

**Tribhuvan University**

***Nostramo* as a Dialogic Text**

**A Thesis Submitted to the Central Department of English  
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of  
Master of Arts in English**

**By**

**Prem Prasad Dhital**

**Central Department of English**

**Kirtipur, Kathmandu**

**November, 2006**

**2006**

**- Prem Prasad Dhital**

***Nostramo* as a Dialogic Text**

**Tribhuvan University**

**Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**

This thesis entitled "*Nostramo* as a Dialogic Text" submitted to the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University, by Mr. Prem Prasad Dhital has been approved by the undersigned members of the Research Committee.

Members of the Research Committee

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Internal Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
External Examiner

\_\_\_\_\_  
Head  
Central Department of English

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## **Acknowledgements**

The present study would not have been completed without the scholarly supervision and encouragement of my respected teacher Mr. Hem Sharma Paudel, Lecturer at the Central Department of English, Tribhuvan University. He provided scholarly guidance, going through the script and correcting my innumerable mistakes. His invaluable supervision, suggestions and constructive comments encouraged and supported me to complete my research task.

Likewise, I would like to extend my profound gratitude to my respected teacher Prof. Chandra Prakash Sharma, Head of the Central Department of English, for granting me an opportunity to carry out this research on the subject of my interest. I am equally thankful to my respected teachers Dr. Krishna Chandra Sharma and Nagendra Prasad Bhattarai for providing me invaluable suggestions.

My heartfelt thanks go to my friends Nagendra Khanal, Narayan Lamsal, Pramod Dhital, Devraj Neupane and other friends for their inspiration and help in the course of preparing this thesis.

At last, I would like to thank Deepak Basnet of Resunga Computer Service, Kirtipur.

November, 2006

Prem Prasad Dhital

Kirtipur, Kathmandu

## **Abstract**

The representation of social stratification, social heteroglossia, social diversity, and social conflict through the genuine dialogic interactions makes *Nostromo* a dialogic novel. The narrative flexibility, thematic diversity, disrupted chronology, unfinalized plot, and the dialogic interactions between and among the multiple autonomous voices in a tension-filled environment amply show the dialogic structure of the novel.

## Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
<b>I. CONRAD'S <i>NOSTROMO</i>: AN INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1-8</b>
<b>II. DIALOGIC STUDY: A THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTION</b>	<b>9-29</b>
General Background	9
Idea of Dialogics	10
Heteroglossia	14
Polyphony	16
Novel and Language	20
Prosaics and Unfinalizability	23
Carnival	25
Chronotope	28
<b>III. SINGLE TEXT MULTIPLE CENTERS</b>	<b>30-65</b>
Heteroglossia and Dialogics in the Novel	30
Polyphonic Structure of the Novel	56
<b>IV. <i>NOSTROMO</i> AS A DIALOGIZED TEXT</b>	<b>66-69</b>
<b>Works Cited</b>	<b>70-71</b>

## I. CONRAD'S *NOSTROMO*: AN INTRODUCTION

This research primarily focuses on the dialogic aspects of Joseph Conrad's *Nostromo*. It tries to explore how Conrad has subverted the single authority of any monologic discourse by representing social diversity, social heteroglossia and social stratification through the dialogic interactions. The research further analyses the narrative flexibility, perspectival variations and the disrupted chronology of the plot which make a decentralized and unfinalized structure of the novel. The complex structure of the novel tries to correspond the complexity and diversity of social reality.

The monologic discourses like epic and poetry cannot capture the real nature of social reality because they are composed from a single perspective of the author and the authorial voice presents itself as the ultimate semantic authority. Poetry is the expression of author's single voice, his view, emotion and feeling. Similarly, epic is absolute, closed and complete genre. They follow rules and system. Bakhtin says, "[. . .] an absolute epic distance separates epic world from contemporary reality" (*Epic and Novel* 843). The epic does not capture the current reality but it is far away from current reality. Only the national heroes, gods or demi-gods can be the chief character of epic, not the ordinary man.

But Bakhtin says novel is a dialogic discourse which breaks the monologic tradition of finalization, systematization and unitaryness. It is open-ended, free and democratic discourse where multiplicity, plurality and heterogeneity flourish to cultivate the diverse colors of the social reality. The language of the novel "is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth" (*Discourse* 272). Therefore, novel is not distanced from the current reality but it can best represent the social reality.

The authorial voice is not overpowering and subordinating other voices in the dialogic novel. But it involves in the dialogic interaction as the one of the many voices. A dialogic work embodies dialogic sense of truth by allowing the consciousnesses of characters to be truly "someone else's consciousnesses" (*Problems* 57). Conrad's *Nostramo* subverts the tradition of monologic discourse and immensely displays the dialogic features and this subversion of the monologic discourse is the focus of this analysis.

Joseph Conrad was born in 1857 in Poland and became British citizen in 1886. Conrad's problematic life, rich experiences in the sea and wide social experiences of different parts of the world work as the influential factors to present heterogeneity in his works. He died in 1924 in England. His masterpieces like *The Nigger of the Narcissus* (1897), *Lord Jim* (1900), *Heart of Darkness* (1899), *Nostramo* (1904), *The Secret Agent* (1907), and *Under Western Eyes* (1911) make him one of the most famous novelists of 20<sup>th</sup> century. Conrad explores different aspects of human life and society like; colonialism, moral corruption, isolation, fear of unknown, dark and hostile nature, material obsession, and existing evil within a man and in the society in his novels. Self-betrayal or betrayal of the community to which one belongs and its terrible consequences are an ever-recurring theme in Conrad's books.

*Nostramo* presents politically, economically and morally fluctuating condition of an imaginary Latin American country, Costaguana. The economic imperialism of England and America, economic exploitation, social injustice, and the loyal service of existing government to the foreign interests generate political conflicts which results in murder, violence, loot and extreme political unrest in Costaguana. At the center of every action and ideology, there is the San Tome Silver Mine. The evil influence of

the mine creates moral corruption and extreme sense of material obsession in the characters.

Conrad presents extremely heterogeneous society in *Nostramo* where people from different countries like America, Spain, Italy, England and France, and the different races like whites, Negroes, Jew, Indians and Hidalgos come together. Their different interests, ideologies and desires get open stage to conflict and contest in the novel. *Nostramo* is not only the public drama of socio-political, socio-economic and socio-cultural conflict but also the product of Conradian innovative narrative technique. In the introduction of the novel; it is clearly mentioned:

His use of a narrator who comments on the action in the manner of a Greek chorus, his shift of time-sequence, his impressionistic manner of communicating actions, images and emotions through each character's individual consciousness, and his employment of a powerful irony of tone are particularly striking in *Nostramo*. (Watt 1)

Highly flexible third-person narrative, disrupted chronology, shifting focuses, decentralized and unfinalized plot are some of the striking features of its narrative techniques. Juxtaposition, contrast and irony are immensely used.

Conrad's *Nostramo* gets numerous critical responses since its publication. Different critics analyze *Nostramo* from different perspectives and angles. Because of its diversity in theme and style, the focus of criticisms is also different in different dimensions of the novel. Naturalistic, Marxist, postcolonial, humanistic, stylistic, postmodern and dialogic are some of the major critical perspectives from which *Nostramo* is interpreted and analysed. All available criticisms are not possible to present in this small project of research. Some of the major critical views are discussed here.



Conrad in his "Author's note" says that he has tried to capture the different social aspects and social stratification in the broad canvas of the novel. The world of the novel is rooted in the history and social milieu, as he says:

As to their own histories I have tried to set them down, Aristocracy and people, men and women, Latin and Anglo-saxon, bandit and politician with as cool a hand as was possible in the heat and clash of my own conflicting emotions. And after all this is also the story of their conflicts. (3)

Many critics focus on the political issues of the novel. One of them is Arnold Kettle who says, "The world of *Nostramo* is the world of modern imperialism, of war and violence and concentration camps of displaced persons and mass neurosis, all on a scale and of a kind radically different from previous human experience" (59).

He explores the issues like imperialism, war and violence, displacement and the terrific condition of human life in the novel. Another prominent critic F.R. Leavis shows the conflict between moral idealism and "material corruption" which ultimately invites tragedy in the novel. As he enunciates:

*Nostramo* has a main political, or public, theme, the relation between moral idealism and 'material interests'. [. . .] This public theme is presented in terms of a number of personal histories or, it might be said private themes each having a specific representative moral significance. (211)

Similarly, another critic Eloise Knapp Hay also focuses on the political issues of the novel. As she says, "*Nostramo* is the first to introduce the other, equally "modern" topic of "war and peace", which for Conrad turns out the mean revolution and its consequences in a post-colonial world" (81). Externally Costaguana is free

from colonial domination, but internally it is still controlled by the imperial power and it is still suffering from economic exploitation and cultural domination. David Diaches shows the relation between individual and society in *Nostramo*. He says, "society is necessary, yet inevitably corrupting. This is a theme which Conrad explores again and again. It is the theme of *Nostramo*" (1156). He analyses one of the themes of *Nostramo* that is the inevitable influence of social corruption into individuals. Edward Said explores some implied connections between Conrad's autobiography and the portrayal of characters in the novel. He says, "Decoud is Conrad's portrayal of himself as the confused intellectual for whom the ground he walks on is subject to doubt, [. . .]" (109).

Another prominent American Marxist critic Frederic Jameson's approach to *Nostramo* is materialist concerned with historical and political change which is not primarily ruled by ideas and beliefs; rather it is seen in the contradiction and tensions, the splitting and faultlines, within a text. He tries to observe implicit political consciousness inside the text. He writes:

The resonance of his book springs from a kind of unplanned harmony between this textual dynamic and its specific historical content: the emergence of capitalism as just such as always-already-begun dynamic, as the supreme and privileged mystery of a synchronic system which once in place, discredits the attempts of 'linear' history or the habits of the diachronic mind to conceive of its beginnings. (125)

Further, another critic Royal Russel observes *Nostramo* from naturalistic point of view in which he tries to explore the futile existence of the characters in the vast and hostile atmosphere. He explicates Conrad's ironic vision of human life in *Nostramo* where temporality and vulnerability of human life is apparently prone to

corruption and destruction in the vast eternity of the universe. As he enunciates, "While reading novel, we are continually made conscious of such a perspective which measures the temporality of man's existence from the vantage point of the eternity of things. [. . .] a view permeated by 'The crushing, paralysing sense of human littleness'" (132).

Many critics anchor their critical views on the narrative structure of the novel. Conradian techniques and styles in *Nostramo* is highly appreciated. The complex narrative structure and its inextricable relationship with the themes secure the position of *Nostramo* as a unique novel. In this context, Jacob Lothe says:

Conrad's fictional content is inextricable from narrative presentation. [. . .] It is to stress that the rhetorical persuasiveness, ideological tension, dramatic intensity, and continuing interest and relevance of Conrad's fictional vision depend upon and are indeed generated and shaped by diverse and original narrative techniques. (160)

Lothe shows the inextricable combination between narrative flexibility and thematic diversity. But for Arnold Kettle, "*Nostramo* is from technical point of view an amazing *tour de force*" (71).

Conrad makes *Nostramo* a free, unbounded and open ended text. The varieties of perspectives inside the text are not fixed rather they are shifting from one thing to another. *Nostramo* is the composite of such varieties of techniques and styles. As C.B. Cox enunciates:

[. . .] our visual perspectives rapidly changes, and this reflects shifting attitudes to man, society and nature. The sequence is 'fluid' in that we are not allowed to settle for any one point of view. Positive actions colorful people, warm feelings, are constantly framed in a vision,

which seems to negate their existence; the narrative creates different and opposing areas of value, but offers no final reconciliation. (154)

Different critics observers *Nostramo* form different angles and corners.

Primarily most of the critics focus on the political issues of the novel. Only very few critics pay attention in its dialogic aspects. One of them is Daphna Erdinast – Vulcan who says, "I would suggest that Conrad's ambivalent attitude to his protagonist reflects the dialogic tension between myth and history – a tension which lies at the very core of the novel and determines its complex dynamics" (129). She shows dialogic tension between myth and history as the core determiner of its complex dynamics. She further says:

It is an encapsulation of the dialogic dynamics in the novel, the conflict between two incompatible modes of perception. The deliberate problematization of the relationship between the author's biography and his fiction is closely related to the theme of this extremely difficult novel with its penetrating and painful treatment of the relationship between history and myth. (130)

Vulcan's observation of the dialogic tension between myth and history does not cover other genuine dialogic aspects of the novel. The novel is extremely rich in its thematic diversity, social heteroglossia, narrative structure and internal dynamism. The researcher has taken Bakhtin's dialogic theory as the basic tool to analyse the different dialogic aspects of this novel.

The present research work has been divided into four chapters. The first chapter presents a short explanation of the hypothesis, a brief introduction of the author and the novel, some critical views on *Nostramo*, and an outline of the whole research work.

The second chapter presents the brief explanation of theoretical modality that is going to be applied in this research. It explains general background of the dialogic theory and brief autobiography of Mikhail Bakhtin. This chapters briefly explains the major concepts of Bakhtin's dialogic theory like idea of dialogic, heteroglossia, polyphony, novel and language, prosaic and unfinalizability, carnival and chronotope.

In the third chapter, the text is analysed on the basis of theoretical modality of second chapter. Abstracts are quoted as evidences to prove the hypothesis. There are two parts: first part analyses the issues of heteroglossia, social diversity, social stratification and dialogic interactions in the text, and the second part analyses the polyphonic structure of the novel.

The fourth chapter is the conclusion of this whole research work. On the basis of the textual analysis of chapter three, it concludes that Conrad's *Nostramo* genuinely represents complex and diverse social reality, social heteroglossia, social stratification and multi-langaugedness through the dialogic interactions in its polyphonic structure which make the novel a dialogic text.

## II. DIALOGIC STUDY: A THEORETICAL CONSTRUCTION

### General Background

Mikhail Mikhailovich Bakhtin, a prominent 20<sup>th</sup> century genre critic, was born in Orel, South Moscow, in 1895. He studied the classics and Philology. His writing career started to flourish from 1920s and continued until his death in 1995. Because of his religious views, he was sentenced to internal exile and forced to work as a clerk on the Siberian border by the communist government of The Soviet Union in 1929. Although he published his major works in the 1920s and 1930s but he remained largely unknown outside of the Soviet Union until translations in the 1970s brought him to world attention.

Bakhtin is a theorist of genre, particularly of novel. In his major works, *Rabelais and His World*, *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* and *The Dialogic Imagination*, he introduces different and distinctive features of novel. He compares and contrasts novel with poetry. For him, novel is unique, free and democratic genre whereas poetry is closed, unitary and authoritarian.

Bakhtin says novel is the dialogic discourse which can best represent the society. It can capture the social diversity, social stratification and social conflict in more realistic way. But poetry is monologic discourse which is the expression of author's single voice, his view, emotion and feeling. But in the novel, authorial voice is one of the many voices. Bakhtin says epic is absolute, closed and complete genre. He says, "[. . .] an absolute epic distance separates epic world form contemporary reality| (*Epic and Novel* 843). The epic does not capture the current reality but always presents "firsts" and 'bests'. Only the national heros, gods, demi-gods can be the chief character of epic, not the ordinary man. Thus, Bakhtin says epic is "walled off" from life. So, in a work of monologic discourse," [. . .] genuine interaction of consciousness

is impossible, and thus genuine dialogic is impossible as well" (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 81). Thus, novel can touch life, reality and society.

According to Bakhtin, the novel is more oriented toward the social/historical form of rhetoric than toward the particular artistic or aesthetic ideas present at any particular moment while poetry focuses primarily on aesthetic concerns and only secondarily on the other aspects of social existence. We find multiple voices, diversities, liberty and heteroglossia in the novelistic discourse. There is dialogue or interaction between and among the characters.

Bakhtin explicitly sets his theory against Aristotle's *Poetics*, which proposes that primary component of narrative form is a plot and that should evolve coherently from its beginning to an end in which all complications are resolved. But Bakhtin elevates discourse into the primary component of narrative works; and he describes discourse as a mixture of voices, social attitude and values that are not only opposed, but irreconcilable, with the result that the work remains unresolved and open-ended.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin contrasts monologic novel of Leo Tolstoy and dialogic novel of Dostoevsky. In Tolstoy's novel, authoritative voice dominates other voices of the characters. But Dostoevsky's novels contain a plurality of "unmerged consciousness", a mixture of "valid voices" which are not completely subordinated to authorial intentions. The character's voice is equally as important and "fully weighted" as the author's own. His characters are endowed with free speech and liberty. Bakhtin explores the carnivalesque features in Dostoevsky's novel which suggests laughter, celebration and the breaking down of hierarchy.

### **Idea of Dialogics**

Before entering into the concept of dialogics, it is pertinent here to discuss about dialectics. Bakhtin's concept dialogic is different from the dialectic concept of

Marx and Hegel. Hegel says there is always conflict between two ideas. The dialectical relationship between two opposing ideas generates another new idea. Antithesis is inevitable to the thesis. As the result of the conflict between thesis and antithesis, there comes the third idea which Hegel calls synthesis. In Hegelian spiritual dialecticism, idea precedes action or spirit precedes matter. Another philosopher Karl Marx says there is always conflict between two forces in the society. He sees class struggle in the society i.e. the conflict between "haves" and "haves not". The conflict is for matter or property. This is what Marx calls "dialectical materialism" in which matter is primary and idea is secondary. Bakhtin says Hegel and Marx are the great intellectual heroes of monologic thoughts and they are the great synthesizers who attempted to give a shape to apparently different propositions into a coherent, all-encompassing system.

Bakhtin's dialogic theory primarily focuses on the concept of dialogue on the notion that any form of language whether speech or writing is always a form of dialogue. In this context, it is pertinent here to quote Lynne Pearce, "In essence, all thought became, for Bakhtin, a matter of 'dialogue' and 'difference': dialogue requires the pre-existence of difference which are connected by an act of communication to generate new ideas and positions" (227). Pearce here clarifies that dialogue is made in difference which is the primary condition and the process of communication or interaction connects that differences to foster new ideas. Dialogue consists of three elements: a speaker, a listener and relation between the two. Thus, what language says is always the product of dialogic interaction between two or more people.

Dialogue is conscious effort to address someone and the addressor expects to get some response. All languages have the inherent "addressivity" for Bakhtin, and all languages are addressed to someone. "Dialogics (cf 'dialogue', 'speaking across')



refers to inherent 'addressivity' of all language, that is, all language is addressed to someone, never uttered without consciousness of a relationship between the speaker and addressee" (*Handbook of Critical Approaches* 349).

So, dialogism is an orientation toward the interaction between the various languages of the speaker and the languages of the listener. All the speech is thus oriented toward what Bakhtin calls the "conceptual horizon" of listener, this horizon is comprised of various social languages of a listener. One of the most striking and memorable of Bakhtin's own metaphor for the operation of dialogism is that of a "bridge"; this bridge may be seen to connect not only the speaker and his or her interlocutor, but also individual words of speech which pass between them and become a "shared territory".

Bakhtin explores dialogics even at the level of the individual word not only at the level of whole utterance:

Dialogic relationships are possible not only among whole (relatively whole) utterances; a dialogic approach is possible toward any signifying part of an utterance, even toward an individual word, if that word is perceived not as impersonal word of language but as a sign of someone else's semantic position. (qtd. in *Pearce* 227)

According to Bakhtin dialogue is not self-consuming artifact and it is not also dialectic because dialectic can be contained within a single consciousness, and encompasses contradictions in a single, monologic view. But dialogic encompasses different cultures, language and consciousness freely interacting with each other. As Bakhtin says:

Take a dialogue and remove the voices (the partitioning voices), remove the intonation (emotional and individualizing ones), carve out

abstract concept and judgement form living words and responses, cram everything into one abstract consciousness and that's how you get dialectics. (*Epic and Novel* 149)

For Bakhtin, dialectics is abstract, monologic, bounded and finalized notion. It is not live and open process. So, dialectics abstracts the dialogic from dialogue. It finalizes and systematizes dialogue. But in dialogic, everything is unfinalized, and in the process of making. Bakhtin says, "In dialectics, we have a thought that, like a fish in an aquarium, knocks against the bottom and the sides and cannot swim further or deeper" (*Epic and Novel* 162). From these lines it is clear that dialectics is limited within its own periphery like a fish in an aquarium.

Bakhtin says novel is a dialogic discourse which breaks the monologic tradition of finalization, systematization and unitaryness. It is open-ended, free and democratic discourse where multiplicity, plurality and heterogeneity flourish to cultivate the diverse colors of social reality.

Bakhtin contrasts the notion of dialogic with the notion of monologic. Monologic is the communication within oneself where a speaker speaks with himself. According to Bakhtin, in monologic text, all aspects of plot, dialogue, and characterization are subordinated to the monologic will of the author. Characters are static and predetermined, and they lack any vestige of autonomous creativity and free will. Their work is to function as the mouth piece for the transmission of the author's own ideological view point. Again, Bakhtin says free untrammelled dialogue is therefore subordinated to the dictates of a monolithic objectified world which ultimately controlled by a unitary, transcendental authorial consciousness. As he says, "[. . .] introduced in such concepts as 'system of language', 'monologic utterance', 'the speaking individuum', various differing nuances of meaning, but their basic content

remains unchanged" (*Discourse in the Novel* 35-6). These lines of Bakhtin clarify the nature of monologic discourse which is rooted on rules, system, individuality and unchangibility.

Bakhtin takes human life as an on going process and unfinalized dialogue. As he says, "The single adequate form for verbally expressing authentic human life is open-ended dialogue. Life by its very nature is dialogic. To live means to ask questions, to heed, to respond, to agree and so forth. In this dialogue a person participates wholly and through out his life [. . .]" (*Toward a Reworking of Dostoevsky Book* 293). The whole verbal behaviour of human being is dialogic which is the main feature of daily existence.

According to Bakhtin truth comes to us only dialogically. He is not in favour of "ready-made-truth". Thus, he writes: "Truth is not born nor it is to be found inside the head of an individual, it is born between people collectively searching for truth, in the process of their dialogic interaction (*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* 110). For him, the source of truth is dialogic interaction. Dostoevsky's novels expose the dialogic sense of truth far better than the other writers for Bakhtin.

### **Heteroglossia**

Heteroglossia is Bakhtin's other important concept of language which literally means "a mixture of tongues" but he invoked the term to account for the social diversity of speech types. Language, for Bakhtin, is different from structuralist and formalist notion of it. Language is not abstract phenomenon rather it represents social stratification and verbal-ideological world. Bakhtin says even literary language is stratified according to genre, period and so on. As he says:

The internal stratification of a single national language into social dialects, group manners, professional jargons, generic languages,

languages of generations and age groups, languages of trends, languages of authorities, languages of circles and passing fashions languages of socio-political days, even hours – this inner stratification of every language at any given moment of its historical existence is a necessary precondition of the novelistic genre. (*Discourse in the Novel* 62-3)

A single national language is stratified into different forms and that is used differently at different times and different social context. Human society is full of diversity and difference. That diversity is reflected in the language. Even a single person's language is heteroglossic according to the time and situation in which s/he uses. A person's conversation with his boss, wife, children, friend and father comprises different sorts of stratification of language. So, different context may take different language.

For Bakhtin, novel is the colorful mixture of such different voices, multiple languages, and plural consciousnesses. He says:

The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even a diversity of language) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized [. . .]. 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 the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. (*The Dialogic Imagination* 262-3)

Bakhtin argues that themes are "orchestrated" in the novel by means of this stratification of the national language. That means heteroglossia presents the thematic diversity in the novel. Again he writes:

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; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (*The Dialogic* 263)

Therefore, heteroglossia as the social diversity of speech types brings so many things together like salad dish in the novel. Through the speeches of the characters, narrator and authorial speech, heteroglossia enters into the novel. Bakhtin further says, "the diversity of voices and heteroglossia enter the novel and organize themselves within it into structured artistic system" (*Discourse* 46). So, the novel is the artistic system in multiety-in-unity. There is no prescribed form and structure of novel but its internal composition shapes it in an artistic structure.

### **Polyphony**

Polyphony is another key concept of Bakhtin's critical theory. Polyphony literally means "many voices" but it has broader significance in his theory. For him, the dialogic interaction between free and autonomous multiple voices creates polyphonic discourse.

For Bakhtin, novel is not monologic discourse but dialogic discourse. In the monologic discourse single voice, single perspective and single consciousness are at work inside the limited, unitary system but multiple perspectives, multiple consciousnesses and multiple voices are at work in the free, democratic and unfinished atmosphere in the dialogic discourse. As Lynne Pearce says: "[. . .] his emphasis on the 'freedom' and 'autonomy' of the voices constituting an authentic polyphonic text" (225). Polyphony advocates freedom and autonomy of multiple voices, not the dominance and control of single authorized voice. It is contextual to

mention Guerin here, "Instead of subordinating the voices of all characters to an overriding authorial voice, a writer such as Dostoevsky creates a polyphonic discourse in which the authors voice is only one among many and the characters are allowed free speech" (350).

All characters are endowed with free speech and their voices are not subordinated. They are as equally important as authorial voice. Authorial voice is only one of the many voices. Bakhtin's definition of modern polyphonic novel is made up of plurality of voices that avoids reduction to a single perspective. Dialogues are extremely powerful in polyphonic novel.

While interpreting Bakhtin two closely related criterias are inevitable of polyphony: a dialogic sense of truth and a special position of author necessary for visualizing and conveying that sense of truth. Since Bakhtin regards the polyphonic work as "form-shaping ideology", these two factors are the essentials to such work. Bakhtin further extends that 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. Bakhtin often speaks to the participants of a dialogic conception of truth as "voice idea". When such voice ideas come to interact, they may produce a dialogue changing both of them giving rise to new insight and new dialogues. In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, he observes:

It is quite possible to imagine in and postulate a unified truth that requires a plurality of consciousnesses, one that in principle cannot be fitted within the bounds of single consciousness, one that is [. . .] by its nature full event potential and it born at a point of contact among various consciousnesses. 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 fact, the author, in monologic works retains full control over the work and never surrenders the right to mediate between characters and readers. In such works, only the author, as the ultimate semantic authority, retains the power to express a truth directly. The truth that the works carries becomes the truth of his or her, and all other truths are mere appendage. By contrast, in polyphonic works the author ceases to exercise monologic control. Polyphony demands a work in which several consciousnesses 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 7*).

Similarly, the direct power, which in monologic work belongs to the author alone, belongs to several voices in a polyphonic work. By renouncing his monologic 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" (*Problems 7*).

Further explaining his notion of polyphony, 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 own ideology may receive expression in the work. But what is new in such work is that others may and do contest the author's ideology on equal ground. And it is the author himself who sets the stage for these contests. The polyphonic author necessarily plays two roles in the works: 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 novel do display this phenomenon profoundly. As he outlines:

A plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses, a genuine polyphony of fully valid voices in fact the chief characteristics of Dostoevsky's novels. What unfolds in his works is not a multitude of characters and fates in a single objective world, illuminates by a single authorial consciousness, rather a plurality of consciousness, with equal rights and each with its own world, combine but are not merged in the unity of event. (*Problems* 6-7)

Though the characters in polyphonic work have been created by the author, but once they come into existence, they will escape his control and prevent him from knowing as advance how they will answer him. Therefore, Bakhtin characterizes polyphonic novel having plurality of independent and emerged voices and consciousnesses that are free into play.

Bakhtin uses a very good analogy to characterize the monologic world as "Ptolemaic": the earth, representing the author's consciousness, is in the center around which all other consciousnesses revolve. The polyphonic world, as on the other side, is "Copernican": as the earth is but one of many planets, the author's is but one of many consciousnesses.

Another crucial point of Bakhtin is that plot of the polyphonic novel is no longer the sequence that characters are ordained to follow, but the result of what they happen to say or do. Similarly, the dialogues that compose the novel – that make the entire novel one "great dialogue" – are not shaped beforehand, not planned in the usual sense. Rather they take place "right now, that is in the real present in the creative process" (*Problems* 63). Like the characters, the work remains unfinalizable



throughout its creation. Similarly, plot is also not the coherent sequence of events that all complications are resolved at the end as Aristotle says. In this context, one of the critics Guerin says, "Author may build indeterminacies to his or her polyphonic design, introduce multiple voices, render ideas intersubjective and leave novels seemingly unfinished – all to leave free characters" (352).

From the above discussion we can point out that polyphonic novel does not have special pre-planned and pre-determined design of plot. The writer does not give us finalized plot, but "a live event, played out at the point of dialogic meeting between two or several consciousnesses" (*Problems* 88). Therefore, the polyphonic novel is a "great dialogue" that is still in the process of making.

### **Novel and Language**

Bakhtin enunciates that novel is primarily dialogic, essentially open and indeterminate in meaning. It is incomplete, unformed and still developing which he calls "the genre of becoming". Novelistic word is "a world – in the making", it is itself in the process of becoming what it is.

Bakhtin views that novel is the genre which can display dialogic conception of truth more vehemently than any other genre. He says novel is the supreme achievement in the history of literary form. Bakhtin speaks repeatedly of the novel as the form that best embodies 'prosaic intelligence', 'prosaic vision' and 'prosaic wisdom' (*Discourse* 404).

The novel as a dialogic discourse captures two aspects of language in their interaction and combination: dialogicity and heteroglossia. The novel takes the ways in which various languages of heteroglossia enter in the dialogue with each other. For Bakhtin, languages, like genres, are ways of conceptualizing the world in words. A language (of heteroglossia) is a complex set of beliefs. Each language of heteroglossia

has come out from vast array of social and psychological experiences. As he says, "On entering the novel heteroglossia is subject to an artistic reworking. The social and historical voices that populate language, all its words and forms which provide language with definite concrete sense, are organized in the novel into a structured stylistic system [. . .]" (*Discourse* 43).

For Bakhtin, "languages throw light on each other: one language can after all see itself only in the light of another language (*Epic and Novel* 843). There is the colorful gatherings of languages which interacts with each other and identify themselves in the relationship of each other in the novel.

By using very appropriate and wonderful metaphor of Galilean universe, Bakhtin distinguishes novel form the monologic discourse like poetry. He says the world of novel is no longer Ptolemaic but Galilean. Like the earth, the language has ceased to be at the center, and has become one of many planets. It seems that different languages understand the world differently, and that each must compete with others. As Bakhtin describes it, the novel is based on maximally intense Galilean linguistic consciousness:

The novel is the expression of a Galilean perception of language, one denies that the absolutism of a single unitary language – that is, it refuses to acknowledge its own language as the sole verbal and semantic center of the ideological world. [. . .] the novel begins by presuming a verbal and semantic decentering of ideological world [. . .]. (*Discourse* 366-67)

Bakhtin opposes the notion of absolutism and centrality of language and meaning. What he means to say is that no language enjoys an absolute privilege in the 'eyes of novel'. Each must be tested and retested with respect to other. Each language of

heteroglossia is allowed to view other languages, and each found its own image in the eyes of others. From the diverse perspectives and standpoints, the novel offers a vast plentitude of maximally rich images of language.

On the other hand, poetry as a monologic discourse uses Ptolmaic linguistic consciousness which is unitary and centralized. As Bakhtin says:

At the time where major divisions of the poetic genres are developing under the influence of unifying, centralizing, centripetal forces of verbal-ideological life, the novel – and those artistic prose genres that gravitate toward it – was being historically shaped by the current of decentralizing, centrifugal forces. (*Discourse 37*).

Here, he discusses two forces that operate in the language: centripetal and centrifugal. Centripatal force tends to push things toward a central point; centrifugal force tends to push thing away from a central point and out in all directions. Bhaktin says that poetic language (Monologic) operates according to unifying, centralizing, centripetal forces whereas the language of the novel (dialogic) operates through the current of decentralizing, centrifugal forces.

The fundamental impulse of novel, therefore, is to dialogize heteroglossia as intensively as possible. Moreover, the creation of images of language is a form of sociological probing, an exploring of values and beliefs, and not mere play of forms. Bakhtin further explicates that "the image of a language is the image assumed by a set of social beliefs, the image of social ideologeme, that has been fused with its own discourse with own language" (*Discourse 357*).

Bakhtin further says that novelistic dialogism is essentially inexhaustible and reflects the infinite potential of social languages in dialogue. Heteroglossia, in sum, is exerted to make the discourse unfinalizable. Therefore, the real novelistic discourse

is fundamentally different from the "manifest dialogue" of plays. Thus the language of the novel "is the fleeting language of a day, of an epoch, a social group, a genre, a school and so forth" (*Discourse* 272).

Bakhtin, time and again, enunciates the fundamental difference between prose and poetry. Prosaics, according to him, regards novelistic discourse not as style but as style of styles, or more clearly, as the dialogization of styles. Novels are dedicated to the hybridization of the languages. By contrast, poetry regards style as a system. It focuses on tropes, poetic structures, and a host of rhetorical devices.

Therefore, the polyphonic novel is composed of various styles, speech patterns, and dialogues that interact dynamically as "heteroglossia", or many languaged discourse. As Bakhtin says "the novel as whole is a phenomenon multiform in style and veriform in speech and voice" (*The Dialogic* 261). Therefore, the novel is open, free and dynamic discourse which comprises diversity in unity.

### **Prosaics and Unfinalizability**

While interpreting Bakhtin's theory, "prosaics" and "unfinalizability" are unforgettable concepts. Bakhtin opposes "prosaics" to "poetics", the long established trend of "theory of literature". "Poetics" is the traditional term for understanding the "theory of literature". In the trend of "poetics", prose is always underestimated, and it is taken as less artistic and less literary genre.

According to Bakhtin, "prosaics" encompasses two related, but distinct concepts. First, it opposes to "poetics" and forms a theory of literature that privileges prose in general and the novel in particular. Prosaics in the second sense is far comprehensive than the theory of literature. It is a form of thinking that assumes the importance of everyday ordinary things.

Bakhtin further states that all the methods upto now by which prose is analysed are derived from "poetics", so they cannot reveal the "prosiness" of prose, and the "novelness" of novels. Moreover, everyday world is dead, automatized and uncreative for the formalists and traditionalists. What Bakhtin believes is that novels have special way of conceiving events and of understanding the interrelations of space, time, social milieu, characters and actions. For him, the everyday world is a sphere of constant activities, the source of all social change, creativity and the special area of novel.

Bakhtin further says that "prosaics" is always suspicious towards system. If one thinks prosaically one doubts that any aspects of culture could be organized systematically. Bakhtin believes that the chaotic nature of everyday life cannot be detained within rules, system or organization. In his view, the natural state of thing is a mess. In culture, mess is also normal. The cultural world, Bakhtin argues, bears both centripetal (or "official") and centrifugal (or "unofficial") forces. The former seeks to impose order on the heterogeneous and messy world; the latter, continually disrupts that order. Centrifugal forces register and respond to the most diverse events of daily life; so they are prosaic facts.

In fact, Bakhtin says that only "prosaic" instead of "poetics" can explore the "prosiness" of prose and "novelness" of novels. "Prosaics" only can understand "prosaic intelligence", "prosaic vision" and "prosaic wisdom" (*Discourse 404*). Everyday life, diverse events, social reality and unimaginative facts are some of the special areas of "prosaics". It opposes romantic fancy and imagination (i.e. building castle in the air).

Bakhtin puts the view that the world is not only a messy place, but is also an open place. The term "unfinalizability", therefore, emerges to claim this place in the

way of his conceptualization. It designates a complex of values central to his thinking: innovation, surprisingness, openness, potentiality, freedom, and creativity. As Bakhtin writes, "Nothing conclusive has yet taken place in the world, the ultimate world of the word and about the world has not yet been spoken, the world is open and free, everything is still in the future and will always be in the future" (*Problems* 166).

In his opinion, time is open and each moment has multiple possibilities. Nothing is predictable, determined and finalized but everything is in the process. He repeatedly rejects models of any cultural process that strives to investigate that process in terms of laws and system. Unfinalizability and real creativity cannot be located in a system of laws. It is an ongoing process. Moreover, history is open and unfinalizable. Unfinalizability and prosaic do shape Bakhtin's understanding of historicity.

For Bakhtin, only the novel could come close to representing 'open present' and real historicity: "Reality as we have it in the novel is only one of the many possible realities; it is not inevitable, not arbitrary, it bears within itself other possibilities" (*Epic and Novel* 854). This sense of time becomes intrinsic to the way novels describe moments in history and in the lives of characters.

For Bakhtin, the open social atmosphere and social activities are always in the process of continuation. Nothing is predictable but they are in the process of becoming. Therefore, the novel which represents the social realities and historicity, is also in the process of becoming, and inherently possesses the quality of unfinalizability.

### **Carnival**

Bakhtin provides another provocative notion, that is "carvinal" or "Carnavalesque", and it is described as a quality to be identified with the development

of the novel. Originally, a carvinal was a feast celebrated by Roman Catholics before the Lenten fast began. In a broad sense, a carnival is an occasion or season of merrymaking, feasting and entertainment. In the past, there were carnivals which were symbolic of the disruption and subversion of authority, a turning upside down of the hierarchy.

Bakhtin regards the spirit of carnival as a shaping effect of a polyphonic novel because novels for him are inspired by laughing truth, indebted to parodic genre. For him, carnival is associated with laughter, comedy, parody, travesty and the breaking down of hierarchy. In carnival laughter, Bakhtin sees an externally "unofficial" truth about the world –a truth that rejects the existence of established "official" truth. Bakhtin further says, "The principle of laughter destroy [. . .] all pretence of an extra temporal meaning and unconditional value of necessity. It frees human consciousness, thought, and imagination for new potentialities" (*Rabelais and His World* 49). Thus, carnival breaks all the restrictions and dismantles the hierarchy of power, and frees human consciousness and imagination for a new potentiality and creativity. Bakhtin further explains that it completely frees human consciousness from all oppressive social norms and even from the fear of death.

Bakhtin further extends the concept of carnival to explain the incorporation of carnival into social life and its formative effect on literature and language. It is the centrifugal element, which breaks the center and hierarchy, and creates equality in the society at the moment of its celebration. Bakhtin states, "The suspension of all hierarchical precedence during the carnival was of particular importance [. . .] all there considered equal during the carnival [. . .] Utopian ideal and the realistic merged in this carnival experience, unique of its kind" (*Rebelias* 40).

Bakhtin's concept of carnival incorporates element of what he calls "critical utopia". People are free to break, mock and satire the established norms, values, restriction and authority. They crown and decrown the mocking. This "crowning" and "decrowning" symbolize the disruption of power hierarchy and an effort to create equal society. This is the mixture of utopia and reality in the carnival.

Carival is a cultural celebration which has greater significance in life and literature "Gaijatra" is a good example of carnival in Nepalese culture. During this time, people are free to satire and mock whatever they want. No rules and regulation, norms and values create obstacles for them. "Unofficial" actives become dominant over "official" activities. As M.H Abrams says:

This literary mode parallels the flouting of authority and inversion of social hierarchies that, in many culture, are permitted in a season of carnival. It does so by introducing a mingling of voices from diverse social levels that are free to mock and subvert authority, to flout social norms by ribaldry, [. . .]. (63)

Bakhtin further extends that novel has carnival body but other genre do not. The novel can be touched, groped and entered. As carnival plays a vital role in the society to dismantle the hierarchy through culture, Bakhtin uses novel to do the same task in the field of literature. It is most of all an "anti-force", it is subversive. It disrupts the authority and introduces alternatives; it is a kind of liberating influence. This sort of feature of carnival has always positive indicators. "To degrade [Carnivalesstically]," Bakhtin states, "is to bury, to sow, and to kill simultaneously, in order to bring fourth something more and better" (*Rabelais* 21). This features of carival always seeks new, better and dynamic creative potential in the life and society.



Similarly, Bakhtin further extends the notion that carnival is a way of understanding the world and carnival sense of truth is an essential part of form-shaping ideology. He says carnival is not a mode of "abstract thinking" but "artistic thinking". It is not a set of proposition about the world but a way of viewing the world.

Bakhtin expresses that the root of modern polyphonic novel is the ancient folk culture, folklore, folk laughter and carnival. He traces the occurrence of the carnivalesque in ancient, medieval, and renaissance writers (especially in Rabelais). For Bakhtin, Dostoevsky's novel exhibits the real features of carnival and he writes out of a rich tradition of seriocomic, dialogic and satiric literature. Just as the public ritual of carnival inverts the values in order to question them, so the novel calls closed meanings into question.

### **Chronotope**

Chronotope literally means "time and space". Bakhtin describes chronotope in relation to how "time and space" is encoded in the novel. The basic concern of chronotope is to explore the intrinsic connectedness of temporal and spatial relationship that are artistically expressed in the literature. Bakhtin's interest is not in the way literature reflects the world; instead it is with the way in which literature organizes the world spatially and temporally.

Bakhtin further says chronotope is a way of understanding experience, nature of events, and actions. Actions are performed in a specific context, and "time and space" differ by the ways in which they take context, and the relation of actions and events to it. All contexts are shaped by the kind of time and space that operate within them. His significant point is that time and space vary in qualities, different social activities and their representations presume different kind of time and space.

Again, Bakhtin stresses that chronotopes are fair ground for the activities. They are "the ground essential for the [. . .] representability of event" (*Forms of Time and of the Chronotope* 250). Therefore, chronotope is the spatio-temporal situation in which events and action take place. Events have intrinsic relationship with that situation. So, chronotope is the place where "the knots of narrative are tied and untied. It can be said without qualification that to them [Chronotope] belongs to the meaning that shapes narrative" (250). For Bakhtin, meaning is not fixed and absolute but contextual. Meanings cannot be separated from socio-historical and socio-cultural situations.

Bakhtin further explains that literature offers a multiplicity of chronotopes. A great number of literary genres have been working for conceptualizing the "image of a person", the process of history, and the dynamics of society. Some genre do better job than others of "assimilating real historical time and space" and "actual historical person in such time and space" (*Forms of Time and of the Chronotope* 204). Among multiple genres novel is the best for Bakhtin. It presents the actual sense of chronotope. Therefore, it offers most profound image of people, actions, events, history and society.

### III. SINGLE TEXT MULTIPLE CENTERS

In the monologic discourses, everything like action, belief, ideology or meaning is centralized according to the monologic will of the author within its finalized and systematized structure. It is united and systematized by the "centripetal forces." The main character becomes the centrality of the focus as the authorial voice. We find the centrality of meaning, singular perspective and monologic sense of truth in it.

But Conrad's *Nostromo* displays multiple centers of ideologies and actions, beliefs and attitudes, interests and desires within its complex structure. There is not the single ideology, single perspective, and single character or voice dominating the whole story of the novel. But there are multiple characters with equal autonomy and freedom, multiple stories and actions, multiple ideologies and meanings. Bakhtin's concept of multiple meanings and multiple centers are different from the Derridian concept of "decentering" and multiplicity of meanings. For Derrida, there is no ultimate truth or no truth at all because language doesn't carry truth or meaning. Searching center or ultimate meaning is going into aporia. But Bakhtin does not mean that a text does not have any meaning or center, and he says there are multiple meanings and centers in the dialogic text. Different contexts give different meanings. Novel is free, open-ended, and democratic genre and it is structured by the "centrifugal forces" of the language. Conrad's *Nostromo* displays multiple centers of ideologies, actions, histories and multiple meanings through the dialogic interactions between and among the heterogeneous characters.

#### **Heteroglossia and Dialogics in the Novel**

Heteroglossia is the most essential feature of a dialogic novel. Heteroglossia – diversity of speech types – essentially covers the various aspects of social reality. The

concept of heteroglossia itself unfolds the area of heterogeneity and variety. Diversity of people as a must to enhance heteroglossia in the genuine dialogic interaction. Language, for Bakhtin, is not an abstract phenomenon rather it represents social stratification and verbal ideological world. There are always different ways of speaking and such different "languages" reflect the diversity of social experiences, conceptualizations and values. People of different professions have their own way of speaking, as do different generations, different classes, ethnic groups, age groups, and any number of other possible divisions. The most important thing to grasp here is that these different languages are not just a matter either of professional Jargon, or of varied form of the *langue* or system. Instead what constitutes these different languages is something that is itself extralinguistic: a specific way of conceptualizing, understanding and evaluating the world. A complex set of experiences, shared evaluation, ideas and attitudes "knit together" to produce a way of speaking. So, attitudes and views of the world identify languages. Bakhtin says languages embody the "specific point of view on world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values" (*Discourse in the Novel*, 291-92).

Heteroglossia is the inherent quality of a dialogic novel. Heteroglossia in the novel should not be considered simply as author's artistic exploitation of language what Russian formalist 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.

While interpreting Joseph Conrad's *Nostramo* from this theoretical background, diversity of speech types is to be analysed as the first and foremost quality of a dialogic novel. This chapter basically focuses on how Conrad has

dialogized the heteroglossia to correspond social diversity and social reality in the novel.

Conrad has presented the social, cultural, political and economic condition of whole Costaguana, an imaginary Latin American country in the broad canvas of the novel. During the time of colonial expansion, people of different races, cultures and countries come together and as a result the society gets its form in heterogeneity as in Costaguana. Conrad has created such a dialogic platform where people of different social sectors and professions come into interaction. we can analyze those heterogeneous people from various angles of social stratification.

Conrad has peopled *Nostramo* with numbers of characters from different socio-cultural, socio-political and socio-economic backgrounds. There are politicians, capitalists, workers, bureaucrats, aristocrats, military persons, sailors, priests, fighters, businessmen, engineers, doctors and other different professionally stratified people. From the point of age groups, there are young, adult, child, middle-aged and old people, both men and women. On the other hand, Conrad has presented racially different people like whites, Negroes, Jews, Indians, Hidalgos and other native races. The emigrants in Costaguana are also from different social backgrounds like French, American, British, Spanish and Italian. It is contextual to mention here what Conrad himself says about the characterization of *Nostramo* in "Author's Note", "As to their own histories I have set them down, Aristocracy and people, men and women, Latin and Anglo-Saxon, bandit and politician with as cool a hand as was possible [. . .]" (3). From this background, we can clearly point out that Conrad's characterization of such heterogeneous people in the novel bears real color of social diversity and multiplicity in its heart. F.R. Leavis' comment on *Nostramo* also supports this point. He says, "Sulaco, standing beneath snow-clad Higueroa, with its population of Indians, mixed-

bloods, Hidalgos, Italians and English engineers, is brought before us in irresistible reality, along with the picturesque and murderous public drama of South American state" (210).

Conrad has presented the whole country (Costaguana) and its liquid situation in the novel. Such broad social atmosphere and the characterization of numerous people with different thoughts and ideologies, and their conflicts reflect the real nature of social complexities. Conrad has dialogized the languages of laymen to president Dictator. The interactions of such discordant voices genuinely present different speech styles and manner.

His voice had penetrated to them, sounding breathlessly hurried: 'Hola ! Vecchio ! O, Vecchio ! Is it all well with you in there?'

'You see –' murmured old Viola to his wife.

Signora Teresa was silent now. Outside Nostromo laughed.

'I can hear Padrona is not dead.'

'You have done your best to kill me with fear,' cried Signora Teresa.

(22)

This abstract shows the languages of working class people and their colloquialism.

Nostromo, a man of the people and the leader of workers speaks openly and directly

with old viola. Mrs. Viola, an Italian also speaks with too much intimacy with

Nostromo. 'Hola' and 'Vecchio' are colloquial words which enhance the local color in the dialogue.

But in the dialogue between Don Pepe, an old Costaguana major and gobernador of San Tome' Silver mine, and the owner of the mine Charles Gould, we find certain degree of formality and more complex syntactic structure. Their

languages carry some professional value. Don Pepe's language reflects the tone of middle class spirit.

'I have already sent a memorial', said Charles Gould, steadily, 'and I reckon now confidently upon your excellency's favourable conclusions.'

'Ah. Don Carlos ! What we want is advanced men like you in the province. The lethargy – the lethargy of those aristocrats ! The want of public spirit ! The absence of all enterprise ! I, with my profound studies in Europe, you understand –' (70)

In the language of Don Pepe, the broken syntaxes and the use of different punctuation marks show the middleclass hatred and anger towards the nature of existing aristocracy.

Charles Gould, "El Rey de Sulaco" (173), "the only representative of the third generation of Gould's" (41), "a true Inglez" (40) and the owner of Gold Consession speaks, "All this piece of land belongs to the Railway company. There will be no more popular feast held here" (92). This piece of dialogue shows Charles Gould's position of power and his intention of suppressing the natives who celebrate their own local feasts and festivals in their own land. We find a sort of majestic tone and aristocratic ethos here. In another dialogue, he says,

'But the images will serve well enough. What is wanted here is law, good faith, order, security any one can declaim about these things, but I pin my faith to material interests. Only let the material interests once get a firm footing, and they are bound to impose the conditions on which alone they can continue to exist. That's how your money-making is justified here in the face of lawlessness and disorder. (65)

Bakhtin says language carries beliefs and ideology or conceptualization of world in words. The language of Charles Gould not only shows his sense of duty as the whiteman to the native people but also the justification of material profit in terms of peace, order, law and prosperity in the situation of instability and anarchy. Along with the sense of humanity, a complete selfish business motive is percolating in his language.

Similarly, there are also other forms of heteroglossia. Sir John, a Britishor and the chief of the Railway Construction Company says, "we cannot move mountains", (36). His speech explicates the hidden motive of the colonizers. They want to exploit the natural resources and rule the natives in the name of development. Ironically their advanced technology cannot move the mountains.

Conrad has given significant role to the Christian priests as well. Father Roman's religious speech to the mass of poor workers of the mine is worthy to mention here:

This picture my children, [. . .], has been painted in Europe, a country of saints and miracles, and much greater than our Costaguana [. . .] no doubt it is extremely far away. But ignorant sinner like you of the San Tome' mine should think earnestly of ever-lasting punishment instead of inquiring into the magnitude of the earth, with its countries and populations altogether beyond your understanding. (79)

This is a formal language with complete syntactic structures. Father Roman presents himself as a superior and well-learned person in front of the ignorant workers. His language clearly reflects ethics of Roman Catholicism. But the last sentence shows how religion has been used for political purpose. Father Roman warns the workers not



to think outside the world of mine and it is beyond their understanding. It is a way of taming workers from the potential rebellion.

General Montero's public speech at a party is significant here. He says, "The honour of the country is in the hands of the army. I assure you I shall be faithful to it" (90). This is the language of a military general which is vibrant, bombastic and highly formal. His speech also shows his faithfulness towards military dictatorship.

In the dialogue between old Garibaldino, an Italian emigrant and Mrs. Gould, we find different sort of language diversity.

'And is it for ever, Signora?' he asked.

'For as long as you like.'

'Bene. Then the place must be named. It was not worthwhile before.'

He smiled ruggedly. 'I shall set about the painting of the name tomorrow.'

'And, what is it going to be, Giorgio?'

'Albergo d'Italia una', said the old Garibaldino. 'More in memory of those who have died,' he added, 'than for the country stolen from us soldiers of liberty by the craft of that accursed piedmontese race of kings and ministers.' (93)

Garibaldino is extremely poor but he is a man of experience and culture. Mrs. Gould has provided a shelter for him. In his language, we can find a great sense of respect to Mrs. Gould. Use of Italian words and Italian tone amply show the typicality in his speech. He never uses her name but instead he uses "Signora" and "Albergo d' Italia Una". A poor man cannot take equal position by pronouncing the name of a rich person. But Mrs. Gould uses his name and address directly because she is rich and powerful. She undoubtedly loves poor people but her class verifies her language.

Garibaldino expresses his hatred and anger toward king and minister. He loves freedom and worships liberty because "The old republican did not believe in saints, or in prayers, or in what he called priest's religion. Liberty and Gribaldi were his divinities (17).

Pablo Barrios, a famous military general of the Riberist government fully supports the Europeans to fight against Monterist rebellion. His language reflects the speech style of the native people:

'Senores, have no apprehension . Go on quietly making your Ferro Carril – your railways, your telegraphs your – There's enough wealth in Costaguana to pay for everything – or else you wouldnot be here. Ha ! ha ! Don't mind this little picardia of my friend Montero. In a little while you shall behold his dyed moustaches through the bars of a strong wooden cage Senores ! Fear nothing, develop the country, work, work ! [. . .] we shall gow rich, one and all, like so many English men, because it is money that saves a country and (121).

General Barrios is a native of Costaguana. His belief on work, development and the prosperity of the people are clearly reflected in his language. The broken syntaxes, rough pronunciation and incomplete sentences show the native way of speaking English. As a military General, his expression is full of confidence, and his loyalty towards European is unshakable. His language is rough, colloquial and different from the sophisticated languages of Englishmen like Charles Gould, Sir John or Engineer-in-chief.

Holroyd is an American millionaire and capitalist, and the backer of Charles Gould to run the silver mine "but his parentage was German and Scotch and English, with remote strain of Danish and French blood, giving him the temperament of a

puritan and an insatiable imagination of conquest" (60). This background of Holroyd itself is heterogeneous and amazing. His dialogue with Charles Gould exemplifies the languages of sophisticated and high class people:

[. . .], we in this country know just about enough to keep indoors when it rains. We can sit and watch. Of course, some day we shall step in [. . .] we shall be giving the word for everything: industry, trade, law, journalism, art politics, and religion [. . .] and then we shall have the leisure to take in hand the outlying islands and continents of the earth.

We shall run the world's business whether the world likes it or not. (60)

His short, balanced and complete sentence structure clearly exposes distinctive speech style of high class people. The clear expression of ideas without any obstruction shows Holroyd's profound oratory power and educated background. In his language, we can find the whole strategy of all colonizers. In the name of development, they went to capture all the sectors of the country slowly and gradually. From his speech, Holdyord, "the steel and silver king" (173) is very clever capitalist who wants to hold the power of Costaguana at the proper time.

Conrad had used so many French and Italian words to show the diversity in speech styles. In different places, a full length of dialogues have been composed in French and Italian. '*Va bene, va, bene*', Giorgio would matter" (24), this is the use of Italian language to specify the typical speech style of Giorgio. A lady friend of Charles Gould speaks in French: 'No, its no go. *pas moyen, mon garson. Ce'st dommage, tout de meme. Ah' zut' e ne vole pas mon monde* [. . .]' (46). Her English is not good as she speaks 'No, it's no go'. Her mixture of incorrect English with French shows her typical way of speech style. Many times in the dialogues of Martin Decoud, a Frenchified intellectual, we find the mixture of French language with English.

"Have you read my thing about the regeneration of costaguana - *unne bonne blague, hein?*" (113), "*Le sort en est Je te*" (122), "*si, la, losa. Si, si, nina*" (122) and etc.

This speech style of Decoud shows his French background, French education and his love for French norms and values because he is a 'Frenchified adopted child of western Europe' (115). There are other so many characters who performs their own way of speech styles and manners.

*Nostramo* is extremely brimming with various languages of heteroglossia; various characters do speak in their own ways, embodying divergent attitudes and beliefs. And these individual consciousness are absolutely saturated with conflicting social values. It clearly captures the idea of Bakhtin that "the style of the novel is to be found in the combination of styles; the language of the novel is the system of its languages" (*The Dialogic Imagination* 262). In *Nostramo*, the major voices like Charles Gould, Mrs. Gould, Nostromo, Decoud, Garibaldino, Signora Teresa, Holroyd, Dr. Monyham, General Montero, General Barrios, Don Pepe, Don Juse, Father Roman, Captain Mitchell and many others do speak their own languages and they are tremendously dissimilar in their own way. Therefore, the various languages of heteroglossia that abound in *Nostramo* are not abstract entites but the "living impulse." They are born and grow out of the rich social sphere, and they have shaped and reshaped overtimes. Thus, they should be acknowledged as powerful as seeing the world by their own eyes. They draw images, and the creation of such images in language in a form of social probing, an exploring of values and beliefs rather than a mere play of forms. Moreover, these images are the tools for understanding complex social beliefs that make up a society. Further, "the images of the language are inseparable form the images of various world views and from the living beings who

are their agents – people who think, talk and act in a setting that is social and historically concrete" (*From Prehistory of the Novelistic Discourse* 131).

However, the mere presence of heteroglossia is not enough to meet the criterion of the dialogic discourse in the novel. The most significant asset is indisputably the interaction of these voices: both the interaction and intersection between and among them. So, not heteroglossia alone, but the "dialogize heteroglossia" is the inevitable crux to be judged any novel form dialogic angle when the dialogization occurs, the value systems and world views of different languages compete and clash each other in the novel. As a result, an unfinalizable dialogue gets created in tension-filled environment. And, in *Nostramo*, the dialogization of heteroglossia is fairly intense.

Despite its multifarious thematic aspects, the San Tome Silver mine is at the center of the novel. The silver of the mine and its connection with economy and politics, past and present, foreign and national interests of Costaguana breeds a complex network of events and actions that constitute the plot of the novel. The world inside the novel is filled with tensions, troubles, contradictions, revolutions and counter-revolutions, conflicting desires and motives. Fully independent consciousnesses counter and recounter, interact and intersect with each other in a fully developed dialogic atmosphere. They evaluate and illuminate in the eyes of other. Different characters have different sorts of ideology of revolution. Charles Gould, Decoud, Giorgio Viola and the Monterists are the major characters who bear their own type of ideology of revolution. The psychological revolution that occurs within Nostromo himself also has great importance in the novel. The hint of potential revolution of the workers against capitalists at the end of the novel bears another ideology of revolution that is Marxist's. Now, further analysis of this chapter focuses

on the dialogic tensions between and among the characters on the basis of their ideologies, interests and desires.

Charles Gould is an idealist who wants to revolutionize the prevailing condition of Costaguana by giving peace, order, law, prosperity and stability through the prosperous development of the silver mine. He comes naturally by his revolutionary plan, as the son of "ancestral Goulds" in Costaguana: "liberators, explorers, coffee planters, merchants, revolutionists" (40). Lets see how he justifies his ideology:

What is wanted here is law, good faith, order, security. Anyone can declaim about these things, but I pin my faith to material interest. Only let the material interests once get a firm footing, and they are bound to impose the conditions on which alone they can continue to exist. That's how money making is justified here in the face of lawlessness and disorder. It is justified because the security which it demands must be shared with an oppressed people. (65)

This justification of material success or what he calls 'material interests' directly contradicts with the prohibition of his dead father. Charles Gould says, "He was afraid I would hang on to the ruinous thing, waiting or just some such chance and waste my life miserably. That was the true sense of prohibition, which we have deliberately kept aside" (58). He is completely obsessed with the conception of success and the charm of the mine which is opposite to the tragic failure of his father. Charles Gould not only challenges the prohibition of his father but also challenges the tragic history of the silver mine by presenting himself as a confident and determined personality.

Holroyd is the backer of Gould Concession and the representative of American capitalism and economic imperialism. His financial backing of Charles

Gould introduces economic imperialism in Costaguana. Despite his financial back support, we can see the conflicting perspectives of Mr. Gould and Mrs. Gould about Holroyd in the following dialogic interaction:

'Mr Holroyd's sense of religion', Mrs Gould pursued, was shocked and disgusted [. . .]. 'But it seemed to me that he looked upon his own God as a sort of influential partner who gets his share of profit in the endowment of churches. That's a sort of idolatry.'

'No end of them', said Mr. Gould, [. . .].

'oh, he did not boast', Mrs. Gould declared scrupulously. 'I believe he is really a good man but so stupid ! [. . .].'

'He's at the head of immense silver and iron interests', Charles Gould observe.

'Ah, yes ! The religion of silver and iron [. . .], 'she says. (56-7)

This dialogic interaction between husband and wife presents the conflict of two contrasting values: business value and true spiritual value. Mr. Gould favours the business value of Holroyd whose religious value lies in the profit of silver and iron. He has developed his own sense of religion of business and donates the churches every year. But Mrs. Gould favours true sense of spiritual value and devoted herself in the service of poor. She contradicts with their religion of "iron and silver" and says it is just "a sort of idolatry".

Further, there is the immense progress of silver mine or "Imperium in Imperio". And "The extraordinary development of the mine had put a great power in his hands" (105). Charles Gould is successfully handling the business in the direction of Holroyd. But the sudden uprising of Monterists' revolution gives terrible threat to the silver mine and the existing power of Europeans. Monterists' ideology of

revolution is against the colonial ideology of Europeans and Americans. It is the uprising of native people against the Riberists government of aristocratic bourgeoisie which works infavour of foreign interests. The commandante of National Guard, Gamacho's opinion clearly shows the Monterists ideology of revolution:

[. . .] war should be declared at once against France, England, Germany and the United states, who by introducing railways, mining, enterprises, colonization, and under such shallow pretence aimed or robbing poor people of their lands, [. . .] the aristocrats would convert them into toiling and miserable slaves. (280)

This Monterists ideology directly juxtaposes with the ideology of Charles Gould, "law, good faith, order, security"(65) comes form the immense progress of "material interests" of the silver mine. They call it the aim of "robbing poor people" in their own land. It also contradicts with Holroy's and sir John's colonial strategy of handling power through the development of "industry, trade, law, journalism, art, poetic and religion" (60).

The Moneterists' ideology of liberating Costaguana form the foreign encroachment cannot remain away from the moral degradation and material corruption. The following comment of the narrator justifies the point, 'he meant to demand a share in every enterprise – in railways, in mines, in sugar states, in cotton mills, in land companies, in each and every undertaking – as the price of his protection" (277).

The Monterists' ideology of independence or freedom (a selfish and corrupted) also contradicts with the old Garibaldino's pure ideology of "Liberty". He says, "these were not a people striving for justice, but thieves" (20). He does not like the revolution of Monterists which fosters murder, violence, loots in the name of liberty.



"He had an immense scorn for this outbreak of scoundrels and lepers, who do not know the meaning of the word liberty" (20). He worships his hero of "liberty" Garibaldi who had fought for freedom in Italy. Giorgio also took part in that revolution under the command of Garibaldi in his youth. "He had lived among men who had declaimed about liberty, suffered from liberty, died for liberty, with a desperate exaltation, and with their eyes turned towards own oppressed Italy" (27). He worships sacred and pure sacrifice for liberty not like that of Monterists.

Giorgio's opinion about religion also contrasts with Father Roman, Father Corbelan and Father Baron because, "The old republican did not believe in saints or prayers, or in what he called 'priests' religion" (17). Further "Though he disliked priests and would not put his foot inside a church for anything, he believed in God" (27). Father Roman, Corbelan and Baron are the representatives of the Church system and they instigate people for prayers in the churches for their salvation. But Giorgio only believes in God not in priests and prayers.

Further, Decoud a "Frenchified" and "adopted child of western Europe" (115) formulates another ideology of revolution that is the separation of Sulaco from the unquiet body of Costaguana. His separatism is an attempt to protect Sulaco Aristocrates from the threat of Monterists rebellion. His separatist ideology has fueled the war of aristocratic Blanco party against Montarists. They separated Sulaco and established The Occidental Republic of Costaguana. Decoud is scepticist and materialist. He confronts and contradicts with different characters. His dialogic tensions with Father Corbelan in remarkable to mention here:

'And you – you are a perfect heathen,' he said in a subdued deep voice.

'But is it perhaps that you have not discovered yet what is the God of my worship?' 'You believe neither in stick nor stone', he said.

'Nor bottle', added Decoud without stirring, '[. . .], but why call me a heathen?',

'True', retorted the priest, 'A miracle could not convert you.'

'I certainly do not believe in miracles' said Decoud quietly.

'A sort of Frenchman – Godless – a materialist', he pronounced slowly

[. . .]. 'Scarcely human, in fact', Decoud commented under his breath.

(143-4)

This is the conflict between two contradictory beliefs. Decoud is "the imaginative materialist and scepticist" (260) whereas father Corbelan is a staunch religious priest. He scorns the materialist belief of Decoud and calls him "a perfect heathen" and "the victim of faithless age" (*ibid*). Decoud intersects by saying that his God is different from Corbelan's and he believes in "human in fact." This interaction and intersection of two opposing ideas beautifully met the dialogic principle of Bakhtin.

Martin Decoud is the first man to recognize and criticize the real nature of Charles Gould's idealism in front of Mrs. Gould. We can see how Charles Gould's idealism gets flourished in the language of Decoud:

'Mrs Gould, are you aware to what point he has idealized the existence, the worth, the meaning of San Tome silver mine? Are you aware of it?'

'What do you know?' She asked in a feeble voice.

'Nothing', answered Decoud, firmly. 'But, then don't you see, he is an Englishman?'

'Well, what of that?' asked Mrs. Gould.

'Simply that he cannot act or exist without idealizing every simple feeling, desire, or achievement. He could not believe his own motives if he did not make them a part of some fairy tale [. . .].' (156)

Here, Decoud points out the English nature of Charles Gould who cannot live without idealizing the existence, worth and facts. Mr. Gould's "material interests" is a part of fairy tale in the eyes of Decoud.

Decoud is a true lover also. His interesting dialogue with Antonia shows it, "No one is a patriot for nothing. But I am clear sighted, and I shall not use that word to you, Antonia. I have no patriotic illusions. I have only the supreme illusion of a lover" (138). Decoud formulates the separatist ideology as a patriot and also accompanies Nostromo to save the silver for the sake of nation. But he says he is not a patriot. His work and his thought contradict here. He does not pin his faith in any fixed thing.

Decoud accompanies Nostromo to save the silver in the dark Placido Gulfo. He wants to complete this mission successfully for his political reputation which is expressed in the dialogic interaction with Nostromo:

'I am looking forward to a glorious and successful ending to my mission. Do you hear capataz? Use the words glorious and successful when you speak to senorita'. 'I dare say, senor Don Martin', he said moodily. 'There are few things that I am not equal to. I, a man of the people, who cannot understand what you mean [. . .].

'Shall I go back with you to Sulaco?' He asked in angry tone.

'Shall I strike you dead with my knife where you stand?' retorted Nostromo [. . .]. Your reputation is in your politics, and mine is bound up with the fate of this silver.' (215).

Here, we can observe the unequal mental status of Nostromo and Decoud, one is uneducated and another is a scholar. Their languages clarify their motives behind the mission of saving the silver. Nostromo does it just as a duty of a loyal man and for his

name, and Decoud does it for glory and to heighten his political reputation. This piece of a dialogic interaction shows the differences between two major characters of the novel.

Decoud killed himself in the utter loneliness and solitude. The narrator presents internal dialogic tensions of Decoud's mind, "After three days of waiting for the sight of some human face, Decoud caught himself entertaining a doubt of his own individuality. [. . .] Decoud lost all belief in reality of his action past and to come" (354). He doubts his own action, love and his own existence. "Both his intelligence and his passion were swallowed up easily in this great unbroken solitude of waiting without faith" (*ibid*). Nothing remains as the matter of faith for him. Conradian idea of nihilism comes forward in this terrible situation of Decoud. He is completely sad and "his sadness was the sadness of a sceptical mind" (*ibid*).

Decoud even doubts his own love for Antonia. His love for Antonia was the most essential part of his life before but now "he no longer dared to think of Antonia. She had not survived. But if she survived he would not face her. [. . .] Antonia could not possibly have ever loved a being so impalpable as himself" (*ibid*). His life and actions before and his thoughts on the verge of death completely contradicts with each other. In the extreme tension of his skeptical mind, he killed himself and "the brilliant Don Martin Decoud, [. . .] disappeared without a trace, swallowed up in the immense indifference of things" (356). Here, we can observe the irony of human life in the vast indifferent world.

Nostromo "Capataz De Cargadores – a Mediterranean sailor" (94), Italian in origin, is another major character and the title of the novel. Nostromo's life can be divided into two contradictory parts: his famous public life before the terrible journey of saving the silver and his individual life after the journey.

Initially, Nostromo, "a fellow in a thousand" (94) lives the life of loyalty, service, honesty, bravery and he has the great influence over the lower class people of Sulaco. Lets observe what Conrad himself says about Nostromo in the "Author's Note": "But Nostromo doesnot aspire to be a leader in a personal game. He doesnot want to raise himself alone the mass. He is content to feel himself a power – within the people" (4). This is exactly what the initial part of Nostromo's life. We can see his loyalty and honesty in his own language; "And I have sat alone at night with my revolver in companies warehouse time and again by the side of that other Englishman's heap of silver, guarding it as if it had been my own" (94). Nostromo represents the working class people and his language explicates the duty and honesty of a loyal worker. Captain Mitchell always boasts "that fellow of mine, Nostromo" (97) that shows his sense of possession. Nostromo (Our man), Capataz de cagadores (man of the people) always lives for other. He saves the lives of Europeans form the terrible mobs, he carries the message to General Barrios in Catya – it is a terrible journey in the midst of buring violence, and he saves the silver from the hands of Monteros. These are the major heroic actions which he performs in the novel.

Before the departure for the mission of saving the silver, there is a hot dialogic tensions between dying old Mrs. Vida and Nostromo:

'Look Gain' Batista, it has killed me at last ! [ . . . ], while you were away fighting for what did not concern you, foolish man.'

'Why talk like this?' mumbled capataz. The capataz said, 'I am engaged in a work of a very great moment.'

'Would you go to fetch a priest form now? Think ! A dying woman ask you !' [ . . . ]. 'You refuse to go?' She gasped. 'Ah ! You are always yourself, indeed.'

He said, 'I am needed to save the silver of the mine.' [. . .]

'They have been paying you with words. Your folly shall betray you into poverty, misery, starvation. The very leperos shall laugh at you – the great Capataz,' gasped the sick woman. (185-85)

In this dialogic tension, we can see two contradictory beliefs conflicting with each other. The request of a dying woman for the priest which implicates Mrs. Viola's strong religious belief and Nostromo who "did not believe in priest" (184) is stuck to accomplish the most "desperate affair" in the whole career of his life, defies her request. Again, from this episode we can point out that Nostromo is a careerist and lives for only public fame. Mrs. Viola takes him as a son and saviour of her children and old husband, also forecasts Nostromo's terrible future and uselessness of his service of the Europeans which becomes the matter of lamentation in the later career of Nostromo.

We can see the dialogic tensions between myth and history in Nostromo's characterization. Myth and history are usually conceived of as contradictory modes of discourse. As Paul Ricoeur says:

Myth is a narrative of origins, taking place in a primordial time, a time other than that of a everyday reality, whereas history is a narrative of recent events, extending progressively to include events that are further in the past but all, nonetheless, situated in human time. Mythical narratives are characterized by being anonymous, and so without any determinant origin. They are received through tradition and accepted as credible by all the members of the group, with no guarantee of authenticity other than the belief of those who transmit them. But

history entails a rigorous demand for authenticity and verification.

(qtd. in *Vulcan* 130-1)

Nostromo's two contradictory parts of life represent two contradictory modes of history and myth. In the initial part of his life, Nostromo is presented as a mythical man and in the later, the great transformation in his thoughts and actions present him as a historical man. It is better to observe how his mythical personality has been presented in the novel.

When the carriage moved on took off his hat again a grey sombrero with a silver cord and tassels. The bright colors of a Mexican serape twisted on the cantle, the enormous silver buttons on the embroidered leather Jackets, the row of tiny silver buttons down the seam of the trousers, the snowy line, a silk cash with embroidered ends, the silver plates on headstall and saddle, proclaimed the unapproachable style of the famous capataz de cargadores – a Mediterranean sailor – got up with mere finished splendour than any well-to-do young ranchero of the campo had ever displayed on a high holiday. (93-4)

His embroidered dress with different silver items, his silver gray mare, "the unapproachable style" and his movement "more finished splendour than any well-to-do- young ranchero of the campo" present Nostromo as an extraordinary personality. Nostromo, "The lordly capatazz cargadores, the indispensable man" (97) is a mythic character both in his personality and actions. His unknown parentage, his kind "stepparents", his magnificent physical appearance, and his reputation for supernatural exploits are some of the features of his mythical character. His last mission of saving the silver can be taken as the ritual adventure of the mythical hero. These features also presents Nostromo on the line of traditional epic hero.

After the successful mission Nostromo returns back to Sulaco from the Isabel. A tired, hungry and thirsty Nostromo gets up from 14 hours long sleep. After the long sleep, there starts the process of self-realization, self-evaluation and self-transformation in the mind of Nostromo. "His mouth was dry. It was dry with heavy sleep and extremely anxious thinking, as it had never been dry before [. . .], he tried to spit before him – 'T fui-' and mutter a curse upon the selfishness of all the rich people" (297). This shows the slow process of his change from mythical man to a mere historical or factual man. His all majestic personality is changed in to simplicity: "with bare feet and head, with one check shirt and a pair of cotton calzoneros for all worldly possessions. [. . .] he was simple. He was as ready to become the prey of any belief, superstition, or desire as a child' (297-8). "The indispensable", "incorruptible" "disinterested" and "courageous" Nostromo changed into corruptible, self-interested, feeble and vulnerable ordinary man. This sort of juxtaposition creates the dialogic tensions in the complex dynamics of the novel. Daphna Vulcan also supports this points, "Conrad's ambivalent attitude to his protagonist reflects the dialogic tensions between myth and history" (129).

After the complete transformation in Nostromo, he realizes his own position and the selfish motives of the rich men. He says, "They keep us and encourage as if we were dogs born to fight and hunt for them. The veccho is right" (298). He regrets for his refusal to bring the priest to dying Mrs. Viola and realizes the gravity of her forecast. He realizes that he had been used as the dog for the selfish motives of the rich men. His language here raises the voice of poor people against the rich.

The sudden encounter of two opposing consciousnesses, Dr. Monygham and Nostromo in the Custom house in front of hanging dead body of Hirsch who is killed by Sotillo, generates a genuine dialogic tension on the basis of their class



consciousness. The doctor represents the class of capitalists because "he was loyal to mine" (307) and a devoted fellow of Mrs. Gould. He serves the interests of Europeans because "The Doctor was anxious to save the San Tome mine from annihilation. He would be nothing without it. It was his interest. Just it had been the interest of Decoud, of the Blancos and of the Europeans" (324). But Nostromo represents the proletarians and counters the doctor strongly. He says, "You fine people are all like. All dangerous. All betrayers of the poor who are your dogs" (323). His voice represents the voice of the poor people against the exploitation and betrayal of the rich capitalist. He realizes that his service to rich man or "fine people" is nothing more than the service of a "dog". He further says, "a poor man amongst you have got to look after himself. I say that you do not care for those that serve you. Look at me ! After all these years, suddenly, here I find myself like of those curs that bark outside the walls – without a kennel or a dry bone for my teeth" (323). Nostromo is homeless and economically poor. Despite his long service to them, he has no home or "cannel" to live and nothing or "dry bone" to eat. His extreme realization of his class position and his direct protest of the capitalist with the Doctor is the supreme example of the dialogization of class conflict in the novel. He says, "Ah ! And whom am I to thank for that? What are your politics and your mine to me – your silver and your constitutions – your Don Carlos this, and Don Jose that – " (325). All things like law, politics, mine and silver, constitutions of the capitalists have become useless to him because that give nothing to him.

After the death of Decoud, Nostromo is only the man who knows the hidden treasure of the silver. He makes it a great secret. Lets observe how Nostromo "victim of the disenchanted vanity" (35) has changed his mind from public interest to self-interest, "I must grow rich very slowly" (357). He wants to be rich slowly and

gradually because he does not want to be suspected. The possession of silver has corrupted his mind." The spirit of good and evil that hover a forbidden treasure understood well that the silver of San Tome was provided now with a faithful and life long slave" (356). The great Capataz has become the corrupted slave of the "cursed" silver. His all mythical characteristics disappear and he becomes a mere factual or "material man, ". The capataz is undone, destroyed. There is no capataz. You will find the capataz no more" (311).

Nostromo loves Giselle , the younger daughter of Garibaldino. While Nostromo is going to visit Giselle, he has been shot mistakenly in the darkness by Garibaldino thinking that it is Ramirez who is forbidden in that great Isabel. Garibaldino hates Ramirez because of his one sided love to Giselle. Nostromo died the death like a "thief". The sense of betrayal is so strong in his mind. He says, "I die betrayed – betrayed by –" (396). He knows the ultimate cause of his death "the silver has killed me" (*Ibid*).

There is some connection of his death with legendary gringos, enslaved by the buried treasure under the primeval curse. Nostromo becomes possessed by the legendary gringos" as if an out cast soul, a quiet, brooding soul, finding that untenanted body in its way, had come in stealthily to take precession" (291). Nostromo 'compared himself to legendary gringos, neither dead nor alive" (373).

When he wants to tell the secret of the hidden silver to Mrs. Gould, she refuses it and says "let it be lost for ever" (397). Nostromo also refuses to tell the secret to the photographer who wants the silver for the potential revolution of the poor against the capitalists. He says, "The rich must be fought with their own weapons" (398). But Nostromo died without telling the secret of silver and it is lost for ever.

Nostromo's characterization on the basis of two conflicting modes of myth and history enhances the extremely rich dialogic tensions in the novel. Further, his role as a loyal and faithful worker, his self awareness and his protest of richmen's betrayal to the poor, and his transformation from incorruptible, and disinterested Capataz to corrupted and self-interested captain Findanza are some of the features of social reality.

Mrs. Gould is also the victim of the overwhelming influence of the mine. Her initial idealism and her support is an important factor in Charles Gould's adventurous enterprise. Mrs. Gould's own generous and virtuous self is also contaminated by her participation in her husbands project to reopen the mine and operate it. Dr. Monygham is the other character that knows and explains to her that the moral principle does not underlie or survive capitalism: "There is no peace, no rest in the development of material interests. They have their law and their justice. But it is founded on expediency and is inhuman, it is without rectitude, without the continuity and the force. That can be found only in a moral principle" (363). The doctor's language points out the moral degradation and inhumanism of "material interest". Mrs Gould also changes into the opposite to her youthful self. She comes to perceive the truth and regrets it, but she is unable to save her husband from his bondage to the mine. At last, "she saw the San Tome mountain hanging over the Campo, over the whole land, feared, hated, wealthy; more soulless than any tyrant, more pitiless and autocratic than the worst Government; ready to crush innumerable lives in the expansion of its greatness" (37).

She realizes the underlying inhumanity, corruption, immorality and terrible effects of the mine and material obsession in the politics of Costaguana. Her moral discovery and transformation is completely opposite to the "material interests" of

Charles Gould and the "religion of silver and iron" of Holroyd. Obsession to material interests dehumanizes Charles Gould and dries up their marriage. Despite her love, generosity, helpfulness and service to the poor people, her condition is quite opposite to the picture of "Madonna, in blue robes and the child on her arm" (359) because she is childless.

On the other hand, Charles Gould's ideology of establishing law, order, peace and prosperity through the development of "material interest" is degenerated and decayed. His passion for the mine changed into material obsession that dehumanizes him. He involves himself in bribery and political conspiracy only for the sake of the silver mine. He wants to save it at any cost. Obsession of material interest and "magical charm" of the silver mine completely swallow up his mind. He has become ready to destroy the mine by the explosion of dynamite if it goes out of his possession. He says, "[. . .] nothing but dynamite shall be allowed to dislodge it from here. It's my choice. It's my last Card to play" (149). This is the extreme example of cruelty, inhumanity and madness. The initial part of Charles Gould's life and his ideology and the later part of his life and complete material obsession are two contradictory facets of his characterization that meets the dialogic principle of Bakhtin through the underlying current of tensions and turmoils in the novel.

*Nostromo*, therefore, is the novel that easily meets the criterion of Bakhtin's proposition that the style of the novel is to be found in the combination of styles and the languages of the novel is the system of its languages. It is composed of various styles, speech patterns, and thus ideologies that interact dynamically as a "heteroglossia", or many languaged discourse. The novel finely displays the fundamental notion of Bakhtin that the universe in which the language lives is no longer Ptolemaic, but Galilean. Like the earth, the language has ceased to be at the

center, and has become one of many planets. Different languages of heteroglossia in the novel understand the world differently and each competes with others. Thus, the novel is built on a maximally intense Galilean linguistic consciousness.

Moreover, shaped by a Galilean linguistic consciousness, *Nostramo* stages dialogues between and among the languages. Each language views other languages, and each glimpses its own image in the eyes of others. As prosaics regards novelistic discourse not as a style but a style of styles, or more accurately, as the dialogization of styles, *Nostramo* enormously possesses this disposition. Considering the language not a unitary or monologic discourse, it conjoins desperate languages and incorporates disruptive points of view. At the same time, it records situations and become the site of struggles. So, the hybridization and mutual interillumination of languages set the dialogic line of the novel.

### **Polyphonic Structure of the Novel**

Polyphonic structure is another essential factor of a dialogic novel. Bakhtin's theory of polyphony demands a work in which several consciousnesses meet as equals and engage in an unfinalizable dialogue. The direct power, which in monologic works belongs to the author alone, belongs to several voices in a polyphonic or a dialogic work. We have analysed various voices and consciousness, the varied ideologies and world views chasing and competing between and among themselves in the tension-filled environment in the previous chapter. The position of the author in the polyphonic work is both crucial and critical. If the author cannot assume the genuine authorial role, that the polyphonic work requires, it always remains vulnerable to turn into monologic one. And in monologic work, only the author, as the "ultimate semantic authority", retains the power to express a truth directly. The truth of the work becomes his or her truth, all other truths are subordinated. By contrast, the "form-

shaping ideology" of polyphonic or dialogic work itself demands the author ease to exercise monologic control.

The author confronts his or her characters as equals and embodies dialogic sense of truth by allowing the consciousness of a character to be truly "someone else's consciousness" (*Problems* 7). Therefore, Bakhtin characterizes polyphonic novel having plurality of independent and unmerged voices and consciousnesses that are free into play. Polyphony advocates freedom and autonomy of multiple voices, not the dominance and control of single authorized voice. This chapter basically focuses on the authorial position, free and autonomous positions of the multiple consciousnesses, plot structure and the narrative flexibility which constitute a genuine polyphonic structure of the novel.

In *Nostromo*, Conrad has introduced varieties of themes through the dialogic interactions of multiple voices. Colonialism, economic imperialism, public and personal interests, class conflicts, greed, material obsession, moral degradation, love and romance, ironical situation of man in the hostile world, conflicts of different desires and ideologies are some of the apparent themes of the novel. Different characters carry different sorts of desires and ideologies. Through the conflicts of such different desires and ideologies, thematic diversity itself unfolds in the process of dialogic interactions. Though there are many other characters but Charles Gould, Mrs. Gould, Holroyd, Nostromo, Decoud, Dr. Monygham, Riberias, Monteros and Garibaldino are the major characters of the novel. They are independent and autonomous voices in themselves.

They are not presented as the mere characters but they are presented as the lively human beings having flaws and weaknesses, positive and negative qualities.

There are love, hatred, hostility and desire in them which create a lively social atmosphere which is full of tensions, turmoils, instability and unrest.

Most of the critics take Martin Decoud as the authorial voice of the novel. Edward said also supports this point, "Decoud is Conrad's portrayal of himself as the confused intellectual for whom the ground he walks on is subject to doubt, the author whom the simplest sentence was very hard to begin" (109). The role of Decoud as the authorial voice is not so overwhelming and overpowering to the other voices of the novel but he is the one of the many voices. Conrad leaves all characters free to flourish in the fully developed dialogic atmosphere. The author also participates in the dialogue, and conflicts and contests with different characters through Decoud. This is the genuine feature of dialogic or polyphonic novel.

Decoud is the independent and fully developed character of the novel. He has different sort of world view and perspective. He formulates the ideology of "separatism" and says, "We have the greatest riches, the greatest fertility, the purest blood in our great families, the most laborious population. [. . .] The Occidental territory is large enough to make any man's country. Look at mountains ! Nature itself seems to cry us 'separate'" (135).

From this different world view, Decoud justifies his ideology of separatism as the nature's demand. He is scepticist and doubts on everything. He criticizes idealist Charles Gould, "simply that he cannot act or exist without idealizing every simple feeling, desire or achievement" (156). He does not like Mr. Gould's nature of idealizing everything.

His doubts on everything, even on his own existence and his love for Antonia, entstigate him to commit suicide in the utter loneliness of the Great Isabel. He contradicts himself sometimes, "I have no patriotic illusions. I have only the supreme

illusion of a lover" (138). No doubt he is a lover but he formulates separatist ideology to make a good nation of the good people. Decoud as a authorial voice does not dominate and subordinate other voices but acts as one of the many voices.

At the center of all actions and ideologies, there is the San Tome silver mine. The perspectives of different characters are also different on the silver mine. Charles Gould has built an ideology of "material interests" which is the product of his passion for the mine. Through the development of the mine, he wants to bring "law, good faith, order, security" (65) in the country. He takes the mine as the matter of passion, possession and ancestral identity but later that change into material obsession and moral degradation. He has his own independent ideology and consciousness which is different from other.

On the other hand, initially Mrs. Gould supports the ideology of Charles Gould but after her moral discovery, her perspective is changed and she takes the mine as the dehumanizing factor "a feared hated, wealthy, more soulless than any tyrant. [. . .] ready to crush innumerable lives in expansion of its greatness" (370). She develops her own perspective and ground which is different from her husband. Their conflicting and contrasting perspectives and world views develop as the two independent consciousnesses.

Holroyd, an American backer of Ground concession, has different perspective of the mine. He wants to use the mine as the instrument of economic imperialism. "Holroyd connection meant by-and-by to get hold of the whole Republic of Costaguana, lock, stock and barrel. It interested the great man to attend personally to the San Tome mine" (63). He wants to use both Charles Gould and the mine as the medium to capture the whole country. Being capitalists, motives of Charles Gould and Holroyd also contradicts with each other. Ideologically Gould's "material interests" is



for the betterment of the country but Holroyd's interest of the mine is to paralyze the country slowly and gradually and to capture it. Mrs. Gould also criticizes his "religion of silver and iron" by saying that it is 'an idolatry'. These three characters belong to the same capitalist class but they differ and contradict independently with each other. There is no authorial control and domination.

Old Gabridaldino does not have any particular perspective on the mine. He wishes the betterment of Goulds because they give him the shelter. But his personal history and strong faith on "liberty" make him a distinct character. He had fought for freedom under the command of his ideal hero Garibaldi in Italy. His ideology of liberty is different from Decoud's separatism and Monteros' rebellion for the national freedom. His ideology is the pure form of liberty without corruption and violence, and "liberty and Garibaldi' were his divinities" (17).

Similarly, other characters are also autonomous and capture the equal significance in the novel. Nostromo, initially, does not have any particular ideology. He is just a loyal, honest and brave man who involves in the service of the rich man. But he is distinct and highly praised character because of his extraordinary influence of power over the Cargadores and his heroic actions. He lives for his public fame and public welfare. But after his transformation from great "Capataz de Cargadores" to self-interested captain Fianza, he starts to protest the exploitation and betrayal of the rich men to the poor. He says, "you fine people are all alike. All dangerous.; All betrayers of the poor who are your dogs" (323). His voice counters the ideology of different characters like Gould, Holroyd, Decoud and Dr. Monygham or to the whole corpse of colonial ideology. His dialogic tensions with Dr. Monyghan, genuinely enhance to his class consciousness that counters the exploitation, injustice and betrayal of the capitalists to the poor people.

The Monterists and Blancos are two opposing parties. The former carries the ideology of national freedom and the upliftment of the poor: "[. . .] war should be declared at once against France, England, Germany and the United States, who, by introducing railways, mining, enterprises, colonization, [. . .] aimed at robbing poor people in their lands" (280). This anti-colonial sentiment of Pedro Montero and his brother has countered all colonial sentiment of Holroyd, Sir John and other colonial agents. Blanco is the party of aristocrats which favours the foreign interests and fights for the protection of Sulaco aristocrats. Conrad has presented these two opposing parties as the free and autonomous voices. They conflict and interact on the basis of their own distinct grounds. Similarly, there are so many other minor characters who also bear distinct and individual identity, and perspectives in the novel like Father Carbelan, Hernandez, Sotillo, Antonia, Don Jose etc. They are multiple autonomous voices which introduce heteroglossia in the dialogic interaction of the novel. Thus, the novel is saturated by several interacting consciousnesses or a plurality of unmerged voices.

Polyphonic structure of the novel is different from the traditional pattern of monologic discourse. For Bakhtin, plot of the polyphonic novel is no longer the sequence that characters are ordained to follow, but the result or what they happen to say or do. Similarly, the dialogues that compose the novel – that make the entire novel one "great dialogue" – are not shaped before hand, not planned in the usual sense. Rather that take place "right now, that is in the real present in the creative process" (*Problems* 63). The plot of the polyphonic novel is also not the coherent sequence of events that all complications are resolved at the end as Aristotle says. In *Nostramo*, we do not find a single story with proper beginning, smooth and linear development to the climax, and the proper ending with complete resolution of all complications.

Rather we find multiple stories, record of personal histories of the characters, history of nation, history of silver mine and the distortion of chronological sequence of the plot in *Nostramo*.

The highly flexible third-person narrative of *Nostramo* is different from the tight and strict narration of monologic discourse. The third-person narrator's attitude is most directly related to the variations of narrative perspective and distance. In *Nostramo*, thematic apposition frequently depends on a combination of narrative omniscience and narrative mobility. Both contribute essentially to the novel's characteristic narrative flexibility, dynamism, and thematic range. The third-person narrator presents the actions and events from a distance with a great range of details and at the same time he goes into the mind of the characters to express their feeling, thoughts and motives. The focus of the narrative perspective frequently changes and shifts from one place to another, from one action to another and from one character to another like a movie camera. C.B. Cox also supports this point, "Our visual perspective rapidly changes, and this reflects shifting attitudes on man, society and nature" (154).

In the time of Spanish rule, and for many years afterwards, the town of Sulaco – the Luxuriant beauty of the orange gardens bears witness to its antiquity – had never been commercially anything more important than a coasting port with a fairly large local trade in Ox-hides and indigo. (8)

This very beginning sentence of the novel is an ample example of shifting focus of narrative perspective. It goes to history (Spanish rule) and shifts to the nature (orange garden) and then to the trade centers (Ox – hides and indigo).

The narrative focus continuously changes and shifts from nature to culture, present to past, physical to mental state of the characters and the vice versa, which constitute the complex network of the events in the plot. These perspectival variations make the narrative more fragmented and multi-faceted, and the result is the distortion of the chronological order of the plot.

The first and second chapter of the first part entitled "The Silver of the Moon" introduce present condition of Costaguana with the glimpses of its history. But in third and fourth chapter instead of progressing forward in the conventional manner of linearity, it spirals backward and provides the detail history of old Garibaldino. Then again, it comes into the present and introduces Charles Gould and Mrs. Gould, existing government of Blancos and its representatives like Vincente Riberia, General Montero in the chapter five. In this chapter, we also find importance of O.S.N. company and the entrance of foreign officers like Sir John, and engineer-in-chief. Then the narration again goes back and provides the detail history of Costaguana Goulds and the San Tome silver mine in the chapter six.

Similarly, the whole narrative pattern of the novel follows the same style of going backward to forward, present to past, culture to nature, physical to mental and the vice versa. There are different events and stories that are threaded into a flexible narrative pattern. There are three love stories: the love story of Charles Gould and Emilia Gould, Decoud and Antonia, Nostromo and Giselle. Charles Gould's reopening of the mine, Holroyd's backing, outbreak of Monteros' rebellion, counter revolution of Decoud's separatism, establishment of Occidental republic, death of Pedro Montero, Fuenates and Gamacho, death of Mrs. Viola without priest, moral discovery of Mrs. Gould, moral degradation and material obsession of Charles Gould, Hirsch's death by Sotillo, Nostromo and Decoud's mission of saving the silver, Decoud's suicide in

solitude, Nostromo's transformation, and his death by the shot of Garibaldino are some of the major events that are interwoven in the complex narrative pattern of the novel without chronological order.

Every character in the novel is presented with his/her personal history and the role of action. There is no single story, single history and single linear plot. The novel comprises multiplicity in different aspects. Thus, there are different centers of actions, stories, histories and ideologies in the novel. Every major character is the center of his own ideology, history and action like Gould, Nostromo, Decoud, Garibaldino, Holroyd, Emilia and Monteros. The narrative flexibility of the novel weaves those different aspects into a complex network. Conrad has created open and democratic world where these different ideologies, worldviews and perspectives conflict and contradict with each other. Instead of finalized plot, we have, as Bakhtin says, "a live event, played out at the point of dialogic meeting between two and several consciousness" (*Problems* 88).

The story of the novel has already began before the beginning of the novel. Conrad's flashback of Spanish colonization of Costaguana, tragic history of Costaguana Goulds and the failure history of Charles Gould's father in the silver mine are the prominent proofs of its beginning. And the ending of the novel doesnot resolve all the complications because there is another potential revolution looming in the horizon in the name of the poor people against rich capitalists. This is clear in the language of the photographer, "Do not forget that we want money for our work. The rich must be fought with their weapons" (396). Therefore the plot of *Nostromo* is not finalized plot but it is still in the process of making.

The thematic diversity, social heteroglossia and the presentation of social reality have inextricable relationship with the structure of the novel. Jacob Lothe also

supports this point, "The diversity of thematic apposition in *Nostromo* is similarly inseparable from the elasticity of Conradian narrative as it operates in this novel" (172). The tight narrative structure and chronological sequence of the plot as in monologic discourse can not depict the diversity of social reality.

Social reality itself is heterogeneous. There are different sorts of people, multiple voices, incompatible modes of thoughts, desires and perspectives. They conflict and contradict with each other. To represent such heterogeneous social reality, Joseph Conrad has used narrative flexibility and elasticity, distorted plot structure and perspectival variations. From this whole analysis, we can say that Conrad's *Nostromo* easily meets the Bakhtinian concept of Polyphonic structure of the novel.

#### IV. *NOSTROMO* AS A DIALOGIZED TEXT

*Nostramo* is intrinsically a dialogic novel. And it has represented social diversity, social stratification, social heteroglossia and social conflict in a fully developed dialogic atmosphere. Conrad has peopled *Nostramo* with numerous characters from different backgrounds, cultures, races and socio-economic status. They have their own ideologies, interests, desires and speech styles. Such different autonomous and unmerged voices conflict and contrast on the basis of their own ideologies and interests which create genuine dialogic interactions in the novel. They deserve the power to change and modify the social situation and they are also changed by the situation. None of the characters is isolated from the society but they are the product of the society itself. Thus, the inextricable relationship between the characters and the society creates a complex dynamics in the novel.

*Nostramo* is extremely brimming with various language of heteroglossia; various characters do speak in their own ways embodying divergent attitudes, beliefs and ideologies. Charles Gould, John, engineer-in-chief, father Corbelan's English background, Holroyd's American, Decoud's French, *Nostramo*, Garibaldino, Teresa, Antonia's Italian background, and Monteros, Gamacho, Sotillo and general Barrios' native background show the social diversity of Costaguana and it enriches the heteroglossia in the dialogic interaction of the novel. There are whites, Indians, Negroes, Jews and Hidalgos which is the colorful mixture of the different races in the characterization of the novel. Professionally they are also different people. There are capitalists, workers, doctors, engineers, bureaucrats, politicians, military persons, fighters, priests and the like. By presenting various levels of social stratification, Conrad successfully represents the real color of social diversity and social reality in the novel. They have their own speech styles, manners, beliefs and pronunciations.

Their voices represent the ethos of different classes, cultures and professions. Charles Gould and Holroyd's voices represent the language of higher class capitalists though they are different in their ideologies and beliefs. Father Corbelan and Roman's languages reflect the religious ethos of Christianity. General Barrios' speech style and pronunciation is different from the sophisticated English of Gould, Holroyd and father Corbelan because he is a native and his English is rough and colloquial. His strong and bombastic language shows the manner of a military general. Garibaldino's Italian tone and the mixture of French words in Decoud's language show the typicality in their speech styles. Nostromo's language represents the voice of working class people because his speech style is also different from the Europeans and Americans. Similarly, there are other different contrasting voices, speech styles, and manners in the novel. So, language is not an abstract phenomenon rather it represents different beliefs, world views, perspectives and the attitudes of the characters.

The world of the novel is full of tensions, troubles, contradictions, revolutions and counter-revolutions, conflicting desires and ideologies. Fully independent consciousnesses and unmerged voices counter and contest, interact and intersect with each other. Different major characters carry different ideologies of revolution which generate genuine dialogic interactions in a tension-filled environment. Charles Gould's ideology of "material interests", Decoud's separatism, Holroyd's economic imperialism, Montero's ideology of national freedom, and Garibaldino's "pure liberty" are the major ideologies, and they conflict and contradict each other. The whole plot of the novel is developed on the basis of the conflict of these ideologies.

We can find the great contradictions in the lives of Charles Gould, Mrs. Gould and Nostromo. Charles Gould's initial ideology of bringing peace, prosperity, law and good faith through the development of "material interests" changed into material



obsession and moral degradation. Mrs. Gould's initial involvement in her husband's work has become the matter of regret and remorse. After the moral discovery, she finds her life barren and childless. Nostromo's transformation from incorruptible, desperate and lordly Capataz to corruptible, self-interested and common Captain Fidanza generates dialogic tension between myth and history. Contradictions juxtapositions and conflicts are the essential features of a dialogic novel.

To correspond with the complex and heterogeneous social reality, Conrad has used highly flexible third-person narrative, disrupted chronology and rapidly shifting focus of the narrative perspective which create a complex structure of the novel. The story has already begun before the beginning of the novel which is clear from the narration of different histories of the characters and the mine. And another potential revolution of the poor against the capitalists is looming in the horizon at the end of the novel. Instead of providing a finalized plot with complete resolution of all complications, Conrad's *Nostromo* carries an unfinalized plot to correspond the dynamic nature of social reality. Unlike monologic discourse, it is still in the process of making.

Instead of a single story, there are multiple stories and multiple centers in the novel. Every major character is the center of his/her ideology, history and action like Gould, Decoud, Nostromo, Montero, Garibaldino and Holroyd. The conflict and contrast of those different centers of ideologies and actions create a decentralized and ununified plot of the novel. Thus, what is to be read in the novel is not the plot but the dialogues. Displaying the immense dialogic sense of truth, *Nostromo* gets shaped by a Galilean linguistic consciousness, and it stages dialogues between and among the languages. Instead of finalized plot, the novel contains a live event, played out at the point of dialogic meeting between two or several consciousnesses. The monologic

control of authorial voice as the "ultimate semantic authority" lacks in the novel and it displays the dialogic sense of truth in a free and democratic atmosphere.

Therefore, from the whole analysis, we can say that the representation of complex and diverse social reality, social heteroglossia, social stratification and thematic diversity through the genuine dialogic interactions, and its apparent polyphonic structure make *Nostramo* a dialogic novel.

## Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Orchard: Harcourt Publishers, 2000.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail. "Discourse in the Novel." *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, 1994. 33-47.
- - -. "Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel." *Critical Theory Since Plato*. ed. Hazard Adams. Rev. ed. New York: Harcourt, 1992. 839-55.
- - -. Emerson, Caryl. Ed. and trans. *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- - -. "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." Emerson and Holquist 204-56.
- - -. *Rebelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1968.
- - -. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M.N. Bakhtin*. Trans. Caryl and Michael Holquist. Austin: UTP, 1981.
- - -. "Toward Reworking of Dostoevsky Book." Emerson 290-302.
- Conrad, Joseph. *Nostromo*. Hertfordshire: Wordsworth Classics, 1996.
- Cox, C.B. "Shifting Perspectives." Dyson 152-55.
- Diaches, David. *A Critical History of English Literature*. Rev. ed. Vol. 4. New Delhi: Allied Publishers, 2001.
- Dyson. A.E., ed. *Casebook Series Conrad: Heart of Darkness, Nostromo and Under Western Eyes*. London: Macmillan Press, 1981.
- Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna. "Nostromo and the Failure of Myth." Jordan 128-43.
- Guerin, Wilfred, et al. *A Handbook of Critical Approaches to Literature*. New York: OUP, 1999.
- Hay, Eloise Knapp. "Nostromo." Stape 81-97.

- Jameson, Frederic. "Romance and Reification: Plot Construction and Ideological Closure in *Nostramo*." Jordan 166-27.
- Jordan, Elaine, ed. *New Casebooks Joseph Conrad*. London: Macmillan Press, 1996.
- Kettle, Arnold. *An Introduction to the English Novel*. Vol. 2. London: Unwin Hayman, 1999.
- Levis, F.R. *The Great Tradition*. London: Penguin, 1967.
- Lothe, Jakob. "Conradian Narrative." Stape 160-76.
- Pearce, Lynne. "Bakhtin and the Dialogic Principle." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patrica Waugh. New York: Oxford University Press, 2006. 223-32.
- Roussel, Royal. "The Ironic Vision." Dyson 131-51.
- Said, Edward. "The Novel as Beginning Intention: *Nostramo*." Jordan. 103-15.
- Stape, J.H., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Joseph Conrad*. Rev. ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1996.