

Considerations on Heterodiscourse from *Don Quixote* / *Considerações sobre heterodiscurso a partir de Dom Quixote*

Lucas Vinício de Carvalho Maciel*

ABSTRACT

The paper aims to discuss some aspects of heterodiscourse from two books commonly referenced as *Don Quixote de La Mancha*. Based on Cervantes's text, we argue that Bakhtin's notion of heterodiscourse encompasses different phenomena: (i) diversity of voices, (ii) plurality of styles, and (iii) varieties of speech genres, which comprise novelistic prose.

KEYWORDS: Heterodiscourse; *Don Quixote*; Voices; Styles; Speech genres

RESUMO

Propõe-se neste artigo abordar alguns aspectos do heterodiscurso, a partir dos dois livros comumente referenciados como Dom Quixote de La Mancha. Ilustrando-se com base no texto cervantino, argumenta-se que a noção bakhtiniana de heterodiscurso abarca diferentes fenômenos: (i) diversidade de vozes, (ii) pluralidade de estilos e (iii) variedades de gêneros discursivos, que compõem a prosa romanesca.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Heterodiscurso; Dom Quixote; Vozes; Estilos; Gêneros discursivos

* Universidade Federal de São Carlos - UFSCar, São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil; lucasvmaciel@yahoo.com.br

Introduction

In a recently published Portuguese translation of *Discourse in the novel* (BAKHTIN, 2015 [1930-1936]), Paulo Bezerra chooses to translate the Russian word *raznorétschie* as “heterodiscourse,” differently from the previous Brazilian translation by Bernardini *et al* (BAKHTIN, 2010),¹ who translate it as *plurilinguismo* [heteroglossia]. The Spanish translation of the essay also uses the word *plurilinguismo* (BAJTIN, 1975). In the North-American edition of Bakhtin’s text (BAKHTIN, 1981)² the Russian word is translated as “heteroglossia.” This translation is also found in Brazilian works, such as the ones written by Faraco (2006) and Tezza (2003), who use the word from the English edition.

Due to these multiple possibilities of appropriation of the Russian word, it is valid to say that the new translation of the word as heterodiscourse is considered a coherent choice, since more than a plurality of voices, the Bakhtinian concept refers to voices that are different because they oppose other voices. The plurality is reached in face of the other: discourse becomes nonsimilar (not necessarily contrary) to the others around it.

Thus, in order to discuss how heterodiscourse encompasses several literary-linguistic phenomena, this study aims to analyze passages from *Don Quixote* that show important aspects of the concept developed by Bakhtin.

The following three sections will explore constitutive aspects of heterodiscourse. In the first one, we examine the plurality of voices that compose the narrative and analyze how the voices of the authors, narrators and characters are architectonically organized. Then, we observe how different literary and non-literary styles are represented through the voices of the participants of Cervantes’s work, cooperating for the heterostylistic nature of the novel. In addition, we emphasize the importance of the diversity of discourse genres that are integrated in the novel, contributing to its heterodiscursivity, insofar as this myriad of genres adds different styles and voices to the novel.

¹ The translators disagree over the date *Discourse in the Novel* was written: for Paulo Bezerra it was written between 1930 and 1936, and for Bernardini *et al.* it was written between 1934 and 1935.

² BAKHTIN, M. *Discourse in the Novel*. In: BAKHTIN, M. *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* by M. M. Bakhtin. Edited by Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: Texas University Press, 1981[1934-1935].

The last section summarizes the discussions developed, pointing to the understanding that heterodiscourse is a broader concept than heteroglossia is. If the latter seems to be reduced to social languages (or varieties), the former allows us to understand the complexity of these languages, materialized in different voices, styles, and genres.

1 Heterodiscourse: Diversity of Voices, Styles and Discourse Genres

According to Bakhtin (2015, p.27), the “novel as a whole is a phenomenon multiform in style and variform in speech and voice.”³ From this consideration, we intend to clarify the possible differences, when carrying out the analysis, of the diversity of voices and styles, and heterodiscourse.

Although these concepts may overlap and sometimes be confused, we will explain each one and show their peculiarities or even their pervasiveness. *Don Quixote* is the basis for this study.

1.1 Heterodiscourse: Diversity of Voices

The concept of diversity of voices can be understood as the plurality of voices and, since Bakhtin carries out his studies from discourse in the novel, it is important to remember that these voices are initially from specific speaking persons in the novel: author, narrator, and characters. These Bakhtinian propositions would be, then, situated in the literary scope.

Schnaiderman (2005, p.20), however, opportunely warns that “despite the relevant works of literary theory based on Bakhtin’s reflections and the contribution they can still make, what he has designed to be explored in other fields seems to be particularly rich in suggestions.”⁴ Schnaiderman’s position is essential, since it attests to the possibility and the importance of seeking to carry out Bakhtin’s studies in other fields of knowledge.

³ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁴ Original text: “por mais relevância que tenham os trabalhos de teoria literária baseados em Bakhtin, e por mais que eles ainda nos possam dar, o que ele deixou delineado para a exploração de outros campos parece particularmente rico em sugestões.”

Nevertheless, it is important to point out that some of Bakhtin's reflections use the literary prose as an object of analysis in order to develop concepts. That is the reason why the origin of these concepts should be considered when making their transposition to other spheres of communication, to texts which do not always present elements of the novel.

In *Don Quixote*, for instance, there are complex dialogic relationships between the voices of authors, narrators and characters, constituting a singular diversity of voices, which contributes to the heterodiscursivity of the novel. We should start with the issue of authorship, which, for many reasons, is truly complex. The first reason is that between the publication of the *First Part of the Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha*, in 1605 and the *Second Part of the Ingenious Gentleman Don Quixote of La Mancha*⁵ in 1615, there is an apocryphal continuation of the first book, whose author would be Alonso Fernández de Avellaneda (cf. Vieira, 2012), although there is no agreement regarding this subject.

This issue is relevant for our discussion because the reference to this apocryphal *Quixote* will be present in the voices of Don Quixote, Sancho and other characters in the Second Part. Therefore, a reality created by a different author (person and creator) appears in the discourse of Cervantes's characters. Somehow, there is certain displacement of the hierarchical and exotopic relationship most common to the novel, inasmuch as the external author becomes objectified by the characters' voices. This is *suis generis*, since, according to Bakhtin (1999),⁶ it is the discourse of the characters that is generally the object of the author's discourse.

In general, the voices of the characters are a creation of the author; these voices are his "object." In the case of the reference to the apocryphal Don Quixote, the voices were not created by Cervantes, but by a different author. Therefore, the object in Cervantes's novel is the voices of others. There are, then, dialogic relationships between Cervantes's text and the apocryphal text; however, it is not only a simple external reference, but a movement in which one dialogues with the other. For the characters' voices of the apocryphal author-creator to enter Cervantes's novel architectonics, these

⁵ The tomes are named according to the English translation that is being used: CERVANTES, M. *Don Quixote*. Translation by Edith Grossman. New York: Harper Collins Publishers Inc., 2003 [1605-1615].

⁶ BAKHTIN, M. M. (1963). *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Edited and Translated by Caryl Emerson. Introduction by Wayne C. Booth. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

voices need to go through some instances: the voices of authors, narrators, characters. Thus, they are not a simple reference to the previous book. Cervantes chooses the voices of the apocryphal novel that will enter his novel. These voices, by their turn, are conjugated in Cervantes's novel architectonics under the auspices of a primary author-creator that, through secondary authors, narrators and characters, gives place, in a refracted way, to the voices that are external to the apocryphal novel.⁷

This is an aspect of heterodiscourse, inasmuch as there are dialogic relationships between voices of different discourse instances: author, narrator, characters. In addition, in this case, through these discourse instances, utterances from different subjects – Cervantes and the apocryphal author – are conjugated.

Besides these external dialogic relationships,⁸ it is possible to notice, exclusively in the world of Cervantes's creations, several dialogic relationships between the voices of author, narrator, and characters.

An issue that should be observed is the plurality of authors. From a Bakhtinian perspective, any work has two fundamental authors: the author-person and author-creator. The author-person is “a constituent in the ethical, social event of life” (BAKHTIN, 1990, p.10),⁹ the person who lives in the real world. This person, when willing to produce an aesthetic work, needs to use cognitive knowledge and ethical values in a discourse project that, once it is finished, will allow others to see an author-creator in his unique, singular aesthetic creation, “a constituent in a work” (BAKHTIN, 1990, p.9).¹⁰ An author-creator organizes the verbal material and gives support to the discourse project. This author-creator is an element of the work and only of that work. The author-person may, certainly, continue to write, for instance, and create many other works. Each one has its own architectural organization, put together under the perspective of an exclusive author-creator.

Miguel de Cervantes is the author-person, but to the analysis of *Don Quixote*, what matters the most is to understand the author-creator, a discourse instance under which the novel architectonics is organized. As author-person, Cervantes could write

⁷ For the difference between primary and secondary author from a Bakhtinian perspective, see Bezerra (2005).

⁸ See Maciel (2017) for a discussion about external and internal dialogic relationships.

⁹ BAKHTIN, M. Author and Hero in the Aesthetic Activity. In BAKHTIN, M. *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays* by M. M. Bakhtin. Translation and notes by Vadim Liapunov; supplement translated by Kenneth Brostrom. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1990 [1920-1924].

¹⁰ For reference, see footnote 9.

other works, but *Don Quixote*'s unit is signatory of an author-creator who is exclusive of this work.

Through this author-creator there is the constitution of a novel in which, maybe in a baroque style and certainly to develop a parodic project, two (secondary) "authors" of *Don Quixote*'s story are presented.

The first author would be Cide Hamete Benengeli. The story narrated by Benengeli, however, would not be his creation, but his narration of stories compiled in La Mancha. Even the title of his work is "History of Don Quixote of La Mancha. Written by Cide Hamete Benengeli, an Arab Historian" (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.81).¹¹

The story of this first author (more of a compiler than a writer) is written in "Arabic [...] characters" (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.80).¹² For this reason, the text had to be translated into Spanish. This is told by the "second author," the Christian author (who is called as such due to his opposition to the Moor, the Arab author), who (re)tells the story of Don Quixote from Benengeli's translation. There is, therefore, two secondary "authorial" instances until the final text of Don Quixote: the first author (Cide Benengeli) and the Christian author. This makes the translation process even more complex.¹³

It is relevant to notice that the Christian author is not restricted to the sole translation of the Arabic text, but makes interventions in the text, retelling it. Sometimes, usually at the beginning or at the end of the chapters, the Christian author makes references to his process of retelling the Moor's story:

(i) They say that in the actual original of this history, one reads that when Cide Hamete came to write this chapter, his interpreter did not translate what he had written, which was a kind of complaint that the Moor had concerning himself for becoming involved in a history as dry and limited as this one [...] (CERVANTES, 2003 [1615], p.767).¹⁴

¹¹ For reference, see footnote 5.

¹² For reference, see footnote 5.

¹³ This excerpt, due to several narrative instances, is, according to Riley (1986, p.38), a common characteristic of the genre "chivalry novel": "[...] the pretense that the manuscript of the bulk of Don Quixote was in Arabic, and most important of all the attribution of the 'history' to the Moorish chronicler, sage and magician, Cide Hamete Benengeli: both devices common to the romances of chivalry" [RILEY, E. *Don Quixote*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1986].

¹⁴ For reference, see footnote 5.

(ii) But let us leave Sancho and his rage, dear reader, with no argument or quarrel, and return to Don Quixote, whom we left with his face bandaged and treated for his feline wounds, which did not heal for eight days, and on one of them something happened that Cide Hamete promises to recount as exactly and truthfully as all things in this history are recounted, no matter how trivial they may be (end of chapter XLVII) (CERVANTES, 2003 [1615], p.794).¹⁵

It is noticeable that there are instances or layers to be considered in what regards the supposed author. The first author would be the Arab Cide Hamete Benengeli, who compiles and records Don Quixote's adventures. The Arab's writing is then translated. However, this translation is not the same text of Don Quixote. This text is the result of another author's action, a Christian author who, based on the translated story, presents Don Quixote's story, modifying the translation. There are, then, three instances: the Arab author, the translator, the Christian author.

It is interesting to point out that the narration is a result of a complex discursive play through which the text to which the reader has access is refracted due to these three instances. Moreover, when talking about this diffuse authorship, it is important to make clear that none of these two authors corresponds to the author-creator, who should be understood as someone who unifies and supports Cervantes's discourse project in this exclusive work, the unifying element of the work's architectonics.

The Moor, the Christian and the translator, whose art of translation always presupposes creative work, are secondary authors, since "are all measured and defined by their relationship to the author as person (as to a special subject of depiction), [...] they are all depicted images that have their authors, the vehicles of the purely depictive origin" (BAKHTIN, 2004a, p.109).¹⁶ In other words, differently from the "pure author," each "author" is "partially depicted, designated [...] enters as part of the work" (BAKHTIN, 2004a, p.109).¹⁷

Moreover, it is important to emphasize that Benengeli's and the translator's voices only appear, even if directly cited, when refracted by the Christian narrator's voice. The voice of the latter, thus, is extremely important, since it refracts Benengeli's

¹⁵ For reference, see footnote 5.

¹⁶ BAKHTIN, M. The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2004a [1959-1961].

¹⁷ For reference, see footnote 16.

and the translator's previous narration. It also refracts and arranges the voices of the characters: Quixote, Sancho Panza, and all the others. When addressing the arrangement of the characters' voices in the narrative, we should note some aspects.

In a certain point of the narrative, Don Quixote is in an inn that he believes to be a castle. He imagines he is hugging his beloved Dulcinea of Toboso, but he is actually hugging one of workers of the place. Don Quixote is, then, attacked by another guest who had previously arranged a meeting with the referred worker in order to satisfy his "sinful desires" (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.127).¹⁸

The episode is described as the following, in direct speech, by Don Quixote to Sancho:

I wish only to say that heaven, envious of the good that Fortune had placed in my hands, or perhaps, and this is more likely, the castle, as I have said, being enchanted, as I was engaged in sweet and amorous conversation with her, without my seeing or knowing whence it came, a hand attached to the arm of some monstrous giant came down and struck me so hard a blow on the jaws that they were bathed in blood, and then beat me so badly that I feel worse than I did yesterday when the Yanguesans, because of Rocinante's audacity, committed the offense against us which you already know. And from this I conjecture that the treasure of this maiden's beauty must be guarded by some enchanted Moor and is not intended for me (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], pp.130-131).¹⁹

In Don Quixote's words, the inflictor of his wounds is an "enchanted Moor." Don Quixote's words are found in the narrator's voice in another passage:

In short, when Don Quixote discovered that he was bound and the ladies had vanished, he began to imagine that all this was the result of enchantment, as it had been the last time when in that very castle an *enchanted Moor* of a muledriver had given him a severe beating; to himself he cursed his lack of intelligence and good sense, for after having been hurt so badly in that castle, he had dared enter it a second time [...] (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.406, emphasis added).²⁰

The narrator, thus, integrates Don Quixote's voice into his own voice, refracting it. More than that, he changes its direction, since what was a serious matter when

¹⁸ For reference, see footnote 5.

¹⁹ For reference, see footnote 5.

²⁰ For reference, see footnote 5.

spoken by the character is ironically tinged by the narrator. We could say that it is a double-voiced discourse with a diverse orientation in which the “discourse becomes an arena of battle between two voices” with “a semantic intention that is directly opposed” (BAKHTIN, 1999, p.193).²¹

Somehow this refraction of the character’s voice in the narrator’s voice may be close to the “provoking discourse,” which Bakhtin envisions in some of Dostoyevsky’s works (BAKHTIN, 1999).²² In these works, the narrator takes over the characters’ voice with the intention to mock them. Differently from that which occurs in *Don Quixote*, however, in Dostoyevsky it seems that the narrator engages in a dialogue with the character, as if the latter could hear the former. Therefore, the irony that recovers the voice is perceived by the character and not only by the reader, as it happens in Cervantes.

In any case, this mutual orientation between the voices of the narrator and characters is already present in Cervantes. Possibly its development in Dostoyevsky would show what, according to Bakhtin, would be the evolution (of elements) of the prose in the novel genre.

Summarizing what was discussed previously, one of the characteristics of heterodiscourse is this complexity of the dialogic relationships between the voices of a one (I) and an-other (hetero), the discourse of one and the discourse(s) of other(s). In the case of the novelistic prose, the dialogic relationships do not oppose (only) an author-person to other external discourses: to other literary works, to political, philosophical, religious discourses with which the author dialogues somewhat explicitly.

We should emphasize again that the dialogic relationships do not take place between texts, but between subjects that give movement to them. In novelistic prose, however, it is crucial to consider that heterodiscourse, the discourse of the other, enters the novel according to the discourse project of the specific author-creator. In this work, the voices of others may be found in different narrative instances in the discourse of the narrators and characters. In the novel sphere, the voice of the narrator is alien to the voices of the characters, and their voices are alien, too; they are other voices. Moreover,

²¹ For reference, see footnote 6.

²² For reference, see footnote 6.

to each character the voice of other characters is a facet of heterodiscourse, of the discourse of the other with whom he/she has a relation.

Therefore, one of the characteristics of heterodiscourse is the myriad of dialogic relationships that are established between the voices proper to the novel, i.e., the voices of the author(s), narrator(s) and characters.

1.2 Heterodiscourse: Different Styles

There are many possible definitions of what style is, all of which are certainly the object of a controversy. In any case, Bakhtin's definition of style is the one we have adopted in this article. A conception of style based on the reflections of the Circle must consider two aspects: (i) the lexical and phraseological choices and (ii) the discourse genres through which the utterance is materialized (BAKHTIN, 2004b).²³

We understand that although style is proper to each author, it is never indifferent to the discourse genre through which the utterance is materialized. The author's lexical and phraseological choices adjust to the discourse genre. This is why Bakhtin says that there is no style without genre and no genre without style: "Where there is style there is genre" (BAKHTIN, 2004b, p.66).²⁴

However, genre and style should not be confused, since there are other characteristics that comprise discourse genre, such as compositional structure and theme, in addition to style.

This discussion was raised because one of the characteristics of the heterodiscourse pointed out by Bakhtin is the dialogue between styles. According to Bakhtin (1981, p.262): "the style of a novel is to be found in the combination of its styles; the language of a novel is the system of its 'languages.'"²⁵

In *Don Quixote* a plurality of styles can be found: from the (parodied) style of chivalrous novels, the speech of educated people, such as Don Quixote, to the speech of common people, such as Sancho.

²³ BAKHTIN, M. The Problem of Speech Genres. In: BAKHTIN, M. *Speech genres and other late essays*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 2004b. [1952-1953]

²⁴ For reference, see footnote 22.

²⁵ For reference, see footnote 2.

Examples of the style of chivalrous novels, parodied in *Don Quixote*, are found in the titles of the chapters. An example is the title of chapter XX of the First Part: “Regarding the most incomparable and singular adventure ever concluded with less danger by a famous knight, and which was concluded by the valiant Don Quixote of La Mancha” (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.155).^{26 27}

In this title, a series of linguistic choices motivate the presence of a chivalrous style: the use of the preposition “de” [regarding], which means “about,” proper to discourses that are (or intend to be) educated; the qualifiers “jamás vista ni oída” [most incomparable and singular] before the noun “aventura” [adventure]; the adverbial phrase “con más poco peligro” [with less danger] before the verbal phrase “fue acabada” [concluded], whose structure (passive voice) is supposedly more complex than active voice; the verbal phrase in the passive voice complemented with the agent “de famoso caballero” [by a famous knight] and followed by a comparative adverbial clause, “como la que acabó el valeroso Don Quijote de la Mancha” [which was concluded by the valiant Don Quixote of La Mancha], which makes the sentence longer and more complex, thus more appealing to erudite readers.

There are many other examples of passages in which the “chivalrous style” can be found. However, what we intend here, more than bringing many examples, is to show how evident they are. And this happens because, even without a literary analysis or a linguistic explanation, this style may sound strange to readers, when compared to their everyday language. They can probably recognize the presence of a chivalrous style through these linguistic choices.²⁸

This style, by the way, does not appear only in the narrator’s voice, but in the voice of Don Quixote, who, sometimes, intends to speak similarly to what he believes the characters of the novels he had read would speak.

The following excerpt shows how he speaks to the “ladies” he meets at the inn door:

²⁶ For reference, see footnote 5.

²⁷ Since style is being discussed, here is the original title in Spanish (for comparison purpose): “De la jamás vista ni oída aventura que con más poco peligro fue acabada de famoso caballero en el mundo como la que acabó el valeroso Don Quijote de la Mancha” (CERVANTES, 2016 [1605], p.257).

²⁸ Indeed, this unfamiliarity is something that even those who lived during Cervantes’s times experienced. One way of raising this parodic effect was through the use of literary references recovered by the reader (cf. Riley, 1986). For reference, see footnote 13.

– Flee not, dear ladies, fear no villainous act from me; for the order of chivalry which I profess does not countenance or permit such deeds to be committed against any person, least of all highborn maidens such as yourselves (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605], p.39).²⁹

This way of speaking intends to simulate a chivalrous language, without observing that this is a literary style and that it is a usual feature of a specific kind of literary writing; therefore, its use sounds odd when spoken in a communicative situation.

Don Quixote, however, does not always speak this way. The use of this kind of language is related to his belief that this is the way a person should speak to a lady. When talking to other characters, he does not use archaic language, although he always presents certain amount of erudition when speaking. We notice it in the following excerpt, in a dialogue with Sancho Panza:

What do you fear, coward? Why do you weep, spineless Creature? Who is pursuing you, who is hounding you, heart of a mouse, and what do you lack, beggar in the midst of plenty? Are you perhaps walking barefoot through the mountains of the Rif, or are you sitting on a bench like an archduke and sailing the tranquil current of this pleasant river, from which we shall shortly emerge onto a calm sea? (CERVANTES, 2003 [1615], p.676).³⁰

In the work we find (i) the parodic chivalrous style of the narrator, which is sometimes adopted by Don Quixote, (ii) the educated speech of this character and other characters, and (iii) the voices that would represent a more popular way of speaking. Some of Sancho Panza's speeches are good examples:

Sancho said to his master:

“Senor, I’ve already conveyanced my wife to let me go with your grace wherever you want to take me.”

“*Convinced* is what you mean, Sancho,” said Don Quixote, “not *conveyanced*.”

“Once or twice,” responded Sancho, “if I remember correctly, I’ve asked your grace not to correct my words if you understand what I mean by them, and when you don’t understand, to say:

‘Sancho, you devil, I don’t understand you,’ and if I can’t explain, then you can correct me; I’m so plaint”

²⁹ For reference, see footnote 5.

³⁰ For reference, see footnote 5.

“I do not understand you, Sancho,” said Don Quixote, “because I do not know what *I am so plaint* means.”
“So *plaint* means,” responded Sancho, “*That’s just the way I am.*”
“Now I understand you even less,” replied Don Quixote.
“Well, if you can’t understand me,” responded Sancho, “I don’t know any other way to say it; that’s all I know, and may God protect me” (CERVANTES, 2003 [1615], p.521, emphasis added).³¹

Sancho’s and other characters’ popular way of speaking is interwoven with Don Quixote’s and other characters’ erudite way of speaking. Additionally, we find the parodically erudite speech of the narrator, creating a group of voices in which certain linguistic and stylistic diversity is represented.

Possibly, this diversity of voices, often related to social groups, is understood as “heteroglossia,” thus emphasizing the plurality of social voices. Regarding this understanding, it is important to say:

- (i) “heterodiscourse” does not show itself only as a plurality of languages or language varieties, but as oppositions of one language or variety of languages to other(s) language(s) or varieties of languages. A variety is constituted as such for being an opposition, for being different, “hetero,” from others. In the case of *Don Quixote*, what makes a variety seem more popular or erudite is its opposition to other varieties;
- (ii) one of the aspects of heterodiscourse is certainly this myriad of languages or language varieties that exist in the novel (and in life). Heterodiscourse, however, is not restricted only to that. As previously discussed, for a more adequate understanding of this concept, we must consider not only the social voices represented, but the discourse instances (narrator and characters) that give support and bring these voices to life in the novel.

1.3 Heteroglossia: Diversity of Discourse Genres

According to Bakhtin, an utterance is only materialized in a discourse genre. Thus, the heterodiscursive utterance can only exist through a discourse genre, through

³¹ For reference, see footnote 5. Even in the representation of Sancho Panza’s speech, apparently more popular, aspects of orality, such as its specific syntax (MORAES, 2003) and discourse markers (URBANO, 2003), are not considered.

which the voices of people in a non-fictional genre or the voices of the narrator and characters in a fictional genre are represented.

In *Don Quixote*, for example, it is through discourse genres that the narrator's and characters' voices are presentified. Through them the social voices that compose heterodiscourse, the plurality of (social and stylistic) language varieties, are represented.

Every discourse genre is imbued with the voices of others and one's own, explicitly marked or not. There are some discourse genres, such as the novel, however, in which not only voices, but other genres are integrated. In other words, the novel can conjugate other genres, such as letters, poems, short stories, etc. As Bakhtin observes (1981, p.320):³² “[...] one of the most basic and fundamental forms for incorporating and organizing heteroglossia in the novel [are] ‘incorporated genres.’”

There is, then, another aspect of heteroglossia: the plurality of discourse genres that compose the novel. This plurality is essential, since when entering the novel, other genres allow the integration of the voices of other narrators, characters, who have their own socio-dialectal variety, and bring the styles of other discourse genres into the novel.

This is exactly what occurs in *Don Quixote*, in which there is a variety of discourse genres incorporated into the novel. In the First Part (CERVANTES, 2003 [1605]),³³ there are, for example, the following genres: a note, a song, a lyric poem, a chant, letters, epitaphs, *ovillejos*, poems, and sonnets. Moreover, there is a novella, in which we find a note, a letter, and sonnets. In the Second Part (CERVANTES, 2003 [1615]),³⁴ we find a chant, letters, *coplas*, interludes, a stanza, a gloss, and sonnets.

Bakhtin (1981, pp.410-11)³⁵ comments on this characteristic:

It is enough to mention *Don Quixote*, so rich in inserted genres. [...] They serve the basic purpose of introducing heteroglossia into the novel, of introducing an era's many and diverse languages. Extraliterary genres (the everyday genres, for example) are incorporated into the novel not in order to “ennoble” them, to “literalize” them, but for the sake of their very extraliterariness, for the sake of their potential for introducing nonliterary (language or even dialects) into the novel. It is precisely this very multiplicity of the era's languages that must be represented in the novel.

³² For reference, see footnote 2.

³³ For reference, see footnote 5.

³⁴ For reference, see footnote 5.

³⁵ For reference, see footnote 2.

Therefore, when the novel incorporates a letter, a genre used in everyday life, it makes room for non-literary discourse. On the other hand, when poems and novellas are introduced, the novel makes room for other literary genres. Literary or not, this plurality of genres allows a plurality of styles and voices that contributes, once again, to the stratification of the languages that compose the heterodiscourse of the work.

Final Considerations

The aim of this study was to explore, based on Cervantes's *Don Quixote*, the notion of heterodiscourse proposed by Bakhtin. We hope to have presented, through the analysis, two main points: (i) the concept of heterodiscourse was developed in the scope of literary analysis carried out by Bakhtin, more precisely the novel; (ii) the concept of heterodiscourse is not restricted to the plurality of social language varieties, to heterolingualism.

In fact, these two aspects are related, since they are the characteristics of the novel that allow us to understand that heterodiscourse is more than just a plurality of language varieties. Although variety is a fundamental characteristic of heterodiscourse, this is, for Bakhtin, a specificity of the novel. Heteroglossia, thus, is not at first the plurality of languages and language varieties of the real world, but the representation of this variety in the novel. In the novel, this variety appears in a refracted way in the voices of authors, narrators, characters, and, compositionally, it is found in the novel and in other discourse genres that may be incorporated into it.

Literary works such as *Don Quixote*, therefore, cannot be used for a linguistic study that considers social, historic or any other kind of varieties that comprise or comprised the Spanish language in a given time. In the novel, some of these languages or language varieties are selected by an author-person who, from an author-creator, refracts these languages, seeking to represent or recreate them, giving them a place in the novel through the voices of narrators and characters, whose utterances are always connected to discourse genres. Heterodiscourse, therefore, is an aesthetic characteristic

proper to the novel as a genre. Other analyses may show how heterodiscourse presents itself in other genres or even in the real, ethic, and open life (cf. Bakhtin, 2010b).³⁶

REFERENCES

- BAJTIN, M. *Teoría y estética de la novela*. Madrid: Taurus, 1975.
- BAKHTIN, M. Os gêneros do discurso. In: _____. *Os gêneros do discurso*. Organização, tradução, posfácio e notas Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016a, pp.11-69. [1952-1953]
- _____. O texto na linguística, na filologia e em outras ciências humanas. In: _____. *Os gêneros do discurso*. Organização, tradução, posfácio e notas Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016b, pp.70-107. [1959-1961]
- _____. O discurso no romance. In: _____. *A teoria do romance I: A estilística*. Tradução, prefácio, notas e glossário de Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2015, pp.79-122. [1930-1936]
- _____. O discurso no romance. In: _____. *Questões de literatura e de estética: a teoria do romance*. Trad. Aurora Fornoni Bernardini et al. 6.ed. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2010a, pp.71-210. [1934-1935].
- _____. *Para uma filosofia do ato responsável*. Trad. aos cuidados de Valdemir Miotelo e Carlos Alberto Faraco. São Carlos, SP: Pedro & João Editores, 2010b. [1920-1921]
- _____. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 5ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2011. [1963]
- _____. O autor e a personagem na atividade estética. In: _____. *Estética da criação verbal*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4.ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003a, pp.3-192. [192-].
- _____. O problema do texto na linguística, na filologia e em outras ciências humanas. In: *Estética da criação verbal*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 4.ed. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2003b, pp.307-335. [1959-1961]
- _____. *The dialogic imagination: four essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Edited by Michael Holquist and translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin, TX: Texas University Press, 1981.
- BEZERRA, P. *Dostoiévski: "Bobók"*. Tradução e análise do conto. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2005.
- CERVANTES, M. *O engenhoso fidalgo D. Quixote de La Mancha: Primeiro Livro*. Edição Bilingue. Trad. Sérgio Molina. 7. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2016. [1605]
- _____. *O engenhoso cavaleiro D. Quixote de La Mancha: Segundo Livro*. Edição Bilingue. Trad. Sérgio Molina. 3. ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2012. [1615]

³⁶ BAKHTIN, M. M. *Toward a Philosophy of the Act*. Translation and notes by Vadim Liapunov. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 1993[1920-1921].

- FARACO, C. *Linguagem e diálogo: as ideias linguísticas do Círculo de Bakhtin*. 2ed. Curitiba: Criar Edições, 2006.
- MACIEL, L. A (in)distinção entre dialogismo e intertextualidade. *Linguagem em (Dis)curso*, Tubarão, SC, v. 17, n. 1, pp.137-151, 2017. Disponível em: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/1982-4017-170107-2616]. Acesso em: 01 ago. 2017.
- MORAES, L. A sintaxe na língua falada. In: PRETI, D. *Análise de textos orais*. 6.ed. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2003, pp.169-188. [1993]
- RILEY, E. *Introducción al “Quijote”*. Trad. Enrique Torner Montoya. Barcelona: Crítica, 2000.
- SCHNAIDERMAN, B. Bakhtin 40 graus (Uma experiência brasileira). In: BRAIT, B. (Org.) *Bakhtin, dialogismo e construção do sentido*. 2. ed. rev. Campinas, SP: Editora da Unicamp, 2005, pp.13-21. [1997].
- TEZZA, C. *Entre a prosa e a poesia: Bakhtin e o formalismo russo*. Rio de Janeiro: Rocco, 2003.
- URBANO, H. Marcadores conversacionais. In: PRETI, D. *Análise de textos orais*. 6ed. São Paulo: Humanitas, 2003, pp.81-102. [1993]
- VIEIRA, M. Apresentação à segunda parte de D. Quixote. In: CERVANTES, M. *O engenhoso cavaleiro D. Quixote de La Mancha: Segundo Livro [1615]*. Trad. Sérgio Molina. 3.ed. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2012. [2007]

Translated by Wigna Thalissa Guerra – wignatg@yahoo.com.br

Received August 01, 2017

Accepted March 30, 2018