

of discursive types, nor the predominance among them of double-voiced, internally dialogized discourses. The uniqueness of Dostoevsky lies in his special distribution of these discursive types and varieties among the basic compositional elements of a given work.

How and in what aspects of the verbal whole is the author's ultimate semantic authority implemented? For the monologic novel, this question is very easily answered. Whatever discourse types are introduced by the author-monologist, whatever their compositional distribution, the author's intentions and evaluations must dominate over all the others and must form a compact and unambiguous whole. Any intensification of others' intonations in a certain discourse or a certain section of the work is only a game, which the author permits so that his own direct or refracted word might ring out all the more energetically. Every struggle between two voices within a single discourse for possession or dominance in that discourse is decided in advance, it only appears to be a struggle; all fully signifying authorial interpretations are sooner or later gathered together in a single speech center and a single consciousness; all accents are gathered together in a single voice.

The artistic task Dostoevsky takes on is completely different. He does not fear the most extreme activation of vari-directional accents in double-voiced discourse; on the contrary, such activation is precisely what he needs to achieve his purpose. A plurality of voices, after all, is not meant to be eliminated in his works but in fact is meant to triumph.

10 The Heteroglot Novel

In 'Discourse in the Novel' (1935), from which this extract is taken, Bakhtin's focus moves to the novel form in general. Novelistic form itself is perceived as many-voiced or, more precisely, is defined as the artistic orchestration of a diversity of social discourses: the novel form is fundamentally heteroglot, many-language. However, this defining stylistic feature is understood by Bakhtin to be the result of a centuries-long process of generic evolution. This is one reason why, at the beginning of 'Discourse in the Novel', Bakhtin calls for a new stylistics of novelistic form. Traditional studies focusing upon the language of individual authors and structuralist linguistic approaches are both unable to relate novel form to the 'great historical destinies of genres' (p. 259). Equally, both work with a monologic understanding of language which ignores the dialogic reality of discourse and of novelistic language in particular. What is needed is a '*sociological stylistics*' which can recognize the languaged diversity of novelistic prose and understand the historical processes whereby that became the 'distinguishing feature of the novel as a genre' (p. 300). The passage included here focuses upon the fully materialized heteroglossic novel, outlining the new '*sociological*' stylistics this form requires. (For an account of its historical develop-

ment, see 'Note on the Two Stylistic Lines of the Novel' at the end of this section.)

The shift of terminology from 'polyphony' to 'heteroglossia' indicates a shift of emphasis towards social languages rather than individual voices which were more the focus of analysis in the study of Dostoevsky's prose. However, it is only a change of emphasis; for the various social discourses of heteroglossia to enter the novel they must be embodied in a speaking human being. 'Every language in the novel is a point of view, a socio-ideological conceptual system of real social groups', otherwise it cannot enter the novel, but equally it 'must be a concrete, socially embodied point of view, not an abstract, purely semantic position' (p. 411-12).

However, the diverse and divergent embodied languages of heteroglossia do not enter the novel as an unmediated cacophony. Once they enter the novel they become part of the authorial orchestration; their voices are infiltrated by the intentions of the author. Here, as usual, 'the author' does not refer to any specific historical person but to the 'authoring consciousness', identified only with the total artistic form and substantiated only in that totality.

If the defining feature of the novel as a genre is its artistic organization of the languages of heteroglossia, then clearly a novelistic poetics must concern itself with the artistic representation of speech. For Bakhtin, speech representation entails constructing images of language. An image always necessitates a distance between the perceiver and what is imaged. A person enclosed in a totally unitary language cannot perceive an image of that language since they cannot get outside it. Their consciousness, their ideological perception will be bonded to their words. Only a relativizing of one language against the outlines of another allows one to construct the image of a language and so break the bonds of any language's absolute authority. Bakhtin associates the development of the novel with that freeing of consciousness: 'The novel is the expression of a Galilean perception of language, one that denies the absolutism of a single and unitary language' (p. 366). The novel constructs images of languages in three main ways: by hybridization, by dialogized interaction of different languages and by dialogues. Hybridization has proved another influential Bakhtinian term. It is an utterance in which two social languages come together. What distinguishes it from just any form of double-voiced discourse is that the two embodied voices must represent (must image) two socio-linguistic consciousnesses. The novel form itself is thus an intentional hybrid in which the artistic organization of multiple language images 'demands a broadening and deepening of the language horizon, a sharpening of our perception of socio-linguistic differentiations' (p. 366).

From M. M. Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*,.

Trans. M. Holquist and C. Emerson, ed. M. Holquist, University of Texas Press, Austin, Tex., 1981.

The novel can be defined as a diversity of social speech types (sometimes even diversity of languages) and a diversity of individual voices, artistically organized. The internal stratification of any single national language into social dialects, characteristic group behavior, professional jargons, generic languages, languages of generations and age groups, tendentious languages, languages of the authorities, of various circles and of passing fashions, languages that serve the specific sociopolitical purposes of the day, even of the hour (each day has its own slogan, its own vocabulary, its own emphases) – this internal stratification present in every language at any given moment of its historical existence is the indispensable prerequisite for the novel as a genre. The novel orchestrates all its themes, the totality of the world of objects and ideas depicted and expressed in it, by means of the social diversity of speech types [*raznorečie*] and by the differing individual voices that flourish under such conditions. Authorial speech, the speeches of narrators, inserted genres, the speech of characters are merely those fundamental compositional unities with whose help heteroglossia [*raznorečie*] can enter the novel; each of them permits a multiplicity of social voices and a wide variety of their links and interrelationships (always more or less dialogized). These distinctive links and interrelationships between utterances and languages, this movement of the theme through different languages and speech types, its dispersion into the rivulets and droplets of social heteroglossia, its dialogization – this is the basic distinguishing feature of the stylistics of the novel. Such a combining of languages and styles into a higher unity is unknown to traditional stylistics; it has no method for approaching the distinctive social dialogue among languages that is present in the novel. . . .

At the time when major divisions of the poetic genres were developing under the influence of the unifying, centralizing, centripetal forces of verbal-ideological life, the novel – and those artistic-prose genres that gravitate toward it – was being historically shaped by the current of decentralizing, centrifugal forces. At the time when poetry was accomplishing the task of cultural, national and political centralization of the verbal-ideological world in the higher official socio-ideological levels, on the lower levels, on the stages of local fairs and at buffoon spectacles, the heteroglossia of the clown sounded forth, ridiculing all 'languages' and dialects; there developed the literature of the *fabliaux* and *Schwänke* of street songs, folksayings, anecdotes, where there was no language-center at all, where there was to be found a lively play with the 'languages' of poets, scholars, monks, knights and others, where all 'languages' were masks and where no language could claim to be an authentic, incontestable face.¹

Heteroglossia, as organized in these low genres, was not merely het-

¹ For an extended consideration of these carnivalesque aspects, see *Reader*, p. 194–245.

eroglossia vis-à-vis the accepted literary language (in all its various generic expressions), that is, vis-à-vis the linguistic center of the verbal-ideological life of the nation and the epoch, but was a heteroglossia consciously opposed to this literary language. It was parodic, and aimed sharply and polemically against the official languages of its given time. It was heteroglossia that had been dialogized. . . .

All languages of heteroglossia, whatever the principle underlying them and making each unique, are specific points of view on the world, forms for conceptualizing the world in words, specific world views, each characterized by its own objects, meanings and values. As such they all may be juxtaposed to one another, mutually supplement one another, contradict one another and be interrelated dialogically. As such they encounter one another and co-exist in the consciousness of real people – first and foremost, in the creative consciousness of people who write novels. As such, these languages live a real life, they struggle and evolve in an environment of social heteroglossia. Therefore they are all able to enter into the unitary plane of the novel, which can unite in itself parodic stylizations of generic languages, various forms of stylizations and illustrations of professional and period-bound languages, the languages of particular generations, of social dialects and others (as occurs, for example, in the English comic novel). They may all be drawn in by the novelist for the orchestration of his themes and for the refracted (indirect) expression of his intentions and values. . . .

The prose writer does not purge words of intentions and tones that are alien to him, he does not destroy the seeds of social heteroglossia embedded in words, he does not eliminate those language characterizations and speech mannerisms (potential narrator-personalities) glimmering behind the words and forms, each at a different distance from the ultimate semantic nucleus of his work, that is, the center of his own personal intentions.

The language of the prose writer deploys itself according to degrees of greater or lesser proximity to the author and to his ultimate semantic instantiation: certain aspects of language directly and unmediatedly express (as in poetry) the semantic and expressive intentions of the author, others refract these intentions; the writer of prose does not meld completely with any of these words, but rather accents each of them in a particular way – humorously, ironically, parodically and so forth;² yet another group may stand even further from the author's ultimate semantic instantiation, still more thoroughly refracting his intentions; and there are, finally, those words that are completely denied any authorial intentions: the author does not express *himself* in them (as the author of the word) – rather, he *exhibits* them as a unique speech-thing, they function for him as something completely reified. Therefore the stratification of language – generic, professional, social in the narrow sense, that of particular world views, particular tendencies, particular individuals, the social speech diversity and language-diversity (dialects) of language – upon entering the novel establishes its own special order within it, and becomes a unique artistic system, which orchestrates the intentional theme of the author.

² Bakhtin elaborates this idea in a footnote: the words are not to be understood as the author's direct speech, but as words the author 'exhibits' as it were from 'the distances appropriate to humor, irony, parody, etc.'

Thus a prose writer can distance himself from the language of his own work, while at the same time distancing himself, in varying degrees, from the different layers and aspects of the work. He can make use of language without wholly giving himself up to it, he may treat it as semi-alien or completely alien to himself, while compelling language ultimately to serve all his own intentions. The author does not speak in a given language (from which he distances himself to a greater or lesser degree), but he speaks, as it were, *through* language, a language that has somehow more or less materialized, become objectivized, that he merely ventriloquates.³ . . .

The novelist does not acknowledge any unitary, singular, naively (or conditionally) indisputable or sacrosanct language. Language is present to the novelist only as something stratified and heteroglot. Therefore, even when heteroglossia remains outside the novel, when the novelist comes forward with his own unitary and fully affirming language (without any distancing, refraction or qualifications) he knows that such language is not self-evident and is not in itself incontestable, that it is uttered in a heteroglot environment, that such a language must be championed, purified, defended, motivated. In a novel even such unitary and direct language is polemical and apologetic, that is, it interrelates dialogically with heteroglossia.⁴ It is precisely this that defines the utterly distinctive orientation of discourse in the novel – an orientation that is contested, contestable and contesting – for this discourse cannot forget or ignore, either through naiveté or by design, the heteroglossia that surrounds it.

Thus heteroglossia either enters the novel in person (so to speak) and assumes material form within it in the images of speaking persons, or it determines, as a dialogizing background, the special resonance of novelistic discourse.

From this follows the decisive and distinctive importance of the novel as a genre: the human being in the novel is first, foremost and always a speaking human being; the novel requires speaking persons bringing with them their own unique ideological discourse, their own language. . . .

If the subject making the novel specifically a novel is defined as a speaking person and his discourse, striving for social significance and a wider general application as one distinctive language in a heteroglot world – then the cen-

³ This 'artistic reworking' of heteroglossia as it enters the novel takes a variety of forms established in the course of the genre's historical development. Bakhtin picks out particularly the English comic novel as written by Fielding, Smollett, Sterne, Dickens, Thackeray for its comic-parodic reprocessing of an encyclopedic range of contemporary conversational and literary languages. It especially makes use of 'the common language' of given social groups, spoken and written, and authorial speech moves flexibly in and out of these various languages, completely identifying with none, but keeping the boundaries shifting and ambiguous. Other forms for incorporating heteroglossia into the novel are the posited author as carrier of a particular verbal-ideological linguistic belief system and the speech of characters. Finally, 'incorporated genres' (inserted short stories, poems, songs, dramatic scenes and non-artistic everyday forms) frequently bring heteroglossia into the novel. All these forms serve two speakers, two intentions: the direct speaker and the author of the work. Thus they are all dialogized double-voiced discourses.

⁴ For a summary of Bakhtin's account of this polemicizing in the novel's historical development, see 'Note on the Two Stylistic Lines of the Novel' at the end of this section.

tral problem for a stylistics of the novel may be formulated as the problem of artistically representing language, the problem of representing the image of a language. . . .

All devices in the novel for creating the image of a language may be reduced to three basic categories: (1) hybridizations, (2) the dialogized interrelation of languages and (3) pure dialogues.

These three categories of devices can only theoretically be separated in this fashion since in reality they are always inextricably woven together into the unitary artistic fabric of the image.

What is a hybridization? It is a mixture of two social languages within the limits of a single utterance, an encounter, within the arena of an utterance, between two different linguistic consciousnesses, separated from one another by an epoch, by social differentiation or by some other factor.

Such mixing of two languages within the boundaries of a single utterance is, in the novel, an artistic device (or more accurately, a system of devices) that is deliberate. But unintentional, unconscious hybridization is one of the most important modes in the historical life and evolution of all languages. We may even say that language and languages change historically primarily by means of hybridization, by means of a mixing of various 'languages' co-existing within the boundaries of a single dialect, a single national language, a single branch, a single group of different branches or different groups of such branches, in the historical as well as paleontological past of languages – but the crucible for this mixing always remains the utterance.

The artistic image of a language must by its very nature be a linguistic hybrid (an intentional hybrid): it is obligatory for two linguistic consciousnesses to be present, the one being represented and the other doing the representing, with each belonging to a different system of language. Indeed, if there is not a second representing consciousness, if there is no second representing language-intention, then what results is not an *image* [obraz] of language but merely a *sample* [obrazec] of some other person's language, whether authentic or fabricated.

The image of a language conceived as an intentional hybrid is first of all a *conscious* hybrid (as distinct from a historical, organic, obscure language hybrid); an intentional hybrid is precisely the perception of one language by another language, its illumination by another linguistic consciousness. An image of language may be structured only from the point of view of another language, which is taken as the norm. . . .

While noting the individual element in intentional hybrids, we must once again strongly emphasize the fact that in novelistic artistic hybrids that structure the *image of a language*, the individual element, indispensable as it is for the actualization of language and for its subordination to the artistic whole of the novel (here the destinies of languages are interwoven with the individual destinies of speaking persons), is nevertheless inexorably merged with the socio-linguistic element. In other words, the novelistic hybrid is not only double-voiced and double-accented (as in rhetoric) but is also double-linguaged; for in it there are not only (and not even so much) two individual consciousnesses, two voices, two accents, as there are two socio-linguistic consciousnesses, two epochs, that, true, are not here unconsciously mixed (as in an

organic hybrid), but that come together and consciously fight it out on the territory of the utterance. . . .

The intentional double-voiced and internally dialogized hybrid possesses a syntactic structure utterly specific to it: in it, within the boundaries of a single utterance, two potential utterances are fused, two responses are, as it were, harnessed in a potential dialogue. It is true that these potential responses can never be fully actualized, can never be fused into finished utterances, but their insufficiently developed forms are nevertheless acutely felt in the syntactic construction of the double-voiced hybrid. What is involved here, of course, is not the kind of mixture of heterogeneous syntactic forms characteristic of language systems (forms that might take place in *organic* hybrids), but rather precisely the fusion of *two* utterances into one. Such a fusion is also possible in single-languaged rhetorical hybrids (in which case it is even more fully articulated syntactically). It is typical for a novelistic hybrid to fuse into a single utterance two utterances that are socially distinct. The syntactic construction of intentional hybrids is fractured into two individualized language-intentions.

Summing up the characteristics of a novelistic hybrid, we can say: as distinct from the opaque mixing of languages in living utterances that are spoken in a historically evolving language (in essence, any *living* utterance in a *living* language is to one or another extent a hybrid), the novelistic hybrid is *an artistically organized system for bringing different languages in contact with one another*, a system having as its goal the illumination of one language by means of another, the carving-out of a living image of another language. . . .

Hybridization, in the strict sense, differs from internally dialogized interillumination of language systems taken as a whole. In the former case there is no direct mixing of two languages within the boundaries of a single utterance – rather, only one language is actually present in the utterance, but it is rendered *in the light of another language*. This second language is not, however, actualized and remains outside the utterance.

The clearest and most characteristic form of an internally dialogized mutual illumination of languages is *stylization*.

Every authentic stylization, . . . is an artistic representation of another's linguistic style, an artistic image of another's language. Two individualized linguistic consciousnesses must be present in it: the one that *represents* (that is, the linguistic consciousness of the stylizer) and the one that is *represented*, which is stylized. Stylization differs from style proper precisely by virtue of its requiring a specific linguistic consciousness (the contemporaneity of the stylizer and his audience), under whose influence a style becomes a stylization, against whose background it acquires new meaning and significance.

This second linguistic consciousness, that of the stylizer and those contemporary with him, uses stylized language as raw material; it is only in a stylized language, one not his own, that the stylizer can speak about the subject directly. But this stylized language is itself exhibited in the light of the language consciousness of a stylizer contemporary with it. Contemporaneous language casts a special light over the stylized language: it highlights some elements, leaves others in the shade, creates a special pattern of accents that has the effect of making its various aspects all aspects of language, creating specific resonances between the stylized language and the linguistic con-

sciousness contemporaneous with it – in short, it creates a free image of another's language, which expresses not only a stylized but also a stylizing language- and art-intention. . . .

In the history of the novel the significance of direct stylization, as well as of variation, is enormous, and is surpassed only by the importance of parody. It was in stylizations that prose first learned how to represent languages artistically – although, in the beginning, it is true, these were languages already fully formed and stylistically shaped (or they were already styles in their own right), they were not the raw and often as yet only potential languages of a living heteroglossia (where languages are still evolving, and do not yet possess a style of their own). . . .

Between stylization and parody, as between two extremes, are distributed the most varied forms for languages to mutually illuminate each other and for direct hybrids, forms that are themselves determined by the most varied interactions among languages, the most varied wills to language and to speech, that encounter one another within the limits of a single utterance. The struggle going on within discourse, the degree of resistance that the parodied language offers to the parodying language, the degree to which the represented social languages are fully formed entities and the degree to which they are individualized representation and finally the surrounding heteroglossia (which always serves as a dialogizing background and resonator) – all these create a multitude of devices for representing another's language.

The dialogic opposition of pure languages in a novel, when taken together with hybridization, is a powerful means for creating images of languages. The dialogic contrast of *languages* (but not of meanings within the limits of a single language) delineates the boundaries of languages, creates a feeling for these boundaries, compels one to sense physically the plastic forms of different languages.

Dialogue itself, as a compositional form, is in novels inextricably bound up with a dialogue of languages, a dialogue that can be heard in its hybrids and in the dialogizing background of the novel. Therefore dialogue in the novel is dialogue of a special sort. First and foremost (as we have already said) it can never be exhausted in pragmatically motivated dialogues of characters. Novelistic dialogue is pregnant with an endless multitude of dialogic confrontations, which do not and cannot resolve it, and which, as it were, only locally (as one out of many possible dialogues) illustrate this endless, deep-lying dialogue of languages; novel dialogue is determined by the very socio-ideological evolution of languages and society. A dialogue of languages is a dialogue of social forces perceived not only in their static co-existence, but also as a dialogue of different times, epochs and days, a dialogue that is forever dying, living, being born: co-existence and becoming are here fused into an indissoluble concrete unity that is contradictory, multi-speeched and heterogeneous. It is freighted down with novelistic images; from this dialogue of languages these images take their openendedness, their inability to say anything once and for all or to think anything through to its end, they take from it their lifelike concreteness, their 'naturalistic quality' – everything that so sharply distinguishes them from dramatic dialogues.

Pure languages in the novel, in the dialogues and monologues of novelistic

characters, are subordinated to the same task of creating images of language. . . .

What is realized in the novel is the process of coming to know one's own language as it is perceived in someone else's language, coming to know one's own belief system in someone else's system. There takes place within the novel an ideological translation of another's language, and an overcoming of its otherness – an otherness that is only contingent, external, illusory. Characteristic for the historical novel is a positively weighted modernizing, an erasing of temporal boundaries, the recognition of an eternal present in the past. The primary stylistic project of the novel as a genre is to create images of languages.

Every novel, taken as the totality of all the languages and consciousnesses of language embodied in it, is a *hybrid*. But we emphasize once again: it is an intentional and conscious hybrid, one artistically organized, and not an opaque mechanistic mixture of languages (more precisely, a mixture of the brute elements of language). *The artistic image of language* – such is the aim that novelistic hybridization sets for itself.

Note on the Two Stylistic Lines of the Novel

In the final part of his essay, 'Discourse in the Novel', Bakhtin traces out two stylistic lines observable in the development of the novel as a genre. The first line has its origins in the 'Sophistic novels' of ancient Greece; it is characterized by a strongly stylized, monologic language which aims to exclude heteroglossia beyond its boundaries. However, the very intensity of the stylization implies a polemical awareness of heteroglossia as a dialogizing background. Bakhtin identifies chivalric romances with this stylistic line of development in the European novel. These romances were freely translated across many languages so that, despite the extreme conventionality of their style, they rested upon no stable, centralized language consciousness. In their later stages they also wandered between social classes and this decentring and relativizing of their language is the main reason for the intense stylization. Discourse which is ruptured from any social reality and ideology can only move in the direction of stylistic conventionality: surface elegance, smooth finish, rhetorical ornamentation.

It is perhaps not surprising, therefore, that this first line should become closely associated with a normative linguistic category which Bakhtin terms 'literary language' or 'respectable language'. Literary language – the language of the respectable, educated classes – attempts to unify and order heteroglossia into a single canonical style. It is a major element within the forces attempting to centralize socio-political and cultural life.

As part of this impulse to ennoble language, chivalric romance aspired to provide norms for real-life language, to set the standards for all forms of refined speech. The romance structure incorporated many other genres from everyday life like letters, speeches, conversations but over all this 'multi-imaged diversity of inserted genres there is stretched one

"respectable" language, and this effectively turns everything into one single image' (p. 385).

A major phase in the first line Bakhtin picks out for attention is the development of the Baroque novel in the seventeenth century. The historical significance of this, he claims, is enormous: 'Almost all categories of the modern novel have their origin in one or another of its aspects' (p. 385). Especially important is its idea of testing the hero, of putting him on trial. This tradition moves through Christian legends, confessional autobiographies and Romantic 'chosenness'. In the eighteenth century the Baroque novel divides into the adventure-heroic novel and the psychological novel. In all its various forms the language of a Baroque novel is characterized by Bakhtin as that of pathos. Novelistic pathos, he claims, is associated with justification and accusation; it involves a total obliteration of any distance between speaker and discourse. It also 'borrows' its sense of seriousness and potentiousness from other discourses like religious and judicial power: 'In pathos-charged speech one cannot take the first step without first conferring on oneself some power, rank, position, etc.' (p. 395). In the Sentimental novel as it develops from the earlier Baroque novel, pathetic discourse sets itself against the false elevation of high literary language. However, it simply replaces this form of conventionality by its own highly conventional respectable 'conversational' language. Again heteroglossia is rigorously excluded but, as with all the forms of the novel within the first stylistic line, there is a profound awareness of the force of language stratification. What makes the novel distinct as a genre from other genres like rhetoric and poetry, Bakhtin argues, is that the 'novel is structured in uninterrupted dialogic interaction with the languages that surround it' (p. 399).

The second line of stylistic development does not originate in such recognizable novelistic form. It derives from a multitude of semi-literary, usually low genres drawn from everyday life. Instead of smoothing out their differences by 'literarizing' them within a single respectable language, the second line purposefully preserves their extraliterariness as a means of diversifying the languages represented. Indeed, it is from the minor low genres associated with the itinerant stage, market-day fairs, street songs, that the novel acquires its devices for constructing images of a language. These forms, Bakhtin says, are 'shot through with a profound distrust of human discourse as such' (p. 401). He singles out the discourse of three figures central to this popular tradition – the rogue, the fool and the clown – as exerting an enormous influence upon the subsequent shape of the novel. 'Thus the rogue's gay deception parodies high languages, the clown's malicious distortion of them, his turning them inside out and finally the fool's naive incomprehension of them – these three dialogic categories that had organized heteroglossia in the novel at the dawn of its history emerge in modern times with extraordinary clarity' (p. 405). The rogue is the hero of the first novel-form of the second line: the picaresque adventure novel. This is of tremendous significance for the rogue introduces the notion of the human being as unfinalizable. The rogue is deliberately deceptive, he is inconsistent, alternately brave and cowardly, criminal and honest. Moreover, the masquerading of the rogue mocks the solemnity of heroes in other genres and opposes the finalized image of the human being they con-

struct. Such developments in the picaresque novel prepare the way for 'the great exemplars of the novel of the Second Line – such as, for example, *Don Quixote* with its hero as fool. In these great and seminal works the novelistic genre becomes what it really is, it unfolds in its fullest potential' (p. 409). Part of that potential, developed in the second line, is the novel's ability for autorcriticism; especially in the dialogic interaction between the two lines, the development of novelistic form can be seen as a continuous process of renewal by means of self-parody. The essence of the novel form for Bakhtin is its continually remade novelness.