

I. Introduction

1. Degrading Family Ties

This present thesis is based on *Buried Child* one of the most celebrated plays by an American playwright Sam Shepard. It aims to analyze the drama from the multiple voices, based on perspective of heteroglossia.

Buried Child deals on the degrading family ethics and values, during the 1940s and 50s. The different style of living ideologies of the American families is keeping them dysfunctional and the sentimental idealism of a family union is slowly falling apart. During the 40s and 50s, American youths were being more and more alienated from the mainstream culture, including social ideologies and familial ties. They wanted to break away from the burden of social dogmas and as a result, in the pretext of running away from the social hazards, the generation was being alienated. Their living pattern was more individualistic and way of thinking was incompatible to the traditional way of living.

Buried Child is based on similar theme of family disintegration, where each member is being detached from the other. They live under the same roof and share the same kitchen; however, it seems they are people of different planets, unaware of mutual bond of sharing and caring each others pain and gain.

These themes of family disintegration have multiple aspects of discourses in the play. Heteroglossia is the existence of conflicting discourses within any field of literature activity, such as national language, a novel, or drama or a specific conversation. In the context, *Buried Child* represents multiple voices.

Sam Shepard, American playwright and actor was born in 1943. His plays deal with modern social concerns such as individual alienation and the destructive effects of family relationships in an ailing American society. Born Samuel Shepard Rogers, Jr., in Fort Sheridan, Illinois, he attended San Antonio Junior College, located in California, but did not

graduate. In 1963 he moved to New York City, where he wrote the one-act plays *Cowboys* and *The Rock Garden*, which were produced in 1964 as part of the off-off-Broadway Theatre movement. Other short plays were produced by La Mama Experimental Theatre Club in 1964 and 1965 and by the Cherry Lane's New Playwrights series in 1965 and 1966.

Shepard's first full-length play, *La Turista* (1967), won an Obie Award (given for off-Broadway theatre productions) for distinguished play. It was followed by *Operation Sidewinder* (1970), *Curse of the Starving Class* (1977), *Buried Child* (1978; Pulitzer Prize, 1979; rewritten by Shepard, 1995), *True West* (1980), *Fool for Love* (1983), *A Lie of the Mind* (1985), and *Simpatico* (1994), among others. Shepard became known for his oblique story lines, slightly mysterious characters, verbal skills, and use of surreal elements with images of popular culture. He also worked on motion pictures, co-authoring the screenplay for *Zabriskie Point* (1970) and writing the screenplay for *Paris, Texas* (1984); and wrote two short-story collections, *Motel Chronicles* (1982) and *Cruising Paradise* (1996). Shepard acted in a number of motion pictures, including *Days of Heaven* (1978), *Frances* (1982), *The Right Stuff* (1983), *Fool for Love* (1985), *Baby Boom* (1987), *Crimes of the Heart* (1987), *Thunderheart* (1992), and *Safe Passage* (1994).

Shepard is one of the America's most important playwrights. He has won numerous awards, including ten Obie Awards (given to off-Broadway plays), for sustained achievement in 1980, the New York Drama Critics' Award for *A Lie of the Mind* in 1985, and a Pulitzer Prize for *Buried Child*. His work has been produced primarily in the experimental theatre of downtown New York in places such as La Mana and in regional theatres throughout the United States that are known for their artistic integrity but not for their capacity to reach a broad spectrum of theatre goers. In his way, Shepard has been an underground playwright who has won the respect of most theatre people, including the best playwrights.

Shepard's love for and frustrations with music have found their way into a major theme of his work. He plays drums and guitar and has never realized an early desire for a career in rock music. But the subversive qualities of rock and jazz – their implicit critique of middle class life – appear in his plays in his analyses of the middle class family. His primary themes centre on the family and its complications, the nature of the person alone, and the myth of the Old West. In each theme, Shepard expresses a deep sense of longing and of loss, emotions that his audiences have found significant, best portrayed in *Buried Child*.

Shepard began his work with a sense of the West drawn from popular literature, reshaped it, and produced it in a new form. If the American West has a reality that survived its mythicization in the dime novel and John Wanyne's movies, then Shepard is partly responsible for the way we now see it.

2. Review of Literature

Burried Child, by Sam Shepard speaks to us about the impact of family secrets. A family in general is bounded by bloodlines. Yet relationships within the unit can be disturbed if a dark secret is held. The death of child is a tragedy all together, but when a member of the unit murders a child, the family is bound to fall apart. The members in this family, (Dodge, Halie, their sons Tilden and Bradley) fell apart because they tried to forget what happened. Dodge thought that if no one spoke about it then it would be forgotten. The fact is that nobody forgot, not even Halie. Oh, they can hold on to the secret and let it fester inside, but it doesn't just go away. Secrets are like a cancer. It grows and spreads through your body, eventually killing you.

All the major characters of the play live in the same house, however, in his/her own world. Two other characters Shelly and Father Dewis's living pattern and rank of thinking is very distinct, from others too. So, the Dodge's family seems a coach load of different voices, ways of living, profession and consciousness. In other words, Dodge's house is a platform

where so many voices are playing in their own way. Therefore, lots of heteroglossic elements are found in the play.

Commenting the text from the multiple voice perspective, Richard Benette in *Shepard's Drama and Postcolonial Studies* comments:

The novel orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and by differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia can enter the novel . (43)

Shepard's *Buried Child* depicts almost all the themes concerned with the American society during the 1960s and around. It was the representation of social outbreak of ideas and voices that flourish, especially among the younger generation of people. These multiple voices reflected in the play were the flourishing trend of varied choices being represented in the literature.

Discussing more on the issue of multiple voices, Mikhail Bakhtin in *The Dialogic Imagination* further writes:

A text that honours the basic conditions of *heteroglossia* has ability to depict a range of social dialects, and thereby create a fictional world laden with realistic and socially diverse language communities, conflicting world views, and the sort of inflectional meaning that is a natural result of human dialogue. This theoretical term might be seen to carry a striking resemblance to Barthes and plurality, save for the crucial fact that at every instant, heteroglossia is a moment of interactive play between spoken language, ideas and meaning.

(212)

The heteroglossic mode of interpreting a text has a striking similarity with Roland Barthes, one of the western scholars. Barthes emphasized on ideas that heteroglossia took ideas from the realistic world and pasted them in theories, in regards to lingual representation of vies and ideas. The exact copying of multi perspectives of dialogue and characters shown by people of different culture and custom were sources of heteroglossia.

Similarly, Lee A. Jacobus find the play as a depiction of the failure of American dream as:

Buried Child offers a view of the American family that is painfully distant from the sentimental idealism of popular magazines of the 1940s and 1950s. Shepard emphasizes the rootlessness of the family, its emotional chill and its capacity for violence that is an outcome of the popular trend of family disintegration, practiced in those days. (1197)

Shepard's own view about violence expressed in his works portray realistic world around him. His ideas were often limited to the needs of both of the parent and of the offspring are modified by cultural forces and their account for the variations of the family in different societies. He inserted violence in his writings to depict the mentality of the people of the fragile America that was in the verge of break up from the social, moral and ethical trend followed for generations.

His output for the stage has been prodigious, with dozens of one act plays, and he has a central body of work that has gained him an enviable reputation. His most plays are set in the West, involve a giant mechanical snake designed to make contact with outer space travellers and includes Hopi snake dance as well as military scenes. *The Tooth Crime* (1972) is about turf wars between an aging rock star and an up-and-coming young star. It has a brutality and directness that make it intense, exciting, and revealing of the California rock-and-rock scene in the early 1970s.

Curse of the Starving Class (1977) and *Buried Child* both helped solidify Shepard's reputation. *Suicide in B-flat* (1976) and *True West* (1980) only made it clearer that his work was developing in a consistent vein of black humour and dark criticism of the sanctity of family life. *A Lie of the Mind* (1985), like *Buried Child*, is about disturbed. It is filled with family degrading values and ethics, due to incestuous sin. Incest or potential *incest* is also the theme of *A Fool for Love* (1983), in which Shepard starred on film. The play is set in the West and contains all the themes for which his work is known.

Ernest W. Burgess and Paul Wallin emphasize the role of culture as a counter force to the biological force in a family. Culture that threads a family and a society in to the garland of harmony was the essence of norms and ethics, however, which was fast falling in the American society. Burgess and Wallin emphasized the importance of the familial thread as:

The needs of both the parents and of the offspring are modified according to time and situation. However, by cultural forces and their account for the variations of the family it keeps the relationship and the bond of mutual understanding going in different societies. It is this factor that makes a society active and motivated. (13)

The authority of the parents is continually challenged by youth and the whole system is in the verge of collapse. The age-old cultural and traditional aspects of relationship and bond of mutual faith are slowly being an unwanted aspect. In the similar context, Robin H. Williams, Jr. writes: "The authority of parents is continually challenged by youth (leading to a) clash of authorities that for him is the break from conventional norms and cultural values" (67).

In the context, *Buried Child* not only exposes the reality beyond the disintegration of familial ethics and values but also illuminates a possible role of interpretation of the society leaders. As the text is open, meaning, no particular ideas are imposed at the ending; the audiences find it interesting to interpret it on their own. This open ending itself is a solution

to the mega crisis of familial values fast falling in the modern trend. Shepard in *Buried Child* inserts plurality of all types, and the circumstances for multiple interrelating voices, in other terms multivocality, could easily be facilitated by enabling the text to be read from heteroglossic point of view.

II. Heteroglossia in *Buried Child*

1. Heteroglossia: A General Introduction

Heteroglossia is a technique of analysing and studying a text from various perspectives. Any text is inherent of multiple voices, coming from the diversified background of the plot of the story. The presence of varied tune in the drama often enacts the embodiment of different worldviews. A language is never a unitary system of norms; rather it is always social cultural phenomenon. Therefore, language, reiterates, is always 'languages' in view of Mikhail Bakhtin, the founder of literary school of heteroglossia. There are always many different ways of speaking and such different language reflects the diversity of social experience, conceptualizations and values. People of different profession have their own way of speaking, as do different generations, different classes, ethnic groups, and any number of other possible divisions. And, the most important thing to grasp here is that these different languages are not just a matter either of professional jargon, or of varied forms of the language or system. Instead, what constitutes these different languages is something that is itself extra linguistic: a specific way of conceptualizing understanding and evaluating the world.

Language is speaking and, in turn, speaking is a complex set of experiences, shared evaluation, ideas and attitudes knit together to produce in form of communication. So, attitudes and views of the world identify languages. Bakhtin in *Discourses in the Novel* explains it as:

Languages are not merely for scientific and descriptive activities; rather they are always polemical or political ones. They are the consequences of the whole activity of living of living in particular ways. They embody the specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific worldviews, each characterized by its own objects, meaning and values. (292)

Thus, heteroglossia in the novel should not be considered simply as the author's artistic exploitation of the language to generate what Russian Formalists naively comprehend as defamiliarization. Instead, they should be acknowledged as a novel's fundamental attempt to correspond the reality of the world itself which is indisputably multifarious and prosaic. It should be deemed as a novelist's extraordinary sense to address the modern world that is saturated not by a single truth but by several truths.

Heteroglossia, the languages of speech styles that conceptualize the world in words, is the first and foremost organ of polyphonic novel. Any novel that is to be weighed from the polyphonic angle, thus must be first studied from its speech diversity. The various voices that embody different belief systems need to be analyzed considerably. It is because a novel, for Bakhtin, is always teamed with polyglossia.

Here, it is essential to view, how *Buried Child* can be viewed from heteroglossic perspectives. The drama embodies a large number of distinct speech styles, cult of the people and the land, including others; show an exceptional range of clearly discordant voices. These multiple voices represent the different choices and desires of the family members in the *Buried Child*. They further represent ideologies and consciousness, which have got shaped in the process and reprocess of culture and social conventions of the time.

Among the multiple voices and languages in the *Buried Child*, speech style of Dodge, the family head and Halie the family mother and wife have a distinct place in the drama. However, this distinctness cannot be understood without the heteroglossic perspectives, from Bakhtinian notion.

2. Bakhtin and Heteroglossia

Russian literary theorist and philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin was the founder of a school of literary criticism known as *dialogism*, which emphasizes the relation between an author

and his work, the work and its readers, and the relation of all three to the social and historical forces that surround them.

Bakhtin was born in Orël, Russia. He attended the University of Petrograd, Russia (now Saint Petersburg State University), until 1918 when he moved out of the city. From 1918 to 1924 Bakhtin's writings were devoted to both ethics and aesthetics. He disagreed with the Russian Formalists, who believed that a literary text was a crafted thing, the sum of its technical devices. Bakhtin instead argued for the semantic aspects of literary work, saying that what mattered was not how something was merely made but rather what its *meaning* was. He stressed the importance of this meaning in social and historical context.

In Bakhtin's opinion time is open and each moment has multiple possibilities. He consistently opposes all ways of thinking that strive to reduce the present moment to a simple derivative of what went before. As he emphasizes the “eventness” of the event, he also insists on the “presentness” of each moment. For Bakhtin, only the novel could come close to representing the “open present” and real historicity. “Reality” as we have it in the novel is only of many possible realities; it is not inevitable, not arbitrary, it bears within itself other possibilities” (“Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel”, 854). This sense of time becomes intrinsic to the way novel describe moment in history and in the lives of the characters.

In addition to prosaic and unfinalizability, Bakhtin's third recurrent concern is 'dialogue.' He uses the term in various ways and in such diverse senses that often appears to avoid final definition. However, it is described here in the broadest sense, as 'a model of the world'. Dialogue for Bakhtin is a special sort of interaction. Unfortunately, it has usually been received as an equivalent to interaction, or verbal interaction in general. What Bakhtin argues is that dialogue cannot be equated with argument, nor is it equal to “compositionally expressed dialogue”, that is, the sequential representation of transcribed voices in a novel or

play. Bakhtin also warns us against confusing dialogue with logical contradiction. Moreover, when we imagine dialogue we are prone to think of two monads that come to interact in certain way: for example, opposites contradict and produce a synthesis. Such practice is what Bakhtin calls “theoretism,” and which he regards as dominant in modern Western history. Bakhtin blames that theoretic always understands events in terms of a set of rules. In semiotics, for example, particular people are reduced to counters, and their intimate and ethical relations to their actions are lost. The same is true of Marxist dialectics. Theorists think away the “eventness” of events.

For Bakhtin, a real dialogue is a live process that transcends received models and displays the mark of unfinalizability. All social and psychological entities are procession in nature. So their unfinalizable activity is essential to their identity. And for people, the most important activity is dialogue. Thus, for any individual or social entity, we cannot properly separate existences from the ongoing process of communication. Now it suggests that dialogue involves the constant redefinition of its participants and creates numerous potentials in each of them. Further, no single interaction could exhaust the potential value of future exchanges. Both dialogue and potentials of dialogue are endless. No word can be taken back, but the final word has not yet been spoken and never will be spoken.

The concept of potential is immensely important for Bakhtin's thought and only dialogue reveals potentials. It does so by addressing them, by provoking a specific answer that actualizes the potential. Indeed, the process of dialogue may itself create new potentials. This process cannot take place if one renounces or attempts to insulate one's point of view. It also cannot take place if one adopts a position of total relativism. Such practices preclude dialogue, as Bakhtin often points out. Nor is 'synthesis' or 'merging' of point of view possible: dialogue is not a self-consuming artifact. It is not dialectic, as well, for dialectic can be contained within a single consciousness and encompasses contradictions in a single,

monologic view. By contrast, in a dialogic encounter of two cultures, each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched.

Again, we often lose a sense of dialogic quality of an event because of mental habits, intellectual traditions, and centripetal cultural forces. As a result, the live medium becomes dead: activity is understood as stasis, heterophony is reduced to singularity, openness is lowered to a close systematicity, and potentials are greatly overlooked. Bakhtin speaks such tendency as 'finalization' and 'monologization'. And Bakhtin argues that dialectics is one such monologization. Of dialogue and dialectics he overtly enunciates:

Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning of voices), remove the intonations (emotional and individualizing ones), carve out abstract concepts and judgements from living words and responses, cram everything onto one abstract consciousness-and that's how you get dialectics (“From Notes Made in 1970-71,” 147).

So the dialectics abstracts the dialogic from dialogue. It finalizes and systematizes dialogue. Thus, dialectics is a typical product of the old, Newtonian, monologic view of the world. And, from the viewpoint of monologics the world is closed circle and thus dead. But from the point of view of dialogic the world is a “live event” (24).

No less than dialectics, Bakhtin insists, semiotics materializes and reifies the world: it takes the life out of language and culture. Such error derives from misunderstanding history. According to Bakhtin, culture and individuals accumulate habits and procedures from earlier activity; forms are congealed events and situations. Then, the centripetal forces of culture characteristically codify these habits by converting them into a fixed set of rules. And this condification strives to restrain any change. Such disciplines like semiotics, philology, and linguistics consequently tend to mistake the codification for reality and miscomprehend both present potential and past activity.

For Bakhtin life is an ongoing, unfinalizable dialogue, which takes place at every moment of daily existence. In *Toward a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book* Bakhtin states:

The dialogic nature of consciousness is the dialogic nature of human life itself. The single adequate form of verbally expressing authentic human life is open-ended dialogue. Life by its nature is dialogic. To live means to participate in dialogue: to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree, and so forth. In this dialogue a person participates wholly and throughout his whole life: with his eyes, lips, hands, soul, spirit, with his whole body and deeds. He invests his entire self in discourse, and his discourse enters into the dialogic fabric of human life, into the world symposium. (293)

Bakhtin's constant assertion is that existing forms of knowledge monologize the world by turning an open-ended dialogue into a monologic statement. The dialogue of life requires a dialogic method and a dialogic conception of truth to represent it. But such a concept of truth, Bakhtin argues, is absent from modern Western thought.

The dialogic sense of truth is what Bakhtin urges most. As opposed to “official monologism” with its “ready-made truth” (*Problem of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 110), Bakhtin offers a radically different conception of truth: “Truth is not born nor is it to be found inside the head of individual person, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction” (ibid). In order to exhibit this dialogic sense of truth in literary works, nobody else but Dostoevsky ran first and foremost for Bakhtin. He further announces that real dialogism embodies a world, whose unity is essentially one of multiple voices, whose conversations never reach finality and cannot be turned into monologic form. The unity of the world will then appear as it really is polyphonic.

3. Problems of Authorship

In the preceding topic, I have discussed on Bakhtin's innovative conceptions of the nature of world and events: the prosaic, unfinalizability and dialogue. And to represent such fluid and dynamic forces truly, no other genres can exhibit their potentiality, but the novel. Novel, for Bakhtin, is the genre that is bound to present day reality. It speaks about knowledge and experience in the most genuine sense. But not all novels can embody the essential messiness of the world authentically. For Bakhtin, only those works do reflect the real world vehemently in which the authors do work with special sense of the life and events. The position of the author, therefore, is very crucial; it does encounter numerous problems. On the one hand, he has to fight against his own hegemony, on the other; he must not efface his own presence. Then the question emerges-what sort of position the other does have to assume in the novels.

Bakhtin objects strongly to the view of language as 'langue', a system of abstract norms. In *Discourse in the Novel*, Bakhtin attacks linguistics, poets, and stylistics for mono constructing the fact that different people and groups speak differently. Thus Bakhtin exerts the term heteroglossia to address the true nature of language.

According to Bakhtin, language is never a unitary system of norms. In language, as in culture, order is never complete and always requires a work. It is a task, a project, always ongoing. Moreover, such messiness in the language is the result of the complexities of daily living with all his unforeseen, small, prosaic purposes and shifts in mood and evaluation. These centrifugal forces are not reducible to a system; they are essentially dispersive and disunities. Nevertheless, culture strives for unity and order. Such striving is reflected in the European regularization of national languages – especially in the writing of grammar and dictionaries. Bakhtin does not mean to say that there is anything wrong with this effort. What he means to say is that we must understand it for what it is an attempt to create order by

positing it. “A unitary language is not something given but is always in essence posited” (*Discourse in the Novel*, 270). The apparent mistake of philology, linguistics, stylistics, and poetics is to take as something real which in essence is an ideal, something merely posited in a social struggle for unity. Further, Bakhtin realizes that philology has had a profound influence on Western Linguistic thought. Most of the time, the linguistics reflect and tend to contribute to the centripetal forces of language misidentifying as a scientific or descriptive activity what is inevitably a polemical or political one.

Language, Bakhtin reiterates, is always languages. This does not mean that there are only linguistic dialectics, but much more important there are always many different ways of speaking, many language which reflect the diversity of social experience, conceptualizations, and values. Furthermore, people having different professions have their own way of speaking, as do different classes, areas, ethnic groups and generations and so on. The important thing to understand here is that, for Bakhtin, these different languages are not just a matter of a professionals jargon. In that case, the specialized vocabulary of the given profession could simply be recorded in a dictionary, and the idea of a unified language would be absolute. But it is not, what constitutes these different languages is something that is itself extra linguistic: a specific way of conceptualizing, understanding and evaluating the world.

Attitudes and views of the world identify language. Whatever linguistic features there may be are not themselves definitive. They are the consequences, or as Bakhtin variously put it, the “traces”, “crystallization” or “sclerotic deposits” of these attitudes. Moreover, they are the markers of the whole activity of living in particular ways. Thus, Bakhtin proclaims:

Discourse lives, as it were, beyond itself, in a living impulse toward the objects; if we wholly detach ourselves from this impulse all we have left is the naked corpse of the word, from which we can learn nothing at all about the social situation or the fate of a given word in life. (292)

We speak differently on different occasions. Each of us participates at all times in several languages and their attendant sets of views and evaluations. Thus, Bakhtin asserts that in real life heteroglossia is itself dialogised in various ways.

In order to clarify this Bakhtin urges us to presume a hypothetical person, who probably could not exist: an illiterate peasant, for whom languages are not dialogized. Now we may assume that this peasant uses several languages – prays to God in one, sings song in another, speaks to his family in a third, and so on. Our hypothetical peasant applies each language at the appropriate time; his various languages are automatically activated by these different contexts. What is crucial here is that he does not suspect the adequacy of each language to its task. By contrast, we may also imagine that another peasant is capable of regarding one language “through the eyes of another language” (ibid, 296).

He may attempt to approach the language of everyday life through the language of prayer and song so forth. When this occurs the value systems and world views in these languages come to interact; they ‘interanimate’ each other as they enter into dialogue. This dialogization of language is always going on. Therefore when words, Bakhtin argues, attract tones and meanings from the languages of heteroglossia, they are often attracting already dialogized meanings. Having participated in numerous value systems, these words become dialogized, disputed, and re-accented in yet history of any language.

Unlike the view of Tynyanov and Jakobson, two other Russian critics, that linguistic change is systematic, Bakhtin holds the view that it is not systematic, but messy, produced by the unforeseeable events of everyday activity. Further, it is not the result of purely abstract forces, but of real people’s actions in response to their daily lives.

According to Voloshinov, native speaker do not apply rules, rather they enter the stream of communication. We do not learn native language from dictionaries and grammars, but from specific exchanges in which we do participate. That’s why, the language we

assimilate comes to us already dialogized, already spoken about, already evaluated; it is an aggregate rather than a system. Certainly, the native speakers do internalize norms and become aware of some grammatical regularity, but they do not strictly apply rules while speaking. They talk or write, they use the resources of language to accomplish something. Rather than decode, they understand and respond. Therefore, speech in Bakhtin's conception is always dialogic, and dialogue cannot be reduced to any linguistic categories; it is meta-linguistic.

Now Bakhtin drives his point home that dialogised heteroglossia, which strives to represent the true nature of language, is the special property of novel. According to him, the novel, like the self, is a highly complex combination and dialogue of various voices and ways of speaking, each incorporating a special sense of the world. For him, the novel is the most dialogic genre.

4. Polyphony

The concept for which Bakhtin is perhaps most famous is that of polyphony. It is one of his most intriguing and original concepts. Bakhtin speaks his indebtedness to Dostoevsky whose novels he had studied substantially and put forward his ideas.

Bakhtin discusses polyphony in terms of dialogue and states that it is not an attribute of all novels. For him Dostoevsky was the first and foremost polyphonic writer. Commenting on polyphony, he writes in *Dostoevsky's Poetics*:

Dostoevsky's poetics is constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as object into itself, but as whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other. They are separate entity to each others. (18)

Unfortunately, most critics tend to believe polyphony as an equivalent of heteroglossia. But Bakhtin clarifies that the latter term describes the diversity of speech styles in a language, whereas the former has to do with the position of the author in a text. Therefore many literary works are heteroglot, but very few are polyphonic or dialogic. Again, polyphony is often criticized as a theory that posits the absence of authorial point of view.

For this, Bakhtin vindicates that the polyphonic author neither lacks nor fails to express his ideas and values. He recurrently stresses the commitment and ‘activity’ of polyphonic author. He explicitly maintains that a work without “an authorial position is in general impossible. The issue here is not an absence of, but a radical change in the author’s position,” (67) besides in polyphonic work, authorial point of view differs in kind and method of expression from its monologic counterpart. Polyphonic work does have unity but it is what Bakhtin calls “a unity of a higher order” (source: *Toward a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book*, 298).

Bakhtin acknowledges these and other misunderstanding of monologic habits of thought nurtured over centuries of what he calls in another term ‘theoretism.’ In the concluding part of the 1963 Dostoevsky book, he appeals the critics to think in fundamentally new ways:

We must renounce our monologue habits so that we might come to feel at home in the new artistic sphere which Dostoevsky discovered, so that we might orient ourselves in that incomparably more complex artistic model of the world which he created. (272)

It seems that Bakhtin strongly rejects the Hobson’s choices of modern thought: there is a system or there is nothing; either there is an all-encompassing system or it is total relativism. Such assumption, Bakhtin contends, has dazzled critics over centuries. They have remained ignorant to the possibility of radically different kinds of truth, unity and perspective.

Moreover, such assumption has led many critics to the mistaken identification of polyphony with relativism. Thus Bakhtin warns:

The polyphonic approach has nothing in common with relativism (or with dogmatism). But it should be noted that both relativism and dogmatism equally include all argumentation, all authentic dialogue, by making it either unnecessary (relativism) or impossible (dogmatism). (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 69)

On these grounds, Bakhtin has dismissed the influential forms of relativism dominating current critical thinking. Bakhtin argues that authentic dialogue about values and meanings is pointless if all disputes ultimately reduce to questions of power interest. Further, if all divergent perspectives are fundamentally 'incommensurable', then the possibilities of genuine become illusory. Polyphony, as a form of thinking and artistic visualization, presupposes the possibility and stresses the value of meaning dialogue. Bakhtin not only describes polyphony, but endorses the view of the world it conveys.

As we interpret Bakhtin, two closely related criteria are inevitable of polyphony: a dialogic sense of truth and a special position of the author necessary for visualizing and conveying that sense of truth. Since Bakhtin regards the polyphonic works as a "form-shaping ideology", these two constitutes are the essential to such work. In the Dostoevsky book, Bakhtin elaborates the discrepancy between the monologic and dialogic conception of truth and it has been reflected not only in philosophy but in literature too. It is to be found not only in Kant, Hegel and other great thinkers, but also on the entire tradition of monologic novels before Dostoevsky. "These basic (monologic) principles go far beyond the boundaries of artistic creativity alone; they are the principle behind the entire ideological culture of recent times" (80). So, Bakhtin urges that in order to understand the nature of Dostoevsky's

polyphonic works, one must first challenge the world's 'entire intellectual culture' that advocates its idea of truth as the only one possible.

In fact, Bakhtin's comprehensive study on Dostoevsky directly threatens the reigning concepts of theoritism and semiotic totalitarianism by proposing a non-monologic conception of truth. For him different conceptions are possible and Dostoevsky's novels tremendously display these phenomena. In other words, the novels of Dostoevsky tremendously exhibit the dialogic sense of truth.

Discussing more on monologic sense of truth, Bakhtin strives that it has been built out of two distinct elements, "separate thought" and the "system of thought" (93). In monologic ideology, we encounter "separate thoughts, assertions, propositions...depending on their relationship to the subject and independent of the carrier to whom they belong"(93). In principle, it does not matter who carries these thoughts. The content of these thoughts remains unaffected by their source. Someone may have discovered the particular idea, but it belongs to all and does not require the voice or particular context of the discoverer. In this sense "separate thought" is what Bakhtin calls "no-man's thoughts" (ibid). Then, such separate thoughts gravitate toward a system, the second aspect of monologic truth. The system is formed out of separate thoughts, as out of elements. While dealing over much monologic truth, Bakhtin appears to have Hegel and Marx in mind as champions of monologic thoughts are the great synthesizers who attempted to give shape apparently different propositions into a coherent, all-encompassing system. That's why a system also "no man's", or to put the point plainly, a system can be comprehended and fully contained by a single consciousness. Bakhtin insists that this model of truth has been mistaken for the only one. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, he observes:

It is quite possible to imagine and postulate a unified truth that requires a plurality of consciousness, one that in principle cannot be fitted within the

bounds of single consciousness; one that is...by its very nature full of event potential and is born at a point of contact among various consciousness. The monologic way of perceiving cognition and truth is only one of the possible ways. It arises only where consciousness is placed above existence. (81)

In the passage what Bakhtin has in mind is a conception of truth that allows every moment of existence to be rich in potential. This prosaic conception of truth would be 'placed above existence'; rather it would arise from the experience of the "open present" in each moment. Here Bakhtin's three global concept – prosaic, unfinalizability and dialogue – combine.

Bakhtin further extends that the dialogic sense of truth manifests unfinalizability by dwelling on the 'threshold' of "unmerged voices". He argues that these voices cannot be constrained within a single consciousness as in monologism. Instead, their separateness is essential to the dialogue. Bakhtin often speaks to the participants of a dialogic conception of truth as "voice-ideas". By this phrase, he means a unity of idea and personality or the unity of view and viewer. Moreover, the person who holds the idea becomes a full personality by virtue of that idea; idea is not just something he happens to believe, but is an essential shaping force throughout his life, when such voice giving rise to new insights and new dialogues. The unity of truth becomes the unified 'feel' of a conversation, not the unity of a single proposition. Bakhtin comes to blame that when monologic thinkers encounter such conversation, they usually tend to extract just such a finalizing propositions. What he wants to assert is that "the ultimate individual unit is not the assertions, but rather the integral point of view, the integral point of view, the integral position of a personality" (93).

According to Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's paradoxical thoughts, "is not in accordance to thoughts but in points of view, consciousness, and voices" (ibid). The combination of individual units of this sort does not gravitate toward system. It yields "not a system" but "a concrete event made up of organized human orientations and voices" (ibid).

Time and again, Bakhtin strives to drive the point home that the dialogic sense of truth requires a plurality of consciousness. Unfortunately, before Dostoevsky, the 'form – shaping ideology' of most literary genres, especially of the novel, embodied monologic truth in one or another way. In those genres, only the author, as the ultimate semantic authority, retains the power to express a truth directly. The truth that the work carries becomes the truth of his or her, and all other truths are mere appendage. By this, Bakhtin means that in a monologic work each character's truth is to be measured against the author's own ideology dominates the work and builds its unity. Such works may convey the author's position in various ways. Sometimes a given character may carry it: at other times, the author's truth may be dispersed through a variety of characters.

Moreover, other non-authorial truths, in monologic works, are either refuted or more commonly in novels they are represented as mere characterological traits. By these Bakhtin tends to suggest that the author represents 'other truths' as partial and subsidiary. Such truths do not have the right to demand an answer from the reader; that right is only ascribed to the author's truth. In fact, the author, in monologic works, retains full control over the work and never surrenders the right to mediate between characters and readers.

By contrast, in polyphonic works the author ceases to exercise monologics control. Polyphony demands a work in which several consciousness meet as equals and engage in dialogue that is in principle unfinalizable. Characters must be “not only objects of authorial discourse but also subjects of their own directly signifying discourse “(*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 7). The direct power, which is monologic work belongs to the author alone belongs to several voices in a polyphonic work. By renouncing his monologics hegemony, Bakhtin claims, Dostoevsky created a way to embody a dialogic conception of truth. A polyphonic work embodies dialogic truth by allowing the consciousness of a character to be truly “someone else’s consciousness” (ibid).

Stipulating his notion of polyphony further Bakhtin proposes that to create a truly polyphonic work, the author must be able to confront his or her characters as equals. No doubt, his ideology may receive expression in the work. But what is new in such works is that others may and do contest the author's ideology on equal ground. And it is author himself who sets the stage work: he creates a world in which divergent points of view enter into dialogue and he himself does participate in that dialogue. He is one of the interlocutors in the great "dialogue" that he himself has created. For Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's novels do display his phenomenon profoundly. His novel, Bakhtin outlines is constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousness as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other.

Bakhtin explores this position of author through theological analogies. In his book on Dostoevsky, he compares the polyphonic author to Goethe's Prometheus, who "creates not voiceless slaves (as does Zeus) but free people, capable of standing alongside their creator, capable of not agreeing with him and even of rebelling against him" (6). In "Toward a Reworking of the Dostoevsky Book," he advocates the Judeo-Christian idea that God created morally free people. God may argue with people, as he argues with Job, but Job retains the power to agree or disagree. Similarly Dostoevsky may answer his characters, but he does not manipulate them as passive objects.

Though the characters in polyphonic work have been created by the author, but once they come onto existence, they will escape his control and prevent him from knowing as advance how they will answer him. The polyphonic novel is therefore characterized by a "plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousness, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices" (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, 6).

Using another favourite analogy, Bakhtin characterizes the monologic world as “Ptolemaic”: the earth, representing the author’s consciousness, is the centre around which all other consciousnesses revolve. The polyphonic world, on the other side is ‘Copernican’: as the earth is but one of many planets, the author's consciousness is but one of much consciousness. Further, what Bakhtin argues is to resemble the polyphonic world to be universe of Einstein in which one finds a “multiplicity of systems of measurements” that in principle cannot be reduced to a single system (272).

Besides, Bakhtin explains polyphony's new authorial position in terms of the 'surplus'. He tells us that each of us exerts a 'surplus of vision' with respect to others we encounter. One person can see the back of another's head and know what the other looks like. In monologic work the author enjoys an immense surplus of vision with respect to his or her characters, but characters do not have the same surplus. Bakhtin unfolds that the surplus enjoyed by monologic author is much greater than the surplus we normally find in daily life.

Consequently, such surplus makes it impossible for the author and characters to exist in the same ground and hence to enter into dialogue as equals. Such surplus of the author finalizes a character and evidently establishes his or her identity. Real dialogue, instead, demands partners to meet on the same level. Each must be unfinalizable with respect to the other. For Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's great invention was to find a way to encounter his character as unfinalizable others and engage them in a genuine open-ended dialogue.

As such, in *Buried Child*, which is a perfect combination of monologic authorship and heteroglossic ideas successfully depicts the idea of multiple choices of voices in the text. An implicit critique of middle class life appear in *Buried Child*, whose visions are obscured and the tired characters, who end up each time to claim a new perspective of their life and living; a perfect example of heteroglossic perspectives.

III. Heteroglossic Voices in *Buried Child*

Buried Child since its publication in 1978 has attracted scores of criticism, due to its multiple layers of meaning and interpretations. The drama orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types and by differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. This technique of analysing a text from multiple voices is heteroglossia.

Representation of multiple voices is one of the most striking features of the play. The play is the accumulation of multiple and distinct discordant voices, ways of living, ideologies and consciousness of 1950s and 60s America. These heteroglossic voices happen to appear in the play because of different characters' different social background, professions and ways of living as well as problems created by generation gap.

Buried Child is a strong specimen of heteroglossic tone due to incompatible voices of the characters like Halie and Dodge, husband and wife, who come from farming background, somewhere in the Americas. They are living despite all the disagreements and differences in vision and attitude. Halie, who has an illicit relationship with her son and bears a child, is the centre of falling familial values in the Americas. Their differences are best represented in the following dialogue, where Halie and Dodge are engaged, as:

Dodge: He's not my flesh and my blood! My flesh and blood's is buried in the back yard! (They Freeze, long pause. The men stare at him.)

Halie (quietly): That's enough, Dodge. That's quite enough. I'm going out now. I'm going to have lunch with Father Dewis. I'm going to ask him about a monument. A statue. At least a plaque. (1204)

This conflict of opinion based on belief creates intense situation in the play. Even in the case of birth of the child, Dodge and Halie share different opinions, in the following manner:

Halie: It's his home as much as ours. He was born in this house.

Dodge: He was born in a hog wallow.

Halie: Don't you say that! Don't ever say that!

Dodge: He was born in a goddamn hog wallow? That's where he was born and that's where he belongs! He does not belong in his house! (1204)

These different opinions are the reflection of the falling ethical values in the American society. The dramatic interaction elucidates the divergent and varied thinking pattern of the characters. There by we can outline the heteroglossic elements of the play.

Heteroglossia is the inherent feature of polyphonic text that is variety and diversity of language, voice and consciousness. Dodge, the dominant patriarch of the family has got the consciousness of escaping from the responsibility and not like to take burden of other even of his son where as Halie is very mature housewife of Dodge's family. She not only cares the ongoing life of the husband and son but she tries to amend the next life of expired son Ansel.

Here Halie is presenting her varied thinking pattern that is distinct from her husband and other two sons, as well. It means, Dodge and Halie are living under the same roof but with varied consciousness. Halie still trying to make better even her late child's another world by making monumental work. Such an incompatible consciousness brings strong heteroglossic aspects in the play.

All the major characters of the play do live their own way. Dodge in his seventies, is a lonesome figure, who likes to remain addict to television, which is his only source of entertainment. He, at least has no complaints to the T.V. He is a strong alcoholic and is obsessed towards it. He likes no one's presence in the house; his son's and his wife, too. Time and again he refutes his wife's advice though it is good for his health and appearance. Unlike, Dodge, Halie is different to him. She thinks acts upon the betterment of the family. She tries to run her family properly. But her sons and husband does not support her way of thinking and living.

Dodge, basically is a person of negative attitude. However, his attitude has risen from his familial background. His wife and son are engaged in an illicit relationship, bear a child and is buried, in this situation, it is unlikely for a man to think optimistic. He is preoccupied with alcohol and women. He takes every happenings and events decorated with “not.” To put it another way, Doge is full of negative ideas and consciousness. But Halie has positive spiritual mind because of the influence of the protestant Minister Father Dewis. Dodge’s mentality can be judged from the following conversation.

Halie's Voice: Yes to cut hair.

Doge: My hair? I don't need my hair cut.

Halie's Voice: It’s been more than two weeks Doge.

Doge: I don't need it.

[. . .]

Dodge: You tell Bradley that if he shows up here with those clippers, I’ll kill him. (1200)

Halie insisting Dodge to have his hair trimmed shows her intensity for not only a good looking husband, but also active and creative fellow, as well. However, Dodge’s is against this positive advice. He finds everything dull and often seen to have gone against his wife’s idea.

On their conversation, one thing is clear that she also respects his ideas and doesn’t want to hurt her. Her submissive nature for pleasing her husband is seen, when during the following conversation, Dodge’s insists on the point, she simply gives up, but, in turn he mimics his wife, in the following way:

Dodge: They don't race on Sundays

Halie's voice: What?

Dodge (louder): They don't race on Sundays. [. . .]

Halie: They used to race on New Year's! I remember that.

Dodge: They never raced on New Year's. I remember that. (1199)

Dodge is insisting to what he says and cannot rely to fact against him. He is watching horse racing and his wife warns him against the consequence, but Dodge flatly denies her.

These incidents are facts to many households in the cosmopolitan cities. Dodge is only a representative character. On the other hand, Halie succumbing to her husband's voice and demand clearly shows the different voice present in the modern households. A communicative gap between husband and wife creates dysfunctional situation in the family. And, in turn it leads to the rise of misunderstanding and to the verge of disintegration of the family.

Buried Child has multiple tone of rhetoric's in its characters. For example, Halie comments on the habit of Dodge as:

Halie's voice: You always imagine the worst things of the people!

Dodge: That's not the worst! That's the least of the worst.

Halie's voice: I don't need to hear it! All the long I hear things like that and I don't need to hear more. (1202)

This given extracts highlights the perspective conflict between husband and wife. What is worst in the eyes of Halie is good for Dodge. These differences, in turn show the nature of couples, who are vexed with each other's relationship. Such a different perspective pattern gives sounding heteroglossia to the play.

Another striking feature of the play is revealed in the characters' desire to hold family heritage in the form of wealth. Dodge's family is only one of the hundreds, who were in the cat race to grab property. Wealth was the ultimate reality in then America and due to this, the family ties were falling apart.

All family members are in competition to catch the reign of the family. Dodge attempts to hold the super position in the family. Most of the time, Dodge commands other to do work according his will. But Tilden and Halie overtly refuges Dodge's direction. Tilden, Bradley and Halie are waiting the proper time to grab the property of the family.

1. Heteroglossia as Post modernity in *Buried Child*

One of the striking features of the drama is, it is purely postmodern. It boldly narrates a family, where the family members are corrupt to each other and the demarcation of morality and social boundary has long been broken. Shepard in narrating the family crisis in *Buried Child*, he boldly depicts a mother (Halie) who has illicit relationship with her sons and goes as far to give birth to a child, from the relationship. However, the child dies and the father (Dodge) is in the unsuccessful attempt to hide the sin, which everybody seems to be well aware. Dodge, the family head is indifferent about the family affairs for the reason.

Shepard's intention in *Buried Child* was to create a narrative which communicated and reflected the frustrations of American people but at the same time, which was engaging and entertaining. During the 1940s and 50s, the family values were fast falling and people were seeking a new sorts of definition within the family itself. Set in a context which is easily recognizable, the American farming family, and centred on issues which are universal, the disillusionment with the American dream and the traditional patriarch, *Buried Child* reflects the universal frustrations of American people.

The postmodern style which Shepard uses incorporates surrealism and symbolism in the realistic framework of a family drama. This platform allows for engaging visceral theatre. Shepard is able to create images in the imaginations of people through the use of surrealism and symbolism, evoke and harness the experiences of his audience through its post-modern nature and keep the audience comfortable in the trappings of realism.

A striking feature of post modernity is that the characters (in a family and a society) have multiple disagreeing voices. In the play, most of the time, characters do neglect the voice and presence of other. Almost all the time, Dodge intersects the Halie's opinion. He does not step backward to ignore the presence of Halie. She insists Dodge to take the pill because he has extremely suffered from the coughs. But Dodge does not like the nags of his wife following dramatic extract shows the Dodge's such behaviour.

Halie's Voice: Dodge, if you don't take that pill anybody's going to force you.

(The two men ignore the voice)

Dodge (to Tilden) where'd you get that?

Tilden: Picked it.

Dodge: You picked all that?

(Tilden nods) (1201)

Halie is coming down from the upstairs. Both Dodge and his eldest son Tilden hear the voice of Halie. They see her as she is descending from the upstairs but both representatives of the traditional patriarchy explicitly neglect the voice of Halie. They continue their previous discussion on the corn as if Halie is not came into the scene. Here, refusal of one voice from others' is marked the conflicting condition. Certainly, this is a heteroglossic element of the polyphonic text. And, Shepard artistically brings many such divergent elements to give heteroglossic flavour in the play.

Shepard's *Buried Child* exploits different manner of speaking and such different 'languages' reflect the diversity of social conscious, experience, conceptualizations and social values. A complex set of consciousness shared evaluations, ideas, ways of living, perspectives, voices and attitude toward single truth, event, topic knit together to bring heteroglossic test in the text. Dodge is alcoholic by nature. He “Just stares at the TV” and time and again, “pulls a pack of cigarettes out from his sweater and lights one.” Dodge is

seen on the stage in the state of illness. Always, he “takes bottle” and ‘swings’ time and again. Most of the time, we see him disputing on the unimportant topic and things like that with his wife, Halie. Dodge wants to be lost from the present world. He disputes: “My appearance is out of his domain! It's even out of mine! In fact, disappeared! I'm an invisible man!” (1201).

As Dodge speak like this, we know that he is not an educated man. He defeated farmer of his ongoing time since last 25 years. The hurt of defeat has dwelled in his consciousness. More than that, an illegitimate child birth from Halie and Tilden has become another bitter hurt for his decaying. Dodge always imagines” the worst things of the people1 (1200).

Unlike Dodge, other characters do have different tongue. Halie speaks as an educated person. We find the philosophic taste mixed with religious flavour. She indulges with family development both economically and culturally. She thinks about her husband's health. She wants to make some monumental work for her late son Ansel. She has been provided with wide space in the play for this discussion. She speaks long speeches in the play depicting the disillusion of the American drams. Her conversations are related with family amendment, which is “ironic” in reality, as she is the main culprit, behind the family problems. Sometimes, she comments on the habit of her husband. Besides, that she also bitterly criticizes the catholic religion saying: “Catholic women are Devil Incarnate” (1203). It is a parody of heteroglossic people and their thinking.

The moral fall of the family members are represented through the language used by the characters. Not only Dodge is a foul mouth, but also are other members, as well. Tilden, who seems to rather smart in this case, is not different to Bradely. Tilden does not have philosophic taste in his speaking, rather he talks lolly things, corn, carrot, and whiskey and raining are the matter important for him. Same is the case of Bradley; he appears in the play

with his language like Sonuvagoddamnbitch? (1206). Bradely, who is uneducated, matches in language with his father, Dodge.

A kind of cold war is going silently in the Dodge's family. In between the family members, there are unwelcomed relationships. However, Dodge's social status is not bad the way he behaves in the family. Dodge tells about that: I haven't had trouble with the neighbours here for fifty-seven years. I don't know who the neighbours are! And I don't wanna know!" (1201).

These facts, though seems unlikely are the bitter realities of the American culture, where individuals are being alienated from the rest of the world. They are away from their family, society and away from own, as well. In the postmodern era, people are more self centred than necessary and, hence, are unhappy and arrogant.

Unlike Dodge, Tilden is somehow active character of the play. The play unfolds the incestuous relationship of Tilden and Halie, his mother. However, he is not seen as a disturbed man in the play. Tilden talks about raining and corn. He simply obeys his father and does things accordingly. He is "Dodge's oldest son in late forties wears heavy construction boots, covered with mud, dark green work pants, a plaid shirt, and a faded brown windbreaker" (1201). Dodge does not like Tilden taking corn inside house. So Dodge aggressively commands Tilden: "Dodge: You go and take that corn back to wherever you got it from" (1201).

Sometimes, there seems to be combination of Tilden and Dodge, but it does not last for long time. It seems Dodge is not able to forget or is haunted by the fact that he (Tilden) and Halie shared illicit relationship. They only combine together to overcome Halie's arguments; an indication that both the male are somehow affected. In Dodge's coach load of family journey, every single character does have one secret to say, secret to do. By this, we explicitly understand that the secret is about an illegitimate son Ansel who was that man and

how he comes into the Dodge's family is the topic of discussion. All the characters do have different views about that. But Tilden and Halie want to hide it by lolly jobs. Tilden manipulates his father by doing corn husking. He does not like to discuss about that matter. However both Halie and Tilden know that father Dodge has got the secret about the birth of Ansel. But they try to misinterpret the matter.

Both Halie and Tilden insists Dodge to postponed the matter of past. Halie says “not to go out in the black past anymore” (1204). Dodge feels that Tilden is the unwanted burden of the family. Dodge expects Tilde would be an independent what is the matter of regret is Tilden does not come out from the Dodge's property. Tilden interacts with his father like this:

Tilden: I was alone. I thought I was dead.

Dodge: Might as well have been. What'd you come back here for?

Tilden: I did not know where to go?

Dodge: You're a grown up man. You should not need your parents at your age.

It's unnatural. There's nothing I can do for you now anyway. Couldn't you make living down there? Couldn't you find some way to make a living?

Support yourself? What'd ya come back here for? You expect us to feed you forever. (1205)

The father wants, his son better dead than alive. However, the parody of post modernity is that, the son (Tilden) too, is not happy. He neither was physically satisfied, nor mentally, now. Such situation arises, between the father and son, where both of them are forced to stand each other, despite the fact that both of them want to escape each other. This dramatic extract presents the distinct thought line of post modernity, one of the multiple faces of heteroglossia.

In the same interaction, we find: “I did not know where else to go” (1205), which is the vivid depiction of the fact that a postmodern man has nowhere to go. A postmodern man

is alienated and rooted to what he has, as s/he can hide from the world but where to run from self. And, especially when the sin is unbearable, it is beyond running away. Tilden argues as: “I never went back to my parents. Never, never even had the urge. I was independent. Always independent. Always found a way. I didn't know what to do. I couldn't figure anything out,” (1205).

The second act of the play further elongates the dialogic destiny of Dodge's dwelling centre. It happens intensely after the Grandson of Dodge, Vince, comes into the house with his girlfriend, Shelly. They have come all the way from Mexico. Shelly is a beautiful girl of nineteen with black hair. She wears “tight jeans, high heels, Purple T-shirt and a rabbit fur coat.’ Her makeup is exaggerated and her hair “has been curled” (1207). In other words, Shelly is a modern teenager of that time. Obviously, she has a distinct thought, distinct layer of mind and perspective than others.

Vince is Tilden's son about twenty-two, years “a plaid shirt, jeans, dark glasses, cowboy boots and carries a black Saxophone care” (1207) Vince's get up highlights the modern American fashion. He is a boy of chocolate. His way of thinking differs with his father Tidlen and uncle Bradely.

The second act, displays Shelly's distaste for Vince and his family members. She expects some milkman and little dogs in the houses as they are the ornaments of the modern houses. Unlike Vince, she is extremely conscious about the design of house, servant, milkman, a little dog names with Dick, Jane or Spot. She enters into the heritage of Vince and immediately starts showing her coquetry. She is full curious and at the same time demanding. She inquires, in a sophisticated manner, as:

Shelly: (laughing, gesturing to house): This is it? I don't believe this is it!

Vince: This is it.

Shelly: This is the house?

Vince: This is the house.

Shelly: I don't believe it!

Vince: How come?

Shelly: It's like a Norman Rockwell cover or something.

Vince: What's a matter with that? It's American. (1207)

Shelly expects house according to her modern migrated thought. Vince confronts with her. Vince prevents Shelly to enter into the house in such informal manner. He suggests Shelly, saying "I don't wanna go in there with you acting like an idiot" (1207). Such divergent head of thoughts have got mixed with distracted Dodge's family.

The arrival of Vince into the family is the beginning of another stage of the melodrama in the play. The family members do not recognize and rejects him, however, he insists that he is the blood of the family; son of Tilden and grandson of Dodge. His introduction comes as: Vince: Grandpa, its Vince. "I'm Vince. Tilden's son you remember?" (1224). Dodge only staves at him. Doge looks up at him, not recognizing him. Vince tries to introduce that he is the only one grandson of Dodge and Halie. But Dodge does is not influenced by Vince's explanation.

Shelly, who is witnessing this awkward situation, does not know what to do and hence, persuades Vince to leave the house, but in vain. She says: Shelly: "Vince, why don't we spend the night in the motel and come back in the morning? We could have breakfast. Maybe everything would be different" (1209).

Shelly surprises hearing Dodge voice at once. An extreme dialogue has been created here. Dodge does not accept Vince as grandson though he is. Shelly insists Vince to depart form the house. Shelly confronts: Shelly: Vince, this is really making me nervous I mean he does not even want us here. He does not even like us (1029).

Shelly, by now, who have understood the family problem and the situation of Vince's heritage, decides to leave, however, cannot. This is a situation of modern paradox, a complexity created by the multitude of various tones, by various characters. And, then, she introduced herself to the family. But upon hearing that, Shelly is from Los Angeles (LA), Dodge comes up with his nasty remarks about the city. He blatantly says "LA is the city of stupid people" (1209). He further remarks:

Dodge: It's stupid! LA is stupid and so is Florida! As those sunshine states.

They are all stupid! Do you why they are stupid.

Dodge: I'll tell you why. Because they are full of smart assess! That's why.

(1209)

This situation is very unfriendly and unexpected for the young lady; nevertheless, she stands for the sake of her boyfriend, Vince. This interaction of Dodge with Shelly further adds to the conflicting situation, which already exists. However, this is not the end.

Dodge interacting his poison with Vince, compares Shelly to the status of prostitutes, in the following manner:

Dodge: She is a fireball, isn't she? Regular fireball. I had some a ' them in my day. Temporay stuff. Never lasted more than a week. (1209)

This tense situation is handled, with equal rudeness from Shelly. She confronts her dislike in the following manner:

Shelly: Let go of me!

Vince: You're not going anywhere! You're going to stay right here!

Shelly: Let go of me; you Sonuvabitch I'm not your property. (1210)

She ultimately confronts with Vince and leaves the house. At this point, she also challenges the dominant views of the male dominancy. Shelly strongly supplies the argument against the whole male ideology. She boldly resists the traditional patriarchal pattern of thought. Here, in

this above given dramatic interaction, Shelly represents the Modern enlightened women and Vince takes the side of decaying condition of patriarchal ideology.

Here, we come across one of the most notable presence of multiple voices in the play. Shelly, through this dialogue, tries to stumble down the hitherto, ideology of male towards the female. This given dialogue highlights the conflicts of the two distance trend of thought pattern, ideology and conceptualization of the society. So the *Buried Child* is extremely brimming with the element of heteroglossia as the character represents different facet of life and the world, characters do speak in their own pattern embodying divergent attitudes and beliefs towards life. As a result, the play is the play of multiple voices. Vince and Shelly do have different ideology which is totally distinct from others, especially Dodge, Dewis and others too. Likewise, all the characters of the play voice their ideas in their own styles. They try to divert the situation at their own bank. So, these individual consciousnesses are absolutely saturated with the conflicting familial value as well as social values. It is, therefore suffice to embrace the assertion of Bakhtin “the style of the (text) is to be found in combination of its styles, the language of the (text) is the system of its language.” (The Dialogic Imagination, 262)

Heteroglossia witnesses the unfolding heteroglossia and natural orientation is presented in the text. Internal dialogization, free play of contraction and conflicts are the gist of the heteroglossic text. Further it encompasses fluctuations on voice, ideology, norms and values and things like that.

In other words, it welcomes language diversity and does not eliminate the language character and the speech mannerism. Shepard’s “*Buried Child*” has brought above mention heteroglossic elements artistically. Therefore, the play has become one of important lab to research Bakhtin.

Buried Child then on, moves around the single secret of *Buried Child*. The buried child symbolically, represents the unfolded truth. What is the issue of conflict of Dodge's family? How do family members interpret it? What is the secret of *Buried Child*? Are some of the major scoping questions regarding *Buried Child* Dodge, Halie and Tilden do have different forms of truth and interpretation about the matter. Dodge is overtly fired at Tilden's Oedipal Complex and its result. As Dodge unfolds story, we slightly can guess that the *Buried Child* was an illegitimate offspring of Halie and Tilden. That's why, Dodge murders him. That is one dimension of truth.

Shelly, the girlfriend of Vince, now, is in the house of Vince. She is noticing every ups and down of Dodge's family, closely. One interaction lets the truth out in the light that follows:

“Shelly (to Tilden): Are you Vince Father?

Tilden (to Shelly): Vince?

Shelly (pointing to Vince): He is supposed to be your son! Is he your son? Do you recognize him? I'm just along for the ride here. I thought everybody knew each other!

(Tilden stares at Vince. Dodge wraps himself up in the blanket and sits on the sofa staring at the floor.) (1210-11)

Every truth of world is only for granted. Truth is always an idea that is supposed to be, is the prime gist of the given dramatic extract. Shelly is trying to locate the position of her boyfriend Vince in Dodge family. Along with the hidden motive of Shelly is also secure space for herself. She is proclaiming the temporal existence of single truth. We know that when Tilden has internally dialogize about the position of Vince. Slowly, Tilden lets the secret out and proceeds:

Tilden: I had a son once but we buried him.

(Dodge quickly looks at Tilden. Shelly looks to Vince).

Tilden: We had a baby. (Motioning to Dodge). He did. Dodge did. Could pick up with one hand. Put it in the other. Little baby. Dodge killed it.

Tilden: Dodge drowned it.

Tilden (pays no attention to Dodge): Never told Halie. Never told anybody. Just drowned it

Tilden: Nobody could find it. Just disappeared. Cops looked for it.

Neighbours. Nobody could find it. (1215)

Everyone seems to have a different solution to the mystery. It could have been kidnap, murder, accident or any such behind the secret of the buried child. Tilden upsides down the ongoing motion to play by saving above mention dialogue. He accepts the birth of child, his death but differently. Tilden's story about the secret gives much light on the issue of killing.

However, like everyone, Tilden has his own truth about the lost baby. However, the cause of the death remains suspense. What we find from this interaction is that still the position of Vince in the family is the matter of debate. Directly, Tilden is not able to say Vince is my son; and the truth may be anything, one mentioned in the text or beyond it, as well. As the reality of modern day world is beyond what one assumes. However, when Tilden is in the verge of telling the reality, (or presumably, the readers are made to think so) Dodge prohibits him. That sounds much dialogic. Dodge prevents Tilden as: "Dodge: You shut up about that! You don't know anything about that. That happened before you were born! Long before!" (1211).

This given extracts shows that how much dialogic and distinct opinions do precede the interaction of Dodge and Tilden. Dodge tries to move the issue another side so as to prevent the debate that may help to cover the secret. Dodge changes the topic to ask about the bottle of whiskey at once. When Tilden is in the verge of revealing the so-called truth, what

we are (audience) are supplied, Dodge struggles to walk toward Tilden” to stop him but he falls down: and says: “Tilden you shut up! You shut up about it!” (1215).

Finally, Tilden unfolds the truth that is supposed to be. Dodge family moves through the irreconcilable interpretations as such. That’s why; Shepard has brought the heteroglossic social and individual confrontation to make it free ground where one character can speak his opinion without fearing author’s domination.

From the intersected dialogic dispute of doge, Tilden, Shelly and Vince, we come to the point that Dodge’s family moving through the bushes of incredibility and what the secret does have the family regarding incestuous child birth is an indecipherable truth. Bradley and amputee, further supports the circular movement of truth that could be change in time. Bradley opines: Bradley: “They don’t talk to me like that now. Not anymore. Everything turned around now. Full circle, isn’t that funny? (1216).

He states different view in the ongoing events. Everybody is following the circular movement of truth. What was supposed to be up to now, that is truth around funnily. Bradely puts forward his views. One can get the in-depth fact of the truth, it remains indeterminable. There is diazotization between fact and fancy.

All the characters of the play have become major characters. They contribute notable presence in the play of distinct voices. Since the playwright unable to track those in his intended arena all are major and powerful. They have changed time to time. Dodge's alcoholic consciousness sometimes amplifies the philosophic world views, too. Halie has chances from the kind of housewife into drunkard careless woman, comes with father Dewis in her intoxicated embrace. Tilden obsesses with corn and carrot at first but uncovers the secret unexpectedly. He had a silent tsunami inside his heart from the time of child's murder. Now, he emerges as a spoke person of truth. Physically disable, Bradely defines the circular slipperiness of truth in the style of Derrida. Vince and Shelly become confuse what has been

going on in this house. Father Dewis unable to stay in the altar of protestant mythology leaves the ethics; mythology and morality of the religion in one side and delve into the romantic aroma of the Halie. Such a fluctuation of every single character does contribute in the moral collapse of the cosmopolitan culture of the United States.

Last act of the play provides the clues of fluctuation of the characters. Alcoholic Dodge interacts like a philosopher. He puts his opinion about the new generation of America as: Dodge: Full of faith. Hope: Faith and hope. You're all alike, you hoppers. If it is not God then it is man. If it's not a man then it's a woman than it's a land or the future of some kind. Some kind of future. (1217)

Dodge suggests Shelly as: Dodge: "Don't be so easily shocked, girlie. There's nothing man can do. You dream it up and he can do it anything" (1218). Shelly slowly brings Dodge into dialogic mood. She asked him what "happened to this family anyway?" Dodge philosophic mood breaks and he defines the position of Shelly in the house as: "You're in no position to ask? What do you care? You some kind of social worker. There is not a living soul behind me (1218-19)."

Dodge manipulates Shelly using his decorated intellectuality. Distinctly Father Dewis, a very distinguished gray-haired man in his sixties, is dressed in traditional black suit, white clerical collar and white shirts', interprets the event. He brings the religions smell from his consciousness and mixes in the argument as:

Well, prayerfully, God only hears What he wants to.... we know we're every bit as wicked as the catholics.

The moment, Halie and Father Dewis enter in the house, all other are in intense disputation about the child death. So, Halie seems sorry for that and says:

Halie: Believe me, Father, this is not what i had in mind when i invited you in.

Dewis: Oh, no apologies please. I wouldn't be the ministry if i could not face the real life. (1221)

Father Dewis does not take the conflictual mood of the family as a simple case. He tries to give patient to Halie; he shows the interconnection between real life and spiritual life.

Physical existence of human life can give plenty of experience to lead metaphysical life is the intended view of the Father Dewis. We know all about his double-standardness. In one side, he is a moral minister of protestant who preaches about the religious life but another facet of his life is a model of immorality, implicitly corrupted man.

Similarly, Halie has different point of view about the current time and world, as Father Dewis has. She also shows her double-standard life. In the beginning, she appears as a caretaker of the family, who closely watches, takes the husband, Tilden and Bradely. Later on she shows her corrupted nature. She takes romantic pleasure with Father learning the family in the mood of ruin. She blames the new generation. In her opinion, they no more train like they used to: not at all. They allow themselves to rime amuck in Drugs and women, mostly women and girls. She further claims that the girls of this generation were sad and pathetic little girls. It's just the reflection of the times, an indication of where we stand?

Halie is projecting the direct impact of the corrupted world's wind where she herself, has delved with Tilden. And what has happened in the family is the result of the current world. Not only has that Halie opened the subject of debate for all. She gives the chance to all for comment for disagreement too. This shows her modernist concept toward the things. Ultimately, this is a case of multiplicity and where multiplicity lies is the heteroglossia germinates from it. She states:

Halie: Oh you can disagree with me if you want to, Father. I'm open to debate.

I think argument only enriches both sides of questions don't you?

(She moves toward Dodge) I suppose, in the long run, it does not matter when you see the way things deteriorate before your very eyes. Everything running downhill. It's a kind of silly even think about youth. (1221)

We can find many dimension of one single truth and what we need to understand is we have to believe in one dimension of single truth and others do believe in another. This is the dialogic nature of truth, what Halie wants to put forward as: "We cannot believe in something. We can't stop believing. We just end up dying if we stop. Just end up dead" (1221).

We know the reality of the truth. There is not a single truth is the truth actually. But we have to believe in one form of truth to run our life is the core message of Halie to all. This shows the multiplicity of the fact, truth whatever we call it and certainly it creates heteroglossic situation in society, in culture and in family.

Dodge, finally, puts forward another dimension of the truth. Halie tables her strong disagreement with Dodge. She does not like to listen such a truth directs Bradely to shut up Dodge. Finally Dodge unfolds the secret as:

Well even if ya' don't I'm gonna' tell ya'.(pause) Halie has this kid. This baby boy. She had it. I get her have it on her own. All the other boys i had had the best doctors, best nurses, everything. This one I let her baby by herself. This one hurt real bad. Almost killed her, but she had it any way. It lived, see. It lived. It wanted to be like us. It wanted to be a part of us. It wanted to pretend that I was his father. She wanted me to believe in it. Even when everyone around us knew. Everyone all our boys knew. Tilden knew.(1224)

This is the dimension of the truth of the *Buried Child*. But Halie does not believe this. Dodge says this is known as truth. But what he forgets that all others know it differently. Halie boldly rejects his voice. Her pellucid rejection of Dodge's truth shows the following dramatic

dialogue: Dodge: “You shut up! Bradely, make him shut up!” Ansel would've stopped him!
Ansel would've stopped him from telling these lies! (1224)

Halie puts her disagreement on erstwhile dimension of truth very dialogically. This hot intersected dispute of Halie and Dodge sounds very important to note that projects the extreme conflict of voices in the society, culture and family. These distinct voices of society create polyphonic situation which lets all the people out to put their discordant voices in equal important because of such multiplicities.

Shepard's *Buried Child* ends in an unfinalized manner, with open ending. All the characters do live in their own imagination and no one trying to penetrate in to the territory of others. They believe in different ideologies. They interpret the things according to their consciousness. In other words, Dodge's family is coach load of multiple voices, where Shepard has brought the different voices from different field and profession as well as generation. They interpret the things on their own basis, and everyone has a reason to conspire and suspect the other, and so does s/he have reasons for others. It has an open ending, making it artistically near to the postmodern writings.

As a result, we can find the dialogic representation in the society in the play, where all characters are engaged in personal dislike and hatred, and the play ending with a hint towards uncertain future of the family and the society. However, this sense of curious ending is another feature of heteroglossic perspectives in *Buried Child*.

IV. Conclusion

After a thorough analysis and research on Shepard's *Buried Child* the present researcher has come to a conclusion that the text represents and depicts multiple voices and languages of the American society of the 1950s and 1960s. It was an era, when the traditional concept of familial values was declining and people were fast falling in the trap of illusion of leading an incoherent life.

Buried Child is beguilingly ordinary at first glance. The simple interior is dominated by a television set and an old sofa set. The husband wife, Dodge and Halie are engaged in seemingly the unending family chores. They seem frustrated to each other, and when the sons Bradley and Tilden arrive in the scene, there is almost similar things continuing.

However, with the arrival of Vince, who claims him to be the son of Tilden, thing seems to muddle up. Moreover, when Shelly, Vince's girlfriend digs into the family history, the utopia of family falls apart, except every family member pretend of not knowing what the family sin was.

Dodge, the family head, is one track alcoholic and the reason is obviously, Halie his wife had given birth to a child from the illicit relationship with her son, Tilden. Then after, nothing remains the same and though they live in the same house, are quite indifferent to each other. They are living for the sake of living, as the moral and ethical meaning and value of living has been killed long ago. The illicit relationship, not only destroyed the familial happiness but, it also all the family members like an invincible spirit. The burial of the child remains a secret; however, everyone is aware of it, only that they refrain in face to each other. Eventually, as we watch Shepard explore the family relationships, we begin to sense that the surface ordinariness hides a deeper structure, one that is built on myth.

The play draws multiple voices together in a forum, largely based on agricultural myth. Besides, the birth and death of the incest child, another conflicting issue of the play is

agricultural myth. Dodge and his family are living in countryside, depending on agricultural background. There has been no rain for years and the crops have failed, however, Tilden, one of the major characters comes with a handful of corn, symbolic to the unnatural way of their living. However, as the story proceeds, we are clear that the family members are brawling for the land and property; one of the reasons for the familial breakdown and chaos.

As such, Shepard's *Buried Child* is the story of people, who have fallen from moral grounds and the deteriorating age old familial norms and ethics. Besides, Shepard depicts the face of America where a family and a society are in an attempt of surpassing each other for wealth and flesh. Finally, the play ends with an open ending, giving voices to all the possible visions, to which the society was going towards; a perfect example of heteroglossic perspectives.

Works cited

- Abrams, M. H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 7th ed. USA: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1993.
- Adams, Hazard. ed. *Critical Theory since Plato*. Rev. Fort Worth: HBJC, 1992.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel*. Oxford: OUP, 1972.
- ___. *Discourses in the Novel*. Oxford. Oxford Universal Press, 1971.
- ___. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Oxford, Oxford Universal Press, 1968.
- Burgess, Ernest W., and Paul Wallin. *Engagement and Marriage*. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1953.
- Hooks, Bell. *Postmodern Tendency*. New York: Routledge, 1992.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Politics of Postmodernism*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Jacobus, Lee A. Ed. *The Bedford Introduction to Drama*. 2nd ed. Boston: Bedford Books, 1993.
- Julian, Wolfreys. *Introducing Literary Theories: A Guide and Glossary*. Edinburg. Edinburg University Press, 2001.
- Shepard, Sam. *Buried Child*. *The Bedford Introduction of Drama*. Ed. Lee. Boston, Bedford Books, 1993.
- Williams, Robin M. Jr. *American Society*. New York, Alfred, 1956.

- J Dodge - in his seventies
- J Halie - Dodge's wife; mid-sixties
- J Tilden - Their oldest son
- J Bradley - Their next-oldest son, an amputee
- J Vince - Tilden's son
- J Shelley - Vince's girlfriend
- J Father Dewis - a Protestant Minister
- J The character of Ansel; he is the son which Halie idolizes as an all American Hero, yet he died under suspicious circumstances in a motel room. Halie fantasises about his potential to be a Hero, to be an all American star basket-ball player, reflecting the American hope in the youth. Yet his death and subsequent denouncement reflects the disappointment and disillusionment which many people experienced when they realised the actuality of the American circumstance.
- J The two sons (Tilden and Bradly) both failed in their parents expectation; they were expected to take over the farm or at least care for the parents in their old age, thus fulfilling the American Mythology of the next generation taking over from the last. However both sons are handicapped – Tilden emotionally and Bradly physically. They are unable to care for their parents and thus unable to carry out the American Dream
- J The failure of the farm and the Family as whole. In failing to make the farm successful (Dodge has not planted anything for a number of years) Dodge has failed to fulfil his American Dream. He thus sits and decays in the living room, manifesting his disappointment and disillusionment through his physical immobility.

- J When Shelly arrives she outlines what the ideal American farm house should be, the reality which greets her is very different. This reflects the disparity between reality and the fantasy, embodied in the American Dream, of American life.

1970s economic slowdown

- J The house itself is run down reflecting the poverty of American Farms
- J Nothing has been planted in the fields.

Breakdown of traditional family structures and values:

- J Dodge the ineffectual, patriarch is meant to be the bread-winner and ethical guardian of the family. Instead he takes on the role of a sardonic alcoholic who is bullied by his wife and children, and furthermore disempowered through their actions. His character reflects the failed patriarchs in America who have failed to create the family environments idealised in the American Dream
- J The act of incest and the resultant murder are indexical of a breakdown in the ethical rigidity which characterises the typical American family
- J The character of Father Dewis, adulterous and unauthoritative he fails to fulfil the role of moral guardian assigned to him by society and thus reflects the breakdown of morality and ethics within America.

Character Summaries

Dodge:

- J Aging dysfunctional patriarch of the family
- J Is an alcoholic
- J Is dying
- J Has been emasculated by his son and the infertility of his fields
- J Is ashamed of Halie's conceiving the child and is ashamed of killing it.
- J Sits and watches television and drinks

Tilden:

-) Lost son, he has no purpose, no direction in his life
-) Had sex with his mother
-) Is confused/ashamed/embarrassed about the child and its death
-) Is bullied by the other characters
-) Brings into house crops from the field in the backyard

Bradley:

-) Aggressive brother
-) Lost his leg in a chainsaw accident
-) Is emasculated by the removal of his leg

Halie:

-) The wife and mother in the family
-) Nags Dodge
-) Has sex with her son and gives birth to her grandson/son
-) Abandons the family to socialize with Dewis and revel in past
-) Hero worships the images of her lost son

Vince:

-) Tilden's son
-) Reclaims possession of the house
-) No one recognises him when he arrives

Summary

Buried Child, by Sam Shepard speaks to us about the impact of family secrets. A family in general is bonded by bloodlines. Yet relationships within the unit can be disturbed if a dark secret is held. The death of child is a tragedy all together, but when a member of the unit murders a child, the family is bound to fall apart. The members in this family, (Dodge, Halie,

their sons Tilden and Bradley) fell apart because they tried to forget what happened. Dodge thought that if no one spoke about it then it would be forgotten. The fact is that nobody forgot, not even Halie. Oh, they can hold on to the secret and let it fester inside, but it doesn't just go away. Secrets are like a cancer. It grows and spreads through your body, eventually killing you.

In the beginning of Act I, Shepard introduces us to a typical American family who seems fairly enough wholesome, bu

...

He insists that Halie has forgotten all about it and so should everyone else. This metaphor also plays throughout the corn scenes. At one point in the play it is mentioned that Bradley, (Dodge's second oldest son) made an attempt to get the truth out of Dodge, but to no avail.

Although Tilden is picking corn from out-back, they refuse to see that there is life back there is something growing in deed. The relationship between Halie and Dodge is pretty much dead. In the opening act we see Halie as a potentially, nurturing wife. After reading this play I felt the impact of Tilden's words to his father, when he asked him about dying. Halie has to yell from the upstairs to Dodge who is downstairs sitting on the couch. Doesn't it all seem wholesome? Well it would, except that Shepard places Halie and Dodge at such physical distance. Tilden asks him, "You don't wanna die do you?" Tilden believes that if you don't talk you die. You see secrets make people alienate themselves from others.

What's it like down there? Again this shows the distance between Halie and Dodge.

During a conversation between Dodge and Tilden, Tilden encourages his father to talk.