



A Discourse-Analysis Based Critical Approach to Contextual Interpretation of Heteroglossic Situation in the Novel

Edirisingha Arachchige Gamini Fonseka
Professor of English
University of Ruhuna
Wellamadama
MATARA
Sri Lanka
E-mail: drgamini@gmail.com

Doi:10.7575/aiac.all.v.5n.4p.168

Received: 17/06/2014

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.all.v.5n.4p.168>

Accepted: 28/07/2014

The publication of this paper was sponsored by the University of Ruhuna, Sri Lanka.

Abstract

According to the theory of dialogism propounded by Mikhail Bakhtin, all discourse in the novel is a product of a process of dialogic imagination. Yet heteroglossic situation in the novel differs from general narration, as it involves interaction among two or more characters speaking in their respective voices to represent different aspects of reality in a form of dramatisation. Authors depict certain situations in the reported speech as they can be portrayed in terms of straightforward accounts and certain situations in dialogue as they need dramatization in order to enable readers to realize the actual conflicts or interactions they wish to simulate. Dialogue engendered through the participation of two or several characters is considered heteroglossic situation because of the heterogeneity of the language shades and voices in which they express themselves. While reading a novel for both language development and literary perception, the heteroglossic situations sometimes create problems for the readers as they need more pragmatic knowledge to understand the actual conversations and the messages conveyed through them. There a discourse analysis-based critical approach becomes crucial as it is required to deal with the identities and asymmetrical power relations the characters maintain throughout their conversations, other than the speech acts they carry out, the social atmospheres they help to engender, the messages they help to communicate, and the concepts they help to foreground in relation to their contexts. In regard to this, this paper attempts to develop a discourse analysis-based critical approach to the contextual interpretation of heteroglossic situation in the novel.

Keywords: The Novel, Dialogism, Heteroglossia, Discourse Analysis, Contextual Interpretation, Bakhtinian Poetics

1. A Structuralist View of the Novel to Begin With

From the physical look of a novel as a book containing an elaborate story, it is understood that it is an artistic form developed for representing reality epically. The structure of the novel constitutes objects, characters, settings and incidents as elements of a grand narrative in carrying out its function of representing reality. All these elements filled with semantic value combine forces in the projection of a story that relates the reality unfolding in a dynamic pattern.

“A novel is a long prose narrative that describes fictional characters and events, usually in the form of a sequential story of real life in the historical period and society in which it is set.” (Coles Notes, 1991)

“The novel is differentiated from its predecessors by its internal cohesion, its emphasis on a tightly orchestrated plot and action, its realistic portrayal of characters and situations, and its eschewing of overtly allegorical elements. Characters in novels are more than archetypes, they are invested with a sense of interior consciousness, a psychological depth missing from the figures that populated earlier prose works. It is less fantastic than the romance, relying more heavily on *mimesis*, i.e. the attempt to accurately “mirror” the real or quotidian world in a fictional setting.” (The Electronic Labyrinth)

This type of popular definition of the novel emerges from the type of perception of it achieved by those who have looked at it as general readers rather than literary critics. Based on the structural and functional features of the novel, Henry James (1888) claims with more aesthetic understanding, “A novel is a living thing, all one and continuous, like any other organism, and in proportion as it lives will be found, I think, that each of the parts there is something that each of the other parts.” This complex organic behaviour of the novel as a coherent piece of work generates a power over the reader to engage in visualizing the incidents dramatized there as parts of a movie. Influenced by this definition, Arnold Kettle (1967) warns, “You cannot really separate, say, ‘character’ from ‘plot’, ‘narrative’ from ‘background’”. Both James and Kettle draw our attention to the ideational aspects of the novel as a representation of reality but ignore where these constituents of the novel draw energy from in order to maintain their organic behaviour during its sensorial communication with the reader. While semantically-influenced structuralist theories of the novel of this sort evolved

over several decades, Bakhtin's dialogism opened new vistas for the study of the novel, providing new directions in the appreciation of literature and the perception of language in the novel in a new light. In accordance with Bakhtin's literary theory known as dialogism, the novel can be interpreted more empirically basing our perception of it on the meaning of the words uttered line by line in terms of constituents of an ongoing dialogue.

2. Mikhail Bakhtin's Dialogism Opening a New Perspective

As Klages (2012) introduces, the Russian literary and linguistic theorist Mikhail Bakhtin, whose works produced in the Soviet Union in the 1920s were not discovered by Western thinkers until the 1960s, was not a Marxist or a post-structuralist, but rather a thinker interested in the social relations inherent in any form of speech or writing.

Bakhtin uses the concept of dialogism in discussing the distinction between novels and poetry as literary forms. In poetry, Bakhtin argues, words are used monologically, as if they have no connection to social or historical relations; a word has meaning only in reference to language itself. In prose fiction, by contrast, words are used dialogically, as having both etymological meaning and social meaning. The form of the novel, as exemplified in Dostoevsky, encourages dialogic speech, as different characters speak in recognizably different voices, and engage with each other in debating worldviews, rather than affirming a single worldview. Another aspect of Bakhtin's dialogics appears in his discussions of the "double-voiced" word, a term he uses to describe irony or parody, or words used in quotation marks. A double-voiced word contains two meanings: a literal or monologic meaning, that is, a dictionary definition, and an implied or dialogic meaning, which appears in the social relationship between the two participants in a dialogue. (Klages, 2012)

While most critics as the above involved in the study of the novel in a structuralist light paid attention only to large structures such as characters, settings and episodes, Bakhtin concentrated on the behaviour of "words" or "utterances" as minimal units of discourse in the generation of meaning for the creation of a novel. He declares in *Dialogic Imagination* (284), "The word lives, as it were, on the boundary between its own context and another alien context." Accordingly, a "word" or an "utterance" is an *expression* in a living context of exchange. A word is the main unit of meaning (not abstract sentences out of context), and is formed through a speaker's relation to *otherness* (other people, others' words and expressions, and the live cultural world in time and place). In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (143), he claims, "I live in a world of others' words." A "word" is therefore always already embedded in a history of expressions by others in a chain of ongoing cultural and political moments (Irving, 2004). In *Speech Genres* (68, 84), he states, "Any understanding of live speech, a live utterance, is inherently responsive... Any utterance is a link in the chain of communication." In that sense, while a word or an utterance is marked by *addressivity* (the presence of an intended audience) and *answerability* (the presence of an issue demanding a response), discourse (chains or strings of words or utterances) is fundamentally *dialogic* and historically *contingent* or positioned within, and inseparable from, a community, a history or a place. Along with the recognition of the roles the words play in discourse individually, Bakhtin directs the reader to enjoy the novel as a stretch of discourse, experiencing the behaviour of the words in determining the social relationships between the speakers concerned (Irving, 2004).

3. Bakhtin's Definition of the Novel

According to Bakhtin, the novel is an artistically organized stretch of discourse multiform in style and variform in speech and voice, that contains five categories of "compositional-stylistic unities" identified as authorial voice, stories, inserted literary texts, other inserted texts and speech of characters (Boos, 2000). In order to make use of this definition of the novel, one has to identify the nexus of the characters, including the narrator, and relate their speech to the conditions that prevail within the space where their interactions transpire. In this case the define features of the novel introduced in Bakhtinian poetics need to be taken into consideration. Accordingly, it is vital for the reader to familiarize with the concepts Bakhtin introduces under dialogism, in terms of *polyphony*, *unfinalizability*, *prosaics*, *carnavalesque*, *chronotop*, *heteroglossia* and *exotopy*. While *polyphony* signifies the presence of many voices representing many persons, each one of whom speaks for an individual self, distinct from others (Lodge, 1990), *unfinalizability* respects the possibility that a person can change and that he is never finalized, completely understood, known, or labelled (Cavanah, 2012). *Prosaics*, in contradistinction to poetics, is based on the assumption that the most important events of life are not necessarily grand, dramatic, spectacular or catastrophic, but apparently small, prosaic, and ordinary (Sahu, 2006). While these two concepts – polyphony and unfinalizability – characterize a group, the interaction between the social and the literary, as well as relationship between the body and the material bodily lower stratum are meant to engender the body feeling that transgresses and outgrows its own limits is known as the *carnivalesque* (Robinson 2011). Here Bakhtin adopts the notions of a carnival and the grotesque to describe the polyphonic style: each individual character is strongly defined, and at the same time the reader witnesses the critical influence of each character upon the other. The situations depicted are identified under *chronotope* that literally means "time space" and is defined by Bakhtin as "the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically expressed in literature" (Robinson, 2011). The term *heteroglossia* refers to the qualities of a language that are extralinguistic, but common to all languages. These include qualities such as perspective, evaluation, and ideological positioning. In this way most languages are incapable of neutrality, for every word is inextricably bound to the context in which it exists (Emerson & Holquist, 1981: 428). Bakhtin presents another concept through the word *exotopy* literally meaning 'outsideness', referring to the ability of an author to 'speak' the authentic voices of characters other than their own (Menticulture, 2013). Representing all these language-related characteristics of a novel enumerated by Bakhtin, a new definition of it can be formulated as a multi-episodic narrative of prosaic events presented by an author established in his outsideness, through an unhierarchic body of unfinalizable characters that speak in many varying voices a context-bound language

particular to each character and related to a certain time and space. Of course, there are so many different negative opinions about Bakhtin's poetics (Robinson, 2011; Wellek, 1980), yet I consider the definition of the novel worked out this way would help to make an approach to the trickiest aspect of it – heteroglossic situation, whose presence cannot be denied in any case.

4. Heteroglossic Situation in Theory

Before Bakhtin, there was no notion of heteroglossia and no understanding of the dialogic nature of the language as well as a carnivalesque tradition in culture, and the analysis of the novel was confined to the study of philosophical concepts that emerged through the actions and interactions among the characters and their reactions to various situations and phenomena that emerged within the narrative space. Nevertheless, after the discovery of the dialogic nature of language, new vistas for literary and stylistic study of the novel emerged. As we are dealing with heteroglossic situation, it is appropriate to realize the term etymologically:

In linguistics, the term **heteroglossia** describes the coexistence of distinct varieties within a single linguistic code. The term translates the Russian *разноречие* [raznorechie] (literally "different-speech-ness"), which was introduced by the Russian linguist Mikhail Bakhtin in his 1934 paper *Слово в романе* [Slovo v romane], published in English as "Discourse in the Novel." Bakhtin argues that the power of the novel originates in the coexistence of, and conflict between, different types of speech: the speech of characters, the speech of narrators, and even the speech of the author. He defines heteroglossia as "another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way." It is important to note that Bakhtin identifies the direct narrative of the author, rather than dialogue between characters, as the primary location of this conflict. (Reference.com)

According to Bakhtin, speech and complex cultural discourse in all our genres known as novels, scientific description, art works, philosophical arguments, etc. are mixed through and through with heteroglossia and polyphony (Irving, 2004). In other words, we produce works of these genres, in terms of ideas emerging as appropriated expressions formed of words belonging to a large community, whose existence shapes their speech produced polyphonically, incorporating many voices, styles, references, and assumptions that are not of our "own". What is clear from this claim is that heteroglossia represents a diversity of voices, styles of discourse, or points of view in a literary work and especially in a novel (Marian Webster, 2013). A seminal influence in the modern practices of literary criticism, I.A. Richards stated, "The two pillars upon which a theory of criticism must rest are an account of value and an account of communication," (Richards, 1924). Lodge (1980) proves that Bakhtin's theory has both these essentials, and preserves the humanistic quality of our approach to literary criticism because he considers language more than a system, a social activity. Therefore, the understanding of a novel as a series of heteroglossic situations, where a diversity of voices, styles of discourse, and points of view meet, is essential for achieving accuracy in our perception of all issues it deals with as human behaviour influenced by social norms. Our stances about the characters as individuals, the moral forces they represent, the implications of their behaviours, and the results of their interactions develop from the familiarity of the heteroglossic nature of the events we come across in the course of reading the novel.

5. Actualization of a Heteroglossic Situation

Here an attempt is made to illustrate how a heteroglossic situation actualizes in a novel. The printed characters on the pages in the dust jacket gather life along with our effort to read them. In a modern classroom, an audio recording of the text helps to demonstrate the process in which a novel actualizes in the form of a dramatically pronounced narrative. For example, the LibriVox (2001) audio recording of Charles Dickens' *Great Expectations* voices the Christmas dinner at the Gargeries in Chapter 4 as follows:

It began the moment we sat down to dinner. Mr Wopsle said grace with theatrical declamation -- as it now appears to me, something like a religious cross of the Ghost in Hamlet with Richard the Third and ended with the very proper aspiration that we might be truly grateful. Upon which my sister fixed me with her eye, and said, in a low reproachful voice, **'Do you hear that? Be grateful.'**

'Especially,' said Mr Pumblechook, **'be grateful, boy, to them which brought you up by hand.'**

Mrs Hubble shook her head, and contemplating me with a mournful presentiment that I should come to no good, asked, **'Why is it that the young are never grateful?'** This moral mystery seemed too much for the company until Mr Hubble tersely solved it by saying, **'Naterally vicious.'** Everybody then murmured **'True!'** and looked at me in a particularly unpleasant and personal manner.

Joe's station and influence were something feebler (if possible) when there was company, than when there was none. But he always aided and comforted me when he could, in some way of his own, and he always did so at dinner-time by giving me gravy, if there were any. There being plenty of gravy today, Joe spooned into my plate, at this point, about half a pint.

A little later on in the dinner, Mr Wopsle reviewed the sermon with some severity, and intimated--in the usual hypothetical case of the Church being 'thrown open' -- what kind of sermon *he* would have given them. After favouring them with some heads of that discourse, he remarked that he considered the subject of the day's homily, ill-chosen; which was the less excusable, he added, when there were so many subjects 'going about.'

'True again,' said Uncle Pumblechook. **'You've hit it, sir! Plenty of subjects going about, for them that know how to put salt upon their tails. That's what's wanted. A man needn't go far to find a subject, if**

he's ready with his salt-box.' Mr Pumblechook added, after a short interval of reflection, **'Look at Pork alone. There's a subject! If you want a subject, look at Pork!'**

'True, sir. Many a moral for the young,' returned Mr Wopsle; and I knew he was going to lug me in, before he said it; **'might be deduced from that text.'**

(**'You listen to this,'** said my sister to me, in a severe parenthesis.)

Joe gave me some more gravy.

'Swine,' pursued Mr Wopsle, in his deepest voice, and pointing his fork at my blushes, as if he were mentioning my christian name; **'Swine were the companions of the prodigal. The gluttony of Swine is put before us, as an example to the young.'** (I thought this pretty well in him who had been praising up the pork for being so plump and juicy.) **'What is detestable in a pig, is more detestable in a boy.'**

'Or girl,' suggested Mr Hubble.

'Of course, or girl, Mr Hubble,' assented Mr Wopsle, rather irritably, **'but there is no girl present.'**

'Besides,' said Mr Pumblechook, turning sharp on me, **'think what you've got to be grateful for. If you'd been born a Squeaker --'**

'He was, if ever a child was,' said my sister, most emphatically.

Joe gave me some more gravy.

'Well, but I mean a four-footed Squeaker,' said Mr Pumblechook. **'If you had been born such, would you have been here now? Not you --'**

'Unless in that form,' said Mr Wopsle, nodding towards the dish.

'But I don't mean in that form, sir,' returned Mr Pumblechook, who had an objection to being interrupted; **'I mean, enjoying himself with his elders and betters, and improving himself with their conversation, and rolling in the lap of luxury. Would he have been doing that? No, he wouldn't. And what would have been your destination?'** turning on me again. **'You would have been disposed of for so many shillings according to the market price of the article, and Dunstable the butcher would have come up to you as you lay in your straw, and he would have whipped you under his left arm, and with his right he would have tucked up his frock to get a penknife from out of his waistcoat-pocket, and he would have shed your blood and had your life. No bringing up by hand then. Not a bit of it!'**

Joe offered me more gravy, which I was afraid to take.

'He was a world of trouble to you, ma'am,' said Mrs Hubble, commiserating my sister.

'Trouble?' echoed my sister; **'trouble?'** And then entered on a fearful catalogue of all the illnesses I had been guilty of, and all the acts of sleeplessness I had committed, and all the high places I had tumbled from, and all the low places I had tumbled into, and all the injuries I had done myself, and all the times she had wished me in my grave, and I had contumaciously refused to go there.

I think the Romans must have aggravated one another very much, with their noses. Perhaps, they became the restless people they were, in consequence. Anyhow, Mr Wopsle's Roman nose so aggravated me, during the recital of my misdemeanours that I should have liked to pull it until he howled. But, all I had endured up to this time, was nothing in comparison with the awful feelings that took possession of me when the pause was broken which ensued upon my sister's recital, and in which pause everybody had looked at me (as I felt painfully conscious) with indignation and abhorrence.

'Yet,' said Mr Pumblechook, leading the company gently back to the theme from which they had strayed, **'Pork -- regarded as biled -- is rich, too; ain't it?'**

'Have a little brandy, uncle,' said my sister.

O Heavens, it had come at last! He would find it was weak, he would say it was weak, and I was lost! I held tight to the leg of the table under the cloth, with both hands, and awaited my fate.

My sister went for the stone bottle, came back with the stone bottle, and poured his brandy out: no one else taking any. The wretched man trifled with his glass -- took it up, looked at it through the light, put it down -- prolonged my misery. All this time, Mrs Joe and Joe were briskly clearing the table for the pie and pudding.

I couldn't keep my eyes off him. Always holding tight by the leg of the table with my hands and feet, I saw the miserable creature finger his glass playfully, take it up, smile, throw his head back, and drink the brandy off. Instantly afterwards, the company were seized with unspeakable consternation, owing to his springing to his feet, turning round several times in an appalling spasmodic whooping- cough dance, and rushing out at the door; he then became visible through the window, violently plunging and expectorating, making the most hideous faces, and apparently out of his mind.

I held on tight, while Mrs Joe and Joe ran to him. I didn't know how I had done it, but I had no doubt I had murdered him somehow. In my dreadful situation, it was a relief when he was brought back, and, surveying the company all round as if *they* had disagreed with him, sank down into his chair with the one significant gasp, **'Tar!'**

I had filled up the bottle from the tar-water jug. I knew he would be worse by-and-by. I moved the table, like a Medium of the present day, by the vigour of my unseen hold upon it.

'Tar!' cried my sister, in amazement. **'Why, how ever could Tar come there?'**

The words in normal fonts are the narrator's while those in bold are of the respective characters he refers to. I have presented Joe's contribution to the conversation in terms of repeatedly serving gravy to Pip in italics to mean the significance of his silent presence. When the utterances made by the other characters are presented separately, they appear in the form a stretch of dramatic discourse as follows:

Mrs Joe - **'Do you hear that? Be grateful.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'Especially ... be grateful, boy, to them which brought you up by hand.'**

Mrs Hubble - **'Why is it that the young are never grateful?'**

Mr Hubble - **'Naterally wicious.'**

Everybody - **'True!'**

Uncle Pumblechook - **'True again, 'You've hit it, sir! Plenty of subjects going about, for them that know how to put salt upon their tails. That's what's wanted. A man needn't go far to find a subject, if he's ready with his salt-box.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'Look at Pork alone. There's a subject! If you want a subject, look at Pork!'**

Mr Wopsle - **'True, sir. Many a moral for the young ... might be deduced from that text.'**

Mrs Joe - **'You listen to this'**

Mr Wopsle - **'Swine, Swine were the companions of the prodigal. The gluttony of Swine is put before us, as an example to the young. ... What is detestable in a pig, is more detestable in a boy.'**

Mr Hubble - **'Or girl.'**

Mr Wopsle - **'Of course, or girl, Mr Hubble, but there is no girl present.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'Besides, ... think what you've got to be grateful for. If you'd been born a Squeaker --'**

Mrs Joe - **'He was, if ever a child was.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'Well, but I mean a four-footed Squeaker ... If you had been born such, would you have been here now? Not you --'**

Mr Wopsle - **'Unless in that form.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'But I don't mean in that form, sir, ... I mean, enjoying himself with his elders and betters, and improving himself with their conversation, and rolling in the lap of luxury. Would he have been doing that? No, he wouldn't. And what would have been your destination? ... You would have been disposed of for so many shillings according to the market price of the article, and Dunstable the butcher would have come up to you as you lay in your straw, and he would have whipped you under his left arm, and with his right he would have tucked up his frock to get a penknife from out of his waistcoat-pocket, and he would have shed your blood and had your life. No bringing up by hand then. Not a bit of it!'**

Mrs Hubble - **'He was a world of trouble to you, ma'am.'**

Mrs Joe - **'Trouble?... trouble?'**

Mr Pumblechook **'Yet, ... Pork -- regarded as biled -- is rich, too; ain't it?'**

Mrs Joe - **'Have a little brandy, uncle.'**

Mr Pumblechook - **'Tar!'**

Mrs Joe - **'Tar! Why, how ever could Tar come there?'**

While this stretch of discourse is analysed under the Bakhtinian theory of heteroglossia it becomes clear that the narration occurs in a style far more complex than that of a linear account of the events. Here the narrator Pip is not the illiterate little boy we meet in the churchyard at the onset of the novel. His style of discourse implies that he relates the story even after his gentlemanly education followed by a well-paid job in a shipping company. Of course the narrator Pip exploits the quality of displacement, the potential of the verbal language to graphically recreate distant realities in a way to appeal to all senses, in order to relate what happened in his past. (See Labov, 1980)

6. A Discourse-Analysis of the Text

Once the discourse of the text is meticulously analyzed, all the speech-acts the narrator and the characters carry out surface. It is basically understood that Pip relates in humorous terms how the Christmas dinner went on. So the narrative heteroglossically presents: the theatrical nature of Mr Wopsle's grace saying; Mr Wopsle's emphasis on gratitude; Mrs Joe's remark on Pip as an ungrateful boy; Mr Pumblechook's command for Pip to be grateful; Mrs Hubble's mournful presentiment about Pip's destiny to be bad; Mr Hubble's explanation to Pip's innate viciousness; everybody's endorsement of Mr Hubble's charge of Pip being wicked; Joe's strategy with gravy to console Pip; Mr Wopsle's puzzlement about the type of sermon he would have given to the wicked; Mr Pumblechook's proposition to have poke

as a subject for a sermon; Mr Wopsle's recommendation of the Bible as a source for sermons; Joe's second serving of gravy to Pip by way of consoling him; Mr Wopsle's comparison of the boys to swine; Mr Hubble's addition of girls to that comparison; Mr Wopsle's decline of it as there are no girls around; Mr Pumblechook's suggestion for Pip to recollect the favours he received from others, though he was born as a squeaker; Mrs Joe's claim about Pip's past as a squeaker; Joe's third serving of gravy to Pip in order to console him; Mr Pumblechook's clarification that he meant a pig by a squeaker; Mr Wopsle's endorsement of Mr Pumblechook's comparison; Mr Pumblechook's objection to Mr Wopsle's misleading intervention and correcting that Pip has led his life so far in the lap of luxury; Mr Pumblechook's speculation on the terrible destiny Pip would have undergone at the hands of the murderous butcher Dunstable, if not for his sister; Mrs Hubble's commiseration with Mrs Joe that Pip was a "world of trouble" to the latter; Mrs Joe's account of worries caused to her by Pip; Pip's irritation; Mr Pumblechook's return to the comparison of pork; Mrs Joe's offer of brandy to Mr Pumblechook; Pip's panic about the possibility that his theft would be discovered; Mr Pumblechook's reactions to the so-called glass of brandy; the Gargeries struggle to rescue Mr Pumblechook from his choke; Pip's guilty conscience; Mr Pumblechook's confession to drinking the bitter stuff called 'tar'; Pip's predicament about replacing the wine content of the bottle with tar; Pip's reaction to the catastrophe; and Mrs Joe's curiosity about tar going into the bottle of wine. The audio recording of the text helps to polyphonically engender a truly heteroglossic situation. In addition to the idioms, mannerisms, and discourse styles peculiar to the characters, Dickens has even used dialectal indicators such as 'to them which brought you up...', 'Naterally wicious' and 'biled' to emphasize further the social background of his characters. All these differences are observed in a proper reading of the narrative text so as to enable the heteroglossic situation concerned to concretize. A discourse analysis of this sort can reveal not only the speech acts the characters carry out but also their behaviours and ideologies as well as their attitudes to each other through which the narrative is engendered.

7. The Prosaic Transformed into Fiesta through Application of Poetics

In light of Bakhtin's concept of *prosaics* the Christmas dinner is just a commonplace incident. People usually meet and talk over a dinner on a Christmas evening. Yet the application of the *carnivalesque* in the narration by means of polyphony and heteroglossia makes the incident provocative, interesting, and memorable. As Dickens' intention is to portray adult cruelty towards children in Victorian England the entire setting helps to perceive the basis of their cruelty. Here they use Christmas and religiousness to cover their hypocrisy and sugar-coat their psychological torture of children with Puritanism. Dickens draws attention to this aspect of the situation through the absurdist rhetoric that emerges from the conversation among the adults. The BBC (1995) film version of the episode reveals how powerfully the narration can be dramatized though it is confined to a period of about two minutes.

The solemn atmosphere of the adult world where Pip is a victim undergoing psychological torture loses its tension through an application of laughter generated from incongruity. The adults' effort to impress the young Pip with a façade of intellectuality is frustrated by their own intellectual limitations. Dickens achieves humour out of every detail of the situation. The theatrical sermon unduly emphasizing the necessity of being grateful, the pseudo-religious interpretation of the young people's misdemeanour, the cracker-barrel metaphors to explain religion, the cynical comparison of the young to swine, the hilarious confusion over the metaphor of a squeaker, the false interpretation of Pip's circumstances as a lifestyle in the lap of luxury, the groundless qualms harboured about the demonized character of Pip, Mrs Hubble's commiseration with Mrs Joe over her bad destiny with the troublesome Pip, and Mrs Joe's torment of Pip in response to the other's instigation, altogether provide entertainment for the reader in a spirit of the *carnivalesque*. In between Dickens uses Joe as a sympathetic force to recover Pip from his doldrums and keep his spirit up, however fearful his agonies are. Joe's silent sympathy with Pip subverts the others' explosive apathy within the atmosphere. The humour culminates when Mr Pumblechook is punished with tar water but suspense overcomes it negatively when Mrs Joe enquires as to how tar water replaced the brandy in the bottle and Pip rises to run away. Although the entire scenario is painful to Pip it evokes laughter, so much of laughter that allows the reader to penetrate the actual relationship between these characters and Pip, and their actual attitudes towards Pip as an orphan growing in poverty. Thus, Bakhtin's multifaceted model helps us to enjoy a novel with understanding. His poetics clearly helps to demonstrate how the prosaic is transformed into a fiesta within the narrative space of a novel. Thereby we are also able to perceive the intentions of the author.

8. Contextual Interpretation of Heteroglossic Situation in the Novel

The novel as a piece of art made of words can be studied thus in terms of a series of heteroglossic situations by analysing the speech acts, implicatures, emotions, views, etc. that emerge as constituents and effects of its narrative discourse in order to perceive its philosophy and the fund of knowledge it aims at sharing with the reader. The contextual interpretation of heteroglossic situation in the novel leads to the perception of all its mechanics jutting out from the conceptual framework Bakhtin has developed for the benefit of the critic. Influenced by the Bakhtinian framework of dialogism that recognizes polyphony, unfinalizability, prosaics, carnivalesque, chronotop, heteroglossia and exotopy as the define features of the novel, the reader can dismantle the narrative discourse associated with heteroglossic situations into segments such as authorial voice, stories, inserted literary texts, other inserted texts and the speech of the characters and learn them individually in order to formulate opinions of them with a high degree of accuracy. Thereby the contextual interpretation of the novel becomes much more systematic than otherwise. Then all the key issues it deals with, become vivid, along with the contexts they are related to.

The three-fold analysis of the heteroglossic situation that emerges from the episode of the Christmas dinner in Chapter 4 of *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens provided in the above exemplifies how the approach works. Accordingly, we

can perceive first every speech act that transpires in the narrative, and then the implicature of every respective speech act. Once they are connected with the discourse atmosphere or the narrative setting or related to their context we can develop an overall view of the situation. In that sense the setting engendered here is a Christmas dinner. The adults gather to celebrate the birth of Christ, but instead they show off their religiousness at the expense of the destitute orphan of Pip. Pip's reactions to all the cynical remarks they make are summed up in the following passage.

I think the Romans must have aggravated one another very much, with their noses. Perhaps, they became the restless people they were, in consequence. Anyhow, Mr Wopsle's Roman nose so aggravated me, during the recital of my misdemeanours that I should have liked to pull it until he howled. But, all I had endured up to this time, was nothing in comparison with the awful feelings that took possession of me when the pause was broken which ensued upon my sister's recital, and in which pause everybody had looked at me (as I felt painfully conscious) with indignation and abhorrence.

Thus the religious significance of the setting, the hypocritical behaviour of the adults, the negative impact it has on Pip and Pip's reaction to it, become clear when the narrative discourse is dissected into speech acts and the implicature of each respective speech act is identified. The pragmatic knowledge one achieves this way will serve one as a firm footing while handling any literary, social, psychological, political, economic, or cultural issue the relevant heteroglossic situation deals with in the novel. The experience achieved here is sure to provide the versatility one requires for contextual interpretation of heteroglossic situation in the novel. With an understanding of the episode in question as a specific heteroglossic situation depicting a particular aspect of the character it is easy to relate it to its context in comprehending its role in the panoramic picture of the novel it fits in. Thereby the students are enabled to acquire a graphic knowledge of the entire novel in terms of a series of snapshots. The kind of approach emerging from an exercise of this sort helps the reader recover from the fear of getting lost in his/her explorative journeys across the narrative.

References

- Bakhtin, M. M. *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. 1st ed. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1990.
- *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited by Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- *Rabelais and his World*. Translated by Helene Iswolsky. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1984.
- *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Translated by Vern W. McGee. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1986.
- *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Trans. Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981. 259-422.
- Boos, Florence S. 'Florence Boos' Study Questions.' University of Iowa, 2010.
<http://www.uiowa.edu/~boosf/questions/bakhtintodorov.htm> (Dec 20, 2013)
- Cavanah, Sarah. "Heteroglossia, Polyphony, and Unfinalizability: Examining a White House Press Briefing Through the Theories of Mikhail Bakhtin" *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago Marriott Downtown, Chicago, IL, Aug 09, 2012 Online <PDF>*. 2013-11-08
http://citation.allacademic.com/meta/p582939_index.html (Dec 20, 2013)
- Keep, Christopher, Tim McLaughlin & Robin Parmar *The Electronic Labyrinth*. University of Victoria, 2001.
<http://www2.iath.virginia.edu/elab/elab.html>
- Coles Book Stores, *Dictionary of Literary Terms*. New Delhi: Rama Brothers, 1991.
<http://an-author.blogspot.com/2006/04/literary-theories-of-mikhail-bakhtin.html> (Dec 20, 2013)
<http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/heteroglossia> (Dec 20, 2013)
- Irvine, Martin, 'Mikhail Bakhtin: Main Theories - *Dialogism, Polyphony, Heteroglossia, Open Interpretation*.' Communication, Culture & Technology Program (CCT), Georgetown University, 2004.
irvinem@georgetown.edu
- James, H. *The Art of Fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1888, (Reprinted 1948)
- Jarrold, J. *Great Expectations*. London: BBC. 1995.
- Kettle, A. *An Introduction to the English Novel*, New Delhi: Universal Bookstall, 1967. (Reprinted 1994)
- Klages, M. *Key Terms in Literary Theory*. Continuum International Publishing group, London. 2012.
- Labov, W. & J. Waletzky, 'Narrative Analysis: Oral Versions of Personal Experience', 1980.
<http://www.clarku.edu/~mbamberg/labovwaletzky.htm>
- Lodge, D. *After Bakhtin: Essays on Fiction & Criticism*. London: Routledge, 1980.
- Marian Webster Dictionary*, 'Heteroglossia.' (Dec 20, 2013)
- Menticulture.com. <http://www.menticulture.com/browse/exotopy> (Dec 20, 2013)

Reference.Com - <http://www.reference.com/browse/heteroglossia> (Dec 20, 2013)

Richards, I.A. *Principles of Literary Criticism*, 1924, New Delhi: Universal Bookstall. Reprinted (1996).

Robinson, A. 'In Theory Bakhtin: Carnival against Capital, Carnival against Power,' 2011. ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-bakhtin-2/ (Dec 20, 2013)

Robinson, A. 'In Theory Bakhtin: Dialogism, Polyphony and Heteroglossia.' 2011. ceasefiremagazine.co.uk/in-theory-bakhtin-1/ (Dec 20, 2013)

Sahu, D. 'Literary Theories of Mikhail Bakhtin,' 2006. an-author.blogspot.com/2006/04/literary-theories-of-mikhail-bakhtin.html (Dec 20, 2013)

Smith, Mark F. *LibriVox Recording of Great Expectations*. San Francisco: Internet Archive. 2001. (Dec 20, 2013)

Wellek, R. 'Bakhtin's View of Dostoevsky: "Polyphony" and "Carnavalesque."' *Dostoevsky Studies*, Volume 1, 1980. <http://www.utoronto.ca/tsq/DS/01/031.shtml> (Dec 20, 2013)