

## The Enlargement of Various Definitions–Parody and Its Revival

**Abstract:** Analyzing parody in this contemporary literary and methodological sphere may appear to be anachronistic, considering the specific accounts, that represent quality base, and upgrade the theoretical postulates. Yet, the idea of reactualizing parody in the light of one *classic* text, such as the novel *Don Quixote* of Miguel De Cervantes Saavedra is not aspiring to provoke transformation of the common theoretical stands (antic, modern, and postmodern), nor their confrontation in order to achieve an isolated valorization. The primary intent is to underline once more the impossibility parody to be connected with certain generic concept (rendering this novel parody of chivalric romances), and then this intent is spread through the multidirectional analysis of parody, the fact that seems to be done necessarily, and comprehensively. Parody in the novel *Don Quixote* is being analyzed concerning its three-folded nature–textual, discursive, and phenomenological, elements that describe the conditional nature of parody in general. The textual approach to parody in fact includes the narratological analysis, and the formal acceptance of parody as a trope. The examples that follow the account make parody perceptible through the characteristic of certain personae, playful dispositions, framed texts, transpositions of names, etc. On the other hand, the discursive approach includes examples that highlight narrative specifics, the level of narration, and narrative stance, thus functioning as a second area of parody’s realization. The phenomenological analysis of parody is consequently the third aspect, through which the novel’s possibilities can be depicted, and the selected episode of the enchanted Dulcinea is not the only one, that can be exposed to a certain phenomenological inquiry. Mainly, this approach is directed towards the variations of meaning, and especially the potential stock of the meaning. Through the intentional act (and the effects of parody), this meaning achieves its full actualization.

**Key words:** parody, *Don Quixote*, narratology, discursive theory, phenomenological analysis

In this contemporary scientific and knowledge sphere, to think (or write) about parody would appear to be an anachronistic process. Thus, striving to give more than misunderstood theorizing, and more than simple text with theoretical content, this article (through our unique sense of unwillingly decomposed matters, of which parody is one typical example) will therefore provide one kind of proposal for reintegration, and reunion of various definitions, that are essentially gathered around one equally ambiguous topic. This kind of approach is productive for the new possibility that literary and cultural theory are offering excessively. That new possibility (as we try to explain) integrates several stances: the ancient definitions of parody as trope, modern and postmodern applications of the term, and all this uses are then seen in the light of one classic, but usually designated as modern literary text–*Don Quixote* by Miguel de Cervantes. The following question thus arises–how is it possible to combine the ideas and theoretical aspects, focusing on a text which belongs to the classic, Renaissance (and, thus overgrown) epoch of literature (and literary theory as well)? Here, we feel that it is important to acknowledge the ancient inheritance, influencing the whole Renaissance literature, and, in that manner, parody as well.

Still, the analysis we are willing to provide under the terms of literary specification, narratology, and phenomenology is more than explication of parody—it strives over the classical (formalistic) approach of Viktor Shklovsky (parody as *making* of stories, ambivalent characters and plot), and that is why we are observing the discourse of this story as one of a kind, more than a pastoral foundation:

“This game of shepherds and shepherdesses is in fact the source for all of the pastoral scenes in the novel. Cervantes himself wrote pastoral novels in this same conventional spirit. Pastoral scenes are numerous throughout *Don Quixote*, and at times we are led to believe that the whole novel is about to take off on a new tangent that will turn it into a pastoral. In fact, after his defeat at the hand of the Knight of the White Moon, Don Quixote goes home, intent upon becoming a shepherd.” (Shklovsky 100)

Ancient poetics gives, at the same time, the etymology of parody. First of all, it is being understood as inadequate and unimportant (as a characteristics gained from its content—mocking, non-heroic, laughable). Margaret A. Rose combines the attitudes of several ancient scholars towards parody, thus depicting the ancient *state of affairs*: Aristotle in his *Poetics* is describing parody not directly, but inwardly as connected to comedy, which is thus stigmatized as unserious; then, Rose cites Fred W. Householder Jr., who evokes Aristotle and Quintilian, especially the latter, because his definition of *παρωδή* as a song whose imitations are provided by the abuses of language is not correspondent to the actual meaning of the term *parodia*, usually defined (by Athenaeus, Hegemon, etc.) as “a narrative poem of moderate length, in epic meter, using epic vocabulary, and treating a light, satirical, or mock-heroic subject” (7). On the other hand, if we treat this subject mainly through its etymology, as Lelièvre does, we can see that it suggests more than one meaning—the prefix *para* implies both states: something near and something opposite, generally noted by Linda Hutcheon as “intimacy instead of a contrast” (32). Rose also describes the 16<sup>th</sup> Century scholars, and their way of approaching to the problem of parody—J.C. Scaliger’s *Poetices libri septem*, whose term *ridiculous* directly points to the *inverted* words of poems and songs of the ancient rhapsodists; John Florio, who understands parody as “a turning of a verse by altering some words” (10), which led to the 19<sup>th</sup> Century D’Israeli’s definition of parody as spreading out on alternation and variation in text (or work of art). It is notable that all of these ancient scholars pointed out the indubitable fact—there is something comical and mocking in the essence of parody, and it seems to us that parody is precisely indebted to this kind of quality. We feel that Rose is quite right when she depicts the variety of similar forms to parody:

“Other forms related to the types of parody known to the ancient were what has been called the *cento* or *centones* (a string of quotations, also termed a ‘quolibet’ after the Baroque), which may not necessarily be parodic or comic, but which can be used in parody, or for parodic purposes, and the *σίλλοι*, or *silloi* (from the singular *sillos*). These *silloi* (or ‘squint-eyed pieces’ as they have also been called in English) were epic poems in mock-Homeric hexameters used to attack philosophical argument.” (16-17)

Linda Hutcheon in her book *A Theory of Parody* gives us a profound analysis of modern uses of the term parody, as well as her own specific characterization of parody as a *form of repetition*, form that is established through ironic critical distance, and the pragmatic aspect. It is true that one of the main ancient aspects of parody should not be forgotten—its well-defined function as a parallel, or a kind of *imitation*, code structure as re-coding (bitextual determination, as Jenny states), whose intention varies “from respectful admiration to biting ridicule” (Hutcheon 16). The fact that Hutcheon sees parody as double-text relation, but also as something which stresses the difference (especially because this is the fact by which it is differentiated from pastiche) revokes the pragmatic readers aspect: “Parody is to pastiche, perhaps, as rhetorical trope is to cliché. In pastiche and cliché, difference can be said to be reduced to similarity” (38). Still, acknowledging the importance of textualization, and contextualization, Hutcheon opens up a well-known, but problematic aspect—the *pragmatic range of parody*. If we are to see its specifics, it should be stated as *reworking*, incorporating. Parody is closely related to irony on structural and semiotic level, but also to satire on pragmatic level. The fact that parody always supposes encoding and decoding undoubtedly describes and underlines the instance of the reader, as a willing subject in the course of plot formation, and interpretation. Here we should note that sense of game, playfulness of parody as presupposition, and privileged knowledge of reader’s interpretative intention. This is also synthesized in this statement:

“[...] Irony can be seen to operate on a microcosmic (semantic) level in the same way that parody does on macrocosmic (textual) level, because parody too is marking of difference, also by means of superimposition (this time, textual rather than semantic context). Both trope and genre, therefore, combines difference and synthesis, otherness and incorporation.” (Hutcheon 54)

Parody as a genre and trope also brings about the aspects of meaning and discourse—on the one hand, the meaning is derived through writing and reading, but on the other, the later also requires some common language transformations, and so-to-speak speech act potential. This way of approaching the problem of parody is very familiar to Simon

Dentith, who defines parody in the light of word intonation, discursive communities, and in the way language is being altered through epochs of development: “The slang of one generation becomes the target of parody in the next: ‘hip’ and ‘ace’ are long since as comic as ‘ripping’ and ‘jolly good’, and to use them would be to make yourself subject to mocking laughter” (2), or: “[...] Parody involves the imitation and transformation of another’s words” (3). All these statements underline the cultural allusive imitation as central to parody. In order to explain the discursive nature of parody, we find theoretical postulates of Gérard Genette and Mikhail M. Bakhtin most helpful. Generally, Genette relates parody with its antic inheritance, especially citing Scaliger’s statement about the close connection between parody and rhapsody, thus provoking the tight co-existence between parody and the epic. As to the depiction of the real bond concerning parody and the pastiche, the mock-heroic element is the similar characteristics, but the fact that “they are already inscribed in the very text of the epic” (Genette 15), gives us important direction to understand the recurrent formulas, and retardations in the epic as parody elements. The discursive nature of parody can also be apprehended through the distinction noble/vulgar, satirical/non-satirical (proper parody is one of satirical kinds), transformation/imitation, etc. However, in order to achieve better perceptibility of the different modes of speech, and intention that brings about parody, Genette finds out the polemical mode between satiric, and the serious (thus characterizing Miguel De Unamuno’s anti-Cervantian book *The Life of Don Quixote*), and the playful manner (specifics of parody) between the ironic, and the humorous. We find this argument most inspiring, because *Don Quixote* is exclusively based on distortion of these delimitations, and again (in parts) their confirmation.

Having in perspective this specific nature of parody, we must not omit the fruitful implications of Bakhtin’s theoretical views. Analyzing the double-voiced speech (as transformation, equivalent to the supposed heteroglossia), Bakhtin determines its qualities: “The voice of the Other is speech into speech, enunciation into enunciation, but, at the same time, speech on speech, enunciation on enunciation” (1980, 128). This category is crucial for the existence of dialogism into the text, but also to the perception of the context. Bakhtin’s stratification brings upon the question of verbal presence of this heteroglossia, mainly perceived as modification of the direct, and the indirect speech. However, most applicable to parody are the verbal-analytic modification of the indirect speech (where the words of the Other are present in the indirect enunciation, notable in *Don Quixote* in the context of *consulted literature* for writing the novel, and the one read by Don Quixote), and the irregular direct speech, in which most of the variously directed intentions are intersecting, and are

disclosed. This classification is made more perceptible through the double characterization, that confirms parody as multidirectional double-voiced speech, that transfers various, and mostly opposite intentions, and marked accents: “The voice of the Other always sounds in our mouth as strange to us, very often with ironic, playful, rabble-rousing intonation [...]” (Bahtin 2000, 183). All these statements compel us to note the indeterminacy, and multiplicity of Bakhtinian statements and opinions in contrast to widely structuralist Genettian stance.

Here, we feel obliged to reaffirm and re-examine the actual discursive power of parody. To do so, there are several notions that need to be taken into consideration (more precisely, the Foucauldian discursive pattern). Michel Foucault and his statement about the conjunction of knowledge, power, and truth as actual elements of the dominant discourse gives us opportunity to rearrange and re-confront parody, and its textual aliveness. Sara Mills, in her observations about discourse and ideology, clearly delimits the truth, the subject, and the economic determinants as characteristics of ideology. If we examine this statement: “The notion within ideology of false consciousness assumes that there is a consciousness which is not false [...]” (Mills 29), we can note how Bakhtinian thought has evolved from Marxist critics to post-structuralist (same is true about Foucault). That is why we must feel free to rearrange, and consider parody as specific turnover from the dominant discourse (political, social, artistic, etc.), form of disobedience, and divergent stance. This is one of the most important characteristics of parody in this contemporary world. However, Foucault also reminds us of something which is crucial:

“They (the discursive relations) are actually on the margins of the discourse: they offer him objects on which it can discuss, or more precisely [...] they determine the tangle of relations, that discourse should accomplish in order to be able to speak of this, or that object, to be able to examine it, name it, analyze it, classify, explain, etc.” (51)

All these assertions only highlight the fact that there is no discursive practice independent of the discursive relations, thus no discourse is isolated from the dominant one. That is why it is most important, in order to achieve pertinence, and wide-spread applicability, to range and examine parody as textual (tropic), discursive, and phenomenological mode of being.

Genette acquires one textual perspective of the existence of parody, derived from various examples, one of which is the novel *Don Quixote*. Firstly, we reconsider the terminological implications (the definitions of this novel as modern, realistic, etc.), also noting the absurdity of describing parody through generic modifications (*Don Quixote*

understood as parody of the chivalric romances). Genette comes upon different transformations that this text is exposed to, from objective forgery of identity, to lucid imitations, pastiche, etc. If we consider all the terminological delimitations that Genette made, from parody (as applied noble text to vulgar/real action) to burlesque travesty (a noble text transformed into a vulgar style, with characters that kept their identity), and mock-heroic poem (where vulgar subject is treated in noble style), we can see that all these observations (including the textual ones) converge with the primary definition of parody. We take these conclusions to be applicable to the textual nature of parody, and we examine them through several examples. First of all, we take the construction of the attributes of several characters:

“Our hidalgo was around fifty, strong, but skinny, with a scrawny face. He was fond of waking up early, and going on a hunt. They say his surname had been Quixada, or Quesada, but it is a question that the authors could not agree upon, although there are authentic retentions that his name was Quixana. But, that is of little importance, it is enough for our story not to be substantially withdrawn from the truth.” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 1: 33)

“Thus, Sancho arrived with its escort at a village of about 1000 citizens, one of the best in duke’s possession. [...] The bells started to toll, and in the middle of common happiness Sancho was led to the cathedral with honor, in order to address a prayer to God, and then he was given the keys of this little town with some hilarious ceremonies, and they received him as a lifelong governor of the island Baratarya. [...] Remember, said Sancho, not I, nor anybody of my kinship was ever a ‘Don’. They simply called me Sancho Panza, Sancho was the name of my father, my grandfather, and all the Panzas were without any complement ‘Don’ or ‘Donna’. After all, I think that in this island there are more Dons than stones.” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 2: 365-366)

Reading through these quotations, we can note several important elements of parody: the elements of parody are derived from the specific quasi-imitative, quasi-original figure of Don Quixote, enriched with the attributes of his horse Rocinant, and his servant Sancho. They are described as untypical figures (concerning the chivalric tradition), but the playful manner in which they are represented disables the rejection, and the denial of this fictional world. At first glance, the Don’s madness is something that we perceive as undoubtedly true, incorporated into his physical, and psychological condition. That is the way we interpret all the statements, accepting their dominant humor. However, soon after reading the passages that define Don Quixote’s passion for reading novels (among them even the previous novel of Cervantes!), combined with the gallant, and high (noble) style of the sentences, “whose sense

would not be able to recapture, or understand Aristotle, even if he resurrected only because of it” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 1: 34), we feel free to note the textual aspect of parody as a playful, and polemical relation.

It is interesting to affirm the ways in which parody in this text projects its inconsistency, and polyvalence—the playful, humorous notes of Sancho Panza, and his deformations of the proverbs; satirical range of deforming classical (and typical for the romances) poems and sonnets, but also their inner polemics (discrepancy in dividing the words, and phrases), focused both on their form, and their sense. The textual strength of parody can be also observed through the so-called paratexts—dedications from the author (with his divided identity, although he is designated), and prologues, through which the supposed author is in dialogue with the inscribed reader (incarnated in the figure of author’s friend), which are actually critical, and polemical answers of the problems of art in general, metafictional, and metapoetic dialogue with the Aristotelian poetics, and the medieval tradition. The unclosed and direct revelation of author’s intent—the goal to undermine the bad and disastrous influence of chivalric romances—again marks the textual power of parody, and its ambivalence is pointed to rupture of any kind (in narration, character, plot, references, etc.). The specific status of this form of parody, present in this textual level, can also be seen through the mixture of various elements (and, conditionally, genres)—we observe elements of the burlesque in form of disfiguration of speech (widely noted in Sancho Panza’s utterance), and through mock-heroic elements as well (the final transformation/transgression of Sancho’s attributes, seen as a shadow through the accepted words of Don Quixote). The omnipresent parody on textual level obtains one effective result—total disintegration of identity through versatile, polemically oriented deformations (Don Quixote—the Knight of the Doleful Countenance, Tereza Panza—Huana Panza—Tereza Cascaxo, Aldonza Lorenzo—Dulcinea del Toboso, etc.).

The treatment of discursive diversity, and discursive elements of parody require a more applicated, and extended approach. In fact, this kind of account defines and re-examines the premises of Foucauldian theoretical paradigm. He ranges the field of discourse as limitation of the considered objects, that are actually created by the practices of discourse. In order to understand the creation of discourse object, instead of their nature as *ready-made* facts, we need to figure out and apprehend their excessive authority, and function as borderline of various human utterances. It seems indubitable that this conception in fact reveals the relative character of the real, especially in practices of presentation, and transformation. Approaching to the discursive elements of parody, we need to delimit their

characteristics. If we try to define the term discourse as specific speech, formal conversation, interaction where something is held to be true (beliefs, statements, etc.), transferred to someone else, it is notable that parts of the text, and even the whole text can be realized, and conceived as a discourse. However, if we do not overlook Foucault's definitions, the structured character of discourse cannot be omitted. The rules, and factors that delimit discourses are not only social, cultural (external), but are also governed by the intrinsic discursive structure. That is why, in order to realize, and depict the specific nature of parody as a discursive entity, a textual limitation must be provided. An argument for this statement can be obtained through the relation between the narrator, and the two authors in the novel *Don Quixote*. Similarly, it can be revealed through the manifold of personae, that tell a certain incorporated story (mise en abyme). Several examples would be helpful:

“But, it is I, who is actually a stepson (not a father) to Don Quixote, and I am not willing to take the usual steps, nor I will beg you, my dear reader, like others, eyes filmed over with tears, to forgive or to pass over the flaws, noticeable in this creation of mine. You are not a cousin, nor a friend to my hero.” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 1: 7)

“I can also mention some other particularities, but they are of little importance, and do not contribute at all to the truthfulness of this history, which is by no means bad if its content is true. If we can make any kind of remark about its veracity, then it is probably the fact that its author is an Arab, because they are noted for their lies. Actually, Arabs are our big enemy, and it can be supposed that the author would rather put some characters down, instead of saying a word more.” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 1: 93)

“The parish priest understood their common desire, and said: –Prepare, and beware, because the story goes like this: In Florence, a rich and famous town in Italy, in the region called Toscana, lived Ancelmo and Lothario, the two rich and noble knights, tightly knit together by great friendship, thus called ‘The Two Friends’.” (Де Сервантес Сааведра 1: 349)

In the first example, the general narrator of the story is connected (or identified) with the author (especially if we consider the title *The Author's Preface* instead of marking it as prologue in the English publication of this novel). However, after a few passages, the confirmed author of this novel is perplexed, and related to the actual (and primary) author, namely some Moorish chronicler Cide Hamete Benengeli, who is, unfortunately, because of being a Moor not a reliable one. This facts lead to a different kind of conclusion—it is actually the transdiscursive power of parody that is being demonstrated here: first, the disrupted identity of the relation author/narrator, imagined through their vivid interplay (a parodization



of authorship as well); second, the distinctive trans-contextualization, and vigorous dialogue with the predominant (medieval) prejudices, transformed into a cross-cultural, and interreligious confrontation. The rules of this dominant discursive structure are being held in potentiality, and then are being released through the scope of pseudo-historical context. That is why this text is timeless, and can be read throughout various historical epochs.

In fact, the discursive rules are only demarking the field, in which parody can transform everything into a playful and polemical diversion. This kind of discursive interplay is roused by the narrator's transformations as well, that can be noted in the third example. The narrator's interim actuality is usually provided by one of the characters (as substitute for the narrator), that explicates, or retells a certain (well-defined) kind of story. The third quotation is a fragment of the famous episode *The impertinently curious man*, which is a good example, and can demonstrate diverse functions of parody—from a kind of formal and material disintegration of love poems, letters, and sonnets, to religious, and metatheoretical (philosophical, poetical) contemplations, that are polemically involved into the higher discursive structure. The melodramatic end of this story, filled with declarations of self-sacrifices, again highlights the discursive range of parody, its dialogic (intertextual) nature, and the effects that, instead of being unidirectional (concerning the action), spread on style, subject, matter, characters, etc.

In order to approach to parody from a phenomenological point of view, we call our attention upon one example, that quotes Erich Auerbach as to explain the stylistic, and the philosophical range of the novel. It is one of the major episodes, where the grotesque of courtly love, and deception is at the highest level (as well as the final disintegration of characters):

“By this time, Don Quixote was down on his knees beside Sancho. His eyes were fairly starting from their sockets, and there was a deeply troubled look in them as he stared up at the one whom Sancho had called queen and lady; all that he could see in her was a village wench, and not a very pretty one at that, for she was round-faced and snub-nosed. He was astounded and perplexed and did not dare to open his mouth. The girls were also very much astonished to behold these two men, so different in appearance, kneeling in front of one of them so that she could not pass. It was this one who most ungraciously broke the silence.” (Auerbach 336-337)

The phenomenological perception of intentional acts (in Ingarden's sense) proves to be very applicable to this sequence. In order to maintain directedness in our account, first we should make clear the distinction between the intentional act (characterized with its specific

intentional object, and the range of its attributes/noema), a mental act based on a certain non-existent (but also not ideal) object, and the stratification of the literary work of art (segmentation of different strata), among which the stratum of meaning units is of great importance to our analysis. The fact that the literary work of art has a totally different mode of existence compared to the ideal objectifications, but depends on them in the stratum of meaning units, urges us to apply an approach different from the previous acknowledgements (of Karl Bühler, Edmund Husserl, Rene Welek, etc.). Ingarden's phenomenology is, among other things, based on differentiation between the nominal word meanings, and the functional concepts. The nominal word meanings have a five-folded structure, and some of their most important elements are the material and the formal content, as well as the intentional directional factor (which is more significant to the studies of the syntax). The material and the formal content of the meaning are truly important to depicting the variations and transformations that parody can perform over an existing objects. In fact, the abovementioned quotation is a perceptible example of the relation between the formal, and the material content. Literary work of art as an intentional object defines itself in terms of intentional correlates of the sentence, that are in fact fictional adequate of propositional statements. The dilemma between the real and the fictitious can be solved through this conception—on the one hand, pure intentional objects (derived from such acts) are strictly *subjective*, and they are a result of one conscious subject, while on the other, the derived intentional object (the ones pertaining to the literary work of art) are actually *intersubjective*, and they have already lost their emotional, and value characters. Thus, the problem between the real and the fictitious is something that can be observed in parody through the phenomenological interpretation.

The abovementioned example provides two kinds of statements—assertive propositions, whose character is unconditioned, and sentences that express a supposition. In fact, through this second kind we can observe the full energy of parody in action, because its diversionary power is inscribed into various attributes (changes in material content)—*round-faced, snub-nosed, ungraciously broke the silence*, etc. However, if we analyze the paragraph as a whole, we can mark several transpositions in intentional object as well—the way of depicting this scene alludes to comical ambivalence, and crucial change of the dominant perspective, where the narrator's point of view and Don Quixote's stance suddenly merged. The confirmation of this statement can be noted through the changing of position between the ambivalent characters. Effectively, this process affirms the intentional object that gains its double structure, after being conceived as unique—the potential *stock of the meaning* is emerging, and according to this, everything kept in aliveness—ironical confrontations,

humorous implications, that range the playful side of parody. That is why Auerbach points out the inevitable effect of this episode, and according to this statement, the realized grotesque inscribes the active presence of serious and humorous (satiric), thus providing the polemical, and widely spread double-voiced strength of parody:

“Many illustrators have rendered the scene: Don Quixote on his knees beside Sancho, staring in wide-eyed bewilderment at the repellent spectacle before him. But only the stylistic contrast in the speeches, and the grotesque moment at the end (Dulcinea’s fall and remounting), afford the fullest enjoyment of what is going on.” (339)

Instead of conclusion, we can use the dialogical and innovative nature of language constructions to describe the parodical ambivalence, and reoccurrence—the same way that Don Quixote was born for Cervantes, and vice versa, parody was also born for interpreters, who wish to examine the limitations of meaning in that syntactical, and discursive construction called text, in the same way that these people were born to invent it.

## Bibliography

1. Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis, the Representation of Reality in Western Literature*. Fiftieth-Anniversary Edition. Translation: Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003. Print.
2. Bahtin, Mihail. *Marksizam i filozofija jezika*. Prevod: Radovan Matijašević. Beograd: Nolit, 1980.
3. \_\_\_\_\_. *Problemi poetike Dostojevskog*. Prevod: Milica Nikolić. Beograd: Nolit, 2000.
4. Dentith, Simon. *Parody*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.
5. Де Сервантес Сааведра, Мигел. *Славниот благородник Дон Кихот од Ла Манча*. Книга 1 и 2. Превод: Илија Корубин. Скопје: Наша книга, 1985.
6. Фуко, Мишел. *Археологија знања*. Превод: Младен Козомара. Београд: Плато, 1998.
7. Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsests, Literature in the Second Degree*. Translation: Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1997. Print.
8. Hirš, E. D. *Načela tumačenja*. Prevod: Tihomir Vučković. Beograd: Nolit, 1983.
9. Hutcheon, Linda. *A Theory of Parody, the Teachings of Twentieth Century Art Forms*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 2000. Print.
10. Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art*. Translation: George G. Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1973. Print.
11. Mills, Sara. *Discourse*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.
12. Ricoeur, Paul. *Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning*. 7th ed. Fort Worth: Texas Christian UP, 1976. Print.
13. Rose, Margaret. *Parody: Ancient, Modern, and Post-Modern*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1995. Print.

14. Shklovsky, Viktor. *Theory of Prose*. Translation: Benjamin Sher. London: Dalkey Archive Press, 1991. Print.

## Проширување на различните дефиниции–пародијата и нејзиното обновување

### (Резиме)

Да се зборува за пародијата денес може да делува мошне анахроно, земајќи ги предвид сите специфични истражувања, кои претставуваат солидна основа, но и надградба на теориските постулати. Сепак, идејата за повторно аспектирање на пародијата врз еден *класичен* текст, каков што е романот на Мигел де Сервантес Сааведра *Дон Кихот*, не претендира да биде трансформација на досегашните теориски промислувања (антички, модерни и постмодерни), ниту нивно конфронтирање, со цел да се постигне изолирана валоризација. Примарната намера е уште еднаш да се потцрта неможноста пародијата да се врзе за дадена жанровска определба (како што тоа обично се прави во однос на овој роман, т.е. неговото одредување како пародија на рицарските романи), а отпосле таа се проширува на повеќенасочното аспектирање на пародијата, кое се чини нужно во една синтетичка форма. Позициите од кои се тргнува при анализата на пародијата во романот на Сервантес–текстуална, дискурзивна и феноменолошка–на одреден начин ја исцртуваат условната природа (односно аспект) на пародијата воопшто. Текстуалното аспектирање на пародијата всушност го вклучува наратолошкиот пристап и формалното прифаќање на пародијата како тропа. Оттука, примерите кои проследуваат ја прават пародијата целосно видлива низ карактеристиките на дадени ликови, потсмешливата диспозиција, вметнатите текстови, игрите со имињата, итн. Од друга страна, аспектирањето на пародијата на рамниште на дискурсот вклучува примери, кои ги исцртуваат наратолошките специфичности, т.е. нивото на раскажувањето и раскажувачката ситуација, кои функционираат како своевидно второ рамниште на реализација на пародијата. Феноменолошкиот пристап кон пародијата соодветно е третата димензија, низ која се согледуваат можностите кои ги нуди романот, при што издвоената епизода за маѓепсувањето на Дулсинеа не е и единствената, врз која може да се изврши таквото феноменолошко истражување. Тоа е првенствено насочено кон варијациите на значењето, посебно кон неговата потенцијаланата сопственост, која низ интенционалните акти во уметничкото дело (како и благодарјејќи на средствата на пародијата) постигнува целосна актуализација.

**Клучни зборови:** пародија, *Дон Кихот*, наратологија, дискурзивна теорија, феноменолошка анализа