MIKHAIL BAKHTIN "DISCOURSE IN THE NOVEL"

Towards a Synthesis of Marxism and (Russian) Formalism

BakhtinBakhtin contends that literary criticism has historically tendedBakhtin contends that literary criticism has his ideological examination" (260) (the province of critical schools such as Marxism) or onideological examination" (260) (the ofof artiof artistic craftmansof artistic craftmanship" (260) (the province of formalist criticism [e.g. the Russian Formalist words,words, traditionally, novelistic analysiswords, traditionally, novelistic analysis has tended to isolate questions of form fr (i.e.(i.e. ideology). Given that ideology is semiotic in form (ideas do n(i.e. ideology). Given that ideology is semi language),language), Bakhtin s thesis in this essay is, rather, that thelanguage), Bakhtin s thesis in this essay is, rather, that t areare inseparable, something he hopesare inseparable, something he hopes to prove by focusing on the novel. are insepa at the same time that ideology must take some form.

BakhtinBakhtin contends, firstly, that the novel does not consistBakhtin contends, firstly, that the novel does not cons way,way, the novel as a genre subsumes several sub-genres (what Bakhtin terms inway, the novel as a genre subsumes "several"several heterogeneous stylistic unities" [261]). Secondly, the"several heterogeneous stylistic unities" [261]). Secon expressexpress a single voice or point of view, traditionally assumed to be the authorsexpress a single voice or point o TheThe novel is, rather, *heteroglot* or many-voiced (in an earlier discus or many-voiced (in an earlier discussion of or synonymsynonym *polyphonic*), that is, expressive of a multiplicity of points of view), that is, expressive of a multiplicity limitedlimited tolimited to the author s. In short, as Bakhtin puts it, the novel is "multiformlimited to the author s. In short, as B *voice*" (my emphases; 261). These voices or perspectives include:

> thethe author s own voice, so-called direct authorial interventions (these arethe author s own voice, so-calle
> thethe author s own voice can be clearlythe author s own voice can be clearly heardthe author s own voice ca
> moral sentiment that may have little to do with the progression of the plot itself);
> the narrator s voice (usually following a particular literary style or convention);
> the voices of various characters (usually in an oral or semi-literary style).

InIn other words, the author s voice is merely one amongIn other words, the author s voice is merely one among the manyIn o pointspoints ofpoints of view or voices are lesspoints of view or voices are less the solipsistic expressions of the points of vie broaderbroader class-based perspectives. It is through this diversity of voices and concomitant speech genres or typestypes that *heteroglossia*, i.e. the "internal stratification of any single national language into s, i.e. the "internal strati (262),(262), each of which correspond to(262), each of which correspond to the ideological perspective of(262), each of w novel'snovel's centrifugal disnovel's centrifugal dispersinovel's centrifugal dispersion (as opposed to centripetal unificat (263).

ItIt is precisely because the novel is heteroglot tIt is precisely because the novel is heteroglot that critiIt is pr formalist *and* sociological in orientation. Bakhtin puts it this way: the

> internalinternal social dialogism of novelistic discourse requires the concrete sointernal social dialogism of n discoursediscourse to be exposed, to be revealed as a force that detdiscourse to be exposed, to be revea structure, its *form* and *content*. (my emphases; 677).

That is, the novel must be forcedThat is, the novel must be forced to reveal the "social and historical voices populating la provide language with its particular concrete conceptualisations" (678).

The Dialogic Nature of Language and the Heteroglot Nature of the Novel

BakhtinBakhtin cBakhtin claims that the language of poetic discourse, i.e. lyric poetry, is unitary and monologic: onlBak voice,voice, the poet s, he argues, is to be heard:voice, the poet s, he argues, is to be heard: his poetry, Bakhtin writes, is t his own intention" (674). Moreover, a given poemhis own intention" (674). Moreover, a given poem does not subsume sev lyriclyric poetry is neitherlyric poetry is neither multiform in style nor variform in voice. lyric poetry isneither multiform in stylen isis the dominant characteristic of prose fictionis the dominant characteristic of prose fiction.is the dominant characte argues,argues, are argues, are orienteargues, are oriented towards the interpretation of poetry. As a result, they most c ideological and stylistic diversity to the ideological monologism and stylistic unity of poetry.

BakhtinBakhtin argues that the novel does not fit intoBakhtin argues that the novel does not fit into existing critical fra thethe study of poetry because the latter ignores the fact of heteroglossia. From this point of view, anythe study of poetry beca including the novel, takes shape "at aincluding the novel, takes shape "at a particular historical moment in a socially-specif and is an "active participantand is an "active participant in social dialogue" (670). and is an "active participant in social dial monological)monological) in nature in that itmonological) in nature in that it is an arena inmonological) in nature in that it is a realityreality thatreality that correspond to the several classes which comprise thatreality that correspond to the several clas perspectiveperspective (theperspective (the domperspective (the dominant ideology, that of the ruling class), struggle

seemiseeminglyseemingly unified national language and the broad "socio-ideological conceptual horizon" (669) whicsee subtends, consequently, there are many class-specific sub-languages and outlooks.

TheThe notion that the novel is, like poetry, a monologicalThe notion that the novel is, like poetry, a monological uttera becausbecausebecause historically it, to paraphrase Bakhtin, served the forces of centripetal unification in thebecause ideologicalideological evolution ofideological evolution of specific social groups ideological evolution of specific social groups social, and cultural centralisationsocial, and cultural centralisation in the emergence of European nation-statessocial, and c thethe middle class). This is why, bythe middle class). This is why, by the nineteenth century (the so-called golden age of rea becomebecome the literary genre most favoured by the bourgeoisie. In fact, however,become the literary genre most fa forcesforces (in the form of a fiforces (in the form of a firforces (in the form of a firm linguistic and ideological nucleus coexistcoexist and compete with centrifugal forces within whatcoexist and compete with centrifugal forces within what is in a concreteconcrete utterance of a sconcrete utterance of a speconcrete utterance of a speaking subject" (668) is, accor centrifugal forces confront each other. Every utterance is, as such, bothcentrifugal forces confront each other. Every utte embodimentembodiment of a speech-act" (668). In other words, every utterance is *bboth* "a "anonymous and social a language"language" (668) *and* "simultaneously concrete, filled with specific cont "simultaneously concrete, filled with s utterance"utterance" (668). Each utterance is, as such, necessarily "contradictiutterance" (668). Each utterance is, as (668). This is as true of the novel as it is of any other utterance.

InIn short, literary In short, literary critiIn short, literary criticism in general has long ignored the dialogic nat heteroglotheteroglot nature of the novel, preferring to view the novelheteroglot nature of the novel, preferring to view the novel is,is, as a "closed authorial monologue" (669).is, as a "closed authorial monologue" (669). is, as a "closed authorial monologu andand of theand of the "multilanguagedness" (669) of any society has led critics to underprivilege those genresand of the the novel which were carriers of thethe novel which were carriers of the decentralising tendencies of language or at the very wrongly.wrongly. Where the high genres (such as poetry) were undoubtedly integrwrongly. Where the high genre nationalnational unification in the fifteenth, sixteenth andnational unification in the fifteenth, sixteenth and s suchsuch as the novel grew out of the ribald comedy of the fairs and the buffoon spectacles frequented by tsuch as the n lowerlower classes (what Bakhtin callslower classes (what Bakhtin calls the carnivalesque folk humour of the Middle Ages AtAt those levels, Bakhtin argues inAt those levels, Bakhtin argues in Rabelais and hisRabelais and his World and elsewhere oneone dominant ideology,one dominant ideology, merely a playing with various official languages and versions of reality, no could lay claim to authenticity or absolute fidelity to the truth.

The Critique of Realism

InIn the light of the foregoing, it ought to be clear thatIn the light of the foregoing, it ought to be clear that Bakhtin s views on the ananan important critique of both Empiricistan important critique of both Empiricist /an important critique of both Empiricist / H hashas frequentlyhas frequently been defined as a mirror heldhas frequently been defined as a mirror held up to nature. A itit is not for nothing that the so-called riseit is not for nothing that the so-called rise of it is not for nothing that the so LockeanLockean Empiricism, as a result of which the novel form has come to funcLockean Empiricism, as a result of w literaryliterary Realism. From this point of view, the novelliterary Realism. From this point of view, the novel verbally re-p physical senses of its novelist.

A mimetic model of the novel also informs the point of viewA mimetic model of the novel also informs the point of studystudy The Historical Novel. Here, he contends that any *properly historicalproperly historical* literary workliterary work ac classclass conflict intrinsic to the place and timeclass conflict intrinsic to the place and time which it depicts. For Lukács, t dynamicdynamic changeswhich constitutedynamic changes which constitute European history (to be precise, the dialectical p ofof economic production to its successor). Each moment inof economic production to its successor). Each moment in histor eagereager to protecteager to protect its interests and others struggling to take its place.eager to protect its interests and c dialecticaldialectical synthesisdialectical synthesis of these antitheticaldialectical synthesis of these antithetical forces and t historicalhistorical accuracy of all such works is whathistorical accuracy of all such works is what Lukácshistorical accuracy Lukács sLukács s sense of this term, characters must embody in their individual fictional existence the place of similar realreal individuals in the class-struggle and, by extension, in thereal individuals in the class-struggle and, by extension, in t ofof a literary work, for Lukács, is a function of the deof a literary work, for Lukács, is a function of the degree tof a lite betweenbetween the dominant and emerging classes characteristic obetween the dominant and emerging classes ch dynamo, according to Marx, of history. To accomplishdynamo, according to Marx, of history. To accomplish this, the plot revolves around a conflict between characters representative (or typical) of their respective classes.

BothBoth the Empiricist / Humanist (Watt) and Marxist (Lukács) views of the novel are infoBoth the Empiricist / referentialreferential model of signification in which a given sign is thought to directly correspond to a particular referent. In this mimetic scheme of things, the "direct word (669), as Bakhtin puts it,

> encountersencounters in its orientation toward the object only the resistance of the object itself . . . but

itit does not encouit does not encounter in itsit does not encounter in its path toward the object the funda
opposition of another's word. (669)

Bakhtin argues, however, that in reality

betweenbetween the wordbetween the word [sign] and its objectbetween the word [sign] and its object [referent], betw
there exists an elastic environment of other, alien words about the same object, the same
theme. (669)

That is, any

concreteconcrete discourse (utterance) finds the object at which it was directed already . . . overlain
withwith qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value, with qualifications, open to dispute, charged with value,
of alien words that have already been spoken about it. (669)

From this point of view, any "artistic representation"From this point of view, any "artistic representation" (670)From this po
(670) is necessarily(670) is necessarily "penetrated by this dialogic play of verbal intentions that meet(670) is necessarily "p
(67(670).(670). Poetry forgets that the object of description has its own history of contradictory acts of verbal
recognition (671). By contrast, in prose fiction the

objectobject reveals . . . the socially heteroglot multiplicity of itobject reveals . . . the socially heteroglot mult
judgments.judgments. Insteadjudgments. Instead of the virginal fullness andjudgments. Instead of the virginal full
writer confronts a multitude of routes, writer confronts a multitude of routes, roads and paths . . .writer confronts a m
consciousness. (671)

ForFor the author, in short, the object of description is a "focalFor the author, in short, the object of description is a "focal poi
voicevoice must also sound; these voices create thevoice must also sound; these voices create the background necessary fo
discourse is always already "oriented toward the already uttered, the already known" (671).

The dialogical nature of language and, by extension, theThe dialogical nature of language and, by extension, the
"possibility "possibility (328), indeed, the inevitability of another's"possibility (328), indeed, the inevitability of another's po
thethe object of his description. For the novelist, there is seemingly the object of his description. For the novelist,
perception perception (330) (i.e the novelist confuses his own socially-inspired take on reperception (330) (i.e the
preciselyprecisely because the " already bespoke quality of the world is woven together with the precisely because the
quality ofquality of language" (331). This is whyquality of language" (331). This is why Bakhtin claims that what the novel
isis not reality per se (however this may be defined, empiricallyis not reality per se (however this may be defined, empirically
saysay about reality). The central problem of the novel, Bakhtin arguesay about reality). The central problem of th
language,language, the problem of representing the image oflanguage, the problem of representing the image of a language
aa novel offers is not a dialectical contest of characters and the respectivea novel offers is not a dialectical contest of chara
concludesconcludes in the synthesis of their points of view but, rather, anconcludes in the synthesis of their points of view but,
sometimessometimes given voice to by particular characters, sometimes given voice to by particular characters, in which the
BakhtinBakhtin puts it, the human being in the novel is first, foremost, and always a speaking human being (116),
each bringing with them theireach bringing with them their own unique ideological discourse, their owneach bringing wit
anan *intentional hybridisation* of languages, creates an artistic image of languages, creates an artistic image of the various
competitioncompetition with each other, serving to sharpen the reader's perception of such scompetition with
differentiations. differentiations. The plots of novels function to repredifferentiations. The plots of novels function to repr
worldworld views that these imply. The result isworld views that these imply. The result is that the novel is a literary hybrid, a
for bringing different languages infor bringing different languages in contact with one another (118) without, however, offer
or transcendence of these competing perspectives.

BakhtinBakhtin contends that thBakhtin contends that there are three Bakhtin contends that there are three bas
which, although separable for the purpose of analysis, are in fact inextricably woven together (117):

pure dialogues (117) where characters literally engage in dialogue with each other;

hybridisations hybridisations (117), hybridisations (117), that is, a mixture of two social languages withi
utteranutterance, utterance, an enutterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two
consciousnesses, separated from one anotherconsciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch
somesome other factor (117); sometimes, this intentional or delibsome other factor (117); sometim
unconscious or unintentional;

dialogised dialogised interrelation of dialogised interrelation of languages (117)--the difference between
isis a subtle one, is a subtle one, to be precise, in the former thereis a subtle one, to be precise, in the forme
thethe boundaries of a single utterance--rather only one language is actually present in the
utterance, bututterance, but it is rendered *in the light of another language*. The second language is not,
however, however, actualised and remahowever, actualised and remains outhowever, actualised a
interrelationinterrelation of languages, howeveinterrelation of languages, however, twointerrelation of
utterance.

BakhtinBakhtin gives the term *parodic stylisation* to the process to the process by which authors, by to the process by which languages,languages, parody the logicallanguages, parody the logical and expressive structures of these discourses. This ta

> InIn the case of *stylization* per se, per se, a writer borrows or *appropriates* aa style and/or ideas from another writerwriter but not polemically, i.e., withwriter but not polemically, i.e., with the desire to populate it with his own int however,however, that evenhowever, that even the very act of borrowing in this way installs a certain difference from InIn the case of *parody* perper se, a writer appropriates others discourses but with aper se, a writer appropriates oth samesame words to a different intention,same words to a different intention, to re-place them insame words to a d were.

InIn short, eachIn short, each utteranceIn short, each utterance (parole) is a *hybrid* construction (it is *double-voiced, double-a* utteranceutterance of a single speaker intersects two or more different styles and corresponding world vieutterance of incorporatingincorporating these, the novelincorporating these, the novel thereby offers an image ofincorporating these, the systems that these imply in a given place and at a givensystems that these imply in a given place and at a given time.syste alsoalso interactsalso interacts dialogically with other ideological horizons, therebyalso interacts dialogically with other ideolo using a variety of languages, however, the author avoids giving himself up to any one of them.

The Decentering of the Author

Bakhtin sBakhtin s critique of Realism has important implications for traditional assumptions concerningBakhtin s critique of R thethe process of self-expression. From at least Longinus, as M. H. Abrams reminds us in The Mirror and the Lamp,, the literary work in, the literary work in general and lyric poetry in particular has frequently been viewed as, to, the oror lesseror lesser degree, the *original* expression of some novelist s *innate* and *unique* genius. Suchgenius. Such attitudes thethe author persisted historically eventhe author persisted historically even in the course of the rise to prominence ofthe soso shaped the correspondingso shaped the corresponding rise of the novel, according to Ian Watt. so shaped the corresp ttthatthat even when itthat even when it comes to the golden age of the novel in the nineteenth century, for example, it is accurateaccurate to speakaccurate to speak of *Expressive Realism*. By this. By this Lodge intends the popular (sometimes implicit)implicit) view of the novel as simultaneously the more orimplicit) view of the novel as simultaneously the more or l worldworld view--the authors--and as more or less truthful representations of reality (12). world view--the author s--a predominatedpredominated that the truly classic author, whether novelistpredominated that the truly classic author, whether whichwhich he is able to express in some unique way. To put this which he is able to express in some unique way. T emphasis upon both the

> ideaidea of the authoridea of the author as a uniqueidea of the author as a uniquely constituted individual subje sense owner of his work . . . [and] on the mimetic function of verbal art, its ability to reflect or represent the world truthfully and in detail. (14)

Such a view of authorship isSuch a view of authorship is clearly undergirded in part by a referential orSuch a view of autho (one s(ones ideas can label or refer to the referent) and in part by an exp(ones ideas can label or refer to the refe significationsignification (ideas about reality exist in the writer s consciousness without the aidsignification (ideas about reali signs being merely vehicles by which to express and communicate them with others).

AccordingAccording to Bakhtin,According to Bakhtin, however, given the dialogic nature of signification, authorsA intentionsintentions (i.e. they set out to say something) but these are at least in part not of theirintentions (i.e. they set out to this in a more Bakhtinian way, the semantic centre of a novelist's own personal intentions isthis in a more Bakhtinian way, byby inby intentions by intentions and tones alien to him / her as the novelist compels signs, already populated with the s intentions of others, to serve his own particular intentions. intentions of others, to serve his own particular intentions. Hisint thosethose of others those of others tthose of others that lurk in his / her own creation. In other words, the novelis unwittingly appropriates a wide range of discourses (paroles) thatunwittingly appropriates a wide range of discourses (pa (and(and even abrogate) them in alternate ways to suit his or her own intentions. The consequence of this(and even abrogat thethe necessarily hetethe necessarily heteroglot languthe necessarily heteroglot language which an author makes intentions,intentions, sometimes to refract them and sintentions, sometimes to refract them and sointentions, sometim realityreality is always already mediated by others views thereof whreality is always already mediated by others views degreedegree in his or her owndegree in his or her own work and as a result of which his/her novel is not monologic but dialog thethe authors perspective is important but it ithe authors perspective is important but it is not the sole pthe authors p novel, dispersed in several different and competingnovel, dispersed in several different and competing directions. The aut forfor example, of his various characterfor example, of his various characters who alfor example, of his various charac autonomy (even when their views are closely allied to that of the author).

Bakhtin suggests that point of view in a novel is dispersed in at least four directions:

> through direct authorial intervention;
> through the use ofthrough the use of a *narrator / teller* (the(the author uses a posited teller / narrator to illu

thethe object in quthe object in questithe object in question, to shed a new light on it and thereby to re
through another's utterance);
throughthrough the languages used by through the languages used by charthrough the language
semantically autonomous,semantically autonomous, embodying their particular valuesemantically autonor
theythey rthey reflecthey reflect / refract the author's intentions (in other words, the characters' speeche
themselvesthemselves inherently dialogical: each utterance is really a double-voiced discourse and
servesserves two speakers,serves two speakers, simultaneously expressing two different intentions (theserv
characcharactecharacter's).character's). Heteroglossia is not merely a dialogising background: each cha
ideologueideologue whose words are alwaysideologue whose words are always ideologemes that reflect a
world.world. Characters' languagesworld. Characters' languages stratify authorial languageworld. Characte
character'scharacter's mode of speechcharacter's mode of speech demarcatescharacter's mode of speech
thethe indicethe indice of character, rather of anthe indice of character, rather of an ideology: any use of lan
quotationquotation marks because theinherently intertextual naturequotation marks because the inherently
of originality;
throughthrough the incorporation of *sub-genres*: each genre consists of verbal and semantic forms
forfor assimilating reality. The novelfor assimilating reality. The novel is a "secondary syncreticfor assim
primaryprimary verbal genres" (319)primary verbal genres" (319) for "appropriating reality"primary verbal ge
drawndrawn from both artistic and non-artistic sourcesdrawn from both artistic and non-artistic sources (e.g. t
thethe novel's socio-linguistic unity, each layer existhe novel's socio-linguistic unity, each layer exis
authorial intentions.

FromFrom this point of view,From this point of view, theFrom this point of view, the author is something akin to a ventriloqu
medley)medley) of voices / stylisticmedley) of voices / stylistic subunities inmedley) of voices / stylistic subunities in a nove
in a particular way by the novelist, to form the "higher stylistic unity of the work as a whole" (261).

InIn short, the novel s "structured stylistic systIn short, the novel s "structured stylistic system" (678) sIn short,
ideologicalideological position of the authorideological position of the author amid the heteroglossia of (678) his orideologica
sisimplysimply express thesimply express the dominant ideology of a given society nor do they simply oppose it. Any
ideologicallyideologically complex discoideologically complex discourse in that although the novelist is necessarily from
dialogicdialogic nature of the sign, his / her noveldialogic nature of the sign, his / her novel necessarily alsodialogic nature o
class.class. The reason for all this is that anyclass. The reason for all this is that any individual s consciousness is necessa
forfor hegemony over the individual of competing ideological discourses. The ideological coming to
consciousnessconsciousness of a human is theconsciousness of a human is the processconsciousness of a human is the p
be authoritative [i.e. those of important personages suchbe authoritative [i.e. those of important personages such teachers
It is therefore wrong to speakIt is therefore wrong to speak of the autonomous subject, i.e of a free, unique andIt is therefor
becausebecause no individualbecause no individual is so unfettered ideologically-speaking. In eachbecause no individual is
dialoguedialogue between his or hdialogue between his or herdialogue between his or her own ideological value-system
individual'sindividual's utterance implindividual's utterance impliindividual's utterance implies a socio-lect(s), a concrete
whichwhich he or shwhich he or she partly carves owhich he or she partly carves out for him/herself and which is pa
boundaries of the general language or verbal-ideological system of a given society.

Literary History / Intertextuality

GivenGiven the foregoing, it ought to be clear thatGiven the foregoing, it ought to be clear that Bakhtin ofGiven the
parole,parole, diachrony, andparole, diachrony, and agency where the Structuralists and Deconstructionists emphasise langu
andand impersonality (what Barthes called the death of the and impersonality (what Barthes called the death of the A
modelsmodels of literary history rooted in the nineteenth century (e.g. Hippolyte Taine s). Just as signs aremodels of literary h
caughtcaught up in a dialogue of social voices, so too is each literary text. Each usecaught up in a dialogue of social voices
isis a rejoinder to previous uses thereof as much as it also anticipates future responses. is a rejoinder to previous uses thereof
bebe said tobe said to be always in the processbe said to be always in the process of writing back to (or parodying) other v
sometimessometimes accidentally, sometimes explicitly and sometimes implicitly (or in hidden form). Linda Hutcheon s
pointpoint in both The Politics of The Politics of Postmodernism and The PoeticsThe Poetics of Postmodernism is that all litera
eacheach other but that the hallmark of Postmodernist fiction is thateach other but that the hallmark of Postmodernist fiction
is an islandis an island unto itselfis an island unto itself because writers inevitably abrogate and appropriate, to use the fam
ofof Ashcroft,of Ashcroft, and co., the writings of other writers. of Ashcroft, and co., the writings of other writers. Bakhtin a
ofof its socio-historical context, ratheof its socio-historical context, rather of its socio-historical context, rather tha
discontinuitydiscontinuity (to be precise,discontinuity (to be precise, how the work ofdiscontinuity (to be precise, how the w
inin circulation and attempts to differenin circulation and attempts to differentiate itsin circulation and attempts

discontinuity (Structuralism). discontinuity (Structuralism). Consequently, no literarydiscontinuity (Structuralism). Conseq
asas if it exists in a vacuum: writers and their literary texts must be studied in terms of their relationship to their
precursorsprecursors and their successors. The history of any body of literature begprecursors and their successors.
preceded it and from which it is derived and from which it attempts to distance itself in some ways.

The Role of the Reader

BakhtinBakhtin talks little about the exact role played by the reader in the productive activation ofBakhtin talks little about th
novel.novel. However, given the dialogic nature of language, he stresses that the writer necessarily writes with,
amongamong other things, the point of view of potential readers in mamong other things, the point of view of potential
wordswords is present to the speaker [or writer] notwords is present to the speaker [or writer] not in thewords is present to the
of the listener [or reader], as his apperceptive background,of the listener [or reader], as his apperceptive background, preg
EveryEvery "concrete act of understanding . . .assimilatesthe word to be understood intoitsEvery "concrete act of understand
.. . . and. . . and is indissolubly merged with. . . and is indissolubly merged with the response, with a motivated agreement o
towardstowards this "alien conceptual horizon" (673) that the speaker / writer must orient his discourse in an attempt
toto "get a reading onto "get a reading on his own word" (673). In short, in much the same way that each writerto "get a readin
to his own precursors, so too will others respond in the future to this work.

Conclusion

BakhtinBakhtin offers a view of the novel that is differentBakhtin offers a view of the novel that is different bothBakhtin offers a
andand Marxist conceptions (e.g. Lukács). The novelist appropriates and Marxist conceptions (e.g. Lukács). The nov
alreadyalready inalready in circulationalready in circulation (this is the langue upon which he draws) and rearranges them to
his own literary paroles (e.g., novels).his own literary paroles (e.g., novels). Moreover, texts are not saturated solely withhi
Just as the sign is dialogic in nature,Just as the sign is dialogic in nature, so too is the novel multi-voiced.Just as the sign
ofof different socialof different social classes coexisting with each other and vying for ascendancyof different social classes
various sociolects belongingvarious sociolects belonging to particular characters, the narrator, and the author him/herself.
alwaysalways involved in thealways involved in the procealways involved in the process of writing back to their prede
responses of others.