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ABSTRACT

Arthur Miller’s play, *The Crucible*, was written in 1952 and is best known for its metaphor in which the anti-communist paranoia sweeping through the U.S.A. at the time is associated to the witch-hunt that took place in the Puritan community of Salem, Massachusetts, at the end of the seventeenth century. The plot is developed as the hysteria of a group of girls echoes the individual instabilities of the whole village, culminating with the total collapse of its entire social structure. Inspite of the presence of the remarkable historical and ideological contents of this play, our interest in this paper focuses on the formal aspects of the text considering some concepts of dramatic theory, specifically the relation between diegetic/epic and mimetic/dramatic elements which occur through the enunciative process in the play. Furthermore, another striking feature related to the concepts mentioned above will also be focused: the nature of traditional drama as a representation of a fact in the present time, according to the discussion presented in *Theory of Modern Drama*, by Peter Szondi. As a result of the analysis, such characteristics are expected to point out certain aesthetic and conceptual sources used in the composition of the play.

Keywords: Enunciation. Diegesis. Drama.
RESUMO

*The Crucible* (As Bruxas de Salém), peça de Arthur Miller, escrita em 1952, é mais conhecida como uma metáfora pela qual a paranoia anticomunista, vivida nos Estados Unidos daquela época, é associada à caça às bruxas ocorrida na comunidade puritana de Salém, em Massachusetts, no final do século XVII. O enredo é desenvolvido na medida em que a histeria de um grupo de garotas eocha as instabilidades individuais de todo o vilarejo, o que leva ao colapso de toda sua estrutura social. Apesar da marcante presença de todo o conteúdo histórico e ideológico desta obra, o intuito de nosso trabalho se concentra nos aspectos formais do texto, levando em conta alguns conceitos da teoria do drama, especialmente a relação entre os elementos diegéticos/épicos, e miméticos/dramáticos que podem nela ser encontrados. Outra importante característica a ser destacada, relacionada aos conceitos acima, é a natureza do drama como a representação de um fato no tempo presente, de acordo com a discussão realizada em *Teoria do Drama Moderno*, de Peter Szondi. Como resultado da análise, espera-se que tais características possam assinalar certos recursos estéticos e conceituais que permeiam a composição da obra.
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1. Introduction

Comprised indramatic theory, the categories of diegesis and mimesis are frequently adopted as instruments to analyze and explain literary and discursive practices concerning the text, acquiring a particular importance when the objective is to understand how the contradiction between the dramatic/mimetic and epic/narrativestyles, which are found in dramatic theory since the concepts of Plato and Aristotle, constitute part of modern drama, as it appears in the discussion presented by Peter Szondi in his work (2001, 2004).

Here, some linguistic implications related to these terms are observed, such as the enunciative relation through the dialogs and also time aspects in the play The Crucible, by Arthur Miller (1997). Written in 1952, it is best known for its metaphor in which the anti-communist paranoia sweeping through the U.S.A. at the time is associated to the witch-hunt occurred in the Puritan community of Salem, Massachusetts, at the end of the seventeenth century. However, the historical and social approaches commonly applied to interpret this play, as they can be found in The Cambridge Companion to Arthur Miller(2005), are only a complementary perspective in this article, especially with reference to the context in which this play was written.

Starting from a discussion about diegesis, drama and followed by the analysis of enunciative devices, we expect to identify the presence and function of those elements in the underlying structure of the text, providing a brief reflection on the relevance of the enunciation for the definition of epic and dramatic forms when it is aimed at the distinction between the traditional dialogue based drama and the modern epic elements posterior emerging in the twentiethcentury. The awareness of some specifics concerning
the way enunciative shifting may establish the presence of the “epic subject” (attached by a time or space detachment) inside the dialogs -breaking with their more traditional form and establishing a narration, something that problematizes the dialogue as a specific means of communicating in the modern drama -is expected to indicate useful conceptual instruments for the study of drama and analysis of particular texts.

With these aspects in mind, the analysis has been consequently divided into parts in which some categories such as time, space, characters, plot and sample dialogues are focused according to the considerations about drama, diegesisand the aesthetical discussion involving the composition of the play and the dramatictheory.

In order to do so, let us first have an overall view of the plot and main characters of Miller’s play. Set in Salem province in 1692, the story starts with the sudden illness of a group of girls, which is related to a mysterious ritual dance in the woods. The warning of witchcraft is soon raised, and rumors lead the members in charge of the village start a witch-hunt with the presence of the county’s judges.

The leader of the young girls is Abigail, Reverend Parris’s niece, who took part with the girls in the forest dance and convinces the others to pretend they are possessed by the devil in order to avenge her great resentment and, as the story goes by, ends up trying to take the place of her lover’s partner. While the witch-hunt increases proportion, involving interests and greed for the property of respectable members, the whole community is affected and many are arrested under the accusation of dealing with the devil, including Elizabeth, John Proctor’s wife, Abigail’s original target. A previous affair between Abigail and Proctor – probably the strongest, most proud and honorable character in the play -, generates an intense struggle with ambition, regret and honor together with the dispute of the knowledge of God’s truth and the power of the law made by men.

A severe trial occurs condemning plenty to death, testing the edges of sense, truth, falsehood and consequently the survival of the theocratic establishment. The historical background and posterior consequences are presented in the beginning of the play, introducing also some political and even psychological (referring to hysteria) considerations, that provide the reader with a consistent overview of the situation which is to be developed in the plot.
2. Theoretical aspects

For this reason, defining the point from where the theory in this article will be grounded must be our initial concern, as it was to Szondi, whose method and theoretical assumptions are widely known. This way, the differences he once established between a traditional and prescriptive poetic of the genres, as it appears in Aristotle, in contrast to the historical-dialectic Philosophy of Art which emerged in the eighteenth’s idealist period, led by Hegel, have been widely developed, as can be found in the research of Pedro Sussekind (2003, 2008) and Raquel Imanish Rodrigues (2005, 2009), that are here taken as important references, especially when some specifics related to the characteristics of epic and dramatic forms are presented in their articles. It will be also essential Szondi’s principles that characterize the triad of the so-called “absolute drama”: the representation of a fact in the present in an inter-subjective dialogue (2001, p. 91), a characteristic of the traditional drama that has changed due to a thematic and formal contradiction, leading to a progressive substitution of those elements and the formalization of what will be conventionally called the modern drama, defined by the modification of that initial triad:

Thus, that initial triad is modified: (a’) the fact becomes supplementary, (b’) the dialogue is converted into monologic reflections or becomes “unproductive”, showing an intra-subjective relation, and (c’) time unravels, culminating in the overlap of past and present, as what has already happened continues to intimately reverberate on the characters and their actions, especially when the present evokes a past event being recollected. It is due to this process of transition that the correspondence between form and content was no longer established, emphasizing the emergence of internal contradiction in dramatic form – since in that context the “dynamic transformation of subject and object in the form is opposed to a static separation in the content” (SZONDI 2001: 93) – in the process of its being overtaken by the eruption of a form which has emerged from precipitated contents. In other words, the elements related to form and content “in crisis” mentioned above bring themselves the overcoming of their own contradictions when, executing a formal function, they implode the old and contradictory form, operating a shift to a form which is not contradictory itself, consolidating in a new form – called modern drama. [...] (MACIEL, 2008, p. 17).1

---

1 Assim, aquela triade inicial é modificada: (a’) o fato torna-se acessório, (b’) o diálogo é convertido em reflexões monológicas ou torna-se “improdutivo”, refletindo uma relação de ordem intrasubjetiva, e (c’) o
Along with this theoretical conception, the definition of *diegesis* (telling, recounting) and *mimesis* (showing, enacting), therefore, is the first step of our analysis. Hence, besides the references mentioned above, *The Cambridge Introduction to Theatre Studies*, from Christopher Balme (2008), shall be regarded as the main source. However, our main intention is not the debate about the problems and principles related to the definition of what *diegesis* and drama are. *Mimesis* regarded as imitations of reality, a term “probably derived from the word *mimos* (actor) and is therefore closely related to theatrical performance” (BALME, 2008, p. 67); while *diegesis* is assumed as the narrative attribute of a mimetic representation in a form of drama, a term which is also closely related to epic, as the moments in the text in which it is possible to identify a detachment between the action that is being enacted – the objective action – and the subject who is referring to it, or the “epic subject”. Although the notion of a third person, usually used to make this distinction, cannot be thoroughly adopted, as the subject of a narrative may appear in many guises (the narrator itself, one or many characters etc.), this notion may be helpful since it is understood as any of these possibilities in which it is likely to be found the perspective of a voice detached from the event – when subject and object can be found apart and a narration is established.

Conversely, (traditional) drama will be considered as a form in which such distance between action and its characters does not exist and the action is being enacted at the moment of speech, one of the clearest acknowledgments of dramatic representation in opposition to the epic attitude. Also evident is the almost impossible division into two completely isolated forms of epic and drama, something that is so strongly connected in the ply being analyzed, even though drama prevails, and makes this bond such an interesting aspect to be observed. In this way, the adjective

---

tempo se esgarça, desembocando passado e presente um sobre o outro, na medida em que o já acontecido continua a ter repercussão íntima sobre as personagens e suas ações, principalmente quando o presente evoca o passado recordado. É por conta desse processo de transição que a correspondência entre formação do conteúdo não mais estava dada, marcando o surgimento da contradição interna da forma do drama – visto que naquele contexto à “transformação dinâmica do sujeito e objeto na forma se contrapõe uma separação estática no conteúdo” (SZONDI 2001: 93) –, rumo à sua superação a partir da irrupção de uma forma surgida dos conteúdos precipitados. Ou seja, os elementos conteudísticos e formais “em crise” destacados acima já trazem em si mesmos a superação de suas próprias contradições quando, desempenhando uma função formal, impõem a forma antiga e contraditória, operando uma mudança para um estilo em si nãocontraditório, consolidado em uma nova forma – a que se chama de drama moderno. [...] (MACIEL, 2008, p. 17).
assumption (ROSENFELD, 1985)\textsuperscript{2} of drama and epic as categories comprising the dramatic or epic characteristics is necessary to comprehend a certain form that historically establishes a rupture with a predetermined purity of drama, as it incorporates new aspects, stylistic sources and aesthetic features, formalizing what is considered to be modern drama.

Furthermore, as the linguistic elements of the text are also necessary to support the reflections about the characteristics of diegesis and mimesis through the dialogues, a particular emphasis on the concept of enunciation in the narrative – and the way it occurs in the play – will be required. Such a concept can be either generic, when it is used to express the idea of a verbal production or process between two interlocutors, or more specific when it belongs to a certain area of linguistic studies, like the enunciation theory and discursive analysis (CUNIIA, 1999). Here, this term has been taken from semiotics as it appears in Luiz Tatit (2001)\textsuperscript{3}, due to the possibilities of stretching the term according to the direct and indirect speech shifting which occur during the narration.

From this discussion, it is possible to come up with the following question: how is the voice that tells us about what is happening transformed into the speeches of characters and the narration of fact or actions? Here, the notion of first person related to drama and third person related to epic is considered the linguistic and formal manifestation of the dynamism which allows the text to move from different perspectives through constantly shifting narrative devices – enunciative detachments that change according to the position from where the speech is being performed, directly or indirectly referring to the object. These two different positions, sometimes, may not assume the form of an indirect or direct speech; this way, the objective enunciation would be concealed in a dialogue by an enacted action in which an objective and detached event is referred to. Therefore, these categories must be applied as a conceptual element and not only as a linguistic presence in the text. Such attributes will be posteriorly examined on the play.

\textsuperscript{2}The adjective assumption “refers to stylistic traits that prevails in a work at a higher or lower degree, regardless its genre”. In the original: “refere-se a traços estilísticos de que uma obra pode ser imbuída em grau maior ou menor, qualquer que seja o seu gênero”.

\textsuperscript{3}According to the author, enunciative devices are “operations that establish a statement necessarily detached form enunciation”. In the original: “operações que fundam o enunciado a partir de seu necessário desligamento da enunciação”.

Finally, once the dramatic and epic elements have been observed through the specificities of the enunciation in the play, a reflection about time aspects involved in this relation shall be considered, as underlying those categories. Thus, it is important to attempt a perspective between something that happened in a previous time and the action taking place in the present time, while the story is being developed. According to Szondi, this is the result in the modern dramatic representation which allows us to identify two ways of thinking of the conceptual nature of drama and its shifting into different subjective-objective results in the plays, which used to adopt the notions of the post Renaissance period, based on the inter-subjective dialogue between characters grounded in the present time (BALME, 2008, p. 71; SZONDI, 2001, p. 91), a relation that has become more complex, comprising intra and extra-subjective aspects. Thus, past and present are essential elements which occur via enunciative manipulation and are essential to the discussion around these issues, as summarized in Cunha (1999): “the past tense is related to the narrative or report”, and also “the descriptions aimed to present the characters, their emotions, identities as well as the information about the atmosphere and the location of space and time”\(^4\).

An approximation between these apparently distant literary perspectives, one that focuses on the linguistic and textual elements and a different one concerned with studies of theatre and literary aspects is not a primary goal, since it would be the focus of another theoretical nature. The usage of particular terms such as enunciation – apart from the semiotic theory and specific goals – is justified by its terminological possibilities, as was mentioned before. Along with the concepts of diegesis and mimesis, it possibly allows us to locate our perspective as an essayistic reflection somewhere between a strict, formal and textual linguistic study and general criticism.

3. Author, narrator and the third person

As it is well known, each one of these terms represents different categories in the narration and should not be grouped together in a single category. The author, or the

---

\(^4\)My translation. In the original: “os tempos do pretérito estão relacionados com a narrativa ou o relato” e “as descrições destinadas a apresentar os personagens, suas emoções, sua identidade assim como as informações sobre a atmosfera e as localizações espaço-temporais”.
writer, is the person responsible to originate a particular work, whose authorship can be accounted for. The narrator is, properly speaking, a literary voice, the perspective from where the story is developed, who can take part in the story as a witness, whether as a character or not, remaining distant. The third person, as we saw, is also a perspective, an objective point of view which may or may not be the same as the narrator.

In the play being analyzed, two of these categories seem to become one; the narrator, a third person, starts the play with “an overture” in act one (p. 03), where there is a brief mention about the historical background (date, location) and a physical description of the place in which the initial scene and the first characters are presented: “At the time of these events Parris was in his middle forties. In history he cut a villainous path, and there is very little good to be said for him.” (p. 03). The initial situation is shown through stage directions: “As the curtain rises, Reverend Parris is discovered kneeling beside the bed, evidently in prayer.” (p. 03). Subsequently, the description of the scene is interrupted and a discussion about the nature of the conflict; political, social and historical aspects take place, as a preparation for “The Salem tragedy, which is about to begin...” (p. 6). Subsequently, this third person narration, which interrupted initial rubrics, shifts back to the description of the scene, up to the moment the dialogue finally begins.

It is interesting to notice the interchangeability between the categories being focused. The third person narration’s discussion about the conflict appears as commentary, adding and anticipating information, as part of the body of the text, and it differs from the rubrics with the italics used in the second case and not in the first, which emphasizes the distinction between them. The narrator, the epic element that has not been included as a first person character, for instance, is not present in the text through linguistic evidence, though his voice can be easily inferred behind the rubrics – which have a narrative function -, especially in the occasion of these “interruptions”, when the dialogues stop and share the space with the description and extra information.

For analytic purposes, it was possible to recognize the difference between two different speeches comprising the third person narration. One that is revealed in the rubrics, as stage directions, and occurs regularly in the play; it is generally brief and immediately after the name of the character, presenting the scene, location, the character’s disposition and manners, as other features concerning to details about the
development of the action, e.g. “ABIGAIL, leaning out the door to call to Susanna, who is down the hall a few steps: Come in, Susanna” (p. 08), or to indicate the entrance of new characters, “Enter John Proctor. On seeing him, Marry Warren leaps in fright.” (p.19). The other one, presented as commentary, is usually introduced to add more information about a character, as, for example, in the comments about Proctor (p. 19), Putnam and Rebecca – besides other characters -, which may be considered as stops in the stream of the dialogues, pauses, the reason why it will be referred as interruptions.

An interesting moment in the play is when, in act three, one of these stage directions is uncommonly stretched:

Proctor hands it to him. Hathorne rises, goes beside Danforth, and starts reading. Parris comes to his other side. Danforth looks at John Proctor, the proceeds to read. Hale gets up, finds position near the judge, reads too. Proctor glances at Giles. Francis prays silently, hands pressed together. Cheever waits placidly, the sublime official, dutiful. Marry Warren sobs once. John Proctor touches her head reassuringly. Presently Danforth lifts his eyes, stands up, takes out a kerchief and blows his nose. The others stand aside as he moves in thought toward the window. (MILLER, 1997, p. 93)

This rubric works at moment in which the action is narrated to the reader separated from the regular inter-subjective dialogue, something that is very exceptional in the plot, maybe due to the intensity of what is going on (an important trial which is responsible for defining the destiny of the characters), as there was no other alternative besides the provision of more details being added externally to the enacted action itself. There is a part of the conflict, hence, that is mimetically represented, and another one which is formalized to the reader through diegesis, as it would be transformed into a scene in the circumstances of theatrical performance, indicating the difference between an ‘acted speech’ and an ‘enacted action’, even if the dialogue does not take place.

These features are relevant as the sources utilized in narration may define a specific manner of representing an action allowing, for example, the classification of plays as more traditional and inter-subjective ones (in other words, within what it is called “absolute drama”) or as part of modern drama, in which epic elements receive
great attention. For now, it is not yet possible to attribute either label to the play, which is not our intention, as some more analysis is required.

4. Dialogue

The following discussion will be based on sample dialogues, considered as reliable models or general patterns because of their repeated incidence in the play, aiming to notice the shifting between the enunciation of a present fact (PF) being enacted and a past fact being narrated (FN), which happened in another time or circumstance. As mentioned above, the notions of first and third person may also be required.

Sample dialogue one: “ABIGAIL: Uncle, we did dance; let you tell them I confessed it – and I’ll be whipped if I must be. But they’re speakin’ of witchcraft. Betty’s not witched.” (p.09). In this extract, the past tense is being used to refer to an event that happened previously, not only before the present action – the dialogue being enacted – but also “outside” the actions enacted in the plot; in other words, this event is being added as external information about something that happened in the past, a fact that can only be presented by recall, as it did not occur during the present time that the action occurs, though a past event being recollected is able to make the action move forward in the present. However, as might be assumed, there is no narrator to tell us about this event but the character itself; thus, the narration within an inter-subjective dialogue - the fact being narrated (FN) joins the present fact (PF) being enacted. Despite the distance between the object, what is being told, and the subject, no enunciative shifting form from the first to the third person (a narrator, for example) can be noticed, besides the presence of the past tense.

Sample dialogue two:

MRS. PUTNAM, glancing at Betty: How high did she fly, how high?
PARRIS: No, Goody Putnam, it is –

MRS. PUTNAM, very pleased with it: Why, it's sure she did. Mr. Collins saw her goin' over Ingersoll's barn, and come down light as bird, he says! (MILLER, 1997, p.12).
Examining these two speeches, it is possible to notice a similar structure referring to a past event utilizing the verb in the past tense, but in this case the fact being narrated is something that happened in between a time narrated before in the action and the present situation, differently from the previous “forest dance episode” mentioned above. In both cases the object is put apart in time, although one event takes place in the current time of the plot and the other does not. It is also interesting to notice the presence of the pronoun he, when Mrs. Putnam refers to another character’s speech, an enunciative shifting. Once again, the third person is established by a character; the interference of an external narrator is absent, because the dialogue, in modern drama, progressively starts to narrate.

Sample dialogue three: “PROCTOR, with great force of will, but not quite looking at her: I have been thinking I would confess to them, Elizabeth. She shows nothing. What say you? If I give them that?” (MILLER, 1997, p.125). In this case, the dialogue has been “mixed” with the interference of the rubrics, a common occurrence, though it increases considerably and becomes more intense in the final part of the play. Here, it is not difficult to recognize another voice, detached from the speech of the characters, made explicit by the italics, an exclusive source attached to the rubrics, the moment when the so-called narrator is exposed and the enunciation is shifted to the third person, conducting the reading according to the emotional effects that would be produced by the actor on stage.

Thus, it is possible to affirm that in this play, as in the traditional form, the regular enunciation in the first person sometimes refers to past events within the action being enacted in the present through an inter-subjective exchange in the dialogues, while the events in the story are developed. The dialogues present this feature joining the present fact (PF) being enacted and the fact being narrated (FN). The only exception to this regularity seems to be the use of the stage directions, which sometimes not only add descriptive information to the situations, but also help to tell the story, through the objective voice of a narrator.
5. Time

According to Szondi (2001, p. 91), the present time is absolute in the traditional form of drama. It means the events in the play are developed in a sequential perspective, depending on the inter-subjective exchanges of the dialogues that conduct the development of the plot. This position is more evident when compared to an intra or extra-subjective perspective, in which the presence of the narrator (the “epic subject”) is responsible for telling us what is happening. Such opposition is attributed, as mentioned in this article’s section devoted to theory, to different moments of the dramatic representation which characterize modern drama.

In this play, a diegetic perspective can be inferred when the author locates the story in a specific time in the past, referring to an important event in America’s past history. Once this background is assumed, however, the play follows a more traditional sequential development of drama, based mostly on the present and inter-subjective dialogues. The possible exceptions to this rule have been presented above, although they cannot be regarded as a sufficient argument in order to define this play as part of epic drama – something interesting to consider taking into account the context in which it has been written, since the fifties a “recalling” of the epic style has flourished.

The events in “The Crucible” begins in the present with the girls’ apparent illness and goes straight on following its consequences - causality determines the irrevocable flow of the facts and the characters’ destiny. However, it does not necessarily mean that past does not take part in the story. There are at least two of these past events which are interestingly connected creating an essential bond from where their consequences will affect and be responsible for everything which happens after that. The first one is Proctor and Abigail’s affair, which in the play is referred to by both, as well as Elizabeth, and in the final trial condemns Proctor to hanging, since his wife is not able to tell the truth about it – a hopeless deadlock. The second is the “forest dance”, a kind of ritual where the girls express their deep and repressed wishes; the moment that Abigail is supposed to announce her intentions to kill and substitute Proctor’s wife, thus being directly linked, even as a consequence, with their past affair. Both events are not enacted in the play; they are only referred to in the character’s speech. This way, such past and harmful events underlie the present consequences.
The enunciation of such past events is made by referring to them using the past verbal tense. On no occasion there is a shifting from the present to the past in which the characters would announce the events from a detached time and no “epic subject”, therefore, can be found. The specific circumstances regarding time in which narration and an “implied narrator” can be noticed occur in some “pauses”, when the enacted action stops and the voice may establish either past or future in its speech, which was here considered an *interruption* in the regular flow of the text. Thus, an epic subject cannot be identified taking into consideration only the elements being analyzed according to the concepts regarding the theory of drama utilized to support our interpretation, yet its absence and functioning of those elements, such as the particularity of enunciative patterns, might be relevant to comprehend the way textual aspects may corroborate theoretical assumptions about the differences between the traditional and modern forms of drama.

6. Conclusion

*The Crucible* belongs to a period in the history of theater where traditional drama, inherited from the Renaissance, had already experienced the changes that led to the brechtianepic theatre, which broke with the perspective of the sequential and intersubjective dialogues firmly grounded in the present, recalling the sources of the epic and objective narration. Hence, this play could be expected to feature a great deal of such conventional epic elements, presenting a narrator, filled with intra-subjective monologues and utilizing a dynamic detachment of time and shifting of enunciation. However, these characteristics, even though some of them are present to a certain extent, are not sufficient, for instance, to include this play in a list of the “epic theatre” in the twentieth century. On the contrary, its sober blend of the contemporary social, historical and realistic drama, along with the traditional style and the presence of epic elements, serves better illustrate the autonomy and complexity of the modern literary composition.

Through the discussion of the differences between a first and third person enunciation can be noticed in the shifting from a present enacted fact and a fact
detached in space or time being narrated, three sample dialogues have been chosen in order to present a pattern of representation in which the events, regarding time aspects, are regularly ordered in a sequence of actions performed in the present time, according to a causal development of consequences. Such regularity seems not to be the case in some interruptions, moments in the play where an “implied narrator” was able to refer even to the past or future, adding extra information about some characters and the historical context.

The presence of objective elements, considered as the linguistic forms in the text where an epic perspective takes place, has also been focused, since its existence in the dramatic representation is an important argument for the discussion about the aesthetic components of traditional drama. In the play, such elements were identified mainly as textual sources related to the third person speeches occurring especially in the stage directions, which in some moments perform an extra-subjective narration due to their intensity. In addition, the inter-subjective and present time features of the play, normally observed in traditional forms, have been sustained according to our interpretation, unless the pointed characteristics of the presence of the narrative and objective enunciation were considered as a formal and inseparable structure, rather than a particular or convenient source.

Back to our initial purpose, the discussion about diegesis and mimesis, these essential categories for dramatic theory and literary genres in general, our analysis was expected to contribute with a short but relevant reflection on the enunciative perspective in order to help in identifying the process through which epic and dramatic elements co-exist enabling a complex dynamism and interaction between narration and dialogues in the text.
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