

CARNIVAL IN THE ABSENCE OF THE ACTOR

Elena A. Semenova

*the article is dedicated to the genius clown Chip,
street theater actor Yury Dyachenko
(12.10.1975—28.08.2018)*

ABSTRACT

In article the carnival activities consider as an aesthetic personal activity, not exempt from non-aesthetic moments, going beyond the «special activity of the artist creator». The author introduces the concept of «clown in clownery», correlated in Bakhtin formula of «vnenakhodimost'», based on the love and participation of the author in relation to the hero. It is concluded that in the acting school there is only the first stage of the game (serious) systematized. The second carnival modeling system in which the transition to a new, deep level of philosophical understanding has the casual character at the school of education of actors and directors. The author refers to the results of his research aimed at expanding the ideas of students-directors and students-actors about the chosen profession by immersing in an active carnival-art environment.

KEYWORDS

Humor, irony, carnival attitude, familiar contact, M.M. Bakhtin, G. Shpet, D. McCaw, carnival culture, art, theatre, actor, director.

In real life, the aesthetic responsibility of the actor and the whole person for the appropriateness of the game remains, as the whole game is the responsible act of its player, not of the portrayed hero.

M.M. Bakhtin

M.M. Bakhtin wrote relatively little about the theater. Separate thoughts about the nature of the theater are fragmentarily scattered in many of his works, notes, notebooks, working notes and conversations. We learn a lot about how Bakhtin referred to the theater from his conversations with V.D. Duvakin, with whom he shared his memories of the Odessa theater (Bakhtin 1996: 50), about the Moscow Art Theater, about F. Chaliapin, about the acting talent of A. Piotrovsky (Bakhtin 1996: 64-65), about the literary pubs “Prival komediantov” and “Brodyachaya sobaka” (Bakhtin 1996:64), about the mobile theater of Haideburov (Bakhtin 1996:189-190), about plays staged by V.E. Meyerhold, in particular, about his “Revizor” and about acting of M. Chekhov as Khlestakov (Bakhtin 1996: 200), about the Rheinhardt Theater and its production of “King Oedipus” (Bakhtin 1996: 201) and others.

His thoughts about Shakespearean heroes (Bakhtin 1996, v. 4: 681-731) and about a carnival, in which there is no habitual division into actors and spectators are valuable. He also has interesting statements about the immortality of comic characters

(pulcinella, harlequin, parsley). Those characters, unlike heroic-tragic masks, have the rights not only to choose destiny, but also to change fates and their scenarios. In Epos and Novel, Bakhtin reflects on comic heroes who remain in the eternal phase of formation, rebirth, and dying. Such are the performers of lazzi in Commedia Dell'arte, where the comic hero is not constrained by the plot. It was the clown who was allowed of "laughable outrage", in which he revealed "his simple but inexhaustible human face" (Bahtin 1975: 479). About the laughter of N.V. Gogol Bakhtin wrote that it has a divine face. Gogol's hero is not a man, but laughter "as an actor" (Bahtin 1975b: 490). Bakhtin develops these thoughts in discussions about humor, character, heroization, type, categories of comic and tragic as architectonic forms of an aesthetic object, which, despite the fact that they need compositional methods, relate to the physical and mental values of an aesthetic person, to the forms of his personal, social and spiritual event, to the essence of achievements and accomplishments (Bahtin 1975a: 20). Perhaps that is why Bakhtin attributed the drama with its dramatic dialogues and division into acts not to architectonic forms, but to purely technical, compositional ones.

When asked why Bakhtin did not write about the theater with the same interest as he wrote about the carnival, philosophy of deed, marginality of art and life and other topics, he himself gives a lot of clues. In this article I will focus on three of them.

The first is his answer to the question asked by V.D. Duvakin: "As a spectator, did you like the Art Theater?" (Bakhtin 1996: 76). Bakhtin replied that "so that I love it, I cannot say. I liked it, it made an impression on me..." (Bakhtin 1996: 76). In continuation of his answer, he reflects on the fate of the theater as a canon: "... to canonize the phenomenon of culture means to kill it. It breathes only in an atmosphere of freedom and free struggle, competition... criticism... When this atmosphere is forbidden around, the theater dies ..." (Bakhtin 1996: 77).

The second clue is related to the answer that Bakhtin gave to I. Uvarova-Daniel to her question about why, despite the fact that he wrote about the carnival, he does not have a mystery theme (although it cannot be said that he did not touch the theme of the antique, Eleusinian Mysteries (Bahtin 1975c: 263). To this question M.M. Bakhtin replied: "I didn't have enough life for the mystery" (Uvarova 2014: 91). In this regard, we can afford some comment on this answer. As I. Uvarova-Daniel accurately noted, Bakhtin measured topics with his own life.

And the third clue is related to his involvement into informal intellectual circles, in particular to his first circle, which was called "Omphalos", which in Greek means "navel" (Bakhtin 1996: 51). He continued the traditions of the circles that previously existed in England (D. Swift came out of such a circle), in Poland. M. Bakhtin compared his circle with Pushkin's Arzamas. Such circles included "learned jokers, jokers from science ... jesters from science ..." (Bakhtin 1996: 52). In the XVIII century they were called Swabrians. In each of the participants it was possible to observe a "carnival... gone deep" (Bakhtin 1996: 115) into personality, rooted in it. In these circles there was a preaching of "high philosophical style" (Bakhtin 1996: 52). Parodies and stylizations had a funny, easy, ironic-humorous character and did not make fun of specific historical events, scientific phenomena, etc. (Bakhtin 1996: 54).

Bakhtin was fascinated by an act, an action that is in eternal formation. An act that ties

art and life into a single destiny. A responsible act, which is performed at the cost of torment and suffering. An act (bold or vile, cruel or merciful, honest or deceptive), which like a tail is following a person, wherever he comes, no matter what field of activity he is engaged in. This is a completely different theater - Theater of the Deed.

Once again, Bakhtin, in comparison with his other topics, to study which he devoted quite a big amount of time, he devoted relatively little time to the theme of the theater. Nevertheless, at the moment, a number of academic papers on the Bakhtin Theater have been written. It is interesting that all the works related to the study of the potential of Bakhtin's ideas in the theater came out at the beginning of the 21st century.

Some authors note, and often not without reason, that for anthropology and other scientific fields the theory of Bakhtin's carnival is of purely historical interest today. With regard to theatrical pedagogy, this can be argued. It is possible to perceive Bakhtin's ideas as what was known before them only when it comes to a nominal understanding of his work, but not about the spirit "which breathes wherever it wants". In this case, any ironic statements about Bakhtin's ideas can be characterized by the words of C. Kierkegaard (whom Bakhtin called Kirkegor and highly appreciated) that such irony affirms what is behind it (K'erkegor 1993).

It's interesting that the appeal to the philosophical understanding of the theater through the ideas of Bakhtin develops in parallel with the fading of interest in Bakhtin in relation to the study of laughter. Over the past two decades, researchers have shifted their attention to separate, local aspects of laughter, humor and irony. Modern foreign scientists are attracted by the most diverse aspects of laughter: emotional; sociological; psychological; political; gender and others (Semenova 2018:13-14). In general, against the background of an increasing amount of works on the study of the parts and particulars of the laughing world, not only a decline in interest in Bakhtin's carnival concept is noticeable, but also a deficit of deep apolitical, philosophical understanding of laughter in the categories of transcendental, unfixed, eternally forming act.

I will try to clarify my idea regarding the reasons for this situation in relation to the decline in interest in Bakhtin in the science of laughter. Discovering in the carnival theory the degree of love that Bakhtin felt for all living things, "that strive for the flame of death" (Gershenzon 2000:18), we discover in this love "inner tragedy and tragic guilt in everything." We begin to see how "under every rose of life a cross looms, from which it flourishes" (Gershenzon 2000:24).

Will everyone endure such a torment? Maybe that's why not everyone dares to look at something blossoming, as at the mercilessly feeble, doomed to die, that not everyone who studies Bakhtin, anthropology or gelotology is endowed with the carnival eye (as a more subtle organ of human vision), and not just the eye of a comedian, humorist, satirist, ironicist, researcher of laughter.

The thoughts set forth by Bakhtin are simple in their obviousness, transparency, and obligatoriness. At first glance, the philosophy of deed and carnival theory are much simpler and more understandable than the philosophical treatises of other researchers, such as, for example, E. Husserl or G.G. Shpet. I note that despite the fact that Bakhtin did not agree with Shpet on a number of issues, in particular on the lack of aesthetic

value in the novel (Bahtin1975: 81), many of his thoughts are surprisingly similar to Shpet's thoughts.

As it turns out upon closer reading, Bakhtin's ideas about the deed are almost unattainable in practice. It is much simpler to write about Bakhtin's philosophy of deed, to think about the subtle interweaving of the architectonics of dreams, about the relationship between the author and the hero, about the transgredient moments, about individual aspects of comicism and laughter, than to verify and implement these positions at the cost of one's own life. Bakhtin himself could make it.

Focusing on the need to preserve personal freedom "for unauthorized play" (Gershenzon 2000: 19), Bakhtin drew the attention of science to the importance of a responsible deed in art, involuntarily contributing to the launch of revolutionary processes of rethinking from these positions the theatrical craft and such fields as clowning, street theater and art of performance.

The main reason for the Bakhtin's ideas to be underestimated in theatrical pedagogy, as it seems to me, is that his main positions have not yet been heard in this area. Therefore, those works in which the theme of the Bakhtin theater is raised often pass by the obvious topic that is broadcasted in his works: the actor plays on stage, and the clown plays outside it - clown remains clown everywhere. Bakhtin wrote in detail and specifically about this difference of being an actor-comedian and a fool-clown. That's why the topic that will be discussed further is associated with the carnival deed as another theater of deed - a carnival in the absence of an actor.

So, who wrote what about the Bakhtin theater and who embodied his ideas? It is impossible to pass by the personality of V.I. Polunin, a fellow countryman of Bakhtin, a world-famous clown philosopher who was born in the town of Novosil, Orel Region. Polunin confesses the thesis: the theatralization of life, life as an art. But he positions his approach to art not as an escape from life into art, not as violence by art. There is an attempt to catch this elusive spirit of free play, of the independence of the carnival from life, and their elusive interpenetration of one into another. It's possible to disagree with Polunin that art and life are one. But it is impossible to disagree with the fact that the poetic-romantic direction of the clowning and his hero Asisiiai, who grew up with him, became an adult, became a wise man, are the embodiment of his philosophy, broadcasting the scale of his own exclusively Polunin's deed. In particular, for several years V.I. Polunin has been heading the Street Theater and Circus section, which is being held as a part of the Cultural Forum in St. Petersburg. The section discusses the issues of hospital clowning, the convergence of the theory and practice of circus and street clowning, the specifics of the clowning and street theater, and many other, broadening processes of philosophical understanding of the circus and theatrical profession.

The teachers of The Accademia Teatro Dimitri are engaged in professional education of the carnival worldview for students. The teacher of this academy R. Weihe (author of studies on the theory and genealogy of clowning, mask and theater theory), who was not familiar with the ideas of M.M. Bakhtin, developed for students a scientific and practical program "Theory and Genealogy of Clownery" at the Swiss The Accademia Teatro Dimitri. In particular, his research project aims to study the history and cultural identity of the clowning; aim to analysis of various styles, functions of the clowning; to

discussion of its new forms in art and in modern society; definition of a clown within the framework of various cultural paradigms and theatrical systems.

Richard Weihe considers a clown who in England in the 16th century differed not only from a real fool as a person with physical or mental handicaps, but also from "artificial" fools, that is, from actors who imitated such "stupid" behavior. R. Weihe believes that the meaning of the word "clown" was almost identical to the terms "fool" (fool) and "jester". R. Weihe interprets the figure of a clown as a generic concept, uniting a wide range of comic figures, which is the embodiment of paradoxicality, combining the unity of opposites. A clown can simultaneously be the initiator of laughter (like a court jester) and its victim. Such is the figure of the clown Augustus, who can stumble, fall, while simultaneously demonstrating his masterly acrobatic art or stutter first, speak nonsense, and then, suddenly, burst out with a witty pun, bright wit.

It is possible to distinguish two main, multidirectional and in a sense justified trends that inhibit the understanding of the acting profession and the theater as a whole in the light of Bakhtin's ideas. The first point is historically associated with the idea that the actor is completely released from the character's obligations immediately after "leaving the role". "The result of which always turns out to be a "sad and logical outcome - Hamlet dies in the actor and returns a human to the world; the exhaustion of the stage performance ritual will leave Hamlet dead and free the actor from his voluptuous obligations to feel himself balancing over life and death as a Shakespearean hero. The actor's presence on the stage is marked by being in negative time <...>" (Yastrebov 2000: 281).

As is known, Bakhtin considered the diametrically opposite: "in real life there remains the aesthetic responsibility of the actor and the whole person for the appropriateness of the game, as the whole game in general is the responsible act of the who plays, but not of the portrayed face-hero" (Yastrebov 2000: 281). Another approach to theatrical art is related to the attitude to the theater as to the temple; with the ministry of an actor in it, with an extremely serious attitude to this craft, as well as to the stage general. And as you know, Bakhtin exposes the theatrical stage, which narrows the perspective of human vision. In his opinion, when such figures as a rogue and a jester, which are irreplaceable when there is a need to portray an inner man, his pure subjectivity, become limited by the scene, they remain identical to themselves, ceasing to surprise us. In conditions of theatrical convention, we do not grasp their phenomenal essence.

The complexity of the realization of Bakhtin's carnival concept in theater practice is largely related to the mentality of Russian laughter and the type of Russian actor, his religious relations with the church, which considers laughter to be a manifestation of a sinful principle. At the round table dedicated to M.M. Bakhtin (Orel, May 22, 2018), the main director of the municipal drama theater "Russian Style" named after M.M. Bakhtin V.I. Simonenko noted that the Russian theater is characterized by an appeal "to the deepest sensory mechanisms (to sacredness, religiosity)" (Electronic resource).

What is more, in the Russian theater historically there was a lack of the *pure, apolitical carnival* forms described by Bakhtin. However, despite the fact that the processes of carnivalization in Russia manifested themselves in the artistic environment, the definitions of carnival culture for a long time did not fit into the Russian domestic

theatrical thesaurus. The history of defense of the dissertation of L. Ivleva can serve as indicator of this. She sees the use of the Bakhtin's methodology in studying the pre-theater game language of Russian mummers, in which, on the one hand, the mummers "seemed to play hide and seek with the spirit world," on the other hand, "any imaginary character seems to be embodied in mummers in public" (Ivleva 1998). As L. Ivleva accurately noted, "this culture is either identified with the theater, or it is determined entirely as a folk laugh culture. But it does not fully fit into one or the other framework: it is not a theater, nor a carnival - it is a ritual that exists in game forms and is largely connected with the tradition of ritual laughter" (Ivleva 1998). However, during the defense of her dissertation, members of the dissertation committee evaluated the theatrical-game nature of mummers not from the position of the Bakhtin's concept of carnival culture, but from the point of view of the theater system of K.S. Stanislavsky.

Larisa Ivleva's monograph «Mummers in Russian Traditional culture» researches into traditional forms of Russian mummery. «The author regards mummery as playing in form and myth in content. The show aspect of embodying mythological ideas is, in the author's opinion, of a great ritual significance: personages of mummery represented "in flesh» are as though embodied with the limit of the possible almost reached <...>. The denominations reflect the general principles of ritual re-embodiment, calendar timing of mummery, particular methods of costume-making. Some of the terms indicates to typical actions of the mummers, whereas the other ones displays the connection between mummery and the next world, the world of demonic» (Ivleva 1994: 232).

However, today the interest in the carnival masks described by Bakhtin is observed in the street theater, in which the mask provides greater freedom compared to the role in the theater, "giving the right to not understand, to confuse, to mimic, and to hyperbolize life; the right to speak, parodying, to not being literal, to not being yourself; the right to lead life through an intermediate chronotope of theatrical stages, to portray life as a comedy and people as actors; the right to tear off masks from others; the right to use substantial (almost cult) swearing; finally, the right to publicize private life with all its most private caches" (Bakhtin 1975).

The Russian Union of Street Theaters and Artists (RUSTA), founded in November 2018 in Moscow, which uses posters with the slogans "Carnivalization" and "Mikhail Bakhtin is alive", can serve as an indicator of the growing interest in Bakhtin's carnival concept through young generation today. It confirms the need to pay attention to the history and originality of the development of the Russian street theater related to carnival culture; including the urgent need for its theoretical understanding based on the ideas of M.M. Bakhtin.

In particular, from September 11 to September 17, 2019 (400 km from Moscow at the address: Tver region, Toropetsky district, Krest village) the All-Russian symposium "Creator of Laugh" was held. It was dedicated to the study of the heritage of M.M. Bakhtin, and it was attended by theorists and practitioners of street theater. As part of the congress, the scientific and practical laboratory "BAKHTIN" was opened, during which were held the workshops on the stage movement, street art (work with water and fire, creation of installations, art objects and performances); lectures by specialists in the field of circus, spectacular arts, carnival culture, street theater (Semenova, Berladin 2019: 25, 67-68).

Modern Bakhtin studies also show an increased interest in the opportunity to consider the potential of Bakhtin's ideas in the comprehension of theatrical phenomena. International round tables held in 2017 (*Problema Hronotopa v sovremennyh nauchnyh issle-dovaniyah: Mezhdunarodnyj kruglyj stol, posvyashchennyj M.M. Bahtinu* (Moskva, 19–20 aprelya 2017 goda, Mo-skva 2017), in 2018 (*Nasledie M.M. Bahtina: kul'tura — nauka — obrazovanie — tvorchestvo: Mezhdunarodnyj kruglyj stol, posvyashchyonnyj M.M. Bahtinu* (22 maya 2018 goda, Oryol 2018), and in 2019 in Moscow and Orel (*Materialy mezhdunarodnoj Bahtinskoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii «Ulichnyj teatr protiv teatra voennyh dejstvij», 16-18 oktyabrya, Moskva 2019; Electronic resource a)* were dedicated to this topic.

Next, we turn to researchers who are engaged in theoretical and practical study of the potential of Bakhtin's ideas in theater, in acting. It is impossible to ignore the work of McCaw, the teacher of London's Royal College of Holloway, whose dissertation, defended in 2004 (McCaw 2004), represents, according to K. Emerson, the first large-scale study-testing of the application of Bakhtin's ideas in a professional theater (Emerson 2015: 184). In the first part of the dissertation the theories of Stanislavsky, Bakhtin and such concepts as wearing a carnival mask, hermeneutics of speech genres, etc. are examined. In the second, the use of Bakhtin's concepts in five acting schools: in the system of K.S. Stanislavsky, V. E. Meyerhold, E. Grotovsky, A. Vasiliev, M. Materik.

In an article by D. McCaw published in 2014, the author reflects on the main difference between the concepts of Bakhtin and Stanislavsky, which is that by Stanislavsky an actor creates a character (role), and by Bakhtin, the author creates a hero. D. McCaw cites such words used by Bakhtin and Stanislavsky as character, hero, role, survival, transgredient (in Russian transcription - harakter, geroi, rol', vzhivanie, transgredientniy), correctly noting that, according to both Bakhtin and Stanislavsky, despite the fact that actors and authors empathize with their characters and heroes, this process must inevitably end up with a return to themselves, to their own place in this world. This is exactly what the Stanislavsky system and the philosophy of Bakhtin's act with its theory about author and hero have in common (McCaw 2014). McCaw, as well as M.M. Bakhtin, is sure that it is undesirable to create a character while being in a state of empathic projection to him, since he "continues to identify with the hero, risking playing the hero, and not creating him" (McCaw 2014).

In his book "Bakhtin and the Theater" D. McCaw published in 2016 writes that Bakhtin in his carnival concept of the grotesque body offers a method that cannot be implemented in the actors profession, since this is a completely different philosophy of existence. D. McCaw asks: "What did Bakhtin think about the theatre? That it was outdated? That is 'stopped being a serious genre' after Shakespeare? Could a thinker to whose work ideas of theatricality, visuality, and embodied activity were so central really have nothing to say about theatrical practice?" (McCaw 2016). In the book "Bakhtin and Theater", D. McCaw was the first to investigate the connection of Bakhtin's ideas with the theatrical practice of his time.

P. Drabek wrote a comprehensive review "Bakhtin and Theater?" (Drábek 2016) on D. McCaw's book "Bakhtin and Theater", starting with the phrase that the theater is dead for Bakhtin.

D. McCaw writes: "More frequently Bakhtin refers to drama as being one of the older genres along with epic and lyric, all of which have been overtaken by the more multi-dimensional and open-structured novel. Although these references to drama as a fixed and old-fashioned art form are very general, even so Bakhtin does provoke the student of theatre to consider the differences between drama and theatre and the novel <...>" (McCaw 2016: 27). D. McCaw enters into a frank dispute with Bakhtin's position not in order to question Bakhtin's statement about novel, but in order to use Bakhtin's thesis to highlight implicit problems and ask not new questions regarding the theater itself in a new way. One of the D. McCaw's tasks "to demonstrate that 'techniques of art' (in this case theatre) can extend and refine philosophical problems raised in Bakhtin's writings" (McCaw 2016:2). However, the very idea of an outdated and not outdated art form, about theatricality and non-theatricality among theatrical figures varies greatly in different periods. In this regard, the author focuses on the ideological and artistic differences that arise between Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Grotowski and are expressed in implicit, hidden quotes addressed to each other, which turn to Bakhtin's dialogism. McCaw's thoughts on the dialogue and traditions of folk culture, written in the chapter on Meyerhold and Grotowski (McCaw 2016: 147-211), are interesting. The author believes that Stanislavsky, no less than Meyerhold, was interested in the Medieval Theater, folk comedy del arte and improvisation. But, the aesthetics of constructivism and grotesque designated for Stanislavsky the limit beyond which he could not go (McCaw 2016: 171). McCaw criticizes Bakhtin's early philosophy. In particular, her static vision of the body. McCaw also believes that "Bakhtin's early theory offers no possibility for the individual to learn or develop since the I is effectively disembodied and static. I will argue that his own approach to body, space and time, and indeed to the experience of being an I and my experience of other people, is very limited" <...>, but "comparison with theatre will reveal a much richer and more dynamic account of this fundamental human activity of making meaning" (McCaw 2016: 8).

Further, let us focus on the work of S. Petrilli (Petrilli 2019), which examines the dialogical potential of a polyphonic novel and theater. S. Petrilli finds great the idea of D. McCaw's book "to relates the architectonics of Bakhtin's thought system" with theatre systems of «Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Grotowski each operate a sort of "revolution" in their own original terms, comparable to Bakhtin's revolution in philosophy of language and literary criticism, the "Bakhtinian revolution" (Petrilli 2019: 13).

S. Petrilli believes that, despite the fact that Bakhtin was interested in the novel more than in the dramatic genres, he devoted a considerable part of his attention to the relationship between an author and a hero, who, in his opinion, can be both a character of the novel and a stage character. In the polyphonic novel, there is a kind of dialogic interference in which the hero speaks, acts and reacts to the author autonomously, as if the hero is not conditioned by the author. S. Petrilli writes that «Under this aspect, most interesting is that one of the last paragraphs in the conclusion to McCaw's book is entitled à la Bakhtin "Other, I and thou". In it, McCaw returns to the relationship between the I and the other as described by Bakhtin in his early writings, without failing to reference developments in his later research as well» (Petrilli 2019: 17). Petrilli shares McCaw's view that "the novel's specificity emerges even more clearly when related to theatrical genres considered from a Bakhtinian perspective». The researcher believes that McCaw's book «also sheds light on what Bakhtin calls the process of "novelization," on how the novel, including in its "polyphonic bend", has influenced, or

could potentially influence, theatrical genres» (Petrilli 2019: 17)

At the end of the article, the S. Petrilli concludes, from which it becomes clear that author still shares Bakhtin's position more. Petrilli writes that «McCaw's analyse of Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Grotowski and focus on Bakhtin <...> He in fact confronts perspectives, experiences and interests with Bakhtin that are distant from his research, but not extraneous to it. Under this aspect, most interesting is that one of the last paragraphs in the conclusion to McCaw's book is entitled à la Bakhtin "Other, I and thou". In it, McCaw returns to the relationship between the I and the other as described by Bakhtin in his early writings, without failing to reference developments in his later research as well» (Petrilli 2019: 26). According to opinion of S. Petrilli, «In Bakhtin dialogue is not so much a question of the exchange of rejoinders between an I and a you. Instead, Bakhtinian dialogue is tantamount to involvement, indifferent participation with the other, co-implication, intercorporeality. It brings into play both voice and gesture. The constitutive multiplicity of the other's identity as much as of one's own, where the different voices do not converge with the I, is best grasped through the gaze at a distance, through the eyes of the other» (Petrilli 2019: 26).

A. Ponzio's article "Polyphony, novel and drama in Bakhtin's works (Ponzio 2018:)" also focuses on Bakhtin's polyphonic novel and drama. Ponzio considers it wrong, firstly, to see that the voices participating in Dostoevsky's dialogue are equal and independent in relation to each other, and, secondly, to assume that Bakhtin deliberately denies the voice of Dostoevsky as the author and his personal point of view. According to Ponzio, in Bakhtin, the author is not indifferent to the hero, which otherwise would mean reduction of the voices to the simple status of the depicted objects, and the author does not identify with the hero. However, unlike McCaw and S. Petrilli, who believe that the novel is a dramatization in the highest degree, Ponzio, on the contrary, is sure that the polyphonic novel is not the approximation of the novel to the drama (Ponzio 2018: 226). Ponzio writes that «not only do objectivity and dramatization of dialogue not coincide with polyphonism, but they can even act as an obstacle to its realization» (Ponzio 2018: 226). However, Ponzio concludes that between the theater and the novel there is always a dialogue (Ponzio 2018: 227). Ponzio insists that «both novel and theatre belong to the same perspective, to the same project: that of verbal art, which consists in showing realistically that reality does not have one face only, that words do not have one meaning only, that the centripetal forces in worldview will never succeed in overcoming the centrifugal orientation that characterizes verbal language, the multiformity and diversity of sign manifestations, of very life itself» (Ponzio 2018: 227).

Two articles by K. Emerson on Bakhtin are of particular interest (Emerson 2015, 2017). The first is devoted to the study of the theatrical potential of Bakhtin's ideas (Emerson 2015: 201). The author begins the article by calling Bakhtin a lyricophobic and a theatrophobic, explaining this by the fact that Bakhtin likes to watch more than to act. The author emphasizes that Bakhtin acts as a metaphysician who is watching a demobilized body with interest. K. Emerson expresses the idea that Bakhtin was a technophobe and opposed any acceleration and progress, but the carnival. That is how Emerson explains Bakhtin's lack of interest in theatrical action. Emerson calls Bakhtin a phenomenologist of the theater, who, contrary to himself, provoked us to a new understanding of the theater. But the researcher's attention is focused not on Bakhtin's study of the improvising clown at the carnival, but on his thoughts about the

professional actor, who embodies the theatrical aim in the performance on stage. She refers to the early works of Bakhtin and to the work of 1944, in which the philosopher discusses the Shakespearean tragedy. The researcher comes to the conclusion that the theatrical potential of ideas of Bakhtin can be applied in the mainstream, in the directing theory (in particular, the concepts of "heteroglossia", "polyglossia", etc.) (Emerson 2015: 201). At the end of her work, Emerson asks a key question: are we able to even understand the nature of the interpenetration of art and life for the actor? After all, the dialogue between the actor and the role is as intimate as possible (Emerson 2015: 204). And at the very end of the article, she puts an unexpected ellipsis, concluding that there will never be a consensus on how central the spiritual dimension is to the actor. Emerson writes that, perhaps, we can agree with Bakhtin that a professional actor should be in an eternal state of incompleteness to make up for the mortal loss of the cycle of the carnival body (Emerson 2015: 201).

In the second article in Russian, K. Emerson dwells on Bakhtin's opposition of two actions: "objectification" and "personification" (Emerson 2017: 44). Emerson quotes Bakhtin that personalization and objectification are completely different things, where personalization is not subjectivation, it is the "limit of the self in relations with other personalities" (Bakhtin 1997—20106, v. 6: 432). Emerson writes that people differ from things in that "they continue to exist in time in the most stubborn way, turning to face each other, they grow, decompose, resist and respond" (Emerson 2017: 44). This may be the main difference between events in the *mise-en-scene* of the theater world and the real world.

K. Emerson draws attention to Bakhtin's rhetorical word, his attitude to the heroes of Shakespeare's tragedy (Emerson 2017: 46), in which he discovers "the complete decomposition of the communal body" (Emerson 2017: 46). Bakhtin sees the heroes of Shakespeare who broke away from the Greek choir and "turn the world around them into a carnival decomposing from within" (Emerson 2017: 46), which, despite being outfitted with carnival paraphernalia, represents a world of decline, a world devoid of "the duality of fertile power". The works of S. Sandler (Sandler 2014), E. Weygandt (Weygandt 2015) are partially devoted to these and other aspects.

Considering that today the very connection between polyphony with theater and dramatization is being questioned in Bakhtin's researches, there is reason to assume that the main discussion regarding the contradiction between the principles set forth by Bakhtin in "Art and Responsibility", in "The Author and The Hero in Aesthetic Activity", as well as in "The Poetics of Dostoevsky", etc., and the prevailing idea of the actor's craft, in which the personality of the actor and the embodied artistic image are divided, will take place in the future.

V.P. Zinchenko dwells on the fundamental difference between a person and a guise, paying attention to the fact that the Russian word "personality" is not a synonym for the English word "personality" which means individuality. V.P. Zinchenko calls the person a state, a face, and relates the person-mask to a guise (Zinchenko 2000: 198-199). Let us turn to the thoughts of G.G. Shpet, voiced by him on this topic. He disputed the opinion that the actor is engaged in revitalization, revives an already existing image created by a playwright, writer or anyone else. No, in his opinion, the actor is engaged in personification. He creates from his own face, his own personality. You may notice that

the peculiarities of the Russian laughter mentality are reflected in the folklore theater, in which the personality of the masked man seeks to ward off evil (illness, evil eye), putting on a mask that is not a mask, but rather an amulet for personality.

So, I proceed to present my hypothesis. The carrier of the carnival foundation is not a guise or an actor's mask. This is a "clown in a clowning". I introduced this concept because it is comparable with the Bakhtin formula of *vnenahodimost'* only in a number of aspects. In the clowning there is a certain infernal nature of another, created from my inner self, who is not a real person, not one who can squeeze out my external image, take my own place, not one who is able to introduce some "fabulous uncertainty into my dream", like its (dreams) participant performing a specific role in it. O. Mandelstam believed that the poet differs from the writer in that the poet "is associated only with a providential interlocutor" (Mandel'shtam 1987: 52).

But the position of distance in relation to the hero and the returning to own place in the world is not applicable to the clown in the clowning. This is the zone of the closest contact between me and the other, but as visible as invisible. Here the infinite dynamics of the change of plans works: approximation-distancing; inseparability of the tragic and comic foundation. The clown in the clowning is always in his place, what means he is outside of himself.

Therefore, when Bakhtin warns that in the process of getting used to the hero, the author should not go beyond the line beyond which the image becomes real because in this case the hero will obscure and enslave the author, this cannot be feared by a clown who has other goals. A clown is always infected by someone or something. Bakhtin gives us a description of the techniques for creating a character from ourselves. It is important for actors who always have to get into role (to go through, to merge, to take the place of another, to penetrate the other through transgredient moments), as well as to return to their own place (Bahtin 1979: 28).

A clown does not create a hero - through carnival denial of himself at the "peak of spiritual effort" (M. Mamardashvili) he turns into a hero who has the only one comic interlocutor, a guide in himself, communicating with him in the "zone of maximum approximation" (Bahtin 1975: 476, 478). Carnival denial of oneself does not occur before or after experiencing the maximum peak of spiritual effort, but during it. Exactly at these moments a person grows into a "clown in a clowning", experiencing the catharsis of simultaneously experiencing the excess of carnival and the inescapable insufficiency of art. This is that very excess act — an act of carnival being-an event that extends far beyond the theater. Carnival redundancy can be beyond art. You can look at the carnival, as a component of the actors profession, and at the acting, as part of falling into the carnival state of not only a professional actor, but just an individual, as an aesthetic personality activity that is not exempt from unaesthetic moments, not only beyond the scope of "special activities of the artist-creator", but also the activities preceding it.

In the acting school usually the first level of the game (serious, technical, aimed at getting into a role) is more developed, but not the second level, in which there is a moment of the mystery of carnival denial of oneself not as a person-actor, but as a person-clown. It is no coincidence that outbreaks of carnivalization and carnival

behavior in the acting profession are rarely independently transferred by young people into conscious professional practice. Generally, this happens only as a result of the positive pedagogical influence of a mentor, an idol, an extraordinary scale of personality, authority - a personifier of the carnival world, enthralling into the space of carnival culture, unfolding folded carnival symbols that hide acts of significant human carnival and creative activity. More often these manifestations stop at the level of metanormativity (theatricality, performativity, shocking behavior - *epatage*). The difference between metanormative and deviant behavior is that, like a theatrical action, metanormative behavior is focused on audience resonance (Semenova 2018:7) and on the overstatement and understatement of social norms (Gozhev, Yurkov 2005:272).

The fundamental difference between metanormative and carnival behaviors lies in the fact that the carnival behavior does not aim to create a fundamentally new norm in human society, which would demonstrate the maximum approximation to the human ideal. Carnival norm is not higher not lower than social norm. This is a new ideal norm - a new ideal, a new universally accepted height taken. That is why metanormative behavior does not pose a threat to society. It is located at two poles: above and below. And there arises the question, what is the difference between an action of a clown and an action of an actor.

Let's begin by eliminating the temptation to apply the atomic approach to carnival game and acting, with its goal of dividing an object into elements, components. If we select elements, then it would happen with understanding by them the essence of the whole whole object, its essence is a living cell. If, following Bakhtin, we assume that the carnival is related to a specific imagery, which directs, builds all the behavior of a person in a special way, then carnival being and actors creativity are not physical movements, but the creation of internal forms. Let's go along the path that Shpet points out: we will try to approach the definition of a carnival act, starting not from the definition of an act in general, but from the carnival act itself, in its entirety and specificity (Shpet 2007).

To determine the carnival deed, we need its material composition, structuredness, a specific ratio of "artistic and aesthetic" in it (Shpet 2007: 23).

G.G. Shpet indicates the difference in the subject-semantic framework (Shpet 2007: 21) of writing and acting. He uses the expression "actors own creativity", which is located in "potential", which means that after reading a role, an actor will have to move on to his own creative act (Shpet 2007: 29), in which he will turn to his voice, facial expressions, figure, word, to his face mask (person). With regard to acting, G. Shpet uses an understanding of intrigue, which takes place not in drama, nor in the play, nor in its plot, but in the actor himself. It is this intrigue that the viewer follows. G. Shpet believes that the actor himself creates an imaginary face (Shpet 2007: 31) through motor-sympathetic forms.

When it comes to some process of embodiment of idea by an actor and a clown, neither one nor the other reproduces or interprets someone's intention, but makes his own new reality, creating an area of new detachment (the concept of G.G. Shpet). This is their similarity. According to G. Shpet, artistic realism cannot be interpreted as an historical, realistic act. A decisive role is played by an aesthetic law in which the reality created by art does not grow directly from our practical experience, but from the experience of our

detachment (Shpet 2007). Despite the fact that both in the carnival deed and in the acting play there is a process of creation of the internal form, of living action, of the dressing of "some intelligent image into sensual flesh", of the approach to an ideal future, they have different super-tasks of embodiment of the image. Let's try to assume that the actor's personification is connected with the compositional form, and not with the architectonic one.

In the carnival being-deed, which occurs at the peak of maximum effort, the actions are infinitely diverse, depending on the life situations of him and me. But everywhere excess activity remains, the excess of which tends to constancy (Bahtin 1979: 24). Therefore, there are reasons to take a closer look at the carnival as a kind of stable excess of vision, inextricably linked to the pulsation of the character's life in us, the character who carnivally denies himself and embodies his dream.

In works of Bakhtin we find important judgments about the features of our appearance in a dream of ourselves (Bahtin 1979: 26-27), in which he makes it clear that in a dream we see externally expressed everyone but ourselves. In a dream we do not have a need to express ourselves in an image. But when we tell our dream to another person, we immediately feel a need to clothe ourselves in the outer flesh. That is why Bakhtin also highlights a passive dream, in which we have no need and labor to put the dream in flesh and blood. May be it is about the weakness and thinness of the dream itself. Indeed, in clowning, a character breaks out of the personality, as if jumping out of it, breaks out by the power of his dream. Bakhtin proposes to rebuild the entire architectonics of the dream, making it active (Bahtin 1979: 29).

Summing up some intermediate results, I would like to formulate all the very basics that Bakhtin's ideas give for understanding the difference between a carnival and a theater, between an actor and a clown. Bakhtin quite clearly sets out the thoughts about the fact that in the comprehension of the philosophy of deed neither a psychological approach, nor a philosophical or aesthetic perspective on the perception of being, in which my role is to clothe myself in the mask of someone else's dead person, in the mask of the deceased, will help us (Bahtin 1997—2010, v. 1). That is why Bakhtin discovers elements of violence in an artistic form, Bakhtin, and in an artistic image he sees a killing force that deprives the subject of the future, trying to completely exhaust it (Bahtin, M.M. 1997—2010 [Bahtin 1997—2010, v. 5: 65-66]).

As a result of the analysis, it becomes clear that in a carnival situation there is a personal feeling and an extension to the future, in which a person ceases to perceive himself as one more story. In a carnival deed, a person grows to such a state of inconsistency with himself, in which he has a new vision of himself without the admixture of others, expressed in the appearance, invisible by no one but himself, of a carnival conductor who always examines himself, denies himself. In the area of carnival deed, personal experience merges with critical analysis, clearing the space for organizing a more complex personal integrity of the state of the clown in the clowning. This is where some common points in the professional play of actor, clown and personality are found, which has a constant excess, which, even without being turned into art, dwells on pranks, mutual jocular play, uplifting laughter, carnival self-denial.

REFERENCE

- Bahtin, M.M. (1979). Avtor i geroj v esteticheskoj deyatel'nosti/Bahtin M.M. Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva/ Sost. S.G. Bocharov [Author and hero in aesthetic activity / Bakhtin M. M. Aesthetics of verbal creativity / Comp. S. G. Bocharov]. M.: Iskustvo. P. 7—180.
- Bahtin, M.M. (1975). Voprosy literatury i estetiki. Issledovaniya raznyh let [Questions of literature and aesthetics. Studies of different years]. M.: Hudozh. lit. 504p.
- Bahtin, M.M. (1975a). Problema soderzhaniya, materiala i formy v slovesnom hudozhestvennom tvorchestve// Bahtin M.M. Voprosy literatury i estetiki. Issledovaniya raznyh let [The problem of content, material and form in verbal artistic creativity // Bakhtin M.M. Questions of literature and aesthetics. Research of different years]. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. P. 6— 71.
- Bahtin, M.M. (1975b). Rable i Gogol' (iskusstvo slova i narodnaya smekhovaya kul'tura)// Bahtin M.M. Voprosy literatury i estetiki. Issledovaniya raznyh let [Rabelais and Gogol (art of speech and folk laughter culture) / / Bakhtin M. M. Questions of literature and aesthetics. Research of different years]. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. P. 484—495.
- Bahtin, M.M. (1975c). Formy vremeni i hronotopa v romane. Ocherki po istoricheskoy poetike. // Bahtin, M.M. Voprosy literatury i estetiki. Issledovaniya raznyh let [Forms of time and chronotope in the novel. Essays on historical poetics. // Bakhtin M. M. Questions of literature and aesthetics. Research of different years]. M.: Hudozhestvennaya literatura. P. 234— 407.
- Bahtin, M.M. (1997—2010). Sour. soch. v 7 t. [Coll. Op. in 7 t.]. Russkie slovari; Yazyki slavyanskih kul'tur.
- Bahtin, M.M. Besedy V.D. Duvakina s M.M. Bakhtinyom. (1996). Vstup. st. S.G. Bocharova i V.V. Radzishevskogo; zakl. st. V.V. Kozhinova [Conversations of V.D. Duvakin with M.M. Bakhtin. No. articles by S.G. Bocharov and V.V. Radzishevsky; final article by V.V. Kozhinov]. M.: Progress, 1996. 342 p.
- Drábek, P. (2016). Bakhtin and Theatre? // Theatralia 19 / 2016 / 2. P.152—155.
- Emerson, K. (2017). Perezhiv temnotu stalinskoj nochi, Mihail Bahtin vnov' razmyshlyaet o formalizme [Having survived the darkness of Stalin's night, Mikhail Bakhtin again reflects on formalism] //Zbornik Matice SRPSKE za Slavistiku 92, Novi Sad, pp.39—56.
- Emerson, C. (2015). Bakhtin and the actor (with constant reference to Shakespeare) First Online: 03 July 2015. December 2015, Volume 67, pp. 183—207.
- Gershenzon, M. Izbrannoe. (2000). T.4. Trojstvennyj obraz sovershenstva [Favourites. Vol. The triple image of perfection]. Moskva—Ierusalim: Universitetskaya kniga, Geshrim.
- Gozhev, K.M., Yurkov S.E. (2005). Ponyatie «metanormativnoe povedenie» i ego granicy, povedenie [The concept of "metanarrative behavior" and its limits, behavior] // Izvestiya Rossijskogo gosudarstvennogo pedagogicheskogo universiteta im. A.I. Gercena. №10. T. 5, pp. 268— 272.
- Ivleva L. (1998). Doteatral'no-igrovoj yazyk russkogo fol'klora []. izd-vo: Dmitrij Bulanin, gorod: SPB, str. 194 p.
- Ivleva L. (1994). Ryazhen'e v russkoj tradicionnoj kul'ture [Mummers in Russian Traditional culture]. Ros. In-t istorii iskusstv. SPb. 235 p.
- K'erkegor, S. (1993). O ponyatii ironii / Per. s dat. A. Kos'kovej, S. Kos'kova [Kierkegaard, S. the concept of irony. / Trans. Danish A. Kos'kova, S. Kos'kov]//Logos. № 4, pp. 176—198.
- Mandel'shtam, O.E. (1987). Slovo i kul'tura: Stat'i. M.: Sovetskij pisatel' [Word and culture: Articles]. 320 p.
- Materialy mezhdunarodnoj Bahtinskoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii «Ulichnyj teatr protiv teatra voennyh dejstvij» (16-18 oktyabrya, Moskva, 2019). Programma i tezis. Pod redakciej E.A. Semyonovoj. 2019. [Materials of the International Scientific and Practical Conference «Street Theatre VS Theatre of Military Actions» (16.10. 2019—18.10. 2019, Moscow).

- Ed. by Elena Semenova]. Moskva: FGBNU «IHOiK RAO». 91p.
- McCaw, R.N. (2004). Bakhtin's other theatre. Ph.D. thesis, Royal Holloway, University of London.
- McCaw, D. (2014). Paradoxes of acting: Bakhtin and Stanislavsky. NTQ [New Theatre Quarterly], 30(1), pp. 29—39.
- McCaw, D. (2016). Bakhtin and theatre. Dialogues with Stanislavsky, Meyerhold and Grotowski. London: Routledge, forthcoming. 247p.
- Nasledie M.M. Bahtina: kul'tura — nauka — obrazovanie — tvorchestvo: Mezhdunarodnyj kruglyj stol, posvyashchyonnyj M.M. Bahtinu (22 maya 2018 goda, Oryol). (2018). Sbornik dokladov i statej. Redaktor-sostavitel', perevodchik — E.A. Semenova. 2018. [M.M. Bakhtin's Heritage: Culture — Science — Education — Creativity: International Round Table dedicated to M.M. Bakhtin (22 May 2018, Orel). Collection reports and articles. Editor-compiler, translator Elena. A. Semenova]. Moskva: FGBNU «IHOiK RAO». 515p.
- Petrilli S. 2019. Visualizing Theatrical and Novelistic Discourse with Bakhtin // International Journal of Semiotics and Visual Rhetoric. V. 3(1), January-June 2019. P. 12–31. Doi: 10.4018/IJSVR.2019010102.
- Ponzio, A. (2018). Polyphony, novel and drama in Bakhtin's work // Nasledie M.M. Bahtina: kul'tura — (22 maya 2018 goda, Oryol). Sbornik dokladov i statej. Redaktor-sostavitel', perevodchik — E.A. Semenova [M.M. Bakhtin's Heritage: Culture — Science — Education — Creativity: International Round Table dedicated to M.M. Bakhtin (22 May 2018, Orel). Collection reports and articles. Editor-compiler, translator Elena. A. Semenova]. Moskva: FGBNU «IHOiK RAO», pp. 214-228.
- Problema Hronotopa v sovremennyh nauchnyh issle-dovaniyah: Mezhdunarodnyj kruglyj stol, posvyashchennyj M.M. Bahtinu (Moskva, 19–20 aprelya 2017 goda, Mo-skva) (2018). Sbornik dokladov i statej. Redaktor-sostavitel' sbornika E. A. Semenova. 2017. [The Problem of Chronotope in modern scientific studies: International round table dedicated to M.M. Bakhtin (19-20 April 2017, Moscow FSBSI «IAEaCS RAE»). Collection of reports and articles. Editor and compiler Elena. A. Semenova]. Moskva: FGBNU «IHOiK RAO» 2017. — 500 p.
- Sandler, S. (2014). Bakhtin on Shakespeare (Excerpt from «Additions and Changes to Rabelais»). Pp. 522. PMLA, Modern Language Association of America. 2014.
- Semenova, E.A. (2018). Ulichnyj teatr kak universal'noe prostranstvo formirovaniya karnaval'noj kul'tury lichnosti: ot detstva k vzroslosti [Street theater as a universal space for the formation of carnival culture of personality: from childhood to adulthood]. M.: Sam Poligrafist. 170 p.
- Semenova, E.A. Berladin, Yu.A. (2019). Verifikaciya konceptov M. M. Bahtina v laboratornoj rabote s akterami ulichnogo teatra na s'ezde "Smekhotvorec" [Verification of concepts of M.M. Bakhtin in laboratory work with actors of street theatre at the symposium "The Creator of laughter"] In Materialy mezhdunarodnoj Bahtinskoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii «Ulichnyj teatr protiv teatra voennyh dejstvij» (16-18 oktyabrya, Moskva, 2019). Programma i tezisy. Pod redakciej E.A. Semyonovoj. P.25, 67-68.
- Shpet, G.G. (2007). Iskustvo kak vid znaniya. Izbrannye trudy po filosofii kul'tury [Art as a kind of knowledge. Selected works on the philosophy of culture]. M.: Rossijskaya politicheskaya enciklopediya (ROSSPEN). 712 p.
- Uvarova, I.P. (2014). Daniel' i vse vse vse [Daniel and all all all]. SPb.: Izdatel'stvo Ivana Limb
- Weygandt, E.S. (2015). Embodiment in Post-Somatic, Postdramatic Russian New Drama, Ph.D. Princeton University, Slavic Languages and Literatures, June 2.
- Yastrebov, A.L. (2000). Prazdnik bezumstva: Dionis i Mel'pomene [Holiday madness: Dionysus and Melpomene]. M.: Agraf. 281 p.
- Zinchenko, V.P. (2000). Mysl' i slovo Gustava Shpeta (vozvrashchenie iz izgnaniya) [The thought and word of Gustav Shpet (return from exile)]. M.: URAO. 208 p.
- [Electronic resource]:
URL:[https://](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...) / [youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=...) /

px7pmasYcmc?list=PL0Alj7CUrETm507cbYOrLWyoE_8QXqT7t]

[Electronic resource a]:

URL: <http://www.art-education.ru/events/vserossiyskiy-kruglyy-stol-s-mezhdunarodnym-uchastiem-metodologiya-mm-bahtina-v-teorii-i>

Elena A. Semenova – PhD (of Pedagogical Sciences), Senior Researcher of the Laboratory of Literature and Theater of the FSBSI «Institute of Art Education and Cultural Studies of the RAE» (Moscow, Russia). In 2014 he graduated from the full-time Doctoral Studies at FSBSI «Institute of Art Education and Cultural Studies of the RAE». Author of scientific papers about clownery, carnival culture, street theater. She was starred in the play and document films, in television programs: «Treasure» (2007), «Plus One» (2007), «Death in Eyeglasses or Our Chekhov», (2010), «Clown in the Clownery» (2017) and others. Since 2003 she is an actress of NP «TheatreEx» under the artistic direction of Yuri Beradin. Since 2008 together with Yu. A. Berladin creates cultural educational center «Village theatre» to find alternative ways of forming the carnival culture of modern youth. She developed and tested the author's technique for actors and Directors «Humor against Irony», aimed at the formation of the carnival world-feeling. Initiator and organizer of International round tables devoted to the study of the heritage of M. M. Bakhtin (2017, 2019 in Moscow; 2018, 2019 in Orel); seminars, conferences on the study of the potential of street theater, carnival culture in the professions of Actor and Director (2016— 2019). The author of the idea and organizer of the All-Russian symposium «Creator of Laugh» (Tver region, Toropetsky district, Krest village, 11.09-17.09.2019). Editor-compiler of collections of materials of Bakhtin conferences: «Problema Hronotopa v sovremennyh nauchnyh issledovaniyah: Mezhdunarodnyy kruglyy stol, posvyashchennyj M.M. Bahtinu (Moskva, 19–20 aprelya 2017 goda, Mo-skva); «Nasledie M.M. Bahtina: kul'tura — nauka — obrazovanie — tvorchestvo: Mezhdunarodnyy kruglyy stol, posvyashchyonnyj M.M. Bahtinu (22 maya 2018 goda, Oryol). (2018); Materialy mezhdunarodnoj Bahtinskoj nauchno-prakticheskoy konferencii «Ulichnyj teatr protiv teatra voennyh dejstvij» (16-18 oktyabrya, Moskva, 2019).