

Journal of Russian and East European Psychology, vol. 42, no. 6,
November–December 2004, pp. 12–49.
© 2004 M.E. Sharpe, Inc. All rights reserved.
ISSN 1061–0405/2004 \$9.50 + 0.00.

Dialogic Origin and Dialogic Pedagogy of Grammar

Stylistics in Teaching Russian Language in Secondary School

MIKHAIL M. BAKHTIN

One cannot study grammatical forms [1]* without constantly considering their stylistic significance. When grammar is isolated from the semantic and stylistic aspects of speech, it inevitably turns into scholasticism.

Today, this statement, in its general form, has become virtually a truism. However, in actual educational practice, the situation is far from ideal. In practice, the instructor very rarely provides, or is capable of providing, any sort of stylistic interpretation of the grammatical forms he covers in class. Perhaps he studied stylistics in literature courses (although undoubtedly very little and very superficially), but the subject matter of his courses in Russian language was purely grammatical [2].

The trouble is that our literature in instructional methodology does not provide even a slightly systematic treatment of the stylistics of individual grammatical forms.^a The question itself, as thus formulated, has almost never been

English translation © 2004 M.E. Sharpe, Inc., from the Russian text © 1997 “Russkie slovari,” S.G. Bochavov, and V.V. Kozhinov. “Voprosy stilistiki na urokakh russkogo iazyka v srednei shkole,” in M.M. Bakhtin, *Sobranie sochinenii. Raboty 1940-kh–nachala 1960-kh godov*, Vol. 5 (Moscow: Russkie slovari, 1997), pp. 141–56, 510–33. The text has been retitled for this English translation. See pp. 10 and 25 herein.

Translated by Lydia Razran Stone.

*Bracketed notes in this article are by L.A. Gogotishvili (with the assistance of S.O. Savchuk)

^aV. Chernyshev’s old attempt to construct such a stylistic system is unsuccessful and has almost nothing to offer today’s instructors. Cf. V. Chernyshev, *Correct and Pure Speech (An Attempt at a Russian Stylistic Grammar [Pravilnost’ i chistota russkoi rechi (opyt russkoi stilisticheskoi grammatiki)]* (St. Petersburg, 1914–15) [3].—M.B.

posed in our literature and is not being posed today.^b If he wishes to gain a better understanding of the stylistic significance of, for example, aspects of the verb, the participle or verbal adverb, the instructor is compelled to consult such abstruse volumes as *From Notes on Russian Grammar* [Iz zapisok po russkoi grammatiki] by A.A. Potebnia [7]. And furthermore, the analysis he will find there, although very profound, can far from always be applied to the practical questions he needs to answer. We repeat: he will be unable to find a systematic treatment of the stylistics of grammar anywhere at all.

It goes without saying that S.G. Barkhudarov's textbooks and the related instructional materials he edited do not provide any help at all to the instructor in this area.^c

Every grammatical form is at the same time a means of representing reality [9]. Thus, every one of these forms must also be considered from the standpoint of its inherent representational and expressive potential, that is, their stylistics must be elucidated and evaluated. When we study certain areas of syntax—and they are very important ones—this sort of stylistic elucidation is absolutely essential. First and foremost, this is true of parallel and substitutable syntactic forms, that is, instances where the speaker or writer may choose between two or more equally grammatically correct syntactic forms [10]. The choice in these cases is determined not by grammatical, but by purely [11] stylistic considerations, that is, the representative and expressive effectiveness of these forms. Thus, in such cases, there is no way we can get along without stylistic explanations.

A student, for example, learns under what conditions a particular adjectival clause may be replaced by an adjectival phrase and when it cannot be; he is also taught a procedure for making this substitution. But neither the instructor nor the textbook tells our student anything at all about when and why this substitution ought to be made. Given that he does not understand the purpose of the substitution, one wonders why he needs to know how to make it at all. It is clear that a purely grammatical point of view is inadequate in such cases [12]. From the standpoint of grammar the following two sentences are equally correct:

The news that I heard today interested me very much.

The news heard by me today interested me very much. [This is a normal

^bStylistic grammar (and the field on which it is based—linguistic stylistics) has been developed most successfully in France. The scientific foundations of this science were laid by the school of Ferdinand de Saussure (Bally, Sechehaye, Thibaud, et al.) [4]. The French have splendidly organized texts for use in schools [5]. In Germany these topics have been addressed by the Vossler school (Leo Spitzer, Lorck, Lerch, and others) [6].—M.B.

^cAnd some syntactic exercises in his textbook can actually mislead the instructor with regard to this topic [8].—M.B.

sentence in Russian, equivalent to: *The news, which I heard today . . .*—Trans.] Both are grammatically permissible. But under what circumstances should we prefer the first, and under what circumstance the second form? To answer this question one has to understand the stylistic pluses and minuses, that is, the specific stylistic connotations, of each of these forms. The instructor must demonstrate to the students in an understandable way what we lose and what we gain when we select one or the other of these sentences. He must explain to them that, when we replace an adjectival clause with an adjectival phrase, we attenuate the verbal force of this clause and emphasize the extent to which the action expressed by the verb “heard” is incidental, as well as diminishing the importance of the adjunct “today.” On the other hand, when we make this substitution we have focused the sentence’s meaning and emphasis on the “hero” of this sentence, that is, the word “news,” at the same time producing a more succinct sentence.

In the first sentence there are two heroes as it were, “news” and “I,” with some of the other words clustering around “news” (“very much” and “interested”) and others around “I” (“heard” and “today”). In the second sentence the second hero (“I”) has been eclipsed and all the words are now clustered around a single hero “news.” Instead of “I heard” we say “news heard.” This has a definite impact on the relative semantic weights of the individual words comprising this sentence. To induce the students to understand this for themselves [13], it is useful to ask them if this substitution may be made if it is important to the speaker to stress [14] that he heard this news *today*? The students will immediately see that the relative weight of this word decreases when the substitution is made. The students should further be shown that the verbal force of the subordinate verb and of the adjunct can be attenuated still further, if the adjectival phrase is placed before the noun.

The heard by me today news interested me very much. [Roughly equivalent to: *The news interested me very much when I heard it today*; or *Today’s news interested me very much.*—Trans.]

By using the appropriate intonation for this sentence, we can show our students that the words “heard by me today” are pronounced more rapidly and almost without emphasis. The semantic significance of these words is sharply diminished: our intonation rushes carelessly past them, as if in a hurry to get to the word “news” without stopping along the way, without a pause. This will help the students understand the stylistic effect of placing an adjectival phrase before the corresponding noun, an effect that would be completely eclipsed for them by the formal grammatical issue of whether or not a comma is required in the sentence. Furthermore, this method will make the whole issue of commas appear to them in a new light.

Of course, the above by no means exhausts the stylistic elucidation of these

sentences. However, this discussion has been sufficient for our purposes. Our only purpose here was to use this example to demonstrate the absolute necessity of providing stylistic elucidation of all such syntactic forms [15]. Unfortunately, often, our instructors are very poorly equipped to provide such elucidation. To their students' questions about when and why the substitution should be made (and such questions are asked frequently and persistently), the instructor typically limits his answer to saying that one should avoid frequent repetition of the word "that" [16] [in Russian also used for "which" and "who"—Trans.], and that one should select [17] whatever form sounds better. Such answers are inadequate, and, furthermore, essentially incorrect.

Stylistic elucidation is absolutely mandatory when going over all the aspects of the syntax of the complex sentence [18], that is, throughout the seventh-grade [19] Russian language course. In the best case, the narrowly grammatical study of these issues merely enables students to do a fair job of diagramming an assigned sentence in a ready-made text and teaches them how to use punctuation marks in dictations; however, their own oral and written language remains almost completely unenriched with the new structures they have been taught. Many never use the forms that they have learned through the study of grammar, and, when others use them, they do so with utter ignorance of stylistics.

Teaching syntax without providing stylistic elucidation and without attempting to enrich the students' own speech lacks any creative significance and does not help them improve the creativity of their own speech productions, merely teaching them to identify the parts of ready-made language produced by others. But this is precisely the definition of scholasticism. In this article, we intend to dwell on a more detailed stylistic elucidation of one form—that of the parataxic sentence [a complex sentence without a subordinating conjunction—Trans.]. In our view, teaching this form is extremely productive for training students to use language creatively. At the same time, this issue has never been covered in our literature. It is true that scattered throughout the works of Potebnia, Shakhmatov, and Peshkovskii there are quite a few valuable observations on various types of parataxis, but these observations are (not) systematic and are far from being stylistically complete [20]. Of course, this topic is of interest to us here primarily from the standpoint of instructional methodology.

Using a stylistic analysis of this particular grammatical issue as an example, we hope to better explain our general idea of the role of stylistics in teaching Russian language [21].

Parataxic sentences (in any of their possible forms) are encountered very rarely in the independent written work of students in the upper grades—eight, nine, and ten. Every teacher knows this from experience. I conducted a special

study of all the homework and class essays written during the first semester by students in two parallel sections of the eighth grade, a total of about 300 essays. In all these essays I encountered only 3 cases of a parataxic sentence (excluding quotations, of course)! With the same purpose, I examined approximately 80 essays by tenth-grade students during the same period. I found a total of 7 cases in which such forms were used [22]. Discussion with teachers in other schools confirmed my observations. At the beginning of the second semester, I gave special dictations to the eighth and tenth grades using parataxic sentences. The results of these dictations were completely satisfactory: very few errors of punctuation were made in parataxic sentences.

These dictations and subsequent interviews with students convinced me that, when they encounter a parataxic sentence in a printed text, they have little difficulty understanding it, remember the rules, and almost never make errors in punctuation. But at the same time, they are completely unable to use this form in their own writing and cannot work with it creatively. This is the result of the fact that, in seventh grade, the stylistic significance of this splendid form was never properly explained to them. The students were never made aware of its worth. It should have been demonstrated to them. By means of painstaking stylistic analysis of the characteristics and advantages of this form, the students should have been inculcated with a taste for it, they should have been taught to appreciate parataxis as a most remarkable means of linguistic expression. But how could this have been accomplished?

According to my observations and experience, here is the way this work should be structured. We propose to base this discussion on a detailed analysis of the following three sentences:

1. *Sad am I: no friend beside me* (Pushkin).
2. *He'd start to laugh—they'd all guffaw* (Pushkin).
3. *He awoke: five stations had already fled past in the opposite direction* (Gogol) [23].

When we start to analyze the first sentence, we first of all read it aloud with maximum expressiveness, even exaggerating its intonational structure somewhat, and, with the aid of facial expressions and gestures, reinforcing its inherent drama. It is very important to get the students to hear and value the expressive components (primarily emotional), which disappear when the parataxic construction is transformed into an ordinary hypotaxic construction [a complex sentence with the two clauses related by a subordinating conjunction—Trans.]. They should be made aware of the leading role played by intonation in sentences of this type and of the internal necessity for combining facial expression and gesture with this intonation when Pushkin's line is read aloud. After the students have heard the sentence and it has made an immediate artistic impression on them, the instructor can go on to analyze the means by which

this artistic effect, this expressiveness is achieved. This analysis should take place in the following sequence:

1. We change the sentence analyzed into a normal complex sentence with the subordinating conjunction “since.” First we try to insert the conjunction mechanically without altering the word order.

Sad am I since [I have] no friend beside me.

Through discussion with the students we come to the conclusion that the sentence cannot be left in this form. With the conjunction, the inversion Pushkin uses is inappropriate and the normal logical order of the words must be restored.

I am sad since I have no friend beside me.

Or:

I am sad because I have no friend beside me.

Both of these sentences are completely grammatically and stylistically correct. Through this exercise the students also learn that leaving out or inserting a conjunction is not a simple mechanical process [24], it affects the order of words in the sentence and thus the allocation of emphasis among the words.

2. We ask the students how the hypotaxic sentence they have constructed differs from Pushkin’s original sentence. It is not difficult to get them to come up with the reply that our restructuring has destroyed the expressiveness of Pushkin’s sentence, that in its current form it has become colder, drier, and more logical.

Along with the students, we persuade ourselves that the dramatic component in the sentence, the intonation, facial expressions, and gestures with which we acted out, so to speak, the interior drama of Pushkin’s text, are obviously inappropriate when we read our revised version. The sentence, according to the students, has become more pedantic, mute, suited for silent reading, and no longer begs to be read aloud. In general, as the students learn, we have lost a great deal, from the standpoint of expressiveness, when we replace a parataxic sentence with a hypotaxic one.

3. We begin a logical elucidation of the reasons for the loss of expressiveness in the altered sentence. First of all we analyze the subordinating conjunctions “since” and “because.” We direct the students’ attention to a certain *unwieldiness* and lack of euphony in these conjunctions. Using examples, we demonstrate how harmonious language can be ruined by a profusion of such unwieldy words, how speech takes on a pedantic, dry, and unharmonious character when such conjunctions are used. For this reason, writers of artistic literature always try to keep their use to a minimum. We tell the students how, throughout the entire nineteenth century and even persisting into the twentieth century (in the work of such archaizing poets as Viacheslav Ivanov), the archaic Old Church Slavonic conjunctions “ibo” and “zane” [old forms meaning

for, as—Trans.] continued to live (especially in poetry) because they were shorter and more euphonious than the unwieldy “since” and “because.” We illustrate this with examples.

Now we move on to the *semantic* characteristics of subordinating conjunctions, explaining to the students that such auxiliary words as subordinating conjunctions, which designate the *purely logical* relationships between clauses, are completely devoid of any concrete and imageable meaning. After all, no one can picture or form an image of their meaning. For this reason they will never be able to acquire metaphorical meaning in our speech, cannot be used ironically, and cannot support emotional intonation (to put it simply, they cannot be pronounced with feeling). Thus, they completely lack the rich and varied life possessed by the words in our language that have concrete, imageable meanings. These purely logical conjunctions, of course, are absolutely essential in our language, but still they are cold, lifeless words [25].

4. After analysis of subordinating conjunctions we move on to their influence on the context surrounding them. First of all, we explain to the students the stylistic meaning of word order in a sentence (more accurately, we call their attention to what they should already know about this subject). We use examples to demonstrate the special intonational stress on the first word in a clause (after the pause). A short conjunction, at the start of the clause does not occupy a special intonational slot; however, complex multisyllabic conjunctions like “since” and “because” [two and four syllables, respectively, in Russian—Trans.] unproductively (since they cannot bear stress) fill this first slot and this weakens the entire intonational structure of the clause. Furthermore, the semantic nature of these conjunctions, their characteristic coldness influences the word order of the entire sentence; inversion of words for emotional effect becomes impossible. Comparing Pushkin’s sentence to our revision, we show the students how, because of the change in order, the intonational stress on the word “sad” in the first clause of the complex sentence and the word “me” in the second diminish, and the emotional connotation of the word “no” is strongly attenuated.

5. We aid the students in coming to their own formulation of the following conclusions from our analysis. As a result of inserting a conjunction in Pushkin’s parataxic sentence, the following stylistic changes occur:

- a. the *logical* relationship between the simple clauses is made explicit and moved to the forefront, the emotional and dramatic relationship between the poet’s sadness and the lack of a friend is attenuated;
- b. the intonational loading on each separate word and on the entire sentence is strongly diminished: the role of intonation is now taken by the cold logical conjunction; the number of words in the sentence has increased, but the scope available for intonation has been curtailed a great deal;

- c. dramatization of the words through facial expression and gesture becomes impossible;
- d. the imagery level decreases;
- e. the sentence, so to speak, has moved into a mute register, and has become more suitable for silent reading than for expressive reading aloud;
- f. the sentence has become less concise and has lost its euphony [26].

Analysis of Pushkin's second sentence can be based on the above and so is much briefer. The students' attention must be focused only on the components in the second sentence that are new. First, we remind the students that here there is another logical relationship between the simple clauses; this is reflected in the use of a different punctuation mark [27]. Then we can go on to try to replace this parataxic construction with one containing a conjunction. We immediately encounter problems. [This sentence comes from a description of a girl's nightmare in which she sees her beloved as the leader of a gang of grotesque monsters.—Trans.] "When he starts to laugh, then they all guffaw," completely fails to satisfy the students. They all feel that a highly essential nuance of the meaning is lost. Some propose saying, "Every time he starts to laugh, they all guffaw." Others suggest, "Only when he starts to laugh, do the others dare to guffaw." Still others: "All it takes is for him to start to laugh, for all of them to start guffawing obsequiously." The students all find this last version to be closest in meaning, although it rewords Pushkin's text too freely. As a result of discussion with the students we come to the conclusion, that the words "every time," "only when," and "All it takes . . . for," and even "dare" and "obsequiously" convey various nuances of the meaning of Pushkin's sentence and thus are necessary, but that all of them together fail to capture this meaning completely, since it is inseparable from the verbal form in which it is expressed.

Before moving on to further analysis, it would be useful to introduce the students to the semantic characteristics of the connective words that can be used when this type of parataxic sentence is transformed. Connective words, unlike conjunctions per se, do not completely lack imagery, but this imagery has been strongly attenuated and thus is devoid of metaphorical force; such phrases also allow for some (albeit very weak) emotional connotations. The presence of connective words in sentences (especially unwieldy ones) logicizes this structure, although not to the same degree as the presence of subordinating conjunctions.

In our further analysis we make the following points.

1. The second sentence is dramatic in tone; however, unlike the first, it is dynamic rather than emotional. The action seems to be unfolding before our eyes; the second simple clause ("they'd all guffaw") literally echoes the first ("He'd start to laugh"). We have before us not a narration about an action, but

rather the action itself [28]. This dynamic dramatism is achieved, first of all, through the parallelism in the construction of the two clauses: “he’d” . . . “they’d all,” “start to laugh” . . . “guffaw.” The second clause is a mirror image, so to speak, a reflection of the first, as the monster’s guffaws are a reflection of Onegin’s laughter. We direct the students’ attention to the form of the verb [the present tense of the perfective aspect, which has a future meaning of inception of an action, translated here “’d start to laugh”—Trans.] in the first clause, which intensifies the drama of the action and at the same time suggests that it happens repeatedly (conveyed by the use of “every time . . .”).

2. We direct the students’ attention to how laconic Pushkin’s sentence is: two simple clauses with a total of four words in the Russian and on how completely it reveals Onegin’s role as the leader of this gathering of monsters. We also note that the selection of the verb “laugh” for Onegin and of “guffaw” for the monsters clearly demonstrates that they crudely and sycophantically exaggerate the actions of their leader.

3. We help the students reach the appropriate conclusion from our analysis: that Pushkin’s parataxic sentence does not describe an event, but dramatically plays it out in front of us utilizing its very structural form. When we attempt to convey this meaning using a subordinating conjunction, we move into description, and, no matter how many supplementary words we introduce, we will never fully convey what Pushkin shows us in the same concrete way [29]. When we make the relationship between the simple clauses logical by introducing conjunctive phrases, we destroy the image-producing and living dynamic dramatism of Pushkin’s sentence [30].

Analyzing the third example is quite simple after all that has already been said. The dynamic dramatism we have already encountered is even more highly developed in Gogol, albeit in a somewhat different way. When we read Gogol’s text aloud we have to use somewhat exaggerated intonation to convey the pleasant astonishment of the awakened traveler. The pause between the simple clauses (indicated by the dash [31]) are here filled with the tense expectation of some sort of surprise—this must be expressed by the reader through intonation, facial expression, and gesture. The second clause should be rendered with merry astonishment and special emphasis on the word “five” (five whole stations!). Facial expression and gesture come by themselves when you read this sentence aloud—you cannot hold them back! With our own eyes we see this traveler rubbing his sleepy eyes and with pleasant astonishment realizing that while he was sleeping his coach had already passed by five stations. When we make an attempt to convey this using subordinating conjunctions, we get bogged down in a wordy description and still cannot completely convey what was shown to us in the original version, what was dramatically played out before our eyes. After discussion with the students, we tentatively come up

with the following substitution: “When he woke up, then he discovered that five stations had already fled past in the opposite direction.”

When this sentence is formulated and written on the board, I direct the student’s attention to the bold metaphoric expression, almost a personification, that Gogol uses “five stations had already fled past in the opposite direction.”

After all it was not really true that the stations had fled past, but rather that the traveler had gone forward past them (although the former description is closer to a traveler’s direct perception). We ask the students whether this expression sounds good in our new version of Gogol’s sentence (Gogol’s version sounded great!) and whether it is appropriate when subordinating conjunctions are used. The students agree with me that this expression is somewhat discordant, given the logical style of our sentence, and that it should be replaced by the more sober and rational, but less striking and dynamic phrase, “He had already passed five stations.” As a result of this we produce a new sentence version that is completely correct, but dry and pallid. Absolutely nothing remains of Gogol’s dynamic dramatism, of Gogol’s headlong and bold gesture.

We also bring in supplementary material related to the examples we analyze, explaining to the students that, in the cold atmosphere created by subordinating conjunctions and conjunctive constructions, all the vivid metaphoric expressions, images, and comparisons fade and wither, that Gogol’s beloved hyperbolic comparisons and metaphors, and sometimes irrationalities become completely impossible in the sober context created by hypotaxis [32]. Next, we expand on these points somewhat and use examples to demonstrate the strict lexical selection that occurs in the context of hypotactic sentences (especially those with conjunctions invoking cause-and-effect relations). Words with strong emotional connotations, overly bold metaphors, as well as words that are not “literary” enough (in the narrow meaning of this word), vernacular words or those referring to the coarser aspects of life, overly specific expressions, and colloquial language are all eliminated. A hypotactic sentence gravitates toward a literary-bookish style and is incompatible with colloquial liveliness and the spontaneity of everyday speech [33].

Here we may tell the students in a way they can understand about the significance of the syntactic forms of parataxis in the history of the Russian language and show them how the cold and rhetorical complex hypotactic [34] periods [i.e., mult clause sentences with parallelism—Trans.] of the eighteenth century hindered the literary language in its approach to the living colloquial speech. They can be shown how the struggle within the literary language between archaic bookish elements and living colloquial elements was inextricably tied to the struggle between the complex (periodic) constructions and the simple—primarily parataxic forms of colloquial syntax [35]. It is useful to

illustrate this point with examples of colloquial syntax from [Ivan] Krylov's fables (which, by the way, are exceedingly dynamic) and to compare [Nikolai] Karamzin's style, involving complex hypotaxic periods, in his *History of the Russian State* [Istoriia gosudarstva Rossiiskogo] with the style of his sentimental stories.

Such historical excursions are appropriate in more advanced seventh-grade classes as well as eighth-grade ones.

Having completed the analysis of the three sentences we have chosen from classical works of Russian literature, we should show the students how common the forms of parataxis are in our daily speech. For example, we could analyze the sentence: "I am very tired: I have too much work [to do]." Comparing it with "I am very tired because I have too much work to do," we should demonstrate how the liveliness and expressiveness decreases in the second version. Having revealed the enormous significance of forms of parataxis in our speech, and demonstrating the advantages they have over the corresponding hypotaxic forms [36], we should, however, make sure the students understand that the latter forms are, nonetheless, legitimate and necessary. It should be demonstrated not only that hypotaxic forms are important in practical and scientific language but also that they are essential to literature. The students must understand that the forms of parataxis cannot be used in every case.

Next, working with the students, we should draw conclusions from our work on stylistics. Here the instructor should check the extent to which the objective of all this has been attained. Has he succeeded in giving the students a taste and liking for parataxis? Were the students able to truly appreciate the expressiveness and liveliness of such forms? If this objective has been achieved, then the instructor need only guide the students as they practice incorporating these forms in their own oral and written language.

I organized this practice as follows. First, we performed a series of special exercises in which we constructed various versions of complex sentences with and without conjunctions on set topics, carefully weighing the stylistic appropriateness and expedience of one or another form. Then in checking homework and classwork, I devoted special attention to all cases where it seemed desirable to substitute a parataxic form for a hypotaxic one and made the appropriate stylistic revisions in the student notebooks [37]. When the work was gone over in class, all these sentences were read and discussed. At times, the "authors" did not agree with my editorial revisions, and lively and interesting disputes took place. Of course, there were cases where students got too carried away with the forms of parataxis and used them in some contexts where they were not appropriate.

In general, the result of all this work was fully satisfactory. The syntactic

structure of the students' language improved significantly. Two hundred compositions written by these seventh graders during the second semester contained more than seventy examples of the use of parataxis. In the tenth grade the results were even better: almost every composition contained two or three sentences of this type. This change in syntactic structure also led to an overall improvement in the students' style, which became more vivid, more concrete, and emotional, and, most important, began to reveal the personality of the writers, so that their own living individual intonation could be heard. The stylistics classes were not wasted.

We should note in conclusion that students understand and really enjoy stylistic analyses, even the most subtle and meticulous, as long as they are conducted in a lively manner and the class members are encouraged to be active participants. Stylistic analyses and exercises are as enjoyable as purely grammatical parsing is boring. Moreover, these analyses, if they are presented properly, give grammar meaning for the students: when they are illuminated by their stylistic meaning, dry grammatical forms take on new life and become more understandable and interesting to them [38].

Teachers of Russian have learned through experience that their students' written language typically undergoes a very drastic change. In the lower grades there is no sharp distinction between the students' written and oral language. They are still not being asked to write on literary topics or to present arguments, and, in the descriptive and narrative works they do write, they are relatively unconstrained with respect to language. Thus, the language in their written work, although somewhat clumsy, is lively, concrete, and emotional. Their written syntax is close to that of speech and they are not yet overly concerned with the correctness of their grammar. They thus construct rather bold sentences, which, at times, can be very expressive. As yet, they know nothing about lexical selection and so their vocabulary is motley, and without style, but also expressive and bold. Although this childish language may be awkward, it manages to reveal the writer's individuality; it has not yet been depersonalized.

Then a radical change occurs. This typically happens toward the end of seventh grade, but reaches an apogee in the eighth and ninth grades. Students begin to write in a self-consciously literary and bookish style. They have taken as their model the clichéd language of their literature textbooks: after all, their first writings in literature essentially consist of rephrasing these texts [39]. But under their inexperienced pens the language of the textbooks becomes even more clichéd and depersonalized. The students begin to fear any original expression, any turn of phrase that does not resemble the clichés in their books. They write for the eyes and do not go over what they have written by reading aloud using intonation and gesture. Their language, it is true, becomes more formally correct; however, it is depersonalized, colorless, and lackluster. The

bookishness of this language, its lack of resemblance to their lively and unconstrained oral language is seen by the students as a positive thing.

This is where the instructor must do serious work [40]. He or she must foster another change in the students' written language, so that once again it is close to lively and expressive oral language, the language of actual life. But this resemblance has to occur at a higher level of cultural development: what is needed here is not the unconstrained naive language of children, but the brave confidence and daring of language that has been trained on classical models.

For this purpose it is of decisive significance that instruction in the seventh grade be correctly structured. Study of the syntax of complex sentences must be accompanied throughout by stylistic analysis [41]. This gives the students a good preventive vaccination against the disease of childhood they are facing—self-conscious bookishness of written language. They will suffer from a much lighter case of this disease and will recover sooner [42].

Stylistic work must continue without abatement in the eighth grade. In the ninth grade a complete breakthrough must be achieved, bringing the students out of the dead-end of bookishness onto the thoroughfare of the literate, cultured, and, at the same time, bold and creative language of real life. The depersonalized, bookish language—especially when it naively shows off its bookishness—is a sign of a half-educated writer. A fully cultured and mature person does not use such language [43].

After all, language has a powerful effect on the thought processes of the person who generates it. Creative, original, exploratory thought that is in contact with the richness and complexity of life cannot develop on a substrate consisting of the forms of depersonalized, clichéd, abstract, bookish language [44]. The further fate of a student's creative potential, to a great extent, depends on the language he takes with him out of high school. And this is the instructor's responsibility.

Attaining the objective of helping the student assimilate the living, creative language of the people, of course, requires a large number and variety of instructional forms and methods. Among these forms, units on parataxis are not without importance. Parataxic sentences provide powerful weapons for combating depersonalized bookish language. As we have seen, they most freely reveal the individual face of the speaker; most clearly allow us to hear his living intonation. As soon as such sentences have been assimilated into the students' written language, they will begin to affect the other forms of this language, its whole style. Destruction of depersonalized, bookish clichés will begin. The individual intonation of the writer will begin to show through. And the instructor need only provide flexible and careful guidance to facilitate this process of the birth of the student's individual language.

Commentary and Notes by Russian Philologists

Introduction to the notes (by L.A. Gogotishvili with the assistance of S.O. Savchuk)

First published in the journal *Russkaia slovesnost'*, 1994, no. 2, pp. 47–55 (publication and commentary by L.S. Melikhov). Two manuscript texts exist in the archives. One was written in M.M. Bakhtin's hand on separate sheets of notebook paper, not numbered but placed in order and inserted into the covers of a student notebook. The cover contains the title "M.M. Bakhtin. Stylistics in Teaching Russian Language in Secondary School." However, the first page of this same manuscript has another heading: "M.M. Bakhtin. Questions of Stylistics in Russian Language Instruction in the Seventh Grade. The Stylistic Significance of Parataxis." We have titled the present version of the article in accordance with the heading on the notebook cover. Evidently, this manuscript was the initial draft of an article (in addition to the usual author's corrections; here and there are different stylistic versions of the same fragment; and some paragraphs are crossed out with a wavy line). In addition to the connected text, the end of which Bakhtin marked with a special mark, this same cover contains work in German, on the clean reverse sides of which are a variety of notes Bakhtin made on the article's topic. These are not included anywhere in the connected text of the manuscript.

The second manuscript in the archive (a student notebook with numbered pages, plus five inserted pages, for a total of twenty-five written pages) is written in several hands, none of which belong to Bakhtin. Judging from the characteristic features of these hands (including the numerous spelling errors made by one of the writers), it seems likely that this text was written from Bakhtin's dictation by students in the older grades. Probably, with his initial draft notes for the article in front of him, Bakhtin dictated to the students what he considered the final version of the article, making corrections as he went along. However, this second "dictated" version remained unfinished; that is, Bakhtin most likely did not reread this manuscript and thus did not prepare it, not only for submission to some official authority, but even for typing. Probably, it became unnecessary to have the text in final form (see below).

Comparison of the first (in Bakhtin's hand) and second (dictated) manuscripts show that revisions occurred primarily at the beginning and end of the article (i.e., the first and third parts). The second part is virtually identical in both versions. There are a few format differences: in the first manuscript the work has three sections, indicated with roman numerals; and in the dictated version there is no such numbering (although spaces are left between the adjacent sections of the text). Aside from specific stylistic and lexical differences

between the two manuscripts, there exist more significance differences as well. Bakhtin's concise draft notes are elaborated in the dictated version into larger fragments that are inserted into the surrounding context. The overview portion of the article and the references are also expanded in the second version. The version we have published reproduces the second, dictated manuscript without any changes (with the exception of correction of spelling errors), but at the same time the significant substantive differences between the two versions (especially fragments in the draft that do not appear in the final text) are specially cited and noted in the end notes.

The article was written while Bakhtin was working as a teacher in railroad school No. 39 in Savelova in Kalininskaia (Tver) Oblast, and, at the same time, at secondary school No. 14 in the city of Kimra (1942–45). Thanks to other documents in the archive, we can provide an even more exact date. First of all, inserted in Bakhtin's draft manuscript is a single piece of notebook paper written on both sides, which, in Bakhtin's hand, contains notes for a lesson plan for a demonstration lesson in Russian for the tenth grade of school No. 14 on the topic "The dash and colon in complex sentences (overview and review)." According to this lesson plan, the demonstration lesson was taught (or planned for presentation) on April 18, 1945. Among the six linguistic examples that he proposed to consider in that lesson were the three sentences on which the stylistic analysis in the present article concentrates. It may be assumed that Bakhtin either wrote the plan for the demonstration lesson at the same time he was writing his article, or, more likely, that it preceded the writing of the article. The differences in the analyses of the linguistic material argue in favor of the second alternative: in the lesson, as far as can be judged from the plan, a more traditional (logical syntactic and intonational) analysis is outlined, while the article tries out a new type of stylistic analysis, reflecting the features of Bakhtin's "dialogic" approach to language.

Second, the archive contains a separate sheet of notebook paper containing the following written in Bakhtin's hand:

The article written by M.M. Bakhtin on the topic: "Questions of Stylistics in Russian Language Instruction in the Seventh Grade," cannot be completed and submitted until June 10, since M.M. Bakhtin is currently very busy with his main job as a teacher and member of the examining commission for the tenth grade at school 14.

(signed) Director School 39

Most likely this text is a draft for reference composed by Bakhtin himself and sent or written to be sent to one of the departments of the public education agencies (e.g., the instructional methods office, skills upgrade course, etc). This document makes it possible to establish to the day, as noted by Bakhtin

himself, when work was completed on this article—no later than June 10, 1945. Although the year is not noted in the document, this could not have been any previous year because a factory mark indicates that the date the notebook was manufactured was July 18, 1944, that is, after June 10, 1944. Nor could it have been written after 1945, which was the last year that Bakhtin worked at the school. The fact that the article, as already stated, was never fully completed, and most likely never sent to the person or office for whom it was officially written, is probably associated with Bakhtin's change of jobs and his move to the city of Saransk. According to certain documents, Bakhtin was already listed as a lecturer in foreign literature at Moscow University in September 1945.

The formal occasion for the writing of this work is not fully clear. While Bakhtin's draft manuscript most likely was written as the basis for an oral presentation (as suggested by the word "report" in its final section, as well as by certain features of the syntax), the second, dictated version does not contain these indications of oral presentation. Furthermore, in the note written by Bakhtin cited above, it is called a monograph, which could be submitted, that is, probably an article or instructional method, and for this reason we consider this to be an article in the true meaning of the word.

Although the style is that of a scientific study in the area of instructional methodology (and indeed it is an "exemplary" model of this style), the article nevertheless goes far beyond the boundaries of a work on instructional methodology. In content, the article may be taken to belong in the series of theoretical works of Bakhtin's "linguistic cycle" (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* [Marksizm i filosofiiia iazyka], the second part of *Problems of the Works of Dostoevsky* [Problemy tvorchestva Dostoevskogo], "The Word in the Novel" [Slovo v romane], "The Problem of Speech Genres" [Problema rechevykh zhanrov], "The Problem of Text" [Problema teksta] and others), especially since this article shows certain lexical and theoretical parallels to these works (some of which are mentioned below in the notes). The article undoubtedly has two structural levels and thus two intended classes of readers: instructors and/or specialists in instructional methodology and linguists (although the "linguistic reading" of the article is, of course, less transparent and obvious). The semantic threads that lead from the first (instructional methodology) to the second (theoretical) level of the article stand out particularly clearly in the context of the situation in the instructional methodology literature of the time. In this article, as he always did, Bakhtin took precise account of the existing situation: the aspects of the article dealing purely with instructional methods were meant to be of independent interest to the reader interested in these matters, since they were directly relevant to the topics in teaching methods most discussed at that time. Indeed they retain this interest today in

that the currently used methods for teaching Russian language do not include a consistent understanding of the issues Bakhtin touches on. In particular, Bakhtin's article was targeted at the extensive discussion of the crisis in teaching Russian language in the schools that had been going on since the mid-nineteenth century (and had intensified since the beginning of the twentieth century). Bakhtin's formal position here is close to that of the school of Russian educational methodology developed by F.I. Buslaev, I.I. Sresnevskii, K.D. Ushchinskii, A.M. Peshkovskii, V.I. Chernyshev, L.V. Shcherba, and others. He particularly agreed with this school's criticism of the fact that the content of Russian language courses in schools was isolated from the actual needs of the schools. The critics asserted, in particular, that the status of grammar in the course taught in the schools needed to be revised. They wanted to increase emphasis on the creative study of the "living" Russian language. They attached particular significance to the development of stylistics, in particular, issues in grammatical stylistics, which was Bakhtin's central theoretical focus in linguistics. Bakhtin also shared the general zeal of this school, which was manifested in constant persistent criticism of the dogmatism and scholasticism of instruction in the schools. The root of the methodological disagreement within this unified tradition involved different understandings of the cause of dogmatism and scholasticism in the schools. At different times different understanding predominated. We can distinguish two principal stages: the beginning of the twentieth century and the 1920s and 1930s. While at the beginning of the century the source of dogmatism and scholasticism was seen primarily as the dominance of "unscientific" ideas about language; in the 1920s and 1930s this same feature was attributed to "ultra-formalism" and hypertrophy of "a scientific approach." The former understanding of the reason for the crisis in teaching in the schools manifested itself in a concentrated form at the First Congress of Teachers of the Russian Language at Military Training Academies (1903). Participants in the work of this congress included I.A. Beaudoin de Courtenay, I.A. Sobol'sevskii, F.F. Fortunatov, A.A. Shakhmatov, L.V. Shcherba, and D.N. Ushakov. This tendency was also seen at the First All-Russian Congress of Teachers of Russian Language and Literature (December 27, 1916–January 4, 1917). Both these congresses recommended that efforts be made to find in theoretical linguistics the scientific grounding for methods of teaching language. This had a decisive influence on teaching practice in the schools during the years immediately after the revolution. Since the "theoretical linguistics" of that time either followed the spirit of F. de Saussure or the groove of Russian formalism (and Bakhtin disputed both these trends in philology), formalist diagrams and analyses dominated in teaching methods in schools. During the 1920s and 1930s (i.e., during the second stage in these methodological discussions), the school course underwent some correction as

a result of unceasing criticism from linguists with a broader understanding of their field of science. (See, for example, the criticism by A.M. Peshkovskii of the “ultraformalist” tendencies in the teaching of language, note 2.) However the general orientation of teaching methods in the schools toward the Saussurian-formalist approach (which was considered to be the scientific one) continued until the 1940s, that is, to the time when Bakhtin wrote this article.

On the surface Bakhtin’s position fit well into the framework of the understanding of the reason for the crisis in school education that developed during the second phase of the development of this educational methodological school (coinciding, in particular, with Peshkovskii’s criticism of “ultraformalism”). However, in actuality, his ideas were at variance with both the first and the second understandings of the reason for the crisis: that is, both formalism and Peshkovskii’s ideas (see note 12 for the differences between Bakhtin’s and Peshkovskii’s positions). Bakhtin provided a theoretical justification for his thinking about the reasons for this crisis in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* and its implications for instruction are specified in the present article. He believed that scholasticism ruled in the schools because of the inherently false monologic orientation of all the competing trends in the linguistic thinking of the time, both purely theoretical and educationally applied. (Even though Peshkovskii’s position might erroneously be taken as being in agreement with Bakhtin’s position in the present article, Bakhtin believed that these false ideas were also manifest in Peshkovskii’s works.) Bakhtin considered the sources for the general dominance of monologic tendencies in linguistics to be implicit in the evolution and formation of this science, which was developed “in the process of mastering a dead foreign language” (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 75). Using this approach, living languages are studied in linguistic science and in the schools “as if they were dead; and one’s native language—as if it were foreign” (*ibid.*, p. 78). In actuality, Bakhtin, evidently, took the point of view that the overthrow of scholasticism and dogmatism in the schools would be possible only after the monologic tendency in linguistics was overthrown. The road to overcoming linguistic monologism lay, according to Bakhtin’s general philosophy of language, through the full and comprehensive assimilation by linguistics of the whole cycle of problems that he associated with his central concept of “dialogic relationships.”

In this context, the connection in this article between the external methodological and the deep theoretical levels becomes clearer. This article seems on the surface to be a specific stylistic-methodological analysis of a specific syntactic phenomenon (the parataxic sentence), performed, as stated in the article itself, to develop students’ individual speaking styles. However, on its second, theoretical level this article is at the same time directed at refining Bakhtin’s general linguistic conceptions. In it he uses dialogic relationships, in his special

understanding of the term, to elaborate on a previously incompletely explicated idea that he had outlined in his early works with respect to his global theoretical attempts to “revise the forms of language in their normal linguistic treatment” (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 98). Although Bakhtin did not fully implement this new “dialogic classification” of all linguistic forms, which was completely new to linguistics, both in practice and theoretically, this undoubtedly should be considered to be the final hypothetical goal of his linguistic conceptions. (For more detail on this issue, see note 1 to “Dialogue” [Dialog]). Specific syntactic analyses performed in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, *The Problems of Dostoevsky’s Works*, “The Word in the Novel,” and the present article make it possible to tentatively evaluate the potential heuristic power of Bakhtin’s idea, although each of these works has its own particular features in this regard.

This article is unique in the following respect. In other works, dialogic theory was “tried out” mainly on various ways to convey another person’s speech, which, by its very nature presupposes dialogic relationships. (The emphasis in these works is on the study of the language of literary works, in which the very presence of a number of characters already presupposes the existence of dialogic relations.) Here, however, he uses dialogic methods in an innovative reinterpretation of parataxic sentences, that is, a general linguistic syntactic construction that is in no way traditionally associated with dialogism.

Before moving on to the specifics of the associations Bakhtin established between this type of sentence, which from a normal point of view is far from dialogic, and dialogic relationships, we must first discuss a terminological problem that arises. In the 1940s and 1950s, in his writings Bakhtin frequently used all kinds of terminological “hybrids,” which contained his own complete, or, more frequently, reduced meanings inside a linguistic envelope coined by someone else and widely used (making it understandable to Bakhtin’s hypothesized reader). (For more detailed discussion of this unique rhetoric strategy used by Bakhtin in the 1950s, of the reasons for it and its objectives, see the general introduction to the set of training materials under the general title “From the Archival Notes to the Work ‘The Problem of Literary Genres’” [Problema rechevykh zhanrov].) An analogous terminological situation arose in this article. The term “dialogic relationships” is not used a single time in the text of this article; nor is there any mention of a dialogue or dialogism. As a functional synonym (“terminological hybrid”) to this category of terms, Bakhtin uses the concept “dramatization” (or “dramatism”). Of course the term “dramatization” is not a complete analogue of dialogic relationships. Moreover, in other works the concept of “dramatization” is sometimes treated almost as the antithesis of the dialogue. Thus, in Bakhtin’s works of literary criticism in which he develops the theory of polyphony (see M. Bakhtin, *Problems of*

Dostoevsky's Poetics [Problemy poetiki Dostoevskogo], 2d ed., revised and expanded [Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963], pp. 272–73, for a discussion of the relationship between polyphony and dialogic relationships), drama is not only not considered a polyphonic phenomenon, but is actually called a monologic genre (ibid., pp. 22–23). However, if we consider the mental context of the reader whom Bakhtin was addressing in this article (and this context included, in particular, the active life of the concept of dramatization in well-known and prestigious linguistic works, including the numerous writings of B.B. Vinogradov), then the concept of drama and the associated derivatives (dramatism, dramaticness, dramatization, etc.) prove convenient, although “semi-alien” synonyms for dialogic relationships, since they create for the reader the visual image of the breakup of a whole monologic utterance into “different voices.” Bakhtin often used this dual-voiced terminological hybrid in other texts as well; for example, in the work “1961. Notes” [1961 god. Zametki], p. 332: “The word is a drama in which three characters participate (it is not a duet but a trio).” We might even speak of a stable textual-semantic correlation between dialogism and dramatism that may be traced in many of Bakhtin’s works (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, “The Word in the Novel,” “The Problem of Text,” and “Dialogue-1”). It is very likely that the concept of “dramatism” was the unelaborated semantic embryo for Bakhtin’s next dialogically oriented category, which stood in contrast to the profoundly monologic interpretation of dramatism in Bakhtin’s constant opponent V.V. Vinogradov (see note 21 to “Dialogue-1”).

As for the present article, the direct association here between “dramatism” and “dialogic relationships” can be considered to be what motivated Bakhtin to “dramatize” the sentences he analyzes (i.e., the intentional utilization of facial expression, gesture, emotional intonation, etc.). This device of dramatization is used here to help demonstrate that each parataxic sentence contains several (at least two) “heroes,” each capable of injecting his “voice” into this formally unitary (monologic) construction, and, thus, capable of entering into a dialogic relationship with the other(s). Ultimately, Bakhtin leads his readers to the general theoretical conclusion that all parataxic constructions per se are potentially dialogic (dramatic) (see notes 26, 30, and 32).

This theoretical conclusion regarding what would seem to be a particular syntactic construction nevertheless touches upon all of syntax and on grammar as a whole. By selecting for analysis a structural type of sentence that is defined on the basis of the usual logical-grammatical (monologic) criteria, but reinterpreting it as dialogic, Bakhtin holds up to question the fundamental postulates of linguistics; in particular, the criteria that are traditionally laid down as the basis for the grammatical classification of linguistic phenomena.

The fundamental problem that this implicitly suggests can be formulated as follows: what does the “collision” of the monologic and dialogic approaches lead to? Does Bakhtin’s dialogic method of analysis not destroy the existing classification of parataxic complex sentences based on formal and logical (monologic) criteria, and thus also destroy the classification of all complex sentences? Or, on the contrary, do the results of applying the dialogic approach justify considering the parataxic complex sentence (with all its variants) to be an independent type of complex sentence. This would justify a similar classification of all the other structural types of sentence, in turn supporting the traditional criteria used for the classification of linguistic phenomena. Providing any categorical answers to these questions in Bakhtin’s name would be premature, especially since Bakhtin himself only outlined the contours of a possible new (dialogic) approach to the classification of linguistic phenomena. However, the fact that Bakhtin thought the dialogic approach would alter the traditional classification in one way or another is beyond doubt. What is open to question is only how significant these changes would be. Would they touch only on certain types of sentence or—in the extreme case—would they radically alter the entire system and the types of relationships between the things classified?

As for the parataxic sentences analyzed in the present article, then (if we tentatively elaborate on the features that Bakhtin merely outlined) this type of sentence, which, from the logical-grammatical (monologic) point of view, is a single group, most likely can be subdivided into several *different* types of dialogic syntactic construction. However, on the other hand, these different types may, on a more abstract level, be considered a unified “archetype” possessing common, purely formal linguistic features.

In the context of this general theoretical problem, the question arises of whether Bakhtin’s choice of the parataxic sentences as the object of analysis was arbitrary. Ignoring the possibility that this might have been done either because of the superficial demands of the topic, or out of considerations of practical convenience (the opportunity to provide a dialogic interpretation of a syntactic structure studied in the school’s curriculum), one of the reasons for this selection might have been the fact that Bakhtin had previously classified parataxic constructions as one of the linguistic phenomena that reveal the intrinsic tendencies of language development as a whole. This type of statement concerning parataxic sentences can already be seen in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (with regard to the newest sociolinguistic tendency to prefer parataxic combination of clauses to hypotaxic ones as noted by C. Bally, *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 142). In this article, Bakhtin focuses on the active role of the parataxic sentence in the history of the Russian literary language, within which, since the end of the eighteenth century,

bookish, and, according to Bakhtin, monologic forms of speech gradually died out while colloquial forms, oriented to the addressee, to communication, and to dialogue increased in strength (“Dialogue-1,” p. 211). As an optimal linguistic form for embodying this tendency, parataxic constructions, which migrated from colloquial speech into literary genres, and led to attenuation of the monologic and strengthening of the dialogic aspect of speech, facilitating the formation of new features in the universal structure of the language (according to Bakhtin, involving an increased tendency toward dialogism).^d

It should be noted that in this article Bakhtin uses the traditional techniques of syntactic analysis for his own purposes. What “monologic” linguistics uses for a direct proof, Bakhtin uses for *reductio ad absurdum* proofs. Thus, Bakhtin’s method involves the transforming of parataxic constructions into hypotaxic ones, which entails overtly expressing and thus foregrounding the logical (and especially causal) relationships among the parts of the parataxic sentence. This method, rather than serving to explicate the direct presuppositions of the initial sentences (which, according to monologic linguistic thinking, clarify its meaning), clearly demonstrates the contrary: that the essence of the dialogic relationships implicit in the deep substantive structure of parataxic sentences cannot be reduced to the logical, formal-grammatical, psychological, or mechanical, or to any other natural relationship (“1961. Notes,” p. 335). According to Bakhtin not one of the “transformations” is capable of adequately conveying the meaning of the initial utterance.^e Furthermore, since each transformation, by its very nature, is based on emphasis on monologic associations, this inexorably leads to the reduction of the dialogic relationships in the sentence. If, as the method of syntactic transformation dictates, we explicate the logical relations that, like dialogic relationships, are implicitly present in every parataxic sentence, we will arrive at an “ordinary” complex sentence stipulating temporal or cause-and-effect relationships that do not appear to depend on the context of the speech act. According to Bakhtin’s method of analysis, explications of dialogic relationships lead to the restoration of the implicit communicative situation, which always involves interaction among several positions—that of the author, the “hero,” the topic, and the addressee

^dCf. A.M. Peshkovskii’s opposing view that the evolution of language proceeds in the direction of greater grammatical differentiation, whether coordinate or subordinate (that is, toward hypotaxic linkage of clauses). A. Peshkovskii, *Russian Syntax in a Scientific Light* [Russkii sintaksis v nauchnom osveshchenii] (Moscow, 1956), p. 474.—L.G. and S.S.

^eCf. on this issue, A.M. Peshkovskii’s contrary assertion that the meaning of the intonations (linking parts of parataxic sentences) is absolutely identical to that of certain logical types of conjunctions. A.M. Peshkovskii, *Russian Syntax in a Scientific Light* (Moscow, 1956), p. 170.—L.G. and S.S.

who spoke previously. (A specific dialogic description of parataxic sentences and a more detailed explication of the theoretical aspects of Bakhtin's analyses will be given in the notes keyed to specific pages of the article.) In other words, this analysis contains an implicit semantic perspective, which is either eclipsed in the traditional syntactic analysis based on formal-logical principles, or completely neglected it. The latter possibility (complete neglect) should by no means be ruled out; if only because Vinogradov's works, written after the publication of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and after the publication of Voloshinov's article "On the Limits of Poetics and Linguistics" [O granitsakh poetiki i lingvistiki] (in *In the Struggle for Marxism in Literary Science* [V bor'be za marksizm v literaturnoi nauke] [Leningrad, 1930]), which specifically argued against Vinogradov's type of analysis) stubbornly continued to evaluate (albeit with some qualifications) everything that Bakhtin classified under the rubric of "dialogic relationships" as purely semantic (nonlinguistic) in nature, that is, as rhetorical phenomena, ultimately based on a logical subfoundation, understood in the spirit of G.G. Shpet. (More detail on this aspect of the problem will be provided in the notes to the work "On the Philosophic Basis of the Humanitarian Sciences" [K filosofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk].)

The second, profoundly theoretical level of this article is so substantive that, in the scholarly attempt to fully reconstruct Bakhtin's philosophy of language, it can be used to fill in a number of theoretical and practical lacunae (see notes 15, 26, 30, and 32).

Notes

1. In the draft manuscript (i.e., the one in Bakhtin's handwriting) there are three sections indicated by roman numerals. The roman numeral I stands at the beginning of the text.

2. The problem of the relationship between grammar and stylistics as it related to the discussion of the Russian language course taught in the schools was posed as early as the late nineteenth century (F.I. Buslaev, I.I. Sreznevskii, K.D. Ushinskii, N.F. Bupakov, V.I. Chernyshev, and others), but took on special urgency during the period of preparation for and implementation of school reforms (in the early twentieth century and the prerevolutionary years). See A.M. Peshkovskii on the evolution of views in this area ("Certain Aspects of the Study of Language in the Seven Year School" [Voprosy izucheniia iazyka v semiletke], "The Role of Grammar in the Teaching of Style" [Rol' grammatiki pri obuchenii stiliu], "How to Conduct Classes on Syntax and Stylistics in Schools for Adults" [Kak vesti zaniatiia po sintaksisu i stilistike v shkolakh vzroslykh], in *Certain Aspects of the Methodology for Teaching Native Language, Linguistics, and Stylistics* [Voprosy metodiki rodnogo iazyka, lingvistiki, stilistiki] [Moscow, 1930]). The replacement of the old scientific and methodological conceptions underlying the Russian language course with new ones (see the introduction to these notes) was directly reflected in school curricula. The 1921/22 curriculum indeed required grammar

to be isolated from other aspects of the Russian language, since grammar was considered to be one of the subjects that provides *knowledge*, and stylistics to be a class that teaches *skills*. However, the study of Russian in the 1933/34 curriculum was oriented primarily toward mastering the various linguistic genres, so that the classes in grammar, deprived of their previous leading position, were mixed in with classes on stylistics, orthography, and linguistic culture. Subsequently, analogous statements in the 1938/39 curriculum and in the identical curricula for the following years, which were in effect in schools during the period when Bakhtin was writing this article, actually did take on the proscriptive and contradictory features Bakhtin notes here. On the one hand, the “artificial, harmful gaps” between grammar, literature, and linguistic culture were condemned and the goal was set to develop an essentially integrated course in the Russian language (which Bakhtin considered to be a self-evident need). On the other hand, the whole unit on “The Development of Speech” was transferred to the literature curriculum, which limited classes in Russian language primarily to mastery of grammatical concepts and the rules of spelling (what Bakhtin terms “pure grammar”) and the language teaching methods recommended were appropriate to these topics (grammatical parsing, selection of examples of grammatical rules, historical commentary on particular linguistic phenomena, etc.).

For more on Bakhtin’s unique understanding of the relationship between grammar and stylistics see *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, “The Problem of Speech Genres,” and “The Word in the Novel.”

3. Vasiliĭ Il’ich Chernyshev (1867–1949)—famous and highly respected linguist of the time, author of works in the area of Russian literary language and the language of artistic literature, dialectology, and lexicography, pronunciation, stylistics, and methods for teaching the Russian language. Chernyshev’s book *The Correctness and Purity of Russian Speech. An Attempt at a Russian Stylistic Grammar* [Pravil’nost’ i chistota russkoi rechi. Opyt russkoi stilisticheskoi grammatiki], was, while still in manuscript form, awarded the Academy of Sciences M.I. Mikhel’son Prize for 1909 (nominated by A.A. Shakhmatov) and went through three editions between 1911 and 1915. Bakhtin’s negative assessment of Chernyshev’s book probably can be explained by the former’s disagreement in principle with the book’s proposed treatment of stylistic grammar as derivation of norms and variants for using linguistic units, making this book a “normative stylistic reference.” Chernyshev’s selection of criteria of “correctness” as the basis for building a stylistics of grammatical forms reflects, in Bakhtin’s view, the general susceptibility of Russian linguistics to a normative (monologic) approach to language. See note 3 to “Dialogue-II” for Bakhtin’s critical assessment of the normative aspect in linguistics as a clear expression of a monologic tendency. It is interesting that the first edition of Chernyshev’s book was analyzed in detail in a review by the famous Slavist I.B. Iagich, who, while describing the general conception of the book as unimpeachable, nevertheless recommended that the author expand the third (syntactic) section by adding stylistic commentary per se, which agrees with the thrust of Bakhtin’s criticism (see V.I. Chernyshev, *Selected Works in Two Volumes* [Izbrannye trudy v 2-kh t.], [Moscow, 1970] vol. 1, pp. 652–54). However, the generally acknowledged evaluation of Chernyshev’s book, including its stylistic section, was highly positive. Continuing the tradition that started with the normative grammars of M.V. Lomonosov and F.I. Buslaev, and having, as a result of its high evaluation, a serious influence on Russian linguistics, Chernyshev’s work in many respects facilitated the increase in interest in the normative aspects of stylistics both in theoretical works associated with linguistic culture (G.O. Vinokur, C.I. Ozhegov, G.V. Stepanov, F.P. Filin, and others) and in practical texts on

stylistics, dictionaries of “difficulties,” “correct forms,” and so forth (A.N. Gvozdev, K.S. Gorbachevich, D.E. Rozentel’, L.I. Skvortsov, and others). It is characteristic that, unlike Bakhtin, V.V. Vinogradov evaluated Chernyshev’s work relatively highly (see V.V. Vinogradov, “Chernyshev as an Analyst of the Russian Literary Language” [Chernyshev kak issledovatel’ russkogo literaturnogo iazyka], *Russkyi iazyk v shkole*, 1947, no. 2; Introduction to *Chernyshev, V.I. Selected Works in Two Volumes*, vol. 1 [Moscow, 1970]).

4. See note 6 to “The Problem of Speech Genres” on the school of F. de Saussure. Among the principal works of the members of this school in the area of linguistic stylistics are the following: C. Bally (1865–1947), *Précis de stylistique* (Geneva, 1905); *Traité de stylistique française* (Paris, 1932; Heidelberg, 1909). *French Stylistics* [Frantsuzskaia stilistika] (Moscow, 1961); *Le langage et la vie* (1913); *Linguistique générale et linguistique française* (Paris, 1932). *General Linguistics and Issues in the French Language* [Obshchaia lingvistika i voprosy frantsuzskogo iazyka] (Moscow, 1955); A. Sechehaye (1870–1946), “La stylistique et la linguistique théorique,” in *Mélanges linguistique offerts à M. Ferdinand de Saussure* (Paris, 1908); “Les règles de la grammaire et la vie de langage,” *Germanisch-romanische Monatsschrift*, vol. 6, 1914; and A. Thibaudet (1874–1936). French philology also concerned itself with matters of the stylistics of artistic literature. Its interpretation of the phenomenon of conveying another person’s (“experienced”) speech (style indirect double), in the book *Gustave Flaubert* (Paris, 1922), was singled out by L. Spitzer as the most correct (L. Spitzer, “Zur Entstehung der sogenannten ‘erlebten Rede,’” *Germanisch romanische Monatsschrift*, vol. 16, 1928). For Bakhtin, the rendering of someone else’s direct speech was a seminal point with critical significance for all of linguistics as a whole (see notes 34 and 38 to “Language in Artistic Literature” [Iazyk v khudozhestvennoi literature]).

5. A great deal of instructional literature of this type is indeed published in France. What specifically Bakhtin had in mind is difficult to determine, but see, for example, the text C. Bally, *Traité de stylistique française*, vol. 2 (Heidelberg, 1909) (volume 2 contains only exercises addressed to college and secondary students); V. Bouillot, *Le français par les textes. Lecture expliquée. Récitation. Grammaire. Orthographe. Vocabulaire. Composition française. Course moyen* (Paris, 1929); A. Goby, *Le livre du maître pour l’enseignement de l’analyse* (Paris, 1934); E. Legrand, *Stylistique française* (Paris, 1924); P. Larousse, *Cours de style. Livre de l’élève* (Paris, 1875); M. Roustan, *Précis d’explication française* (Paris, 1911).

It is interesting that L.V. Shcherba’s proposed models for the linguistic analysis of a literary text represented, in his own description, “attempts to transplant French explication du texte” to the soil of Russian teaching methodology (L.V. Shcherba, *Attempts at a Linguistic Interpretation of Poetry. I. Pushkin’s “Memory”* [Opyty lingvisticheskogo tolkovania stikhotvorenii. I. “Vospominanie” Pushkina] [Petrograd, 1923]; *Attempts at a Linguistic Interpretation of Poetry. II. Lermontov’s “The Pine” Compared to Its German Prototype* [Opyty lingvisticheskogo tolkovania stikhotvorenii. II. “Sosna” Lermontova v sravnenii s ee nemetskim prototipom] [Leningrad, 1936]. L.V. Shcherba, *Selected Works on the Russian Language* [Izbrannie raboty po russkomu iazyku] [Moscow, 1957], pp. 26–44, 97–109).

6. A detailed analysis based on the tenets of Vossler’s school and a critical analysis of the work of its members is provided in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. See note 8 to “The Problem of Speech Genres” regarding Bakhtin’s attitude to the Vossler school.

7. At the time that Bakhtin was writing this article, there were two editions of A.A.

Potebnia's work *From Notes on Russian Grammar* [Iz zapisok po russkoi grammatike] 1st ed. (Voronezh, 1874) (Parts 1–2); 2d ed. (Kharkov, 1888) (Parts 1–2), 1889 (Part 3, prepared by Potebnia himself. Potebnia did not complete *Part IV: The Verb, Pronoun and Numeral and Preposition* [Glagol, mestoimenie, chislitel'noe, predlog] (it is this book, most likely, that Bakhtin had in mind), and it was prepared for publication by A.V. Vetukhov, M.D. Maltsev, and F.L. Filin for the centennial of A.A. Potebnia's birth (1935). It came out in 1941, in a relatively small edition of 5,000 copies.

8. In the draft of this article, Bakhtin makes his negative assessment of school texts in the Russian language more specific, saying that, in his opinion, the main fault of Barkhudarov's text is the absence of any stylistic guidelines (with the exception of isolated remarks of a stylistic nature in the section on types of simple sentence). As for the exercises in this textbook, which, according to Bakhtin, "mislead" both the teacher and his pupils, then probably, he had in mind that the exercises associated with the selection of grammatical synonyms and seemingly targeted directly to the solution of stylistic problems, do not actually pose these stylistic problems, but only encourage the generation of as many syntactic constructions with similar meanings as possible, without any explanation of the semantic changes that take place as a result of syntactic transformations. An example of this is exercise 158 in the section on parataxic sentences; the other sentences in this section are associated with mastery of the rules of punctuation: "copy, put in the punctuation marks, explain them" (S.G. Barkhudarov, *Russian Grammar. Part 2, Syntax* [Grammatika russkogo iazyka. ch 2, Sintaksis] [Riga, 1941], p. 102). See note 12.

9. By "simultaneously" he probably meant that language is not only a means of communication but also a means of representation. Here, however, Bakhtin notes only the first two of the "three dimensions" of language, omitting language as the object of representation. See the notes to the work "Language in Artistic Literature" [Iazyk v khudozhestvennoi literature] for more on the problem of Bakhtin's idea of the representing and represented aspects of language.

10. Within the Russian literature on instructional methodology, A.M. Peshkovskii is the one who first posed the problem of grammatical synonymy (Peshkovskii, *Certain Aspects of the Methodology for Teaching Native Language, Linguistics, and Stylistics*, pp. 60, 152–58). Subsequently, interest in this problem was particularly associated with the intensive development of methods for teaching Russian as a second language (foreign language, in national schools—G.A. Zolotova, D.Iu. Maksimov, I.I., Raspopov, V.I. Sukhotin, and others). However, the goal of studying syntactic synonyms as one of the areas of work to develop speech, was not explicitly formulated in school Russian language curricula until 1972–73. See note 12 on the relationship between Bakhtin's and Peshkovskii's positions.

11. The word "purely" was taken from the draft in Bakhtin's hand; the "dictated" manuscript has "often."

12. The question, of some importance to Bakhtin, of the variation in grammatical forms ("Given that he does not understand the purpose of the substitution, one wonders why he needs to know how to make it at all") truly was not considered very important in Peshkovskii's system and this influenced the general view on this issue. Peshkovskii believed it was important to identify and classify synonymous constructions and thus it was permissible to limit oneself to "naming the grammatical forms that differ from each other in ordinary terms" since "even this type of identification enriches the pupil grammatically and stylistically" (Peshkovskii, *Certain Aspects of the Methodology*, p. 60).

13. This is what it says in the “dictated” manuscript, the term is illegible in Bakhtin’s version but is most likely “analyze by themselves.”

14. See note 15.

15. In this article Bakhtin’s analysis of the example *The news, that I heard today, interested me very much* plays the role of a general syntactic exposition (see note 18) for the further analysis of the three different versions of parataxic sentence. Without using his typical terminology, Bakhtin nevertheless in actuality establishes the universality of dialogic relationships for each and every type of utterance or sentence.^f

The inclusion of dialogic relationships in the category of basic syntactic universals is the core of Bakhtin’s entire philosophy of language. Bakhtin believed that any, even the most “neutral” speech act, or one abstractly isolated from dialogue, unavoidably contains these relationships, since the meeting of the word and its object is always complicated by dialogic features (“The Word in the Novel,” p. 90). The saturation of an utterance with these relationships, their relative importance and the extent of their influence on the semantic aspects of speech may be very heterogeneous (they may be reduced to the maximum extent possible, almost completely muffled, but it is nevertheless not possible for this influence to be reduced to zero). Bakhtin’s works typically analyze only the complicated “secondary” forms of dialogic relationships (heterogeneous methods for reflecting the prediscovered, anticipated, or implicit speech of others associated with the relationship of the speaker and his utterance to the other person’s point of view). Bakhtin rarely touches on the purely linguistic “primary syntactic” aspect; however, it is always implicit in what he says. (The theoretical aspect of this problem is especially clearly discussed in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* when internal speech is analyzed.) In the final analysis, all these complicated forms of dialogic relationships with which Bakhtin concerned himself in earnest in “The Word in the Novel,” *The Problems of Dostoevsky’s Works*, and other works, from the beginning, are based on this fundamental type of dialogism (the meeting of the word and its object), which in one way or another influences the subject-predicate structure of the sentence, and on the shift in the accentuated “objective landmarks” (the “foci of attention,” so to speak) and the alteration of their composition, including purely quantitative changes and the like, which can still occur even in a single sentence. In the example analyzed here, Bakhtin expresses the universal aspect of the problem by comparing the “simple” feature of number of “heroes” (or objects)—two in the original sentence and one in the transformed one—and then by explaining the changes that take place in the sentence’s meaning as a result of this syntactic transformation. (See L.A. Gogotshvili,

^fSee “The Problem of Speech Genres” for more about Bakhtin’s exploration of sentences and utterances, which, although not important in the present methodological article, is of fundamental theoretical importance in his works as a whole. Here, it should also be remembered that, in his further analysis of individual sentences, Bakhtin (see below) to some extent pays attention to the real-world context of the artistic works from which these sentences were taken. In other words, in actuality, he analyzes these sentences as whole utterances or as components of a particular utterance known to the students. According to Bakhtin’s understanding (see note 94 to *Training Materials* [Podgotovitel’nie materialy]), this is, on the one hand, justified, but on the other, is a limited methodological technique. (Cf. Bakhtin’s specially emphasized critical remark on the fact that in Vinogradov’s article on incomplete sentences all the examples are taken—without any cautionary methodological stipulations—from artistic works [*Language in Artistic Literature*, p. 292].)—L.B. and S.S.

“M.M. Bakhtin’s Philosophy of Language and the Problem of Relativism of Values” [Filosofiiia iazyka M.M. Bakhtina i problema tsennostnogo reliativizma], in *M.M. Bakhtin as a Philosopher* [M.M. Bakhtin kak filosof] [Moscow, 1992], pp. 142–74.)

One striking and relevant feature of the present article, which is nowhere else so emphasized, is the author’s focus on the number of “foci of attention” in the sentence and on syntactic devices for altering this parameter. In other words, Bakhtin, from his own dialogic point of view, is here touching upon the problems that are the traditional object of study in systematic syntactic investigations, which he typically avoids, in particular, the problems of the subject and predicate, which are directly linked to the analysis of the focus of attention in the sentence and its “verbal force,” and which Bakhtin intentionally ignores in other cases. (Cf., for example, note 1 to *Training Materials*; although, judging from the notes in the archives of scientific literature, this topic was always of interest to Bakhtin.) Bakhtin’s typical refusal to consider this type of problem can evidently be explained by his disagreement in principle with the dominant linguistic approaches to these topics, the majority of which Bakhtin considered to be based on a “system of language” understood in one way or another. (See note 24 to “Dialogue-1” regarding Bakhtin’s complex attitude to this influential linguistic category.) The basic linguistic universals that Bakhtin postulated could not be adequately interpreted within the framework of a “systems” approach. However, the desire to nevertheless express his “dialogic” point of view in the context of alien types of linguistic thinking led Bakhtin to prefer illustrating the specifics of the method he proposed in relation to more “open” linguistic problems in the area of stylistics, the genre stratification of language, methods for conveying another person’s speech, and so forth. According to linguistics at the time, problems of this type were frequently considered not to be purely linguistic, but rather derived or “applied” (see notes 38 and 46 to *Language in Artistic Literature*). Bakhtin himself referred to them as “borderline.” Only Bakhtin’s implied semantic threads led from here to the area of linguistic universals, which is at the very “heart” of systemic linguistics and also of linguistic philosophy, and these threads were further camouflaged by his technique of tentatively accepting alien initial postulates (see note 12 to “Dialogue-1” on the tentative acceptance of the category of “language system” in “The Problem of Speech Genres”). This topic’s special textological and terminological fate requires special investigations to adequately reconstruct Bakhtin’s understanding of base linguistic universals. At present, everything said on this topic must be considered merely hypothetical.

The unexpected appearance of one aspect of this normally neglected topic in the present maximally “simplified” work can evidently be explained by the article’s implicit objectives: the need to provide the context for the appropriate understanding of the following analyses of parataxic sentences. Thus, in analyzing the first “base” example, Bakhtin does not set up any hierarchical evaluative ranking, considering the original sentence and all its modifications, including the last “one-focus” one as equally legitimate means by which the speaker conveys his meaning at one moment or another. (In other words, Bakhtin is, so to speak, erecting another story in his edifice above its universal foundation; he is building a second dialogic story oriented to the addressee. See the reference to this aspect in the article fragment cited in note 14.) However, in his analysis of parataxic sentences the situation changes: Bakhtin evaluates the syntactic transformations that have a single focus, somewhat negatively, as dryly and coldly logical, which is contrasted to the living meaning of multifocus sentences (see notes 25, 30, and 32). “Cold” logic in the context of this article is a functional synonym for Bakhtin’s understanding of “monologism,” which, in the rhetorical coordinate system constructed

here, may be described as the extreme of the single-focus (single point of view) sentence. In other words, this sentence type represents the reduction of a number of “heroes,” each of whom in principle may have his own “voice,” to a single “hero” (focus of attention), and thus the reduction of the sentence to a single voice. It is precisely this effect (achieved by focusing attention on whether a sentence contains one or several “heroes,” a concrete explanation for why two or more voices appear in the sentence) that Bakhtin required. It is among these “heroes,” who always number more than one in a parataxic sentence, that various dramatic (i.e., dialogic) relationships are established, as Bakhtin stresses later in the article. Bakhtin will later evaluate these same syntactic transformations of parataxic sentences, which, in the extreme case, strain toward a single focus, as reinforcing the monologism (cold logic) of an utterance.

It must be remembered, however, that this latter circumstance does not have general meaning in Bakhtin’s linguistic theory. According to him, even constructions that formally have a single focus may, by virtue of the context of the whole utterance, have multiple dialogic voices (see, for example, Bakhtin’s assessment in “The Word in the Novel,” p. 136) that the formally single-focus lines from Pushkin’s *Eugene Onegin*: *Such things may often give / A conversation greater charm*, reinforce the parody and irony in the preceding sententious statement, that is, that the lines contain two voices. The fact is that, having focused attention on the objectives of instructional methodology in his concrete explanation of the possible sources of the various “heroes” in one sentence (on the presence of several “heroes”), in this article, Bakhtin neglects all the other more complex forms of dialogism, the source of which lies outside the purely linguistic semantics of the linguistic units used in the sentence (in the surrounding context, in prediscovered and anticipated speech and in an orientation to “current opinion,” etc.). In his further analysis of parataxic sentences, Bakhtin will also rely on the context of the work from which his examples have been taken. However, the role of context is limited to the fact that it helps the instructor to explain more exactly to his students the semantic changes that occur in the process of syntactic transformation. This article is not at all oriented to the language of artistic literature; this is not its primary objective. At the end of the article Bakhtin takes the position that parataxic sentences, with their strong dialogic potential, are a very frequent phenomenon in colloquial and written language. The thesis at the very beginning of the article that language is not merely a means of communication, but also a means of representing reality (see note 9) serves as a striking addition to this position. As if to provide a counterweight to this position, in works specially devoted to the language of artistic literature, he says that language in literature is not merely a means of representing reality, but also the object of the depiction (this three dimensionality of language, which is not mentioned in the present article, is introduced not only in “The Word in the Novel” but also in the work *Language in Artistic Literature*, which is simplified with regard to style and terminology as in the present article). The concept of language as a means of showing, and not only of recounting helps build a purely methodological bridge between the object of speech (“the hero”) and the possibility of hearing in the sentence the reflected speech of this same hero. Only a hero who is shown (represented) can speak, but not a “hero” who is merely described in an informative manner.

Although, in the general outlines given by Bakhtin, the analysis of the first “base” sentence also has obvious parallels with various analytic methods well known in linguistics (e.g., the method of communicative parsing; there is no sense in posing the problem of priority here), Bakhtin’s method additionally contains another dialogic aspect, most often either eluding other known analytic methods or simply intentionally

ignored in them. In the majority of cases even the linguistic methods of analysis that focus directly on the problem of dialogue consider only the relationship between the speaker and the addressee in the sense of these terms used in traditional rhetoric. The difference between these methods and Bakhtin's conception are fundamental in that they result from differences in interpreting the fundamental postulates that are thought to underlie linguistics. The specific features of Bakhtin's understanding of the fundamental postulates in this area have not yet been clearly established, and this, in particular, frequently leads specialists in Bakhtin to confuse the types of analysis that are encountered when monologic (as Bakhtin understood it) methodology is evaluated when it is used like the dialogic. And this confusion is constantly accompanied by today's standard references to Bakhtin.

16. Such recommendations to avoid the frequent repetition of conjunctions can be found in the book by V.I. Chernyshev, *Correct and Pure Russian Speech* (p. 639), which Bakhtin mentions earlier. An analogous example of the frequent repetition of the word "that/which" and a critical analysis of the reaction of teachers to this error is considered in an article by Peshkovskii "The Role of Grammar in the Study of Style" [Rol' grammatiki pri obuchenii stilia] (in *Certain Aspects of the Methodology*, p. 131). However, Peshkovskii suggests that the only correct method of working on the error is to "say, shorten one or both of the dependent clauses by using a participle" (ibid.).

17. This is the version given in the "dictated" manuscript; one can read Bakhtin's manuscript as "to be guided by."

18. Here the more conservative formula given previously is expanded: the need for a dialogic approach (or to use the terms in this part of the article—for "stylistic elucidation") now pertains not only to individual syntactic forms (see the fragment referred to in note 15), but to the entire syntax of complex sentences. Since it follows from Bakhtin's analysis that, without referring to the simple sentence, the dialogic study of complex sentences is not possible (see the last syntactic transformation of the sentence just analyzed), then Bakhtin is expanding the sphere of application of the dialogic approach to syntax as a whole. In other words, the dialogic approach is given universal linguistic status (see also note 19).

19. In Bakhtin's handwritten draft manuscript there is a more detailed enumeration of the questions of syntax he believed require mandatory stylistic interpretation. "Such stylistic elucidation is absolutely mandatory in the study of all other separate turns of phrase (and the corresponding substitutions), in explaining the position of the subordinate clause (before, after, or embedded in the main clause), in the study of complex sentences with several subordinate clauses (stylistic significance of the forms of subordination and sequential subordination) and in a number of other cases."

20. See the introduction to these notes on the likely reason Bakhtin chose parataxic sentences as the object of stylistic analysis in this article. Of the works by Potebnia, Peshkovskii, and Shakhmatov that he mentions, he most likely had in mind the following: A.A. Potebnia, from *Notes on Russian Grammar*, vol. 4 (Moscow-Leningrad, 1941), pp. 11–116; 2d ed. (Moscow, 1977), pp. 132–40; A.A. Shakhmatov, *Syntax of Russian* [Syntaksis russkogo iazyka] (Leningrad, 1941); A.M. Peshkovskii, *Certain Aspects of the Methodology for Teaching Native Language, Linguistics, and Stylistics* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1930), pp. 95–108, 133–61, 154–58; and *Russian Syntax in a Scientific Light*, 1st ed. (Moscow, 1914), 7th ed. (Moscow 1956). From the formal point of view, the closest of all to Bakhtin's understanding of the nature of parataxic sentences can be found in a work by V.V. Vinogradov that is not mentioned here. This work considers the problem of the parataxic linkage of clauses in connection with analysis of the stylistic

functions of verb tense forms (V.V. Vinogradov, “The Style of ‘The Queen of Spades’” [Stil’ “Pikovoi damy”], in V.V. Vinogradov, *Selected Works. On the Language of Artistic Prose* [Izbrannye trudy. O iazyke khudozhestvennoi prozy] [Moscow, 1980], pp. 232–33). However, in substance, Vinogradov’s interpretation of parataxic sentences (in complete accord with the “monologic” nature of his general view of language; see note 3 to “Dialogue-II”) is the opposite of Bakhtin’s. In parataxic constructions, Vinogradov sees not the linguistic interaction of two “voices,” but “subjective displacements of the sphere of narration” within the framework of a single monologic consciousness, that is, alternation among different levels of one and the same (author’s) consciousness.

It should be remembered that the term for “parataxic sentence” that Bakhtin uses in this article [literally: complex subordinate sentences without conjunctions—Trans.] is no longer used at the present time. In his time, this term was retained in the schools in accordance with the dominant treatment of parataxis as a variant of compound and complex sentences, with the conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions omitted (A.A. Potebnia, A.M. Peshkovskii, A.A. Shakhmatov, L.V. Shcherba). In the 1950s, parataxic sentences began to be viewed as an autonomous structural/semantic type of complex sentence (N.S. Pospelov, V.V. Vinogradov), which put an end to dividing them into parataxic compound and parataxic complex sentences (see N.S. Pospelov, “On the Grammatical Nature and Principles Underlying Classification of Parataxic Sentences” [O grammaticheskoi prirode i printsipakh klassifikatsii bessoiuznykh slozhnykh predlozhenii], in *Syntactical Aspects of Contemporary Russian* [Voprosy syntaksisa sovremennogo russkogo iazyka] [Moscow, 1950], pp. 338–54). In school instruction, this change of orientation in the study of parataxic sentences and the corresponding change in terms was recorded in the Curricula for Russian Language and Literatures for 1954–55, that is, after Bakhtin had written this article.

21. Here a new section occurs in the manuscript written in Bakhtin’s hand, marked by a roman numeral II; in the “dictated” version, the boundary between the sections is indicated by a few blank lines.

22. The following addition is inserted here in the draft manuscript: “In general the written language of secondary students contains extremely few uses of the colon and the dash. They use these punctuation marks almost exclusively in simple sentences with a general term followed by homogeneous lists (and they also use a dash when they omit the linking verb). Secondary students do not know how to use complex constructions where these punctuation marks are required.”

23. Bakhtin cites examples from the following works: first sentence—A.S. Pushkin, “October 19” [19 oktiabria]; second sentence—A.S. Pushkin, *Eugene Onegin* [Evgenii Onegin] (chapter 5, verse 27); third sentence—N.V. Gogol, *Dead Souls* [Mertvie dushi] (vol. 1, chapter 11).

At first, as the draft shows, Bakhtin planned to base the analysis in his article on a larger number of sentences: (1) *Sad am I: no friend beside me.* (2) *He’d start to laugh—they’d all guffaw. He’d frown—they’d all be silent;* (3) *I awoke: five stations had already fled past.* (4) *I am very tired: I have too much work to do.* However, in the process of writing the draft, his initial plan changed. He retained only the first three of these to demonstrate types of parataxic constructions (deleting the second sentence in example 2, as well), and the fourth example is crossed out in the draft with a wavy line and is moved, slightly altered, in the second manuscript, to another portion of the article, where it is used to illustrate the role of parataxic sentences in everyday speech. See page 23 of this issue. See note 31 on the punctuation mark in the third sentence.

24. Compare to the analogous sharply critical remark addressed to Peshkovskii with regard to his “experiment” on “mechanical” replacement of direct speech by indirect without the “appropriate stylistic reworking.” Bakhtin considered this type of experiment to be “only a pedagogically poor and unacceptable method for conducting grammatical class exercises” which had nothing in common with “the living vitality of set phrases in the language” (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 124).

25. It is essential to remember that, in giving such a negative evaluation of subordinating conjunctions, Bakhtin was pursuing the dominant objective of this article and was intentionally restricting the province of dialogic relationships (see note 15). In the “unrestricted” context of Bakhtin’s linguistic theory, subordinating conjunctions are evaluated differently: their capacity (which here is denied) to reflect the two-voice structure of sentences that contain them is acknowledged (see, in particular, Bakhtin’s description of one of the variants of “latent indirect speech,” “pseudo-objective motivation,” which is based on just such dialogic use of subordinating conjunctions and conjunctive phrases, in “The Word in the Novel,” p. 118).

26. Within the context of his restricted methodological topic, and thus, in the framework of his use of arbitrary (i.e., other people’s) terminology (e.g., “emotional dramatism” instead of “dialogic relationships,” “cold logic” instead of monologism, etc.), Bakhtin’s analysis of the example *Sad am I: no friend beside me* is absolutely self-sufficient.

However, if we consider this analysis in the context of his overall linguistic theory, we, evidently, must note one semantic particularity of the dialogic process implied here.

Thus, although the transformed syntactic constructions in the form of complex sentences with subordinate clauses indicating cause (*I am sad because [since] no friend is beside me*) also bear, according to Bakhtin’s general theory, unmistakable dialogic nuances associated with the orientation of the majority of sentences of this structural type to the cognitive context of the addressee. (For more detail on Bakhtin’s understanding of dialogic relationships associated with the cognitive context of the person addressed and described as a “change in point of view,” see L.A. Gogotishvili, *M. Bakhtin’s Philosophy of Language*, pp. 153–58.) However, in this article Bakhtin focuses on the reverse circumstances: the fact that these transformed constructions reduce to a minimum the saturated dialogism of the initial sentence, causing it to approach a monologistic utterance (i.e., stark, emphasized, cold “logic”). This is not a “contradiction,” but rather the logical and rhetorical device of “*reductio ad absurdum*,” which Bakhtin used frequently to explain the universal nature of dialogic relationships in the alien language used by Russian linguists who opposed this innovation. After all, only something that exists can be reduced.

The particular semantic technique used in this article and discussed in note 15 (demonstration that a sentence contains dialogic relationships by establishing that it contains several foci of attention or “heroes”) is here manifest in the fact that the striking two-focus construction of Pushkin’s initial sentence, which corresponds to the two clauses of this complex sentence, is replaced in the transformed construction by a reduced (“almost” single-focus) form. In the transformed construction (*I am sad since there is no friend beside me*), one of the two foci (points of view) that formally exists here is expressed with more force—the outlook of the “I.” The “friend” virtually loses his status as an independent “hero.” Even the most predicative part of the subordinate clause (“no”) semantically here relates (i.e., predicates) not so much to “friend” as to “I.” What is important is not that the “friend” is absent, but that he is not “beside me” (here we are abstracting from the nuances of the logical and grammatical interpretations of various types of predication in linguistics). The decrease in the semantic role of the

second “hero” (the friend) and thus the attenuation of his potential voice leads in turn to a decrease in the dramatism (dialogism) of the sentence.

We should discuss the problem of intonation separately. In the works of the Voloshinov school the shift of intonation to the “mute register” is associated with the *intensification* of dialogism (since it is not possible to adequately and without loss intone aloud the internal interference and merger of several voices in a formally unified linguistic construction). This article, on the contrary, speaks of intonation as the most convenient technique for revealing the dramatism (dialogism) of a sentence. However, there is no real contradiction here: aside from the obvious advantages of using intonation (and gestures) to explain the crux of the matter to seventh-grade students, it must be remembered that, as noted above, this article is special in a semantic sense. In it Bakhtin puts aside all the dialogic relationships that are imported into the utterance from without (see note 15), and it is precisely these “imported” aspects that are most difficult to convey through intonation. Bakhtin here is conducting an analysis that in actuality does not consider Pushkin’s context. He focuses exclusively on the dialogic potential of the syntactic construction being studied. Thus, all the components of dialogue that are imported from outside, including all contextual components, which would immediately come to the surface if the objective of the analysis were the poem as a whole (as is the case in other works by Bakhtin) are painlessly amputated for the purposes of this article.

27. The separate sheets included with Bakhtin’s handwritten draft contain the following comparison of sentences one and two with regard to the differences in their intonational structure. “Emotional expressiveness results from lowering the voice on the word ‘I’ (Sad am I). In ‘He’d laugh,’ on the contrary, the voice rises imparting energy and dialogism.” A comparative analysis of intonational patterns of all three examples and their semantic interpretation is not included in the final text of the article.

28. In the draft this sentence occurs in the following form: “The event of speech [speech act], thus, dramatically reproduces the actual event that this speech is talking about.”

29. See “Temporal Form and Chronotope in the Novel” [Formy vremeni i khronotopa v romane], in M. Bakhtin, *Questions of Literature and Esthetics* [Voprosy literatury i estetiki], p. 399, on the fundamental difference between a simple communication about an event and a demonstration/portrayal of the event, in connection with Bakhtin’s category of the chronotope.

30. In the manuscript this sentence is continued: “as in the first example, we lose emotionality.”

Bakhtin’s analysis of the second example of a parataxic sentence (*He’d laugh, they’d all guffaw*) very transparently illustrates the dominant semantic theme of this article: the universality of the linkage between the “objective” (thematic) and the “vocal” (dialogic) composition of sentences. The first example (*Sad am I: no friend beside me*) is a kind of simplified illustration of this postulate, since the source of the possible second voice in the utterance is not a hero (“part”) of the sentence but the addressee. (This “narrow” interpretation of dialogism is not only persuasive and understandable to students, but accords with treatments in the traditional schools of Russian linguistics.) The third example analyzed below (*He awoke—five stations had already fled past in the opposite direction*), on the contrary, is a more complex illustration of the main theme of the article. (Bakhtin focuses attention on the process of turning secondary thematic

components of a sentence into independent “foci of attention,” almost into “heroes,” that is, he interprets the fact that a one-focus sentence turns into a two-focus one as a formal condition for enhancing dialogism—see note 15.) In the analysis of the second example, all the theoretical points implicit in the article are revealed to the point of nearly being physically visible. It is here that the contrast between representation (portrayal) and mere recounting becomes completely clear. Both “heroes” in the original sentence (“he” and “they all”) are not only animate (in the third example, the second “hero” is an inanimate object), but are the subjects of actions (in the first example, the second “hero,” “the friend,” is not an active, but the passive subject of the action, and is almost transformed into its object). Moreover, the actions of both “heroes” portrayed here almost completely approximate the verbal actions that are expressed in so-called verbs or speech or thought (“laugh,” “guffaw”) and these speech acts of the “heroes” are not isolated, but dramatically, that is, dialogically, yoked (it is no accident that Bakhtin uses the word “echoes” in his description of the second clause’s relation to the first verb). The dynamic dramatism Bakhtin speaks of here is thus a remote and simplified precursor of polyphony. In this example, a relationship is established between two “voices” that are independent of the author. All that remains to create true polyphony is one fundamental step: the “hero” not only must be portrayed as the subject of a speech act, but also must speak himself, gaining the right to his own source of meaning within the general semantic space of the utterance created by the author. (In Bakhtin’s experimental classification of types of dialogic relationships referred to above, the relations between the reduced voices of the “heroes” in the second example can be included in the class “shift of speech centers”—see Gogotishvili, *M. Bakhtin’s Philosophy of Language*, pp. 149–53.)

Bakhtin’s analysis of this example also reflects the specific idea in this text that there is a correlation between the number of “heroes” and the nature (monologic or dialogic) of the sentence, as noted in note 15.

In what the article calls the most successful transformation of the syntactic construction (*All it takes is for him to start to laugh, for all of them to start guffawing obsequiously*), the first “hero” of the original sentence (“he”) is in actuality reduced to a grammatical object describing the condition under which the second “hero” (all of them) acts, and the second hero has been transformed into the central focus of the sentence (syntactically this is achieved mainly by putting the first “hero” into an oblique case “him”). Thus, here too, in accordance with the main idea of the article, reducing a two-focus construction to a one-focus one “logicizes” the sentence, that is, strengthens its monologic sound. It is also noteworthy that, in this article, Bakhtin avoids giving the formal grammatical names of the types of conjunctions that are proposed to link the clauses from the initial versions of the parataxic sentences analyzed. When he analyzes the first example, Bakhtin mentions only that the logical type of connection here is different than in the first example. However, when he analyzes the first example, he does not mention that there is a cause-and-effect relationship linking the two sentences. The first transformations of the second example, which were subsequently rejected (*When he laughs, then they all guffaw*, etc.), foreground the temporal relationships between the clauses, which, of course, do not correspond to the sense of the original sentence, and which Bakhtin does not mention either directly or indirectly. Ignoring all formal grammatical definitions of types of logical connectives, Bakhtin leads his students (and readers) to the conclusion, which he considers fundamental, that no type of logical relationship is in principle able to convey the whole semantic content

of dialogic relationships. This conclusion is here reinforced by the point that the original dialogic relations cannot be conveyed by means of any elaborated lexical enrichment of the transformed constructions. In his theoretical perspective, the combination of these points leads to the core of Bakhtin's linguistic theory of indirect speech.

31. In the "dictated" manuscript and thus in the version published here, there is another punctuation mark—a colon—in this example. The colon occurs in all modern versions of Gogol's *Dead Souls* (including those published in the 1930s). However, in the draft notes to the article in Bakhtin's handwriting, including those relating to the lesson plan for the demonstration lesson in the Russian language (see the introduction to these notes), this sentence contains a dash. The lack of correspondence between the punctuation Bakhtin proposes and that written in the "dictated" version of the manuscript could be explained by a random mistake of the student to whom he was dictating and the fact that Bakhtin did not reread this manuscript. However, the lack of correspondence between Bakhtin's punctuation and that used in all the official Gogol editions of the time may be explained by the fact that punctuation practice shows that the colon and the dash are in many respects "discretionary" punctuation marks, that is, marks whose use is not governed by strict rules. Bakhtin may have been citing this example from memory, and thus may have used his own punctuation. (It is interesting that contemporary Russian shows a tendency toward expanded use of the dash—see A.V. Shapiro, *Contemporary Russian. Punctuation* [Sovremennyi russkii iazyk. Puntuatsiia] [Moscow, 1974].) The use of the colon in this example corresponds more to the rigid rules of punctuation taught in school, which are based on a logical syntactic analysis that identifies a temporal and cause-and-effect relationship between the clauses of such sentences and stipulates that these must be indicated with a colon (in this article Bakhtin generally avoids naming the types of logical connections between clauses—see note 30). However, Bakhtin's use of the dash may be dialogically motivated. The dash, in some sense, moves the second part of the sentence away from the first, creating an "empty" space between the two foci of attention (i.e., "the heroes") visually corresponding to the pause, that is, to the distance required for establishing dialogic relations between the "heroes" of dialogic relationships (for more detail, see note 32).

It is interesting that in prerevolutionary editions of N.V. Gogol's works (see, e.g., N.V. Gogol *Works of N.V. Gogol* [Sochineniia N.V. Gogolia], 15th ed. [St. Petersburg, 1900], vol. 5, p. 222), the sentence being analyzed here contains a dash, as used by Bakhtin.

32. In the context of ordinary stylistic analysis, based on a traditional understanding of tropes, the third sentence (*He woke up—five stations had already fled past in the opposite direction*) is the simplest and most obvious example (and is so evaluated in the article itself). However, from the point of view of the specific features of Bakhtin's dialogic stylistics, this sentence, on the contrary, should be classified as a veiled complex case. This circumstance is associated with the fact that, here, Bakhtin is, once again, without saying so right out, touching upon the problem of base linguistic universals (see note 15). In this case, Bakhtin, as if in passing, notes the problem inherent in the type of linguistic thinking he disagrees with, that is, the traditional theory of tropes (in particular, the metaphor). If we dissect the dialogic subtext of Bakhtin's analysis of this example, we find that in Gogol's sentence, the metaphor plays a far different role than is attributed to it in the traditional theory of tropes, instead serving a special syntactic function directly related to dialogism. Specifically, Gogol's metaphor reveals the dialogic ("two focus") potential in a "one focus" event.

For the purpose of purely logical convenience in explaining this statement, it is best to interpret Bakhtin's analysis of this example backward, that is, rather than working from the original to the transformed sentence, working back from the transformed version to the original. As in all the preceding cases, the original sentence is acknowledged to be more successful. In, *When I woke up, I found I had already passed five stations*, there is one "hero" on whom attention is focused, "I." And Bakhtin guides the discussion so that a one-focus transformation is indeed derived. He even performs a special syntactic procedure, at the instructor's initiative with the student's approval. He shifts the words "five stations" from the syntactic position of the subject to that of the object, which once and for all deprives them of the status of an independent "hero." In Gogol's original sentence there are two "heroes" ("I" and "five stations"), and it is precisely the presence of these two foci that makes it possible to read the phrase dramatically, enabling him to show (represent) the event, rather than simply recounting it (as occurs in the transformed version). In actuality, Bakhtin is, so to speak, revealing the techniques used by this "master of the word" (i.e., Gogol) for turning a one-focus sentence into a two-focus one. This is the source of Bakhtin's exaggeration of this completely typical, one might say "ordinary," literary device as "Gogol's bold gesture." With this evaluation, Bakhtin focuses attention on the fact that tropes, as part of living, semantically rich language, are not simply a displacement of meaning according to principles of adjacency, similarity, analogy, and so forth, that is, are not simply a phenomenon of lexical semantics, but a special syntactic device capable, among other things, of performing direct dialogic functions. The trope can transform the secondary components of a syntactically single focus sentence into independent foci of attention, into independent "heroes," capable, in the extreme case, of introducing their own "voice" into the utterance. (No wonder, Bakhtin defines the "bold" device Gogol uses as "virtually personification.") The second "hero" appearing in Gogol's sentence cannot speak, since it is still a "thing," but it has become a "thing" with which the other "hero" of the sentence can enter into attenuated but still dialogic relationships (e.g., he can experience with regard to it the dialogic emotion of anticipated surprise). The base linguistic universal law appearing here can be formulated as follows: possession of two foci is a formal syntactic condition for dialogic relationships. (Remember, however, that the field of operation of this universal is limited here, since from the beginning this article has been dealing not with all types of dialogism, but only with internal-syntactic dialogic relationships, which are not related to the "greater" context or the external situation. According to Bakhtin, if the latter factors are considered, dialogic relationships may saturate single focus constructions as well—see note 15.)

On the whole, Bakhtin's seemingly particular linguistic analyses, which are furthermore performed in the context of a semantically simplified article on instructional methodology, paradoxically, are proving to be a source of supplementary information for a more complete restoration of one of the missing links in Bakhtin's linguistic philosophy as a whole, for recreating Bakhtin's understanding of the base universal forms of syntactic dialogism, and thus of thinking in language. Thus, although the relationship analyzed in this article is to some extent included in Bakhtin's tentative taxonomy of dialogic relationships, which was compiled before the first publication of the current article (see Gogotishvili, *M. Bakhtin's Philosophy of Language*), since this aspect of the problem had been indirectly treated in other work of Bakhtin, it was never identified in the taxonomy as an independent type in that it seems to be intermediate between "focus of attention" and other types of dialogic relationships.

33. See the conclusions discussed in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, pp. 126–28, on the ousted speaker from constructions with indirect speech of the “emotional-affective,” and “color” components that characterize the individual, as distinct to the situation with direct speech and their replacement by analytic, objective/logical elements. This situation is analogous to what happens when parataxic constructions are replaced by hypotaxic ones. The similarity noted here between the two different types of imagery—poetic (metaphors, hyperbole, etc.) and the two-voice prosaic (colloquial, dialectal, nonliterary components used to create the “objective” “color” of the word in the narrative), a distinction which, in other works (“The Word in the Novel,” pp. 90–92) is assigned fundamental significance, Bakhtin uses here to emphasize how both fulfill the function of disrupting the “unity of smooth and pure one-voice language” (*ibid.*, p. 140), attenuating the “monologic and strengthening the dialogic component of speech” (“Dialogue-1,” p. 210).

34. Hypotaxis (Greek *hypo*—under, below; *taxis*—location), the same as subordination, that is, a syntactic connection that has its own system of means of expression for organizing a complex sentence. Period (Greek *periodos*—circle) with regard to the nature of a syntactic structure, a relatively frequent complex sentence with a number of syntactically analogous subordinate parts relating to a single main clause.

35. See “Dialogue-1,” p. 211, on the tendency for bookish (monologic) forms of speech to die out and colloquial (dialogic) ones to increase, and, more generally, on the role of the dialogue in the history of the literary language. Cf. also the references to C. Bally in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* in connection with the tendency he noted for hypotaxis to be replaced by parataxis (*Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, p. 142). Bakhtin’s position on this issue is different in principle from the theoretical conclusions of others, in particular from Vinogradov’s ideas about the development of the Russian literary language and especially how they assess the significance of the colloquial language in this process: Bakhtin considers it unambiguously positive, and Vinogradov tends to think it negative.

36. The draft manuscript names these conjunctive forms “before the corresponding (causal, temporal, or conditional) conjunctive forms.” See note 30 for a discussion of possible reasons why this phrase was deleted.

37. In the draft manuscript this sentence continues: “(although this cannot be classified as a stylistic error).”

38. In Bakhtin’s draft manuscript, the third section, marked with a roman numeral III, starts here.

39. Above this sentence in the draft manuscript is written: “i.e., a retelling of a retelling.”

40. There is a fragment that is not present in the text on one of the separate sheets of paper enclosed in the draft manuscript. “In their effort to achieve formal (narrowly grammatical) correctness, teachers forget the objective of developing the individuality of their students’ speech. Teachers are afraid of boldness in the speech of their charges, and often simply recommend that they do not diverge from linguistic clichés so as “to avoid errors.”

41. The draft manuscript contains the addition: “When the fifth and sixth grades are repeated, the most difficult grammatical forms (aspects of the verb, participles and verbal adverbs) should also be stylistically illuminated.” The fact that Bakhtin in this article refers in passing (see also p. 13) to the stylistic (which here means “dialogic”) elucidation of grammatical forms, as to an obvious goal, indirectly attests to the fact

that he planned a dialogic review not only of syntactic forms but of grammar as a whole (see the introduction to these notes and notes 15, 18, and 32).

42. The third part of the article revisits one of the central problems noted in “The Word in the Novel”—the problem of the “ideological development of the individual,” albeit from the simplified viewpoint of instructional methodology (“The Word in the Novel,” pp. 154–79).

43. The draft includes the words “in another language.” See “The Word in the Novel” for a more elaborate and theoretically fuller development of this topic.

44. The draft manuscript contains another ending to this sentence: “the richness and complexity of evolving reality.”

Copyright of Journal of Russian & East European Psychology is the property of M.E. Sharpe Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.