

THE CRISIS OF DIALOGISM AND THE RISE OF POSTNOVEL

SOLOMIA VYSOTSKA

Universidad Católica de Ucrania, Ucrania



Unidimensionality of the novelistic discourse was already characteristic of the 1920-s avant-garde, which greatly limited the possibility of a dialogue with its agonism, utopism and futuristic orientation: the voices of the parties were distributed according to the notion of the “categorical imperative”, and psychologism as the text leitmotif broke the equilibrium “the author – the protagonist – the reader ” in favor of the author, which led to the gradual loss of the insight and encapsulation of texts (in postwar surrealism, for instance) and to the necessity of “disentanglement” of the contextual field of the novel with the aim of its appropriate perception.

The reason of this was not only a social and intentional split between the clerisy as the creator of the above-mentioned project and the “masses”. The very nature of the aesthetic and ideological movement which avant-garde presents, presupposed sanation of the culture by denying the previous cultural phenomena, which led to the so-called “monologue in chorus”. Experimental novel excluded dialogism preferring to avoid the components, which used to be considered traditional and classical. In this respect ellipsis,

omission and “alienation” are the basic constituents of the avant-garde novelistic discourse.

The paradox of the situation lies in the fact that at the peak of the self-isolation effort, which is the aim, the aesthetically meaningful strain of the author’s activity, the source of this activity is “dissolved” in the counter flow 1) reciprocally superposed scenarios of aesthetic information metacoding and 2) way of interpreting this information in the reader’s mind.

The experience of communication “breakup” in 1960-1970-s was repeated by postmodernism which saw the citation as the basis of the novelistic discourse. The citation ousted “the alien word”, lost the frame of perception (i.e. was considered as a word which does not belong to anyone). In was the citation, which, while performing the function of the main building material, excluded the possibility of the dialogues of the “languages” and “truths”, which first of all upset the value of the notion of the character, which is now perceived as one of many simulacra corridors and after that the value of the author who “vanished” in the citation, having sacrificed the transcendence.

Ostentatious multi-dimensionalism of a postmodern text, abundance of codes and decoding possibilities (in R. Barthes’s sense) is totally reduced. In this sense formulaic style, charades and hermeticism of the postnovel continue the development of the 1920-s experiment of overcoming the pressure of the tradition. The citation in postmodern discourse functions as a peculiar state of the word. The process where the author directs the reader’s attention to the text of culture can be defined as the process of “alienation” of the word from the author and the reality of culture. Taking into consideration M. Bakhtin’s definition of the “alien word” as one of the characteristics of a classical novelistic discourse, the word “alienation” in a postmodern novel can be treated as the event

which leads to the total liquidation of any markers of the word's belonging to a definite author: a "no one's" word is formed. The necessity is conditioned not only by the peculiarities of postmodern aesthetic program. "The word alienation" is called-for at a certain stage of the novelistic discourse's intertextualization. In other words, multiplication of intertextual links inspires, at this stage, the authors' resistance that is caused by a natural fear of death, which was justly, though, maybe a bit hastily described by R. Barthes. This resistance can be described more precisely as the search for the new ways to treat the word since the usual methods of its appropriation no longer exist.

Thus we can speak about the devaluation of the novelistic paradigm of "indirect speaking".

Let us look closely at this process.

In a classical novel the word is dialogical: on the one hand, it describes the object, on the other hand, "any word presupposes some reaction and cannot get rid of the influence of this programmed answer" (Бахтин 1975: 93) and exists on the border of its own and alien contexts (Бахтин 1975: 97). The word in a novel is dialogical by its nature as "the dialogical intention is seen here as the event of the word itself" (Бахтин 1975: 97). In the postmodern conditions of the total intertextualisation of discourse the word creates the dialogue with itself. This idea, which is a bit metaphorical, can be interpreted as the questioning of the inner semantic hierarchy of the word, when its "direct" and "connotational" meanings get equal communication statuses.

The idea of the infinite production of textual semantics in the pair *the text - the reader* leads R. Barthes to the conceptual moment – "the death of the Author" and his successors to the idea of the character's death in the novel. At the same time, decentralization of the source of the author's activity does not lead to the reader's absolutization: the latter is deprived of the

qualities of an independent doer either and is “dissimilated” among the processes of their own discourse techniques. Thus, intertextuality is turned into coexistence of “anonymous, intangible citations without any quotation marks which, at the same time, have already been read” (Барт 2001: 384). This special state of a citation in the first postmodernist novels is, in a way, a transitional moment between the “alien” word in a classical novel and the “alienated” word of the postnovel. At this borderline of citations the code-changing can be seen, using postmodernist deconstruction of classical

works; but in the postnovel the border between citations is vague. The citation without any quotation marks, and later the text as the citations catalogue, presupposes the change in the reader’s perception and a sophisticated selectivity of the answers.

When analyzing the problem, N. Semenova states, and her statement is justified, that the theory of intertextuality does not cover M. Bakhtin’s idea of meta-linguistics: lexical citation with distinct borders inserted into a different context is replaced by the concept of “a cultural code” which is R. Barthes’s central category. As M. Bakhtin remarked, defining the borders of the citation, which plays an important role in intensive meaning construction, is considered to be an unconscious process within the framework of the theory of intertextuality (Semenova 2002: 150). In this sense R. Barthes’s poststructuralist concept is presented as a logical development of the ideas of the Formalist school. In the 1920s, M. Bakhtin was engaged in the polemics with these ideas, which are indirectly connected to the Russian scholar’s concept of dialogism.

Transference of the author’s attention from the relations between utterances to relations between texts reveals a specific postmodernist interpretation of the dialogue, which is deprived of ethical (individualizing) component of the personality within the word. According to J. Kristeva, “dialogism” as

a term may be easily used in literary semiology since logic required by dialogism simultaneously is 1. Logic of alienation as well as logic of the relations between parts of a sentence or a narrative structure which presupposes some rise – contrary to continuity and substantiality – which are subjective to the logic of “existence” and may be defined as monological ones; 2. Logic of analogy and opposition do not exclude oppositional pairs – contrary to the level of causality and identifying determination; 3. Logic of transfinity (Kristeva 2000: 436).

However, the ontological meaning of M. Bakhtin's concept was not perceived by postmodernists. N. Semenova insists that his linguistic works have not been read correctly either. That is why she believes that the ground for J. Kristeva's and R. Barthes's “revolutionary views” may be confusion (Semenova 2002: 148). It is evident that M. Bakhtin's concept played a role of the first impetus for the formation of intertext theory though its philosophical, and ethic and ontological basis was ignored. Like R. Barthes, J. Kristeva analyzes the psychological mechanism of writing as the consequence of the dialogue with yourself (but a different one) as well as the form of the author's self-alienation, as a means of the writer's splitting into the subject of the utterance-process and the subject of the utterance-result (Kristeva 2000: 436-437). At the same time, as she believes, the utterance as a historic and scientific one is always constructed as a dialogue matrix hence it includes the receiver who it is addressed to in an immanent way. As a result, there are two levels of dialogism: the first level – scriptor-respondent, the second level – when the subject of the utterance-process and the subject of the utterance-result replace each other in turn. The horizontal axis (subject-receiver) and the vertical one (text-context) coincide at last and manifest the main idea: each word (text) is the crossroads of two words (texts). This makes it possible to read one more word (text) (Kristeva

2000: 429). This is how J. Kristeva defines the notion of intertextuality.

Thus, J. Kristeva reframes both, M. Bakhtin and R. Barthes, accepting the “language philosophy” from the former and the struggle against connotations, which represent ideology from the latter. The unifying link here is the carnival idea with its opposition to the ideological censorship and prevailing dialogism. But the carnival discourse (as the postmodern one) involves the citation without quotation marks into its space (the word which is impersonal, as if deprived of its value and ethics). Bakhtin’s “alien word” was still the crossroads of I-being and the Other’s being, of different “truths” of the world, implemented by a word. Therefore, the citation in the postmodern sense is not equal to the “alien word” (“Multilingualism, introduced into a novel ... - is “alien speech in an alien language, which serves the refracted expression of the author’s intentions, - Bakhtin writes. – The word in such an utterance – is a special double-voiced word which is always dialogical by its nature.” (Бахтин 1975: 137-138). To understand the “alien word” it is necessary to understand the citation limits as this is the point where the sense is created. In J. Kristeva’s intertextuality theory (as in R. Barthes’s concept of the text as the codes system, where the notion of “the citation without the quotation marks” is used) citation is seen as a process that is unconscious by its nature.

Thus, from the point of view of Bakhtin’s ontological theory, the postmodern intertext idea is another modification of a dialogue – the crossroads of textual consciousnesses in the multiplicity area. In this respect, postmodernism, together with the classical subjectivism and centrism theory critics, eliminates the bearer of the word and the discourse which each time sends the reader to “another” citation in the area of infinite hypertext utterings. Disqualifying “the author” (the center, the reliable source), postmodernism theorists choose

diatextuality as the object of their analysis, hence bringing formalistic and semiological message to its climax.

Postmodern epistemological shift looks overall like eliminating the axiological plan from discourse and replacing polyphony with impersonal plurality, reshaping the dialogue (in Bakhtin's sense of the word) into a chorus. This is the very stage when extreme intensity of intertextuality as the modus, which is creating and generating senses of postmodern narration. Is it possible to say that "alien word" in the novel, which is dialogical, questioning by its nature (taking into account plurality of idiolects which exist in the novelistic discourse) and "no one's", which is quoted without the quotation marks, alienated from the author's position so that words in postmodern text are equal? Of course, it is not. Postmodernism tends to overcome the novelistic word, which, going through the artistic reaction to plurality and plurilingualism of the world solves the ontological conflict between the author's word, the general word of the époque and the character's word.

It was "the alien word" of the novel, which helped the main event of the novel to take part, according to M. Bakhtin. On the other hand, postmodern rebellion against the author and the authority leads postponing the reaction to the alien word as the citation loses its previous status and the wormholes, which are marked by the code change can or cannot be recognized by the reader.

Thus, the possibility to solve the conflict is excluded or postponed. This idea reflects the main internal crisis of the postmodern writing. The reality of the text which is totally literaturelised, but not at all, delegitimizes the author's presence to such an extent that ceases to influence the process of the protagonist's and the characters' words' demarcation. The author's death, proclaimed by R. Barthes is seen as the classical novelistic discourse transformation ("the alien word", polyphony) into postnovelistic one ("the cited word").

Therefore one can invert Bakhtin's idea that classical forms, such as the education novel are exhausted in the post-novel at the end of the 20th century by overcoming the novel plurilingualism while alienating the word from its native context, which leads to the qualitative change of the novelistic discourse. As the diachronic analysis shows, since the New Age, the novel was seen as a specific form of reciprocal languages rejection, which was meaningful and considerable only on the valuable Monologue perspective. But the linguistic shift in European cultures showed the necessity to elaborate a new linguistic picture of the world – the picture, which would be pluralistic and accented. That is why the post-modern interests are focused on the novel: it was closely connected to the linguistic image of the modern person's world. Some literatures had theoretical ground for the postnovel, and in poststructuralism homeland it rose as the synchronic theoretization ground, which gave postmodernists the opportunity to grasp the surrealism achievements which had not been developed or demanded by the previous generation (for instance, transgression and psychological automaticity principles).

The postmodern novel is symmetrical to the theoretical essays and is crucial for transmitting the new, hypertextual vision of the world – if we assume that the hypertext is a multidimensional, non-linear text where the information is presented as a rhizome where the reader is randomly finding the way. On the other hand, the shift from the modernist question: “How I see the world?” to the postmodern one: “What is the world?” means verification of the utterance on the level where the speaker is altered. The reader is also present in the semantic field of the text as a potential and polyvariant person, as an impersonal respondent or as another textual consciousness. This is how depersonalization of the classical novelistic discourse happens: the linguistic

world of the character – the linguistic reality sphere – the linguistic world of the author. Bakhtin's idea of the dialogue was treated by the poststructuralists as the author's relativization, as the citation without any quotation marks belonging to everyone and to no one. "Alienated word" – the citation without the authorship – upsets the balance between the linguistic world of a person and the world's plurilingualism. The personality, which comprehends him or herself and the others in the sense of multiplicity and temporal relativity, becomes diminished: it is also a citation among other citations' dialogue. Such an approach does not only destroy the hierarchical (pre-postmodern) genre leitmotif of the novel, turning the author into the scriptor, but also changes the chronotope completely. The postmodern chronotope loses its integrity; it is split into a series of chronotope "islands", which, as all the other citations, are annihilated at the point of the meeting.

It should be noted that the postnovel's polycentricity is not limited by polyglossia: fabulaic layering which cannot be brought to the play on reflections of the valued history (or metahistory) can also be seen as its direct result. The fabulaic plurality of the postmodern novel is regulated by reciprocal engulfing of the different visions of the events and neutralizes (makes impossible) verification of the content of the novel for its intertextual stability: any attempt to go beyond the novel's limits to establish intertextual links is blocked by inner parallelism of the fabulaic versions. While unfolding the postmodern fabula tends to compare and contrapose several generic intrigues, and each of them sends the reader and the critic to its protoplast. The direct result of this juxtaposition is placing the exposition and the denouement, which are traditional for each genre model (the birth and death or wedding, the crime and its solving) outside the text, beyond its space. This becomes possible and justified as the receptive energy is

shifted from expecting the predictable finale in the frame of new events to reproducing a well-known fabulaic framework among some genre models.

Deactualization of the finalizing perspective releases the experience of being a part of the world, reproducing event, which is different from its renewal in the traditional value-oriented hierarchy. The existence aiming at selfovercoming, engulfs the event of artistic reproduction of the world as a unity. Postmodern discourse releases the experience of this reproducing. This process has a positive meaning and is, in its turn, engulfed by the attempts of *novelistic* interpretation of the *postnovel* discourse. The poetics of reproducing in the context of the obsession with the novelty (transformation) is the source of devaluation of the core concepts of the hierarchy existence, such as the authorship, truth, historical and moral progress and the like. Postnovel architectonics grounds the ontologically real environment of a person's belonging to reproducing the world.

This is how postmodernism tends to practically overcome autonomization of a novel by including its components into an infinite game of senses. Within this utterance the coincidence of *fabula* and *siuzhet* is possible; grasping the meaning of the content is devaluated and it is impossible to acquire the external position 1) for the events represented and 2) for the event of representation.

Placing understanding and artistic expression assessing beyond the framework of the perceiving this utterance helps to form the aesthetic program, which contraposes understanding as grasping the content and understanding as implementing the sense. Implementing the sense must be seen as overcoming the automaticity of judgment inertia, which strictly "fantomizes" the human being. Implementing the sense means to completely stop taking part in life. Aesthetic experience does not take part in practical decisions, but

reveals the possibility of a conscious choice (that is, decision) in the areas where it used to be blocked by the automaticity of life routine.

Further literary studies of postmodernism phenomena should be aimed at overcoming the withering analytical tendency; overcoming as it sees its task in discrediting the next “final” sense in the plurality of interpretations which is triumphing over and over again. It is obvious that elaborating absolutely new social interaction frames gradually begins in the depth of nearly marginal -- taking into consideration modern cinema-centricity – cultural praxes. It is possible that literary theory, which is trying to find a totally new object for study in the results of these praxes, should itself renew its mostly monological instruments. The most difficult task here can be the accurate inclusion of a powerful dialogical paradigm potential into a vast context of humanitarian rebuilding, whose main task is to master the perception of the world which is not competitive.

REFERENCIAS

Барт Р. *S/Z*. М.: Эдиториал, УРСС, 2001.

Бахтин М.М. «Слово в романе». В *Вопросы литературы и эстетики* М. М. Бахтина, 72–233. М.: Худ. литература, 1975.

Кристева Ю. «Бахтин, слово, диалог и роман». В *Французская семиотика: От структурализма к постструктурализму*, 427-457. М.: ИГ Прогресс, 2000.

Смирнова Н. *Эволюция метатекста английского романтизма: Байрон-Уайлд-Гарди-Фаулз*: дис. на соискание уч. степени докт. филол. наук: специальность 10.01.08 – теория литературы. – М., 2002.