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Abstract: The main thesis of this commentary relates to the great influence of Literature, both fiction and literary criticism, and especially the stream of consciousness phenomenon in learning a foreign language. In desire to express the huge influences of literature, the stream of consciousness technique and human mental activities on learning foreign language, the author of this review tries partly to explain the basic thesis as the individual component of the complex and unbreakable connection among these three categories (literature, applied linguistics and psychology) covered by the mantle of cultural codex.

The book entitled Globalization and management in foreign language learning process: English at the beginning of the third millennium by Dr. Slobodanka Djoljic brings together a combination of divergent theoretical and practical approaches to the foreign language learning process and to the complex psychological phenomenon - stream of consciousness - in an era in which this phenomenon has become a landmark of literary theory. Really, the book is an methodological innovation which expresses the process of learning foreign languages as the equivalent of stream of consciousness writing technique through the prism of psychoanalytical approach to the spontaneous assimilation of different issues surrounding this phenomenon, appearing in the human psych as the part of conscious consciousness, unconscious consciousness or sub-consciousness. All these parameters participate in the learning process but mainly we cannot define them consciously.

I. Psychoanalytical And Literary Approaches To The Stream Of Consciousness Phenomenon

The psychology, metaphysics and physiology had their saying, there were impressive attempts made to (re)create the spider’s web (H. James) by which man feeds his voracious psyche with all sorts of data, coming from all possible directions, inner and outer ones.

The alpha and omega of the experimental and the mystical phenomena in literature is certainly the interest in "psychoanalysis," which was perfected by Sigmund Freud’s analysis of human consciousness in all particulars. Many authors and theorists were inspired by Freudian psychoanalysis and its application, so they accepted it as Freud had intended. They have chiefly oversimplified it by their superficial research. Therefore, besides somewhat arbitrary conclusions about its impact and scarce description of those impacts on the literary work, there are no precise arguments.

The Freudian “psychoanalysis” begins its literary life with the appearance of psychological novels, initially expressing superficially, and then going deeper into the psyche of characters with new achievements in literary prose, to finally mature as a highly complex psychoanalytic method in the stream of consciousness novels. In fact, Freud's psychoanalysis and psychotherapy are too complex, incomprehensible, and complicated to draw an arbitrary conclusion that fiction writers of the 20th century, or at least some of them, even know the essence and supplements of psychoanalysis to use them intentionally. Even more absurd are possible theories and critiques of the impact of "psychoanalysis" on the modern novel, without going more deeply into psychoanalysis and its analysis. The term "psychoanalysis" encompasses too many intertwined phenomena, to be taken for granted and used arbitrarily.

Different components of modern psychological theories enter deep in literary theory, critics are aware of this phenomenon, so are the literary theorists as well as the authors themselves. However, the psychoanalysts are most accurate and complete in defining this overlapping. Continuous, silk thread of psychoanalysis in contemporary fiction remains experimental and mystical phenomenon whose first problem presents "the relation between art and science", followed by a lot of questions that, until now, did not get adequate answers.

When French psychoanalysts Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari speak of experimental prose, they compare Kafka to James Joyce and Samuel Beckett as revolutionary writers. According to Deleuze and Guattari, the works of Joyce and Beckett are experimental in language, while the psychological categories are named differently. In order to explain the subjective-objective relation in a literary work as a combination of multiple relationships between external factors and man's naturalness, they define the phenomenon "anti-Oedipus
complex." This phenomenon is equated with "organism-God-body (without organs)" relation in which the organism represents a person's inner world, subjectivity, while the body without organs is a physical experience, interlinked system of "power and flows" rather than organism. In turn, both are in conjunction with the transcendental, with God. Deleuze and Guattari claim that this relation brings about the new unit of measure, the so-called "deliberate writing." (Deleuze, Guattari 2001: 1599) According to them "... the national or collective unconsciousness is often passive in the outside world and still in the process of decay, literature is overwhelmed with the role and function of the collective ... this allows the writer more possibility to portray a different community and to forge an opinion on the awareness and sensibilities of others, ascribing it to (in his solitude) another science. \(\text{\cite{Deleuze, Guattari 2001: 1599}}\) The balance between the subjective and the objective perspectives in experimental prose must be accomplished in order to achieve the effect of intensive reflective and spiritual reality. Deleuze and Guattari take the method of William Burroughs and James Joyce as examples of the so-called "butchered text method" which refers to the temporal-spatial perspective. Furthermore, they mention Nietzsche's interlocking of "eternal return of the present as something that opinion does not know" and the theory of Stephen Mallarmé, who combines well known, fragmented style with alchemical dream.

At the heart of Jacques Lacan's psychoanalysis is to organize the unknown, ironic, and something that causes controversy in the text in a mysterious way, using unusual phrases, foreign words, word plays, allusions, mathematical formulas and character features. Lacan writes analytical theory as poetry, applying philosophical thought and symbolical logic. "The primary purpose of the modern text is to get closer to the reader so that every reader can interpret it in their own way" (Lacan 2001: 1285).

Trying to demystify scientific fantasy of objectivity, Lacan does not attribute impersonality and exteriority to art, but science and theory. According to him, a text without the influence of psychological factors, which make both life and characters more realistic, is not art. The link between the external world and a man is presented through a mirror which Lacan tentatively calls "imago". Imago of the outside world or one's appearance is present in hallucinations or dreams, always reflecting the internal state of an individual, its fragility (señilitiy) or its fair projection, thereby making this "subjective-objective" relationship unbreakable.

Lacan referred to another element of psychoanalysis applied to the experimental works, the phenomenon of "unconscious" whose most detailed explanation can be found in the theory of Sigmund Freud. The unconscious, according to Lacan, is the centre of instincts in the human mind which must be brought to the consciousness and be defined by words like "enigmatic symbol of total mystery." (Lacan 2001: 1293)

Freud's interpretation of the causal link between consciousness and subconsciousness is what we are primarily interested in as it is a guiding line from the stream of consciousness in the literary work to the complex category of psychoanalysis. In order to know one's consciousness it is impossible to ignore the existence and influence of the subconscious content of mind. According to Freud, there is absolute evidence of the existence of subconsciousness. "The increased intensity of meaning and connection is completely justifiable motive, the one that can lead further from the limitations provided by the experience. If there is a presumption that our subconsciousness does not help in the successful construction of a practical method, which hinders us to apply an impact on the direction of conscious processes, this success will defeat us with the undisputed evidence of the existence of what we assume to be. First, we become aware, then we take the stand that the process is unsustainable and pretentious to confirm that any process in the human mind must be conscious." (Freud 1980: 429)

Further analysis of the relation between the conscious and the subconscious processes reveals the unbreakable and intertwined causal link between them, apart from a portion of space in the human mind which is occupied by a presence of "conscious awareness", and also its latency for a significant period of time so we call it the subconscious, which is not understandable to the conscious mind at all. If we take into consideration all our hidden memories, the existence of the unconscious (subconsciousness), at that moment, becomes a totally incomprehensible part of mind. By assumption, the subconsciousness is much more powerful and significant than generally accepted and usual stream of thought and it is almost inseparable from it. Freud argues that each of us becomes aware of his thoughts only at the moment of focusing on his own consciousness. However, others can draw conclusions about someone's mind, whose behavior becomes more understandable to the viewer, by analogy based on the evidence or procedure.

Accordingly, the experimental stream of consciousness technique is nothing more than the attempt which ends at the beginning of the conscious and chaotic string of thought which makes the expression of the human psyche seems more real and authentic, but it doesn't constitute the complete process of psychoanalysis. Unconscious expression of a stream of consciousness is characteristic of each individual whose identification is complete only by adding "ego" directed at other people. Only then the conclusions about someone's consciousness can be drawn. The premise should be that "ego" of every individual is too strong and that, in order to observe a person, we should first reduce the gap between the "ego" and "non-ego," which is only widening with the development of consciousness. An analytical approach to human consciousness always
causes a certain amount of doubt regarding the combination of consciousness and subconsciousness, just as in
the process of learning a foreign language.

The human psyche is still, largely, a taboo subject for psychoanalysts. Freud advised against entering this
area which is not sufficiently explored. Since each individual is specific and unique, there are no rules.
Therefore, the psychoanalysis, with a myriad of components, is only valid if all the components are considered
simultaneously, because an unbreakable, causal thread between them is undoubtedly there. Research experts and
their experience show that a man very well understands how to recognize mental context of other people
through their actions, which is certainly an unconscious action and that is called "the unconscious
consciousness." (Freud 1980:430)

Relation between the subjective and the objective perspectives is closely linked to the conscious-unconscious
relationship and both are disguised with very chaotic category of synchronic code. The perception
of all of them actually plays a very important role in the process of learning a foreign language and the
coodination of an individual with the outside world.

Observation of this combination leads to a conclusion that everything is seeable at the same time, just as
it occurs, all united, all connected to each other, everything explained and explicable by something else.
Furthermore, it should be described simultaneously which is impossible by using the traditional methods of
description, narration or memory. The impressive theory of modern age like, Jung’s theory of the 'collective
unconscious', made of his followers the true believers in humanity’s collective unconscious state and its
reflection on literary texts. They accept this process as the universal symbol of archetypal, psychoanalytical
experiment of modernity. Many highly influential modern and postmodern theories of literature are indebted to
psychoanalysis and its concept of the unconscious.

Harold Bloom’s ‘anxiety of influence’ illustrates the subjective expressions in literary texts and their
interpretations. Bloom calls it the ‘misprision’ (mistaking, misreading, misinterpreting) because, although the
influences appear, they can never be completed with equal conscious or unconscious processes in the minds of
different persons. The procedure could be accepted as the start for recognizing and interpreting the stream of
consciousness like the very impressive, almost inescapable category in modern literary theories, psychoanalytical
and applied linguistics.

At the beginning of the third millennium the stream of consciousness technique appears again as the most
popular method in the conception of modern novel. This psychoanalytical phenomenon in the centre of modern
writers’ attention let a reader to connect the thoughts, to see them as a whole and to conclude about them
opening the horizon towards some skills of literary and life-living experiments. Speaking of the phenomenon
stream of consciousness, William James mentioned some positive activities of human mind with the view to lift
it up on the level of resolving the problems by analyzing the novel’s intrigue and its main characters, and finally,
naming it the stream of thoughts.

Linking the methodological perspective on stream of consciousness in literary text and its reflection on
human mental activities during the learning process is almost equally described by a classic example of how
Stephen Dedalus can only become an artist once he had understood his stunned past.

“The thinking process of the character is what makes the reader identify and potentially, justify or rectify
his own life. There is a form of transference occurring between a reader and character’s reflection. Some
modern writers make a demand on the reader to participate and this must be compared to some other writers’
way of developing and narrating a story, which lets the reader identify with the characters and inner stories,
rather than demanding the transference. The writing of those other writers is more assertive, more affirmed, and
in a less demanding manner, presents the story, not the character’s reflection, to the reader. So in modern
literature, in order for the character to continue with his life, he must first understand his past. The nexus
between the past and the character, in order to rectify the present as the part of psychoanalytical procedure, is
what could be classified as the “Process of Being.” Psychoanalysis offers a systematic account of the psychic
instruments (especially the unconscious) and a theory of the mind and human psychic development. Sigmund
Freud initially theorized a relation between the ego and the unconscious on one side as he contrasted the
encompassed consciousness and the individual’s contact with the external world on the other. In this model, the
ego and the unconscious occupied different areas and the problem was to understand how human energy moved
back and forth between the two. This process could be understood as the antecedent of the stream of
consciousness interpretation.” (Lončar-Vujnović 2012: 82)

The stream of consciousness writers (especially Joyce) have not used explanatory descriptions or
narrative summaries, which would have been conceptual stratifications and falsifications of something which
happens subconsciously at the very sinews of their characters’ lives. According to them, if an author has involved
himself in the text using the description or narration, the magic of character’s stream of consciousness would be
destroyed by the author’s subjectivity.

According to the structural patterns, we identify the different authors’ stream of consciousness
approaches, for instance, from the complex layers of devices in Ulysses to the single device of character unity
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in *Pilgrimage*. All aforementioned patterns are very necessary to be used in creating the stream of consciousness fiction. Is it true or not, let Joyce himself give the answer:

"It [art] awakens, or ought to awaken, or induces, or ought to induce, an aesthetic stasis, an ideal pity or an ideal terror, a stasis called forth, prolonged and at last dissolved by what I call the rhythm of beauty."

"What is that exactly?" asked Lynch. "Rhythm," said Stephen, "is the first formal aesthetic relation of part to part in any aesthetic whole or of an aesthetic whole to its part or parts or of any part to the aesthetic whole of which it is a part." (Joyce 2001:166)

It has become apparent that there is a pattern of development within the stream-of-consciousness genre. From the earliest experiments with impressionistic rendering of the inner world, illustrated at its best in Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* and at its most extensive in Dorothy Richardson's *Pilgrimage*, through the extremely forceful presentation of psychic life in Joyce's *Ulysses*, to the culmination of experiment in *The Waves* and *Finnegan's Wake*—which led to stream of consciousness, and obscurity—we have come to a subtle retrenchment in Faulkner's novels. There are many things remaining unsaid about stream of consciousness technique and other representatives in modern literature, but we consciously have only mentioned some of them.

We also have not made an attempt to catalogue fiction determining finally what is and what is not stream of consciousness writing. The complexity of this subject dictated such limitations if the central task of clarifying a stream of consciousness term would be accomplished. (Lončar-Vujnović 2012:176)

Speaking of the theme, we have suggested that the main technique in controlling the process of stream of consciousness writing has been an application of the principles of the psychological free association. The primary fact of free association is that it is a simple psychological reflection on human mind, suspended by Freud’s, Jung’s, Lacan’s or Deleuze and Guattari’s works. The psyche, which is almost continuously active, cannot be focused for very long in its processes, even when it is most strongly willed; when little effort is exerted to concentrate it, its focus remains on any one thing but momentarily. Yet the activity of consciousness must have content, and this is provided for by the power of one thing to suggest another through an association of qualities in common or in contrast, wholly, or partially—even to the barest suggestion. Three factors control the association: first, the memory, which is its basis; second, the senses, which guide it; and third, the imagination, which determines its elasticity. The subtlety of play, the rank of precedence and the physiology of these factors are problems of dispute among psychologists. None of the stream-of-consciousness writers, except to a limited extent Joyce in *Finnegan’s Wake*, have been concerned with the complexities of the psychological problems; but all of the writers have recognized the primacy of free association in determining the movement of the psychic processes of their characters. But there is a difference in their methods. It is indicated chiefly in the difference in subject matter—which is, for the earlier novelists, motive and action (external man) and for the later ones, psychic existence and functioning (internal man). The difference is also revealed in the psychological and philosophical thinking in back of this. Psychologically it is the distinction between behaviorist concepts and psychoanalytical ones; philosophically, it is that between a broad materialism and a generalized existentialism. Combined, it is the difference between being concerned about what one does and being concerned about what one is.

Taking into consideration Freudian or Existential interpreting of stream of consciousness literature, we have suggested that all of the authors doubtless were familiar, more or less, with psychoanalytical theories and with the twentieth-century recrudescence of individualism and were directly or indirectly influenced by them. Even more certain we have affirmed that these writers were influenced by the broader concepts of a "new psychology" and a "new philosophy"—a nebulous label for all post-behaviorist and non-positivistic thinking, including any philosophy or psychology which emphasized man's inner mental and emotional life (e.g. psychoanalytical psychology, religious mysticism, experimental mysticism, much symbolic logic, Christian existentialism, etc.). It is this background which led to the great difference between traditional writers (materialists), partly experimental writers (older generation of modernists) and neo-experimentalists (younger generation of modernists; who have been expressed in this study). Yet as novelists all of these writers were concerned with the problem of characterization. There is naturalism in character depiction found in the work of both the late and the early of the novelists, but there is a contrast and it is determined by the difference in psychological focusing. In short, the stream of consciousness novelists were, like the naturalists, trying to depict life accurately; but unlike the naturalists, the life they were concerned with was the individual's psychic life.

Finally, the realm of life the stream of consciousness literature is concerned with is either a mental or a spiritual experience — both it's "subject" and the "manner or style". The subject includes the categories of mental experiences: sensations, memories, imaginations, conceptions, and intuitions. Moreover, it is often impossible to separate the what (subject) from the how (style).
II. Stream Of Consciousness Writing Technique: An Innovative Method In Applied Linguistics

The stream-of-consciousness novel is identified most quickly by its subject matter. This, rather than its techniques, its purposes, or its themes, distinguishes it. Hence, the novels that are said to use the stream-of-consciousness technique to a considerable degree prove, upon analysis, to be novels which have as their essential subject matter the consciousness of one or more characters; that is, the depicted consciousness serves as a screen on which the material in these novels is presented.

"Consciousness" should not be confused with words which denote more restricted mental activities, such as "intelligence" or "memory." Naturally, the stream-of-consciousness writers have not defined their label. We, the readers who have stamped it on them must try to do it. When James was formulating psychological theory, he had discovered that "memories, thoughts, and feelings exist outside the primary consciousness" and, when even further, by saying that they appear to one, not as a chain, but as a stream, a flow.(James 1890:239) Whoever, then, first applied the phrase to the novel did so correctly only if he was thinking of a method of representing inner awareness. What has actually happened is that monologue intérieur was clumsily translated into English. Stream of consciousness, then, is not a synonym for monologue intérieur. It is not a term to name a particular method or technique; although it probably was used originally in literary criticism for that purpose. Consciousness indicates the entire area of mental attention, from pre-consciousness on through the levels of the mind up to and including the highest one of rational, communicable awareness. (Hoffman 1945:126-129) Stream-of-consciousness fiction differs from all other psychological fiction precisely in that it is concerned with those levels that are more inchoate than rational verbalization—those levels on the margin of attention. So far as stream-of-consciousness fiction is concerned, it is pointless to try to make definite categories of the many levels of consciousness. Such attempts demand the answers to serious metaphysical questions, and they put serious questions about the stream-of-consciousness writers' concepts of psychology and their aesthetic intentions—questions which the epistemologists, the psychologists, and the literary historians have not yet answered satisfactorily. It is desirable for an analysis of stream-of-consciousness fiction to assume that there are levels of consciousness from the lowest one just above oblivion to the highest one which is represented by verbal. Naturally, the stream-of-consciousness writers have not defined their label. We readers who have stamped it on them must try to do it in this study, involves no communicative basis as does the speech level (whether spoken or written). This is its salient distinguishing characteristic. In short the prespeech levels of consciousness are not censored, rationally controlled, or logically ordered. By "consciousness," then, I shall mean the whole area of mental processes, including especially the prespeech levels. The term "psyche" I shall use as a synonym for "consciousness," and at times, even the word "mind" could be used as another synonym. "Hence, "consciousness" must not be confused with "intelligence" or "memory" or any other such limiting term. Henry James had written novels which revealed psychological processes in which a single point of view was maintained and the entire novel is presented through the intelligence of a character. But these, since they do not deal at all with prespeech levels of consciousness, are not as stream-of-consciousness novels.

Marcel Proust has written a modern classic which is often cited as an example of stream-of-consciousness fiction, but A la recherche du temps perdu is concerned only with the reminiscent aspect of consciousness. Proust was deliberately recapturing the past for the purposes of communication; hence he did not write a stream-of-consciousness novel." (Wagenknecht 1943:505) Let us think of consciousness as an iceberg—the whole iceberg and not just a relatively small surface portion. Stream-of-consciousness fiction is, therefore to follow this comparison, greatly concerned with what lies below the surface.

The greatest problem of the stream-of-consciousness writer is to capture the irrational and incoherent quality of private unuttered consciousness and in doing so still to communicate to his readers. After all, readers in the twentieth century, have expected of language and syntax to be a kind of perfect empirical order what Roman Jakobson identified with the two primary operations of human language: metaphor (condensing meaning together), and metonymy (displacing one on to another). It was this which moved to French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan to comment that ‘the unconscious is structured like a language’. Indeed, by reinterpreting Freudianism in terms of language, a pre-eminently social activity, Lacan permits us to explore the relations between the unconscious and human society. One way of describing a part of his work what concerns to the language is to say that the unconscious is not some kind of seething, tumultuous, private region ‘inside’ us, but an effect of our relations with one another. The unconscious is, said Lacan, ‘outside’ rather than ‘within’ us—rather it exists ‘between’ us, as our relationships do. It is elusive not so much because it is buried deep within our minds, but because it is a kind of vast, tangled network which surrounds us and weaves it through us, and which can therefore never be pinned down. The best image for such a network, which is both beyond us is language itself; and indeed for Lacan the unconscious is a particular effect of language, a process of desire set in motion by difference. When we enter the symbolic order, we enter into language itself; this language, for Lacan, is never something entirely within our individual control. On the contrary, language is what internally divides us, rather than an instrument we are confidently able to manipulate. According to Lacan, language always pre-
exists us: it is always already ‘in place’, waiting to assign us our places within it. It is ready and waiting for us rather as our parents are; we shall never be able entirely to shake off the dominant role which our parents play in our constitution. Language, the unconscious, the parents, and the symbolic order: these terms in Lacan are not exactly synonymous, but they are intimately allied. They are sometimes spoken of by him as the ‘other’ - as that which like language is always anterior to us and will always escape us, that which brought us into being as subjects in the first place but which always outruns our grasp. We have seen that for Lacan our conscious desire is directed towards this ‘other’, in the shape of some ultimately gratifying reality which we can never have; but it is also true that our desire is in some way always received from the ‘other’ too. We desire what others- our parents, for instance- unconsciously desire for us; and desire can only happen because we are caught up in linguistic, sexual and social relations- the whole field of the ‘other’ – which generate it.

Much more simple than Lacan and also from a communicative perspective, Edgar Morin writes: “We can think of magic, mythologies, and ideologies both as mixed systems, making affectivity rational and rationality affective, and as outcomes of combining: a) fundamental drives, b) the chancy play of fantasy, and c) logico-constructive systems. To our mind, the theory of myth must be based on triumic syncretism rather than unilateral logic.” (Morin 2001: 2316)

A writer of stream-of-consciousness fiction, like all serious writers, has something to say, to express some sense of values, and the most, he wants to communicate to the reader in a specific way. Unlike other writers, however, he chooses the internal world of psychic activity to dramatize these values. But psychic activity is a private thing and must be represented as private in order for the writer to gain reader confidence. Consequently, the stream-of-consciousness writer has to do two things: (1) he has to represent the actual texture of consciousness, and (2) he has to distill some meaning from it for the reader. This presents a dilemma to the writer, because the nature of consciousness involves a private sense of values, private associations, and private relationships peculiar to that consciousness; therefore it is enigmatic to an outside consciousness. Sigmund Freud affirmed that one can never know directly the contents of the “unconscious.” Freud considered about mental processes which should not be treated just as objects of psychological research but as the connection among the most intimate conscious mental acts and the “unconscious.” “Anyone who is ignorant of the facts of pathology, who regards the blunders of normal persons as accidental, and who is content with the old saw that dreams are froth need only ignore a few more problems of the psychology of consciousness in order to dispense with the assumption of an unconscious mental activity…It is, however, satisfactory to find that the correction of inner perception does not present difficulties so great as that of outer perception-the inner object is less hard to discern truly than is the outside world.” (Freud 1952:430) This is for various reasons ambiguous in using the words “conscious” and “unconscious” sometimes in a descriptive and sometimes in a systematic sense. Therefore, this transitional phase in the process is very important, especially when the mental act is not conscious yet but it is certainly capable of entering consciousness, according to J. Breuer’s expression. “In consideration of this capacity to become conscious, we also call the system the preconscious.” (Freud 1952:431) Making the connection between any stream of conscious literary text and psychoanalysis, we find out that there are conscious and unconscious ideas; but there are also unconscious instinctual impulses, emotions, and feelings, or there are such constructions in this instance devoid of any meaning in the stream of consciousness writings.

The problem of form for any stream of consciousness novelist is the problem of how order is imposed on disorder. He sets out to depict what is chaotic (human consciousness at an inchoate level) and is obligated to keep his depiction from being chaotic (to make a work of art). We may look at the problem in the following manner: if an author wishes to create a character by presenting that character’s mind to the reader, then the work in which this is done has per se as its setting the character’s mind. It has as its time of taking place the range of the characters’ memories and fancies in time; it has as its place of action wherever the characters’ minds wish to go in fancy or memory; and it has as its action whatever remembered, perceived, or imagined event the characters happen to focus on. In brief, the writer commits himself to dealing faithfully with what he conceives to be the chaos and accident of a consciousness—unpatterned, undisciplined, and unclear.

To look back on the era of experimentation with a sigh of relief and a reluctant admission that the experimenting produced some of the major literature of the century is not to appreciate the entire significance of the movement. The stream-of-consciousness novel becomes the tremendous result of the period with: stream-of-consciousness methods which are, now, conventional methods; the vagaries of prespeech mental life which are established twentieth-century forms; and, the devices for conveying private consciousness become ones which writers use confidently and readers accept without a murmur. Stream of consciousness as a method of character depiction is a newly admitted reality. Art has always attempted to express, to objectify the dynamic processes of our inner life. Now that “inner life” is a reality which we recognize as available to any consciousness, and now that techniques, devices, and forms have been established for conveying this reality, fictional art has come closer than ever before to achieving its purpose.

But the acceptance of the reality of inner life, of the prespeech levels of consciousness, as a proper subject of fiction is the significant thing for us to notice. If we randomly look at the work of some of the most
important mid 20th century writers, this acceptance becomes obvious. One might notice it (and accept it as a standard convention) in the fiction of Elizabeth Bowen, Graham Greene, Katherine Anne Porter, Robert Penn Warren, and Eudora Welty—to mention but a few, and to overlook entirely the vast amount of more ephemeral work in which unuttered consciousness is not only casually accepted as a legitimate subject, but is even automatically formed in the image of the great experimental stream-of-consciousness novels.

Warren’s method of projecting Burden’s unspoken mental activities is, however, not an imitation of Faulkner; the suggestion of stream of consciousness in All the King’s Men is disarmingly conventional. It is usually presented in the first person and sometimes in the more objective second person. “Going to bed in the late spring afternoon or just at the beginning of twilight, with those sounds in your ears, gives you a wonderful sense of peace.” (Warren 1946:325)

This avoidance of mechanical devices, syntactical aberrations, fragments, and logical obscurity reflects his dislike of the purely mechanical (the psychoanalytical and theoretical) aspects of mental functioning. Warren’s interest is in spiritual struggle (growth or decay), which manifests itself dramatically in the unuttered confusion of the mind. He depends on rhetoric, symbols, and free association to represent this confusion. It is significant that both the ignoring of psychological theories of consciousness and the accepting of the basic description which these theories have given Warren’s generation are present in his depiction of his character.

Finding the connection between literary & psychological phenomenon, stream of consciousness and applied linguistics, we suggest that the dialects between the “madness” understood as having “logic-and reason-flouting quality of a dream” (Faulkner) and the “system” understood as a set of logical links chaining the diffuse, the elusive and the protean into some sort of a firmer structure, known as the mind, has always been a challenge for the men of letters trying to solve the mystery of the cross-breeding of such divergent qualities in man. The compatible vision of literary, psychological and linguistic aspects in learning foreign language relates to the usage of some basic elements of stream of consciousness technique (direct, indirect monologue, mental response, flux of consciousness, flow of consciousness, free association, rhetorical devices, metaphor, symbol) mainly controlled by the principle of free association through memory, senses, the imagination and “cinematic devices” popularly named the “montage”. “Montage” refers to a class of devices which are used to show interrelation or association of ideas, such as a rapid succession of images or the superimposition of image on image or the surrounding of a focal image by related ones. The main secondary devices appearing from primarily “montage” are: multiple-view, slow-ups, fade-outs, cutting, close-ups, flashbacks, camera-eye, and the others.

With the aid of the given sciences, namely, with the help of their analytical tools for dissecting layers, fibers and tissue of a complex and rich human experience, the whole process of understanding, describing and recreating the above mentioned dialectics could be viewed from different perspectives, in terms of a variety of approaches, methods and techniques. One of them is the stream of consciousness procedure, a truly fascinating experiment aiming at recapturing “fluidity” of the thought and learning processes as opposed to its systematic “fixity” (T. S. Eliot) by means of literary techniques and devices.

Moreover, such a concept of literary work makes an essence of the book Globalization and management in foreign language learning process: English at the beginning of the third millennium by Dr. Slobodanka Djolic and her unusual innovative approach to the learning English as the most popular language on the planet. In addition, a literary perspective of stream of consciousness or stream of thoughts is the outline in learning foreign language, and especially in the framework of cognitive theory which supports “some individual mental processes as the inner mental actions in any learner with a view to understand the linguistic concept and the learning-teaching material expressed by a teacher.” (pg.161) Using aforementioned phenomenon—stream of consciousness—any learner is capable to manipulate with possible speaking interpretations of the foreign language he learns and, with the individual usage of knowledge in the natural situations and conversation. In the further analysis of including a learner as the unique psychological figure into the process of learning foreign language, the author declares that the process mainly is the usage of learner’s mental activities. (pg.161)

Actually, the most impressive equivalent of psychological personality in foreign language learning process, according to the author, is the stream of consciousness technique earlier defined through the prism of Literature, Philosophy and Psychoanalysis.

In the fifth chapter, taking into consideration the complexity of teaching-learning process, the author analyzes the methodological, pedagogical and psychological factors primarily insisting on the roles of Literature, culture and literary sources which aim at the development of motivation in foreign language learning process.

Since our living century is burdened by the issues of human existence and the states of mind, the book Globalization and management in foreign language learning process: English at the beginning of the third
millennium by its concept and obvious strategy of developing stream of consciousness or stream of thoughts in both, the foreign language learning process and the interpretation of the individual personality, achieves the desired effect.

Lastly, this book provides an insightful research and the stream of consciousness reflection on a foreign language teaching-learning process as completely new and persuasive methodological approach. Almost identically as the vivid vision of passing characters through the reader’s prism in literary texts, so the knowledge of foreign language after reading a book makes the completely new picture of learning foreign language in the third millennium.
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