Zagadnienia Rodzajów Literackich, LVI z. 1
PL ISSN 0084-4446

Mustafa Kirca
Çankaya University*

The Problematic of Reading Generic Signals in Parodic Discourse

Abstract

The aim of this study is to analyze the double-function of generic signals in double-voiced discourse of parody which involves by its nature the parodied and the parodying voices simultaneously. The paper claims that generic signals, which are supposed to be working mostly at an unconscious level to create a generic context for the reader in interpreting a text, become double-voiced by the parodist's manipulation and work at a conscious level. It is common that the parody writer barrows and appropriates generic signals of the genre he parodies to indicate the parodied genre and also his departure from this genre. Parodic intentions become palpable immediately with the „parodic stylization" — to use Bakhtin's term — of the generic signals, which brings about the Bakhtinian refraction of the authorial voice in parody. Since the parody writer intentionally appropriates the speech of the prodied genre, authorial refractions become clearer in parodic discourse. Through studying such refractions with a particular emphasis on genre parodies and specific examples from Cervantes' Don Quijote, the present study argues that generic signals in parodic discourse assume the double-function of signaling the parodied genre and the parodying voice simultaneously. In order to show how generic signals assume a highly communicative function in parody, this study focuses on texts where the author parodies not a single writer and a single work, but a whole genre with its conventions. As a genre parody which aims for the governing discourse behind the genre it imitates, Cervantes' Don Quijote produce significant examples that the double-function of generic signals can be seen explicitly through the authorial refractions in the text.

Generic signals, parody, double-voicedness, Bakhtinian refraction

* Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Department of Translation and Interpreting Studies
Çankaya University Ankara, Turkey
e-mail: m.kirca@gmail.com

I

When E. D. Hirsh states in *Validity in Interpretation* that „all understanding of verbal meaning is necessarily genre-bound," he highlights the central role of literary genres in interpretation (Hirsh 1967: 76). Hirsh presupposes that a reader has „generic expectations" when he confronts a literary text in that he knows this is a certain type of meaning and accordingly expects certain types of traits (Hirsh 1967: 73). The theory of hermeneutics regards genre as a „communication system" for writers and readers to generate meaning in a literary work; i.e., the reader should know the genre the text belongs to in order to interpret it. Genre is communicated early in a text through the operation of certain taxonomy markers which the reader uses for generic classification. In his comprehensive study of generic markers in *Kinds of Literature*, Alastair Fowler asserts that some „indicative constituents" which he calls „generic signals" provide the reader in a literary text with the recognition of the genre that the text belongs to and offer a generic context to interpret it (Fowler 1987: 88). He points out the function of these indicative signals in communicating genre when he argues that „the generic markers that cluster at the beginning of a work have a strategic role in guiding the reader" (Fowler 1987: 88). Through the operation of these signals in a literary text, a „generic contract" is established between the writer and the reader:

> Through such signals as the title, the meter, and the incorporation of familiar *topoi* in his opening lines, [the writer] sets up a contract with us. He in effect agrees that he will follow at least some of the patterns and conventions we associate with the genre or genres in which he is writing, and we in turn agree that we will pay close attention to certain aspects of his work while realizing that others, because of the nature of genres, are likely to be less important (Dubrow 1982: 31).

It is assumed that for literary works generic signals function smoothly as „the key words of the code" which will enable the reader to decode the text, and that generic signals serve this end „at an unconscious level" — „beneath the level of attention" (Fowler 1987: 88). However, for specially coded parody, generic signals do not function so smoothly. The unique features of parodic discourse — the inclusion of the parodied material through quotations and the presence of parodic incongruity — make parody a specially coded text (Rose 1993: 171) and affect the nature of generic signals and the way they are used. It is argued with the present study that generic signals have a unique role in parodic discourse in terms of their indicative function and they work at a conscious level — at least for the writer. Due to their double-function of signalling both the genre of the parodied text

and the parody itself, generic signals play a more communicative role in genre parody than in other genres. The aim of this study is to analyze the double-function of generic signals in parodic discourse through examples from the examined texts to observe the refraction of the authorial voice.

Before illustrating the double-function of generic signals in a parody text, parodic discourse should be identified here as a double-voiced discourse. According to Bakhtinian dialogism which he defines in *Dialogic Imagination* as „another's speech in another's language, serving to express authorial intentions but in a refracted way" (Bakhtin 1992: 324), parody is a type of internally dialogized heteroglot discourse. In such discourses which „serve two different speakers at the same time and express simultaneously two different intentions," Bakhtin argues, „there are two voices, two meanings and two expressions" (Bakhtin 1992: 324). He claims, „the languages that are crossed in [parody] relate to each other as do rejoinders in a dialogue" (Bakhtin 1992: 76). Parody, as a form of imitation[1] as „the imitative use of the words, style, attitude, tone and ideas of an author," (Cuddon 1999: 640) reproduces what is parodied[2] through repetition, hence containing two voices present side by side: the one represented and the one representing[3]. It is claimed that „[t]he parody does not just let the parodied text «glimmer» through its own text, […] but first sets up the text to be parodied by imitation or partial quotation" (Rose 1993: 171). Parody is therefore a form of textual dialogism in Bakhtin's terms, and he particularly emphasizes its double-voicedness:

> [I]n parodic discourse two styles, two „languages" (both intra-lingual) come together and to a certain extent are crossed with each other: the language being parodied (for example, the language of the heroic poem) and the language that parodies (low prosaic language, familiar conversational language, the language of the realistic genres, „normal" language, „healthy" literary language as the author of the parody conceived it) (Bakhtin 1992: 75).

The recent studies on parodic discourse stress the fact that the parodic voice is in open disagreement with the one it imitates, „the first holding the second up to ridicule" (Vice

---

[1] Linda Hutcheon in her attempt to compose a theory of modern parody in her seminal *Theory of Parody* opposes the idea that parody is a mere repetition or imitation, and she adds to the definition the concept of „critical distance" in the imitation: parody for Hutcheon is imitation, or repetition, „with critical distance, which marks difference rather than similarity" (Hutcheon 1985: 6). She, therefore, emphasizes the peculiar function of imitation in parody: parody imitates not to highlight the similarity between the parodied text and the parody but to highlight the difference between these texts, which is achieved through the critical distance of the parodist.

[2] Bakhtin offers in *Problems of Dostoevsky's* Poetics a more diversive and larger catalogue of what can be parodied: „Parodistic discourse can be extremely diversive. One can parody another person's style as a style; one can parody another's socially typical or individually characterological manner of seeing, thinking, and speaking. The depth of the parody may also vary: one can parody merely superficial verbal forms, but one can also parody the very deepest principals governing another's discourse. Moreover, parodistic discourse itself may be used in various ways by the author: the parody may be an end in itself (for example, literary parody as a genre)" (Bakhtin 1984: 194).

[3] In parody, there are two voices; namely, the parodied text as the textual background (the one represented) and the text of the parody itself (the one representing) coexist, and these two voices are in dialogic interaction with each other.

1997: 63). The disagreement between the two voices reflects the author's parodic intention contrary to that of the original. Therefore, the parodic work „becomes an arena of battle between two voices. […] [T]he voices are not only isolated from one another, separated by a distance, but are also hostilely opposed" (Bakhtin 1984: 193). The parodist imitates another's language, and he appropriates and reaccentuates it for his own purposes which are almost always incongruous with the intention of the original[4]. The authorial voice of the parodist is refracted through this double-voiced language and it can reflect directly the parodic intention. Bakhtin's concept of „refraction" here refers to „the «angle of refraction» of authorial discourse as it passes through various other voices" (Bakhtin 1992: 432). In parody, the evocation of the parodied word that is incorporated by means of quotations and imitations serves to „express authorial intentions but in a refracted way" (Bakhtin 1992: 324). In terms of the parodic incongruity between the voices which creates the comic effect, double-voicedness in parody can be distinguished from other forms of double-voiced discourse in non-parodic texts. When parody is defined in terms of Bakhtinian double-voicedness, Gary Morson describes the complex task of a parody reader thus: „The audience of a double-voiced word therefore meant to hear both a version of the original utterance as the embodiment of its [original] speaker's point of view and the second speaker's evaluation of that utterance from a different point of view" (Morson 1989: 65).

II

The first generic signal that the reader is provided with when he confronts a text is the title of the work because, as Fowler says, „[t]itles are the first explicit commentary the reader is given" (Fowler 1987: 92). The title itself may help recognize the genre of the text in question. Fowler argues that titles function as generic signals since „titling conventions differ from genre to genre" (Fowler 1987: 92). To exemplify this, Fowler's discussion in *Kinds of Literature* over the titling convention of epic can be referred to here. He states that on the model of *Iliad* an „*-iad* suffix" is used in the title to signal the epic genre such as *Luciad*, *Francide*, *Columbiad* (Fowler 1987: 95). His examples also point out the aforementioned aspect of generic signals; namely, parody uses the same suffix in the title to signal the epic genre it imitates:

> [T]he consequent opportunity for parody and mock epic was too good to miss. Pope's *Dunciad* is the leader of a large group, including Churchill's *Rosciad*, Whitehead's *Gymnasiad*, Spence's *Charliad*, Cambridge's *Scribbleriad*, Smart's *Hilliad*, Chatterton's *Consuliad*, and Wolcot's *Lousiad* (Fowler 1987: 95).

[4] The difference between the imitated and the imitating texts are brought to the fore by means of an inconsistency created by the parodist between these two texts. In the definition of parody and in the production of its comic effect, Margaret A. Rose sees „the creation of comic incongruity or discrepancy [as] a significant distinguishing factor" (Rose 1993: 31); and like Hutcheon, Rose points to the difference, rather than the similarity, between the parodied and the parody and sees this difference as the source of the parodic incongruity, which is created with „a dissimilarity or an inappropriate similarity between texts" (Rose 1993: 32).

This shows that the same generic signal of titling is used by the parody writer but it is appropriated for his parodic end. The title *Dunciad*, for example, is a generic signal of the epic as recognized by the *-iad* suffix, echoing *Iliad* as Fowler relates, and it is adopted by Pope, who reaccentuates it according to his parodic purpose. Thus, the title reflects Pope's authorial intention by implying an inappropriate person as an epic hero. The suffix *-iad*, as Fowler claims, may belong to the epic convention of titling and indicate the parodied genre, but the „Dunce" part of the title belongs to Pope and his authorial voice is audible through the refraction in the same word. Bakhtin states: „It frequently happens that even one and the same word will belong simultaneously to two languages, two belief systems […] — and consequently, the word has two contradictory meanings, two accents" (Bakhtin 1992: 305). This is exactly what happens in the titling convention of these parody texts. The same refraction is detectable in other titles that Fowler gives for mock-epic above. All of them borrow the *-iad* suffix and appropriate it according to their purposes. This shows that the same generic signal of titling is used by parody but again superimposed by the contradiction between what the title suggests (heroic) and the theme of the work itself (mock heroic).

Similar to Pope's title *Dunciad*, the title *Shamela* is also a good example for the double-functioned generic signals. In *Shamela*, Fielding's target is not only Richardson's *Pamela* but also the epistolary novel in general, but he imitates *Pamela* as the representative of the genre. Fielding's title *Shamela* echoes *Pamela* to indicate the genre, but the „Shame" part in the title is an ironic innuendo against Pamela's so-called chastity and it belongs to Fielding. Thus, *Shamela* is a double-voiced title to signal both the Richardsonian novel and the parody of it. Here, Richardsonian „discourse dominating a given epoch is turned into an object and itself becomes a means for refracting new authorial intentions" (Bakhtin 1992: 309).

The title of Laurence Sterne's *Tristram Shandy* serves as another example to illustrate how titles as generic signals may have a double-function in parody as a result of the fact that they are accentuated by the parodist. Fowler states that „a full personal name in the title of a narrative […] indicates either a biography or a fictional biography" (Fowler 1987: 93). „Tristram Shandy" as a proper name in the title, then, is the sole indication of a biographic work, so it signals the same genre as other biographic writings. However, the presence of a highly comical name simultaneously signals the parody itself. If the full title of the novel, *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, is considered, it suggests like other biographic writings that the life of the person is depicted in the work. The full name and „The Life" in the title belong to the discourse of the biography genre and Sterne adopts it in his novel. However, the same discourse is populated with Sterne's accent as well: He uses a comical name that is in contradiction with „Gentleman" in the title and adds the narration of the „opinions" of Tristram besides that of his life. As a result, there emerges an incongruity between the title and the expected content of the work as well because the reader learns more about the life of his Uncle Toby and Tristram's opinions about him rather than his own life story. The novel is, in fact, a parodic reflection on „the difficulties of ever completing an autobiography" (Rose 1993: 91). Consequently, the one and the same word serves for two speakers and when it refracts in the parodic text, it openly shows the authorial intention.

Opening topics of a literary work follow the title for providing a generic context for the reader. The opening topics and formulas in a parody text may similarly be populated with the parodic intention of the author and point to the double-voiced discourse of the parody. Opening words and topics, according to Fowler, are influential „in preparing [the reader's] expectations of genre in a more discriminating way" (Fowler 1987: 98), and he illustrates this by discussing the epitaph's convention of opening formula: „Here lie(s)…" It is enough to have a look at some famous epitaphs given by Fowler to observe this. Dryden on his wife: „Here lies my wife: here let her lie / Now she's at rest, and so am I;" and John Wilmot, Earl of Rochester, on King Charles II: „Here lies a great and mighty king/Whose promise none relies on" (Fowler 1987: 101). This opening word of epitaphs is also borrowed by writers who adopt it for their comic intentions. Therefore, the one and the same word refracts and shows two voices at the same time as the following examples depict: „Here X. lies dead, but God's forgiving, / And shows compassion to the living," or „Here Reynolds is laid" (Fowler 1987: 101). In both of these examples, the opening words signal the epitaph genre, but they simultaneously signal the parodic intention. In the first example, the „X" to imply an unknown person is contrary to the nature of epitaph writing, and the word „dead" is redundant in this line since an epitaph is to commemorate a dead person. Likewise, in the second one, the passive voice usage is unconventional and helps creating a pun on the word „laid". Consequently, one can say the authorial voice is refracted in these parts and the opening words of the above epitaphs signal both the genre and the parody of it at the same time.

Other than opening words, different formulas can be regarded as generic signals since they help communicate the genre at the very beginning of a work. Prologues, epigraphs, and even dedications, for instance, can be devices for the author to indicate his theme and genre directly. Particularly for parody, these opening formulas are the very places where the parodist can openly express his theme, genre, and perhaps the parodic intention and its target. Therefore, these are the places where the parodic accent can be more direct and sharper. Although one cannot treat a dedication as a generic signal of a fixed genre (unless the genre is stated by the author), it can still signal the parody. It is known that when the prose fiction writing emerged, it was conventional to dedicate the work to a well-known and mighty person for his protection. Laurence Sterne makes use of this tradition and adopts a dedication in *Tristram Shandy*, but he also appropriates his dedication according to his comic intention. He dedicates his book to a Mr. Pitt, whom Sterne himself adopts, but not for his protection. Thus, in these parts, Sterne's parodic voice is refracted in the dedication: „I humbly beg, Sir, that you will honour this book, by taking it — (not under your Protection — it must protect itself, but) — into your country with you; where if I am ever told, it has made you smile" (Sterne 2003: 5).

III

Cervantes' parody work *Don Quijote* is a revealing example that the double-function of generic signals can be seen explicitly throughout the text. As a genre parody, *Don Quijote* aims at not a single author or his work but the governing discourse behind the genre it imitates. Cervantes states in his Prologue to Part One of *Don Quijote* that „the whole thing is an attack on romantic tales of chivalry" (Cervantes 1998: 10). He declares his aim

and the target of his parody overtly in his prologue through the mouth of his imaginary muse-friend who, addressing Cervantes, states: „all your story tries to do is shatter the authority of all those tales of chivalry, and their influence on people, especially common people, all around the world. […] In sum: keep yourself focused on demolishing the whole false, irrational network of those chivalric romances, despised by so many, yet adored by so many more" (Cervantes 1998: 11). His parody undermines the authority of romances of chivalry by imitating them with the accentual system of parody's language (Bakhtin 1992: 75-6). The writer first imitates and then distorts the romance genre by incorporating the conventions of chivalric writing into the new context of *Don Quijote*. Within this new context, Cervantes gives new values to the chivalric romance writing and reshapes it to formulate his counterstatement, i.e. contrasting the conventions of chivalry with the realities of ordinary life.

It should be referred at this point more closely to Cervantes' well-known prologue which starts with the writer's direct address to the reader as „leisurely reader". Before the reader enters into the text of *Don Quijote*, Cervantes' prologue at the beginning of the book can be regarded as a generic signal, and like the other generic signals of the novel[5] it has a double-function. In this prologue, the refraction of the authorial discourse is distinct since Cervantes immediately wants to make it explicit that his *Don Quijote* does not resemble other books of chivalry. The writer says:

> Leisurely reader: you don't need me to swear that I longed for this book, born out of my brain, to be the handsomest child imaginable, the most elegant, the most sensible. But could I contradict the natural order of things? Like creates like. So what could my sterile, half-educated wit give birth to except the history of a sniveling child, withered, whining, its head stuffed with all kinds of thoughts no one else would even think of, like a man bred in a jail cell, where everything grates on your nerves and every new sound makes you still sadder (Cervantes 1998: 7).

As Elias L. Rivers argues, „the vocative […] «reader» with an epithet, and the use of the […] «thou,» form of address, were established literary conventions of the prologue" (Rivers 1998: 798). However, within this utterance, Cervantes' parodic discourse is also present. He chooses an unconventional epithet, „leisurely reader" (or „idle reader" in different editions) and with this Cervantes establishes an ironic conversational relationship with the reader and signals a change in the direction of the discourse. The reader,

[5] For instance, Cervantes uses chapter titles in *Don Quijote* which may serve as generic signals for the reader. These chapter titles are double-voiced. They are adopted to signal the genre, and meanwhile, they are stylized by the authorial discourse. It is possible to detect the voice of the author besides that of the romances of chivalry in almost all of these titles, but perhaps it is the title of the eighth chapter where the parodic intention is most overt: „the great success won by our brave Don Quijote in his dreadful, unimaginable encounter with two windmills, plus other honorable events well worth remembering" (Cervantes 1998: 43). Like the other chapter titles in the book, this one too indicates the existence of two different voices: the voice of chivalric romances is audible when the title introduces „the great success" won by „a brave knight" in „a dreadful encounter," which creates the reader's generic expectations; this encounter, however, is only with „two windmills" contrary to the reader's expectations. The title simultaneously introduces the authorial voice, and thereby signalling the parody. Therefore, it can be argued that the chapter titles in *Don Quijote* consist of two different and opposing voices, and as generic signals they have a double-function.

therefore, is made to recognize the authorial voice at the very beginning. The refraction is sharp all through the prologue and the authorial discourse of the parodist is audible together with the parodied speech. When Cervantes utters that this book is born out of his brain, hence his child, he imitates the traditional view of „literary paternity" which treats a literary work as the child of the author-father. Nevertheless, he immediately adds his parodic voice: „[T]hough I may seem to be Don Quijote's parent, I am only his step--father" (Cervantes 1998: 7). As this illustrates, Cervantes' prologue is a place where the parodic intention is overtly signalled through refraction in one and the same discourse. Jale Parla focuses on the importance of Cervantes' prologue in her book entitled *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman* and points out how it transgresses the traditional borders of the genre and subverts the reader's expectations with the innovative narrative of the author. She claims that Cervantes' prologue is rather a contract between the author and the reader:

> Indeed, this [prologue] is a contract rather than a prologue. A contract which, from the very beginning, makes it known for the reader that the story he is holding in his hand is not like any other story he is familiar with and […] enforces him to be ready for and open to the innovations of the story (Parla 2001: 25, my translation).

Likewise, the opening sentence of *Don Quijote* can well be interpreted as a generic signal that indicates the existence of the clashing discourses, for the novel's opening sentence, as in the other examples above, is also reaccentuated by the parodic intention of the author. The novel starts thus:

> In a village in La Mancha (I don't want to bother you with its name) there lived, not very long ago, one of those gentlemen who keep a lance in the lance-rack, an ancient shield, a skinny old horse, and a fast grey hound. […] Our gentleman was getting close to fifty, but strong, lean, his face sharp, always up at dawn, and a devoted hunter. It's said his family name was Quijada, or maybe Quesada: there is some disagreement among the writers who've discussed the matter. But more than likely his name was really Quejana. Not that this makes much difference in our story; it's just important to tell things as faithfully as you can (Cervantes 1998: 13).

Cervantes starts his narrative as any other tale by indicating the place where the hero lives, „in a village in La Mancha", resembling the very opening sentences that tales generally use. Therefore, by starting his work with the same opening topic, Cervantes borrows someone else's word which should be given perhaps in quotation marks. Nevertheless, he adds his authorial discourse immediately in the same sentence and signals his parodic intention: „I don't want to bother you with its name". After this short but wholly indicative interruption, the discourse of storytelling continues with another formula, „There lived", and one expects it to continue with „long ago". However, Cervantes interrupts again the flow of the speech by his parodic tone and completes it with a discourse of his own: „not very long ago". Furthermore, as the translator's footnotes in the Norton edition state, „the linguistic resemblance of the name «Quijote» to the chivalric

nomenclature" and the „Don" part of the title[6] show the existence of the discourse of the books of chivalry (Cervantes 1998: 16). However, Don Quijote adopts the title „Don" himself and then comes up with the surname Quijote, which is also made-up in the manner of chivalric nomenclature[7]. In these parenthetical breaks, the authorial word is indirectly reflected, indicating the parodic intention early in the work. Such components at the beginning of a parodic text, as the examples from *Don Quijote* above illustrate, are devices for the parodist to communicate his intention to the reader, so he may populate them with the authorial voice. Therefore, as generic signals, the opening formulas of the novel have a double-function. They indicate both the parodied speech and the parodying speech of Cervantes with refractions.

Since a genre is recognized by means of its paradigms and paradigmatic founders, allusions in a literary text to the representatives of the genre that the text strives to fit in are „the most direct forms of indication" because references to the representatives of the genre can easily establish a generic context for the reader (Fowler 1987: 90). For Fowler, these „underlying allusions" are highly communicative in terms of the genre of a literary work, although he immediately adds that „no doubt many generic allusions are unconscious" (Fowler 1987: 90). Repetitive allusions to the representatives of the genre indicate that the text in question also belongs to this genre and so it is expected to follow the conventions of the genre, hence establishing a „generic contract" between the writer and the reader. This is particularly detectable, according to Fowler, when an innovative work is taken into account because „a difficult or innovative or generically complex work may have to secure its generic context with many allusions" (Fowler 1987: 90), and he gives prose fiction writing as an example to this: When prose fiction was too new to be recognized by the reader as a new form of writing, early novels made a large amount of allusions to the founders of the genre (Fowler 1987: 90). Fowler points to the fact that Fielding composed *Tom Jones* „with prefaces that amount to essays in genre theory" and he adds that „later, however, when the novelistic form was more familiar and easy to recognize, generic allusions tend to be more specific" (Fowler 1987: 90).

Similarly, the parodist makes extensive use of references to and direct quotations from the representatives of the genre that is parodied. These generic allusions in parody may be said to belong to someone else. Nevertheless, the parodist adds his own parodic intention to these „alien" words and makes them his own property. Therefore, it is safe to say that allusions as generic signals particularly undergo change in parody due to the double-function they serve. Generic allusions in parody are composed of two accents: there is the accent of the parodied genre to which the parodic work refers and at the same time there is the accent of the parody itself. A generic context, therefore, is established with systematic quotations from the parodied genre, and by this way, the parodist signals the genre to the reader. Moreover, the presence of the parodic intention is indicated at

[6] If the references to the romances of chivalry are analyzed in the library scene in *Don Quijote*, it becomes clear that it is conventional to use „Don" and „Knight" in the titles to indicate the presence of the chivalric tale: *Don Olivante de Laura*, *Platir the Knight*, *The Knight of the Cross*, *Don Belianis*, to count some among many referred to in the novel (Cervantes 1998: 35-37).

[7] Not for the modern English reader perhaps, but for a Spanish reader of Cervantes' contemporary, this surname may sound quite strange, „quijote" meaning „thigh armor" (Cervantes 1998: 16).

the same time within the very same quotations populated by the authorial voice. Having this double-function of signalling two intentions, generic allusions in parody are separated from regular allusions in non-parodic literary kinds: „the use of quotation to establish comic discrepancy or incongruity […] distinguishes parodic quotation from most other forms of quotation" (Rose 1993: 79). Parodic quotation draws attention to the authorial parodic voice through refractions in the allusions. The generic allusions of a parodist, then, work at a conscious level in that he intentionally seeks to draw attention to the parody itself and wants his reader to be aware of the existence of two texts, two voices, within a single work, and of the parodic incongruity between them. While generic allusions in a non-parodic literary text signal the genre it belongs to, it can be argued that allusions in parody signal the departure of the parodic text from the genre it continually refers to. The parodist raises „generic expectations" for a particular type by means of his allusions and then surprises these expectations by introducing his own parodic accentuation. Margaret A. Rose relates: „[The parodist] first sets up the text to be parodied by imitation or partial quotation […] so that the reader will expect it, and then produces another version of it which the reader does not expect and which sets up some incongruous contrast with the original work" (Rose 1993: 171).

This can be exemplified plainly through the text of *Don Quijote* where Cervantes gives many references and explicit allusions to the representatives of chivalric romances to signal the parodied genre and to create a certain context for the reader. Cervantes' novel includes two words existing side by side. As a parody of chivalric romances, it includes the background voice of this genre, i.e. the whole tradition of the romances of chivalry is implied in *Don Quijote* through the writer's imitations of and allusions to the conventions of chivalric romance writing. Cervantes creates a knight-errant in the manner of chivalric romance heroes. Moreover, Don Quijote in turn imitates the tradition of chivalry which he reads from romances. Cervantes' hero is an addictive reader of romances of chivalry and he imitates what he reads. Although he is an ordinary person, he imitates knights and their lives, chivalric codes of knighthood, and the language of romances in his speech. Therefore, through the main character (Don Quijote) as a reader and imitator of romances, the backgrounded genre of the parody is given. Apart from Cervantes' imitation of the chivalric romance writing in general, his literary character Don Quijote provides the reader with his imitative heroic actions of particular paradigmatic romances. It is argued, as a result, that Cervantes imitates as a way of writing and Don Quijote as a way of living (Robert 1986: 112). By means of all these imitative chivalric actions of Don Quijote, the parodied text is incorporated into the parody text, and they exist side by side within one and the same work but as two separate voices[8] Cervantes appropriates the discourse of another speaker, namely the discourse of romances of chivalry, and „forc[es] his intentions to refract and diffuse themselves through the medium" of the chivalric writing tradition (Bakhtin 1992: 302).

[8] This is, for Bakhtin, a „form for incorporating and organizing heteroglossia in the novel" (Bakhtin 1992: 315). Bakhtin suggests that „Cervantes" *Don Quixote* […] realizes in itself, in extraordinary depth and breadth, all the artistic possibilities of heteroglot and internally dialogized novelistic discourse" (Bakhtin 1992: 324).

Early in the novel, Cervantes provides a large catalogue of references to the paradigms of chivalric writing (Cervantes 1998: 13-4), and later in the famous library scene, the same catalogue is repeated when Don Quijote's friends, the priest and the barber, check each and every book in Don Quijote's library to decide which will be cast into the fire and which will be saved (Cervantes 1998: 35-9). It is understood from this library scene that Don Quijote is a devoted reader of chivalric stories, so his library is rich with the well-known romances of the time. In this scene, therefore, the reader is provided with a whole range of the generic context of chivalric romances by means of the references to the representatives. Among the many books mentioned, *Amadis of Gaul* is seen as the most influential source on *Don Quijote* as the priest states that „this was the first of the chivalric stories ever printed in Spain, and all those that came after have had their beginning and very origin in this book" (Cervantes 1998: 35). It is implicitly indicated by these words that *Don Quijote* may have its origin in *Amadis of Gaul* and there are also repetitive allusions in *Don Quijote* to specific events from this paradigmatic text for Cervantes' work. Don Quijote is specifically obsessed with imitating its hero. He declares his intention to imitate the madness of Amadis for the love of Oriana: „Long live Amadis' memory, and let Don Quijote de La Mancha imitate him in any and every way he can" (Cervantes 1998: 161). However, he cannot find any similar reason for his despair to that of Amadis. He says, „in fact I am neither rejected nor disdained by Dulcinea del Toboso" (Cervantes 1998: 161). Amadis' situation, therefore, does not suit Don Quijote.

Orlando Furioso is referred to as another representative of the genre which depicts its hero go mad like Amadis due to his devotion to the lady he serves as a knight, and Don Quijote is not sure which one to follow: „[Don Quijote] went back to debating a point he had argued with himself many times before, without ever resolving the matter, and this was whether it would be better, and more to the point, to imitate Roland's wild madness or Amadis" mournful ones" (Cervantes 1998: 160). As has been said, generic allusions show that the text in question belongs to the genre that is referred to and is expected to follow the same conventions with this genre, but metaphorically speaking, the allusions to *Amadis of Gaul* or *Orlando Furioso* cannot establish a connection between *Don Quijote* and chivalric romance genre because its hero is unable to follow properly the convention of „going mad out of a knight's rejected love from his lady". Thus, these allusions in *Don Quijote* are populated with Cervantes' parodic intention as well and they show his departure from the conventions of the romance tradition. These repetitive references in *Don Quijote* should be seen as generic signals that enable the writer to evoke the genre he parodies. Moreover, Cervantes stylizes the generic allusions by the incongruity he creates between the generic context indicated by the allusions and the context of the parody. As exemplified from the novel, Cervantes' allusions as generic signals have this double-function of indicating two different voices simultaneously. Therefore, he emphasizes the fact that, instead of following them, he departs from the traditions of the genre he has signalled. He parodies the romance genre and develops a counterstatement to it, and by means of the generic allusions in the text, he both indicates the genre he parodies and his „anti-genre" created by parody[9].

[9] Particularly genre parodies are regarded as „antitheses to existing genres" which they imitate (Fowler

IV

These examples of various generic signals in *Don Quijote* show that Cervantes' authorial voice is always present behind the discourse of chivalric romances. It comes to the surface sometimes wholly audible on its own and sometimes mingled with the parodied voice. His parodic intention is refracted when the discourse of his work passes from the medium of chivalric romances to that of parody. The generic signals in *Don Quijote* are also appropriated by Cervantes to reveal his parodic voice along with that of the parodied. As a genre parody and an anti-genre, *Don Quijote* uses the same generic signals with romances of chivalry but it imitates them with parodic accentuation. Cervantes' borrowed generic signals are brought into the new context of *Don Quijote* that is opposed to their original context, and therefore, an inconsistency between them is created so that both the genre *Don Quijote* departs and the parody itself are indicated. In a parodic text, „readers are implicitly invited to discover the new point of view from which the incursion was made" (Morson 1989: 70). Such an invitation is realized by the help of double-voiced generic signals. In *Don Quijote*, for instance, Cervantes stylizes not only the parodied genre but also its generic signals to indicate his novel as an antithesis to the existing romance genre.

The parodic stylization is carried out by means of parodic incongruity. It is seen as the governing principle also in the stylization of generic signals in parodic discourse: the parodist is able to use the generic signals of the parodied genre in his own way by means only of creating a discrepancy between what the generic signals indicate and what the parody work provides. As the above examples from the examined works show, parody generally uses the same generic signals with the parodied genre; these signals, nevertheless, indicate not the presence of the parodied genre but absence of it. As a result, generic signals play a unique and more communicative role in a parodic work due to its being a specially coded text. Parody is intentionally double-voiced, and the speech of the parodied genre is deliberately evoked in the parodic text and consciously appropriated by the parodist to serve his purpose. The parodist imitates another's speech but he reaccents it with parodic intentions to create an inconsistency by means of which the authorial voice of the parodist refracts. The parodist, in order to indicate his parodic intention, also reaccents generic signals. Generic signals in parody, as a result, serve a double-function: along with the genre, they simultaneously signal the authorial voice of the parodist.

This article is a revised and expanded version of the paper presented at *The XII Annual Conference of the English Department University of Bucharest, Romania: Genres and Historicity: Text, Cotext, Context* University of Bucharest, 3-5 June, 2010.

1987: 175), for they parody a genre to transform it as, for instance, Sterne did with *Tristram Shandy*: „Plot, continuity, scale, authorial intrusion: these and other features of the novelistic repertoire were countered so decisively by Sterne that he achieved a paradigmatic form still being imitated and developed" (Fowler 1987: 177). Genre parody accentuates the genre it parodies to create an „anti-genre" and the parodist accentuates the parodic signals to indicate his counterstatement to the genre he parodies.

References

Bakhtin Mikhail M. (1984), *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics,* Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press.

Bakhtin Mikhail M. (1992), *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays,* Austin, University of Texas Press.

Cervantes Saavedra Miguel de (1998), *Don Quijote,* Diana De Armas Wilson (ed.), London, W. W. Norton.

Cuddon J. A. (1999), *The Penguin Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory,* London, Penguin Books.

Dubrow Heather (1982), *Genre,* London, Methuen.

Fowler Alastair (1987), *Kinds of Literature,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

Hirsh E. D. (1967), *Validity in Interpretation,* New Haven, Yale University Press.

Hutcheon Linda (1985), *Theory of Parody,* London, Routledge.

Morson Gary Saul (1989), *Rethinking Bakhtin,* Evanston, Northwestern University Press.

Parla Jale (2001), *Don Kişot'tan Bugüne Roman,* Istanbul, Iletisim.

Rivers Elias L. (1998), *Cervantes's Revolutionary Prologue,* In *Don Quijote*, ed. Diana de Armas Wilson, London, W. W. Norton.

Robert Marte (1986), *Doubles,* In *Critical Essays on Cervantes*, ed. Ruth El Saffar, Boston, G. K. Hall & Co.

Rose Margaret A. (1993), *Parody: Ancient, Modern, Post-Modern*, London, Cambridge University Press.

Sterne Laurence (2003), *The Life and Opinions of Tristram Shandy, Gentleman*, London, Penguin.

Vice Sue (1997), *Introducing Bakhtin,* Manchester, Manchester University Press.