what they are. They can be what they want them to be. On the other hand, an old lady has in her handbag real tickets, a real bus pass, a real pension

book (ibid.p151). These objects are objects. They have no voice of their own. They are like objects used in natural science. In drama, however, they work powerfully as symbol or metaphor, or metonomy, (the part for the whole, the pension book for the pensioner). They are used as artifacts, and are studied as human sciences. In drama, they are not used as objects of natural science. In the class about Dr Lister, an authentic microscope was placed next to surgical instruments. As a "classic example of the power of drama to synchronize information", it meant: "This man is of the past". The past lived in the brass, in the size, in the clumsiness of the technology, in the hand-finish. Above all it existed in the actual existence of the object. This expressed the truth of a real man in a real past more quickly than a theatre prop. The senses, as it were, react to the microscope, where an imitation would need explaining. The microscope creates its own context, while an imitation would have to be put into either an imaginary or a deliberately constructed context. The real microscope indicates something about the human being in close proximity to it, as objects in a picture relate to a human being painted nearby. Hence, while Dorothy Heathcote insists on the unity of natural science and human science, she never actually investigates anything as an object. It is always related to a human context.

We find the same relation to a human context in a second area where Dorothy Heathcote is concerned with science. She frequently uses the findings of scientific research to explain her drama techniques.

Thus, she uses the classifications of culture of T.E.Hall, in

The Silent Language, Bale's classification of human interaction, in Bales Interaction Process Categories Defined and Grouped by Types, Lesley Webbs's work on play and teacher intervention, in a personal paper presented to Dorothy Heathcote, Blake and Moulton's managerial grid, in The Managerial Grid, and Irving Goffman's, Frame Analysis,(15). This last she took into her general vocabulary of role-play. A look at her use of T.E.Hall's work will give a general indication of her attitude to science.

She uses his classifications of culture to explain her own segmenting. This is a term she uses to describe how she classifies all the information given her by a class. She changes, however, his abstract names into more accessible ones.

The following are the divisions of culture of Hall. (Op.cit.p.38). He divides culture into defence, play, learning, exploration, interaction, subsistence, association, bisexuality, territoriality, temporality. Dorothy Heathcote, on the other hand, divided culture into commerce, law, communication, clothing, education, family, food, health, leisure, shelter, travel, war, work, and worship. (Wagner, p.54).

The question is how do these two compare. How has she got from one to the other?

Clearly she has adapted it. The most important part, the major triad, suggested to her a way of simplifying the complexities of "the varying ways in which we function in different social situations".

"It is impossible to contemplate all this without running into

the terrifying complexity of the word role, a complexity which is to do with the varying ways in which we function in different social situations, under so many different kinds of authority and power. It is to do with the many levels of our existence within a vast range of social patterns and the many different meanings we make of how the world uses us and our personalities".

Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.107.

This vast range is what Hall's classification seems to capture. But she has considerably adapted it. Betty Jane Wagner points this out. She herself takes the adaptation further.

"Borrowing the terminology Edward T. Hall used in The Silent Language, she calls her three classes the formal, informal, and technical levels. These are the terms Hall uses to describe three levels of functioning that take place in every culture. To avoid confusion I shall call the three sources of authority within drama, the unquestioned assumption, reliance on experts, and, using David Riesman's term, inner direction."

(Wagner Op.Cit p.178.)

Both Dorothy Heathcote and Betty Jane Wagner have used the scientific work of T.E. Hall. But, in doing so, they have adapted it to their own ends. It served to bring together several aspects of culture, and several aspects of the various activities that go on in the classroom. The major triad in particular was useful to diagnose the levels a teacher is often at with her class. She is sometimes technical, as they get the clothing right, or build a market area, with its trades and stalls, but always able to move to the informal (the intervention of a thief, or market inspector), and the formal, (the meeting about the rights of market people). At whatever level the teacher is, she is at the heart of human culture. She is both universal and particular.

Hence the scientific observations and conclusions of T.E.Hall have helped Dorothy Heathcote in her theory of universals. It

helps her to explain what a universal is, for her teaching purposes. But she has not taken over the scientific work in its entirety. She used only what she found worked in class for her.

It seems then that Dorothy Heathcote relates science and art as human activities. She is aware that there is a difference. But she does not insist on this as Mikhail Bakhtin does. Mikhail Bakhtin and Dorothy Heathcote have in common an interest in how natural science and human science relate one to the other. Again, both used the results of scientific research in their work. But they did not use it like scientists. Dorothy Heathcote used science to help her understand what is going on in a classroom, and to make her work simpler to understand when explaining it to others. Mikhail Bakhtin used the science of psychology, linguistics and economics to show precisely the difference between his own literary work and that of the linguist, Saussure, the psychologist, Sigmund Freud, and the political economist, Karl Marx.

CHAPTER ONE, SECTION ~~THREE~~ TWO.

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S THEORY OF SPEECH.

The Russian word is "slovo". The Greek word is "logos". They both mean a word and they also mean speech. Speech is language, what is spoken. But, for Mikhail Bakhtin, it is language in its "concrete reality. It is a total concrete phenomenon" (19). Speech is not reproducible. It is not repeatable. It can be quoted. It can be replied to. Speeches are related dialogically to one another. Dialogical: that is the word which explained everything for Mikhail Bakhtin. He was well aware that speech could be studied as an object, like all physical phenomena. THe science of linguistics in particular studied the composition of language beyond grammar and syntax, -the practical tools of the teacher of languages. But the spoken speech, the verbal act, was different from this science. It entered the realm of meta-linguistics.(20) Meta-linguistics, for Mikhail Bakhtin, is entirely different from linguistics. There follow two quotations, one from an early work, and one from "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski", to show his increasing awareness of a completely separate science.

"In a way clearly uncritical, the formalists project upon a system of language the constructive features of poetic works, just as they transpose distinctly linguistic elements into poetic construct.
This leads to a mistaken orientation of aesthetic theory towards linguistics, under a deceptive or additional form, and to varying degrees.
Basically, this attempt presupposes, without any proof, that the linguistic element in language, and the constructive element of a work of language, must necessarily coincide.
We suggest that they do not, and cannot, coincide since these

two phenomena come from two different origins".
Formal Method in Literary Studies, Leningrad, 1928. p.118-9.

Linguistics and this further science differ in their object. The object of linguistics is language and its subdivisions. The object of meta-linguistics is speech.

"Speech, that is, language in its living concrete reality". The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski. Russian edit. p.242. Engl. edit. p.151.

"Speech, that is language as a total concrete phenomenon". Ibid. p.244, Eng.edit. p151.

"Speech, that is, what is spoken". Ibid. p.246, Eng.Edit. p.152.

Linguistics is only one ingredient of this activity. The other activity is whatever the fact of its being spoken brings to a verbal production, that is, a context, which is unique, historical, social, and cultural.

"Spoken speech, the verbal act, as a non-repeatable unit, historically unique, and individual.
The parts of language studied in linguistics are, in principle, reproducible in an unlimited number of speeches. Paradigms of propositions are equally reproducible. It is true that the frequency of reproduction is different from the parts, (maximum reproduction for phonemes, the minimum reproduction for phrases). It is due to this reproducibility alone that they can be parts of language and assume their function.
The parts of verbal communication, however, the whole speeches, are not reproducible - although one can quote them - and are related dialogically one to the other".
Problems of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, p.307.

Speech can be quoted, but, even then, it is different, a different voice, tone, context, value. Even translation, from one language to another is impossible, - at least in any absolute way. Translation is always interpretation.

"Every system of signs, (that is, every language), no matter how tightly drawn is the group which customarily adopts it, can always be, in theory, de-coded, that is, translated into other systems of signs (other languages). Consequently there is a common logic of sign systems, a language of languages, potential and unifying, (but, of course, it cannot become a particular language, a language among languages).
But text, (as opposed to language as a system of steps to understanding) can never be translated in an absolute way, because there is no text of texts, potential and unifying".
Problems of Text in Linguistics, Philology and other Human Sciences, p.284-285.

So speech can be quoted but not repeated. It cannot be translated. Can it be written down? Can it be printed and reproduced in a book?

Mikhail Bakhtin replies that it can be written down mechanically, as a living, growing, unique fingerprint can be fixed in ink and printed on paper in many copies.

"A natural uniqueness (for example, a fingerprint, and the unrepeatable meaning of text.
The mechanical reproduction of a fingerprint in an unlimited number of copies is all that is possible. Equally, a mechanical reproduction of a text (by printing).
But the reproduction of the text by a subject - coming back to the text, re-reading, new performance, quotation, is a new event and is not repeatable in the life of the text,...(it is) a new link in the historic chain of verbal communication."
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, etc. p.284.

A text, therefore, a book, when read as part of human science, and not as an object, is unrepeatable. When a reader sits with an author as another subject, and develops his own text at the same time as the author's text, it is a new event, unique and unrepeatable.

This is the constantly recurring theme of Mikhail Bakhtin - the complete unknowability, unrepeatability, of the individually existing thing. It can only be known in a general way. It initiates knowing. All knowledge, scientific and human commences with the individually existing object.

"The question is to know whether science can deal with individually existing things, which are absolutely non-repeatable, such as speech. Do these not go beyond the limits of generalized scientific knowledge?
Of course it can.
First, the starting point of every science is a unique non-repeatable thing. Throughout the enquiry it remains observing it.
Secondly,science, and especially philosophy, can and must study the form and the specific function of these individual, existing things".
The Problems of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, p.287.

So scientific enquiry begins with an object and remains observing that object as object. Mikhail Bakhtin defends the importance of scientific knowledge. But he is concerned to preserve the difference between it and human science. There is a clear distinction between addressing an object and addressing another subject.

Mikhail Bakhtin distinguished five aspects of addressing another subject in spoken word. These aspects are:

1. The context. Speech demands context.
2. The primacy of the social. Speech is always social rather than individual.
3. The values of speech, namely, beauty, truthfulness, exactitude, exist in the actual speech itself at the time of its being spoken.
4. There is always a speaker, a hearer, and something they are talking about.
5. Every speech relates to another speech, giving rise to intertextual, or dialogic, relationships.

Implicit in each of these is the primary part played by "the other". This is particularly helpful for understanding what happens in role in a drama classroom.

1. THE CONTEXT OF SPEECH, THE NON-VERBAL SITUATION, IS INTEGRAL TO THE MEANING OF ANY SPEECH.

Mikhail Bakhtin gives an example.(21)

"There you are".
"Well, yes".

He comments that the sight of those words brings a sense of loss. On hearing the context, however, the time and the place, the people, a quick and easy interpretation is reached.

"There you are," she said, just like that. "There you are", and well, what could I say, I just said, "Well, yes".

The writer and the girl define a space. They recognize the situation, that two people have met and they are known to each other. They react to it with various values, truthfulness, more or less exactitude, or deceitfulness; "I just said, well, yes".

In 1926, Mikhail Bakhtin described three aspects of the extra verbal context.

"The extra verbal context of speech here has three aspects.
a. The spatial horizon common to the speakers. (Both understand and share the same visible area.)
b. The knowledge and understanding of the situation is equally common to the same two speakers.
c. The evaluation of the situation is also common to the two speakers".
Speech in Life and Speech in Artistic Theory, in Zvesda, 6, 1926. p.250.

This is not very clear. In b. and c. the understanding and evaluation of a situation may be what is actually being transmitted in the conversation. Some years later, he explains that the people have to be related to a common subject which

they are capable of knowing, and evaluating.

"Let us agree to call by an already familiar word, situation, the three understood aspects of the extra verbal part of speech.
The space and time of the speech: where, and when.
The object and theme of the speech: What is spoken about.
The relationship of the speakers to what is happening: evaluation".
" The Stylistics of Artistic Discourse, in Literaturnaja ucheba,3, 1931.p.76.

Here, more precisely, time and space are both part of the extra-verbal situation. What is spoken about is equally part of the context. In the third place, evaluation, the truthfulness of the speech can only be judged in the situation.
This is the first point to be made about speech. It depends for its meaning on its context, and this is non-verbal.

For the drama teacher, the context is very important. Dorothy Heathcote calls it "constructing the meaning".(22) She provides, by careful selection, the context which will enable a class to have a synchronic experience. This means that the class will have the experience of several meanings at the same time. In her work on Dr Lister (23), she wants the class to experience two historical periods, one in the last century and the other in this. She constructs eight contexts for learning to take place. This is a particular effect of the art form of drama. A carefully constructed context allows many meanings to be understood simultaneously. It works synchronically.
In the work at Stockton-on-Tees to be looked at in the next chapter, she suggests, at one point, a sleeping sentry, as Porphyro enters the castle. The subsequent conversation

between Angela, the old servant, and Porphyro, would take its meaning from that context. The danger would be heightened. The voices would be even quieter. The urgency would be intensified in the voice of Angela. In this, it is different from the context a novelist might build up word by word and line by line.

2. THE SECOND ASPECT OF SPEECH IS THAT IT IS ALWAYS SOCIAL RATHER THAN INDIVIDUAL.

Speech is addressed to someone. As soon as there are two people in conversation, there is society.

"Speech is constructed between two people who are socially organized. If there is no real person spoken to, he is pre-supposed, in the guise of the, as it were, normal representative of the social group to which the speaker belongs. Speech is oriented towards a person spoken to, oriented towards what a person is".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. p.101

The social nature of human beings is essential to Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of speech. In this, he shared a particular strand of contemporary thinking.

A few examples here might help to recall the importance of this strand in European thought (24). Mikhail Bakhtin was influenced by it, but he in turn developed it further.

"Self awareness has nothing real in itself, except in so far as it knows its reflection in other consciousnesses".
Hegel, Philosophical Propedeutics. p.100, in the French translation.

"The individual does not enclose within himself all the essence of the human being, neither in his moral being nor in his thinking being. The essence of a human being is contained only in community in the union of man with man".
Ludwig Feuerbach. Principles of the Philosophy of the Future, 1843. (No p.ref.given in Todorov.)

In the passage from Hegel, self-awareness is the recognition of self in the consciousness of another. This kind of reflective thinking is seen as the essence of being human. It is what distinguishes being human from being animal. Feuerbach is equally concerned with what makes the essence of a human being. He is forthright in saying that the essence of the human being is contained only in community.

The newness of this in the history of thought can be appreciated if we recall a parallel step in human consciousness. It was the momentous step, in the opposite direction, from community thinking to individual morality. W.F.Albright, in his book, "From Stone Age to Christianity",(25) describes the emergence of an individual conscience, in the person of the prophet, Ezechiel. This was entirely new in the history of Israel.

A similar development can be seen in the history of the Greeks. For example, Aeschylus, in, The Oresteia, resolves the problem of guilt and revenge in the community of the city.(26) Euripides, in his work some fifty years later, will resolve the same problems, not before the court of the community, but in the moral consciousness of the individual, who personally has choices to make; for example, Pentheus, in, "The Bacchae" (27).

A second important step in human consciousness occurred in the development of individualistic thinking in the Seventeenth century.(28) In the Middle Ages, the detail of the nature of man was elaborated in a theocentric world. The world revolved round man and man round God. This medieval world picture vanished with the discovery that, in fact, the world went

round the sun. The individual began to find a new place in society. Society was a human, not a divine, invention. With the development of political philosophy, under its various forms, (29) it became possible for writers, such as Hegel and Feuerbach, to assert, as they do in the two passages quoted, that the individual not only has a place in society, but that place is essentially communal. It begins with the other person, and must now recover that essential primacy of the other.

To come more immediately to the circle of Mikhail Bakhtin, the next quotation is from Herman Cohen. Herman Cohen was a contemporary and follower of Ernst Cassirer.(30) Cassirer taught at the University of Marburg. His work was an early influence on the group of friends round Mikhail Bakhtin, through one of the group, Matvei Kagan. He had studied at Marburg under Cohen. When Voloshinov died in 1936, he left an unfinished translation into Russian of the first volume of Cassirer's work, The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms, 1923. Here then is Cohen.

"Only a "you", the discovery of "you" can lead me to an understanding of my "I"."
Religion der Vernuft aus den Quellen des Judentums, 1919.
(No p.ref. given in Todorov.)

With the mention of "you" and"I" in this context, we are not far from Martin Buber, a writer whom Dorothy Heathcote also quotes. (31) She speaks of the class in front of her as a class of "thous". She is not thinking directly of their primacy in their relationship. But she is thinking of their relationship, and the deep respect for that relationship which is involved.

"The individual is a fact of existence in so far as he enters into living relationship with other individuals...the fundamental fact of human existence is man-with-man."
The Problem of Man, Aubier, Paris, 1962 p. 113.

Much earlier, in 1929, Martin Buber wrote an explanation of what he had himself called the dialogical principle. In 1923, he wrote his book, I and Thou, in which he spoke of this relationship in anecdotal terms.

He dreams often that a small animal is tearing the flesh off his arm furiously. The fury abates. He stands. He cries out. His cry, as he recalls it in the morning, is each time:

"the same cry, inarticulate but in strict rhythm, rising and falling, swelling to a fulness which my throat could not endure, were I awake, long and slow, quiet, quite slow and very long, a cry that is a song. When it ends my heart stops beating. But then, somewhere, far away, another cry moves towards me, another which is the same, the same cry uttered or sung by another voice. Yet it is not the same cry, certainly no "echo " of my cry, but rather its true rejoinder, tone for tone, not repeating mine, not even in weakened form, but corresponding to mine, answering its tones, -so much that mine, which had at first to my own ear no sound of questioning at all, now appears as questions which now all receive a response. The response is no more capable of interpretation than the question. And yet the cries that meet the one cry that is the same do not seem to be the same as one another".

As this ends, there arises in him a certitude that now it has happened. He goes on to say that the dream occurred in this way until the last time some two years ago. Then, when his own cry died away, he waited, he listened, but no call answered him. For the first time he was waiting for it. Normally it surprised him. This time it was a-waited, and it failed to come. Instead something happened to him. Instead of concentrating only on hearing the sound of the cry, he exposed himself to the distance, open to all sensation and perception.

"And then, not from a distance but from the air around me, noiselessly, came the answer. Really it did not come; it was there - so I may explain it,- even before my cry. There it was, and now, when I laid myself open to it, it let itself be received by me".

"I heard it," he said, "with every pore of my body!"

More soberly, later, in the revised edition of his book, I and Thou. (ed.1970,p.69) Martin Buber says:

"In the beginning there was relationship".

To continue with this brief outline of one strand of contemporary thinking, G.H. Meade, from the point of view of social psychology, made the same assertions about the essentially social nature of the self.

"Self consciousness refers to the capacity to evoke within ourselves a group of definite responses which belong to the other members of the same group... When we refer to human nature we refer to something essentially social. It is impossible to think of a self-hood which develops outside the social experience... One must be a member of a community to be a self".
Mind, Self and Society, in Social Psychology, 1977, p.227, 204, 228.

Similarly, Claude Levi-Straus, speaking as anthropologist, said, epigrammatically:

"To say man is to say language, to say language is to say society".
Sad Tropics, 10\18, Paris, 1965.p.351.

Mikhail Bakhtin goes further than all these. He asserts that the other, the social, precedes the individual. He does not concern himself at all with the biological, individual act of speech. He is concerned only with its social nature.

"There is no experience outside its incarnation in signs. Hence, from the outset, there cannot be even a question of a radical, qualitative difference between the external and the internal. It is not the experience which organizes the expression, but, on the contrary, it is the expression which organizes the experience, which gives it for the first time a form and which determines its direction".
Marxism and Philosophy of Language. p.101

Again, four years before, in the words of Voloshinov:

"Beyond the material expression there is no experience. What is more, the expression precedes the experience, is its cradle".
On this side of the Social, Zvezda,5, 1925, p.229.

Even more vividly, he insists:

"Only the inarticulate cry of an animal is really organized on the inside of the physiological apparatus of the individual. The most primitive human speech enunciated by an individual human organism is already organized outside itself in the inorganic conditions of the social situation, and it is so organized both in its content, its meaning, and its significance".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, p.111

And most vividly:

"Even the tears of a baby are orientated towards the mother".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language, p.104.

The basic reality of language is not in the words, but in the interaction of speech. Mikhail Bakhtin understands the word "dialogue", not simply in the narrow sense of direct verbal communication, with the voice, between one person and another, but "all verbal communication, no matter what the form". (Ibid. p.113.). All verbal communication is directly related to its context in society.

"Let us call the meaning of the complete speech its theme. In fact the theme of a speech is individual and unrepeatable, as speech itself is. It is the expression of the concrete historical situation which has given birth to the speech. It follows that the theme of speech is determined not only by linguistic forms which compose it, words, morphological and syntactical forms, sounds, intonations, but also by the extra-verbal speech of the situation. If we omit these aspects of the situation, we would not know how to understand the speech, as if we had omitted its most important words".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. p.119-120

In the case of Mikhail Bakhtin, the context is not merely the time or place, but it is also the society in which it takes place. In their book, Stylistics in Artistic Discourse, Voloshinov - Bakhtin related dialogue to the economic basis of

society. In this they followed Marx. The social communication between members of society is, in consequence, based on economics. This means the verbal interaction of those same members is based on economics. And the verbal interaction is speech, dialogue. Hence dialogue, in the narrowest sense of what happens when two people discuss something, at the same time manifests the fundamental principle of that society. In the case of Mikhail Bakhtin that principle is Marxist. That is how it has been explained here. But the basic principle could be quite otherwise. A capitalist principle, a utilitarian principle, would equally manifest itself in the ordinary conversation of ordinary people talking together. J.Hobbes and J.S.Mill would argue that the individual is prior to society. Society is a voluntary organization to serve the needs of the individual. Other philosophers would argue for a nice balance between the individual and society (J.Maritain. B.Lonergan).

The point is this. The nature of society, and what people think of society, is shown in the ordinary conversations of people. For Mikhail Bakhtin, society precedes the individual. The conscious activity of the other person precedes the self. The meaning of speech lies not in what one person says, or another, but at the interaction of the dialogue of two people at the point where one leaves off and the other takes over. It lies between the two.

Again, this is an area of considerable importance to the drama teacher. It concerns the social significance of the concrete actions performed in class. Dorothy Heathcote speaks in a way similar to that of Mikhail Bakhtin, of "meaningful

space between people". In her 1982 lecture at the National Association for the Teaching of Drama she said on the subject of social encounters;

"Yet it is not an encounter of person with person. This is a bit funny to say. It is what happens in the space between people. It is not her talking to him and him talking to her, or what ever it is in the class. It is the new dimension that comes in the space between in this particular art form. And so that is a much more subtle affair than letting everybody hear what everybody else says."
Heathcote at the National; Ed T.Goode, p.15.

In Mikhail Bakhtin's language, "letting everybody hear what everybody else has said", is a monologic expression, while the "new dimension", in "the space between people", is dialogic.

3) THE THIRD ASPECT OF SPEECH HIGHLIGHTED BY MIKHAIL BAKHTIN IS THAT VALUES EXIST IN SPEECH RATHER THAN IN THE SPEAKERS. SPEECH HAS BEAUTY, TRUTH, EXACTITUDE.

"Only speech can be beautiful, as only speech can be sincere or deceitful, courageous or timid. These qualifications, (beautiful, sincere, deceitful), only relate to the organization of speeches and works of literature in connexion with the functions which they assume in the unity of social life and, above all, in the concrete unity of the ideological horizon".
Formal Method in Literary Studies, Leningrad, 1928, p.117.

This is not as obscure as it sounds. It places the values of speech in the context of society. Speech is beautiful, or truthful, exact or inexact, in its social context. The concrete unity of the ideological horizon does not mean both parties in a conversation agree in Marxism or Capitalism. The ideological horizon here is the common web of ideas which two people have from their culture, and personal history.

It must be noted that the value of speech is not the content of speech. It is not that speech is always about ethics, about right or wrong, duty, responsibility. Rather, irrespective of content, speech itself is truthful, or deceitful, vulgar, coarse, exact, untrustworthy. It has values in itself. Mikhail Bakhtin goes to great lengths to distinguish the many different ways in which speech has values.

Speech can have implicit values. This is when the value belongs to the unexpressed common horizon. All assumed knowledge, of common speech, of language, of a particular society, or of a political and economic system,is part of the implicit horizon of speech. The list is unending of all the unexpressed assumptions we make before we begin to speak to anyone.

Explicitly, speech expresses its values verbally or non-verbally. Verbally, it expresses values in semantic and non-semantic forms. Semantic forms have phonic and structural elements. Structural elements are selected, by choice, or else are a compositional requirement.

This can be put diagrammatically.

Implicit. Explicit.

Non-verbal Verbal

Non-semantic Semantic

(Phonic) (Structural)

Elective, Compositional

Here then is what Mikhail Bakhtin says about gesture, non-verbal communication, intonation, and choice of language. As we go through in detail, we will look also at what Dorothy Heathcote does and says about these same important concepts.

a). Non-verbal values of speech are conveyed by gesture and "meaning-making movements of the body".

"Let us agree to call every evaluation which is incarnate in the material world an expression of values. The human body itself will serve as the first and original material of this expression of values, -gesture, the meaning-making movements of the body and the voice (outside articulated language)".
On the Frontiers of Literary and Linguistic Theory. Leningrad, 1930. p.227-228.

This passage emphasizes the "first and original material of this expression of values". In her book, Children Dancing, Rosamund Shreeves repeats this assumption of the dance teacher.

"Dance is a truly unique and direct form of communication, rooted deep in our physical and emotional selves. Movement is our earliest means of expression. Our bodies respond with movement far more instinctively than with words".
p. 12.

Dorothy Heathcote would balance the movement and the words so as to give preference to neither, except as the practical needs of the class would require. (cf.Wagner p.159)

b). Verbal values are expressed in two ways, semantically and non-semantically. Non-semantically means a voiced sound but not articulated in words. It means intonation. Mikhail Bakhtin puts great emphasis on this elusive element of speech.

"Intonation is always found at the boundary between verbal and non-verbal, between what is said and what is not said. Intonation discourse enters into immediate contact with life. Especially by intonation the speaker enters into contact with those spoken to: intonation is social par excellence".
Speech in Life and Artistic Theory. Zvezda, 6, 1926, p.253.

And again, four years on:

"Intonation is the most subtle and sensitive medium of social relationships which exist between speakers in a given situation. Intonation is the sound expression of social evaluation".
Style in Artistic Discourse. Literaturnaja ücheba, 5, 1930, p.78.

And:

"Intonation moves in two directions, to the hearer as an ally or witness, and towards the object of the speech, as if it were an assumed third living participant. The intonation insults it or flatters it, puts it in a low key or highlights it".
Speech in Life and Artistic Theory. p.255.

It will be explained, in the next section, how dialogic words look in two directions, towards the object, and towards the person spoken to, "with a sideways glance".

Dorothy Heathcote is well aware of the need for a tonal control.

"This means a good ear, and tonal control above the normal used or expected to be used in everyday commerce. All teachers need this skill of course, but the teachers using drama need it especially because their material is so much more than the outward form, and it can only be fully revealed by the richest range of tone, volume, pitch, and all the immense variety of a well controlled choice of modulation and vocabulary".
Collected Writings. p.33

In her explanation of teaching registers, while not explicitly mentioning intonation, tone of voice is precisely what makes the difference between one teacher's approach to the class and

another's. Betty Wagner expresses her use of teaching registers in this way.

"By teaching registers, Heathcote means the attitudes you employ in putting yourself at the service of the class... This attitude can be exhibited whether or not the teacher is in role as a character in the drama, or, if in role, in any dialect, tone, or social variation in language appropriate to the dramatic situation".

Wagner p.38.

When a teacher is in role, she is watching the class sideways, and adapting words and posture and tone to immediate needs. The word Mikhail Bakhtin used for this is "ogliadka", a sideways look (32). The sideways look, and intonation, provide a context in which the communication takes place. They are a particular application of the first aspect of speech, the context.

c). Now we come to the third kind of value expressed in speech. This time it is semantic expression, which can be either by selection or by combination.

"We have to distinguish two forms of expression of values (in poetic creation), phonic (non-semantic), and structural. Each has functions which fall into two groups -selective and compositional.
The elective function of social evaluation appears in the choice of lexical material, in the choice of epithets, metaphors, and of other figures of speech -the whole area of poetic semantics, and, finally, in the choice of a theme, in the narrow sense of choice of content.
In this way nearly all stylistics and a large part of thematics belong to the elective group.
The compositional functions of evaluation decide the hierarchical place of each verbal element in the whole work, its level, and the structure of the whole.
Here are to be found all the problems of poetic syntax, of composition in its proper sense, and of genre".

On the Frontiers of Literary and Linguistic Theory, in V bor'be za marksizm v literaturnoj nauke, Leningrad, 1930, p.232.

This is to cast an eye over everything that has ever been written. Everything that has been written has an elective area and a compositional area. By elective is meant all an author puts into the choice of subject. Decisions are made about what is to be said, about figures of speech, or the style which is best for the purpose. Words are tried, and rejected, or accepted. Images come into the head, to be matched with what is thought. Metaphors occur which seem adequate, but only so far. Others are pursued till they seem to diverge from what the author intends to say. This is the area of personal choice in which the author seeks what to say.

But once the decision has been made, the author is also the victim of the words, and phrases, of the language that is being used. Whether it is a story, or a poem, or a novel, the rules of the genre are to be observed.

In both the elective and compositional aspects of writing, values are expressed. These are values of truthfulness, of aptitude or suitability, and of beauty. The truth of speech, the accuracy, the beauty lies in the way words are selected and the way they are combined. It is in combination and in selection, in the interaction of words in the process of a writer's putting them down, that truth and beauty exist. Again we come back to the basic social nature of words, and the need for each word to have around it the context of the other words, even those that have been rejected.

4) SPEECH HAS A SPEAKER, AND AN OBJECT AND A HEARER.

We have looked so far at the context of speech, the social nature of speech, and ways in which speech carries values. In each of these "the other" has been present to the speaker. This section looks at the interaction of the speaker and "the other".

"Speech is, in a way, the scenario of an event. The living understanding of the complete sense of speech must reproduce the event, along with the mutual relationships between the speakers. It must play it anew and he who understands must take the role of the one spoken to.
But to take that role he must clearly understand the position of the other participants".
Speech in Life and Artistic Theory, p.257.

So imagine an event. Two speakers meet. There is something to talk about, say a wedding. What they understand, that is, their living understanding, must reproduce the event, along with the mutual relationships between the speakers. Their relationship is essential to that understanding. It is not sufficient to reproduce only the words. Once a person has that understanding, that common horizon, as Bakhtin says, in discussing dialogue, he can take the role of the one spoken to. But Bakhtin insists he must first clearly understand the position of the other participants.
The interaction between the participants and the object about which they are speaking has three aspects.

1. "The hierarchic value of the character or of the event which forms the content of the speech".
Speech in Life and Artistic Theory. p.266.

So someone, an author say, invents a character, Falstaff, Hans Castorp, Jane Eyre, for a reader or listener.(33) For Mikhail Bakhtin, a primary consideration for the kind of interaction which takes place is where the character comes in the social order. It is important whether the character is of a higher order or a lesser order in relation to the writer and to the reader. The meaning depends on social status.
In our random example, the "knightly disorder" of Falstaff is part of our understanding of him, as it is part of his relationship with Prince Hal. The closed bourgeois mentality of Castorp is essential for his relationship with the Medieval and Renaissance characters of the clinic where he is recovering from tuberculosis. Charlotte Bronte and the reader need to understand the social relationship between Jane Eyre and Mr Rochester, between being "in service" and being "the master".

2. The second aspect of the relationship of author and reader and the object they are discussing is:

"The degree of proximity of the person or the event to the author".

Ibid, p.266

This is the aspect which decides the choice of narrative form. In deciding what sort of account the writer is to give, the degree of proximity to the character is to be considered. The account will differ according to whether the distance is formal, or personal, or intimate, or humorous, or critical. Such considerations will decide if the account is to be an objective account or a diary, or a parody, or a harangue.

3. The third aspect deals with the listener, who never coincides completely with the author, or the other speaker, in the case of a conversation.

"The interrelationship of the hearer with the author on the one hand, and with the character on the other".
Ibid. p.266.

The two speakers, or the author and reader, can be allies. But sometimes the author is on the side of the character against the reader. Alternatively, the reader is on the side of the character against the author.

Here, then, very early in his work, Mikhail Bakhtin put great emphasis on the relationship of author, reader, and the character, or object under discussion. It was the relationship of the author, "the other", and what ever they are talking about.

Dorothy Heathcote, too, is aware of these relationships. In her work with sixth formers in a school in Stockton-on-Tees, she is teaching the poem of John Keats, Ode on the Eve of St.Agnes. These are the lines.

"Beside the portal doors
Buttressed from moonlight, stands he, and implores
all saints to give him sight of Madeline,
But for one moment, in the tedious hours,
That he might gaze and worship all unseen;
Perchance speak, kneel, touch, kiss,
- in sooth such things have been.
Ode on St Agnes Eve. V.9.

From the point of view of the four aspects of the word we have so far looked at in Mikhail Bakhtin's theory, this passage would be like this.

1. The importance of context. The context of the journey is clearly shown. The time is nighttime, in the moonlight, and the place is beside the portal doors, where there are buttresses, so it is a castle.

2. The social nature. The social nature of all poetry is difficult for Mikhail Bakhtin. Sometimes, as we shall see, he thinks it is monologic, in the sense that the poet always uses his own voice, and does not speak through other voices as a novelist does. But poems like Pushkin's Eugene Onegin do quote other voices and so are dialogic. Here John Keats speaks through the voice of Porphyro. Porphyro is "the other". His presence makes possible a human dialogue.

3. The words give values. Porphyro is in the shadow, buttressed from moonlight. So there is secrecy, timidity, thoughtfulness, and strength of purpose. He implores the saints. He is anxious yet determined to win through.

4. The relationship of author, reader and object under discussion. The author and speaker is John Keats. His hearer, to his mind, is one who may need a little convincing -hence the arch tone of cajolement in the -"in sooth such things have been".

The social level of relationship, the first of Bakhtin's aspects of relationship, is that of equals. John Keats writes of Porphyro as an equal. He likes him. He admires his youth and his love for Madeline. As a consequence of this, the style he has chosen is intimate. He knows his thoughts, and, with a touch of irony, attempts to convince the reader. He hovers on the detail of the buttress, the exceptionally short visit he

so yearns for, "just for one moment", and the longueurs of the watching hours, "in the tedious hours".
Most ironical is the delicate expression of his impatient love.

"Perchance speak, kneel, touch, kiss.."

There is a celebrated poem of Catullus where he renounces his love of his girl, and even as he thinks of her in his despair, he begins to fall voluptuously in love with her again.(34)

"scelesta, vae te, quae tibi manet vita?
quis nunc te adibit? cui videberis bella?
quem nunc amabis? cuius esse diceris?
quem basiabis? cui labella mordebis?
at tu, Catulle, destinatus obdura".

Which roughly translated means:

"You're a bitch! Damn you! Just what's left?
Who'll go with you now? Who'll even look at you?
Who will you love? Who will you belong to?
Who will you snuggle up to? Whose pushing little lips will you nibble...
There you go again, Catullus! Watch out, son!

The same hint of humour exquisitely plays about the accumulation of adjectives as Porphyro contemplates his "but for one moment". The result however is to double his endeavour to reach Madeline, while the effect on Catullus is to double his restraint. The technique of ironical interplay with the reader is the same in each case.

The second aspect of the relationship of author, character and reader is their proximity to the event. The event itself is mythological. But the feeling of lovers' tryst is a common feeling which unites reader and author. This is expressed in

the very intimate writing; "perchance kneel, touch, kiss..."

Thirdly, the interrelationship of the author and the character, and the author and the listener, are here very clear. Keats speaks in a friendly voice of Porphyro, but with a touch of persuasive irony to his reader. "In sooth, such things have been..." He is aware of both, as Catullus was.

That is a tentative look at the poem of John Keats to illustrate the several points in the theory of Mikhail Bakhtin which so far we have discussed. These points are the context, the social nature, the values expressed, the relationship of author and reader, and, under this heading, the social relationship of the speaker and character, the proximity to the event, and the interrelationship of author to character and author to listener.

We now turn to Dorothy Heathcote's work on the poem. When she introduced this poem to a class of sixth formers, she asked a boy to represent Porphyro. Several students represented what he was thinking. Others again represented Angela the beldame, and the hostile knights feasting in the hall. She slowed down the event to two lines.

"Beside the portal doors,
buttressed from moonlight, stands he".

She attempted to make a still picture of this. She asked the rather shy boy, Porphyro, where he would stand, and in what attitude. He would not have to speak. Other students would speak for him.

At the other end of the classroom she created the banquet in the hall of the castle.

In Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, the boy was attempting to identify with the Porphyro of John Keats. There was not just his unspoken gesture. There were also the voices of the students round him. Each of these would be different. It was not possible to make the identification even with a makeshift cloak round him. His thought, expressed by his representatives, came nowhere near what John Keats said he was thinking. He was putting on the style of another. But he never became one with the author. In fact, as he became nearer to the character, he began to oppose the author. The voices of his representatives were those of unmistakable Teesside teenagers telling a mate not to be so daft.

"In a place like this".
"Eyes everywhere".
"Can't go further".
"Let's go back!"

Similarly the banqueteers were laughing and fooling about, as they in turn tried to move from their notion of a drunken banquet to that of John Keats.

"Take his legs off!"
"Drunken swine!"

At the most serious moment of the still life they were with their character and against the author. Dorothy Heathcote had set in motion a polemical dialogue with the author. Mikhail Bakhtin would say this is precisely the function of narrative. Once begun, a polemical dialogue of this kind becomes less

polemical as the readers understand better the role they are to play. They become better readers. This means they become the sort of reader the book is meant for. This is not to say they lose their identity. Paradoxically, selfhood is achieved the more one identifies with another. That is the keystone of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory. In the classroom, the students reacted to the words as their Teesside selves. But they were led towards a more acceptable status of reader. To be a reader, a listener does need some shared knowledge, a shared horizon. The author leaves clues in his work as to who and what that reader is. Ross Chambers, in his book, Story and Situation, illustrates, from several short stories, how the author has a certain kind of reader in mind(35). It is the role of the reader to become that specific reader. But it is only a role. While we are in it, we are also outside it, through the sideways glance, through our watching the author and his character from our own point of view, and adding our own voice from our own situation.

Mikhail Bakhtin writes:

"We will constantly have in mind the author, the character, and the listener, not outside the artistic event, but solely in so far as they enter into the actual area of perception of the work of literature, in so far as they are necessary constituents. In return, all the definitions, which the historian of literature and of society will propose, to define an author and his characters, (the author's biography, chronological qualification of the characters to an exact degree), these are all excluded here. They do not enter directly into the structure of the work: they remain outside it.
Similarly we will only have in mind the listener whom the author himself considers, towards whom the work is orientated and who, by that very token, determines the internal structure. In no way do we envisage the real public which tells itself that it has actually read the work of such and such a writer."
Speech in Life and in Artistic Thought. p.260-261.

5). THE FIFTH POINT THAT MIKHAIL BAKHTIN MAKES ABOUT THE WORD, IS THAT EVERY SPEECH RELATES TO A PRECEDING SPEECH, GIVING RISE TO INTERTEXTUAL OR DIALOGIC RELATIONSHIPS.

"No member of a verbal community ever finds words in his language which are neutral, exempt from aspirations and evaluations of someone else, uninhabited by the voice of someone else. No, he receives the word from the voice of someone else, and the word remains full of it. It penetrates into his own context, saturated through with someone else's intentions. His own intention finds a word already inhabited".
Problems of Dostoievski's Poetics. Russian edit, Leningrad 1929, p.131. Eng.Transl. Ardis, 1973, p.167.(36).

In Voloshinov's, Boundaries between Poetics and Linguistics, (37) there is a paraphrase of this same affirmation of the key principle of intertextuality.

"Actually, for a poet, language is entirely pregnant with living intonations: it is entirely contaminated by evaluations and embryonic social orientations, and it is precisely with these that one must fight in the process of creation. It is precisely among these that such and such a linguistic form must be chosen, such and such an expression.
The artist does not receive any word under a virginal linguistic form. The word has already been made fecund by the practical situations and poetic contexts in which he has found it. This is why the work of the poet, like that of every artist, can only accomplish a limited transference of those values, limited shifts of intonation, perceived by himself and his listener on the basis of those former evaluations, former intonations".
Voloshinov, Boundaries between Poetics and Linguistics. Leningrad 1930. p.231.

This is the first principle of the relationship of speech to other speech. The words are already inhabited.
Secondly, when they are actually used by the author or speaker, at that precise moment, they are unique, and cannot be repeated. They exist, interact, and then become part of the "limited transference" someone else may be making.
In the next passage, Mikhail Bakhtin explains this unrepeatable quality of speech. It was written some time after

the previous extract, in the 1950's. He had returned to his lifelong attempt to elaborate the difference between linguistics and metalinguistics.

"Two limits of text:
Every text presupposes a system of signs which everyone can understand - that is, conventional, valid within the limits of a specific group, a language, even the language of art. In text everything that can be repeated corresponds to this first polarity, everything that can be taken outside the text, -the given features.
But at the same time, each text, (in so far as it is speech) represents something that is individual, unique, and non-repeatable, and all its meaning is there, (the intention, the reason for which it was created.) This is the part of the speech which relates to the truth, to justice, to good, to beauty, to history. In relation to this, all that is repeatable and reproducible, is material and means. It emerges to a certain extent from the limitations of linguistics and philology. This second polarity is proper to the text itself, but it is only revealed in the actual situation, and in the sequence of texts, (in the verbal communication within a certain area). This pole is not bound to the (repeatable) elements of a language system, (that is, the signs) but to other texts, (non-repeatable), by particular relationships of a dialogical nature, (and dialectical, if one abstracts from the author)".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences. p.283-284.

When they come together in actual speech, linguistics becomes metalinguistics. Universal aspects of language and philology become individual. Common features become unique. The repeatable becomes unrepeatable. Meaning exists here, in the actual situation, and in the way one text, or speech, follows on from the other. Aesthetic and moral values exist at that moment in that speech. It is a moment of something created new from what is given.

"The given and the created in verbal speech.
Speech is never the simple reflection, or expression, of something that existed before it, given, and all prepared. It always creates something that has not existed before, which is absolutely new, and which is non-repeatable, which always relates to values, (to truth, to good, to the beautiful.)
But this is never created except by starting from something

given, language, the really observed fact, the sentiment experienced, the subject himself speaking, that which was already present in his conception of the world".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, p.299.

The relationship between the two polarities, the components of speech, on the one hand, and speech itself, on the other, is that of a means to an end. Speech, unique, unrepeatable, in the actual situation and in the sequence of one speech after another, is itself an end, an object of living.
In a note before he died, he wrote:

"The recognition of repeatable elements of words, (that is, of language,) and the interpretative understanding of non-repeatable speech.
Words as means (language) and word as interpretation. The interpreting word belongs to the realm of ends. The word as ultimate goal.
Laughter and freedom. Laughter and equality".
Extracts from Notes, 1970-71, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, G.S.Bocharov, Moscow, 1979, p.338-339.

The network of speech, of people speaking together, is here seen as an end, or goal, of human activity. It is something to aim at, like laughter, or freedom, or both. Freedom is something human beings aim at and rejoice in. So is laughter. It is an end in itself, which needs no further justification beyond itself. It is like play, or climbing a mountain.(38)
It follows from this unique nature of speech, and Mikhail Bakhtin is not slow to draw the conclusion, that speech is always independent, even of the author who may put words into the mouth of his character.
Sometimes it is said that, in a novel, an author is often confused with a character. He identifies with such and such a character. He "puts himself into the novel".

It is a current preoccupation of the drama teacher that she may appear to put words into the mouths of the pupil. The pupil is told what to say and says it. Dorothy Heathcote spoke to this subject at the National Conference of N.A.T.D. in 1982. She addressed the title of Drama Teacher, Facilitator or Manipulator? (39)The same problem of the dominance of the teacher's voice among others in the classroom is behind an article by Warwick Dobson.(40)

According to Mikhail Bakhtin, it simply is not possible to put words into someone's mouth. There is always a distinction between the subject speaking the speech and the author who produces both the character and the speech. The author is producer and cannot be product. He cannot identify with his product completely.

"Even if the author - creator had created an auto-biography, or a very authentic confession, it would still remain, to the extent that he has produced it, outside the universe which is there represented.
If I tell, orally or in writing, an event I have just lived, in so far as I tell, orally or in writing, this event, I find myself already outside the space and time in which the event took place.
To identify absolutely with oneself, to identify one's "I" with the "I" which I tell of, is as impossible as to lift oneself up by the hair. No matter how real or truthful it may be, the universe represented can never be chronotopically identical with the real universe where what is represented took place and where the author of the representation is himself found.
This is why the term "image of the creator" appears unfortunate. In a piece of work, everything that becomes image and which consequently enters into its chronotopes, is product, and not producer.
The "image of the creator", if, by that term, is understood the author-creator, is a contradiction in terms. Every image is something produced and not something producing".
Remarks in Conclusion, in Questions on Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975. p.405.

These are emphatic terms. They leave no doubt that, once words are spoken, they are independent of the speaker. They belong

to the hearer. They begin to interact with the listener.

"Discourse, as in every sign generally, is inter-individual. Everything that is said, or expressed, is found outside the "soul" of the speaker, and does not belong to him alone. Discourse cannot be attributed to the speaker. The author, (the speaker), has inalienable rights over the discourse, but the hearer also has rights, and also there are the rights of those whose voices echo in the words found by the author, since there are no words which do not belong to someone. Discourse is a drama which involves three roles. It is not a duo, but a trio. It is played outside the author, and it is not permitted to interject him into it".
Problems of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, p.300-301.

The author, the listener or reader, the character, are three independent roles(41). Speech is independent of any one speaker. Rather it is the verbal interaction between three speakers, the author, his character, and the reader. What these produce is something new and unique, and truth lies only at that unrepeatable moment.

The following passage is lengthy, but it underlines the emphasis Mikhail Bakhtin placed on his primary intuition that truth is not transmitted from one to the other, but is constructed like a bridge, in the process of interaction. He is criticising formalist methods of describing how communication works. He describes their "telegraph" system, and then rejects it out of hand.

"What is transmitted is inseparable from the forms, the methods, of the concrete conditions of transmission. But the formalists, in their interpretation, tacitly presuppose a communication entirely predetermined, and unchangeable, and a transmission which is just as unchangeable. This could be systematically expressed. Two members of a society, A. (author) and B. (reader). The social relationship between them is unchangeable and firm at the moment. There is also a prepared message X which must be sent simply from A to B. In this prepared message X, "what it is", (content), is distinguished from "how it is", (form), the literary discourse being characterized by the "point of view of expression" (how).

This scheme is radically false.
In reality, the relationship between A and B are in a state of transformation, and that permanently: they continue to be modified during the process of communication.
Nor is there any prepared message X. It forms during the process of communication between A and B.
Finally, it is not transmitted from one to the other. But it is constructed between them like an ideological bridge: it is built in the process of their interaction".
Formal Methods in Literary Studies, Leningrad 1928, p.203-204.

More succinctly, towards the end of his life, Mikhail Bakhtin repeated.

"Semiotics is particularly concerned with the transmission of a prepared message with a prepared code. But, in the living word, messages are, strictly speaking, created for the first time in the process of transmission, and basically there is no code".
Extracts from notes, 1970-71, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, p.352.

To explain further the unrepeatable nature of the living word, Mikhail Bakhtin invented a series of words - heterology, heteroglossial, and heterophonic.

"In language there is no word, no neutral forms, which do not belong to someone. All language proclaims itself shot through, pierced through, with intentions, and accentuated. For the consciousness which lives in a language, the language is not an abstract system of normative forms but an heterological concrete opinion about the world. Each word feels the profession, genre, course, bias, particular work of literature, the specific person, its genesis, age, day and hour.
Each word is redolent of the context and contexts in which it has lived its intense social life. All the words and all the forms are inhabited by intentions.
In a word, inevitably, there exist the contextual harmonies, (of genre, of the present time, of the individual)".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow 1975. p.106.

Here is the new word, a "heterological" concrete opinion. The word "heterological" stresses the differences which occur between words. Words differ because of the genre of literature

they are now in, or in which they have been. The profession of the speaker, the specific person of the speaker, as well as his social status, the origin of the word, its age, the context of the particular day and hour; in these detailed ways, words take on their particular differences.
There are various different kinds of meetings and circumstances which also need to be taken into account. Words differ in the way they are used in a factory or workshop, in offices and social organizations, in meetings, and in conversations in the street. These are all different types of conversation. In listing them, Mikhail Bakhtin is pointing out that difference.

"In observing social life, we can easily isolate, beyond the artistic communication already indicated, the following types.
1. Communication in production, (in the factory, workshop, kolkhaze).
2. Communication in business, (in offices, in social organizations).
3. Familiar communications, (meetings and conversations in the street, at the canteen, and at home).
4. Ideological communication, in the precise meaning of the word, (propaganda, communication in school, science, philosophy in all its varieties)".
The Stylistics of Artistic Discourse, in Literaturnaja ücheba, 3, 1930, p.66-67.

Mikhail Bakhtin maintains that in all speech the element of difference is the dominant one. But it is not so dominant as to make all communication impossible. It sets a tension between the pull towards difference and diversity, and the pull towards uniformity and orthodoxy and common meaning. For him, the truth lies neither in the one nor the other, but in the tension at the moment of its being expressed.
In this following passage he sees the danger of a common language. He means any language, for instance, Russian,

English or French. He means the Académie Francaise, which attempts to control forms of correct French, and corresponding societies, formal or informal, in any country. Such societies attempt, by example rather than by precept, to set a standard of accepted writing and speaking. A similar process of imposing a common language can be seen in a working class society, or a peer group in school. The reason is unimpeachable. It is to achieve maximum understanding. But, in Mikhail Bakhtin's theory, difference is annulled by such an imposition of an external, though necessary, unity.

"The category of common language is the theoretical expression of the historical processes of linguistic unification and centralization.
The common language is not a given fact but is always imposed and, at every instant of the life of language, it opposes real heterology.
But at the same time, it is perfectly real as the force which overcomes heterology, which imposes certain limits, which guarantees a maximum of mutual understanding, and which is crystallized in the real, although relative, unity of the everyday spoken language, the literary language, the "correct"language".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p.83-84

The distinction is that of centripetal and centrifugal. The nub of the argument is that the novel is centrifugal. It represents the words of other people more closely than any other genre. It favours heterodoxy. It runs counter to orthodoxy. The words heterodox and orthodox have now a political content. The novel becomes a threat to political orthodoxy. This means not merely a political orthodoxy that is right, both in the sense of conservative and in the sense of ultimate correctness, but any party that is actually in power no matter its philosophy. Even when they are fictitious, and put into the mouths of characters in a book, opposing opinions

still have their own unrepeatable and unique existence. They are a threat. In this light the uproar against Salmon Rushdie's "The Satanic Verses" is comprehensible. The fiction was more of a threat than the truth. The same applies to Voltaire's "Candide", to Flaubert's "Madame Bovary", to George Eliot's "Middlemarch". In these, and in many others, society saw a threat against its cherished orthodoxies.
Poetry, on the other hand, is centripetal. It supports orthodoxy. This is because it does not feature other voices but one voice, that of the author.

"While the principal species of poetic genres develops in the stream of centripetal forces, unifying and centralizing the verbal and ideological life, the novel, and genres of literary prose attached to it, are formed historically in the current of centrifugal, de-centralizing forces".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of literature and Aesthetics, Moscow,1975,p.86.

This is the key to the theory of literary history of Mikhail Bakhtin. The growth of the novel and the weakness of central political authority are related. The novel expanded during periods when political power at the centre was weak. He does not say that the novel created that weakness. He does not make it a cause, a rebel. Rather it exploits the weakness and is used by writers when they find that there is less centralizing power.

"The embryos of the prose novel appear in the polyglot and heterological world of the Hellenistic period, in Imperial Rome, in the process of the decomposition and decadence of the verbal and ideological centralism of the medieval church. Similarly, in the modern period, the spread of the novel is always joined with the decomposition of stable, verbal and ideological systems, and, on the other hand, it is joined with the reinforcing of the linguistic heterology, and its impregnation by intention, as much at the inside of a literary dialect as outside it generally".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p.182.

Thus speech, in the prose novel, is centrifugal. Each word is straining against the imposition of meaning. Society, too, is at times centrifugal, when a weak government cannot impose a centralized authority. The novel flourished as the expression of that weakness.

This is a broad vision of the history of the novel. Mikhail Bakhtin himself saw it as an original contribution to the history of ideas. Traditional analysts of stylistics united poetry and the novel in a unified scheme. It misunderstood the way in which the speech of others is represented in the novel. When they heard of Bakhtin's wide vision of literature in society, Todorov writes that it was like the world of Ptolemy when faced with the world of Galileo. Bakhtin himself thought his own theory was like an orchestrated piece of music, which they had chosen to play on the piano.

"Traditional stylistics misunderstood this sort of assemblage of language and styles in a superior unity. It did not know how to approach the particular social dialogue of language in the novel. Hence stylistic analysis does not embrace the novel as a whole, but only such and such a subordinate stylistic level.
The specialist leaves on one side the fundamental specific feature of the novel genre: he transforms the object of study, and, in place of the novel's style, analyses in fact something entirely different. He transposes to the piano a theme symphonically orchestrated".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p.76-77.

The largeness of the scale upon which Mikhail Bakhtin is thinking is all the more impressive when compared with the list of his opponents. These are some of those who have tried to impose on the natural centrifugal force of speech, especially as represented in literature, a unifying system.

"The poetics of Aristotle, of Augustine, the medieval church's theory of the "common language of truth", the Cartesian theory of neo-classicism, the abstract universalism of Leibniz, (the idea of a universal grammar), the concrete ideologism of Humboldt, whatever the nuances which separate them, express the same centripetal forces of the socio-linguistic and ideological life. They serve the same objective of centralization and unification of European languages".
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p.84.

This reverses the traditional understanding of several heroes. The unities of the Oedipus Rex, the Civitas Dei of Augustine, the Summa Theologiae of Aquinas, A Discourse on Method of Descartes, the great universal schemes of Leibniz and Spinoza, the "Enlightenment", have been placed in the role of great uniting forces, both literary and political. But they are not the only forces. Centrifugal forces were also at work. The Civitas Dei was written when the Goths were at the gates of Rome.(42) The formal disciplines of tragedy, and the rigour of plot, were transformed by Euripides.(43) The metaphysics of Aquinas were opposed both by the finer distinctions of Duns Scotus, and the empiricism of William of Ocham.(44) The Enlightenment found its counter movement in the writings of Giambattista Vico.(45) The movement traceable to this latter has survived to the present day in the contemporary theories of structuralism and new critical theory.(46)

It is tempting to dismiss Mikhail Bakhtin as a student of Karl Marx, who obediently, or diplomatically, applied the theory of thesis, antithesis, synthesis to history in an uncritical way. But the fact is that his particular approach is much older than Marx. Because of the theory of dialogue which this essay describes, the opposition to any absolute statement is in the nature of language itself. It is not too much to say that

Mikhail Bakhtin, with his older idea of truth, paves a way for a post-communist, post-Marxist view of truth as being between people, and not held by any one person or party at any one time.

We have looked at five features of speech. Each one might be regarded as an aspect of the relationship between oneself and "the other". The context of time and place, the participants, their common horizon of knowledge, are an encounter of one and "the other". "The other" is primary. The values which speech has, of truthfulness, or beauty, only occur in this relationship. The reader and listener relate to each other and to the object about which they are speaking. Finally the relationship of self and "the other " gives rise to inter-textuality.

In this chapter we have proceeded by magnification. We began with a wide scope. Among all the works of Mikhail Bakhtin we selected what he had to say about natural and human science. From this we selected the word. From the word we selected its active role in speech and in genre. We isolated five features of speech, of which the last one is intertextuality. Our next section will examine intertextuality, in high magnification, as it were.

CHAPTER ONE, SECTION TWO, PART TWO.

INTERTEXTUALITY.

We now have come to the area of the work of Mikhail Bakhtin which will take all the rest of this chapter. We have come gradually from his theory of the word to that of speech, and now we come to the essence of his theory of speech, intertextuality.

To recapitulate, we have seen that speech is always in the presence of " the other". It is "the other" that provides speech with a context. The primacy of the "the other" is essential to the social nature of speech. The presence of "the other" is the basis of its having values such as truth and beauty. The speaker, "the other", and the object they are talking about relate creatively, inventing their relationship here and now. Speech is centrifugal and heterodox. Orthodoxy has to be imposed on it.

What then happens when orthodoxy is imposed? What is the balance between centripetal and centrifugal, between familiar and strange, between known and unknown?

It is called intertextuality. There is no speech without relationship to other speeches. At its most elementary, every relation between two speeches is intertextual.

"Two verbal works, two speeches, juxta-posed one to the other, enter the particular type of semantic relations which we call dialogic".

"The dialogic relations are all the semantic relations between all the speech at the heart of verbal communication".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology and other Human Sciences, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, S.G.Bocharov. Moscow, 1979, p.297, 296.

This is the central part of the theory of speech of Mikhail Bakhtin. We will proceed from the most general remarks which he made to the most particular. It must however be kept in mind that he was too much concerned with literature and the application of his theory to take the time to develop a coherent theory. What apparent coherence there is has been put together from the original sources which till now have been in Russian or French. He did not express his theory logically, because he was too eager to apply it to the practical understanding of literature. Only for reasons of explanation does this essay attempt to put a logical framework on his ideas.

Intertextuality is the specific quality of speech when it is used in conversation.

"These (dialogical) relations are profoundly specific, and cannot be classified with logical relationships of linguistic or psychological or mechanical or any other kind of natural relationships. It is a particular type of semantic relation, whose parts must be whole speeches, (or considered as whole speeches, or potentially whole speeches), behind which are held, and in which are expressed, real or potential subjects of the word, the authors of the speech in question".
The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology and other Human Sciences, p.303

Mikhail Bakhtin makes two points about intertextuality here. He says that the speeches must be whole. Secondly he stresses the relation of the author in the speech to the speech.

1. The wholeness of the speech.

This means that the speeches are at the point where they have provoked a reply.

"The completeness of speech is partly the internal aspect of changing the subject of speech.

The change can only happen because the speaker has said, or written, everything he wanted to say at that precise moment, or in those circumstances.
The first criterion, and the most important for the completeness of the speech, is the possibility of replying to it; more exactly and more generally, of occupying, by relation to it, a position of response... Speech must be completed in one way or another in order to be able to react to it".
Problems of Discursive Genres, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, S.G.Bocharov, Moscow, 1979, p.255.

2. Mikhail Bakhtin also stresses the relation of the author in the speech to the speech. In the speeches are held, and expressed, the real or potential subjects of the word, the authors of the speech in question.

A word of explanation here.

When we learn a language, say French, at the beginning, the words and sentences to which the student is introduced by the teacher are independent of their speaker. But, very quickly, the teacher introduces little episodes, for example, "a la boulangerie", or "a la gare". The adding of the context of the shop and the people, and the goods to buy and sell, makes the meaning clearer. The fact that a person is speaking the words makes them easier to understand. The person of the speaker, in this humble example, makes all the difference to the understanding of the sentence. The person speaking is important.

What happens in ordinary speech happens also in the novel. In a novel we read what people think and say, and so come to understand their character. Character is shown in what people say. However, while we are conscious of the character in the novel from what he or she says or does, we are less conscious of the author behind the novel itself, behind the characters and speeches, who has actually made them up.

Mikhail Bakhtin points out that there is a whole genre of literature where the author actually sits next to the reader, as it were, and both author and reader observe the character together. Examples of this would be Lawrence Sterne, in "Tristam Shandy", and Henry Fielding in "Tom Jones".

"To become dialogical, logical relationships and object, semantic relations must be incarnate, as has already been said. That is, they must enter into another sphere of existence, becoming discourse, that is, speech, and receive an author, that is, a creator of this particular speech, whose position the speech in its turn expresses. In this sense every speech has an author, whom we hear in the speech itself as its creator...
The dialogical reaction makes personal the speech to which it reacts".
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski. p.152. (47)

In dialogical speech the author is consciously present. "Incarnate" is the strong theological word used by Mikhail Bakhtin. It properly refers to the manhood of Jesus Christ in its specific and unique existence. Like any human being his unique individuality is not able to be known, but only penetrated in depth to a more or less degree. There is no limit to what can be learnt. The only limit springs from the nature of language. Language, while it reveals, also conceals. That is a paradox. It may be understood in this way.
In "The Prehistory of Discourse in the Novel", Mikhail Bakhtin speaks of the problem of translating from one language into another: for example, from French into English, from a foreign language into a maternal or native language. Une cigarette, in French does not mean a cigarette in English. You've only to smoke one to know that they are a very different experience. A Zitanes and a Marlborough are entirely different. Their smell, the social background, the gestures they involve, their

implications are very different. Une cigarette, when translated as a cigarette in this sense conceals as much as it reveals. This applies to a deux-chevaux and Rover Metro, a screwdriver and a tourne-visse.

"In the process of literary creation, the reciprocal illumination of maternal language and a foreign language, (where the particular work contains such), underlines and makes objective precisely the different conception of the world which each language has, its proper form and the axiological system which belongs to it.
For the intelligence which creates a literary work, it is not the phonetic system of the native language, its morphological details, its abstract vocabulary, which came to light in the area illuminated by the foreign language, but precisely that which makes of a language a concrete and absolutely untranslatable conception of the world: to be precise, the style of the language as a whole.
The Prehistory of Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p,427.

The point that is being made here is that every representation in language puts us in contact with the speaker of the language. A most obvious example is the case of some one speaking a foreign language. As soon as we are aware what the language is, we are able to identify who is speaking. We know the language, for instance, French, and from her use of dialects, if the speaker is a woman, and from her style of language, in all its variety, even as far as her most individual and idiosyncratic expressions, we can know her. Such personal forms, however, belong to the private use of language in spoken speech rather than to the literary use. The fact that a writer has a hesitant delivery, or a particular pronunciation, does not affect written work. Literary representation, which cannot count on our intimacy with the characters which it deals with, only knows collective subjects of speech.

"All these (non-literary) forms even where they approach the highest point of literary representation, as, for example, in certain genres of double-voiced rhetoric, (parodic stylization) are oriented towards the speech of an individual".

Here Mikhail Bakhtin is referring to private communication between individuals. On the other hand:

"In the authentic novel is felt behind each speech the nature of social languages, with their logical and internal necessity. The image of such language in the novel is the image of the social horizon, or the social ideologeme sewn into its speech, into its language."
Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975,p.167-169.

Thus there are two kinds of intertextuality. There is a quality of all speech and a quality of written speech. All speech involves at least two subjects and is therefore a potential dialogue. All speech has an intertextual dimension. In an earlier work, quoting the aphorism, "Le style c'est l'homme meme", Mikhail Bakhtin continues:

"Style is human, but we can say style is two humans, or more exactly, a human in his social group, incarnated by his approved representer, the listener, who participates actively in the internal and external speech of the former".
Discourse in Life, and Discourse in Artistic Theory, in Zvezda, 6, 1926, p.265.

Ten years later Mikhail Bakhtin widened the scope of intertextuality to include speech that has preceded a dialogue, speech that in one way or another has been said before on a previous occasion. An encounter with that former discourse always occurs.

"The dialogical orientation is of course characteristic of all discourse. It is the natural goal of all living discourse.

> Discourse meets the discourses of someone else on all the roads which lead to a particular object, and it cannot avoid entering a living and intense interaction with it.
> Only the mythical "Adam", with his first speech addressing a virginal world which has not yet been spoken, the solitary Adam, could truly avoid the absolutely mutual reorientation in respect of the discourse of another person which is brought about on the road to an object.
> Discourse in the Novel, in Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, Moscow, 1975, p.92.

Intertextuality is a quality of all speech. Even "things", as opposed to words, have been touched by words in some former state, which cannot be avoided in the subsequent speaking of them.

It is a quality which can be weaker or stronger, but is nonetheless everywhere in discourse.

Mikhail Bakhtin often makes simple oppositions, on the basis of a simple distinction between the presence and the absence of textuality. He opposes monologue and dialogue, poetry and prose, the novel and all other genres, literature and non-literature.(48) But because at the same time he believes that intertextuality is a difference of degree, and not of kind, he often makes statements which are flagrantly contradictory.

For example, he distinguishes poetry and prose, on the grounds that the poet does not distribute speech to other voices. He does not represent people speaking, but rather he speaks himself. He creates an image in words of an object in the world. His concern is with his word and the object. The novelist, on the other hand, is concerned with the word and its speakers.

And then he contradicts himself. Even the purely lyrical poet distributes speeches to foreign voices.

"Is not every writer, (even the purely lyrical poet), is he not always a dramatist, in so far as he distributes all the speeches to foreign voices, including to the "image of the author", just as they are distributed to all the other masks of the author?"

The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, in The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation, Moscow, 1975,p .288-289.

This passage shows the contradictory nature of some of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory. But his essential position is that intertextuality is a quality of all speech, yet, in some speech, it is more obviously present than in others.

The passage also confirms an assumption of this paper that writers and dramatists, the novel and the drama, are the same from the point of view of the central theme of Mikhail Bakhtin's work. Indeed, from this one comparison here, it would seem that the dramatist is the distributor par excellence of speeches to other voices(49).

That a rigid distinction between the novel and drama is unnecessary to Mikhail Bakhtin becomes clearer from a consideration of his theory of genre. His theory of genre is a theory of blurred or mixed genres. This will be one of the features of his writings that is useful to drama teachers. They are not in any way dependent on him. But we will see that what he has to say about "the other", blurred genres, the sideways look, and intertextuality makes possible a fresh look at the concepts of role, subtext, genre, and the universal.

CHAPTER ONE, SECTION THREE.

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S THEORY OF SPEECH APPLIED TO NARRATIVE.

INTRODUCTION.

We began, in section one, with the difference, for Mikhail Bakhtin, between natural and human science. This was to isolate that quality in human science which he called dialogue.

In a second section, we traced the dialogical quality in speech, in dialogue, in genre. He called it intertextuality. Other words which he used to describe its subtle aspects were heteroglossia, dialogicality, polyphony. We have looked at its several features, its context, its social nature, its values, its relationship with speaker, listener and object, and its reference to other voices. We specifically indicated the quality of "the other", the blurring of genre, and the "sideways look".

In his book, "The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski", Mikhail Bakhtin explains dialogicality and applies it to specific works of Dostoievski. He examines four artistic verbal phenomena, stylization, parody, polemic, and dialogue. He applies to them his theory of polyphony. We will see how he does it and what is the effect. We will then attempt to apply the theory of polyphony to Dorothy Heathcote's work on the classroom teaching of a text, and to the priest's reading of a liturgical text in church.

SOME GENERAL REMARKS.

Mikhail Bakhtin's first distinction is almost predictable. He distinguishes single-directed speech from represented speech. There is speech that relates to a thing, and speech that relates to a person. This is the distinction we looked at in section one between natural and human science.

Single-directed speech is speech about an object. The words are necessarily connected with a world out there, and with the objects in it. To understand a word, you look at the object. A word in a dictionary is defined by its object. A scientific explanation, a legal document, the instructions for making a flan, or changing a car headlamp, stand or fall by their comparison with an actual object or situation in the real world out there. They are "direct,linear, object-oriented words, which denominate, inform, express, or represent." They have direct reference to an object. They are intended "for direct, object-oriented comprehension". (50)

They are distinguished from speech that represents other speech. This is the second kind of speech. Words are the object. This second kind refers to words. For example, a newspaper article might quote the words of a prime minister. The words quoted are now in a different plane from their original expression. They are represented by the newspaper writer, in a different context.

Another example is an author who writes a novel. It is the particular quality of the novel that it represents the thoughts, words and intentions of the characters. They

themselves may be giving a scientific lecture, or having a personal argument, but in the novel, they are represented by the author for his own purposes, in a new plane.

In both these examples, there are two centres of speech. Two people discuss something, or plan an action. They speak about an object. At the same time, those words are represented to the reader by the author.

Now, at one time, this is monological, at another, it is dialogical.

In the first example, the novel, the monological speech depends on the dialogical. The character who speaks is dependent on the author who is quoting him, or her, to the reader. It is clear that there is a difference between the first example, a journalist who quotes the prime minister, and the second, a novelist who has invented both the characters and the object about which they are speaking. The novelist pre-determines the characters and invents their speech as accurately as possible to display that character. The more successful the author is, in matching speech and character, the more life-like will the character be. The reader will feel the character has an almost independent existence. But the character remains a product of the novelist's imagination. It can never be free of this bond with the author. In this sense it is called monological. The speech of others is quoted or represented for a purpose of the author's own. Similarly, a judge will quote a witness to a murder, and a historian will quote a document to support a conclusion.

Mikhail Bakhtin feels that literature has always been understood to be monological.(51) The major critical emphasis

of this century has assumed that literature is monological, even where it appears to be dialogical, as in the novel. Criticism has assumed the author is responsible for the text. Hence, in examining form and content, as has already been noted, the author was assumed to have something to say, and a way in which to say it. For example, this assumption lay behind the French student's "Explication du texte". Again, F.R.Leavis stressed the personal history and intentions of an author.(52)

Other critics, for example, Ferdinand de Saussure, used linguistic analysis as a critical tool. But it was also a philosophical concept. As a concept, it questioned the necessary connexion between words and their object. Words, it was claimed, have more to do with morphology and semantics than with objects and situations. The author no longer has to conform to reality, but to other authors and other texts. At the same time, anthropology, for example, the work of Claude Levi-Strauss, was exploring the sign-making function of humans. What makes us specifically human is our ability to make signs.(53)

From these two sources, the one philosophical, the other anthropological, according to Terence Hawkes, in his Structuralism and Semiotics (54), structuralism and deconstruction emerged in the practice of criticism. They are already part of classroom language and examination practice. They emphasize the author, the medium of communication, and the listener's active part in understanding. Reading is a cultural transaction.

The point of this summary of current critical thinking is that

Mikhail Bakhtin would have no part in it. He opposed the linguistics of Saussure. While he undoubtedly emphasized the author and the listener, the literary genre, the uniqueness of the word, these major themes of his theory have their roots in literature and not in linguistic philosophy, or in anthropology. At times he seems to be saying the same things as the structuralists, and he has been claimed for their cause(55). But his roots are in existential philosophy and his concern is with literature, and its practical influence on political and social life. This is to be emphasized.

Mikhail Bakhtin did not approach dialogue as a theologian, or a philosopher, or any kind of scientist. His approach was literary. Literature led him to dialogue. It led him to mixed genre, to "the other", to the"sideways look".

Some have used other writers to explain what goes on in the drama classroom. David Davis used Vygotsky in a lecture entitled "Drama is a weapon". (56) Dorothy Heathcote used Piaget, (Collected Writings p.132), to give drama a look of respectability, as she says herself (Op.cit. ad loc.)! This is not what Mikhail Bakhtin is doing. He does not take a theory from psychology, or sociology, and show how it helps the understanding of his subject. He reads literature. Literature leads him to its original source in dialogue.

Consequently to apply his theory to drama is quite different from applying an alien science. It comes as it were from the nature of text itself, spilling out from inside, where other theories seek to impose from the outside.

He never claimed to have a new theory. Rather he had an instinct that there was more to literature than an author

writing and a reader reading, no matter how actively. There was more to dialogue than one person speaking and then the other, and a compromise. He was fascinated:

"by a group of artistic-verbal phenomena which has long attracted the attention of both literary scholars and linguists. They are stylization, parody, skaz, and dialogue... A single trait is common to all these phenomena, despite their essential differences: in all of them the word has a double -directedness: it is directed both towards the object of speech, like an ordinary word, and towards another word, towards another person's speech."
Problems of the Poetics.p.153.

As a result of this a "totally new" approach to speech is required, an approach which does not fit within the bounds of stylistic or linguistic investigations.

Thus we come to a third type of speech, the dialogical double-voiced word. It is not single-voiced, and single-directed to its object. Nor does it quote or represent speech as its object, as monological speech does, where the author was quoting or representing for his own purposes.

Rather it is double-voiced, polyphonic, dialogical. Dialogue in this sense occurs when two equally-weighted (which means neither is subordinated to the other) and directly object-oriented utterances come together.

"Two equally and directly object-oriented words within a single context cannot stand side by side without dialogically intersecting, regardless of whether they corroborate one another, or have any other sort of dialogical relationship, (the relationship of question and answer, for instance). Two equal-weighted words which speak to the same subject, once they have been together, must inevitably become orientated one to another. Two embodied thoughts cannot lie side by side like two objects: they must come into inner contact, i.e. they must enter a semantic bond."
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski.p.156.

This is the third type of speech described by Mikhail Bakhtin.

His description is characteristically intractable, and he is not well served by his curious translator. The passage is a tissue of metaphors - side by side, equal weighted, orientated, embodied, inner contact, semantic bond. To understand what he meant we have the advantage of four applications which he made of his theory, to stylization and skaz, parody, polemic and internal dialogue.

1. STYLIZATION AND "SKAZ".

Stylization means to put on the style of another person, in the direction of that person's intentions. You follow as nearly as possible the intentions of the other person. You cooperate with them. So an author might narrate another person's story, or put himself or herself in the place of a character and write in the first person.

"Stylization stylizes another style in the direction of that style's own tasks.
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski p.160.

When a teacher takes a role in a classroom drama, there is seldom an attempt to imitate a model for the role. Rather the teacher takes on the style of the role, selects certain gestures, tricks of speech, vocabulary. An actor taking a part in a play, an author speaking in the style of a character, are both stylizing that person.

They speak the words their character would speak. They assume and uphold the meaning which they have in the context of their character. But they do not fall in exactly with them, as in imitation. They take up the style of these words and go along with it. This appears to be what Dorothy Heathcote is

referring to when she describes the role a teacher may take in the classroom.

"The adult joke about my operation is an excellent example of this. The first account of the operation will be concerned with seeking to put the experience into perspective by communication, but later accounts will take on order, style, selection, so that, later, the account will be not a re-living of the actual event, (which is now in perspective), but a re-experience of the effectiveness of the previous tellings, with one eye upon the recipient."
Collected Writings. p.49-50.

When she takes the role of the director of the clinic in the classroom in Stockton-on-Tees, she speaks to the reception, takes off her bleeper, sits in front of the students, and looks at them. She selects bits of the life of a director rather than attempt to act a director. She puts on the style. She uses the words and the gestures. She conjures the environment of the hospital, the nurse, the reception hall, the bleeper. But she is not imitating the director.

"Having penetrated into another person's word, and having made itself at home in it, the author's idea does not collide with the person's idea but rather follows the direction of that idea, merely making that direction conditional."
The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski.p.160.

The teacher, in the instance of the clinic, has penetrated the words of the director of the clinic. She has made herself at home in them. But her idea does not collide with the idea of the director and her patients. The teacher, here Dorothy Heathcote, follows the idea of the director, but at the same time she has students who want to be useful in the clinic and who also want to pass their A-level exams. She takes these along the direction of the director and the clinic. At the same time, however, by creating the style of the director of

the clinic, she has also made that clinic and that director conditional and not absolute. The director is changeable, and usable, and approachable, and for long periods can be forgotten about, until the role is needed again to tighten the work by creating a further tension.

In the terms used by Dorothy Heathcote, the director and the clinic are "the great lie". This framework, of the drama, enables the students to enter a conditional and relative world. (57)

Mikhail Bakhtin would say that what makes the conditional and relative nature of "the great lie" is the double voice, or dialogical language, used by the teacher. Once you accept that you are addressing another person, then you must take into account what that other person is going to say. What you yourself are going to say becomes dependent on that other. It becomes relative, and conditional. Were the teacher to use monologic language, as sometimes, say, in a science lesson, there would be an absoluteness present, created by that language. It must be added that even in a science class, when the teacher and students are concentrating on some formula, or mathematical demonstration, there is still a fair amount of dialogical interplay. The distinction between monologue and dialogue is, even in Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, one of degree rather one of quality.

In the clinic, however, the same words in the same context carry the voices of the teacher and the examination students, and, at the same time, the voices of the director of the clinic and her student helpers. The teacher uses the same words, but now they are relative to the class.

Thus, in a narrated story, for example, where a teacher is telling a story in class, the two voices are those of the narrator of the story, and of the person telling the story to the audience, in this case the teacher. The teacher who tells the story of e.g. "Where the Wild Things Are", takes the class along the same direction as the author - narrator of the story,(58). But the teacher does not imitate the author. She puts on the style of the author, but now, because it is she who is telling it, it can be stopped, and changed, and is no longer absolute, but conditional.

Gavin Bolton, in much of his work, has students work in pairs, telling each other an event which has occurred, (58). As each says the story, at the moment of delivery, it is, in the words of Mikhail Bakhtin, absolute. But when it is repeated by another voice alongside it, it is rendered conditional.

Mikhail Bakhtin isolates a particular and common type of stylization which he calls by an untranslatable word, "skaz". When an author in a narrated story puts on the dialect and speech idiosyncrasies of the narrator, he uses "Skaz". So Sir Walter Scott often adopts the language of his characters; for example, the speeches of David Deans, or the lawyer, Mr Saddletree, to name but two characters in The Heart of Midlothian. Authors of short stories, such as Edgar Allen Poe, in The Facts in the case of Mr. Aldemar, often narrate a whole tale in the persona of their character. Dorothy Heathcote puts on the style of a director of a clinic, or Henry Vlll, or a workman ready for "summat". In all these cases, an extreme form of stylization is being used -"skaz".

"The narrator's own story, in refracting the author's

intention, does not diverge from its own straight path, and remains faithful to the tones and intonations which are truly typical for it"

Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski.p.160

2. PARODY.

The second application of the double-voiced word is to parody. In parody, the opposite occurs to what happens in stylization. The voices, far from merging, are "hostilely counterpoised". The author speaks through another person's words, but, in contrast to stylization, he introduces a semantic direction into that word which is diametrically opposed to its original direction. Mikhail Bakhtin continues:

"The deliberate perceptibility of the other person's word in the parody must be particularly sharp and distinct. The author's intentions, on the other hand, must be more individualized and filled with content."

Problems in the Poetics etc. p.160.

This means that, in parody, the original statement, or speech, is perceived with particular sharpness and distinctness. In the teaching of a set book, this in itself would be no mean achievement. The teacher could parody a book, poem, or line, and so make the original line clear to the student. More than this, however, the teacher's intentions, and the author's intentions, must be more individualized. We shall see shortly how Dorothy Heathcote, in her parodies of Keats' poem, Ode on St Agnes' Eve, has her own individual intention and her own melodramatic content, her adventure story, and in general, her own ideas of the poems and books under discussion.

Parodies can be of very different kinds, according to Mikhail Bakhtin. The parody may be of another's style. The way of looking, thinking, or speaking, of another can be parodied,

both as a type of social being and as an individual character. The parody can be of superficial forms of words, or of the deepest principles of another's speech. It can be an end in itself, or serve a further purpose.

The main point is that the author's aspiration, and that of the speaker, or narrator, or character, are different, whereas in stylization and the narrated story, both aspirations are directed towards a single end.

In the lesson conducted by Dorothy Heathcote, there are several examples of parody. The clinic itself with its eccentric patients is a parody of world literature. The gothic story of Porphyro seeking a bride is a parody of the poem. Each of the presentations of a moral dilemma by the students is a parody. They use the words of the author, but not in the author's meaning. They utter them with dull intonation, often not knowing what the words mean. Sometimes they are understood in the very opposite meaning. Thus the boys struggle to express the remark of Peter Grimes, "Because I enjoy it." This at least is their version of why Peter Grimes does what he does. It also paraphrases the two lines:

"a father's pleasure, when his toil is done,
to plague and torture thus an only son."
Everyman Book of Narrative Verse p84.

The boys are unable to find a way in which to say this. One tries sadistically. He tries ironically. He tries sarcastically. The listeners chorus their disagreement. He attempts to say the words as if he meant them. But he overacts, and makes plain the parody as he puts his own meanings alongside the more serious purposes of George Crabbe.

Again, in the scene in the banqueting hall, which we shall look at in chapter four, the boys parody eating and serving. Dorothy Heathcote herself brings out the parody by referring to the problem of the gravy.

Again, at the portal, Porphyro holds his long gesture. But it represents a gothic adventure story, and parodies what Keats was actually getting at.

When she presents her clients in the clinic, the director introduces them with descriptions which are parodies of the characters in the set books. Maria Eschen, who is fond of jokes but goes too far, the patient who hides knives, (Bedevere), and the one who has an obsession with horses' tails, (Tam O'Shanter).

In the final stages of the work, on the last day, the families of each client in the clinic explain why their relative should be of value in the world. They use words from the original authors. But these sentences and words are now being used to justify a release from the clinic. They are now double-directed. They have the original intention of the author, and the added intention of the relative in the director's office of the clinic. The speeches are double-voiced. They are also a parody of the world of literature, just as the clinic itself is a parody of that world.

To describe this in more detail, the families of the various clients gather round in the clinic. The clients are symbolized by empty chairs. They stand in groups "as you feel you are together".

The debate now rages over whether Michael Henshard is fit for society, or King Arthur is a better king than Henry Tudor, or

what precisely are the hallucinations of Tam O'Shanter.
The questions, which Dorothy Heathcote put to the students as director of the clinic, are now put by the students. They now have the vocabulary. Phrases from the original texts, names, places, references are now used in this new and different context, and with a different purpose: that of setting their relatives free from the clinic.
Mikhail Bakhtin ends his remarks on parody by referring back to his remarks on stylization. Whenever anyone stylizes the language and accent of another, there is always a hint of parody. One might conclude that anyone who plays a role cannot fail to have a hint of parody.
Irony, he claims, is analogous to parody, in the case where the aspiration communicated to the other person's word is hostile to it.

"Another person's words, when introduced into our speech inevitably take on a new aspect, - our understanding and valuation: i.e. the other person's words become double-voiced. But the interrelationship between the two voices can vary. Alone the repetition of another person's statement in the form of a question leads to a collision of two interpretations in a single word: we are not only asking a question. We are problematizing another person's statement. Our practical everyday speech is full of the words of other people: we merge our voice completely with some of them, forgetting whose they are: others we take as authoritative, using them to support our own words: still others we people with aspirations of our own which are foreign or hostile to them."
Problems of the Poetics, p161-162

3. THE HIDDEN POLEMIC.

We have examined two particular forms of narrative, stylization and parody. We now look at a third type, where the words of the other person are not used to express an author's intentions, but where they remain beyond the bounds of that

speech. They influence, and even determine, the speech of the author. This happens in the hidden polemic and in the hidden dialogue.

Mikhail Bakhtin explains the hidden polemic as the phenomenon where the author's word is directed towards its object, as every word is, but, in addition, every statement about the object is so constructed that, besides expressing its object-oriented meaning, it strikes a blow at the other person's word about the same topic, and at the other person's statement about the same object. Directed at its object, the word collides within the object itself with the other person's word.The other person's word is not reproduced. It is implied. But the entire structure of the speech would be completely different if this reaction to the implied word were not present.

Mikhail Bakhtin gives an example from Crime and Punishment by Dostoievski.

Raskolnikov has just heard, in a letter, that his sister is to marry a rich man, to provide for Raskolnikov himself. She is to sacrifice herself for him.

"It is clear that none other than Rodion Romanovich Raskolnikov is involved here, and is in the foreground. Yes, well, and we can arrange his happiness, pay his way at the University, make him a partner at the office, assure his whole future: perhaps in time he will be a rich man, honoured, respected, perhaps in time he'll even end his days a famous man.
But what of mother? well, after all, this is her Rodya, her precious Rodya, her first born! Well, for such a first-born son, how could she hesitate to sacrifice even such a daughter? Oh, kind and unjust hearts.
But what of it? -we won't refuse Sonya's fate, will we? Sonechka, Sonechka Marmeladova, eternal Sonechka, so long as the world stands.
Have either of you measured the sacrifice fully? Is it right? Can you manage it? Is it any use? Does it make sense?
"Do you know, Dunechka, that Sonya's fate is no more wretched

than your fate with Mr Luzlion. There is no question of love here", writes mama.
And what if, besides love, there can be no respect, either. What if, on the contrary, there already exists revulsion, contempt, and loathing? What then?"
Problems of the Poetics p.60.

In this paragraph every word is double-voiced. Every word contains a conflict of voices.

"It is clear that..." Rodion's sister has said, in her letter, that she is doing it - marrying a rich man, - to benefit her brother. "It is clear" that he is in the foreground. Her words in the letter, and Raskolnikov's saying of them in the opposite sense, with anger and sarcasm, lie side by side. The presumed words of the sister are then quoted by Rodion. "Yes, well, We..." He quotes the words she has used in the letter to convince him that what she has done is right. She prejudges how his future will be. "We can arrange his happiness, pay his way..." But now, in quotation, he is ironically contradicting her words, while quoting them. He is showing his anger, and cautioning himself to be wary of the whole thing.

Then his mother's voice enters in. "Well, after all, this is her Rodya, isn't it? Her precious Rodya, her first-born?" The mother's words are filtered through the letter of her daughter, and are taken up again polemically, and in the opposite sense, by the son. The love and tenderness of the mother are also there, along with the bitterness, the irony, and the indignation, at the sacrifice of his sister, and further, the melancholic tone of his love for his sister.

"We won't refuse Sonya's fate, will we, Sonechka..."

These words are those spoken by her father in a previous passage. He had lived on, and drunk away, what his daughter

earned by prostitution. The words spoken by Raskolnikov are both Sonya's and her father's. All three voices, in the one sentence, are hearing each other and enter into conflict with each other.

Mikhail Bakhtin gives a second example of hidden polemic from Dostoievski's Poor Folk. Devushkin is speaking.

"I live in the kitchen, or, more correctly speaking, here next to the kitchen is a little room, (and I would like to point out that our kitchen is clean and bright, a very good one,) a small nook, a humble little corner...that is, to put it even better, the kitchen is large, with three windows, and along one wall there is a partition, so it is as if there was another room, a supernumerary one: it is all roomy and convenient and there is a window, and it is all -in a word, it is convenient."

Problems of the Poetics,p.170.

Note, in both these passages, an irritating quality of "stopping the story". Mikhail Bakhtin comments that almost after every word, Devushkin takes a sideways glance at his absentee interlocutor. He is afraid she will think that he is complaining. He tries in advance to destroy the impression which will be created by the news that he lives in a kitchen. He does not wish to upset her. Words are repeated in different registers and nuances - in the kitchen, next to the kitchen, little room, small nook, humble little corner, large, roomy, supernumerary, room, convenient.

In this narrative is the constant threat of his interlocutor. Each word is double-voiced. It carries the voice of Devushkin, and the possible answers of the girl he is talking to. Her words are controlling, determining, and affecting his words. Here neither excludes the other: neither overcomes the other: neither is the last word. They exist together as dialogue. Stylization and parody are not like this. In them, the words

reproduced are outside the author's context. The author reproduces the words and uses them for his own purposes. In parody, the author tries to pass off the reproduced word as his own words, or he tries to pass off his own words as the reproduced word.

"The implied word, which is spoken in the first place, that is, the actual word of the original speaker, only provides the material, and acts as a document confirming the fact that the author is in fact reproducing a specific word of another person. In the hidden polemic, however, the other person's word is antagonized, and this antagonism determines the author's words no less than the object itself which is under discussion. This causes a radical change in the semantics of the word: alongside its object-oriented meaning there appears a second meaning, the element of directedness towards another person's word".
Problems of the Poetics, p.162.

Open polemic, on the other hand, has, as its object, simply the word of the other person which it is refuting.
There follow two examples from the teaching of Dorothy Heathcote. One is of open polemic and the other is of hidden polemic.
Here is an example of open polemic used by Dorothy Heathcote. The students are searching the books for examples of moral dilemmas. They are explaining that Sir Thomas More, in A Man for all Seasons, accepted a bribe and then gave it away. She openly attacks them.

"If he knew it was a bribe," exclaims Dorothy Heathcote, "why not expose it?"
The girls answer that he did not wish to hurt the lady who had given him the bribe.
"But we would say that he should have given it back, not just flushed it down the toilet."
The girls reply that he gave it away.
Dorothy Heathcote asks, "To whom?"
"He was a fool", she continues, after a slight pause, "to give it away to the unstable Rich. I would have serious doubts if I had given it away. Poor Rich!"
The girls answer that Rich did not mind. He bought some cloth.

"Is it weakness or is it strength to live up to something you can't...What happened to More?"
"He was executed".
"Oh!".

In this passage, Dorothy Heathcote opposes the view both of the students and of the author of A Man for all Seasons, that More was right to take the bribe, and then to give it away. Alongside the words they use, she places the opposite words. What they see as strength she proposes as weakness. "Is it weakness, or is it strength...?"
When they explain that More was executed, with the assumption that it was unjust, she says "Oh". She implies that it was just. She reverses the meaning of the phrase, "He was executed", in the sense that the students meant. For them, it was a final vindication. For her it was his just deserts. This is an example of open polemic.
In hidden polemic, the word is directed towards an ordinary object, which it denotes, depicts, expresses, while obliquely taking swipes at the other person's word, colliding with it, as it were, in the object itself. Thus the other person's word begins to influence the author's from within. The hidden polemical word is double-voiced, although the interrelationship of the two voices within it is a special one.

"The other person's thought does not personally make its way inside the word, but, rather, is reflected in it and determines its tone and meaning".
The Problems of the Poetics, p.162.

At the very beginning of the session Dorothy Heathcote attempted to change the assumptions of the students, by using a hidden polemic.

"Did they tell you anything?
Or were you just herded in like sheep?
Have you been threatened?
Are you threatened? - all this gear?
(A long pause). Eh?
Did you say something"?

The students have nebulous assumptions. A few nods answer the first question as the easy way out. "Did they tell you anything?" The second question, "Or were you just herded in like sheep?" is patently false. Dorothy Heathcote herself had led them down the classroom to their safe benches only minutes before. The fact that they were not herded in like sheep now lies by the side of the question and its concomitant suggestion that they were herded in like sheep, and the two meanings are interacting in the one set of words.

The same interaction takes place in the next question. "Have you been threatened?" The students know they have not been threatened. Now their being threatened and their not being threatened are interacting within them.

The next question increases this tension. "Are you threatened now?" Clearly the students want to say no. They smile at the apparent ludicrousness of the suggestion, that their timid feelings should be described as threat. "All this gear", is a phrase spoken in a tone of voice which eases the tension. They realize what the threat was, an outside threat, the cameras and the strangers.

The long pause allows something to be said about the apparatus. The silence tries to force the students into words. "Did you say something?" The hidden antagonism here challenges the students into a reaction against what is suggested to them.

These were two examples from Dorothy Heathcote's teaching at Stockton-on-Tees. Mikhail Bakhtin concludes his survey of polemic with a note about how widespread is the inner-polemical word, a word with a sideways glance -"ogliadka" -at another person's hostile word. It includes all cutting remarks,

"all self-deprecating and florid speeches, which repudiate themselves in advance and have a thousand reservations, concessions, loopholes, etc. Such a speech, as it were, cringes in the presence of, or in anticipation of, another person's word, answer, or objection".
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p163.

The individual manner in which a person constructs his speech is to a large degree determined by his characteristic awareness of the other person's word and his means of reacting to that word.

Secondly, Mikhail Bakhtin underlines the enormous significance of the hidden polemic in literary speech. He goes so far as to say there is an element of inner polemic in every style, the difference being only in its degree and character.

"Any literary word is more or less keenly aware of its listener, reader, critic, and reflects in itself his anticipated objections, assessments, and points of view."
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p.163.

But the literary word is also aware of the presence of another literary word, and another literary style placed alongside itself. Mikhail Bakhtin applies the principle of intertext-uality to the history of literature. He refers to the element of so-called reaction to a foregoing literary style which is present in every new style. There is, in this case, an inner polemic, a hidden anti-stylization of the other style. This

often combines with an obvious parody of that style. The example that Mikhail Bakhtin gives of hidden polemic of style against a previous style, is The Confessions of Jean Jacques Rousseau.(60)

4. THE HIDDEN DIALOGUE.

Analogous to the hidden polemic is dialogue.

"Every word in such a dialogue speech is directed towards its object, but at the same time reacts intensely to the word of the other person, answering it, and anticipating it. The element of answer and anticipation penetrates deeply into the intensely dialogical word."
Problems of the Poetics, p.163.

With his next sentence, Mikhail Bakhtin takes us to the mysterious heart of his work.

"Such a word envelopes and draws into itself the speeches of the other people and intensely re-works them. The semantics of the dialogical word are quite special. Unfortunately the subtle changes in meaning which occur as a result of intense dialogicality have not as yet been studied."
Problems of the Poetics, p.163

After our careful pursuit of the often elusive thought of Mikhail Bakhtin, it appears, on his own admission, that the very basis of his theory, the foundation stone, has not been adequately studied. Fortunately, he does attempt to indicate the direction taken by these subtle changes in meaning.

"If the opposite word (gegenrede) is taken into consideration, there occur specific changes in the structure of the dialogical word, which make it internally eventful (sobytiinoe) and illuminate the word's object in a new way, revealing in it new aspects which are inaccessible to the monological word".
Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p.163.

Dialogue in this sense is of two kinds. In one kind, the other person is not actually present. In the other, the other person is present, but the dialogue takes place between words that are not actually being said.

Mikhail Bakhtin imagines a dialogue of two people in which the speeches of the second are omitted. The second interlocutor is invisibly present. Words are absent, but the profound traces of those words determine all the words of the first interlocutor.

He gives an example from Dostoievski. Devushkin is speaking.

> "The other day in a private conversation, Evstafy Ivanovitch said that the most important civic virtue is the ability to make a lot of money. He was joking, (I know he was joking), it was a moral lesson that one shouldn't be a burden to anyone else, but I'm not a burden to anyone! I have my own piece of bread; true, it is a modest piece of bread, sometimes it's even stale, but it is mine, I win it with my own labour and use it lawfully and blamelessly. But what can one do? I know myself that my copying is not much of a job, but, still, I am proud of it. I work, I spill my sweat. Well, and really, so what, if I just copy! Is it a sin to copy, or something? "He just copies!" What is so dishonourable about that?
> Problems of the Poetics,p.172.

Note that the word "copy" is mentioned three times.

1. I know myself that my copying is not much of a job.
2. So what if I just copy.
3. "He just copies".

Devushkin's accent, his way of speaking, diminishes, while that of the other person takes over completely, to the point of quoting his or her exact words; "He just copies".

But this is no mere repetition. Devushkin's voice is also in the phrase, exaggerating it, and refuting it at the same time. Mikhail Bakhtin invents the dialogue which is hidden behind Devushkin's words.

Stranger: One must know how to make a lot of money. One should not be a burden to anyone. But you are a burden to others.
Devushkin: I'm not a burden to anyone, I've got my own piece of bread.
Stranger: But what a piece of bread it is! Today it is there. Tomorrow it is gone. And most likely a stale piece, at that!
Devushkin: True, it is a modest piece of bread: sometimes it is even stale, but it is mine: I win it with my labour and use it lawfully and blamelessly.
Stranger: But what kind of labour. All you do is copy. You're not capable of anything else.
Devushkin: Well, what can one do? I know myself that my copying is not much of a job, but still, I am proud of it.
Stranger: Oh, there's something to be proud of, all right! Copying! It's disgraceful!
Devushkin: Well, and really! So what if I just copy!"
Problems of the Poetics,p.174.

Mikhail Bakhtin comments that, though only one person is speaking, in the original piece of prose;

"we feel that there is a conversation, and a most intense one at that, since every word that is present answers and reacts with its every fibre to the invisible interlocutor. It points outside itself, beyond its own borders, to the other person's unspoken word".
Problems of the Poetics,p.164.

This thesis aims to show that Dorothy Heathcote in particular, and drama teachers in general, do in practice what Mikhail Bakhtin suggests in theory. They use the notion of "the other" in taking roles. They use the "sideways look". They fill their classrooms with high adventure, in which the large issue, the ultimate questions, are faced. They de-throne, equalize, subvert, in a word, make carnival. Above all, they blur the genres.

At one point early in her session at Stockton-on-Tees, Dorothy Heathcote asked, "Has anyone a superb example of a moral dilemma? My client makes bad choices in his moral dilemmas."

The students proposed one from the play, A Man for all Seasons. Henry Tudor is saying:

"Your conscience is your own affair, but you are my chancellor".
"What does that mean?" asks Dorothy Heathcote.
The student replies: "Whatever you personally think, you've got to agree with me".
Dorothy Heathcote asks, "Whose moral dilemma is it? Is it Thomas's or Henry's?
Say it to me as if I am Thomas".

At this point, she puts the student in role, to speak to her as if to Thomas, -she is in role as Thomas. Dorothy Heathcote simplifies the discussion which has been going on. The teacher has been talking with a student in the way any author might struggle with a character. The student has, in turn, been struggling with what her teacher was thinking and saying. The teacher, in her turn, was struggling with her own character, her own problem, and who she is, and what she wanted to say about moral dilemma.
But now they are king and chancellor. That simplifies everything. They have not to be themselves but two other people.
The student makes the effort. "Your conscience is your own affair, but you are my chancellor".
Dorothy Heathcote does not answer this in her role as Thomas. She only listens as Thomas, to determine the words of the student in role as Henry. She now makes the student give the other side to the question, Thomas' side.

She asks:"What does Thomas say? Does he not say, "Your grace is unjust".
The student says, "I am your gracious loyal minister..."
Dorothy Heathcote interrupts with a Henry-like intonation, -"Playing for time!" she says.

Two things have happened here.

First, a piece of text has been broken down into other possibilities. The student was on the verge of adding another phrase, according to the original text of the play.

"I am your grace's loyal minister, - but God's first".

As Henry,Dorothy Heathcote allowed only the first part of the phrase, and then immediately interrupted with a phrase which prompted an alternative reaction. "Playing for time!" she said.

As Henry, but not the Henry of the script, she had assumed that the end of the sentence was not going to be straight-forward. He was going to play for time. She had not assumed, as the student had assumed, that he would be the hero, and would have the put-down answer. Her reply did not allow Thomas the moral highground of saying "But God's first". In her role as Henry, she has opened up the possibility of a different and less than holy Thomas.

This is what the students have understood. They answer that Thomas has the moral dilemma, but when they write out their list of dilemmas, they write that both have the dilemma. Henry has one as much as Thomas.

So other possibilities are opened up by this dialogue.

Secondly, those possibilities can be freely chosen. The injection, "Playing for time!" breaks the grip of the text. It shows that there are other possible interpretations. The students are now free to give any answer, rather than the expected answer. They now have a dialogue, as opposed to a monologue.

In a monologue, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, the speaker and

author are the same. The teacher and the class are seeking to speak with one voice about the same things. In a monologic novel, the author and the characters speak with the one voice. In a dialogue, the author sets a distance between himself and the characters. The words acquire so many meanings and references that they go beyond the specific control of the author. Author's words and character's words interact, by being placed alongside each other. Mikhail Bakhtin has a model of the conscious interacting word, one which accumulates its meaning as it passes from mouth to mouth, each in a different context.

The following extract from The Brothers Karamazov by Dostoievski is the key text given by Mikhail Bakhtin to illustrate his idea of hidden dialogue. Unfortunately he does not pursue the analysis of the text. He simply prints it and leaves it, as if it is self explanatory.

"Who do you think is the murderer? Ivan asked, apparently, coldly somehow, even with a certain note of arrogance in the tone of his question.
"You know yourself who did it", said Alyosha quietly and penetrantly (sic).
"Who? That fable about that crazy idiot epileptic? About Smerdykov?"
Alyosha suddenly felt he was trembling all over.
"You know yourself who did it", broke feebly from his lips.
He gasped for breath.
"Who, who, who?" cried Ivan, now almost ferociously. His restraint had suddenly disappeared.
"I only know one thing," in the same near whisper. "It was not you who killed father".
"Not you! What do you mean, not you?" Ivan was dumbfounded.
"You did not kill father, you did not do it", repeated Alyosha, firmly.
The silence lasted half a minute.
"I know myself that I didn't do it. Are you delirious?" said Ivan, smiling palely and crookedly. His eyes bored into Alyosha.
Both stood by the lantern.
"No, Ivan, you have told yourself several times that you

are the murderer".
"When did I say so?...I was in Moscow...When did I say so?" murmured Ivan, completely at a loss.
"You often told yourself so when you were left alone in those terrible two months", continued Alyosha, again speaking softly and distinctly. But now he was speaking as if outside himself, as if not of his own will, but rather obeying some irresistible command.
"You accused yourself and admitted to yourself that the murderer is none other than yourself. But you did not kill him, you're mistaken, you are not the murderer, do you hear me? Not you! God has sent me to tell you so".
"Brother", began Alyosha again in a trembling voice. "I've told you this because you will take my word, I know you will. I've told you once and for all, not you! Do you hear, once and for all. God laid the burden of telling you on my soul, even if you hate me from this hour and forever more..."

Problems of the Poetics. p.216.

Ivan asks the question, "Who do you think is the murderer?"(1.1.) But Alyosha does not answer this question. He answers the "certain air of arrogance" (1.2.). He says, "You know yourself who did it" (1.4.).

The question put by Ivan had anticipated a reply such as "I know it was Smerdykov". Ivan in fact gives this answer himself, not in so many words, but contained in his parodic and scornful denial of that very answer. "Who? That fable about that crazy idiot epileptic? about Smerdykov?" (1.6-7.) The parody, the scorn, and the disbelief, cause a physical trembling in Alyosha (1.8.). They lie alongside his earnestness. He can only repeat what he said before, but this time feebly, because of the interaction of the disbelief and his earnestness. "You know yourself who did it" (1.9.).

The ambiguity in the words has not yet become clear to the two brothers. They are evoking different responses which neither of them as yet knows or anticipates.

Alyosha is expecting the answer, "It is Smerdykov", in spite of the scorn poured on the very idea by Ivan. But Ivan is

expecting, suddenly and without warning, his own name to be pronounced.

Hence his ferocity as he cries; "Well, who, who?" (1.12.) He has now lost all restraint (1.12-13.), all the coldness and arrogance which he had at the beginning of the conversation (1.2-3). Alyosha is forced, under the pressure, to understand what Ivan is wanting him to say. He realizes that, in fact, he is to say the opposite.

"I only know one thing: it was not you who killed father" (1.14-15.).

Ivan too now realizes he has heard the opposite to what he anticipated. (1.16-17.)

"Not you". Ivan repeats the phrase, and attempts to make it conditional, and less absolute, by a touch of parody. The repetition, the tone of unbelief, rob the phrase of Alyosha of its meaning. Ivan pursues the dethronement, by repeating a second time with greater emphasis, "What do you mean, not you?" (1.17.) This is a carnival dethronement in the sense we will see in chapter three. The relativising effect of dialogue cuts down to size the statements of the other party. Here Ivan uses parody to make the awful absoluteness of his brother's statements conditional.

Alyosha now pronounces words which Ivan had never expected to hear from anyone. He had said them to himself while he was in Moscow, as we shall soon hear. Over and over again, he had said to himself, "You killed father, you killed father". Now he hears those same words, and they are, after all, what he would dearly love someone to say to him. But they now come to him from Alyosha, with the opposite meaning.

"You did not kill father. You did not do it"(1.18.).
These words anticipate, and immediately contradict, the "You killed father", the words Ivan had expected to hear. They are, in Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, filled with that answer, even though it was never actually spoken.
The silence lasted half a minute (1.20). The brothers have coincided in their thoughts, but in diametrically opposite senses.
In the terms of Mikhail Bakhtin, the words thus laid side by side cannot but interact.
Ivan accepts what Alyosha is saying, superficially. He intends to cheat. He smiles crookedly.
"I know myself I did not do it." He attacks. "Are you delirious?"(1.21.)
His words, when confronted by those of Alyosha, accept them. The sentence, "I know myself that I did not do it", contains Alyosha's sentence, "You did not do it". Ivan's words are filled with those of Alyosha, but now they have the voice of Ivan, with the arrogance now regained.
"I know myself that I did not do it", is a classically polyphonic phrase. At one level a murderer says he did not do it. At another they suggest the business is much more complicated, There are more ways of committing murder than by wielding a weapon. Ivan now dares Alyosha to go further, to offer him the chance of reprieve and salvation, in order to reject it.
So his eyes bored into Alyosha (1.22-23.).
They both stood by the lantern (1.24.). The lantern is the sign of ordinary life, of the normal twilight, in which we

live our lives. It is at this point the inviting moment of safety which beckons Ivan.

Alyosha says back to Ivan the words he has been saying to himself.

"You have told yourself several times that you are the murderer." (1.25-26.)

But now the words, "you are the murderer," in the voice of Alyosha, carry the possibility of salvation. When Ivan said them to himself, they carried his despair. Ivan is now at a loss. (1.28.) Alyosha's words have penetrated, and are saying back to him, what he has in fact been saying to himself. Coming as foreign words from someone else, they change the absolute nature of his own words. His own words to himself, "I am the murderer", carried absolute command and conviction. When heard from the mouth of Alyosha, they do not carry that absolute, but are now conditional, limited to a particular time and place, and can be contradicted.

Ivan procrastinates: "When did I say so?" (1.27-28.) The fact is that he genuinely does not recognize himself as having at any particular moment in time asked himself, or convinced himself, that he was the murderer. It is only now, faced by Alyosha's words, that he begins to discover the truth of what he has been saying to himself. "I was in Moscow...!"

These words are continued by Alyosha's next statement. "Those terrible months" (1.30.) is quoting back, in changed form, the words "I was in Moscow." (1.27.) They now carry Alyosha's voice. Whatever happened in Moscow is now understood. It reacts, both inside and with, the words of Alyosha. But Alyosha is no longer in control of what he is saying (31-33.).

There is too much of Ivan's voice and meaning in his own. His words have been forced out of him at the irresistible contact with Ivan.

"You accused yourself, and admitted to yourself, that the murderer is none other than yourself." (1.34-35.)

Again, Ivan is hearing his own words from Alyosha. But, because they come from Alyosha, they also carry Alyosha's voice. They have the possibility of a meaning other than Ivan had understood.

Alyosha's words are coinciding with those of Ivan, on the subject of those terrible months. But they say the opposite.

"But you did not kill him; you're mistaken. You are not the murderer, do you hear me? Not you!" (1.35-37.)

Their words are now colliding. Ivan might agree with Alyosha, or he might disagree. He might hate him for knowing that he has preferred his own conviction to what they both know is the plain fact according to the law.

So Alyosha is trembling as he begins again. (1.38.) He knows he has succeeded in speaking his word. The only reason he spoke was because he knew Ivan would take his word. (1.39.) Ivan has taken his word, but might react by hating him for ever. That risk Alyosha has to take.

So he speaks. For his part, Ivan can either accept it, and accept the one who speaks it, or, while accepting it, hate nonetheless the one who speaks it. (1.42.)

Things can never be the same again between them. Both are changed.

This then is the dialogic principle at its most serious, and its most concrete. No doubt this attempt to explain the

principle, in its application to the text Mikhail Bakhtin himself proposes as "a brief but very vivid dialogue", in which " Dostoievski's device is exposed and revealed with complete clarity in the content itself" (p.216), is obscurum per obscurius. But the general lines are clear. Each one of the speeches of Ivan and Alyosha intercepts and re-works the words of the other. They anticipate them, and call them out, until, unpredictably, there emerges a shocking choice for both of them. For Alyosha, the choice is that he should continue speaking even to the extent of alienating his brother. For Ivan, the choice is that he should reject the chance of safety offered by Alyosha, because he is too truthful, like his father, to do otherwise.

Mikhail Bakhtin is here describing something that is part and parcel of teaching, and, in particular, of using drama as a teaching medium. The next chapter will attempt to support this view by examining the dialogue in Dorothy Heathcote's session with Sixth Formers, as they were then called, in Stockton-on-Tees. It will examine her use of different forms of dialogue, in role as "the other", using "the sideways glance," and blurring the genres. This latter will be seen more clearly when we come to see how she adopts, more overtly, carnival modes of expression in Chapter Four.

Notes to Chapter One.

1. Problems in the Work of Dostoievski, Leningrad, 1929. Rewritten and revised, The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, Moscow, 1963, Transl. R.W.Rotzel, Ann Arbor 1973. More recent translation, not available for this thesis, C. Emerson, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
2. Literature and its Theorists. Tzvetan Todorov. Cornell University Press, 1987, pp.70-72.
3. Rabelais and his World. Moscow, 1965. Written in 1940, (apart from certain additions), Transl. Helen Iswolsky. Camb.M.I.T. 1968
4. The three books were:
Formal Method in Literary Study, A critical introduction to sociological poetics, Priboj, Leningrad, 1928. Published under the name of P.N.Medvedev. Transl. A.J.Whehle, John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, 1978.
Freudianism, a critical sketch, Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, 1927. Published under the name of V.N.Volosinov. Transl. I.R,Titunic, The Academic Press, New York, 1976.
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Leningrad, 1929. Published under the name of V.N.Volosinov. Transl. L.Matejka and I.R.Titunic, Seminar Press, New York, 1973.
For detailed bibliography, cf. Clark and Holquist, op.cit. p.356, and the discussion, pp.146-170.
5. These latest collections of papers contained the following titles.
"Questions of Literature and Aesthetics". was published by the author himself in 1975, the year he died. Apart from i), v), and vii), it is translated in The Dialogic Imagination, Ed. M.Holquist, Transl. C.Emerson amd M. Holquist, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1981. The original contained the following.

i) The Problem of Content, Material, and Form in Verbal Artistic Creation. pp.6-71. Written in 1924. Previously published in part, in Kontekst 1973, Moscow, 1974
ii) Discourse in the Novel. pp.72-233. Written in 1934. Previously published in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1972.
iii) Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel. pp.234-391. Written in 1937-1938. Previously partially published in Voprosy literatury, 3, 1974.
iv) From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse. pp.408-446. Written in 1940. Previously partially published in Voprosy literatury, 8,1965; and Russkaja i zarubezhnaja literatura, Saransk University, 1967.
v) Rabelais and Gogol, pp.484-495. Written in 1940, revised in 1970. Previously published in Kontekst 1972, Moscow, 1973.
vi) Epic and the Novel. pp.448-483. Written in 1941. Previously published in Voprosy literatury,1,1970.
vii) Remarks in Conclusion, pp.391-407. Written in 1973.

"The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation". G.S.Bocharov, Moscow, 1979. It contained:

i) Art and Answerability, pp. 5-6. Previously published, Den'iskusstva, 1919; Voprosy literatury, 6, 1977.
ii) Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity. pp.7-180. Written in 1922-1924. Previous publication; Voprosy filosofii, 7, 1977; and Voprosy literatury, 12, 1978.

iii) Extracts from lectures on the History of Russian Literature, pp.374-383. Transcribed by R.M.Mirkina from a course of lectures given in the twenties, probably 1924.
iv) The Novel of Development and its Significance in the History of Realism, pp.188-236. Written 1936-1938.
v) On the Philosophical Bases of Human Sciences, pp. 409-411. Written c.1941. Previously published partially in Kontekst 1974, Moscow,1975.
vi) The Problem of Speech Genres, pp.237-280. Written 1952-1953. Previously published partially in Literaturna ücheba, 1, 1978.
vii) The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and other Human Sciences, pp.281-307. Written 1959-1961. Previously published in Voprosy literatury,10, 1976.
viii) Letter to Kanaev on Goethe, p.236. Written Oct.11, 1962.
ix) Letter to Kanaev on Goethe, pp.396-397. Written Jan,1969.
x) On the Revision of the Book on Dostoievski, pp.307-327. Written in 1961. Previously published, Kontekst 1976, Moscow, 1977.
xi) Response to a question put by the Editorial Board of Novyj Mir, 1970. pp.328-335. Previously published in Novyj mir, 11, 1970.
xii) Internal Review of L.E.Pinsky's Shakespeare.1970. pp.411-412. Written 1970.
xiii) Notebooks 1970-71. pp.336-360.
xiv) On the Methodology of Human Sciences, pp.361-373. Written in 1974. Previously published partially, in Kontekst 1974, Moscow, 1975

These have been translated in The Architectonics of Answerability, ed. Michael Holquist, Trans, V.Liapunov, and K.R.Brostrom, University of Texas Press, Austin, published after 1984, for ii) Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity, and (from the 1975 collection) The Problem of Content, Material and Form in Verbal Artistic Creation. In Speech Genres and Other Late Essays, ed. Michael Holquist, Trans. Vern McGee, University of Texas Press, Austin, Published after 1984, are to be found, iv) The Novel of Development and its Significance in the History of Realism; v) On the Philosophical Bases of Human Sciences, vi) The Problem of Speech Genres, vii) The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and Other Human Sciences, and xiii) From the Notebooks, 1970-71.

6. Cf Mikhail Bakhtin. Clark and Holquist, p.319.
7. Grice.H.P, Logic and Conversation, in Syntax and Semantics, Academic Press New York 1975, vol 3. p.45.
8. Sacks et al. Systematics for the organization of turn-taking. Language, vol 50, No.4 (1974) p.727.
9. Ken Hirschkop in Bakhtin: Essays and Dialogues on his work. Ed.Morson. Univ. of Chicago, 1986, p.79.
10. Todorov, Literature and its Theorists, p.85.
11 Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.166.
12. Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.153.
13. Cf. Sally McFague, Models of God, S.C.M. Press, London, 1987. p.9. for a general view of the major changes of this century. Also A.R.Peacocke, Creation and the World of Science, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979. S.Toulmin, The

Return To Cosmology, Postmodern Science and the Theology of Nature, Berkeley and Los Angeles, University of California Press, 1982.

14. The bibliography is huge. An accessible description of the changes in thinking about science this century is in Fritjof Capra, "The Turning Point", (Flamingo Fontana, London,1983); Theodore Roszak, "The Making of a Counter Culture", (Faber, London,1970); Timothy Leary, "The Politics of Ecstasy", (Paladin, Granada Publishing Co. 1970). These share an apocalyptic and romantic view. A more serious historical introduction is in "The European Mind" by Paul Hazard, (Meridian Books, Cleveland, 1963). The struggle in the individual disciplines has been described by various writers. Clifford Geertz, ("Local Knowledge", Basic Books, New York, 1983, and, "The Interpretation of Culture", Basic Books, New York, 1973,) shows how interpretative anthropology has changed the science of anthropology. The problems of logic and reason in ethical statements, the use of scientific language to discuss human actions and human morality, have engaged philosophers such as A.J.Ayer, in "Language, Truth and Logic", (Gollancz, London, 1967,) Bertram Russell, in "The Problems of Philosophy", (Oxford, 1952), and Stephen Toulmin in "Reason in Ethics" (C.U.P. 1964). Herbert Butterfield in "The Origins of Modern Science", (London, 1962), and Paul Ricoeur, in "Narrative and Time", (Vol 1, University of Chicago Press, 1984,) have, each in their own way, attempted to explain science and history, and what the difference may be between the two notions of truth. In literary studies, the approach to a literary text was scientific, in the sense of seeking the factual question of what does this text mean. This has become, in, for example, Ross Chambers, "Story and Situation", (Manchester University Press, 1984,) the hermeneutical question of what is the point of this text.

15. This extract is quoted from Todorov, Literature and its Theorists, Cornell University Press, 1987, p.87. The extract from Mikhail Bakhtin is from the translation of his book, by C. Emerson, (Minneapolis, 1984.) P.56 refers to Rotsel's translation, 1973.

16. Todorov, Literature and its Theorists, Cornell University Press, p.87.

17. Dorothy Heathcote. Collected Writings, p.133.

18. Cf. The Fight for Drama, the fight for Education, Ed K.Byron, N.A.T.D. 1990, p.61. Ref. No. 21,20,28,31.

19. Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, Russian edition, Moscow, 1963, p.242,244,246; English Translation, Ardis, 1973, p.151,152.

20. Ibid.

21. Cf. Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.44.

22. Dorothy Heathcote, Collected writings, p.131.

23. Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.132.

24. Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique. p.52. footnote.

25. W.F.Albright, From Stone age to Christianity, Doubleday Anchor, New York, 1957, p.326.

26. Aeschylus, The Oresteia, transl. P.Vellacott, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1959. pp.166ff.

27. Euripides, The Bacchae, Transl. P Vellacott, Penguin Classics, Harmondswoth, 1973, pp. 206-209, 218-222.

28. P. Hazard, The European Mind, Meridian Books, Cleveland,

New York, 1963, pp. 180-197, for Richard Simon, and the revolt against the traditional interpretation of scripture.

29. This refers to the development of political theory in the eighteenth century. "All the intellectual views and ideas which as a whole were to culminate in the French Revolution had already taken shape, even before the reign of Louis XIV ended". P Hazard, op.cit. p.446. He is thinking, in particular, of "The Social Contract", of J.J Rousseau.

30. cf. Clark and Holquist, Mikhail Bakhtin, The Belknap Press, of Harvard University Press, 1984, pp. 54, 265.

31. Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings, p.153.

32. Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p. 163. 172ff.

33. Cf. Henry IV pt 1, William Shakespeare,
The Magic Mountain, Thomas Mann.
Jane Eyre, Charlotte Bronte.

34. Catulli Carmina. Carmen 8. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1958. p.6.

35. Ross Chambers, Story and Situation, p.31.

36. The quotation here is translated from Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.77. In the 1963 edition of The Problems of Dostoievski's Poetics, p.167, the word "intention" is replaced, in the first instance, by "interpretation", and, in the second, by "thought".

37. Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.77.

38. cf. Hugo Rahner. Have you ever practised Eutrapelia?

39. Dorothy Heathcote, The Drama Teacher, facilitator or manipulator? Ed.T.Goode, N.A.T.D. 1990.

40. In Theatre and Education Journal, no. 2, p.38, and in the companion article in Drama Broadsheet. Vol.5, Issue 3, p.2ff. The concern continues in John Carey's article in Drama Broadsheet, Vol.7, issue 2, on Teaching in role and classroom power. In Warwick Dobson's article he follows a distinction made by Bakhtin between linear and pictorial art. It corresponds to the distinction in literature between Classical and Baroque. (Cf, Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.107, quoting Wolfflin, Fundamental Principles of the History of Art, Gallimard, Paris, 1966, p.25-7).
Warwick Dobson justifies the teacher's being very clear, in role, about her own words and those of the role character. The interaction between her role and her own values is fruitful for the class. They see clearly the difference between the two voices, and "the clash of attitudes detectable in the two voices provides a touchstone against which the participants can assess their own attitudes in the light of the `dialogue' they have witnessed"(p.37).
But, following the pictorial mode, Bakhtin's view of dialogicality is even more productive. The two voices are not clearly defined. They are blurred on the outside, and highly individualized on the inside. The voices themselves prevent the emergence of a dominant voice.

"The context of the author is forced to dissolve the compact and closed character of another's discourse, to reabsorb it, to efface its frontiers. This style of transmitting the discourse of another can be called pictorial.
It tendency is to efface the piecemeal character of the contours of this discourse. Here the discourse itself is individualized to a much higher degree. The perception of the

different aspects of the speech of another is refined and nuanced.
Not only is the objective meaning of speech seen, or the statement it contains, but also all the linguistic details of its incarnation into words".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. p.119, quoted in Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.108.

Consequently, the aim of the teacher is not so much to keep her personal evalative role different from her role in any drama, but to understand the genre of activity in which she is engaged. The aim would be to create a state of dialogicality in the classroom. Though difficult in itself, this would not be as difficult as aiming to keep distinct the person from the role.
41. Perhaps it should be said in passing, that Mikhail Bakhtin's references to drama are in no sense technical. He uses drama terms, duo, trio, role, scenario, play, as familiar analogies, just as he uses familiar analogies from science, (chronotope, embryo). We shall see later that in general he does not accept the received genres of epic, lyric, drama, but he creates a new genre which combines both the novel and drama. For his purposes, speech in the novel and speech in drama are the same. (cf.Clark-Holquist op.cit p.287). The fact is that all his evidence for the carnival aspect of the novel is taken from Medieval carnival drama. On the other hand his only extant work on a drama subject, on Goethe and a review of a book on Shakespeare, treat both these poet-playwrights as prose literature.
42. Marrou, St Augustine and his influence throughout the ages, Longmans, London, 1957.p.8.
43. Lesky, A History of Greek Literature, p. 101-104.
44. Copleston, Medieval Philosophy, Methuen, 1952 p.107-135.
45. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, p.11. Also, Isaiah Berlin, Against the Current, pp.80-129.
46. Hawkes, Structuralism and Semiotics, p.11-58.
47. Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p.152.
48. Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique. p.99-106.
49. There is a contradiction, however, in the statement of Mikhail Bakhtin in The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p.28, that "Drama is by nature alien to genuine polyphony". He is comparing the polyphony of Dostoievski, with that of Shakespeare. He is comparing the "single full-valued hero's voice" in any one of Shakespeare's plays with the "plurality of full-valued voices" in the bounds of a single work of Dostoievski. He also points out that the voices in Shakespeare's plays are not ideologists in the full Bakhtinian sense of the word. They do not represent "points of view vis-a-vis the world".
Hence, it is impossible to speak of a "completely formed and deliberate polyphony" in Shakespeare's plays. This does not affect our argument that what Mikhail Bakhtin says about polyphony in Dostoievski is applicable to classroom drama and to liturgy. He is referring to the enclosed and finalized play. He is referring to characters that appear on paper to be monologically created by their author. There is no doubt that much performance is monological, in the sense of strict

direction. In classroom drama, however, and, perhaps less obviously, in Liturgy, the work is open, in precisely his terms. It almost seems that the classroom drama of Dorothy Heathcote is more dialogical than the novels of Dostoievski.

50. The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, p.154.

51. Problems of the Poetics, p.66. "The statement of an idea in literature is, as we have seen, usually totally monologistical".

52. Cf. F.R.Leavis, Wordsworth, the creative conditions, in The Critic as Anti-philosopher, Chatto and Windus, 1982, pp.36-37.

53. Claude Levi-Strauss, Tristes Tropiques, Paris, Plon, 1958, Transl. and abridged, New York, Athenaeum, 1964. Translated John and Doreen Weightman, London, Cape, 1973, Penguin Books, Harmondworth, 1976.
Structural Anthropology, Transl. Claire Jacobson, and Brooke Grundfest Schoepf, London, Allen Lane, 1968, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1972.

54. Structuralism and Semiotics, Methuen, London 1977, p.19-58.

55. Ken Hirschkop takes Morson to task for this abrogation in his article in Essays on Mikhail Bakhtin, Ed. Morson. p.

56. Unpublished lecture, given in The School of Education in The University of Durham, 1986.

57. Wagner, Drama as a Learning Medium, p.67.

58. Maurice Sendak, Where the Wild Things are, Puffin Books. London, 1970.

59. e.g. Gavin Bolton, Selected Writings, p.170, lesson one no.5, and lesson two, no.4 and 5.

60. Rousseau followed John Locke, in opposing the traditional thinking of the seventeenth century. The eighteenth century had a very different feel about it. It was rational, and sentimental. The change from one to the other has been described in great detail by Paul Hazard in his The European Mind. Because he was in reaction against the style of that previous century, Rousseau's own style, claims Mikhail Bakhtin, is full of that style, and parodies that style.

CHAPTER TWO.

DIALOGUE IN THE TEACHING OF DOROTHY HEATHCOTE.

1. GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO DOROTHY HEATHCOTE.

Dorothy Heathcote is a drama teacher. She was senior lecturer in Drama in Education in the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, till her retirement in 1985. She has published numerous articles.(1) She lectures and runs courses throughout the world. She has made videotapes of much of her work, as an aid to analysis, and to show to as wide an audience as possible how drama is used as a medium of education. Her influence has been most felt, however, on the many students who have studied with her at Newcastle.

Like Mikhail Bakhtin, she has an insight into drama which she has variously attempted to explain throughout the years. Like him, she uses sociology, (Hall, Goffman,) psychology, (Piaget, Vygotski,) anthropology, (Geertz,) Radio 4, chance remarks, students' essays, to make clear what she does in drama.

Like him, she is intuitive. She prefers metaphor to academic explanation. (2) Like him, she is more concerned with what is said, than with who said it. Like him, she writes clearly. Yet she strains at language, invents words, and is often misunderstood or obscure because the experience she is attempting to describe is beyond the reader, and beyond the language. She has to show what she is doing. Hence her preference for the demonstration, for working in schools with

her students and with children, and for the videotape.
She differs from Mikhail Bakhtin in that she is practical, and pragmatic, where Bakhtin is theoretical. This is the basis of the application of the theory of the one to the praxis of the other. She uses benchmark words, such as role, genre, context, the sideways glance, (3) to mention only the ones examined in this present work. This chapter explores her practice in the light of the theory of Mikhail Bakhtin.

2. DIALOGUE IN THE TEACHING OF DOROTHY HEATHCOTE.

In 1978, Dorothy Heathcote worked for three days in a school in Stockton-on-Tees. She was asked to help some sixth formers prepare for an English Literature exam. They had seven books to study. They were, Twelfth Night, The Mayor of Casterbridge, A Man for all Seasons, and four narrative poems; Tam O'Shanter, Peter Grimes, An Ode on St Agnes' Eve, and Mort D'Arthur.
She began by creating "a big lie". They were in a clinic, with many patients. These were to meet some experts in English Literature, who would compare the symptoms of the patients with the people they had met in their studies. The comparison might help the director to make up her mind whether the patients were fit for society.
In time the "experts" had identified themselve so closely to the characters that they related to them as family. At the point we begin, Dorothy Heathcote has formed the students into families, each around a vacant chair. The chair represents her client, from her clinic. But the chair also represents a

character from each of the set books, which the students are studying. As members of that person's family, they have to decide what grounds there are for the priority treatment of their relative, and what grounds there are for that person's early return to a useful life in society.

One group approaches her. They say their relative is Peter Grimes.

1. D: Peter Grimes? Which is he? The murderer! I thought he was a closed case.
2. Girls: We don't. We are not satisfied.
3. D: What are you not satisfied about?
4. Girls: We don't feel enough has been done. He can be cured.
5. D: Are you saying I haven't tried to get to the bottom of this?
6. Girls: No, but why is he doing this?
7. D: That is not important. He has killed four people. I find him incurable.
8. Girls: Are you saying you have the right to say he is incurable, and that's it?
9. D: Do you feel related to him? They do say that people's behaviour is a result of their experiences. So perhaps some of the blame may lie at your door. What have you done to help him? I understand he was ostracized by his own people.
10. Girls: We tried to help. We thought that was your job.
11. D: He is certainly mentally disturbed.
12. Girls: He has an inferiority complex. He is mentally disturbed. He needs friends...trust...he needs to be trusted.
13. D: How do we create trust in human beings? I understand he was ostracized by his own people. No other boys were allowed to work for him. Now, is that showing trust?
14. Girls: No, but!
15. D: Well, have you any propositions?
16. Girls: Find out why he is doing this.
17. D: I am trying to.
18. Girls: Well, how did you try?
19. D: We have interviewed him. We have tried Rishark tests on him. There is no evidence but that the man is a bad character in terms of.. (indecipherable word on video), or in every sense of the word. He cannot be a priority at this time.
20. Girls: But that is what we think. He can do harm, he is violent.
21. D: I agree. - that is why he is in a strait jacket! (A shocked shuffling occurs at this). You are shaking your head.

22. Girls: You cannot keep him in a strait jacket all his life.
23. D: I agree. I only know it gives us time to think. Will it help to ostracize him? -to spend all the nights on that lonely boat? I shouldn't think that is neighbourliness at all.
24. Girls: He still needs friendliness.
25. D: Are you prepared to visit him if I let him out of the strait jacket?
26. Girls: Yes.
27. D: Very well - you are taking rather a risk. Has he any history of stable relationships? Is there any evidence of a life of stability?
28. Girls: When he was a young boy, before his father impressed the bible on him, before he was dominated by other people, and felt to be no good.
29. D: But I have used my skills. Is he a fit member of society? He is a notorious man. People are writing about his case. He will be handed down as a legend of the time and of the place.
30. Girls: I don't see why.
31. D: And you say there is hope?
32. Girls: We'll try.
33. D: Have you any proposition?
34. Girls: If he was to watch an event acted out..
35. D: Would that not re-confirm him?
36. Girls: If it were in private, so no publicity..
37. D: What about the dead children then?
38. Girls: That's why actors.
39. D: He does not know the difference between hallucination and actors. How do we know he will not be hallucinating when the actors are brought. There are places in this clinic where he will not go. - he sees dead bodies, he sees his dead father there. You are asking me to spend public money on your own appreciation of his case. Look, if I give you permission to visit all the other families and petition, lobby, them for your particular case, tease out their opinion, if their opinion is for your case, - would you do that?
When you have evidence that you can convince other people, then I'll see you again.

This is a piece of dialogue, parallel to the dialogue of Alyosha and Ivan. The group of girls approaches Dorothy Heathcote. They say, "Our relative is Peter Grimes". The reply is peremptory. "Peter Grimes? Which is he? The murderer! I thought he was a closed case!" (1.1)

The name, Peter Grimes, is said first by the students, who are

relatives, and then it is said by the director. But now it is a question and carries a polemical tone. The name spoken by the students is given a different direction, which directly opposes the feelings of the family. They have come sympathetically to their relative. For the director, he is the forgotten one. "Which is he?" He is remembered for his most damaging feature, "the murderer". Finally he is dismissed. "I thought he was a closed case."

The students reply monosyllabically and stubbornly to this abrupt reception. "We don't". They add, "We are not satisfied".(1.2)

The director now becomes half teacher. She encourages them, by repeating their phrase. But this time she takes it in the sense intended by the girls. "What are you not satisfied about?" (1.3) She has put on the style of their words. She is one with them. So they soften a little.

"We don't feel enough has been done. He can be cured".(1.4)

The students have gained a little confidence. The phrase, "He can be cured," has a touch of assertiveness about it. It anticipates, and partly determines, the reply of the director. The reply is polemical. "Are you saying I haven't tried to get to the bottom of this?"(1.5)

In the assertion, "He can be cured", the director had seen the implication, that, because she says the patient cannot be cured, she is not doing her job right. It is this implication which she attacks. "Are you saying that I have not tried to get to the bottom of this?"

The girls at this point do not wish to be so bold. "No", they say, and immediately go on to find a finer, more subtle

approach to their proposal that he can be cured. The question to be asked, they say, is, "Why is he doing this?"(1.6)
This distinctly palliative, refined, and tentative approach is pushed aside by the director.
"That is not important. He has killed four people. I find him incurable." (1.7)
This reply is again abrupt. It evokes a more instinctive and less prepared reply. The family use a form of words the director used previously, but now very polemically. They attack the right of the director to say who is, or is not, incurable. "Are you saying that you have the right to say he's incurable, and that's it!" (1.8)
In this dialogue so far, each phrase has aimed at another. It has been determined by that other; it has determined it. Each phrase has carried the voice of its opposite.
While discussing Peter Grimes, the director and the relatives are watching each other, and attempting to disturb, or coincide with, the internal dialogue of each. There is a parallel with the sideways look and polyphonic words of Ivan and Alyosha, but as yet it is still at a relatively superficial level.
The director begins to show that the family had a part to play in the murders. "Do you feel related to him?" (1.9)
She does not ask, "Are you related to him?" "Do you feel related to him?", is a form of words which creates the feeling of being related. It anticipates that feeling and the answer which will be given. The answer will not be information. It will be an intelligent feeling, one which the students, as family, secretly harbour, but dread its coming into the open.

Not that they know this at this point. It is only with the words of the director that their reply comes into being. They play here a direct parallel to Ivan Karamazov. He did not know what he had been saying to himself in Moscow, until it was heard from the mouth of his brother.

The director continues: "They do say that quite often people's behaviour is a result of their experiences. So perhaps some of the blame may lie at your door. What have you done to help him?" (1.9)

The girls have little to say. But their brief answer shows how seriously now they have undertaken the part of relatives. "We have tried to help him". (1.10) Then, with a sudden turn, the family begins to attack the director. This is a direct parallel to Ivan's attack on Alyosha. "We thought that was your job." (1.10)

So the job of the director is under attack. She has to prove that she has done her job. A technical term is produced, almost casually. "He is certainly mentally disturbed". (1.11) The term, and its derisory tone, evoke a complementary, but altogether more sympathetic technical term from the family. "He has an inferiority complex". (1.12) They have produced a more accurate term for the one provided by the director. A complex is a species of the very general category of "Mentally disturbed". This family is now well able for the director. They then state the remedy, with increasing confidence as they say it. "He needs friends, -trust, -he needs to be trusted." (1.12)

The family are now pointing to their responsibility to trust their relative. They have spoken partly in accusation of the

director. But the secret thought implied there is that their own guilt is involved. Airily, the director makes the general point. "How do we create trust in human beings?" (1.13.) This is a good example of Dorothy Heathcote's technique of taking a fact from a child and giving back an implication. Here the fact is that we have to trust someone. The implication is a universal. "How can we create trust in any human being?"(4)

The director continues. "I understand he was ostracized by his own people. No other boys were allowed to work for him." She adds the direct, unanswerable question: "Now is that showing trust?" (1.13)

The students are by now feeling very related to Peter Grimes. They defend him. With their, "No, but", (1.14) they frankly admit their complicity in the general lack of trust which has contributed to Peter's condition. Yet they will not leave it at that. The director suggests that they may have some proposals to make.(1.15) Their answer repeats the opening words of the dialogue, but now addressed very plainly to the director. "Find out why he is doing this".(1.16) The girls have now put their exam question to the teacher. "Give reasons for the condition of Peter Grimes", would be its probable form.

"Find out why he is doing this", is not a command. Their tone suggests the next stage is to be a joint operation of relatives and the director. The director answers as if commanded. "I am trying to".(1.17) But the "trying to" answers the tone of the students, and, while retaining the archness of

the director, it lessons its antagonistic impact. It enables the whole project to be viewed as an attempt to find out why Peter Grimes acts in this way.

Almost in her own tone, the tone of the director, the students quiz her.

"Well, how did you try?"(1.18)

The director is on the defensive. "We have interviewed him," is a tame answer.(1.19) However the authority with which it is said, the formality of the word, "interview", the awe-inspiring sound of the technical term, "Rishark test", conceal the fragility of the reply. She firmly announces her conclusions: "There is no evidence in terms of... or in every sense of the word. He cannot be a priority at this time". (A word is indistinct at this point in the tape.) The reply of the students is not directed to the formal dismissal of the case, but to the tone in which it has been delivered. "But that's what we think!"(1.20) As relatives, they find they can now agree to his violence and potential harmfulness. "He is violent".

The word "violent" finds a new response in the director's understanding.

When Dorothy Heathcote planned this session, it is possible she did not plan the detail of putting Peter Grimes in a strait jacket.(1.21) Nor did she see him in one the moment before she said this. No doubt she was aware that the agreement, which was occurring between them at this point, must be a stage to further exploration. The word, "violent", evoked an image of strait jacket, and she said it. Whether planned or unplanned, it certainly marked a new apprehension

of their situation on the part of the students. The dialogue is not following a planned route. It is being created at each moment here at this desk by the two parties.

The effect of the strong word, strait jacket, is to make the relatives all the more determined to help him. They shake their heads.

"You can't keep him in a strait jacket all his life".(l.22.)

They have jumped to the conclusion that the straitjacket is a life sentence. The director corrects that implication. "It gives us time to think".(l.23) She reminds the relatives about their own extreme measures, - they ostracized Peter Grimes, leaving him to spend lonely nights on the boat.

These words have the effect of putting the feeling of guiltiness in the way of the relatives. It reinforces their role, In role, they accept what is being said. "That is not neighbourliness". They realize this and change the word, neighbourliness, to friendliness. "He still needs friendliness".(l.24.)

The director develops the idea of friendliness. "Are you prepared to visit him if I let him out of the straitjacket?" -"Yes", they reply.(l.25-26.)

The director describes the risk involved. She uses technical terms and abstract words.(l.27) The reply of the students is surprisingly simple.

The technical questions are:"Has he any history of stable relationships? Is there any evidence in his life of stability?"

They answer, "When he was a young boy, before his father impressed the Bible on him, before he was dominated by other

people and felt to be no good".(1.28)

This is new; new to the director and to the students. The pressure of the dialogue has evoked, in an entirely natural way, the evidence which they had in some passive way taken in from the book. Words have awakened words. In the way the words are said, in their tone, there is implied the defeat of the director.

She defends herself. "But I have used my skills!"(1.29.) This is lame. She takes up the theme of the fitness of these people for society. "Is he a fit member of society?"

Then she makes a leap in her thinking which bewilders the relatives.

"He is a notorious man. People are writing about his case. He will be handed down as a legend of the place and of the time". (1.29.)

This in fact is what has happened. It became a poem. The students have forgotten this. They have closely identified themselves with the Peter Grimes of history. They have forgotten that they are studying a piece of literature. The remark comes as a complete surprise to them. "I don't see why".(1.30)

The director does not delay at the failure of this little attempt to move the students to a further distance from the actual event. Now that the seed has been sown, they will come back to it later, when they are ready for it.

This preparing for understanding in the students' own good time is a standard technique of Dorothy Heathcote. There follows a good example of how ideas prepared some time before recur in the student's understanding.

"And you say there is hope?"(1.31.)

"We'll try", say the relatives.(1.32.)

"Have you any proposition?" demands the director.(1.33)

The reply of the students picks up a previous hint of the director. She had announced, at the very beginning of the three days' teaching, when the students seemed to be taking in very little, that patients can identify with characters in books. It now recurs.

"If he was to watch an event acted out..."(1.34.) The dialogue which now follows is opening new ground both for the director and relatives, and at the same time for Dorothy Heathcote and her students. Each draws on the other to the point of facing the almost self-denying problem of acting and hallucination. The director asks: "Would that not re-confirm him?"(1.35.) This means that, by watching a scene depicting a man and a young boy, the patient's desire to repeat his cruelty and his murders might be revived. He could confuse the acting and the real thing, as he clearly confuses hallucinations and real objects.

When a scene is shown to an audience, they look at the situation with critical conscious awareness. The students have been themselves experiencing this conscious assessment in their scenes from the set books. Naturally, then, they expect a critical response from their relative, if they were to show him some scenes from his life. What they ignore, however, is that, in some people, the depiction may have the same effect as an hallucination. Peter Grimes would not know the difference between a depiction by actors, and an hallucination, when he sees a scene which is not there, but is

represented in the disguise of actors and stage props.
The students struggle with the problem. "If it were in private, so no publicity..." (1.36.) They instinctively believe that no one can change their behaviour if surrounded by people. Privacy is needed for thinking. Peter Grimes would have to watch the depiction in private.
At this point the girls are not thinking about hallucination. They are thinking about the possibilities for thought and personal fundamental change, which are the effects of good drama.
When the director asks, "What about the dead children?"(1.37.) the students are perfectly clear about the difference between a dead child and someone acting as a dead child. "That's why actors".(1.38.) This clear answer of the students meets a further difficulty. The patient is ill, and what will serve with a class will not serve with him.
"He does not know the difference between hallucination and actors"!(1.39.)
The director gives proof. There are places in the clinic that he will not go, -he sees his dead father there.
Here is a clear analogy with Ivan Karamazov.(p.105-6, supra.) He heard Alyosha describe his guilt. He recognized its truth. He attempted to hide the truth, by attacking Alyosha and calling him delirious. What Alyosha was calling the truth was simply the hallucination of a delirious mind.
The director reacts in the same way. She recognizes what the relatives are saying. So she attacks by saying, as Ivan said, that the patient will hallucinate, will be delirious.
There is a further point. We all to some extent hallucinate.

We often, through our imagination, see what is not there. An actor, a context, can conjure up an Oedipus, or a Medea, or some other archetypal figure, - the father -, and our imagination becomes wild with implications. We often see far more than what is there. The line between hallucination and critical response to an actor is not so clear cut as the definite assertion of the director would like us to believe. Her reply, far from dashing the hopes of the students, actually renews their confidence. Their plan may work, for all the director may say. In the same way, after Ivan's attack on him, that he was delirious, Alyosha goes forward with a trembling confidence, knowing there was no other way.

The director and the students are involved in the same ultimate questions as Ivan and Alyosha. We shall see in the next chapter how this concern about ultimate questions, and the possibility of change in both the speaker and listener, are a new kind of literary genre. It is a genre which, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, best explains the nature of the novel. What explains the novel might also explain the dialogue and the mixed genres of classroom drama.

The director gives permission for the relatives to visit other relatives of the other patients and convince them that Peter Grimes has a right to go about in society, and that they are justified in spending so much of their (school) time on him.

To conclude this chapter, we recall that, in the literary dialogue of The Brothers Karamazov, and in the classroom dialogue of Dorothy Heathcote and her students, inner and unspoken words are brought to expression. They are expressed, with a reference to all other words around them, in a

particular context. They resist, probe, agree; in a word, they interact. In the one passage the words refer to a father's death, in the other to Peter Grimes. In this the two passages are remarkably alike. But the most important likeness, for the purposes of this thesis, is that the words address each other, refer to each other, they keep an eye on each other, with a "sideways look". Dostoievski and the reader and the two characters, Alyosha and Ivan are aware of each other, in the sense of being aware of "the other". The teacher, the students and all the roles they play, Peter Grimes, director, relatives, are aware of "the other", and, in the interaction, are becoming themselves. They improve vocabulary, grow courageous, and take responsibility for someone.

Notes on Chapter Two.

1. Cf. General bibliography for references to her works.

2. Cf Of These Seeds Becoming, in Educational Drama for Today's Schools, Ed. Baird Shuman, Editor's note,p.1; and The Authentic Teacher and the Future, in Collected Writings, p.170).

3. Cf. Collected writings, p.140, "Drama also can start at any point and, and travel backwards, forwards, and even take a sideways glance, if necessary". Also,p.49. "The adult joke about my operation is an excellent example of this. The first account of the operation will be concerned with seeking to put the experience into perspective by communication but later accounts will take on order, style, selection, so that later, the account will be not a re-living of the actual event (which is now in perspective) but a re-experience of the

effectiveness of the previous tellings, with one eye upon the recipient". Cp. p.82, the account of dramatizing after an event, "for the pleasure gained and the effect we have seen it make upon others many times".

4. For Dorothy Heathcote the term "universal" means a generalization which focuses a lesson - i.e. brings together many scattered meanings and releases the possibilities of future development. Instead of Peter Grimes, she says human being. Human being is seen, for her, in the terms of the primary message systems of E.T.Hall, The Silent Language. She sees the class, students, and people in general, in terms of a network of culture, which Hall analyses into ten areas. Within each of these areas, a Major Triad operates, of formal, informal, and technical activity.

That is how, possibly, Dorothy Heathcote understands the word universal.It is a puzzling word. Its ordinary meaning is the opposite to individual. Its meaning in an artistic context is that an individual and unique action can, at the same time, belong to part of a larger framework. It has implications wider than itself.

In philosophical language, the problem of universals is as old as the traditionally first Ionian philospher, Thales. The problem is this. The world and people we perceive with our senses are constantly changing and different. Yet we know them, can make generalizations about them, and can speak of them without the individualizing qualities that make them unique. So I can talk about cups, all cups in the universe, even though the only ones I have ever seen are the ones in our kitchen, and those I have sporadically read about. -the Grail,

the chalice, the loving cup. This is the problem of the one and the many, the particular and the universal.

It has throughout history been resolved in one of three ways. There have been those who said the universal exists and the particular is its faint reflection. -the idealists. Their tradition stretches from Plato to the neo-platonists, both Plotinus in the second century, and the Seventeenth century platonist divines, and to Hegel and Marx in the nineteenth century.

Then there are those who think only the particular exists. The universal is no more than the sum total of the examples of particulars that you have seen. This is the nominalist, or the empirical, tradition. It has its roots in Aristotle, but its real father was William of Okham, and the line goes to the present day through John Locke, David Hume and J.S.Mill.

A third position is that of the moderate realist, which claims Aristotle as its leading light, and Augustine, Aquinas and Maritain, as its major proponents. These would attempt to balance the universal and the particular by an intricate psychological apparatus which perceives the universal form in the particular instance.

In her theory Dorothy Heathcote appears to be empirical, in the tradition of John Locke. But in her practice she is moderate realist. The advantage of being empirical is that it is practical and useful. It works, and requires little that cannot be proved. What cannot be proved cannot be true. As a dramatic instrument, empiricism is a search unending into deeper and greater knowledge. It develops a sense of wonder as the logic of discovery unrolls. But its disadvantage is an

uneasiness about principles, intuitions, possibilities and what cannot be proved by deductive or inductive reasoning. It is her equal concern with the latter that makes me wonder if, in practice, Dorothy Heathcote is moderate realist.

The history of the relationship of the universal and the particular can be read in the standard histories, in particular, in F.C.Copleston, The History of Medieval Philosophy, and Etienne Gilson, Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages, and, The Unity of Philosophical Experience.

CHAPTER THREE.

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN'S THEORY OF DIALOGUE APPLIED TO LITERATURE.

1. INTRODUCTION. Mixed Genre.

We have attempted to identify and describe a quality of dialogue which is called dialogicality. It is "the other" in whose presence one speaks. This relationship of self and "the other" has five qualities. It can only be in a context. It suggests the primacy of "the other". Values depend on it. Speaker and listener interact as self and "other". The complex reference of one to the other is called intertextuality.
We have examined it practically, in the case of four literary phenomena: stylization, parody, polemic, and dialogue. We have indicated the "word with the sideways look".
Mikhail Bakhtin calls it "jolly relativity". The presence of the other and the watching eye create "jolly relativity". The term does not mean it is funny or trivial. It is a relativizing activity which permeates the whole of society and the whole of literature. It creates its own new genre, a carnival genre.
Clifford Geertz begins his book Local Knowledge with the observation that:

"there has been an enormous amount of genre mixing in intellectual life in recent years and it is, such blurring of kinds, continuing apace".

He concludes that:

"the interesting question is not how all this muddle will come magnificently together, but what does all this ferment mean".
Local Knowledge,p.19, and p.34.

Dorothy Heathcote thinks that:

"Blurred genre is one of the gifts drama teachers bring to the school, but often people cannot understand it if you don't show them how it works, or demonstrate it with your classes, publishing around, even by just pinning things on the wall, and doing collages. It may look like an infant classroom, but it could have some productive effect. As you deal with the human condition, you have the responsibility to find the best means to present that human condition".
The Fight for Drama, the Fight for Education, p.54.

This chapter considers the mixed genre. At some length it will describe, following Mikhail Bakhtin, the nature of mixed genre, and the long tradition to which it is the heir.

2. THE NATURE OF GENRE.

The concept which Mikhail Bakhtin has of literary genre has two advantages for his general theory of literature. It obviates the need to distinguish form and content, and it decidedly stresses the social nature of literature.
To examine the form and content of a piece of literature has been common enough practice in literary analysis. The student asks what is the author saying and attempts a summary of it. Then the student considers the form or shape of the piece, the way it has been written.
The roots of such an approach lie in the distant past, in the distinction Aristotle made between the material and formal cause of any object. (1) These were not actually existing craftsmen who worked on different processes of the product. Matter and form did not have distinct existences. They were

principles of being, mental constructs, which made possible the philosophical understanding of reality. This understanding was for him primarily a metaphysical understanding, that is, an understanding of the world from the point of view of its being.

What was a great step forward in the fourth century B.C. lost much of its finesse in subsequent centuries. By the time of William of Ocham in the fourteenth century, and Descartes in the seventeenth,(2) principles of being were given actual crude existence. They were seen as things apart from each other. The body was different from the soul, and was separable from the soul. The soul had a place in the body. Matter was distinguished from form and separated from form, the body from the soul, the material of literature from the shape and form of literature.

The notion of literary genre, on the contrary, maintains the union of form and content.

Again, even more than the words and dialogues of speech, the genres in which we speak are intertextual. They come from other people, other ages, other mouths, and are filled with historical usage. The genres of everyday speech precede our understanding. They precede the individual's understanding. This emphasizes the predominantly social nature of words.

"Question, exclamation, order, demand, these are the most typical complete examples of daily speech. In the chatter of the sitting room, light and inconsequential, where every one feels at home and the main difference and separation among those present, (whom we call the auditorium) is that of men from women, in this situation, a very particular form is fashioned of generic achievement..
Another type of achievement, (completeness), works itself out in the conversation of a husband and wife, a brother and sister.
Every stable daily situation has an auditorium organized after

a certain fashion, and has consequently a little repertoire of little daily genres".
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. p.98-9.

These are primary, in the world of every day speech. Secondary genres are more complex.

"Novels, dramas, scientific research, the major journalistic genres. these arise in the conditions of a more complex, developed and organized, cultural communication, an essentially written communication, artistic, scientific, social, political in character.
In the process of their formation, they integrate into themselves and transform the various primary genres, constituted in the conditions of immediate verbal communication".
The Problem of Discursive Genres, p.239

Genres therefore begin in the conditions of immediate verbal communication, and are transformed into complex discursive genres.

We have seen that all speech has a double orientation, towards the listener and towards an object, towards "life, its events, its problems." (Formal Method in Literary Studies, p.177) Genre, however, relates speech to life rather than to the listener. The double orientation is present, but the emphasis is not equally divided. Genre is:

"A complex system of ways and means of taking hold of reality, to embrace it in understanding it.... Genre is the sum of ways of approaching reality, with a sense of completeness".
Formal Method in Literary Studies, p.181,183.

Hence genre is a model-making system, which proposes an image of the world. The artist must learn to see reality through the eyes of genre. Like speech, genre is always in context. It is always in space and time. It is used in a certain definite place and at a certain definite time. The word chronotope was coined by Mikhail Bakhtin specifically to designate these two

elements in regard to genre. Different historical periods and situations call for different genres.

"Many people, who possess the language admirably, feel completely powerless in certain spheres of communication, precisely because they do not possess all the practical forms which are in use in those spheres. Often a man who admirably possesses discourse in diverse cultural spheres, who can give a conference, lead a scientific debate and who joins in public questions admirably, is quiet, or joins in awkwardly in a normal conversation".
The Problems of Discursive Genres, p.259.

Each genre that is often unconsciously used in everyday conversation, and, still more, every literary genre which an author may use, bears the collective memory. This means it is aware of all the uses that have gone before, even the most simple and often used genres of greeting someone in the street. They carry the trace of all their previous history.

"Genre lives in the present but always remembers its past, its beginnings. Genre is the representative of creative memory in the process of literary evolution."
The Problems of the Poetics, p.87.

The more complex a genre is, the more it remembers its past history.

"Cultural and literary traditions (even the most ancient) are preserved and live, not in the subjective memory of the individual, not in the collective psyche, but in the objective forms of the culture itself, including the linguistic and discursive forms. In this sense they are inter-subjective and inter-individual, (consequently social). By this means they intervene into literary works, since the individual memory of creative individuals is nearly completely out of the question"
Remarks in Conclusion, p.397.

History, then, is alive in the objective genres as each is brought into play at any one time and place. It is not in any one individual mind, nor is it in the particular memory of any one individual. The understanding of the past exists at each

time and place that it is discussed between people in speech. It is primarily a social possession rather than an individual one. It can only be possessed when the other person is there actually or virtually.

For Mikhail Bakhtin, the novel is one particular kind of genre. It is not clear-cut, in the way epic or lyric poetry or tragic drama or comedy are distict literary genres.

He claims that the distinguishing feature of the novel is intertextuality and heterology. But other genres possess this as well. Oddly enough, the authors he describes as novelists are not the ones who would spring spontaneously to mind. Rather than Jane Austen, Walter Scott, Stendhal, Balzac, James, Conrad, Mann, to name a few, he proposes Socrates, Xenophon, Menippeus, Petronius, Apuleius, Rabelais, Fielding Sterne, Balzac, Tolstoy...

The novel, he claims, following the classic writers on the aesthetic of the novel, is a mixture of all the genres that have gone before. It is the youngest of the genres.

"Among the major genres only the novel is younger than writing and the book, and it is the only one which is organically adapted to the new forms of silent reception -that is, reading.
The study of other genres is analogous to the study of dead languages: the study of the novel is analogous to the study of living languages, young with abundance...
The novel is not simply one genre among others. It is the only genre in the making among genres which are completed long since and are already half dead".

Epic and Novel, p.448.

This was a common opinion among the classical writers on the novel.Here are two passages from F. Schlegel:

"Other poetic genres are now complete and can now be entirely analysed. The poetic genre of the novel is still in the making".

Kritische Ausgabe II. Athenaeum, 116, Fr.Transl. p.112.

"All modern poetics has the original colour of the novel".
Kritische Ausgabe, 11, Athenaeum, 146, Fr.Transl. p.117.

This compares with Mikhail Bakhtin:

"To a certain extent, it is with the novel, and in it, that the future of all literature is born".
Epic and Novel, p.481.

He compares the novel with epic poetry. The novel has the three following particularities.

"1. The tri-dimensional style of the novel coupled with the multi-voiced consciousness which is brought about in it.
2. The radical transformation of the temporal coordinates of the literary image in the novel.
3. The new zone of construction of literary image in the novel, namely, the zone of maximum contact with the present (contemporary) in its completeness."
Epic and the Novel, p.455-456.

He compares these with three qualities of Epic.

1. As Goethe and Schiller would say, the object of Epic is what is completely past, the epic national past.

2. Epic is derived from national legend and not from personal experience or free invention.

3. The epic world is separated from the contemporary world by an absolute epic distance. The world in which the events take place is separated from the world of the bard who recounts them, and from his audience, either at the time of the original account or at later readings or enactments.
This third feature is the essential one. What distinguishes the novel from the epic is that, in the epic, there is no continuity between the epic world and the time of its being described by the bard.

"The reference of the represented world to the past, and its belonging to the past, are the formal trait which constitutes epic as a genre.
The representation of the action by the author on the same temporal and value system as his own and that of his contemporaries, (and consequently starting from a personal experience and personal discovery), constitute the managing of a radical transformation, the passage from an epic to a novel world."

The Epic and the Novel, p.4556-457.

Hence what makes the novel different from Epic is its openness to the contemporary world. The novel does not deal with a closed world.

This distinction seems to be clear enough. But later Mikhail Bakhtin describes the novel as an aspect of Epic. Twenty years later Epic is described as an aspect of the novel. Todorov concludes:

"It appears then that Mikhail Bakhtin's description of the genre of the novel is not coherent and at times is unreasonable. It does not occupy the place he made for it in his system.
It is at the intersection of two categories, intertextuality and temporal continuity. But these do not specify the genre enough to situate it in any one historical instance".

Todorov, Le Principe Dialogique, p.139.

Intertextuality and temporal continuity: these are the two aspects of the genre of the novel which help our understanding of drama in the classroom. The one is the awareness of all the voices in the words, of all that has gone before and will come after. Dorothy Heathcote marks this in her fundamental concepts, (Collected writings p.37). The other is the openness to the contemporary world. This is called relevance, and needs to be demonstrated constantly to a class, whether they are investigating social issues, or Poseidon's gift of fire to the world.

3. THE HISTORY OF THE GENRE OF THE NOVEL.

According to Mikhail Bakhtin, the novels of Dostoievski belong to a different genre from that of his predecessors and contemporaries. These were writers such as Turgenev, with his Fathers and Sons, Goncharov with his Oblomov, and Tolstoy, with his Anna Karenina, and War and Peace. He calls their novels socio-psychological novels. They are family novels, biographical novels, and novels of every day life. In them heroes relate to other characters, not as persons, but as embodiments of social position and class. Thus a father relates to a son, a husband to a wife, a rival to a rival, lover to beloved, landlord to peasant, proprietor to proletarian, well-to-do bourgeois with declasse vagrant. In these novels:

> "the plot can never become the simple material for the intercourse of consciousness outside the plot, because the hero and the plot are made of a single piece. The heroes, as heroes, are born of the plot itself. The plot is not only their clothing. It is also their body and soul. And conversely, their body and soul can be revealed and finalized only within the plot".
>
> Problems of the Poetics,p.86.

Dostoievski's heroes, however, were not locked into a plot of that same high seriousness. His heroes found themselves in adventure plots. Thus, the aristocrat in an adventure novel has nothing in common with the aristocrat in a social domestic novel.

> "The aristocrat in the boulevard novel is in a situation in which a person has found himself. The person behaves as a person in aristocrat's clothing. He shoots, he commits crimes, flees his enemies, overcomes obstacles. All social and cultural institutions, establishments, estates, classes, domestic relationships, are only situations in which the eternal man can be himself. Problems of the Poetics, p. 86.

Consequently the adventure plot is put at the service of an idea. It is combined, in Dostoievski, with the statement of profound and acute problems. It puts persons into extraordinary situations which reveal and provoke them. It brings them together and collides them with other persons under unusual and unexpected conditions, precisely for the purpose of testing an idea, and "the man of an idea, i.e. the "man in man".(ibid.)

These "extraordinary situations", "unusual, unexpected conditions", enable Dostoievski to combine sermons, confessions, fables, lives of the saints, formal dialogue, and other kinds of literature into his story.

This abbreviated catalogue appears to be a description of drama classrooms. The adventure story, the small section of a story, a still picture, the piece of literature, or the telling of a joke, a moment of tension, which comes to an end at the ring of the school bell, the moment when everyone bursts out laughing, what we have here is a different kind of activity from any other classroom. Carnival describes it, but carnival with the long and serious tradition described in this chapter.

4. THE HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF MIXED GENRE AS A NEW GENRE OF LITERATURE.

Classical Greek literature recognized the epic poetry of Homer and Pindar as a specific genre. It recognised tragedy, in Aeschylus, and in Sophocles, comedy, in Aristophanes, history, in Thucydides, and rhetoric, in, for example, Demosthenes. In the fourth century, as the classical period came to an end, a new genre of literature began to emerge, the Spoudogeloia, the comic-serious, or tragi-comic. It included the dialogues of Plato, the satires of Menippus, bucolic poetry from the Alexandrians and others. The distinctive feature which unites these works is a carnival attitude to the world. They have, says Mikhail Bakhtin, an atmosphere of "jolly relativity", (VESELAIA OTNOSITEL "NOST". Problems of the Poetics, p.88.) He explains:

1. They carry a new relationship to reality. Their starting point for understanding, evaluating, and formulating reality is the present, the topicality of the immediate present. Hence they do not begin at an epic or tragic distance:

> "not in the absolute past of myth and legend, but at the contemporary level, in direct and even crudely familiar contact with living contemporaries. In these genres, mythical figures, and historical figures from the past, are deliberately and empathetically contemporized. They act and speak in familiar contact with the unfinalized present. Consequently, a radical change takes place in the structuring of time and of values in the artistic image".
> Problems of the Poetics, p.88

2. These tragi-comic genres are not based on legend, but are consciously based on experience, (although on an insufficiently mature experience), and on free imagination.

This is an upheaval in the history of the literary image, claims Mikhail Bakhtin.

What he means by that is the following. First, a personal anecdote. I was shocked some years back to hear a lecture on the relationship between Virgil and wall painting in Pompeii. It appears that his description of the underworld in the Aeneid,(3) and that of the islands, which Aeneas and his men visited on their journey, were taken from wall paintings, and not from observing some real islands or some outlandish dream of his own. The descriptions were already there in the received tradition. This, evidently, was as true for Virgil in the first century B.C. as it had undoubtedly been for Homer in the seventh century B.C. Homer took his descriptions from the mouths of other poets rather than from looking at nature. (4) In other words, epic poets continued to express the pictures, scenes, and stories they had already received. Aeschylus, in The Persians,(5) at Salamis, does begin with an actual experience of their defeat. But already he has, in his play, epically distanced it from the present, and put it into the remote past, by his language, and by his situating it in the Persian court. Again, Euripides reworked the myths he had received. He gave his characters much more of the feel of the Athenian Market of his day, but the mythological content was very clear. In the Bacchae,(6) Teiresias, drunken and garlanded as any Greek, follows Dionysus to his feast on the mountain. Pentheus, the king, stubbornly refuses to follow the God of the non-rational, to his undoing. The story was not invented, even though a very fifth century Teiresias and Pentheus inhabit it. These writers were not inventing a

world. They were entirely dependent on the stories they had received. Aristophanes also kept the mythological form. Its characters stalked his stage. Heracles, Dionysus, Charon, are characters in The Frogs.(7) But they were re-interpreted, to stage a mass public trial of the two poets, Aeschylus and Euripides. The interpretation was a parody. They were arraigned, in the story of The Frogs, precisely because they had dared to change the mythology.

These are examples of classical genres which developed while maintaining a connection with the past. The literary figures, the images on the stage, were the same as ever, but the interpretation was contemporary. With the Spoudogeloia, this was no longer the case. The genres became confused. New literary images emerged. Mikhail Bakhtin calls this an upheaval in the history of the literary image. Literary images were now taken from life.

3. These genres were deliberately multifarious and discordant. They rejected being limited to a single style of the epic, or tragic, or rhetorical, or lyrical. They mixed high and low, serious and comic.

"They make wide use of introductory genres - letters, manuscripts, which have been found, parodically reconstructed quotations, and the like!".
Problems of the Poetics,p.89.

Prose is mixed with poetry, living dialects combine with slang, and authors are concealed behind famous predecessors. Above all, and in all of these genres:

"the represented word, (IZOBRAZHENNOE SLOVO) appears alongside the representational word (IZOBRAZHAIUSHCHEE SLOVO) and in certain genres double-voiced words play a leading role."
Problems of the Poetics, p.89.

This means that words which represent other words, in some way change those words. Genres which represent other genres, as the novel does, also have the power to transform those genres. Two genres are particularly important for the development of the narrative of Dostoievski, and, for our purposes, for the development of the genres we use in the classroom or church. They are the Socratic dialogue, and the Menippean satire.

i) The Socratic Dialogue.

Mikhail Bakhtin claims that the Socratic dialogue was widely used as a genre. He defines it precisely as the kind of dialogical intercourse between people in the collective search for the truth.

"The truth is not born and does not reside in the head of an individual person: it is born in the dialogical intercourse between people in the collective search for the truth". Problems of the Poetics,p.90. (The phrase "between people" is emphasized in italics by the author).

The accepted view of Socrates' method is that it was aporetic. This means that he reduced what people said to its basic lack of sense or reason. He showed by his questioning that there was very little reason for holding to be true what everyone actually held to be true. At best we have to admit our helplessness and ignorance. He himself had no positive or alternative proposal for discovering the truth.
Mikhail Bakhtin takes this standard view a stage further. He implies there was something oral, spoken, and in the actual speech as it was said, that was never written in the dialogues which Plato wrote.

"Socrates called himself a "pander": he brought people together and caused them to collide in a dispute, as a result of which the truth was born; in relation to this new-born truth Socrates called himself "a midwife", because he assisted at the birth. For this reason he called his method an "obstetric" one. But Socrates never called himself the exclusive possessor of ready-made truth"
The Problems of the Poetics, p.90.

Plato, in his earlier dialogues, (the Meno and the Symposium,)

recognised the dialogical nature of the truth. He was under the influence of his master and was still developing his own philosophical outlook. In his later works, (Phaedo, Timaeus), the outward shape of a dialogue concealed his own ideas. He had a theory of the world and of its existence and of the nature of reality, which he put into the mouth of Socrates. In these later dialogues, the replies are determined by the author, so that he can explain further his own theory. This is the opposite of the dialogue Mikhail Bakhtin is talking about.It is a monologue in dialogue form. Socrates is turned into the sort of teacher we meet everyday, whose questions are already answered before they are spoken.

It must be said that this is a vexed question. Mikhail Bakhtin has accepted a widely-held view.(8) It is commonly held that there is a continuum from the negative method of Socrates, where he aimed to come to the truth which neither he nor his listener knew beforehand, to the closed monologue of the later works of Plato, where he knew what he wanted to say and arranged for the right questions to be put to Socrates. Irrespective of that academic doubt, what is clear is Mikhail Bakhtin's view of it. There is, for him, a clear distinction between the obstetric method of coming to the truth, where Socrates is midwife, and the truth lies somewhere between him and the people he is questioning, and the catechism method, where an already discovered, ready-made and indisputable truth is expressed in a monologue, even when disguised as a dialogue.

"It finally degenerated into the question-and-answer form of training neophytes, i.e. the catechism".
The Problems of the Poetics, p.90.

There are some other features of the Socratic dialogue which are important for the development of narrative.

1. One basic device for exposing ignorance or falsehood, was to juxtapose several points of view, as in The Symposium, where each guest at the dinner is invited to say what they think love to be.(9)

A second device would take simply one point of view and show its inadequacy. So, in The Republic, or in the Crito,(10) Socrates would question his friends about justice in the state, and if justice has the quality of wisdom, then what is this wisdom? Is it the wisdom of the carpenters? or of the bronze workers? Thus the opinion is questioned and shown to be inadequate, but at the same time it leads to a further question.

> "Well then,I said, is there any form of skill to be found among any of the citizens in the state we've just founded which is exercised not on behalf of any particular interest but on behalf of the city as a whole, in such a way as to benefit the state both internally and externally?"
> Plato. The Republic. 428.

The first device, that of simply putting opinions side by side, is called syncrisis, and the second, that of attacking a statement, is called anacrisis. Both place differing opinions together and seek the truth by their interaction.

2. The heroes, questioners, victims, characters, of the dialogues of Plato are ideologies. This is in Mikhail Bakhtin's sense of ideology. We have seen that he called ideology an entirety of reflections and refractions, in the human brain, of the social and natural reality which it expresses and fixes by a word, a picture, a diagram, or some

other semiotic form.(supra p.11.) The heroes and characters are the pictures, words, diagrams which stand for refractions and reflections of reality in the human brain. They stand for ideas, and are simply an "ideological event of searching for and testing the truth". (Emphasis on the word "testing" by Mikhail Bakhtin.) The plot is used simply to provoke the word. So Socrates is on the point of death. That is the plot. A man is going to die and his friends are with him. They begin to discuss the afterlife. Because of the plot, his words "are cleansed of all automation and objectivization and reveal the deepest layers of personality and thought".(11) In The Apologia, and The Phaedo, Socrates discusses his own death, and the immortality of the soul. The philosophical investigation however is limited by the form of the memoir and actual historical record of what happened. With Socrates a special kind of dialogue emerged - the dialogue of the threshold.

3. In each dialogue, a person represents an aspect of an idea; for example, education, or health, or justice. Both the idea and the person are put to the test in the dialogue, against the background of other ideas.

> "To the degree that the genre's historical basis, and its relation to the memoir are weakened, foreign ideas become more and more plastic, and people and ideas which in reality never come into actual contact, (but could have done so), begin to meet in the dialogues. This is only one step away from the dialogue of the dead, in which people and ideas divided by centuries comfort one another on a dialogical plane. In The Apologia, Socrates looks forward to dying and having dialogues with the shades of the past".
>
> Problems of the Poetics, p.92.

These are the characteristics of the Socratic dialogue which have a place in the development of narrative.

Ideas, and the people who expressed them, interact one with another, and the truth lies in the interaction, before any one overcomes the other.

As a specific genre, it lasted only a short time. Other dialogical forms followed it, and amongst them was the Menippean Satire.

ii) The Menippean Satire.

Menippus (12) was a slave from Gadara, in Sicily. From being a slave, he became a wealthy citizen of Thebes, in the fourth century B.C. He filled thirteen books with his writings, but none have survived except in quotation in the works of other people. We know that The Arcesilaus ridiculed the philosophical academy, The Birth of Epicurus ridiculed the cult of personality, and The Necyia assaulted the foolishness of the traditional representations of life after death. Menippus alternated prose with poetry. This varying the forms was a technique adopted by the Roman writers, Varro, Petronius, and Seneca.
He is only known from those who followed him and imitated him. These were Romans - Varro, Seneca, Petronius, Lucian, Apuleius, Hippocrates, and Boethius in The Consolations. His own teachers were Antisthenes, a pupil of Socrates,as Plato was, and another whose name is not known but he was a writer of Socratic dialogues, none of which have survived. Two other teachers influenced him, but of them only the names survive, Heracleides Ponticus and Bion Borysthenes.

The characteristics of Menippean satire, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, are these.

1. There is a comic element.
2. They are fully liberated from the limitations of historical and memoir form. They are free of legend, and are not bound by any requirements of verisimilitude. They have an

"extraordinary freedom of philosophical invention, and of invention within the plot".(13)

3. The most daring and unfettered fantasies and adventures are internally motivated, justified, and illuminated here by a purely ideological and philosophical end,

"to create extraordinary situations in which to test and provoke a philosophical idea, -the word, or the truth, embodied in the image of the wise man, the seeker after this truth".
Problems of the Poetics,p.94.

The fantastic here serves not as an embodiment of the truth, but as a search after the truth, its provocation, and, most importantly, its testing. The extraordinary adventures are to test the truth and not the character or specific individual.

4. There is an:

" organic combination, within the satire, of free fantasy, symbolism, and, on occasion, the mystical religious element with extreme and (from our point of view), crude underworld naturalism. Truth's early adventures take place on highroads, in brothels, dens of thieves, taverns, market-places, prisons, and at the erotic orgies of secret cults".
Problems of the Poetics, p.94.

The idea, which is being explored, has no fear of the underworld, or of the filth of life. The man of the idea -the wise man- is confronted with the extreme expression of worldly evil, depravity, baseness, and vulgarity.

5. It became the genre of ultimate questions. Boldness of invention and fantasy combines with extraordinary philosophical universalism and extreme ideologism. Ultimate philosophical questions are put to the test. They are not merely academic questions but bare ultimate questions with ethical and practical bearing(14). Thus Bion wrote of a

journey through the various schools of philosophy, while Varro wrote of voyages over ideological seas.

6. The Menippean satires have three levels of construction. Their action, and the putting together of ideas, takes place on earth, in heaven and in the underworld, and at the thresholds of each. This structure will appear again in the Medieval Mystery play, and in the Renaissance "literature of the heavenly gates".

7. A special type of "experimental fantasticality" emerged. Observation was made from an unusual point of view. For example, in The Golden Ass of Apuleius, the story is narrated from the viewpoint of an ass, or rather, of a man who turned into an ass. In other examples, radical changes occurred in the scale of the observed phenomenon. It might be on a giant scale or a dwarfish diminutive scale.

8. In the Menippea there is also experimentation in moral or psychological matters. There are found unusual and abnormal states of mind, insanity, split personalities, unrestrained day-dreaming, unusual dreams, passions bordering on insanity, suicide, etc. These destroy the tragic integrity of a man and his fate. In him, the possibilities of another life are revealed. He loses his finalizedness, and singleness of meaning. He ceases to coincide with himself. This is quite the opposite to what happens in the classical genres, in epic poetry or drama. In these genres, dreams are intended to make a prophecy, or to warn, or to motivate. They do not take the dreamer beyond the bounds of his fate and his character. They do not destroy his integrity.

Thus, for example, Macbeth does not finish up in the asylum.

The witches are a part of his story. They strengthen the resolve that is already in him. They have their part in his death. Similarly, in The Aeneid, the monstrous event on the shores of Troy, when Laocoon and his sons are eaten by the serpent, has its part in the panic of the Trojans, and in their pulling the great horse into their city, for all its ghoulishness.(15)

But in the dialogues of St Augustine with God,(16) a new man emerges at the end, and Augustine did not know where the dialogue was going. The reader in turn does not know what changes will occur during a reading of those dialogues. Similarly, in the Dialogue of Two Marcuses, Varro portrays a man in dialogue with his own self. The man is completely at odds with himself. The reader, too, does not know what will happen in the reading. The being- at- odds is what the dialogue is about, not some other great end to which this is ordered.

9. The Menippea contain scandalous scenes, eccentric behaviour, incongruous speeches, and performances.

"These destroy the epic and tragic integrity of the world: they form a breach in the normal stable course of human affairs and events, and set free human behaviour from pre-determining norms and motivations."
Problems of the Poetics,p.96.

10. They provide many sharp contrasts and oxymoronic combinations, transitions, changes, ups and downs, rises and falls, unexpected comings-together of distant and divided things, mesalliances of all sorts.

11. There are elements of a Utopian society, dreams of it, and journeys towards it.

12. Other genres are extensively used: novellas, letters,

symposia, oratory, the mixture of prose and verse.

"The inserted genres," says Mikhail Bakhtin, "are presented at various distances from the author's ultimate position, i.e. with various degrees of parody and objectivization. The verse parts are almost always to a certain degree, parody."
The Problems of Poetics,p.97.

13. Hence, the Menippea abound in a wide variety of styles and tones.

"There is formed here a new attitude to the word as the material of literature, an attitude characteristic of the whole dialogical line in the development of literary prose."
Problems of the Poetics,p.97.

14. Finally, these writings have a journalistic character in their reacting to the ideological issues of the day. They are topical and contemporary:

"a sort of diary of a writer which seeks to discover and evaluate the general spirit and tendency of evolving contemporary life".
Problems of the Poetics.p.97.

At the end of this lengthy catalogue, Mikhail Bakhtin notes that the genre of literature which he has been describing emerged in the decay of the tradition of a nation, and in the destruction of those ethical norms which make up the ancient ideal of seemliness (sofrosune). Ultimate questions about death, law, society, education, the gods, justice, were now raised wherever people gathered - in market squares, on streets, highroads, in taverns, or public baths, or on the decks of ships. Accepted traditions of behaviour, the rule of the polis, the city-state, the traditional education, had broken down. In the aftermath, human life was perceived as

"roles played out according to the will of blind fate, on the stage of the theatre of the world."
Problems of the Poetics p.98,

This is important for two reasons. In the first place, Mikhail Bakhtin here enunciates the fundamental theory that a period of history, which is itself in confusion and change, produces the genre of literature which also mixes and confuses preceding genres. He will give the same explanation for the rise of the early novel of Rabelais during the period when the Renaissance had disrupted the comparatively stable medieval world. The modern novel has its origin in a similar period of revolutionary change.

Secondly, the passage is important for the present thesis, because it mentions the theatre. "Roles are played out on the stage of the theatre of the world". This is a metaphor. It illustrates the feeling people then had of being at the mercy of fate as individuals, without the comfort of the city-state. The Hellenistic world was a vast world, and they were as if on its stage. If anything is to be understood here about Mikhail Bakhtin's view of the theatre, it is that it imitates life. We walk in life as if on the stage. This is a traditional view of the theatre. Mikhail Bakhtin did not write about the theatre as such. Yet much of his material is taken from medieval drama, to support his theory of carnival. It would appear that Mikhail Bakhtin thought of theatre as he thought of the novel.

There is an important corollary to the description of Menippean literature. Mikhail Bakhtin, in the 1930's, pointed out that the diatribe, not classical rhetoric, was the definitive influence on the ancient Christian sermon. The diatribe was one of the popular genres, which took various effects of the classical demosthenic rhetoric, and vulgarized

it. This then rather than the classical oratory of Demosthenes and Cicero was the model for the revolutionary preaching of the Gospel.

A word of explanation. For over a hundred years, questions of literary genre have dominated scriptural and patristic studies, as they now dominate literary studies. Form-criticism radically changed the understanding of scripture. Structuralist and deconstructionist theories in turn are now further influencing it. The bible is understood to be a library of many different kinds of literature, and many different genres. It took shape in the fourth and third century B.C, at the same time as the development of the Menippean literature.

Hence Mikhail Bakhtin is re-expressing one of the classical theories of the incarnation theology, namely, that the world was preparing for the coming of the Gospel. Vergil's Fourth Georgic is the locus classicus for this theory (17). In classical latin, a golden age poet describes a triumphant vision of the future. The Roman Road, the Diaspora of the Jews, the common language, koine Greek, all conspired to the spread of Christianity. That is the theory.

Mikhail Bakhtin would oppose this. It was not the Roman or Greek world which prepared for the Gospel, but the break-up of that world. When the Gospel writers, whoever they were, looked for models, they found to hand the subversive, celebratory Menippean literature. They used the forms of literature which were at hand to express their own celebratory and revolutionary message. New wine, new bottles: new message, new genre.

iii) A third influence on the genre of the novel is Carnival itself.

Carnival is a pageant without a stage, and without a division into performers and spectators. In the carnival everyone is an active participant, everyone takes part, no one merely watches. Even the policeman and the icecream seller are part of it. It is not acted. Its participants live in it. They live according to its laws, so long as these laws are in force. They live in carnivalistic life. The carnivalistic life is life drawn out of its usual rut. It is, to a degree, life turned inside out, life the wrong way round.(18)
Carnival has the following characteristics.

1. All distance between people is suspended, in favour of free familiar contact among people.
2. A new modus of interrelationships is established between people. It is opposed to the omnipotent, hierarchical, social relationships of non-carnivalistic life. Eccentricity is the special mark of the carnival attitude.
3. Mesalliances occur: the sacred with the profane, the lofty with the lowly, great with insignificant, wise with stupid.
4. All that is sacred, authoritative, or conventional, is profaned and vulgarized.

Carnival is what happened among people at certain times of the year. It was a social occasion. It was an event long before writing and long before written literature. But it was, all the same, a part of human culture.

In literature the carnival spirit had the following effects on writing.

1. The epic and tragic distancing of the audience which occurred in classical genres, in Homer and Sophocles, was changed. It was transformed into a zone of familiar contact.
2. The organization of plot became less strict.
3. The author related to his characters in a familiar way.
4. The action was determined by the new logic of mesalliances, and of the profanatory lowerings of status.
5. The words used in carnival literature, their verbal style, became transformed from the epic and tragic styles.

In this new genre of literature certain images recur. Mikhail Bakhtin points out the more important ones.

1. Crowning and uncrowning.

There is ritual crowning and uncrowning of the carnival king or queen. The normal political authority is changed. In this short-lived life, is mirrored the rise and fall of all princes, the pathos of change, of death and renewal. In this "experienced and play-acted sensuous form of the ritual performance", is expressed a living attitude to life. What is customarily thought of as absolute and permanently fixed, is revealed for what it really is, conditional and impermanent. All carnival symbols and images include these two opposites. They affirm the reality of death. They also negate death and show its powerlessness. Carnival celebrates the change itself, the process of replaceability, rather than that which is replaced. Here is the theory of Mikhail Bakhtin writ large in political life, that dialogue is at the point of change from

one person to the other, when all the voices are present, each one refining the other, in a delicate interaction.

2. Hence fire is a characteristic symbol of carnival. It is profoundly ambivalent. It destroys and it renews. In carnival performance, a structure of bric-a-brac, called Hades, is often burnt. Candles are carried and extinguished. A bonfire is often the centre of the proceedings.

3. Laughter is also a characteristic of carnival. It ridicules and pulls down the mighty and powerful. It causes them to look critically at themselves. The laughter is often ritualized. It occurs in scenes of death and birth, at anything to do with reproduction, and symbols of reproductive power. It parodied sacred texts and divinities. It was directed towards civil authorities, the truth, the change of world order. It laughs at both poles of the change, because it is concerned with the process of change itself. In this lies its profound ambivalence. It cannot be coopted in the service of any one pole of a change because it celebrates the change itself.

4. Parody is inseparable from the carnival genres.

"Parody is the creation of a double which discrowns its counterpart. (RAZVENCHIVAIUSHCHII DVOINIK). Every thing has its parody, its double, its jester, in carnival literature."
Problems of the Poetics,p.104-5.

5. The carnival square is where carnival takes place. It belongs to the whole people. It is universal. Everyone takes part in it. The square is symbolic of the whole people. Other

places, where carnival takes place, take on the significance of a carnival square - streets, taverns, roads, baths, wherever people meet.

Thus, according to Mikhail Bakhtin, the Socratic dialogue, the Menippean satire, the medieval carnival, the novels of Rabelais and Dostoievski have a common bond. They represent the words of others, in a new and unrepeatable context. At each repetition they acquire new meanings while retaining their former meanings. The words themselves come into contact with each other in new ways, with unpredictable results.

"In the subsequent development of European literature, carnivalization constantly assisted in the destruction of all barriers between genres, between self enclosed systems of thought, between various styles etc. It destroyed all manner of isolation and mutual neglect, it brought together things which were far apart, and it united things which were separated. This was the momentous function of carnivalization in the history of literature".

Problems of the Poetics,p.111.

Notes to Chapter Three.

1. Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy, p.78-84.
2. Copleston, Medieval Philosophy, p.1, for a general view of Descartes and Medieval Philosophy; p. 126 for William of Ocham's rejection of the universal.
3. Virgil, the Aeneid, VI l.295-316. for the picture of Charon on the Styx. and III, l. 506ff for the final journey to Italy and the storm which flung the travellers to the Isle of Polyphemus.
4. Lesky, The History of Greek Literature, pp.41-53.
5. Aeschylus, The Persians, l. 1-159, for the opening lament in the Court of the Persian king.
6. Euripides, The Bacchae, l. 1044-1149. for the messenger's description of the eventual tragedy.
7. Aristophanes, The Frogs, l.1119-1250. for the battle of the two writers.
8. Albin Lesky, The History of Greek Literature, p.515.
9. Symposium, 178a.
10. Crito,47c and passim.
11. Problems of the Poetics,p.91.
12. cf. Albin Lesky,op.cit.p.670.
13. The Problems of the Poetics, p.93.
14. "..all problems which were in the least "academic", (gnoselogical and aesthetic) fell by the wayside, as did complex and extensive argumentation, leaving, essentially, only bare "ultimate questions" with an ethico-practical inclination." Problems of the Poetics, p.95. This well illustrates the difficulties of the translator
15. Aeneid, II, 199-233.
16. Augustine, The Confessions, Bk.XI, ch.XIX
17. Virgil, The Eclogues, Ch.IV, l. 14-17.
18. The Problems of the Poetics, p.100.

CHAPTER FOUR.

DOROTHY HEATHCOTE AND CARNIVAL.

In 1978, Dorothy Heathcote taught a three day session in a school in Stockton-on-Tees. The entire session was recorded on video, some 15 hours. She set herself to teach the texts which the sixth form were to study for their A-level examinations. Her declared purpose for her teacher students was to look at methods of negotiation, with a class.
In this chapter we will look at her work on text in the light of what we have seen of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogue and carnival. First there will be a general look at several aspects of carnival, then four particular aspects.

1. GENERAL ASPECTS OF CARNIVAL.

When Dorothy Heathcote leads the class down the room to the benches she does three things which are instantly recognizable as a de-throning ceremony.

"Come on in," she says: "Let's sit down. Sit in your desks where you are used to; it's a bit of an open arena feeling". She sits down herself and says a loud, unmistakeable, smiling and parodic, "Raight then!" All over Yorkshire these words mean, "Let's get started: we are ready to work".
The teacher-pupil relationship is at once changed to that of a gang of people ready to do a job of work. Classroom authority begins to give way to another authority. A new relationship of

equality is suggested.

She asks a series of questions.

"Did they not tell you anything? Were you just herded in like sheep? Have you been threatened? Are you threatened? Do you feel threatened? All this gear! Hm...(a very long pause.) Did you say something?"

These questions attempt to dispel ordinary daily classroom fears. The arena where they are to work is free from threat. But the students have to admit this themselves, and so release themselves from it. That is the reason for the stubborn pause at the end.

She begins a second de-throning activity.

"Would it bother you terribly if I asked you to wear your names. Would you mind? So that you can be addressed as people. My name is Dorothy Heathcote. Would you like me to wear my name? Do you want me to write Mrs, or Miss, or Dorothy? How do you address teachers? Can I borrow a pen? Heathcote - it looks like Heath-cote! All set?"

The normal style of address for students and teachers is re-examined. The reason is that, "Now we are people." A new relationship is being formed, and the participants must decide their names, and style of address. Dorothy Heathcote is herself de-throned and renamed, Mrs, Miss, or Dorothy. She parodies her own name. "It looks like Heath Cote." She is defining a new authority in the classroom. It is parallel to the new authority at carnival time. Here is a new dispensation in the classroom where they are. They have new names. It is like the enthronement of the new queen of the carnival time. She spends a little time discussing the texts set for the examination. She asks about their sense of worry. She herself

is worried about the reading of these books. She asks them to trust her in a special way. She is going to do something very artificial.

"I will go out, and when I come back, it will be very artificial. Meanwhile will you put your chairs round so that it well be a very ordinary position, with just this artificial thing in the middle."

She puts on a white laboratory coat and stands near a table covered with papers. The papers are set texts, prepared for another part of the lesson.

"Miss Jones, if anyone needs me, I'm down in the foyer with a group of guests. -I'm not wearing my bleeper!"

She walks over and sits down in the circle of chairs with the students.

"How much information have they given you? (Silence.)
Typical.
You do realize it is a psychiatric clinic?"

Some nod, a sort of acquiescence.

"Did you? How did you guess?
I hoped it would be just like a mansion from the road.
How did you recognize it? Do you mind if I take a few notes?"

She takes up a pen and pad, which add an air of formality.

One student ventures that the feel of a clinic was "in the air".

Dorothy Heathcote pursues the point.

"And did you see any people? -behaving in a strange way? No one under the trees, enjoying the sunshine?
Well, you will be wondering why you have been invited here. I understand that you are currently studying English literature -it is the right group of people, isn't it? I have a hunch. There is an odd group here. Society finds their behaviour bizarre. Why? What impels them to act the way they

do? You may be able to help me use literature to help them.
One man draws.
Maria Eschen. You may know someone who may help Maria to see her problem. She loves jokes. Her jokes are always too much, however. How could you help her? Could you show her a model, which helps her to see that her behaviour goes too far.
In these seven books? Can you find someone?
If Maria could see someone going too far, could she learn to see who she is herself? If you look at someone else behaving as you do, you see yourself.
We have another called Tam. Perhaps you could recognize him, and say, "I know that one. That one is in my book as well".
Tam has a problem of getting to bed, and a curious obsession with horse tails. Do you recognize him?
Would you say I am right about my patients?
Another one keeps hiding knives. Do you know someone in literature who hides knives? He once threw one into the middle of the lake.
What happened to your literary one?
Another woman has a box of trinkets. Do you know a parallel?
So you think my hunch is right?"

During the exchange, the students have begun to understand that their knowledge of the set books was being put to the test. They warmed to the game. At this point it was more a game than entering an imaginative field. Dorothy Heathcote continues:

"I wonder if I could create situations for my clients, and let them see people behaving in literature at crisis points. The one who picks up knives has a choice. Sometimes he hides them. Sometimes he hurls them into the middle of the lake. He never does anything else. Is it possible to show what his choices are, and that what he does has a certain logic? Will you help him? (There is a certain hesitancy). Are you saying that you don't know how to be helpful?
There's no problem with that. I'll find a way."

In this section two dethronements occur. A new authority is now established, the director of the clinic. At first it was the authority in the classroom that was changed. Now a new equality is established. The students are guests and are the equals of the director. She needs them as consultants. By treating them as consultants, she signals that a new relationship has begun, inside the terms of the story, inside

"the big lie". This is a dethronement of the director of the clinic who has appeared till now to have a dominant role in the life of the patients. The students, on the other hand, have been enthroned in the position of equals to her, as consultants with expert knowledge in their own field. Secondly, her clients are de-throned literary figures. Maria, Bedevere, Tam O'Shanter, Michael Henshard are tumbled from their literary perch and become eccentric and somehow manageable.

There is parody in the vision of the august figures of the books as people who play jokes, throw knives or simply go off to bed.

The students are laughing by this time. The absolute has became conditional. It is parallel to a special carnival time. Dorothy Heathcote now comes out of role and speaks as Mrs Heathcote. She explains that she has looked for a way of dealing with all seven books at once. The difficulty is how to cope with different styles, how to shut off one and push up another.

"It's like a map of the London underground -how do we get from one to the other,-or like the building of a new estate, where we put down the roads first. We are getting the roads organized".

Dorothy Heathcote now introduces the concept of moral dilemmas. She explains that every one of the set books is about people who took choices, political choices, life and death choices.

As director of the clinic, she says she has gathered together the literature to look for the moral dilemmas that her clients have lived through.

The clinic has now become the scene, or the area where the carnival takes place. The new relationships have been established. The students are now consultants with equal expertise. They are in free familiar contact with each other. Hence there will be mesalliances, - meetings which would not occur in the normal run of events. Great literature will find itself side by side with nonsense. Sensitive language will be with coarse language, vivid symbolism with the trivial. We shall see banqueting knights having a problem with the gravy on their bread. There will be deep wisdom and unthinkable stupidity. There will be the hair-raising profanation of set texts, while their authority and conventions are probed and criticised.

To assist the search for moral dilemmas amongst her patients, Dorothy Heathcote produced envelopes with plain cut-out figures in them. With these the students are to make pictures of any dilemma they may find. A relevant quotation from the text would underline their picture.

This activity is pursued by the students throughout the rest of the day. It is essentially a carnival activity. It reduces to a cardboard cut-out the complex characters of the set books. Each text itself is reduced to a symbol, a corn stook or a bridge. Dorothy Heathcote urges the students to think in symbols, rather than by using names. She asks them to note the places in which an incident occurs.

"Look at all these places mentioned in the Ode to St Agnes' Eve; there are eleven".

The reason for doing this is almost casually stated.

"If you see a moral dilemma in a place, with a quotation next to it, so my client sees a situation and a place, and a dilemma."

This means that the client of the clinic sees the real world as a simplified representation, like a cut-out shape. He or she does not see the world in anything like its normal complexity. For the client, this simple vision is the norm. What we would call an extremely naive and childish cut-out is for the patient in the clinic the norm. What the patient sees, and what actually is, never come into dispute in the patient. There is no internal reflection, no "other" with which to compare.

It is therefore the intention of the director to create such a comparison. She is going to make dialogue happen. The students are to help her. If her patients can see a symbolic version of their dilemmas, they may be brought to a better understanding of how complex their problem really is. But they have to start where they are at, that is with the vision of reality they know, the cut-out. They begin with a carnival representation of their dilemma.

In this first section several aspects have been proposed, which make possible an analogy between the drama classroom and the carnival square. These are the carnival arena, the dethroning, the special time, and the simplified representation of reality, in a parody.

2. FOUR EXAMPLES OF CARNIVAL.

In the rest of the chapter, four examples will show distinctive carnival features. These are;

a) the texts are reduced to the ultimate questions of life and death.

b) the characters of the original texts are dethroned from literature and brought to trial in a classroom.

c) and d), the complexities of the texts are converted to symbols and so are manageable.

Example a)

A group of students are discussing A Man for all Seasons by Robert Bolt. They are examining the words of Thomas More and Henry VIII.(1) Henry is saying:

"Your conscience is your own affair, but you are my chancellor. Whatever you personally think, you've got to agree with me."

Dorothy Heathcote asks: "Whose moral dilemma is it? Thomas More's?

She and the students now put on the style of Henry and Thomas by her saying: "Say it to me, as if I am Tom. What does Tom say? Does he not say, "Your marriage is not just."

The student replies, "I am your gracious loyal minister."

"Playing for time." says Dorothy Heathcote in role as Henry.

She then asks again if it is More who has the moral dilemma, or both the questioned and the questioner. She suggests perhaps the students should put both dilemmas.

In this passage the students stylize the words of Henry. They try to use them in the sense that Henry intended them, in so

far as sixteen year olds could possibly know this. "Your conscience is your own affair."

They are then questioned, as to whose dilemma this one is. They invent a parody, -Thomas More is actually reduced to Tom. "Say it to me as if I am Tom". In role as Henry, they repeat, "Your conscience is your own affair, but you are my chancellor. Whatever you personally think, you've got to agree with me".

While these words were being spoken, Dorothy Heathcote listened in the role of Thomas. But now she comes out of role, to ask the student what he thinks Tom would have said. She proposes alternative words, a direct statement of what Thomas thinks.

"Does he not say, "Your marriage is unjust?"

The student searches for something like the words enshrined in the text. "I am your gracious loyal minister..."

"Playing for time!" pronounces Dorothy Heathcote, now momentarily in the role of Henry, impatient with a chancellor who will not speak his mind.

She has only seized on a part of the text, and has cut off the less courteous but very direct ending to the sentence -I am your gracious loyal minister, -but God's first". Hence she has made a travesty of the text, reducing it to something entirely different from the original. It is Henry now who has a problem with a dithering chancellor. She has broken the authority of Thomas More, and the conventional interpretation of his rightness. This is a dethronement and a reversal in the sense of carnival. The travesty may well be appalling. The original lines by Robert Bolt, quoting his sixteenth century sources,

may be puzzling, and questionable. He too was only making a play. What is undoubted is that the process of change is being marked and celebrated. What actually is being changed is not so important at this point.

This text shows role play, as Thomas, or Henry, parody, and travesty. But most clearly, and very quickly, the students have been forced to face ultimate questions, namely, the problem of conscience and law. This has always been one of the major life-and-death issues. We have only to think of Antigone. Her conscience was to bury her brother while the law forbade her. This first example was to show the way drama classes deal with life-and-death issues. They get to the point very quickly.

Example b)

The same group continued its search for moral dilemmas in A Man for all Seasons with the incident of the bribe.(2) A cup is given to Thomas More. Dorothy Heathcote demands why he did not give it back, if he knew that it was a bribe.

"This seems to be a very serious moral oversight. He kept quiet about a bribe".

The exaggerated formal language here forces the student, Tracy, to answer that "More knew that she was wrong but he did not want to hurt her. So he gave it away to someone else."

"Took the easy way out!" said Dorothy Heathcote.

This was brutal. The student's attempt to defend Thomas is brushed aside. Thomas More is now facing a court once again, but this time in a different century.

In a loud voice, Dorothy Heathcote addresses all the class.

"Everyone, here is a man who was sent a gift. More accepted it, then gave it away".

With this the whole complex decision and statement of More is reduced to a simplicity that borders on the travesty.

She pursues her questioning

"If he knew it was a bribe, why did he not expose it? Is it a point of morality to whom you return the bribe? Should you have given it back? or flushed it down the toilet? (It is not clear on the videotape what she is referring to, but certainly it is not a cup. JF.B.)
He was a fool, to give the cup away to the unstable Rich. I would have serious doubts if I had given it away. Poor Rich!"

The student answered that Rich did not mind - he bought cloth with it.

Dorothy Heathcote maintains her questioning.

"Is it weakness or is it strength to live up to something you can't - (Not clear what is said here in the video. JF.B) What happened to More?"
"He was executed!" replied the students.
"Oh!" said Dorothy Heathcote.

Her tone shifts to that of advocate. As director of the clinic she begs that the same fate cannot await her client.

"But my client has a wife and family. What will they do, if he goes to prison?

The students eventually agree that More was right not to expose the briber. They come back to the point of view that they had in the beginning, but now they have examined it from the opposite point of view.

Two examples of menippean satire occur in this passage. The text was reduced to a travesty. A polemical interaction occurred in the dialogue with the students. "Took the easy way

out"!, was the phrase which led to a revision of the ideas which the students brought to the text. They examined it from a different point of view, before returning to their original point.

The second menippean feature of this scene was its formal shape. It was a courtroom scene. An investigation took place. Thomas was tried before a modern jury for bribery.

Example c)

Dorothy Heathcote is now with the group that is working on the novel, The Mayor of Casterbridge.(3)

She asks, "Is it immoral to buy a wife you have just seen?"
The students reply, "He bought her for five pounds".
"Why?" pursues Dorothy Heathcote. "Is there any evidence why he bought her?"
"She had a rough deal", they answer.
"Was she a permanent wife, or a night out? What were Henshard's feelings at this point? Was he drunk? Is it drunkenness, or morality? Could another person, who had the same guilt, find out how the guilt happened to him?"

Here again there is a trial. The director is looking for evidence. Someone who lived in the past is before a present day court. It is a travesty of the original, in the technical sense of a simplified version which does not do duty to all the facts, but on the other hand gets very quickly to the essential questions of morality, and responsibility, and guilt.

The dialogue is polemical. The words of the director are interacting with the straightforward answers of the students, to widen their understanding of the issues involved. She loosens the grip of the text, and the author's view. She

contradicts what they are accepting from the author about the heinous drunkenness. She shows there may be a different point of view if Henshard were merely drunk.

Again we are in the area of Ivan and Alyosha, and the problems of guilt and responsibility. The director of the clinic is in two areas, in two voices, in Bakhtin's terms. She is talking to relatives of Henshard about his lifetime of responsibility for taking the wife when drunk. But she is also talking to the students about their guilts and responsibilities. The two are together. Their involvement comes from their own selves, while outwardly they are dealing with the unconnected problem of Henshard. This is the effect of dialogical interaction. Like Ivan, the students feel the discussion is about them as well as about Henshard, that idiot who got drunk and bought a wife, to paraphrase Ivan's remark about Smerdykov.

Example d)

Susan, the wife whom Michael Henshard bought, has decided to send her daughter, who is Henshard's daughter, to see him in his house in Casterbridge.(4) After listening to the students, as they put together the story, she overturns their thinking with:

"This is a housewife who interferes in the marital affairs of another. She makes her decision and uses her daughter to find a father she would not recognize".

The questions follow.

"Why did she not tell her daughter? It was not her Father? The original daughter had died? Could this lead to serious problems? It is so small an act, to go and look for a child,

but it landed the girl with the person she did not very much like.
Terrible, you may say?, but was it murder?"

This is elliptical because the camera does not convey all the reactions of the students to which Dorothy Heathcote was reacting as she put her barrage of questions. The sudden implication that the death of the original daughter might have been murder seems arbitrary. But it throws the whole discussion into a new seriousness. Again we are in court, and the subject is murder, and people from the past are being arraigned before a modern court.

The students are stung into replying that Elizabeth, the daughter, went to Henshard, for her mother's sake.

The words of the dialogue are multi-voiced. They have the tones of the original author, and those of the Director, and those of students and teacher.

These four examples illustrate specific carnival features of classroom drama. The rest of this chapter will give more examples in Dorothy Heathcote's course at Stockton-on-Tees.

3. OTHER EXAMPLES. THE BIG ONE.

On the next day, the carnival activity continues with a classic dethronement. Dorothy Heathcote proposes to make a waxwork. "All I want," she says, "is somebody's body. How are you pronouncing Porphyro? I just want a male body, trousers and jacket."

The jocular tone adopted here is overtly to put the students at their ease. They are not required to do anything. Less ostensibly, and more instinctively, she has used a carnival dethronement. Even more, she has introduced the profane, and the profanization motif essential to the Medieval carnival.(5) She brings the sacred text of John Keats down to the level of the reproductive power of the earth and of the body. "All I want is somebody's body". With all its ambiguity, this is seriously intended. The stark effect on the students is attenuated by the question, -How are you pronouncing Porphyro? She has introduced a diversion. It lessens the shock of her ambiguous remark. Even here, however, there is a dethronement, in the sense of her not knowing how to pronounce the difficult name. The pronunciation is what matters more than the name itself.

Then, after this slight lull to allow some recovery, she shocks even more, by appearing to understate, and then by making the point absolutely clear.

"I just want a male body -trousers and jacket". The body itself is further reduced to its symbolic coverings, the trousers and the jacket, sufficient coverings for the

generative organs, male and female.

Then Dorothy Heathcote turned to the next character, the ancient beldame. "Is it Agnes? Look it up! Angela?" Again she questions a name, but this time she gets it wrong. Agnes is not the name of the Beldame. So she dethrones the classical expectations of the text, and begins to enthrone someone the students will understand. A student volunteers. She is assured she will not have to speak. "One Angela!" exclaims Dorothy Heathcote, with an unmistakably ironical tone. It is parody. She tries her shawl on Angela, to make her more like a beldame. But, as she goes to fit it on her, she remembers Porphyro. She puts it on him. "Put this over one shoulder, -it alters a bit".
This is a clear instance of a transformation. The boy is altered into Porphyro. Porphyro himself is now changed into a shawl round a boy.
A volunteer then comes forward for Madeline. "One Madeline," announces the ironical voice, acknowledging for all to hear that parody was afoot. "One standing waxwork model!"

This episode dethrones the three characters of John Keats' poem and enthrones them in the carnival square. They become physical and symbolic, the body, and the shawl.

The banquet in the poem now becomes a carnival feast. The students create a corridor, an entrance, a hall. They decide on the symbols which will give a feel of the night: a sleeping porter, a cat, a riding whip, or a sword for Porphyro

"There's a medieval element in the banquet," says Dorothy Heathcote, "so ladies cannot cross their knees, and are you eating with your fingers? Did they have plates? or bread platters? and eat the plate afterwards?"

The banquet of Keats' poem is reduced to difficulties with gravy, to whether or not legs were crossed, and eating with fingers, -in other words, a carnival feast.

At this point in the work, Dorothy Heathcote steps back and surveys the scene. She then uses narrative in the conventional way in which it is often used in drama in the classroom. (Cf. The State of the Question. p. xi-xiii) It quickly distances the students from a scene in which they have been taking part. As the teacher speaks, they look at themselves with her eyes, from the outside, and for the moment they are turned from participants into percipients. So Dorothy Heathcote looks at the stilled banquet scene.

"There's an air of being related in space but not in heart. There's an air of serving and attention to serving. A sense of people..."
At this, the solemn tone of pronouncement is broken, and she laughs. "Actually, it's an amazingly depressing banquet!"
The effect of the laughter is that the boys take themselves less seriously, and shuffle themselves into something more of a banquet.
"Hold it there!" says Dorothy Heathcote. She looks at the beldame.
"She walks crablike, sideways, with a sense of containment."

She looks at Porphyro.
"The alien one,
who comes unannounced,
unattended,
unnoticed
unseen
unknown...!"

Narrative is used here by the teacher to distance the students from their story. They have, for these few moments, looked at themselves reflectively from another person's point of view.

What Mikhail Bakhtin adds to this, and what Dorothy Heathcote, and other drama teachers, understand in practice, is this. The words of the narrative have this effect not because they are referring to a reality that is there. In the case of Porphyro they are clearly not referring to the boy. The teacher is not holding a mirror up to nature, or determining a nature out there. The words are referring to words. They are intertextual. They are bringing the class back to the poem, to "the alien one, who comes unannounced...

A word may here be in place about the relation of words to an external reality. It is a problem as old as the Ionian Thales. He felt everything was made of some similar material. There was an "everything", that was always the same and yet always changing. He said it was water. Water was, at one time, ice, at another time, steam, at another time, a river. It was solid, it was moving, it was spirit. Behind this simple speculation was speculation. Our cast of mind, our European way of thinking, is speculative. We put things together and compare and contrast differences. This is the inheritance of the Greeks to us. Plato said all things were, not water, but shadows of their real selves. Aristotle said they were not so much shadows as a mental construct, a human abstraction from the things which move and change about us. The cynics and sceptics doubted the possibility of any universal judgement, of any speech about things. Notice, all of these were thinking of a world out there which somehow is to be encapsulated in thought. This was the problem of the universal.

Ludwig Wittgenstein, in his Philosophical Investigations, has shown the way to eliminate any necessary connection with a

world out there. Words are self-referential. They refer to other words, to their context, and to their genre.(6).

"Hold that position!" Dorothy Heathcote now says. "I want to take you into the interior of this poem".
A student reads:

"Meantime across the moors,
had come young Porphyro with heart on fire
for Madeline. Beside the portal doors
buttressed from moonlight stands he."

"That is his choice", says Dorothy Heathcote.
Three girls have been allocated to him as his spokespersons. He knows that he will not have to speak. He is only the "jacket and trousers". Dorothy Heathcote says to the three girls, "You three must tell him more about his decision. Offer him alternatives. Show him what they are: if he goes forward, how he may be changed; if he stops, what he may miss".
At this, the girls begin to speak to Porphyro inaudibly.

"May I trouble you?" intervenes Dorothy Heathcote: "I didn't quite hear. I would like to hear it spread right down to this banqueting half".
She adds, out of role: "I realize it is an intrusion. It is asking private matters to be made public, but drama works this way. You see, literature allows privacy. Could you please repeat it again so that we can all hear."

Drama is here distinguished from literature. Drama makes private matters public. Literature allows privacy. This is a practical definition, to encourage the students to speak, loudly and slowly, their thoughts to Porphyro. What in fact happens, in so doing, is that, in Bakhtinian terms, their thoughts become less absolute, and open to contradiction, by association with other speeches.

Dorothy Heathcote now asks the girls to repeat the reasons and motives they were attributing to Porphyro. The girls speak:

"Go on.
You love her.
It's worth it.
It's dangerous."

"Is there anything else to add?" says Dorothy Heathcote. She allows a ruthlessly long pause, before repeating. "Is there anything else to add?" Then she eases the pressure. "Don't worry about not keeping on saying...you'll find that if you push yourself, and allow others to push you, there's a lot more to add to the meaning, because you add only what you understand".
She herself watches Porphyro, and speaks from the point of view of the helpers.

"She's only a woman. There will be more like her!"
Then she adds; "Now, Porphyro, rest a minute. Thank you."

Porphyro has been standing for three quarters of an hour, with his arm and cloak shading his face.
During this time, the class has been making a parody of Keats' poem. It was quite a solemn mockery, even though there were often smiles on their faces. Porphyro has adopted a burlesque pose of the romantic lover. The shy girls have begun to attack him, and put him on trial. Porphyro has been brought into the present, and is being judged. This is carnival. Judgement now comes from a different quarter.
Dorothy Heathcote addresses the banqueteers.

"Banqueteers, do you think of something relevant to his decision". (This sentence has an archaic ring to it, thanks to the strange imperative, "Do you..") "He hits some tremendous

decisions later on, and as long as we think of words such as "law abiding", "virtuous," we can see how righteous these decisions in fact will be. So keep on adding, and when it seems like dying, keep adding."

She looks at Porphyro and the three speakers from the point of view of the banqueteers. She begins to speak in narrative mode, with words full of reference, and watching the class, and the banqueteers.

"You are not on your own property, sir!
Are you sure you are safe to do this thing?
What if the banqueteers had armed themselves with knives!
They will kill you.
Do you know it is St Agnes' Eve?
She may not want to be disturbed.
She is virtuous."

Each question, or statement, is followed by a pause. From the carnival point of view, this is the trial of Porphyro. Dorothy Heathcote is suggesting the death of the carnival king by the knives of the banqueteers, in the carnival story. And he himself is seeking a bride. There is to be a wedding, and a hint at the orgiastic motif of carnival, "She is virtuous." This is parallel to the feastings and weddings and licence of medieval carnival.

Dorothy Heathcote moves the class into action. "Did he come in? And how did he come in? Check in your books".

The students read from verse nine.

"Beside the portal doors,
buttressed from moonlight, stands he, and implores
all saints to give him sight of Madeline,
but for one moment in the tedious hours,
that he might gaze and worship all unseen:
perchance speak, kneel, touch, kiss - in sooth such things have been.
He ventures in..."

"That's quite a description of his manner", said Dorothy Heathcote. "He implored the saints that he might gaze and

worship, -he ventures in.
Can you, Porphyro, begin to move and Tracy will read the lines and teach you the manner of it. You, (Tracy), will conjure for him how things are now".

At this point she explains a little of what she is doing.

"The problem with modern T.V. and theatre is that everything is done quickly. We are slowing down experience into meaning. As she (the student) reads, we see how slowly this occurs in our experience".

She now looks at Porphyro, as he enters the castle, and puts questions to him. This is the same technique as before. The questions, the dialogue, refer to other words, both those of the poem, and those forming in the girls, as they are put under pressure to speak.

"What is he feeling when the portal is down behind him?
Is there evidence that he closed the door? Even closing a door is important. Does he see? hear? touch?
Does he want to touch Madeline, her place? face? form?"

She adds, just in case the student in role as Porphyro wants the chance to speak; "He can talk in a waxwork".

Again carnival elements here are; the reduction of the whole story to the symbolic "closing of a door": the vision of Madeline, the desire to touch her, with its reverent profanation: the feel of adventure.
But Dorothy Heathcote is not sure that the students understood how slowly the action is to be. She tells an anecdote to show how fast things happen but how slowly they become experience.

"I was told a secret recently. I didn't pause, I kept on washing-up, but I was completely changed, and am changed towards that person. No less and no more a friend, but just a different colour. I have not demonstrated it yet to that person, because I can't dream how to.

And so we unpack a pause in a person's experience. When Porphyro senses it, he moves, and we teach him how many experiences he has.
So, get that pregnant feeling again, so that the person comes in at a frozen moment".

Dorothy Heathcote is careful to explain here that time stands still while understanding happens. Time at the present stage of the lesson is very different from normal lesson time, and from time in normal life. She has not yet dreamt of a way of expressing the instant complete change that happened to her at the moment of washing-up. Porphyro, and the boy portraying him, does not understand what is happening as he approaches the castle, but time can stand still, while the helpers tell him the several experiences of his entry. They unpack the moment and turn it into experience. This is a carnival element. It introduces variations of time and space.
As the class looks at the still picture of Porphyro, Dorothy Heathcote recalls the context of the clinic and says portentously.

"The interior life is not the same as the external behaviour in my patients."

This remark may appear trite. Its main purpose is to give a further vantage point for understanding Porphyro, from his feelings as well as from his exterior posture. She is keeping the class in the area of the dialogue. She says to Porphyro:

"As you feel yourself taking the decision, verbalize it, if you can".

Porphyro now says, with shy but deep commitment, in words that would make John Keats scream:

"I must go forward to see my girl".

These words are an entirely serious burlesque of the poem. The word "forward" is from the poem, and has an archaic tone, indicating that the student is beginning to make his own the formal feeling of the poem.

Dorothy Heathcote adds:

"You're giving it like we've printed it, to share Keats' mind. Do it slowly. It won't look natural to do things while feeling them at the same time, while it is natural to express feeling and answer questions for exam purposes, except that we are not used to finding visible evidence of feeling".

This is a way of explaining how drama distorts, or appears to be unnatural. To do something, and to be aware of it as you do it, is not normal. We do something, and, afterwards, perfectly normally, we express what we have felt. We can formulate answers to questions in an exam. So there is Porphyro's original entry, or the legend of it. Subsequently John Keats writes it down. Then we ourselves read the poem and are able to say what he was feeling and intending. That is the poem. The exam answer is written to explain the feelings and intentions of Porphyro. What the drama does is to bring together the first action of Porphyro on entering the castle, and the feelings he had then, and the subsequent understandings of that action, by makers of legend, John Keats, the teacher preparing the class and our students as they read it now. All this is brought into consciousness. Drama does this synchronically. (cf.Dorothy Heathcote, Collected Writings p.131-2.)

However, Mikhail Bakhtin's notion of intertextuality brings a synchronic dimension to the diachronic narrative. The dialogic

nature of the words means their intertextuality. That is, the words refer to other words, interact with other words. They are words with "a sideways look". It is not simply that drama is synchronic and narrative is diachronic. Narrative has a synchronic constituent, which lies in its need of context, its direct contact with "the other", its values, its relationship of speaker and reader, and most importantly, its intertextuality.(cf.Chapter 1). p67 ff.

As Porphyro stands at the threshold, Dorothy Heathcote takes and reads the text herself. She reads very slowly, attending to the tone. As she brings the room to a hushed stillness, melodrama creeps in. This is a parody of Keats. He is a romantic poet, but not in the sense of the gushy extremes later attributed to them. Dorothy Heathcote pays no attention to the whimsical self-distancing phrase, "in sooth such things have been."
She takes the text and looks around. An anticipatory hushed stillness awaits her. She changes this.

"He ventures in with storm in his heart".

This is a misreading. She has glanced at the wrong lines in the text, and made them serve the drama she is now enacting. The phrase, "will storm his heart", occurs two lines below the phrase, "he ventures in". The phrase which should follow, "He ventures in," is, "Let no buzzed whisper tell:" and it maintains the hushed silence.
She continues:

"This is more difficult. There is a lot more coming. He finds

this woman. Will it shake her till she trembles? You girls, follow Porphyro like his furies, you understand his interior mind.
He ventures in: Keats' words will teach you the slowness of the experience".

Tracy reads:

"He ventures in: let no buzzed whisper tell:
all eyes be muffled, or a hundred swords
will storm his heart, love's fevrous citadel:
For him those chambers held barbarian hordes,
hyena foemen, and hot-blooded lords,
whose very dogs would execrations howl
against his lineage".

In the silence that follows this reading, Dorothy Heathcote adds a quietly-spoken corollary:

"Don't make a sound. In a place like this! With eyes everywhere!"

She says to the girls following Porphyro, "Can you give that feeling?"

They move down the room a little, still rather fast. Dorothy Heathcote continues to help them.

"They will rise from the table and kill you
A hundred swords will storm your heart.
Love' fevrous citadel, -all that love in him".

The girls now themselves add:

"Can't go further!
Let's go back!"

These remarks are a mixture of the words of Keats, and of the teacher, and of the girls themselves. They are side by side and interacting as multi-voiced words. They are chiefly stylized words, as they are trying to go along with the teacher and with Keats in the direction of their thought. But,

at the same time, their own thoughts are beginning to emerge. There is a basic disruptiveness in all speech, as it moves simply from one word to the other, from one mouth to the other. That is what is happening in these phrases of the girls.

Carnival images are present in the text. There is a dismemberment. Swords are to storm the heart. The love is fevrous, hot like a fire, both destructive and constructive. Dorothy Heathcote makes a carnival travesty out of them. She asks for a gesture to express storm and burning. "Dare you clutch your heart?" - and, to assuage the gentle disbelieving smile, she adds in her own voice; "I assume you are old enough to have been in love, and have some idea of the fever of love".

She increases the Gothic feeling of this episode by referring to a Gothic building. She recalls a catholic college in London which was said to be haunted. It had pointed doors and archways, - smaller doors for smaller people. We are in a melodramatic adventure, in a turreted haunted building.

She turns to the banqueteers to ask them what will they do to him?

One says, to a chorus of half hidden embarrassed sniggers, "Take his legs off."

The remark is taken seriously.

"What will that do to him? Without legs you will not look well on a horse. No pot legs: no national health: no job: no security".

Three points are noteworthy here.

1. When the boy said, "Take his legs off," he said it quietly and a little disruptively. It was more a challenge than a contribution. Dorothy Heathcote, however, attempted to breed implications from that one remark. It is not a phrase, but an action with consequences. If legs are cut off, you will not look well on a horse.

2. At this level of implication Dorothy Heathcote is similar to Mikhail Bakhtin.

Mikhail Bakhtin sees his world symbolically. It is his habit of mind. In Medieval literature, he perceives a limb or a body as a symbol for a universal physical limb or body, which opposes, subverts and reflects the spiritual and intelligent person. There is always "the other". "The other" is always implied in any word, or sign or symbol.

Dorothy Heathcote also is aware of implication. When she sees a limb, or a body, she is aware of implications. She sees all limbs and all bodies, as a brotherhood. Here the consequence of having a severed limb is that you would not look right, and certainly you would not look right on a horse. There is no possibility of deception, no pot leg, no national health, simply loss of work. Thus she draws out the implications.

There are also differences between the two teachers and thinkers. The consequences drawn out by Dorothy Heathcote are social and political. Severed limbs mean loss of job, loss of mobility, insecurity. The consequences drawn out by Mikhail Bakhtin involve the opposites, the parody, the relativizing "other" that each existence implies. Hence severed limbs in, for example, Gargantua, by Francois Rabelais, stand for a

parody of the medical profession and an encomium of the human body.

In book one, chapter 44, Friar John has captured my Lord Posterior, and surrenders him to all the devils.

"Then at one blow he sliced his head, cutting his skull over the temple-bone and taking off the two parietal bones and the sagittal suture, together with a great part of the frontal bone: and in doing so he cut through the two membranes and made a deep opening in the posterior lobes of his brain. So his cranium remained hanging on his shoulders by the skin of his pericranium, falling backwards like a doctor's cap, black outside and red within. And he fell to the ground stark dead."
Gargantua.Penguin Edition,p.134.

This extract is a celebration of the body. It refers to the medical profession, to all the intimate details of anatomy, is utterly ghoulish and at the same time unthreatening, because of the laughing eyes of the author watching the reader. The technique, of high dialogicality, self reference, and the sideways look, is the same as that of Dorothy Heathcote. The only difference is in the actual type of consequences that are drawn. To repeat, hers are social and political, those of Bakhtin are literary and philosophical.

3. Dorothy Heathcote is not herself aware that she is showing the student the serious nature of the remark, that it does have social consequences, and that it could be a carnival dismemberment. Most likely, she sensed the possibility of disruption in the boy's remark, and checked it by a deliberate appraisal of its consequences. There was a feeling for a blood letting, a carnival killing or maiming, but she curbed what she thought was mere disruptiveness.

In general Dorothy Heathcote works in what she herself calls the classic mode. (cf. Her note on p.145, Collected writings.)

She leads her students from fact to implication, from knowing to understanding. She has no thought that the implication or the understanding when eventually achieved may be laughing at her. In Mikhail Bakhtin's view, the end product of understanding will still have the opposite, the other, the relativizing principle, which will reduce even what we have learnt to its humane place in the world.
There is a difference of principle here. For Dorothy Heathcote, the end of knowledge is simply to know. That in itself is sufficient. For Mikhail Bakhtin the end of knowledge is laughter.(cf.Chapter 1.p.57.)

Porphyro, the student in role, now begins to find words.

"I want to see her. No one understands".

The banqueteers continue drinking wine.

"Not one beast affords him mercy" quotes Dorothy Heathcote. "Meanwhile the beldame is moving towards Porphyro. What then is she thinking?"

A boy reads the verse, very dully.

"Ah, happy chance! The aged creature came
shuffling along with ivory - headed wand,
to where he stood, hid from the torch's flame,
behind a broad hall-pillar, far beyond
the sound of merriment and chorus bland:
He startled her: but soon she knew his face,
and grasped his fingers in her palsied hand,
saying, "Mercy, Porphyro! Hie thee from this place,
they are all here tonight, the whole bloodthirsty race!"

The girl, who is Angela, begins to speak her thoughts. "So Porphyro has at last come!"

"Is she expecting him?" asks Dorothy Heathcote, "Please check, let the words come. We are dealing with Keats and not our own interpretation. -according to our own experience, but we don't change his ideas."

With these words she explains the essential need to know the actual words of John Keats, and constantly to check the text. Her intention is to raise the students to the poetry. But it seems that she has done this by bringing out the carnival aspects of the poem in the arena of the classroom. It may be tempting to think that the carnival will be over, that it was perhaps a technique for simplifying the poem, and that the students will read the poem with understanding and acceptance as the examination gets nearer. But the habit of seeing through the eyes of someone else, the dialogical principle, which is the lesson behind the drama, remains. Once carnivalized means always carnivalized, in the deeply serious sense of always sitting on one's own shoulder putting the next question.

At this point the students are noticeably more fluent in their speech.

Dorothy Heathcote asks the beldame to grasp Porphyro's fingers in her palsied hand, and so he will feel how old she is.

The student makes the gesture. She takes the hand of Porphyro. In carnival terms, this is a meeting of life and death, of young and old, alive and palsied. Bodily deformity is to the fore. They discuss shuffling. "Shuffling means nowt until you are the shuffler."

"People do not shuffle because they decide to, but because they must. An enormous experience lies there of what she is like physically to herself, of what causes her shuffle, the palsy, and you must be sensitive of her feeling of her own body when she touches your strong fingers".

At this point Dorothy Heathcote explains a little more of what she is doing.

"We are not asking you to act. You are only there to perceive, because literature is words, and you are creating your own poems alongside Keats, even though you may not feel it, -because he sought to fight for the experience to be communicated; all these playwrights did; you stand in their shoes. Don't feel guilty if you haven't started speaking yet. Don't feel guilty, but also don't back off from it. Share it, and when you can, speak it. So, don't feel guilt from me. You must be tired of hearing me talk. I am trying to fill in something that you can take over for yourself when you get to your own situation. The big one will ease you in".

These words convey the active nature of this kind of learning. "You are creating your own poems alongside Keats."(7)

"So shuffle your way in," says Dorothy Heathcote to the beldame. "Soon she knew his face".

The girl attempted to shuffle, to the sympathetic smiles of all around.

"Say your thoughts now. The dwarfish Hildebrand. Madeline knew of him. Skilled in killing, not beautiful to look at. Try saying her thoughts".

The girls begin to speak fluently.

"Flit like a ghost away."
"Leave, for your own good, for your own safety".

This is certainly not the language of Keats. It is their own language, but changed as it comes into contact with, and as it interacts with, that of Keats in the poem. This is carnival time when heightened language, and richer images are allowed. With the final verse, the speakers follow Porphyro and the beldame to a dark small chamber.

"Tell him what he finds there," says Dorothy Heathcote, "how the experience happens, chill as a tomb", she adds, with the melodramatic voice. "Tell him that experience".

The girls now repeat to him the experience,

"Cold, dark, evil place, one door, safe, find Madeline".

The language of the reader of the text of Keats, and that of the girls, now begins to combine. It has become a Gothic adventure, but through this the students are finding their own way into the text.

Two hours were spent on a few lines of a poem. It was, as Dorothy Heathcote said, "the big one". The students have felt what it was like to go into the words of a text. Now they return to their groups, and choose a book and a dilemma to be examined.

The Carnival features, which we have found in the drama classroom, were dethronements, trials, parodies, the celebration of the lower bodily functions, dismemberments, deformity, child murder, a servant deceiving a master, nightmare... all this in the new order established by the clinic.

Drama in the classroom is the heir to a long and honourable tradition. It is an art form. Unlike poetry, or theatre, or lyric, or oratory, or history, it blurs the genres, using many different kinds, which interact amongst themselves.(8) Genres come together in a new unity. In this they are parallel to the novel in the theory of Mikhail Bakhtin.

The reason why drama in the classroom can blur the genres in this way is in the nature of dialogue. Dialogue is

intertextual. It has a present spoken reality which does not transfer to print. Every word that is spoken has "correspondances", to use the expression of Baudelaire. It reverberates with all the other times it has been spoken, or used. It is the synchronic element in the diachronic speech. The Christian liturgy took shape at the same time as the Menippean literature. It mixes many genres. It has the shape of a dialogue with God. There follows an application of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory to the Eucharistic prayer.

Notes to Chapter Four.

1. Heineman Educational, London. 1963,p.33.
2. Ibid. p.59.
3. Penguin Edition, 1985, p.78.
4 Ibid. p.127ff.
5. The Problems of the Poetics, p.101.
"With this is connected yet a fourth canivalistic category,- profanation: the carnivalistic blasphemies, a whole carnivalistic system of lowering of status and bringing down to earth, the carnivalistic obscenities connected with the reproductive power of the earth and the body, the carnivalistic parodies of sacred texts and apothegms, etc.

6. We hardly seem to move in this essay but we meet either the problem of the relation of words to an external reality, or the problem of universals. Suffice it to say here that the Ionians, Plato, Aristotle, the Cynics and the Skeptics, the Idealists and the Nominalists, agreed that there was a world and a relationship to it. Since Wittgenstein, the problem has been restated in linguistic terms, in which the relationship is seen as one of words to words.
7. The question to be asked is whether this kind of active learning is, in any sense, the practical application of theories of writerly and readerly texts. For instance, Roland Barthes, in his "S\Z", emphasises both the writer and the reader. Both are involved in an active collaboration. Ross Chambers, in his book on "Story and Situation", shows how writers put clues into their work for the reader to follow. The text is a tissue of such indications. It would seem that these writers are approaching the same questions, though from a different point of view, as Dorothy Heathcote touches on here. "You are creating your own poems alongside Keats".
8. Two questions occur here which are beyond the scope of this present work. The first is whether the mixed genre of Mikhail Bakhtin is the same as the blurred genre of Clifford

Geertz, and whether either have any resemblance to what Dorothy Heathcote means by the term. The second question, equally damaging to the integrity of this paper, is, if genres come together in a new unity, are they like the novel of Mikhail Bakhtin, which we have already seen does not measure up to the description he has written, Or, on the other hand, does Drama in the classroom, uniquely, measure up to the description he gave of the novel. To amass the evidence for the application of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogue to drama rather than to the novel, as he applied it, would be far too treacherous a shoal for this little barque to traverse.

CHAPTER FIVE.

DIALOGUE AND CARNIVAL IN A LITURGICAL TEXT.

INTRODUCTION

We have looked at a text in Dostoievski's The Brothers Karamazov, in which Ivan spoke with Alyosha, as it has been interpreted by Mikhail Bakhtin. We have looked at a text from the Ode on St Agnes' Eve, by John Keats, as it was taught by Dorothy Heathcote in a school in Stockton-on-Tees. We come to a third text. It is the text of a Eucharistic Prayer recited by a priest in a church in Carlisle.

The complete text follows, with a few remarks about its normal meaning for Christians. The approach in this chapter is different from that normal approach, in that it looks for dialogicality and carnival elements. Some support will be proposed for this view, in scripture, and in the historical development of the prayer. It seems that there were Menippean features in the Jewish Passover, one of the historical antecedents of the Eucharist. Some practical conclusions will be drawn about the performance of the prayer, the qualities of the presider, and the training of a presider.

THE TEXT OF EUCHARISTIC PRAYER TWO.

1. P. The Lord be with you.
2. C. And also with you.
3. P. Lift up your hearts.
4. C. We lift them up to the Lord.
5. P. Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
6. C. It is right to give him thanks and praise.

7. Father, it is our duty and our salvation,
8. always and everywhere

to give you thanks
Through your beloved Son, Jesus Christ.

He is the Word through whom you made the universe,
the Saviour you sent to redeem us.
By the power of the Holy Spirit,
he took flesh and was born of the Virgin Mary.

For our sake, he opened his arms on the cross;
he put an end to death
and revealed the resurrection.
In this he fulfilled your will,
and won for you a holy people.

And so we join with the angels and the saints
in proclaiming your glory
as we sing (say):

Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
    Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
    Hosanna in the highest.

Lord, you are holy indeed,
the fountain of all holiness.
Let your Spirit come upon these gifts to make them holy,
so that they may become for us
the body and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ.
Before he was given up to death,
a death he freely accepted,
he took bread and gave you thanks.
He broke the bread,
gave it to his disciples, and said:
Take this, all of you, and eat it:
this is my body which will be given up for you.

When supper was ended, he took the cup.
Again he gave you thanks and praise,
gave the cup to his disciples, and said:
Take this, all of you, and drink from it;
this is the cup of my blood,
the blood of the new and everlasting covenant.
It will be shed for you and for all
so that sins may be forgiven.
Do this in memory of me.

P.C. Let us proclaim the mystery of faith.
C. Christ has died,
    Christ is risen,
    Christ will come again.

In memory of his death and resurrection,
we offer you, Father, this life-giving bread,
this saving cup.
We thank you for counting us worthy
to stand in your presence and serve you.
May all of us who share in the body and blood of Christ

be brought together in unity by the Holy Spirit.

Lord, remember your Church throughout the world;
make us grow in love,
together with John Paul our Pope,
John our bishop, and all the clergy.
Remember our brothers and sisters
who have gone to their rest
in the hope of rising again;
bring them and all the departed
into the light of your presence.
Have mercy on us all;
make us worthy to share eternal life
with Mary, the virgin Mother of God,
with the apostles, and with all the saints
who have done your will throughout the ages.
May we praise you in union with them,
and give you glory
through your Son, Jesus Christ.
Through him,
with him,
in him,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all glory and honour is yours,
almighty Father,
for ever and ever.
All: **AMEN.**

Before this prayer is said, there is a liturgy of readings and intercessions. It involves reading, singing, reciting, commenting on, and meditating on, the bible.

In this first part, art, music, and drama have traditionally been used to assist the understanding of the texts. The music is as varied as plainchant, Mozart's requiem, the folk song revival, the spiritual, the Victorian hymn, the meditative chant, the progressive music of the cathedral choir. Art has always been prominent in the hanging of pictures, the decoration of the church: the colour and shape of vestments, antipendia, tapestries: sculptures and statuary: flower and candle arrangements: stained glass, pottery, metalwork, and book art.

Drama especially has come into its own. Often there are two, three, or more readers, well practised in voice projection and

the use of the microphone. There are small plays, with actors, scenery, and theatrical clothes. Stage props, teaching aids, overhead projectors, slide projectors and videos, have found a place in the Liturgy of the Word.

Dance is used in processions, and to accompany and express hymns, psalms, and musical interludes.

In general, art, dance, and drama, illustrate the text. Several different pieces of music could give the various moods of the text. Several pictures could be drawn of the same story, say the birth of Christ. Several dances could illustrate the essential movement of the texts.

Some art forms seem to go further than illustration, or interpretation. Describing a Eucharist in 1904, R.H. Benson writes of the:

> "...motions of those three men in green at the foot of that lighted fragrant altar, and see how orderly and exquisite is the whole affair. It is no less than a sacred dance, and there is hardly one religious emotion that does not find its representative there".
> On the dance as a religious exercise, in Letters of a Pariah.

This is a different notion of dance from the dancing of the hymn, or the procession with the gifts for the Eucharist, or the prayer after communion. R.H.Benson has situated dance, as it were, at the inside of the movements of the priest and ministers. The movements themselves are the dance.

In something of the same way, drama can be said to be inside the words. The liturgy is full of narrative, - stories, sermons, songs, poems, letters. When they are read, they function as narrative.(Cf.p.xi,The State of the Question.) Simply to read the words turns people from participant into

percipient. The words distance people from the action. They slow down the events, give order, and establish a ritual. They focus attention. They are parallel to the teacher's words in the classroom. Drama, in this case, is on the inside of the words. It is in the nature of narrative.

The approach here is that of the drama teacher. The view of those who attend the Eucharist, and of those who preside at the Eucharist, is theological rather than literary or dramatic. (1)

This chapter takes for granted the contribution of drama, from the outside, to the interest and interpretation of the texts. It takes for granted that the words of the prayer work dramatically like narrative. They are like the shaping words of a teacher in a classroom drama. It takes for granted the theological and the philosophical analysis of the Eucharist. Its purpose is to show that the drama of the Eucharistic text lies in its dialogicality.

THE TEXT OF THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER IN THE TERMS OF MIKHAIL BAKHTIN.

The form of the Eucharistic prayer is that of a dialogue. The priest and people talk to God. They talk about their salvation, about their well-being, about sinfulness, about memories. It is the same subject as Ivan and Alyosha. They, too, talk about guilt and being safe, murder and truth. The director of the clinic speaks with students about her clients, about their worthiness for the society, and the reasons which brought them to her clinic. We have seen how very quickly they

were discussing questions of guilt, truth, murder, child abuse, responsibility for others, and many other serious moral dilemmas, - buying a wife you have just met, taking a bribe. The priest and people talk to God. God is "the other". In Rudolf Otto's phrase, he is "the wholly other"(2). God is primary in the relationship. The relationship is maintained by "the sideways look". They watch God the Father, while they speak to him about the son. This is the dialogical relationship. It is unique. It is unrepeatable. The two parties, God and people, are changed afterwards.(3) Eucharistic Prayer Two, and all such Roman prayers, begins with an explicit dialogue between priest and people. In the terms of Mikhail Bakhtin, it is a stylized use of language. Each of the speakers quotes the words in the direction of the meaning of the words.

Priest: The Lord be with you.
People: And also with you.
Priest: Lift up your hearts.
People: We lift them up to the Lord.
Priest: Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
People: It is right to give him thanks and praise.
Line 1-6.

This piece of dialogue is a negotiation. The words themselves are not so important as the awareness of each other and the echoing of the words from mouth to mouth. They are trying to put on each other's style. They are watching each other as the director of the clinic watched her team of experts.
The priest now addresses God directly.

"Father, it is our duty and our salvation,
always and everywhere
to give you thanks,
through your beloved Son, Jesus Christ".
Line 7-10.

These phrases are all quotation. "Father" is the scriptural name for God, - Abba.(Rom.8.15). "Always and everywhere to give you thanks", echoes St Paul, to the Ephesians, (5.20.). "Your beloved Son, Jesus Christ", quotes Matthew, 3.17, which, in turn, quotes Isaiah, 42.1. This latter is not a direct quotation, but it is represented in the way Mikhail Bakhtin would describe as dialogical.(Cf.Ch.1,p.?) It is in a new axis and is given a new direction by the speaker. Hence, the priest's words are already full of self-reference, and are polyphonic.

The Prayer continues:

"He is the Word, through whom you made the universe,
the Saviour you sent to redeem us.
By the power of the Holy Spirit,
he took flesh and was born of the virgin Mary.
For our sake he opened his arms on the cross;
he put an end to death
and revealed the resurrection.
In this he fulfilled your will
and won for you a holy people".
Line 11-19.

We are not thinking of these words as theology. We merely note the reference to the theology of the word, "the Word through whom you made the universe".(Cf. footnote 1.) Nor are we thinking of the shape of the prayer, as it has developed over eighteen hundred years. It has a logical form. The prayer outlines the reasons for which we thank God. It proceeds from the desire to thank God to the telling of the story of what he did. Again, it is narrative, and operates as narrative.(Cf. The State of the question, p.?) But it is much more. The text works as dialogue. It is dialogical, in the sense of the theory of Mikhail Bakhtin.

The words compare with the way Ivan Karamazov found Alyosha

was looking into, and reading, his fears. They compare with the students who found that the director was reading their secret fears about their responsibilities for Peter Grimes. The priest, and the people with him, are watching God the Father, as they say the words to him which are his complete joy: they talk about his Son. A dramatic dimension is contained in the nature of the words as dialogical. "He put an end to death" (1.18.).

In the context of the students and the director, such a statement would introduce a dramatic tension. To say to Peter Grimes, with a "sideways look", that Jesus "put an end to death", would amaze him, stretch his credibility, or drive him into deeper despair. Mercy is not for him. But his relatives have hopes for him. There is no need, even for him, to despair. Similarly the words "He put an end to death" would intensify the conversation of Ivan. These words would offer a possibility of hope. The three conversations contain dramatic tension of their nature. The priest and people are reminding the Father of the momentous action of the Son. "He put an end to death".

The argument here is that literature is much more than a good starting point for liturgy. It may well be said that the best way to prepare for liturgy is to read King Lear, or listen to the Mozart Requiem. The human prepares for the divine. The connection between drama and the liturgy is at best ancillary. But the comparison with the two secular contexts is not simply to prepare the human reaction to the liturgical context. Mikhail Bakhtin indicates more. The real argument is that literature in general, and drama in particular, are intrinsic

to liturgy.

The form of the Eucharistic Prayer is that of a conversation. It is a dialogue. Something is happening at the moment of speaking between the people and God, which changes both. Beyond the text there is a personal and unique contact. It is like the contact of teacher and student in the drama classroom, and it is also like the relationship between Alyosha and Ivan in Dostoievski's novel.

Take the phrase, "In this he fulfilled your will". (Line 18.) An instructive jarring chord is introduced here. It is in the phrase, the will of God. It refers to the loving and saving care of God. But, over the years, the phrase has hardened into something imposed, like a law. Tenderness and love have abandoned it. The will of God implies a law-giving sovereign rather than love between equals. So how are these words to be addressed to the Father? As a humble and inadequate phrase for the love of God? Or stylistically, trying to say it in the way it was originally intended? Or quickly, fudging the meaning, or distractedly, or ironically, or polemically? How should one say these words?

Performance is at the heart of the eucharistic prayer. It arises from its nature as dialogue. Like the word "carnival, or"jolly relativity", the word "performance" seems trivializing. But, like those two words, it is an essential part of dialogue. It is the actor's ability to discover the ever-present moment in something he or she says every day for a six month tour. It is the ability of the presider and the people to speak to God with words that are ancient and prescribed by law, in a present moment, that is unrepeatable,

unique, and leaves both partners in the dialogue changed. The priest and people now join in quoting the sixth chapter of Isaiah. This is the song of the angels when they are faced by the holiness of God. Theologically, holiness is the unimaginable, inconceivable depths of the being of God. Glory is its technical outward appearance.(4) In this song, the angels are saying back to God what he is, his own being. (Cf. footnote 1.) Even their words, if they have words, are inadequate. They would have a problem with performance. In Mikhail Bakhtin's terms, the priest and people are like Ivan and Alyosha. They are interacting in the dialogue with God. They are quoting the words of the angels to him. They are putting on their style, as they appeared in the vision of Isaiah. But in the context of the church in Carlisle, their tone is one of inadequacy. The quotation is now in a new plane. The words are filled with the social background, the awareness, the intentions of each one of the people who say them. They are spoken like the words of Keats in the classroom in Stockton. They are a new creation of something old and given. They are polyphonic.

The words are these.

"Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might,
heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.
Line 23-27.

The prayer continues with the theme of the holiness of God. the presider is speaking back to God what he most wants to hear, his word.

"Lord, you are holy indeed,
the fountain of all holiness.
Let your Spirit come upon these gifts to make them holy,
so that they may become for us
the body and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ".
Line 28-32.

At this point, the intertextuality of the words becomes more than ever pronounced.

The context has been a church, an altar, people, and priest at a particular time, on a specific day, in Carlisle. The priest and people have spoken in unison, or listened quietly, while the other spoke. Both were looking at God, with a "sideways look", as they spoke. They used voices in quotation. They stylized the words of the angels. No doubt, too, they were aware of the people round about, each of whom spoke with a personal and unique voice. Their words have been highly intertextual. Many different genres have been mixed so far: the poetic vision of Isaiah, texts from the gospels, intercessory forms, praising forms, and epic story forms. Louis Bouyer says, of the Third Eucharistic Prayer, that it is made of prayers from the Mozarabic rite, from the East Syrian liturgy of Addai and Mari, from the Jewish "memorial", from the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, from the Alexandrian form of the eucharistic prayer of St.Basil, and from one of the prayers of the Roman missal.(5)

We come to an explicit carnival form. The words are these.

33. Before he was given up to death,
34. a death he freely accepted,
35. he took bread and gave you thanks.
36. He broke the bread,
37. gave it to his disciples, and said:
38. Take this, all of you, and eat it:
39. this is my body which will be given up for you.

40. When supper was ended, he took the cup.
41. Again he gave you thanks and praise,
42. gave the cup to his disciples, and said:
43. Take this, all of you, and drink from it;
44. this is the cup of my blood,
45. the blood of the new and everlasting covenant.
46. It will be shed for you and for all
47. so that sins may be forgiven.
48. Do this in memory of me.

The context is here and now in this church at this time. A priest and people are in dialogue with God. "The other" is prior, and what each is saying depends on the presence and words of "the other". The priest and people depend on God, and God depends on them. The otherness is what makes them conscious. The words are quoted from scripture. But they have passed through many mouths and have the imprint of many situations. The words are dialogical. In the juxtaposition they manifest a "jolly relativity". They interact with each other in carnival form.

"Before he was given up to death"(1.33).

This is the introduction to a Menippean threshold situation. There is to be a final speech before a death. It has all the intensity of such moments. It is a last will and testament.

"He broke the bread... this is my body".(1.36-39.)

The ritual breaking of the bread was part of the Passover meal. It took place at the end of the first seder, and again, in the second seder, it was blessed and distributed. At this point in the last supper of Jesus with his disciples, the ritual was performed, but the words said over the bread were new. To break the bread and announce that it is "my body, given for you", is to announce a death. It is a dismemberment, a breaking of the body. This compares with the banquet in

Dorothy Heathcote's exposition of Keats' poem,(P.?). It has the features of a carnival banquet. (P.?)

"This is the cup of my blood... shed for you."(1.44-46.)

There is a death, a blood-letting. The leader is to be killed in a liberating death. But it is to be bloody, a shedding.

"Given up to death."(1.33.)

The leader is dethroned. He is now the least of all.(6)

"Take and eat". "Drink from it".

The context of these words is a ritual meal. It is a banquet. It is a celebration of liberation, and a feast. It is parallel to the carnival feast which overturns all hierarchies in favour of a new equality.

All must share it. "for you and for all".(1.46)

There is a new society, on a new basis of equality, with a new contract. "a new and everlasting covenant",(1.45) "so that sins may be forgiven"(1.47).

There is a enmemberment. A new political body has been formed, in which all are reconciled and reconciling. Reconciliation is the key word here.

"For you and for all, so that sins may be forgiven".(1.46-47.)

The hall mark of the new society is that it is a force in the world for reconciling people to each other. This is a deeply theological idea. But it is also a carnival idea. It dethrones the accepted authority, and establishes a new revolutionary authority of peace and reconciling.(7)

"Do this in memory of me."(1.48)

The ritual is committed to being repeated in history, as a memorial.(8) Ivan and Alyosha remembered the events of their father's death, the absence of Ivan, the accusations against

Smerdykov. They came to a new state of awareness, as a result of their encounter. So the people of God have come to a new state of awareness, a new community, as a result of their encounter.

The prayer continues with acclamations by the people. They are shouting ritual chants as they do in a carnival procession.

49. P.C. Let us proclaim the mystery of faith.
50. C. Christ has died,
51. Christ is risen,
52. Christ will come again.

53. In memory of his death and resurrection,
54. we offer you, Father, this life-giving bread,
55. this saving cup.
56. We thank you for counting us worthy
57. to stand in your presence and serve you.
58. May all of us who share in the body and blood of Christ
59. be brought together in unity by the Holy Spirit.

Here is the closeness of two who are together in dialogue. The unity of Christians is like the unity of Ivan and Alyosha, and that of the director and relatives at the clinic, as they fight for the right of the relatives to be released upon the world, and, at the same time, for the world to be confronted with literature. In the Eucharistic Prayer, the people of God ask for what they need. They recall the carnival banquet, the death and resurrection, the change from life to death which the Word of God has brought about for them. They ask for the new community to continue. They extend their prayer to all who have lived and died. No one is left out of this carnival world.

60. Lord, remember your Church throughout the world;
61. make us grow in love,
62. together with John Paul our Pope,
63. John our bishop, and all the clergy.

64. Remember our brothers and sisters
65. who have gone to their rest
66. in the hope of rising again;
67. bring them and all the departed
68. into the light of your presence.

These are prayers of petition. In the carnival state, with its carnival equality, people can ask for anything they need.

69. Have mercy on us all;
70. make us worthy to share eternal life
71. with Mary, the virgin Mother of God,
72. with the apostles, and with all the saints
73. who have done your will throughout the ages.
74. May we praise you in union with them,
75. and give you glory
76. through your Son, Jesus Christ.

Finally, all is summed up in the Word of God.

77. Through him,
78. with him,
79. in him,
80. in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
81. all glory and honour is yours,
82. almighty Father,
83. for ever and ever.
84. All: **AMEN.**

The "Amen" is the ratification of the assumption throughout this analysis that priest and people are together in saying the same prayer. The people agree. Again, the sense is Bakhtinian. Each remains his or her own self, unrepeatable, unique. Each becomes more a self, by the very fact of trying to become someone else. This is because of the existential difference between people and between the words they say. In the endeavour to become one, difference is made more apparent. In sum, the eucharistic prayer is a dialogical text. It relates to a definite place and time. It is orientated towards

the other person, to the "wholly other". It is full of quotation, of reference to other texts. It is spoken in the presence of the listener. In the space between, there is an interaction between God and the people. By its means, the extraordinary happens. Humans talk to God. The high becomes low, and the low high. It is carnival.

The eucharistic prayer is a carnival text. The elements of the prayer which are Menippean have been briefly described. To be understood better, the prayer needs to be placed against its original background of the Jewish Passover meal.(9).

The Jewish Passover meal is in the home. Its central action is the eating of the paschal lamb. Various herbs are eaten, wine is drunk, unleavened bread is broken and shared. The story of the Exodus from Egypt is told, so that the grace of God may be re-actualized here and now, and fulfilled "next year in Jerusalem", to quote the final words of the meal.

These rituals are Menippean. The shape of the meal, its symbols, and its prayers, were formed during the Hellenistic period when the Menippean literature was developing. The temple was destroyed in the sixth century. In the fourth century, after the exile, the Jewish religion was focussed on the Synagogue, and the home. The family liturgy of Passover and the Friday evening vigil of the Sabbath were the main religious occasions. Historically, like the Christian gospels a little later, the Jewish table liturgy developed at the same time as the Menippean.

The meal itself has Menippean elements. It began with fire, with the lighting of the lamp. Incense was burned. There followed a washing of hands, with scented water. Cups of wine

were blessed and drunk. Parsley was dipped into salt water, and eaten. Then the unleavened bread was broken and handed round. Radish, a bitter vegetable, was eaten, on its own, and then dipped in the sweeter haroseth, a paste of fruit and salad. Then came the main course, the lamb, with its vegetables. More wine was served. The last cup of wine had a special blessing, as the last one, looking forward to the following year. Each symbol and action was accompanied by its appropriate commentary. Hymns and chants were sung. Overall there was a spirit of joy and lightheartedness.

The first point to note is the connection with the agricultural feasts of spring. Louis Bouyer tries to distance the Jewish rite from these rites, but makes the point all the same.

"The passover meal, - from having the primitive significance common to all agricultural feasts connected with the return of Spring, of a partaking in the energies of nature in their circle of renewal after death, - took on for the Hebrew a new meaning, that of the deliverance from Egypt, as marking the new creation and the new and sanctified life which was to follow it for the people".

Life and Liturgy, p.120.

Carnival partakes "in the energies of nature in their circle of renewal after death". It celebrates the process of change from one to the other. The passover meal is set in this background of natural religious celebration.

The lighting of the lamp is a fire symbol, a light in darkness, which overcomes the darkness. This is a carnival symbol.

Each of the dishes, taken and eaten, symbolize and convert to parodic dimensions the national events of the Exodus. The parsley is a green shoot, representing the new life God gave

the people. It is dipped in salt water to show the bitterness of the desert. The radish represents the bitterness of the desert. It is sweetened with haroseth. The desert is an ambiguous symbol for the Jewish believer. On the one hand, the unleavened bread is the bread of affliction that they were forced to eat. On the other hand, it is the manna God fed them with. Ambiguity is typical of carnival.

The carnival square is the room. It was specially prepared with incense. The feel of the living room is changed to a carnival room.

Hands were washed. This was normally done by the youngest of the family, contrary to the everyday supervision by father or mother. This is a dethronement of the ordinary powers, and an enthronement of the least likely. But when Jesus took the basin and the towel, (Jn.13,2), a second dethronement took place. Jesus de-throned himself to be the servant. Again the youngest was normally washed last. Here the youngest was washed first, and the last was St Peter. He protested. But when Jesus the servant rebuked him for it, his reply was comic exaggeration. "Not only my feet, Lord, but also my hands and my head!".

At the centre of the meal is the lamb. Originally it was chosen from the flock, a firstborn lamb.It was killed in the temple by the priests, and brought home for the supper. This represented the lamb whose blood was put on the lintels of the door to prevent the destroying angel in Egypt (Ex.12, 21-24). It also represented the lamb, or kid, which carried the sins of the people and was killed in sacrifice for purification (Lev. 14,10-32). At the ceremonial supper, its shank bone is

held up for all to see. It provided a parodic symbol for the saving power of God.

At the end came the hymn, the song of God's overthrow of Egypt, and of his care for his people. It was a dialogue addressed to God.

"Blessed be thou, O Lord, our God, king of all eternity, thou who dost feed the whole world by thy goodness...
Blessed be thou, O Lord, because thou hast given to our fathers as an inheritance, a vast, good and desirable land...
Have mercy, O Lord, on Israel, thy people, on Jerusalem, thy city..."

Bouyer, Ibid p.125.

These are carnival elements in the Jewish Passover. In this rite Jesus enacted his own ritual of death and life.

"This is my body", he said at the beginning of the meal when, as master of the feast, he broke the bread. This was to dethrone himself, to offer himself to death. At the end of the meal, after the second part of the Hallel, he took the cup. "This is the blood of the new covenant, which shall be shed for you".

The passover meal was a Menippean banquet, a carnival. The meal, which Jesus celebrated with his disciples, on the night before he suffered, had that same quality. Similarly the Eucharist has "jolly relativity". It quotes, and refers to, many other genres of literature. They jostle side by side in the prayer. They interact. They break up the former unities and establish a new one, a carnival world, in which the change from life to death can be properly understood and celebrated.

IF THE TEXT OF THE EUCHARISTIC PRAYER IS DIALOGICAL, WHAT ARE THE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE PRIEST AND PEOPLE?

Several books and videos have tackled the problem of the celebrant of the Eucharist: Ernest Sands in the video, Not the Nine o'clock Mass; Dennis Smolarski in his book, How Not to Say Mass; and Robert Hovda, in his book, Strong, Loving and Wise. These apply in a practical way, the principles of cèlebration for the liturgy.

Three areas are affected by dialogicality and carnival. They are the performance of the prayer, the qualities of the presider, and the training of presiders.

1. THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PRAYER.

Two major insights affect performance: "jolly relativity", and "the sideways glance". The eucharistic prayer is not a monologue. It is a dialogue with God, and its speaker is always watching God. The words are conditional. They are not absolute. They are conditioned by "the other". They are not like a recipe from a cook book, or a speech, or an harangue. They are words with a sideways glance. They watch the Father to whom they are addressed. They are spoken like a dialogue, with the other person in mind. Their reference to other words, other quotations, other occasions, must be as conscious as possible. Varied intonation may bring out the double voices. How is this to be done? Louis Bouyer, contrary to the argument he has proposed for the mixed genres of the prayer, insists that the presider attempts to stylize the prayer, to make it his own, but "forgetting temporarily" all the differences in favour of reading or listening "straight through".

"The various sources of this prayer have been given in detail to provide the basis for a thorough knowledge of all the riches of traditional teaching which the compilers have endeavoured to collect together and pass on. But all this must be forgotten temporarily when it is read or listened to straight through. I am sure that then the essentially pastoral intention behind the choice and arrangement of its elements will be fully understood".

Sheppard, op.cit. p.203-12. (10)

This is a compassionate view, and certainly a congregation would need some careful training to accept anything else but a "straight through reading or listening". One could hardly imagine the prayer to be distributed among many voices, or slowed down to feel the resonances of each phrase, or the introduction of parodic, or polemic voices. A present-day congregation would have to be well prepared for so overtly a carnival style.

But something can be done. The drama is in the dialogical nature of the words, the conversation with the God the Father. Parody, especially a distanced awareness of what inadequate symbols we use, has its place, as does polemic. The model for the saying of the prayer is the internal dialogue of Ivan and Alyosha. It is full of self-reference, polyphony, anticipation of the words of the other person: it is unique, unrepeatable, and leaves both sides of the dialogue changed. If this cannot be shown, at first, in church, it can certainly be learnt in the training of candidates for presiding, and it can be done in the drama classroom. If a poem, which is not Menippean, can be taught in a Menippean way in the drama classroom, how much more can a Menippean text, the eucharistic prayer, be taught in a Menippean way, in the drama classroom?

This may not sound particularly revolutionary. We teach the

text of the prayer, as we teach the text of John Keats. When we finally read the text of John Keats, it will not manifest all the work that has gone into the understanding of it. Yet in a way it will. It is easy to tell when someone knows what they are talking about. In a way we are arriving " where we started, and know the place for the first time".(11) We return to a priest and people in Carlisle talking to the God. The words have a cheerful relativity. They relate to God and watch him sideways on.

This is not always apparent. Presiders have not always been trained in dialogical expression. They are confused about their role in the Eucharist. Sometimes they even think that they are in a play.

In his article in Communio,(12), Everett Diederich points out that when the priest picks up the bread and cup, a sudden little play occurs in the middle of the prayer. The priest picks up the bread and wine as he speaks. But this is not to do what Jesus did. He is not in role as Jesus. He is with the people, talking to God about his son. "He took bread..." It is shown, not played out in role. Everett Diederich criticises those:

"Many priests, young and old, episcopal and presbyteral, liturgists and parish clergy, who accompany the word, "Take this, all of you," with an outstretched circling gesture toward the people, following the gesture with their eyes upon the people".
Op,cit.p.229.

These presiders are in a little play. They are being Jesus. But they have stepped out of their role as talker to the Father. The prayer is a dialogue with God. It is like Ivan and Alyosha. It is like the director of the clinic and the

relatives of her clients. It is like a teacher with her students. The presider must keep an eye on God the Father, and not become involved with the congregation, acting out to them what Jesus did. It is not so much for their benefit but for the Father's, that he might hear from us about his Son. What is required is an awareness of the many genres which are in the prayer. He is the one to bring them together, and allow them to interact. What does this mean in terms of the presider's own approach? Before outlining a lesson in dialogicality for a prospective candidate, we will look at the qualities required of a presider?

2. THE QUALITIES OF THE PRESIDER.

Robert Hovda suggests a list of the qualities of a presider at Mass.(13). At the top of his list are the personal belief and prayerfulness of the celebrant. Then there is his native talent, especially in the area of openness to others, respect for the charisms of others and willingness to share responsibilities with others. He, or she, has a desire for, and a feeling of, being called. Adequate training has been provided for the function in question, and the presider has passed the apprenticeship. There is a call, or mandate, from a faith community and a commitment to continuing education. He explains that the cant phrase, "depth and commitment of faith" actually "is bound up with feelings of awe, mystery, the holy, reverence. It is an awesome thing to face the mystery of the other, and the mystery of ourselves". This indeed is familiar language, taking us back to the existentialist socialism of Mikhail Bakhtin, and the notion of "the other" in role of Dorothy Heathcote.

She herself has a list of her own fundamental concepts.

"All things must die, having had a time of living, of being born, and growing.
There is all that has been before my life, to be tapped and learned about.
I hold a measure of responsibility for how I function, so that those who will come are not cheated by anything I do.
Form in all things is a constant delight.
People are always interesting.
Value judgments teach us nothing.
The thoughts of others can lead us to our own.
Keep fresh the ability to receive.
"Cast bread...it returns!"
Awareness always alert to environment, shapes, colours, line sound.
Use all things as symbols, to guide to deeper reflection.
Codify experience.
Taking nothing for granted keeps respect alive.
Restraint keeps appreciation fresh".
Collected writings,p.37.

She would add, no doubt, Blake's phrase, which she quotes in her lecture on the authentic teacher.(14). Here is the quotation in full, as it is used by Smolarski, who quotes it from Hovda,(15)

"He who would do good to others must do it in minute particulars; "general good" is the plea of the scoundrel, hypocrite and flatterer. For art and science cannot exist but in minutely organised particulars, And not in generalizing demonstrations of the rational power".
William Blake: Jerusalem, Emanation of the Giant Albion. Ch.3, plate 55, lines 60-63.

The two lists have similarities and differences. Hovda's "belief and prayerfulness", prosaic though it may sound, is the same as the specific belief of Dorothy Heathcote in the death and life process. It is a fundamental belief. His "native talent" takes in three aspects which Dorothy Heathcote treats separately, namely, "People are always interesting", The thoughts of others can always lead us to our own", and, "Keep fresh the ability to receive. These cover what Hovda

means with his, "openness to others", "respect of the charisms of others", "willingness to share responsibilities with others".

Robert Hovda, however, speaks formally of the training of a presider. The candidate is to have "proved aptitude, the mandate, the continuing education". Dorothy Heathcote says, "There is all that has been before my life, to be tapped and learned about". This, no doubt, is what Hovda means by "continuing learning", but Dorothy Heathcote's formulation is personal and dynamic. It gives the marvel of life, and the urge to see it through our own eyes. The remark goes deep into Dorothy Heathcote's method. She speaks of pupils as coming into class with all that has gone before.

"The first root is that children have already tried and failed a bit before they come to us...They have already learned to read people before they come to school at five".
Collected writings,p.123.

"Adequate training", for Dorothy Heathcote, has become, "a measure of responsibility for how I function, so that those who will come are not cheated by anything I do". This both personalises the training, and makes it a form of authenticity. Again, Dorothy Heathcote's formulation is more specific than Hovda's.

"Form in all things is a constant delight".

The list is personal to Dorothy Heathcote. She insists that each must make his or her own list of fundamental concepts. But the perception of form is essential for the presider. Actively to perceive the shape of a ceremony, the materials, the participants, and to mould them together, is the essential

art of the presider, as it is of the teacher. "To bring my book and your head and your heart together".(16). To do this, the presider must have a practical sense of form.

Here, there is a difference between the teacher and the presider at the Eucharist. During a service in church, some of the concepts of Dorothy Heathcote may seem difficult to follow. It is hard to see how "the thoughts of others can lead us to our own". How is the presider to be "always alert to environment, shapes, colours, line, sounds"? How does the presider try to use "all things as symbols, to guide to deeper reflection"?

Hovda devotes a whole chapter to the style of the presider. He has a remark about symbolic interpretation, which has a familiar ring, after our reading of Bakhtin. He is quoting a lecture by Alphonso Lingis.

> "Speaking of symbolic function, Lingis said that what is given is not identical with being, because what is given is access to something beyond. One does not comprehend the symbol, because the symbol introduces one to what is beyond. When a face faces, it is like the surface any sensible object has, -a new kind of distance is opened. To address oneself to the face of another is to face the other, the stranger. Conversation plays across this distance. We strive to reduce the other's alien character. But the other remains other, with the power to contest one's interpretation of things. The other can always withdraw. There is a dimension of alterity, a dimension of absence that the face presents to one."
>
> Op.Cit p.71.

These are terms which have become familiar from our reading of Mikhail Bakhtin. The other is always the other. Conversation is the meeting place. What Hovda does not draw out is the carnival nature of the interaction of the other and the self. Nor does he insist on the priority of the other, as Bakhtin does. But the passage emphasises a new appreciation of the

importance of performing in the presence of another in the liturgy.

It seems that both the drama teacher and the priest, Robert Hovda and Dorothy Heathcote, are on the edge of recognizing that the genre they are working in is the mixed genre of Carnival. They work amongst many different kind of genres. But the genres are centrifugal. They interact divergently, rather than seeking to unite or cooperate. This is the insight of Mikhail Bakhtin.

Hovda himself makes the amazing statement.

"This manual...would like to see a generation of presiders who want to be fools, jesters, given to fantasy, who don't mind dressing up in crazy chasuables, and doing unproductive things. The clown function in a social group is related to the critical function, and also to the relieving function of one who helps everybody escape from social pressure for a moment". Op.Cit p.42.

This puts succinctly the two functions of dialogicality, the critical and the carnival, or relieving, function. The word clown is not particularly apt, and its use makes trivial what is an essential characteristic of conversation.

3. HOW, THEN, DO WE TRAIN THE PRESIDER?

Robert Hovda and Dennis Smolarski give many practical ways in which to preside at the Eucharist. These are applications of principles derived from the appropriate liturgical directories, introductions to ritual books, and instructions of the liturgical commissions.(17). Between the instruction book and the performance lies the preparation of the performer.

We have seen how Dorothy Heathcote slowed down the reading of the poem of John Keats to the long contemplation of two lines, as Porphyro entered the castle. A similar experience of "the big one" would introduce the candidate for presider to the state of "jolly relativity", to "the sideways look", to role, and dialogue in the presence of the other.

Take, for example, the line, "In memory of his death and resurrection", (line 54). To open up the word "memory", we would have to think of the people who remember, - historians, grannies, people looking for revenge, people who are grateful. Then, who are they remembering? - Isis, Persephone, a political suicide, a revolutionary victim?

What brings about memory? - photographs, pictures, stories, clothes, a bicycle which belonged, friends, enemies, a house, family, work, things made or presents given: "She gave me a tapestry": the garden, the handbag, letters, papers?

Where do people come to remember? - the museum, the library, the public records office, the monument to Queen Victoria?

Just one of these roles or situations, developed in the drama classroom, would be the door into understanding the words, "in memory". Time spent, to take a random example, at the scene of a crime, slowly reconstructing with the teacher and other students, the events of the day before, or of the century before, endows the words "in memory" with a new context. They have a new reference. They are used in a carnival situation, of "jolly relativity", of "the sideways look", of being in role in the presence of "the other". When the presider stands before God, with the congregation and says, "In memory of the death...", the words have enlarged reference. They are like

Alyosha's words to Ivan, "All those months in Moscow"... Similarly the director probed the memories of the relatives, "Was that a friendly way to treat Peter Grimes, to ostracise him?"

In ways such as this, the presider can be led into the inner feeling of the text. The bridge is built between the words on the page and the prescribed actions performed in public. The ritual words and actions may well be the same as they have always been. But they are performed with a dramatic tension, which derives from understanding their dialogical and carnival nature.

Notes on Chapter Five.

1. It may help to define the difference between the two approaches, if we look briefly at the theological understanding.
It is essentially Trinitarian. That there are three persons in one God is the central insight of Christianity.
"The word was made flesh".
The Gospel of John, I.14.
These words are from the opening chapter of St John's gospel. The history of Israel began with the word of God. God spoke to Moses in the smoke of Mount Sinai, and the people of God was formed. They were given a covenant, a law, a country, a God. They understood that the God, who had saved them now in their present history, was the God who had made the world originally, and who would come again to save them. As they waited for that coming, they read the Law, and observed the covenant,(Cf. Nehemiah ch.8, for the birth of Judaism, after the return from Exile.
The word, which made the world, and saved Israel, became human. "The word was made flesh". Every word this man spoke, and the words that were written about him in the Gospel, became the means of being with the one Word, the one sent by God. Hence the words themselves, spoken and written, are salvific. They are sacramental. They bring about what they signify. They signify God speaking to his people. In reading them, or listening to them, or speaking them, a living relationship with God is established. More precisely, the relationship is with God the Father, through the Word, in the Holy Spirit. (Cf,Schillebeeckx, Christ the Sacrament, Ch.1.)
The words have a theological importance. They also have a philosophical one. This, too, is Trinitarian. It goes back to Saint Augustine. His great love was Plato. But he had studied Plato through the writings of a second century scholar called Plotinus. Hence, when he read St John's Gospel, he interpreted it using the neo-platonic theory of emanations, or expressions. Higher beings expressed themselves in lower beings, and so bridged the gap between the highest and the lowest form of being. (Armstrong, An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy. p.178,p.211).
He suggested that the relationship between a speaker and the word spoken is an analogy for the relationship of the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit in the Trinity.
God is unknowable to the human mind. What is infinite cannot be known by the finite. But something can be known by analogy. In an analogy we compare and contrast something known with something unknown. The analogy with the Trinity is between the word we speak and the word God speaks. How God speaks is unknown. We say, simply, he is like someone who speaks. When a speaker speaks his word, the word expresses the speaker, and the speaker loves the word he speaks. In the same way, suggested Augustine, the Father has, from eternity, spoken his Word, and he loves that Word. The Word fully expresses the Father. The love between the two is substantial, and is a person, the Spirit.
Substantial means not accidental. Love, in Aquinas' philosophy (Summa Theologiae, part I, quaestio 77, article 6,) is an accidental quality of a person. That does not mean it is there

"by accident"! It means it is a consequence of the nature of the soul. It is not the soul itself. It is a power of the soul, along with intelligence. Love follows what is known. Intelligence and love are two accidental qualities of a human person. In God's case, love is substantial. It is one with his being.
It follows from the analogy of the word spoken by humans and the Word spoken by God, that those who speak the word of God, and have a relationship with God through the Word, share in the Spirit, and speak to the Father from the inside of the Trinity. Both theologically and philosophically, attendance at the Eucharist is an expression of the life of the Trinity, lived by the believer at the inside of the Trinity.(Cf. Schillebeeckx, op.cit. p.42.) Note, in this lengthy explanation, the use of analogy, the application of a human theory of speech to God, the trinitarian nature of Russian orthodoxy, (The schism occurred because of a disagreement over the nature of the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the the Son). It is not too fanciful to suppose that these major theological and philosophical themes are the necessary condition of the theory of dialogue of Mikhail Bakhtin
2. The Idea of the Holy, p39. The relationship of Mikhail Bakhtin's "other" and the "wholly other" of Rudolf Otto has not been developed here.
3. That needs a word of explanation. It may be thought that God is unchanging. The "eternal thought thinking itself" of Aristotle is unchanging.(Metaphysics.1074,b,33). But the Judaeo-Christian God is not like its philosophical counterpart. The biblical God intervened in history at the exodus from Egypt, at creation, and at the resurrection of Jesus. From this point of view he does move, he does change, he has enemies, he does overcome them. He is what the technical theologies call a dynamic God, who intervenes in history. (Cf Mckenzie, Myths and Realities, p.43,ff. for the dynamic word of God.)
4. Jerusalem Bible, Lev 10; v.3: note b.
5. The New Liturgy, Ed. Lancelot Sheppard, D.L.T. London, 1970, p.203-212.
6. The theology of "the least of all", of dethronement, or kenosis, is very rich. See S.Mowinkel, He That Cometh, Blackwell, Oxford, 1959, Ch.7. for the messiah-servant.
7. For a bibliography of the theology of reconciliation, see Jim Dallen, in Ritual and Reconciliation, in Liturgy, 9 (1992) No.4, pp.95-99. See also his book,The Reconciling Community; the Rite of Penance, New York, Pueblo, 1986.
8. In biblical thinking, memory is not simply a recalling of the past. To remember something makes it a present reality and and an assurance of its future permanence. Cf. Paul Tihon, Theology of the Eucharistic Prayer, in The New Liturgy, Ed. Lancelot Sheppard, D.L.T. London, 1970, p.178.
9. Cf. Louis Bouyer, The Paschal Mystery, Allen and Unwin, London 1951, and, Life and Liturgy, Sheed and Ward, London 1956, p.115-128.
10. Bouyer is in fact referring to the third eucharistic prayer in this extract, but the point about "forgetting temporarily" the mixing of the genres remains valid for all the prayers.
11. T.S.Eliot, Little Gidding V.

12. Communio, Vol 12.1985. p.223-237.
13. Hovda, Strong, Wise and Loving, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1976, p.12.
14. Coll. writings, p.179.
15. Smolarski, How Not ToSay Mass, Paulist Press, Mahwah, New York, 1986, p.7, and p.11, note 7.
16. John Bunyon, the closing words of A Pilgrim's Progress, quoted by Dorothy Heathcote during her session at Stockton.
17. Cf. Lectionary for Mass, 2nd editio typica,1981, General Introduction. ss.11-57.
The Roman Missal, Collins, Goodliffe Neale, 1974, General Introduction, ss.7-73.

CHAPTER SIX.

CONCLUSIONS.

MIKHAIL BAKHTIN AND DRAMA.

Three situations were the starting point for this investigation. One was the priest saying the eucharistic prayer in a church in Carlisle. The other was a teacher preparing students for an examination in English literature in a classroom in Stockton-on-Tees. The third was an obscure Russian schoolteacher interpreting a passage from Dostoievski's The Brothers Karamazov. The priest was interpreting a text. The teacher was interpreting seven texts. The Russian was interpreting a text, in the light of a theory of dialogue.

In Chapter One, we looked at the work of Mikhail Bakhtin.(1) It was a long chapter. The reason for this is that he is unknown and obscure. The wide and illusive quality of his thought challenged explanation. His translator, in his note to The Problems of the Poetics of Mikhail Bakhtin, says

> This is a translation. Its language is at times quite odd, a trait which it shares, however, with the original. Bakhtin tends to invent rather unusual expressions for his ideas and to use them without giving much explanation. I hope one need not spend as much time with the book as I have in order to appreciate it.

Hence the quotations were long and numerous. The aim was to be faithful to the thought of Bakhtin. "The other", the "sideways glance", the mixing and blurring of genres, cannot be picked out of his work and applied to the drama classroom and the

christian liturgy directly, without first seeing them in the subtle perspective of his own thought. We followed Todorov because much of the original material had not been translated, and because Todorov put into rational order what had been a major insight permeating all the work of Bakhtin.

This was dialogicality. During our treatment we gradually indicated the importance of "the other" in dialogue. We identified "the other" with the other person a teacher or student might take on in role. The interaction with "the other" was examined in four areas, stylization, parody, polemic and inner dialogue.

In Chapter Two, we looked at the video of Dorothy Heathcote teaching text. She used stylization, parody, polemic and inner dialogue. In role, she is like an author who produces a character. She is in dialogue with the other, as an author is with a character. Consequently, her classroom method may be seen as an application of the theory of dialogicality.

A further consequence is that, in the classroom, she was like Alyosha and Ivan as understood by Mikhail Bakhtin. She was the director of the clinic. She encountered the patients and their relatives in similar situations to those of Dostoievski. But when she is in role, she also is out of role, watching the students and adapting to them.(2) This is what Mikhail Bakhtin called "the sideways glance.

In Chapter Three we returned to Mikhail Bakhtin, to examine his theory of Carnival. It is, in essence, a theory of mixed genres. We looked at their nature and their history.

In Chapter Four we applied that theory to the classroom where Dorothy Heathcote was teaching. We found examples of carnival

situations. It is possible to say that Carnival describes the activity of a drama classroom. It describes the mixing of genres, when tragedy becomes suddenly comic, or lyric becomes epic. A serious moment can become funny. A poem or a word by a student can be achingly tender. It describes the reversal of authority involved in taking a role, the dethronements, the ambiguities, the symbols, the use of time and place, which we plan for beforehand, but are ready to adapt when necessary.

In Chapter Five we turned to the priest who says the Eucharistic prayer in church. We saw that here too there was dialogicality, in the form of the priority of "The Other", and "the sideways glance". There was also the mixed genres of the text itself, and the carnival interpretation of the meal.

It seems, then, that the work of Mikhail Bakhtin on the dialogical nature of text illuminates the following four areas of teaching a text in a classroom, or saying a text in church.

1. Taking a role is one instance of the human dialogue with "the other".

2. When the speaker is in class or at the altar, a sideways glance at the other person, and their words, maintains the dialogicality.

3. The nature of the various activities of the drama classroom, and those of the church, is explained by the notion of "blurred genres".(3)

4. The values that we give to dialogue lie in the encounter, in the space between people, and not in any one statement or person. It is only in relative interaction with other words, and in the context of the speech which comes before or after it, that a word comes to be beautiful, or deceitful, or

adequate, or suitable, or false.

The moment of interaction, unique and unrepeatable, is the synchronic in the diachronic narrative.(4)

5. The interaction of conversation, where there is intertextuality, and the mixing of genres, is the basis of pluralism.(5)

Notes.

1. The ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin have been applied in a specifically drama context, by Warwick Dobson, in Theatre and Education Journal, April 1989, issue 2,p.32. He explains the concept of free, indirect speech, with its double, or multiple, voice. He uses the notion of empathy, and that of exotopy. He refers to the dialogical relation between all the utterances within verbal communication. Finally he uses the idea of heteroglossia. He applies them very practically to the drama teacher in role. Contrary, however, to Mikhail Bakhtin, he prefers a linear conception of the various statements in reported speech to a pictorial. (Cf.footnote 23,p.124) In spite of this, his work is an example of the careful way the ideas of Mikhail Bakhtin can be used to illuminate classroom drama. It was Warwick Dobson's interest in Bakhtin that led to this study.

2. Cf.The Photograph on the back cover of Wagner, Dorothy Heathcote, Drama as a Learning Medium. And also, Heathcote at the National, p.13. "It's done in those pauses for breath when you look at them very supportively and say "Of course"...

3. Recently, Dorothy Heathcote was rejoicing in the ability of drama to work in blurred genres.

"This form of teaching permits and encourages blurred genre, and provides opportunities for team teaching...Blurred genre is one of the gifts drama teachers bring to school, but often people cannot understand it if you don't show them how it works, or demonstrate it with your classes, publishing around, even by just pinning things on the wall, and doing collages. It may look like an infant classroom, but it could have some productive effect. As you deal with the human condition, you have the responsibility to find the best means to present that human condition. T.I.E. teams have done some of the forward looking work regarding blurred genre."

The Fight for Drama, the Fight for Education.p.54

Dorothy Heathcote made two footnotes to this text. The first refers to Clifford Geertz who used the phrase blurred genre in his book, Local Knowledge.(Clifford Geertz, Local Knowledge, p.19.ff.) The second note is well worth quoting in full. It follows the reference to Theatre in Education teams.

"It was interesting how Sir Lawrence Olivier's recent memorial ceremony followed so precisely the blurred genre that is mentioned by Clifford Geertz. Everything was blurred. It was a theatrical event, there was no doubt of that, and in it you had all Goffman's framings, from the rituals of apportioning who should sit where, the music placed such and such to do such and such, and then in the middle, Alec Guinness told stories of Olivier, and how he used to change the emphasis on words. And everybody in that moment, could sit and laugh."
The Fight for Drama, the Fight for Education. 1989 p.62.

Dorothy Heathcote was aware of the form of the memorial service. She also distinguished the several art forms used in the theatrical event. Yet they were blurred in the very precise way Clifford Geertz describes. No science these days can keep itself to itself. A new model is needed to express the relationship between the various bodies of knowledge. At the same time, she saw the overall framework. It created laughter even in a memorial service. It celebrated life and death.
There is a movement here from the view of drama as tragedy, or a comedy, or lyrical, or history to an open acknowledgement that these genres are blurred in what we do in a classroom or in the T.I.E. workshop.
The question remains whether blurred genre in the sense of Geertz is the same as the blurred genre of Dorothy Heathcote. What happened in the memorial service, which produced laughter, is that the genres interacted. This was very understandable from the point of view of Mikhail Bakhtin. There was a dialogicality, which produced carnival. But the Blurred Genres of Clifford Geertz are to do with the confusion of models for the understanding of reality, the ludic, dramatistic, and textualist, models.(Op.cit p.33.) They also would make sense, seen in the light of Mikhail Bakhtin's theory of dialogue. But there is no overt connection between the blurred genres of Geertz and those of Dorothy Heathcote, without the mediation of Bakhtin. The model of conversation, as dialogue with a primary other, and its consequent pluralism is what reconciles the two notions of blurred genre. (Cf D.Tracy, The Analogical Imagination.)
4. It would seem that the distinction between diachronic and synchronic is inadequate to describe the difference between narrative and drama. Mikhail Bakhtin has described the synchronic element within narrative. Narrative always has a context, the presence and the priority of "the other", a communication between the speaker and the listener, and intertextuality. Dorothy Heathcote makes a clear distinction between synchronic and diachronic. Narrative is diachronic. The story is related one event after the other, one word after the other. Drama is synchronic. The meanings are immediate. "Events are constructed semiotically, not in literary form". (Collected writings p.131. and her distinction between linear and volume, p.31.)
5. The dialogic principle of Mikhail Bakhtin proposes a specific kind of pluralism. David Tracy points out three forms of pluralism. There is the relaxed pluralism which will allow any belief, ethos or world view which is not excessive. There

is a pluralism in which a dominant theory attempts to explain all other theories. The notion of truth here is that there is only one, and each side believes it has the major share of it. The third form of pluralism is that which seeks to know by analogy. It is not woolly. It is not doctrinaire. It recognizes that knowledge goes from what is known to what is not known. It proceeds by analogy. This is a familiar Bakhtinian position. "The other" comes first. When we meet another tradition and examine it, we begin to know our own thinking, in the presence of the other. The other is always there, as Devushkin's mother and sister are there, as Alyosha is present to Ivan. Hence the need of differing traditions to be together, because only then are they critically alive. David Tracy gives, as his model for pluralism, a conversation. (David Tracy, The Analogical Imagination.)
The major contribution of Mikhail Bakhtin is the detailed analysis of dialogue. It implies pluralism. There is a cooperative effort. But the emphasis is on the uniqueness of each speech, its dependence on the primacy of the other, the centrifugal tendency of speech, and its intertextuality. In other words its "jolly relativity".

APPENDIX ONE.

The Chronology of Mikhail Bakhtin.

1895: Born in OREL, Mikhail Mikhailovitch Bakhtine, of an impoverished aristocratic family. His father was a bank clerk.
He passed his boyhood at OREL
He was a teenager in VILNO and ODESSA.
He studied philosophy at ODESSA.

1918: Diploma in philology at the University of St Petersburg.

1918-20: A schoolteacher at NEVEL.

1920: Schoolteacher at VITEBSK.

1921: Married Elena Aleksandrovna.

1918-21: circle of friends:
Valerian Nicolaevitch Volochinov, 1894-1936.
Poet and musicologist.
Lev Vassilievitch Poumpianski, 1891-1940.
Philosopher and literature specialist.
M.B. Youdina, 1899-1970. Pianist.
B.N. Zoubakine,1889-1937.Poet.
Matvei Issaevitch Kagan,1889-1937. Studied philosophy at Leipzig, Berlin, Marburg. A

disciple of Hermann Cohen and of Ernst Cassirer: organized a workshop in the study of the philosophy of Emmanuel Kant.

Dec 13th 1918. A report in the local newspaper at NEVEL.

"In his speech Comrade Bakhtine, who was defending from the obscurity of religion, wandered about in the clouds, and even above them. In his theme were no living examples, taken from life, or human history. At certain times he recognized and appreciated Socialism, but he complained and questioned whether it paid any attention at all to the dead, (perhaps he thinks there are not enough holy services for the dead), and said that at a future date he hoped the people would pardon us that! Generally listening to his words you would think the whole army of dead and buried would soon rise from their tombs and sweep from the face of the earth all the communists and the socialism they promote...In fifth place spoke Comrade Goutmann...
Molot: no.47, Dec.3, 1918: cf. Clark and Holquist, p.43.

At VITEBSK the circle of friends reformed, with three additional members.

Pavel Nicolaevitch Medvedev,1891-1938. Literary critic.

I.I. Sollertinski. Musicologist.

Marc Chagall. Painter.

1921: Contracted osteomyelitis. (A limb removed, 1938.)

1924: PETROGRAD. The Kantian circle reformed with additional members.

N.Kliouer poet.

K.Vaguinov-novelist.

M. Toubianski -Indianologist.

I. Toubianski- musicologist.

I.Kanaev- biologist and historian of science.

1929: Published The problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski.

Arrested, possibly because of orthodox religion. cf1926 Poumpianski wrote to Kagan:

"All these years but especially during this one we perseveringly concern ourselves with theology. The circle of friends about us is still the same,-M.B.Youdina, M.M. Bakhtine, M.Toubianski, and I."
Pamjat: 4. p.266. Clark and Holquist, p.130.

Condemned to five years in concentration camp at SOLOVKI,changed to exile in KAZAKHSTAN.

1930-1936: KOUSTANAI on the Siberian frontier.

1936: Teacher in SARANSK.

1937: Teacher of German and Russian in secondary school at KIMR near MOSCOW.

1945: Return to SARANSK.

1961: Retired from teaching.

1963: Re-edited The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski.

1965: Published Rabelais, His Life and Times. (had been completed in 1940.)

1969: Move to MOSCOW. Home for aged at KLIMOVSK.

1975: Died 80 years old. Buried in Orthodox Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Aeschylus: The Oresteia. Oxford Classical Texts.1937. transl. P.Vellacott, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1956.

Albright. W.F: From Stone Age to Christianity. Doubleday Anchor, New York, 1957.

Apuleius: The Golden Ass, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Aquinas: Summa Theologiae. Biblioteca de Autores Cristianos, Madrid,1955.

Aristophanes: Lysistrata, etc. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1973.
The Knights, Peace, The Birds, etc. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1978.

Aristotle: Metaphysics, Ed. W.D. Ross, Oxford, 1924.
De Anima, Ed. W.D. Ross, Oxford, 1961.
The Poetics, Ed. D.W.Lucas. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968.

Armstrong.A.H: An Introduction to Ancient Philosophy. Methuen, London, 1947.

Atkins, G.D. and M.L.Johnson, Ed. Writing and Reading Differently: Deconstruction and the teaching of Composition and Literature, University Press of Kansas, 1985.

Augustine: The Confessions, Tr. F.J.Sheed, Sheed and Ward, London, 1943.

Austin,M.J: An Hour to raise the Dead; The Art of Performance in Sunday Worship. The Methodist Sacramental Fellowship. Lecture delivered in Bolton, 1991.

Ayer, A.J: The Problem of Knowledge. Macmillan, London, 1958.
Language, Truth, and Logic, Gollancz, London 1967.

Baird Shuman, R: Educational Drama for Todays Schools, Scarecrow Press, Metuchen. N.J. and London, 1978.

Bakhtin,M. (For detailed chronological bibliography cf.Clark and Holquist, Mikhail Bakhtin, pp.354-356, and the discussion on authorship, pp.146-170. The books catalogued here are the ones most quoted in the text.)
Freudianism, a critical sketch, Gosizdat, Moscow-Leningrad, 1927. Published under the name of V.N.Volosinov. Transl. I.R,Titunic, The Academic Press, New York, 1976.
Formal Method in Literary Study, A critical introduction to sociological poetics, Priboj, Leningrad, 1928. Published under the name of P.N.Medvedev. Transl. A.J.Whehle, John Hopkins University Press. Baltimore, 1978.
Marxism and the Philosophy of Language. Leningrad, 1929. Published under the name of V.N.Volosinov. Transl. L.Matejka and I.R.Titunic, Seminar Press, New York, 1973.
Rabelais and his World. Moscow, 1965. Written in 1940, (apart from certain additions), Transl. Helen Iswolsky. Camb.M.I.T. 1968
Problems in the Work of Dostoievski, Leningrad, 1929. Rewritten and revised, The Problems of the Poetics of Dostoievski, Moscow, 1963, Transl.

R.W.Rotzel, Ann Arbor 1973. More recent translation, not available for this thesis, Caryl Emerson, Theory and History of Literature Series, Vol.8, Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
Questions of Literature and Aesthetics, published by the author himself in 1975, the year he died. Apart from i), v), and vii), it is translated in The Dialogic Imagination, Ed. M.Holquist, Transl. C.Emerson amd M. Holquist, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1981. The original contained the following.
i) The Problem of Content, Material, amd Form in Verbal Artistic Creation. pp.6-71. Written in 1924. Previously published in part, in Kontekst 1973, Moscow, 1974
ii) Discourse in the Novel. pp.72-233. Written in 1934. Previously published in Voprosy literatury, 6, 1972.
iii) Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel. pp.234-391. Written in 1937-1938. Previously partially published in Voprosy literatury, 3, 1974.
iv) From the Prehistory of Novelistic Discourse. pp.408-446. Written in 1940. Previously partially published in Voprosy literatury, 8, 1965; and Russkaja i zarubezhnaja literatura, Saransk University, 1967.
v) Rabelais and Gogol, pp.484-495. Written in 1940, revised in 1970. Previously published in Kontekst 1972, Moscow, 1973.
vi) Epic and the Novel. pp.448-483. Written in 1941. Previously published in Voprosy literatury,1, 1970.
vii) Remarks in Conclusion, pp.391-407. Written in 1973.
The Aesthetics of Verbal Creation. G.S.Bocharov, Moscow, 1979. It contained:
i) Art and Answerability, pp. 5-6. Previously published: Den'iskusstva, 1919; Voprosy literatury, 6, 1977.
ii) Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity. pp.7-180. Written in 1922-1924. Previous publication; Voprosy filosofii, 7, 1977; and Voprosy literatury, 12, 1978.
iii) Extracts from lectures on the History of Russian Literature, pp.374-383. Transcribed by R.M.Mirkina from a course of lectures given in the twenties, probably 1924.
iv) The Novel of Development and its Significance in the History of Realism, pp.188-236. Written 1936-1938.
v) On the Philosophical Bases of Human Sciences, pp. 409-411. Written c.1941. Previously published partially in Kontekst 1974, Moscow, 1975.
vi) The Problem of Speech Genres, pp.237-280. Written 1952-1953. Previously published partially in Literaturna ucheba, 1, 1978.

vii) The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and Other Human Sciences, pp.281-307. Written 1959-1961. Previously published in Voprosy literatury,10, 1976.
viii) Letter to Kanaev on Goethe, p.236. Written Oct.11, 1962.
ix) Letter to Kanaev on Goethe, pp.396-397. Written Jan, 1969.
x) On the Revision of the Book on Dostoievski, pp.307-327. Written in 1961. Previously published, Kontekst 1976, Moscow, 1977.
xi) Response to a question put by the Editorial Board of Novyj Mir, 1970. pp.328-335. Previously published in Novyj Mir, 11, 1970.
xii) Internal Review of L.E.Pinsky's Shakespeare. pp.411-412. Written 1970.
xiii) Notebooks 1970-71. pp.336-360.
xiv) On the Methodology of Human Sciences, pp.361-373. Written in 1974. Previously published partially, in Kontekst 1974, Moscow, 1975
These have been translated in The Architectonics of Answerability, ed. Michael Holquist, Trans, V.Liapunov, and K.R.Brostrom, University of Texas Press, Austin, published after 1984, for ii) Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity, and (from the 1975 collection,)The Problem of Content, Material and Form in Verbal Artistic Creation. In Speech Genres and Other Late Essays, ed. Michael Holquist, Trans. Vern McGee, University of Texas Press, Austin, Published after 1984, are to be found, iv) The Novel of Development and its Significance in the History of Realism; v) On the Philosophical Bases of Human Sciences, vi) The Problem of Speech Genres, vii) The Problem of Text in Linguistics, Philology, and Other Human Sciences, and xiii) From the Notebooks, 1970-71.

Balthasar, H. Urs Von: The Glory of the Lord, A Theological Aesthetics, vol.1. Seeing the Form, T. and T. Clarke, Edinburgh, 1982.

Bales,R.F: Interaction Process Analysis; a method for the study of groups, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1950.

Barnes, D; J. Britten, H. Rosen: Language, the Learner and the School. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Barthes, R: S\Z, Editions de Seuil, Paris 1970: Transl. R. Miller, Cape, London, 1975.

Benoit, P: The Holy Eucharist, in Scripture, the Quarterly for the Catholic Biblical Association, Vol VIII. no.4, Oct. 1956. p.97-108, and Vol.IX, No. 5, Jan. 1957. p.1-14.

Benson.R.H: Papers of a Pariah. 1904.

Berlin. I: The Crooked Timber of Humanity, Fontana, London, 1990.
Against the Current. London, Hogarth Press, 1979.

Berry, C: The Actor and His Text. Harrop, London, 1987.

Berrong, R.M: Rabelais and Bakhtin. University of Nebraska Press, 1986.

Birch,C. and J.B.Cobb, jnr. The Liberation of Life: from cell to community, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Blake and Mouton: The Managerial Grid. Gulf Publishing Co. Houston, 1964.
Boal, A: Le Theatre de L'Opprimé, Maspero, Paris, 1977.
Bolt, R: A Man for All Seasons. Heineman, London, 1960.
Bolton, G: Towards a Theory of Drama in Education, Longmans, London, 1979.
Four Articles, 1970-1980. N.A.D.E.C.T. Includes:
a) Is Theatre in Education Drama in Education? from Outlook, vol 2. 1970. Journal of the British Children's Theatre Association.
b) Moral Responsibility in Children's Theatre. from Outlook, vol.5, 1973.
c) Drama Teaching, -a personal statement. from Insight, Summer, 1976, Journal of the British Children's Theatre Association.
d) Drama for the Eighties.
Philosophical Perspectives on Drama and the Curriculum, in Nixon, (Ed): Drama and the Whole Curriculum, Hutchinson, 1982. p.27-42.
Bolton at the Barbican, Ed. W. Dobson, N.A.T.D. (Longman), 1983.
Drama as Education, Longman, 1984.
Selected Writings on Drama in Education, Longman, 1986.
Booth, Wayne C: Bakhtin and the Challenge of Feminist Criticism, in Critical Enquiry 9, Sept. 1982. Reprinted in Bakhtin, Essays and Dialogues on his Work, Ed. G.S.Morson, University of Chicago Press, 1986 pp. 145-176.
Bouyer, L: The Paschal Mystery. Allen and Unwin, London, 1951.
Life and Liturgy, Sheed and Ward, London, 1956.
The Third Eucharistic Prayer, in Lancelot Sheppard,(Ed), The New Liturgy, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1970.
Bragg, L: Concerning the Nature of Things, Bell and Sons, London, 1948.
Breen, R: Chamber Theatre.
Broderick, J: Galileo. Chapman, Catholic Book Club, London, 1964.
Bronte, C: Jane Eyre. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1966.
Buber, M: I and Thou. 1929. Transl. Walter Kaufmann, T.& T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1970.
Burns, R: Tam O'Shanter, in The Everyman Book of Narrative Verse, Ed. David Herbert, Dent, London, 1990, p.85.
Butterfield, H: The Origins of Modern Science. London, 1962.
Byron, K: Drama in the English Classroom. Methuen, London, 1986.

Capra, F. The Turning Point. Flamingo-Fontana, London, 1983
Carey,J: Teaching in Role and Classroom Power, in Drama Broadsheet, Vol.7,2. Summer,1990, p.2.
Casey, J: The Language of Criticism. Methuen, London, 1966.
Cassirer, E: The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms, 1923, Transl. R.Manheim, New Haven, 1953-5.
Catullus: Carmina, Oxford University Press,1958.
Cervantes, M: Don Quixote, Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1950.

Chambers, R: Story and Situation. Manchester University Press, 1984.
Claxton, G: Live and learn, Harper Row Publishers, London, 1984.
Clark, K. and M. Holquist, Mikhail Bakhtin, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1984.
Cohen,H: Religion der Vernuft aus den Quellen des Judentums, 1919, transl. The Religion of Reason out of the Sources of Judaism, Simon Kaplan, Ungar, New York, 1972.
Copleston, F: Medieval Philosophy, Methuen, Home Study Books, London, 1952.
A History of Philosophy, Vol 2. Medieval Philosophy, Image books: Doubleday, New York, 1962.
Contemporary Philosophy, Cardinal Books, London, 1956.
Courtney, R: Play, Drama and Thought, Cassell and Co. London, 1974.
Cox, H: The Secular City. Macmillan, New York, 1965.
The Feast of Fools. New York, 1969.
Crabbe, G: Peter Grimes, in The Everyman Book of Narrative Verse, Dent, London, 1990. p.77.
Crossan, J.D: In Parables, Harper and Row, 1973.

Dallen, J: The Reconciling Community; the Rite of Penance, Pueblo, 1986.
Ritual and Reconciliation, in Liturgy, 9 (1992) no.4, pp.95-99.
Davies,G.C: Practical Primary Drama. Heineman, London, 1983.
Davies, W.G: New Perspectives on Worship Today. S.C.M. Press 1974.
Department of Education and Science: Drama 5 to 16, Curriculum Matters,17. London H.M.S.O. 1989.
English in the National Curriculum, H.M.S.O. London, 1989
De La Taille, M: The Mystery of Faith, 2vv. London, 1941-50.
Diederich, E.A: Reflections on Post-Conciliar Shifts in Eucharistic Faith and Practice. Communio, vol.12 (1985), pp.223-237.
Dobson, W: Bolton at the Barbican, N.A.T.D. (Longman), 1983.
Narratorial and Authorial Voices in Classroom Drama; in Drama Broadsheet, Vol.5, issue 3, Autumn, 1988, p.2.
Dialogue, Polyphony, and the Use of Teacher in Role in Classroom Drama; in Theatre and Education Journal, Issue no.2, April, 1989. p.31-38.
Dostoievski, F: Crime and Punishment. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1991.
The Brothers Karamazov. Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1958.
Dottridge, N: Teacher in Role: Masks and Carnival, in Theatre and Education Journal, Issue no.3. 1990. p.29-33.
Dronke, P: Medieval Latin and the Rise of the European Love-Lyric. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1965.

Eagleton, T: Marxism and Literary Criticism, Methuen, London 1976
Elam, K: The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama, Methuen, New Accents, London, 1980.
Eliot, G: Middlemarch. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1985.
Eliot, T.S. Collected Poems, 1909-1962. Faber and Faber, London, 1963.
Euripides: Hippolytus. in Alcestis et al. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth,
The Bacchae. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1973.
Evans, T: Drama in English Teaching; Croom Helm, London, 1984.

Fielding, H: Tom Jones. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1985.
Flaubert, G: Madame Bovary, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth. 1950.
Fleming, M: An Investigation into the Philosophy of Drama in Education. Ph.D. thesis in The University of Durham Library, School of Education. 1982.

Galileo: The Systeme of the World. Transl. Thomas Salusbury, London, 1661. (Ushaw Library).
Gardner, H: Frames of Mind, Paladin, London, 1985.
Geertz, C: The Interpretation of Cultures, Basic Books, New York, 1973.
Local Knowledge, Basic Books. New York, 1983.
Gibson, R: Structuralism and Education, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1984.
Critical Theory and Education, Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1986.
Gilson, E: The History of Medieval Philosophy. London, 1936.
The Unity of Philosophical Experience. London, 1938.
The Future of Augustinian Metaphysics, in St Augustine, His Age, Life and Thought, Meridian Books, New York, 1957.
The Christian Philosophy of St Augustine, Gollancz, London, 1961.
Goffman, E: Frame Analysis. Northeastern University Press, Boston, 1986. Orig. Harper-Row 1974.
Gogol,N: Dead Souls, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1961.
Goncharov, I.A: Oblomov, Transl. Duddington, Everyman, London, 1932.
Gorky, M: My Apprenticeship, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1974.
Grainger, R: The Language of the Rite. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1974.
Greeley, A: Against R.C.I.A. in; America, Oct 14, 1989, Vol 161, no.10.
Grice, H.P: Logic and Conversation, in: Syntax and Semantics, Academic Press, New York, 1975, Vol.3, p.45.
Guzie, T: Jesus and the Eucharist, Paulist Press, New York, Paramus N.J. 1974.
The Book of Sacramental Basics, Paulist Press, New York, Mahwah, N.J. 1981.

Hall, E.T: The Silent Language, Doubleday-Anchor, New York, 1973.
The Hidden Dimension, Doubleday, New York, 1966.
Hardy,T: The Mayor of Casterbridge, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1985.
Hargreaves, D: Power and the Paracurriculum, in: Standards, Schooling and Education, Ed. Finch and Scrimshaw, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1980. p.126-137.
Hawkes, T: Structuralism and Semiotics, Methuen, London, 1977.
Hayhoe, M. and S. Parker: Reading and Response, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1990.
Hazard, P: The European Mind, 1680-1715. Meridian Books, Cleveland, 1963.
Heathcote.D: Of These Seeds Becoming, in: Educational Drama for Today's Schools, Ed. Shuman, The Scarecrow Press Inc. Metuchen, N.J. and London 1978. p.1-40.
Drama, A Learning Medium. A lecture given July 12, 1978, at Wellington Teacher's College.
The Enabling Teacher, Radio New Zealand interview with Jack Shallcrass, Oct 18, 1978.
Drama as Context, N.A.T.E. Aberdeen, 1980.
Material for Meaning in Drama, London Drama, Vol 6. no.2.
Drama teacher, -Facilitator or Manipulator? Ed. T. Goode, N.A.T.D. 1982.
Learning, Knowing and Languaging in Drama, in Language Arts, vol.60, no.6, 1983, pp. 695-701.
A Drama of Learning, Mantle of the Expert, with Phyl Herbert, in Theory into Practice, Vol. 24, no. 3, Summer 1985, p.173
The Fight for Drama, the Fight for Education, Ed. K. Byron, N.A.T.D. 1990.
Collected Writings on Drama and Education, Ed. O'Neill and Johnson, Hutchinson, London, 1984.
Hegel: The Phenomenology of Mind; The Science of Logic; The Philosophy of History; in An Annotated Selection, Ed. Wande Orynski, Peter Owen, London, 1960.
Heidegger, M: Being and Time, S.C.M. London, 1962.
Herbert, D: Ed. The Everyman Book of Narrative Verse, J.M.Dent, London, 1990.
Hirschkop, K: Reply to the Forum on Bakhtin, in Critical Enquiry, University of Chicago Press, vol.11, no.4, June, 1985, p.672.
Essays in Poetics, University of Keele, Vol.11, no.1, April 1986.
Hobbes, T: Leviathon. Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1981.
Hornbrook, D: Education and Dramatic Art, Blackwell, Oxford, 1989.
Hovda, R.W: Strong, Loving and Wise, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1976.
Huizinga, J: Homo Ludens, Amsterdam, 1938. Engl.Transl. London, 1949.

Illich, I.D: Celebration of Awareness, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1976.

Jones, A: Ed. The Jerusalem Bible, Darton Longman and Todd, London, 1966.
Jones, M.V: Dostoievski, - driving the reader crazy! in, Essays in Poetics, University of Keele, Vol. 12, no.1, April, 1987.
Jungmann, J: The Mass of the Roman Rite, Abridged Edit. Burns and Oates, London, 1959.

Keats, J: The Eve of St Agnes, in, The Everyman Book of Narrative Verse. Ed. D. Herbert, Dent, 1990, p.130
Keen, Sam: To a Dancing God, Collins Fontana, London, 1971

La Capra, D: History, Politics, and the Novel, Cornell University Press, Ithaca and London, 1987.
Langer, S: Philosophy in a New Key, Harvard University Press, 1957.
Leary, T: The Politics of Ecstasy, Paladin, Granada Publishing Co. 1970.
Leavis, F.R: The Great Tradition, Chatto and Windus, London, 1948.
The Common Pursuit. Chatto and Windus, London, 1965
The Critic as Anti-philosopher, Chatto and Windus, 1982.
Lesky, A: A History of Greek Literature, Transl. Willis and De Heer, Methuen, London, 1966.
Levi-Straus, C: Structural Anthropology, transl. C. Jacobson, and B.G. Schoepf. Penguin Books, 1972.
Sad Tropics, Transl. J. and D. Weightman, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1976.
Lewis, C.S: The Allegory of Love, Oxford, 1936.
Lichtheim, G. Lukacs, Fontana Modern Masters, London, 1970.
Ligier, L: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist, in The New Liturgy, Ed, Lancelot Shepherd, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1970. p.113-150.
Llewellyn, R: The Congregation shares in the prayer of the President, in The New Liturgy, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1970. p.103-112.
Lonergan, B: Insight, Longman Green, Glasgow, 1957.
Lukacs, G: The Meaning of Contemporary Realism, Merlin Press, London, 1963.
The Historical Novel, Peregrine Books, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Mann, T: The Magic Mountain. Transl. H.T. Lowe-Porter, Secker and Warburg. 1928.
Doctor Faustus. Transl. H.T. Lowe-Porter, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1968.
Marcuse, H: Eros and Civilization, Beacon Books, 1955, Sphere Books, London, 1969.
One Dimensional Man, Beacon Books, 1964. Sphere Books, London, 1968.
Maritain, J: Art and Scholasticism, Trans. J.F.Scanlon, Sheed and Ward, London, 1930.

An Introduction to Philosophy, Sheed and Ward. London, 1950.

Marrou,H: St Augustine and his Influence through the Ages, Longmans, London, 1957.

Marson, P. and K. Brockbank, B.M'Guire, S.Merton, Drama 14-16. Stanley Thornes, (Publishers) Ltd, Cheltenham, 1990.

Marx, K: Das Capital. Pelican Books, Harmondsworth, 1976.

Masure, E: The Sacrifice of the Mystical Body, London 1954.

McCaslin, N: Ed. Children and Drama, David McKay and Co. New York, 1975.

McFague, S: Models of God, S.C.M. Press, London, 1987.

McKenzie, J.L: Myths and Realities, Chapman, London, 1963.

Mead, G.H: Mind, Self and Society, in Social Psychology, Selected Papers, Ed. A. Strauss, University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Mill,J.S: On Liberty. in Utilitarianism, Dent, London, 1910.

Moffett,J: Teaching the Universe of Discourse, Houghton Mifflin, Boston, Mass. 1968.

Morson. Ed: Bakhtin; Essays and dialogues on his work. University of Chicago, 1986.

Morson, et al: Forum on Mikhail Bakhtin, in Critical Enquiry Vol.10, no.2. Dec. 1983, pp. 225-319.

Morgan, N. and J. Saxton: Teaching Drama, Stanley Thornes, (Publishers),Ltd. Cheltenham, 1987.

Murdoch, I: The Brotherhood and the Book, Chatto and Windus, 1987.

Neelands,J: Structuring Drama Work. Cambridge University Press, 1990.
Making Sense of Drama, Heineman Educational Books, London, 1984.

Nixon, J: Ed. Drama and the Whole Curriculum, Hutchinson, London,1982.

O'Neil, C. and A.Lambert: Drama Structures. Hutchinson, London, 1982.

O'Toole J, and B.Haseman: Dramawise, Heinemann Educational, Oxford, 1987.

Otto, R: The Idea of the Holy, Transl. J.W. Harvey, Pelican Books, Harmondsworth, 1959.

Passmore, J: A Hundred Years of Philosophy, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1968.

Peacocke, A.R: Creation and the World of Science, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1979.

Pemberton-Billing, R.N., and J.D.Clegg, Teaching Drama, University of London Press, 1970.

Petronius: The Satyricon, Trans. J.P. Sullivan, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1965.

Plato: Platonis Opera, Ed. J.Burnet, Clarendon Press, Oxford, Vol.1, 1900; Vol.2, 1901, Vol.4, 1902.
The Symposium, Transl. W.Hamilton, Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1951.
The Last Days of Socrates, Trans. Hugh Tredennick, Penguin classics, Harmondsworth, 1954.
The Crito, Transl. Hugh Tredennick, in The Last Days of Socrates, Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1954.

The Phaedo, Transl. Hugh Tredennick, in The Last Days of Socrates, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1954.
The Republic, Transl H.P. Lee, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1955.
The Timaeus, Transl. H.D.P. Lee, Penguin Classics. Harmondsworth, 1965.

Poe, E.A; The Facts in the Case of M. Valdemar, in, Ghosts and Marvels, Ed. V.H. Collins, Oxford University Press. No date.

Puig, M: The Kiss of the Spider Woman, Vintage Press, London, 1991.

Rabelais, F: Gargantua, and, Pantagruel, Transl. J.M.Cohen, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1955.

Rahner, H: Man at Play, or Did You Ever Practise Eutrapelia? Compass Books, London, 1965.

Raven, J.E: Plato's Thought in the Making, Cambridge University Press, 1965.

Rawlins, G. and J.Rich: Look, Listen, and Trust, -a framework for learning through Drama. Macmillan, London, 1985.

Reimer, E: School is Dead, Penguin Educational Specials, Harmondsworth, 1971.

Ricoeur, P: Narrative and Time, Vol 1, University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Rosen, H: Stories and Meanings, National Association for the Teaching of English, 1985.

Ross, M: The Claims of Feeling: Readings in Aesthetic Education, The Falmer Press, Lewes, 1989.

Roszak, T: The Making of a Counter Culture. Faber, London, 1970.

Roubiczek, P: Existentialism, For and Against. Cambridge University Press, 1964.

Rousseau, J.J: The Confessions, The Modern Library, New York. No date.

Rushdie, S: The Satanic Verses, Penguin Viking, London, 1988.

Russell, B: The Problems of Philosophy, Oxford, 1952.

Sacks, et Al: Systematics for the organization of turn-taking. in Language, vol 50, no.4, (1974), p.727.

Sartre, J.P: La Nausée, Gallimard, Livre de Poche, Paris, 1938.
Being and Nothing, London, 1957.

Sauvage, M: Socrates and the Conscience of Man, Longmans, London, 1960.

Schillebeeckx, E: Christ the Sacrament. Sheed and Ward, London, 1963.

Scott, W: The Heart of Midlothian, Everyman, Dent, London, 1906.

Sendak, M: Where the Wild Things Are, Picture Puffin, London 1970.

Seneca. The Apocolocyntosis, Transl. J.P. O'Sullivan, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1965.

Shakespeare, W: Henry 1V, Pt 1, and 2. Ed. G.B.Harrison, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1938.
Twelfth Night, New Penguin Shakespeare, Harmondsworth, 1968.

King Lear. New Penguin Shakespeare, Harmondsworth,1972.
Shreeves, R: Children Dancing, 2nd Edit. Ward Lock Educational, East Grinstead, 1979.
Slade, P: Child Drama, University of London Press, 1954.
Smolarski, D: How Not To Say Mass, Paulist Press, Mahwah, New York, 1986.
Sophocles: Oedipus Tyrannus, Ed. R.C. Jebb, 3rd edit. Cambridge University Press, 1893.
The Theban Plays, Transl. E.F.Watling, Penguin Classics, Harmondsworth, 1947.
Southern, R.W: The Making of the Middle Ages. Grey Arrow, London, 1959.
Stendahl: La Chartreuse de Parme, Gallimard, Livre de Poche, Paris, 1962.
Sterne L: The Life and Opinions of Tristam Shandy, Oxford University Press. 1903.
Sutherland, S.R: The Philosophical Dimension, Self and Freedom; in, New Essays on Dostoievski, Ed. Jones and Terry, Cambridge University Press, 1983. p.169-175.

Todorov, T: M.M.Bakhtine, Le Principe Dialogique, Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1981.
Literature and Its Theorists. Cornell University Press, 1987.
Toulmin, S: The Uses of Argument, Cambridge University Press, 1958.
Reason in Ethics. Cambridge Universtiy Press, 1964.
Tracy, D: Blessed Rage for Order. Seabury Press, New York, 1975.
The Analogical imagination. S.C.M. Press, London, 1982.
Plurality and Ambiguity, S.C.M. Press, London, 1987.
Turner, V: The Ritual Process, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1969.

Van Der Leeuw, G: Sacred and Profane Beauty, The Holy in Art. Weidenfeld and Nicholson, London, 1963.
Vergil: Opera, Ed. Hirtzel. Oxford university Press, 1900.
Voloshinov - Bakhtin, On This Side of the Social. 1925.
Voltaire: Candide, 1759, (Ushaw Library. No Publisher or Place.)
Vygotski, L: Thought and Language, Massachusett's Institute of Technology Press, 1962.

Waddell, H: Medieval Latin Lyrics, Penguin Books, Harmondsworth, 1952.
The Wandering Scholars, Fontana, London, 1968.
Wagner, B.J: Dorothy Heathcote, Drama as a learning Medium, N.E.A. Washington D.C. 1976.
Watts, A: The Book on the Taboo against Knowing Who You Are. Abacus, Jonathon Cape, London, 1969.
Way, B: Development through Drama, Longmans, London,1967.
Wicker, B: Culture and Liturgy. Sheed and Ward, Owl Books, London, 1963.

Willis, P: A Preparation for Work, in, Family, Work and Education, Ed. Reedy and Woodhead, Open University Press, Milton Keynes, 1980.

Witkin, R.W: The Intelligence of Feeling, Heinemann, London, 1974.

Wittgenstein, L: Philosophical Investigations, Trans. G.E.M. Anscombe, Blackwell, Oxford, 1963.