

# Circles, borders and chronotopes: Education at the boundary?

Paper submitted for peer review to PESA Conference  
7-10 December 2012  
Taiwan

Jayne White  
University of Waikato, New Zealand  
whiteej@waikato.ac.nz

One must not... imagine the realm of culture as some sort of spatial whole, having boundaries but also having internal territory. The realm of *culture has no internal territory*: it is entirely distributed along the boundaries, boundaries pass everywhere, through its every aspect, the systematic unity of culture extends into the very atoms of cultural life, it reflects like the sun in each drop of that life. Every cultural act lives essentially on the boundaries: in this is its seriousness and its significance; abstracted from boundaries, it loses its soul, it becomes empty, arrogant, it disintegrates and dies (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 301).

Bakhtin's vision of the "systematic unity of culture" being defined by its boundaries can be extended to the notion of *chronotope* – a "systematic unity" of time, space and an axiology. Holquist (2009) suggests that chronotope lies at the very centre of knowledge creation, since what is valued in one place and time is bounded in its meeting of 'other' another. The coordinates of time and space, therefore, are both ideologic orientations and ways of understanding human experience. Central to chronotope is the idea that an individual or culture can, and will, go beyond its own bounds with the additional insights of 'other'.

Based on Bakhtin's own chronotopic boundary meetings as a member of at least three 'circles' of scholars, artists and thinkers early last century, this paper makes the claim that one doesn't merely 'cross' boundaries, as if one could neatly fit into another set of axiologies and ideologies with minimum effort or minor adjustment. Rather, one meets on the boundary threshold as a bridge between disparate worlds (Clark & Holquist, 1984). This paper examines such thresholds as a means of expanding understanding by focussing on educational activity, and its boundaries, in contemporary societies that are characterised by diversity and difference. The route to such threshold encounter is marked by the potential for educationalists to engage with 'other' beyond the limits of their own 'coordinates'. I argue that such experience lies at the very heart of contemporary educational theory and practice.

## Time and space: The chronotope

In Bakhtin's chronotope, a particular – and peculiar - fusion of time, space and experience has already taken place. Indeed, space and time inform and shape each other, and one's activities occur within that time-space synthesis. Hence, experience (act or event) is an inseparable phenomenon from time and space; they act in concert with, and thoroughly inform, each other. Certain kinds of knowledge arise in each particular fusion. Bakhtin uses the metaphor of literary genre to illustrate the diverse nature of chronotopes that may evidence themselves; in each genre he describes, there is a different way of interaction between space, time and experience, but in each genre there is an interplay

between real and imagined worlds. The protagonist in each genre is framed differently against the backdrop of space and time, and thus a different order of the chronotope is revealed. The genre is metaphorical because it emphasises that one's everyday experiences are scribed within a certain positing of space and time – a set of coordinates that determine its order. Thus, chronotope was not intended just as a literary device but as an expression of one's acts *within* and *together with* a specific positing of space and time, as an event-of-being.

Bakhtin's chronotope challenges the notion that space and time are immutable phenomena, and it brings into question any belief that the actor performs an activity either outside space and time or else within a grand truth of space and time. For instance, Bakhtin countered the idea that Kant's (1998) treatment of self-other in time and space – a point I return to later – is correct because of the Kantian self's ability to *a priori* organise concepts autonomously and systematically. In a similar vein, despite the overriding importance attached to Einstein's (1905) theory of relativity, which reconciled the two as a time-space system (Peters 2010), the two phenomena for Bakhtin needed not be thought of as *always* comprising scientific qualities.

Bakhtin's employment of art, literature and language as metaphors for understanding the potential treatment of time-space offer a fertile ground for examining *human activity*. In his mid-career<sup>i</sup> essay *Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the novel* (1981) and late work *Response to a Question from the Novy Mir Editorial Staff* (1986a) Bakhtin analyses various novelistic genres and their treatment of time and space within human acts. He concludes that Goethe's notion of 'great time' – one that takes account of the past, present and future – offers a central means of 'seeing'<sup>ii</sup> time *in space* [my emphasis] (Bakhtin, 1981, p. 30.). It is therefore hardly surprising that Goethe's *Bildungsroman* (along with Dostoevsky's *polyphonic* and Rabelais' *carnavalesque* novelistic genres) provide a rich basis for Bakhtin's overarching theory of dialogism (Morson & Emerson, 1990). Each views time and space as fundamentally inseparable, yet treats them in very different ways (a point that Bakhtin depicts in detail in his various essays). Invoking the 'becoming' subject of Goethe's (1989) *Bildungsroman* in this way Bakhtin brings time, space and culture together in chronotope as a central means of creative encounter. Here the character is not presented as an ideal, ready-made being, but instead as one in a process of becoming – through messy, even problematic, encounters with others in time and space (Bakhtin, 1986b). For Bakhtin, culture is revealed in these exchanges.

Of particular importance for Bakhtin in his treatment of chronotope is not merely the chronotope itself, as a form-shaping ideology where identities are constructed as "differentiated, situated, and circumscribed by specific chronotopic and performative contexts..." (Pereen, 2008, p. 27). Rather, its location is oriented in the midst of other chronotopes. As Bakhtin (1981) explains, every chronotope has its boundary lines that resist fusion despite interaction with others. This is not to say that an outsider cannot speak into the chronotope (as a narrator might tell a story) but, for Bakhtin, their engagement would never result in full immersion: "Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched" (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 7). Thus chronotopes co-exist

dialogically. They may “replace or oppose one another, contradict one another or find themselves in ever more complex interrelationships” (Bakhtin, 1981, p.252) but they never become one and the same. Through encounter with other, culture is thus revealed as “a riddle” (Girenok, 2008, p. 348) that is both foreign and mysterious, but not at all a comfortable overcoat that can be put on and immediately worn with ease. Such a view differs starkly from Lefebvre’s (1991) notion of ‘thirdspace’ as a merging of disparate representational spaces into a conceived and reconciled whole.

Bakhtin’s own career and life span provides a living example of chronotopic thresholds as a means of engaging with diverse ideas. As Rule (2011) explains “Bakhtin was much more at home on the boundaries than in any particular camp” (p. 940) and it was this characteristic that earned Bakhtin the title of the two-faced Janus or misplaced “Humpty Dumpty” (Wall, 1998, p. 677). Bakhtin’s interanimation within three eclectic ‘circles’ in Russia during the early twentieth century provided a rich groundswell for alternative ideas and approaches (White & Peters, 2012). Bakhtin’s resistance to extremes of either dichotomous positioning or, conversely, monologic thought, has its genesis in these early semiotic, formalist, and modernist origins but he is by no means confined to this arena. As Erdinast-Vulcan (1997) explains “Bakhtin’s work lies not in its neat dovetailing into postmodernism, but in its self-conscious threshold position, that is, its fundamental unresolved ambivalence on questions of ethics and agency”. Due to the irreconcilable nature of this position, Bakhtin’s quest was not to create universal truths but rather to understand features of time and space that play a key role in the way consciousness might be understood.

To understand this position it is necessary to appreciate the influence of Kant’s (1998) notion of time and space as coordinates between forms of thinking that define the gap both Bakhtin and Kant believed to exist between the mind and the world. In this sense time and space constitute the kinds of knowledge that might be valued, and its boundaries, at any particular time and place. However, as Holquist explains (2009) Bakhtin rejected Kant’s idea of *transcendence*<sup>iii</sup> as a means of exceeding boundaries through universalized principles based on mental representation. Instead he embraced the concept of *transgradience*<sup>iv</sup> as a boundary that may only be transgressed through lived experience, as a form of visual surplus that is derived in interaction with other. This distinction is important because in this interpretation “reality is experienced, not just perceived” (Holquist, 2009, p. 15) and is therefore determined by the dialogic position of subjects rather than merely its conceptual basis. Based on this theorization, the chronotope allows one to ask “what is the agentic potential of time and space, and for whom?”. Herein lies the basis of Bakhtin’s aesthetic entreaty that emphasizes addressivity and answerability “as a means of penetrating dialogic understanding through artistic appreciation of other” (White & Peters, 2012, p. 4). It is here that chronotopic thresholds play out.

### **Chronotopic thresholds**

We have established that Bakhtin’s chronotope, in its broadest sense, represents time (temporal) and space (spatial) dimensions that frame the way experience can be

understood. Chronotope thus provides a route to the formation of knowledge as a process of 'ideological becoming' - an ontological position - since what is valued in one place and time may differ from another. The coordinates of time and space are both ideologic<sup>v</sup> orientations and ways of understanding human experience. Central to chronotope is the idea that an individual or culture can, and will, go beyond its own bounds with the additional insights of 'other'. Chronotopic boundaries are determined by "the specific views that society attached to them in any particular space and time" (Holquist, 2009, p. 17) and form the basis of any living culture. As such it is a creative act of understanding:

Creative understanding does not renounce itself, its own place in time, its own culture; and it forgets nothing. In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding - in time, in space, in culture. (Bakhtin, 1984a, p. 7).

Bakhtin's route to chronotope, as for his entire thesis, is through language. Like many of his colleagues (see, for example, Voloshinov, 1973) what interests Bakhtin is not the word per se (langue) but its living encounter with other (parole). The boundaries faced by subjects in dialogue thus represent opportunities to examine chronotopic thresholds as a means of "calibrating existence" (Holquist, 2009, p. 16). Thus the forms of language, and their interpreted meaning (taken together as genres) in dialogue serve as a lever for identifying chronotopes and their boundaries. Of particular interest is their existence on the thresholds between one chronotope and another, acting as a potential bridge between disparate worlds (Clark and Holquist, 1984). Matusov (2009) takes Dostoevsky's (1866) example in *Crime and Punishment* where the protagonist steps over the boundaries of morality in both an ontological and an idealogical sense, in order to commit a murder. To achieve such an act, the character had to interact with both the world that was represented in the present and the past and future world that was beyond his immediate grasp. Dostoevsky's artistry reveals this psychological event for the reader through the dialogue of his protagonist who is represented in time and space. For example Dostoevsky writes of his character Raskolnikov as he ponders his fate in the prison cell. In this narrative time is projected forward to a new set of necessary coordinates that are influenced by those of the past (that is, when the crime was committed) and present (as a prisoner in a cell): "He did not know that the new life would not be given to him for nothing, that he would have to pay dearly for it, that it would cost him great suffering" (p. 721). In their totality, suggests Bakhtin (1991), both represented and past-future worlds are divisible and non-divisible at the same time, yet they are never completely reconciled. Raskolnikov is at a threshold - this new life cannot be granted to him without his realisation of the past. His entry into a future outside of the 'prison event' depends on his engagement with past and future time and space coordinates. Taken together, they represent a chronotopic threshold that provides the possibility of something different or 'new', that will always be affected by what has gone before. In other words Raskolnikov will take his past chronotopes, and his projected future ones, to this meeting - they are never abandoned completely.

It is at this chronotopic threshold where Bakhtin (1981) suggests "the sphere of meaning is accomplished" (p. 258). Here, the world is not merely passed over to an individual as a complete whole, but through unfolding (axiologic) relationships with 'other'. The limits and opportunities that exist within these relationships frame the chronotope that orients a

sense of what is 'real', and by association, what can or should be valued. As such, Morson & Emerson (1990) argue that chronotope underpins all activity and offers a way of understanding experience. It represents the identification of culture because each chronotope draws from a construction of the self in relation to other based on a set of agreed, or disagreed, dialogic principles – or rules of encounter – that are manifest only through dialogue with 'other'. In other words, culture exists only through living engagement with “a negotiated relation between” (Holquist & Liapunov, in Bakhtin, 1990, xxvii) and “*emerges* [my emphasis] from breakdowns as an alternative view to cultural differences creating or causing breakdowns” (Matusov, Smith, Candela & Lili, 2007, p. 460). In this view, without attention to difference and awareness of acts as “living event” (Morson & Emerson, 1990, p. 76) culture becomes the only (monologic) means of encounter and thus, according to Bakhtin, “loses its soul” (Bakhtin, 1999, p. 301). It is at its recognition of other chronotopes, therefore, that culture lives and has the opportunity to transgress (NB: not transcend) its own borders. This is a very different view to that being proffered by the discourse of intercultural dialogue (The White Paper on Intercultural Dialogue, in Besley & Peters, 2011), which seeks to “prevent ethnic, religious, linguistic and cultural divides” (p. 5). For Bakhtin, such divides are not only necessary for effective dialogue to take place, but they also provide a means of recognising the essential 'other-ness' of culture. As such, each chronotope is realised to its fullest potential only at its threshold as a kind of gap or disjunct between worlds – as it creates mis-communication, uncertainty and/or surprise (a notion Voloshinov, 1973, describes as an electric spark that is ignited through exchange or Cassirer, 1953, explained in terms of striking a spiritual chord in another). This is a very important concept for education in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Chronotope in education

The chronotope in **formal education** has an intrinsic *pedagogic* significance. It can even be said that it is precisely the chronotope that defines **pedagogy** and **pedagogical** distinctions **among different pedagogical regimes of schools with different educational philosophies**, for in **institutionalised education** the primary category in the chronotope is time. The chronotope as a formally constitutive category determines to a significant degree the **identity of the teacher and students in education** as well (Matusov, 2009, p.149)

Matusov's pedagogical translation of Bakhtin's (1981) literary definition suggests that chronotope also offers a means of interpreting classroom practice (what Vice (1997) calls an examination of the setting and time in relation to the narrative). The point of encounter is forged when disjunctures are recognised. As Sidorkin (1999) explains “The breakability of classroom discourse is one of its most important characteristics. Every understanding includes misunderstanding, because meanings are born between a speaker and a listener, and not only within either head” (p. 105). As such the pedagogical chronotope reflects the 'anti-method' literary and artistic approaches described by Bakhtin (evident in his treatment of Bildungsroman, Rabelais, Dostoevsky, and his encounters with avant garde art) where individuals are no longer defined as products of their 'culture' (that is, a shared and assumed culture) but retain a capacity to generate surprise and uncertainty as a route to transgradience. In pedagogical encounters between teachers and students such an approach offers a means of valuing “contradictions and inconsistencies, for they are necessary for maintaining my internal dialogues” (Sidorkin,

1999, p. 44). Contradictions offer the ‘spark’ of meaning that exists in events where ‘other-ness’ is recognised and valued as a pedagogical imperative. It is here where internally persuasive discourses have their voice alongside what Bakhtin describes as the “voice of the fathers” – that is, the authorial discourses at play within and between chronotopes. The extent to which one is shut down and the other upheld will depend on the degree of open-ness to difference and possible challenge that one chronotope may invoke in its exchange with another.

The pedagogical experiences that take place in educational settings can therefore be described as chronotopic thresholds, or “zones of engagement” (Rule, 2011, p. 938), that create shifting thresholds of communication and, in so doing, provide a means of operating on the boundaries of meanings. Such boundaries can be thought of as pedagogical “opportunity spaces” (Dysthe, 2011, p. 70). Matusov (2009) offers two spheres for chronotopic analysis in this domain. The first, the *didactic chronotope* is defined by pedagogical aspects that are designed to value specific forms of knowledge that are evident in the event such as the curriculum, learning outcomes, forms of instruction, time tabling etc, that define and promote (valued) learning; while the second, the *ontological chronotope*, is characterised by the experience of learning as it is encountered by and for the (agentic) student themselves, evident in events such as the adaption of the classroom to facilitate dialogues and learning styles (versus transmission of information) and use of time (flexible breaks or systems that enable students to determine their own learning needs). The extent to which an educational setting is dialogic or not is therefore defined by the boundaries that are evident (or able to be recognised) between the urgent curiosities of the learner(s), the priorities of the teacher and the different chronotopic events that comprise their approach to learning (Matusov, 2009). Where these boundaries are keenly evident and able to thrive, the internally persuasive discourses of the learners are able to meet with their teacher and his or her learning priorities (as well as those of the authorial discourse). Hence while a set syllabus and its chronotopic boundaries may be in operation, students and teachers have an opportunity to alter its course by bringing their own chronotopic experiences to the encounter. The syllabus may not necessarily change (nor the chronotope in which it is located), but the pedagogical experience will be considerably different. In this location curriculum *is* dialogue and its movement in the flux of time and space. This is not to say that all chronotopes will have equal say in the experience, but that they have the opportunity to posit an alternative position and contribute authentically to the dialogue.

The chronotopic threshold has been recently employed by several educationalists who are keen to examine the transgradient potential of education as a boundary encounter. Odegaard (2011), for example, examined chronotopes as “organising centers for the narrative events” (p. 183) focussing on co-narrative meaning making dialogues during meal times with four year olds by mapping places, scenes, artifacts and descriptions of what happened to the position of learners through language. Fecho (2012) and his colleagues exploited this notion in their pedagogical inquiries as teachers using narratives of their own practice. Each sought moments of ‘jarring’ in their practice as an indication of potential threshold encounters, their responses to these and the conditions that constituted them. Using episodes of surprising or uncomfortable events from their

teaching experience (such as an email from an angry parent, a provocation from a student or teacher reflections of their own practice) they explore the potential of this encounter to broaden their interpretations of learning and teaching. Similarly, in an online history classroom between Arab and Jewish Israeli students, Pollock and Ben-David Kolikant (2011) discovered opportunities for developing political awareness of ‘other through dyadic engagement across chronotopes that were oriented to oppositional political beliefs. Here they were not so naïve as to expect a transformation of deeply held ideas about history, but instead to “develop a genuine, lasting interest in examining their own ontological truth with the help of the Other voice” (p. 146).

Chronotopic investigation of educational philosophies and their outcry in educational institutions is also a fruitful avenue for interpreting educational epochs and their lifespan in contemporary society. Shields (2011) draws on chronotope in this way to emphasise past, present and future oriented meaning of language as “a new and more connected way of thinking about the interplay of time and space, of social and historic forces” (p. 242) that exists in all language – spoken and written. Shield’s orientation towards a tolerance of new ways of encountering the world through the recognition, and celebration, of difference holds promise for the critical interrogation of various types of educational provision and the chronotopes that sustain them. For example White’s (2012) chronotopic analysis of the increasing presence and ‘educational’ treatment of infants in New Zealand early childhood education settings (as opposed to traditional home settings) reveals a number of intersecting, but never fully merging, positions that have largely been ignored in policy and practice:

In such negotiated, uncertain, emotional and sometimes conflicted chronotopic interfaces ECE teachers must continually exercise their professional judgment to ensure that infants and toddlers receive what they believe to be the best possible education and care... Located within an educational context teachers working with infants and toddlers must therefore respond to both the competent child required by the state, but also the vulnerable infant for whom they must advocate in the absence of a loving parent (White, 2012, p. 11).

Notwithstanding their differences, it is evident that each of these authors variously employ the notion of chronotope as a means of examining pedagogical dialogues – as context + practice + assigned value - within and between learning communities. Such complex analysis draws attention to the historical, contextual and axiological features of pedagogy as part of its lived reality in time and space. What is of particular significance, however, is not merely their identification, since aspects of each may be beyond the teacher’s control, but their potential to meet. It is here where boundary encounters take place and chronotopic thresholds have potential to impact on learning. Odegaard (2011), for example, discovered various chronotopic ‘knots’ in young childrens’ dialogue that created opportunities for negotiation and contradiction base on the experiences they brought from outside the immediate setting (such as their engagement with fictional television characters that provided a means through which the children could express their thoughts). This awareness is especially important in educational contexts where student voice is, for whatever reason, silenced within classroom discourse because it draws from different sources and experiences that are not necessarily shared, or valued, by all.

An imperative for examining chronotopic thresholds is no less true for teachers who work with the very young. Invoking reality (past, present, future ‘real life’ events), imaginative (“unharnessed possibilities” p. 209) and community (relationships of power and friendship) chronotopes, Marjanovic-Shane (2011) suggests that all three have the capacity to simultaneously meet on their own boundaries where play is valued as a central means of encounter. Though often misunderstood or instrumentalised by well-meaning adults, playful acts transgress boundaries by negotiating, manipulating, juxtaposing, rehearsing and perhaps even ridiculing the serious positions of other and self, concepts deeply attuned to Bakhtin’s carnivalesque (1968). In play several positions can be simultaneously occupied as a means of exploring diverse perspectives, and relating to others. According to Marjanovic-Shane and White (2012) these boundary experiences can provide opportunities to experience play as an important means of positioning the self among others through genres at one’s disposal (as a kind of *postupok*<sup>vi</sup>). In the play event all chronotopes are celebrated as human creativity at its keenest, thus, “becoming a player means entering into a threefold relationship with others (and self)” (Marjanovic-Shane, 2011, p. 204). It means entering a situation that simultaneously contains three mutually interrelated, yet distinct ways of being, acting and relating to others and self. In play, they argue it is possible to manipulate the chronotopes as a route to axiologic engagement and meaning. Bakhtin explains this as “Being-as-event”:

It is only from within my participation that the function of each participant can be understood. In the place of another, just as in my own place, I am in the same state of senselessness. To understand an object is to understand my ought in relation to it (the attitude or position I ought to take in relation to it), that is, to understand it in relation to me myself in once-occurrent Being-as-event, and that presupposes my answerable participation, and not an abstracting from myself. It is only from within my participation that Being can be understood as an event, but this moment of once-occurrent participation does not exist inside the content seen in abstraction from the act qua answerable deed (Bakhtin, 1993, p. 18).

Through chronotopic threshold experiences that are represented as a kind of jarring, fissure, wobbling, knotting encounter or ‘postupok’, recognition is possible only when some axiologic act occurs to bring the chronotopes to life through an answerable act. This, however, does not constitute a crossing from one to the other. Each of these encounters represents the recognition of boundaries by others as an opportunity to notice and recognise difference, and to examine its impact on the self. Instead of trying to cross the boundary to think and act the same as another (or vice-versa), these studies suggest that “even in the grey much can be sensed and directions can be taken” (Fecho, 2012) based on a greater awareness of oneself, and other in dialogic exchange (not union). Such boundaries represent chronotopic thresholds that may act as a bridge to different ontologic<sup>vii</sup> domains in pedagogy.

## **Chronotopic conclusions**

The notion of chronotope, and its cultural significance, is greatly enhanced when considered as a threshold encounter. For education it opens up the possibility for diversity and difference at its boundaries without seeking reconciliation at the cost of one subject over another. Chronotopic thresholds thus provide an opportunity to encounter the origin

and nature of incommensurable ideas and practice as they are experienced in the social setting. There are no ‘solutions’ promoted here<sup>viii</sup> as is often the case in dialogues concerning difference. Rather there is an, often uncomfortable, encounter with uncertainty as a necessary route forward. In this locale meaning is a lived experience rather than an appropriated or, worse, enculturated end-point to be achieved. In societies that are increasingly ‘global’ and ‘open’ (Peters, 2011) such thresholds represent a means of opening up consciousness so that richer understanding may be experienced through lived encounter. There are also opportunities to re-vision ‘culture’ as a lived event in dialogue with ‘other’.

Throughout this paper I have argued for a pedagogical application of chronotopic thresholds as a central route to learning. While this paper has introduced some recent studies of threshold examination of chronotopes in educational practices across the world, there are many more unexplored intersections at boundaries that exist as opportunities for encounter in learning environments. These are least appreciated in monologic settings that deny the internally persuasive discourses of student and, in doing so, present curriculum and the teacher as fixed, summative and true. What chronotopic thresholds do, for those who are willing to recognise their potential, is invite teachers to dialogically meet with the multiple circles and borders each student brings to their experience as a means of seeing outside of their own ‘reality’, embracing culture as a living act, and examining its potential for learning. When viewed as a means of transgradience boundaries thus become opportunities to see the experience of one-self and other as an event of learning that is informed by coordinates of time, space and axiology. In essence, the chronotope is a boundary that either limits or expands the experience of self and other, depending on how its coordinates are viewed in the social world. Meeting at the thresholds is an experience of uncertainty, de-staliation and unfinalization. For the teacher it is a call to suspend end-point pedagogies in order to “wait, anticipate and most importantly, not miss the moment when it comes” (Sidorkin, 1999, p. 11). Since, for Bakhtin, meaning lives only in such encounters, for all its challenges, it will be worth the effort.

Acknowledgements: Special thanks to Michael Peters for his ongoing interest in this work and its significance in philosophy of education, and to Carl Mika for his gentle provocations that push this work forward. Acknowledgements also to members of the Dialogic Pedagogy community for our many online dialogues, writing and exchanging of ideas across geographical spaces, and their deep relevance for our work.

## References

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1968). *Rabelais and his world*, Trans. H. Iswolsky, Cambridge Mass: MIT Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1999). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetic*, Vol. 8, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). Forms of time and of the chronotope in the novel, in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. M. Holquist. (Ed.). Translation C. Emerson and Holquist, Austin: University of Texas, 84-258.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986a). Response to a Question from the Novy Mir Editorial Staff, in *Speech Genres and other late essays*. (V.W. McGee, Trans). Austin: University of Texas.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1986b). The Bildungsroman and its significance in the history of realism (Towards a historical typology of the novel, in *Speech Genres and other late essays*. (V.W. McGee, Trans). Austin: University of Texas.
- Besley, T. & Peters, A. (Eds.). (2012). *Interculturalism: Education and Dialogue*, Peter Lang: New York.
- Cassirer, E. (1953). *The philosophy of symbolic forms*, (R. Manheim, Trans, Vol. One: Language), New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Clark, K., & Holquist, M. (1984). *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge, Massachusetts & London: Harvard University Press.
- Dostoevsky, F. (1866). *Crime and Punishment*, CRW Publishing: London.
- Dysthe, O. (2011) Opportunity spaces for dialogic pedagogy in test-oriented schools: A case study of teaching and learning in high school. In E.J. White & M. Peters. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, Peter Lang: New York, 69-90.
- Erdinas-Vulcam. (1997). Borderlands and contraband: Bakhtin and the question of the subject, *Poetics Today*, 18, (2).
- Fecho, B. with Cole, P., Altman, I., Dean, A., Falter, M., Hall, L., Hong, X. (2012, in press). Navigating the Grey: Unpacking a narrative of a dialogic teacher. Special Issue of *Educational Theory*. University of Illinois.
- Girenok, F. (2008). After Bakhtin, *Russian Journal of Communication*, 1, (3), 348-352.
- Goethe, J. W. (1989). *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*. (Trans. E. A. Blackall. Edited by E. A. Blackall and V. Lange), Vol. 9, Goethe: the collected works, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University press

Holquist, M. (2009). The role of chronotope in dialog, *Proceedings from the second international interdisciplinary conference on Perspectives and Limits of Dialogism in Mikhail Bakhtin*, K. Junefelt & P. Nordin (Eds.). Department of Scandinavian languages, Stockholm University: Stockholm.

Kant, E. (1998). *Critique of Pure Reason*, Trans & Edited by P. Guyer & A.W. Wood, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*, trans. D. Nicholson-Smith, Oxford: Blackwell.

Lewis, T. (2012). Exopedagogy: On pirates, shorelines, and the educational commonwealth. *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 44, (8). 845-861.

Marjanovic-Shane, A. (2011). You are “nobody”: The three chronotopes of play, In E.J. White & M. Peters. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, Peter Lang: New York, 201-226

Marjanovic-Shane, A & White, E.J. (2012, in press). When the footlights are off?: A Bakhtinian interrogation of play as postupok. Special Issue of *Educational Theory*. University of Illinois.

Matusov, E., Smith, M.P., Candela, M.A. & Lili, K. (2007). “Culture has no internal territory”: Culture as dialogue. In J. Valsiner & A. Rose (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Socio-Cultural Psychology* (pp 460-483), Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Matusov, E. (2009). *Journey into dialogic pedagogy*. Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Matusov, E. (2009a). Guest Editor’s Introduction to Parts I and II: The school of the dialogue of cultures pedagogical movement in Ukraine and Russia, *Journal of Russian and East European Psychology*, 47, (1), 3-19.

Matusov, E. (2010). Chronotopes in education: Conventional and dialogic. *Journal of the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning*.

Morson, G. S., & Emerson, C. (1990). *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a prosaics*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.

Neuman, Y. (2008). Transgradience: A lesson from Bakhtin. *Studies in Multidisciplinary*, 6, 239-256.

Odegaard, E. (2011). On the track of cultural formative practice. In E.J. White & M. Peters. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, Peter Lang: New York, 179-200

Peeren, E. (2008). *Intersubjectivities and Popular Culture: Bakhtin and Beyond*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Peters, M. (2010). Critical historiographies: Retemporalizing experience ‘after’ the spatial turn, Paper presented to *Time, Space and Education*, University of Bergen and Norwegian Teacher Academy, 29-30 September, Bergen.

Peters, M. (2011). Manifesto for education in the age of cognitive capitalism: Freedom, creativity and culture, *Itinerios – Forum Global de Investigacao Educacional*, 1, (1), 26-33

Pollock, S. & Ben-David Kolikant, Y. (2011). Fostering dialogue in a context of socio-political conflict: An instructional model, E. J. White & M. Peters. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, Peter Lang: New York, 129-148.

Rule, P. (2011). Bakhtin and Freire: Dialogue, dialectic and boundary learning, *Educational Philosophy and Theory*, 43, (9), 924-942

Sidorkin, A.M. (1999). *Beyond discourse: Education, the self and dialogue*, State University of New York Press: Albany.

Shields, C. (2011). Bakhtin’s “novel” proposal: Lessons for educational leaders, . In E.J. White & M. Peters. *Bakhtinian pedagogy: Opportunities and challenges for research, policy and practice in education across the globe*, Peter Lang: New York, 227-246.

Vice, S. (1997). *Introducing Bakhtin*. Manchester, New York: Manchester University Press.

Voloshinov, V. N. (1973). *Marxism and the philosophy of language*, trans. L. Matejka & I. R. Titunik, Harvard University Press, USA.

Wall, A. (1998). A broken thinker, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, 97, (3/4), 669-693.

White, E.J. & Peters, M. (2012, August). Creativity and the University: The collective creation of Vitebsk. Paper presented to *The Creative University Conference*, University of Waikato, New Zealand.

White, E.J. (2012, in press), Chronotope spaces in ECE: A dialogic encounter with people, places and things, in J. Sumsion & L. Harrison, *The lived spaces of infant and toddler settings*. Springer: The Netherlands.

---

<sup>i</sup> It is important to note that the publication date does not present an accurate picture of the time in which this text was written. Bakhtin’s texts were published out of date – with his earliest work being published last.

<sup>ii</sup> Bakhtin was very influenced by Goethe’s notion of ‘giving way to the work of the eye’. This was to form the basis for his own theory of visual surplus (Bakhtin, 1990). He explains: “Anything essential

---

can and should be visual...It is generally known that Goethe attached great significance to the art of the eye and visibility” (Bakhtin, 1984b, p. 27).

<sup>iii</sup> Kant’s notion of ‘transcendence’ spoke to the scientific controversies of his era, enshrined in dogmas of rationalism and empiricism that could be surpassed by *a priori* knowledge emanating from experience.

<sup>iv</sup> Bakhtin’s ‘transgradience’ refers to “the ability to perceive beyond the particular and limited perspective of an observer” (Neuman, 2008, p. 329).

<sup>v</sup> Bakhtin’s (1986) interpretation of ideology is concerned with systems of ideas in communication that “betray” (p. 101) the speaker in communication with others.

<sup>vi</sup> Postupok comprises “a constituent moment of my life-of the continuous performing of acts [postuplenie]”. (Bakhtin, 1993, p. 3) that are employed as a means of social orientation.

<sup>vii</sup> By ontologic I refer to Matusov’s (2009a) description in which he cites Sidorkin (1999) to describe ontology as “human existence” (p. 14) as opposed to ‘being’.

<sup>viii</sup> See alternative promotions such as ‘third-ness’ (Lefevre, 1991), “surplus-commons’ (Lewis, 2012), Sidorkin’s (1999) ‘three drinks’ theory, or other reconciliatory ideals.

2012 PESA Conference