

## **Literary Genres in the 19th Century Macedonian Literature, and the Dislocation of the Predominant (Authorial) Voice**

**Keywords:** genre, autobiography, short narrative, generic heteronimity

The question of genre is one of the most important, and thus thoroughly investigated issues in literary theory and literary criticism overall. A certain sum of diversity must be acknowledged: namely, this theoretical term underlines various types of definitions and characterizations, which is why a unified explication cannot be found. If we analyze literature as “aggregate”, a productive force that is more than class, as referred by Alastair Fowler (3), then a mass of groupings will emerge – canonical/noncanonical texts (e.g. works considered as literature, or works on the margins), stratifications by genres, subgenres, literary conventions, motifs, tradition, literary vocabulary, etc. This “classification” just highlights the illusion in which a multilayered (but also normative) term (such as genre) can lead us into. In order to understand this tentative status of the term genre, we should only recall the famous “evolution” of Tynjanov (Biti 428), through which the neglected, non-literary genres thread their way into the center, decoding and precoding the older features. Usually, this is confirmed by the so-called central conception of literature, that divides literary from non-literary genres. Setting this conception aside, we still need a quick overview of various definitions, and the specific implications that are meant by the broadly accepted aesthetic and poetic term genre (especially if a question of genre is raised in a quasi-normative environment such as the 19th century Macedonian literature).

Considering language, fiction/mimesis, and the dominant aesthetic criterion as one of the mostly used aspects in defining the genre, a common fallacy may arise – the fact that language is the medium, and not the main genre determination (although Nortrope Frye in “Anatomy of Criticism” treats literature as order of words); fiction, as stated by Fowler “is not so distinct concept, or not so related to literature, as to settle its definition very firmly.” (6) However, as to the aesthetic criterion, situation may appear to be more emblematic – depicting diverse strata and their mutual features, Roman Ingarden affirms the existence of heterogeneous (not ideal) configuration called literary work of art, which consist of defined strata, thus creating aesthetic qualities or system of ideas, spiritual force manifested in creation and formation (31). Ever since Plato, literature can be seen in the light of dichotomies, and divergencies – from the mode of copies, idols (*eidōlopoiikēn tekhnēn*),

eikastic art to phantastic art, “the making of likeness to the making of appearances” (Ricoeur 11). Plato distinguished various genres according to the authorial voice – forms of fiction (tragedy, comedy), genres where the author speaks about himself (dithyramb), and a combination of these two types (the epic). This kind of stratification is fully accepted by Aristotle (Marino 42).

Adrian Marino traces the notion of genre through historical periods – from Alexandrine period and the Renaissance, in which the threefold distinction appear: narrative poetry, understood as merely an imitation, representative poetry as presentation of action, and allusive poetry, differentiated through its use of symbols and parables (42). It is obvious that the differentiations made between narrative and representative are merely functional – the role of the author through diegesis. The Classicism is the starting point of laws, principles, and separation of genres into categories of higher and lower status (Marino 50), but also the womb in which classic (formal) conceptions are conceived. However, 18th century is the century of retracing, and reexamination of classic notions, which leads to a 19th century broader classification, and appearance of new genres – detective story, gallant poetry, the farce, etc. Ernest L. Stahl affirms the important distinctions that words *Gattung* and *Art* delineate in German, as well as the differences between genre, mode, and kind in English (80). He points out Schiller’s and Lessing’s statements about genres (*Formen*, as stated by Schiller), apprehended as modes of literary presentation. The essential element here is the vivid reception, the immediate answer of the audience. Goethe however uses the term *Naturformen*, excluding the term *Gattungen*, thus creating a new (and stable) ground for including lyric into the demarked (three folded) genre classification (Stahl 86). These statements only explain the specific position of literary history, regarding genetic evolution and transformations of literary artifacts.

Vladimir Biti in his dictionary of literary terms gives a notable depiction of the term genre, starting from German morphological poetics as a foundation for the structuralist and semiotic theory of genres: “Thus in morphological poetics a considerable difference was underlined between the natural and the historic, the abstract and the specific, the constant and the variable dimension of generic entity, kind of motivation for the Goethe’s distinction between *Naturform* and *Dichtart*” (427). Therefore, Todorov’s assumptions of genres, that correlates with the notion of genre in Frye’s criticism are not groundless. Accepting Frye’s ideas of value characters and judgments, systematic approach, immanence and synchronic study of literary work, Todorov reaffirms the segmentation of genres according to the type of audience: drama (as a presented work of art), lyric poetry (works performed by singing), epic

poetry (enunciated works), and prose (works under the act of reading) (16). This classification is added to the previous archetypes – romantic, ironic, comic, and tragic discourses. Although Todorov employs terms which are not exclusively literary (Reichert 66), yet this does not diminish the value of this treat, and the significance of the well-prepared hypothesis: “He (Todorov) speculates that ‘the function of the supernatural [was] to protect the text from the action of the law and by that means to transgress it’ (p.167). Function presumably implies the function for the authors and for their readers, and the law is both the written law of society and the individual’s internalized censor” (Reichert 71). All these assumptions are crucial for the derived postmodern generic categories, such as discourse, writing, medium, communication, textuality, cultural poetics, discursive community, etc. (Biti 429).

If we approach to the question of genre from a phenomenological point of view, a several important remarks can be made, especially in highlighting the forgotten aesthetic value of the literary work. Ingarden’s investigations refer to literary work of art as intentional creation, pertaining to and outgrowing a particular genre. The elements of intentional creativity have their source in the Husserlian philosophical accounts, especially in his transcendental phenomenology overall. Intentionality versus intuition is a sphere of *epoché*, thought as place (transcendent field) without subject, where subjectivity can be held into creation, and be manifested as existence. Thus in Derridean “Speech and Phenomena” writing becomes a substitute for the endless phenomenological voice, existing in the presence of the living present (40). This phenomenological implications rearrange understanding of genre as normative concept – its characteristic becomes the interrelation between *Bedeutung* (as a *will-to-say*, power), and discourse in its potentiality. However, in order to be present any kind of expression (discourse, or traditionally genre) there must be a revival of the language in a form of speech (Derida 60), and a kind of touch between being (*Sein*), and the existence.

Ingarden’s methodology inverts to great extent this Husserlian phenomenological reduction, but it also keeps up with the traditional postulates of the intentional act, and the noetic-noematic component. This can be noted in his observations of the nature of intentional object, created both in the complex area of states of affairs. First of all, Inagarden analyses the quasi-judgmental character of declarative sentences in the literary work of art (160-174), thus creating a kind of genre classification, concerning two specific functions: transposition of the pure intentional states of affairs into a given ontic sphere, and existential setting. In the symbolic dramas, there is not a typical transposition, or accommodation to the objectively existing states of affairs, but in the historical novels there is a complete connection, which

makes the simulated states of affairs “quasi-incarnated, quasi-present” (Ingarden 171). Ingarden, evoking the representational function of the sentence, and sentence correlates, explains the developed states of affairs as an intentionally projected product of the meaning content. In describing the modes of representation, Ingarden gives a form of genre classification: works where thus-appearance of the object rises at the expense of his inherent qualities (which would be a direct distinction between poetry and prose), texts where the represented state of affairs depict potential stock of meaning (symbolic dramas, naturalistic works, etc.), different meaning material that can change the emotional quality of given text, dramatic/non-dramatic form of literary work, differentiated through the existence of “side text” (stage directions in drama) and main text, etc. The Bakhtinian notion of heteroglossia in the novel may be identified with the correlation of the main, and the side text. This kind of generic implications lead Ingarden to affirmation of the textual beauty as value character:

“The fact that we can orient ourselves through and through in the whole, that we can attain such ‘penetrating perceptions’ at all, and that nothing impedes us in this – the fact that one perception does not cover another and thus prevents us from attaining in one glance a ‘survey’ of the *whole* in all its parts, structures, and elements – all this seems to be involved in the peculiar phenomenon of clarity.” (213)

All of these notions are also determined by the distinction between presentation as reproduction, and representation (in Ingarden’s terminology), or genuine presentation as ideal objectification and representation at Husserl. However, although Derridean definition of “the law of the genre” acquires possibility of genre contamination and destabilization, Fowler affirms the appearance of sub/semi-canonical genres, through which the author can reinvent, and change genre prescriptions: “In sum, prescriptive genre rules are indispensable; without them, normative criticism of any sort would be impossible.” (29)

Macedonian literature of the 19th century provides us with a large genre delineation – from dominant forms (speeches, sermons) to latent, but increasingly present genres (letters, diaries, chronicles, biographies, autobiographies, etc.). The non-existing rules of genre in this discursive heteronomy (the only vivid ones are the rules of church sermons) create a hindrance to a more reliable, and consistent genre theory. In that way, the dislocation of the generic features may be widely observed, as to the fact that they do not pertain to any generic system. This heterogeneity, and the justification of this ambivalence can also be found in the theoretical accounts of Mikhail M. Bakhtin. He speaks of “speech genres” as methodological proof of the connection between individual speech act, and the previous (future) contexts. Tzvetan Todorov in his study of Mikhail Bakhtin considers genre as a central point of literary

history, since it is positioned between the history of society, and the history of language. (52) Pavel Medvedev also affirms the formalistic definition of genre as fallacy of a certain kind, since genre is being understood as form of grouping, according to one dominant principle. That is why Bakhtin reworks this old-fashioned statement, and percepts genre as “a typical whole of artistic enunciation, its whole, completion, and justification. The problem of completion is one of the crucial problems in the theory of genre (...) Every genre, if it is an authentic one, is a complex system of modes and means of understanding, overcoming, and completion of reality.” (Medvedev 200)

Bakhtin also suggests a sort of typology, according to which genres are a relatively stable forms (types) of utterances, that can be observed as primary and secondary. Primary genres (form family dialogue, novel, letter, to official documents and literary genres) are the primitive utterances studied by the behaviorists, structuralists, unlike secondary genres, which are included in transformation and interaction. Generic forms are less mandatory, and less normative for the speaker, yet more plastic and more vivid, thus creating diversity of its own kind (Бахтин, “Проблеми речевых жанров” 449). To Bakhtin, speaker (writer) is always free to select the speech genre he is about to employ, thus learning his mother tongue, and social interaction through the process of accepting the given enunciations. Genre finally gives utterance its specific determination, and exclusion from the complete reality, thus connecting it with the intonation, subject of utterance, and its intention (this is the spot where Bakhtin directly opposes the traditional phenomenology).

Genre as modeling component is totally meant in terms of speech qualities and utterances, although Bakhtin’s circumspections respectively overcome the classical dichotomy written/spoken. Throughout Bakhtin’s considerations of genre, the idea of heteroglossia becomes its vital part – the ability to incorporate “a speech into a speech, utterance into (and of) some utterance” (“Marksizam i filozofija jezika” 128). This kind of framing here alludes to the main point of our article as well – sort of historical perspective, through which genres can be specified, and determined as diachronic. That is why Bakhtin reveals a four folded structure into the whole historical perspective: authoritative dogmatism (rendering medieval literature as part of this period), characterized by the tendency to exclude, and separate the two speeches (through the dominance of the direct speech, and the content over the form); rationalistic dogmatism throughout 17th and 18th century (stigmatized with the dominance of modified direct speech, and the analytic modification of the indirect); realistic individualism (18th and 19th century, Renaissance, observed through the deletion of the borders between the authorial voice and the voice of the Other, highlighted

in comments and retorts), and relativistic individualism, which designated the whole modern literature, especially discernible at Bely, Dostoevsky, etc. as a dissociation of the authorial context into the manifested voice of the Other.

Although Bakhtin's analysis rearranges and inspects the syntactical changes into the structure of a given literary work, his statements can be fully accepted as valid – in the 19th century Macedonian literature a sort of belatedness can well be noted (concerning Bakhtin's concept), and the way how authorial context dissolve into the otherness denotes a sort of residual dogmatism (rationalistic), that can be analyzed through the living authorial voice, which can be found in a modified context where the voice of the Other is penetrating. This type of interference marks this whole period, thus creating a possibility for this specific kind of literature to claim its original status, and differential position into the artistic world. Although Bakhtin speaks of value stance, the variety of determinations (as well as the four folded classification) does not include a specific value character, that is imposed onto the literary field (or renderings, such as significant, well-prepared, artistic, more successful literature, etc.). This is the reason why this kind of formulations should be avoided when it comes to the 19th century Macedonian literature as well.

In order to achieve a justified account of this process of dislocation, we focus our analysis on two significant texts in Macedonian literature of the 19th century: the narrative "Proshedba" (A Stroll) by Rajko Zhinzifov, and the autobiographical novel "Avtobiografijata" (Autobiography) by Grigor Prlichev. Zhinzifov's short novel (narrative, sketch) is a crucial part of Macedonian literature, since it marks out the beginning of specific narrative discourse as a form of short travelogue, characterized with a sort of new glance, renewed experience. There is nothing between its dominant elements that gives us right to render this text a short novel (except the author's paratextual note, which describes the significance of genre determination). However, this qualification is followed by two proverbs, one affirming the way of addressing the evil (designating the national and the religious subjugation of Macedonians), and the other underlining the beauty and importance of folk inheritance. These two elements can be seen as a signal of metatextuality as well (Genette 4), since the component of significance is far beyond the technical element that paratext involves – here a specific critical relationship with Dimitrija Miladinov is derived, and with his activity in rousing people's deliberateness of vernacular language, folk education, and religious sermons. At the same time, it also characterizes the whole context of Macedonian literature of the 19th century.

This narrative discourse begins with a long description of the beauties of Macedonian nature. These passages, which are present in diverse places through the text, designate the implicit romantic poetics, saturated with lyrics, and emotional stances: changing of colors in form of contrast, impossibility of finding adequate words to describe, and a sort of decontextualization – narrator’s judgment of contemporary French fashion dissolves into his figure, since he is described as a young man smoking a French cigarette (where we can see the typical author’s comment in dialogue with the narrator’s). The specific narrative ideology is then transformed into a vivid discussion of churches, and their economic situation. This image, previously determined by their arrival at uncle Stojan’s house, again depicts the existence of confronting accents (the Ottoman and Greek political and religious influence versus people’s voice), although the dominant ideological standpoint is realized in a form of polemics. The appearance of narration concerning events, characters, situations is subordinated to a certain ethnographical description of rituals and customs, in contrast to the concrete deeds and actions of the day-to-day life. The factual dislocation of dominant accents can be found particularly in the description of Zdrave’s and narrator’s clothes – detailed image of the clothe components on the one hand dislocates the persistent ideology, which makes fun of this unusual practice, but on the other it underlines the dominant voice by rendering it good, and desirable: “In that moment they brought us two woolen pillows, home weaved, and filled with straw; they bend them over, since we were dressed up by the latest fashion, i.e. in French style: in white trousers, white vest, white silky collar, small fez medzidie, all stylish, and covered with pomade. When we sat down, the little children started to laugh, because our tight pants did not allow us to sit freely, and one of them (it was obvious that he was more sharp minded) shouted: - A stork! A stork!- and a guffaw spread out among kids. – Oh, you, son of a bitch!- cried out the old man. – Catch him! ” (Жинзифов 153).

Consequently, the narrative draws out the most important figures of Macedonian cultural heroes as a direct intertextual bond with the past, and focuses on the significance of the “written word”. This element evokes several implications – Derrida, considering the existence of phenomenological voice as a creator of “geistige Leiblichkeit” (in Husserl’s words “living presence”) treats genesis as non-existence, and gives to writing a privileged position (Vlaisavljević 20-24). In Husserl’s terminology, genesis has 5 levels: authentic evidence, retention, remembering, communication, and writing. In Zhinzifov’s narrative, the notion of historical retention is actually a remembering, transformed and enriched with certain colloquial mundane re-telling (a sort of story). There is a kind of story in initiation,

narrated by uncle Stojan (the possibility of illegal marriage of his son). Instead of conveying a truthful and simple event, Zhinzifov decides to implement such an occasion, through which the common knowledge and rituals are being reinvestigated: “The ruddiness of their cheeks was gone; their faces were not white nor yellow. A heartfelt bitterness was obvious; a sorrow in their souls. When heart is in pain, it wishes to relieve itself from that suffering, searching for something better, more free. However, when the heart does not know or cannot achieve what it is looking for, then the tears are its only consolation.” (Жинзифов 159)

The ethnographical description of the village opens up the relationship between the internal and the external qualities and beauty – virtues of people are arranged in a correspondent environment, thus underlining the dominant ideological voice. This quality can be seen as most similar to travel writings: “The nature of a given piece of travel writing depends on its individual mix of informative and poetical components. However, this does not depend solely on measurable, intrinsically textual features, but also on its readers and their interest and filters. (...) In comparison, a typological contrasting of ‘report’ and ‘narration’ can only be of provisional value.” (“Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters” 446) Actually, the main imagological representation is realized as a contrast between what is occidental, and the folk culture, but it deeply affects the genre as well – through travel writings the importance of acquiring a knowledge of the unknown, the Other becomes its *differentia specifica*, and this narrative as a mixture of travelogue, and short story represents an awkward example of the co-existence between the familiar, and the unknown. Leaving all the transparent dominant ideology and moralization aside, which cannot be denied, this narrative also signifies the possibility of existing as other, being as a conflict of tendencies, where the dominant one prevails, but never totally undermines the presence of the different one, consistent in its refiguration and transformation. The co-relation of two voices is something perceptually realized in the whole 19th century Macedonian literature.

On the other hand, Prlichev’s autobiography can be rendered novelistic, since its basic elements show to great extent the possibility of mixing genres, and type of heteroglossia known in the novels overall. Analyzing spatio-temporal unity of the author and the character, Mikhail Bakhtin gives an important observation of meaning unity of the character, describing genre as one of the transgredient meaning moments, through which this character is being artistically completed. Bakhtin juxtaposes the confessions and the autobiography, considering the first as a certain form of “prayer” and “moral” (“Autor i junak u estetskoj aktivnosti” 161), and the second as “the closest transgredient form through which I can artistically



objectify myself, and my life.” (162-163) Although Bakhtin speaks of the whole consisting the author, and the character as distinctive, and diverse, this equivalence is not the primary goal of autobiography (there can be two different types of biographical value modeling of life, similar to chronotope: adventurer, and socially living as non-historical dominance, through which character is shaped). Bakhtin clearly notes the ingeniousness, and consent of the author and the hero into the autobiographical discourse, as well as their necessary experience of themselves as other. Auto/biography considers the reader as transcendent element, and as a person who takes over the author’s assignment.

In Prlichev’s autobiography the element of transgression, and re-contextualization of the reader as an author can be seen at the beginning, where the (author’s/narrator’s) final decision to write is directly related to the question, and the action of reading. Natasha Avramovska inspects Lejeune’s “autobiographical deal” (37), stated as author’s confirmation of the authorship. The naïve correlation between the author and the hero implies the pragmatic context. Prlichev describes the most important moments of his life, actualizing a discreet literary relation with Homer’s “Iliad”, which he had translated fourteen years before he wrote his autobiography. This autobiography consists of several inserted stories, which trace the novelistic background of the text. His mother as a character is the holder of heteroglossia – she is described as a typical Homeric hero, but the gender qualification (she is woman, after all) position the internal polemics, and the social perspective (she is working as a labourer “in the houses of the others”). This kind of conflict of accents can be widely seen through the scene, where the enunciated blessing is actually a reproach transferred through the mode of irony. The specific act of character’s shaping can also be seen through the narrator’s melancholy, as a rendered feminine sickness, according to Schiesary (93-95). Chronology, and historical events follow the experiences, and the dominant emotional moods of narrator, which is an interesting example of duality, in the same way that we can note the mother as an adventurer character versus narrator as a socially dominant type (that in fact destroys the proposed Bakhtinian model of chronotope).

Prlichev’s mother Neda, depicted as a classical antique hero, also has a unique development – from the alleged divinity to her fall (namely, the scene of her falling of the black mulberry implies the existence of duality in her character, and displacement in a form of rearranged masculinity): “- It is nothing, - she said, lifting her head, and she saw her middle finger of her right hand sprained between the first and the second ankle, terribly twisted. Although she was dizzy from the fall, she started to pull her dislocated finger with all of her strength, until the bones creaked and set themselves into their physiological state. ”

(Прличев 56) One of the main elements in Prlichev's autobiography is his acquaintance with Dimitrija Miladinov, directly confronted with the dominant ideology (Greek education and sermons). The effect of imagological appearance conveyed in a form of polemics again states a crucial difference – the ideal of antique Greek heritage is opposed to the contemporary subjugations, thus it can be noted that the image of the Other is only a result of tendencies, and systematic oppressions (again juxtaposed with Prlichev's idealization of antique moral qualities).

There is a whole chapter dedicated to his artistic creation of the poem "Serdarot" (Sirdar), which is an authopoetical dialogue with the other as oneself. After the indicated death of Brothers Miladinov, this autobiographical discourse becomes more critical, and at the same time more a form of chronicle of events. The way Jakim Sapundziev and Prlichev involved into the spread of national education is related to achieving an economically higher status, and new position toward his mother. Here, a metatextual comment intersects the narration: "I would like to tell you something else: the described Neda in 'O Armatolos' is my mother, and Neda's dream is my mother's dream. It is so true that mother's love helps writing as well." (Прличев 80-81) Prlichev's stay in the prison in Debar inserts another story in the whole, especially through the medium of the dream, which anticipates the recent rescue (here, a form of divine help as a chivalric chronotope element is noticeable, especially if we take into account the Hellenistic influence over Renaissance literature). Another hybrid component can be observed – the stay in the prison during the Ramadan feast (in accordance with the national, and religious Other) is a perfect presentation of specific autobiographical poetics: hero is experiencing himself as another entity, enforced with the whole situation of identity's change, again allusive in intertextual sense. However, the end of this autobiography underlines another displacement – discourse becomes aggravated, and transforms into an intimate confession of author's inherent state. He is hardly disappointed with the perception of his "common Slavic" translation of the Homer's "Iliad", and this description reaffirms the monological stance, and value point of view. Until the end, all of the nuances discernible in this autobiography become unilateral, and merge into one dominant accent. However, this does not diminish the beauty of this polyvalent structure, which labeled the whole epoch as creatively new, and literary alive.

If we take into account all of these ways of creating generic heteronimity in the 19th century Macedonian literature, we can observe the kind of generic prescriptive rules shaped into an ideological horizon, that does not discriminate other value stances, and represent an exile for socially, and nationally subjugated peoples/authors.

## Works cited:

1. Аврамовска, Наташа. *Автобиографијата во македонскиот литературен 19 век*. Скопје: Институт за македонска литература, 2004.
2. Бахтин, М. М. “Проблеми речевых жанров”. Во *Литературно-критические статьи*. Прир. С. Г. Бочаров и В. В. Кожин. Москва: Художественная литература, 1986. 428-472.
3. Bahtin, Mihail (V. N. Vološinov). *Marksizam i filozofija jezika*. Prev. Radovan Matijašević. Beograd: Nolit, 1980.
4. \_\_\_\_\_. *Autor i junak u estetskoj aktivnosti*. Prev. Aleksandar Badnjarević. Novi Sad: Bratstvo-Jedinstvo, 1991.
5. Biti, Vladimir. *Pojmovnik suvremene književne teorije*. Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska, 1997.
6. Derida, Žak. *Glas i fenomen: Uvod u problem znaka u Husserlovoj fenomenologiji*. Prev. Zoran Janković. Beograd: Istraživački izdavački centar SSOS, 1989.
7. Fowler, Alastair. *Kinds of Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.
8. Genette, Gérard. *Palimpsest: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Channa Newman and Claude Doubinsky. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1997.
9. *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters*. Eds. Manfred Beller and Joep Leerssen. Amsterdam-New York, Rodopi B. V., 2007.
10. Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art*. Trans. George G. Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.
11. Marino, Adrian. “Toward a Definition of Literary Genres”. *Theories of Literary Genres*. Ed. Joseph P. Strelka. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978. 41-56.
12. Medvedev, Pavel. *Formalni metod u nauci o književnosti*. Beograd: Nolit, 1976.
13. Прличев, Григор. *Избор*. Прир. Томе Саздов. Скопје: Мисла, 1991.
14. Reichert, John. “More Than Kin and Less Than Kind: The Limits of Genre Theory”. *Theories of Literary Genres*. Ed. Joseph P. Strelka. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978. 57-79.
15. Ricoeur, Paul. *Memory, History, Forgetting*. Trans. Kathleen Blamey and David Pellauer. Chicago and London: Chicago University Press, 2006.

16. Schiesari, Juliana. *The Gendering of Malancholia: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, and the Symbolics of Loss in Renaissance Literature*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1992.
17. Stahl, Ernest L. "Literary Genres: Some Idiosyncratic Concepts". *Theories of Literary Genres*. Ed. Joseph P. Strelka. University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1978. 80-92.
18. Todorov, Tzvetan. *Mikhail Bakhtin, le principe dialogique*. Paris: Edition du Seuil, 1981.
19. Vlaisavljević, Jugoslav. "Fenomenologija i gramatologija". *Vo Glas i fenomen: Uvod u problem znaka u Husserlovoj fenomenologiji*. Prev. Zoran Janković. Beograd: Istraživački izdavački centar SSOS, 1989. 11-29.
20. Жинзифов, Рајко. *Одбрани творби*. Прир. Гане Тодоровски. Скопје: Мисла, 1981.

## Literary Genres in the 19th Century Macedonian Literature and the Dislocation of the Predominant (Authorial) Voice

(Abstract)

**Keywords:** genre, autobiography, short narrative, generic heteronimity

The specifics of the 19th century Macedonian literature to great extent goes beyond the strict genre issue, and opens up questions about the factual position of the variety of genres, that experience expansion and impossibility of genre systematization. On the other hand, treating the levels of heteroglossia (according to Mikhail M. Bakhtin), we have the opportunity to reveal how is it possible for one explicitly linear style (such as the medieval literary canon) to be outgrown by its offspring – pictorial style (in the Macedonian literature of the 19th century we can detect the beginning of the co-existence between the authorial and the narrative voice). We dedicate our inquiry to depicting the characteristic elements of that process concerning two specific examples – the autobiographical discourse in “Avtobiografijata” (Autobiography) by Grigor Prlichev, and the short story “Proshedba” (A Stroll) by Rajko Zhinzifov. At the same time, the variety of literary genres in that period provides us with a wide range of comparison overall. The fact that Prlichev’s autobiography is more than that – it comprises of several novel elements (spatio-temporal confrontations, merely assigned genre specification, divided subjectivity, different/confronting value stances, etc.) only confirms the validity of vast genre delineation. As to the Zhinzifov’s narrative, the absence of a wider plot structure (the fact that “nothing” actually happened) determines this short novel as very similar to the travel writings of that period (usually defined through their ethnographic, playful mode of historicity, and the distinctive range of fiction). The endeavor to acquire narratological and phenomenological inspection should enrich the specific analysis of heteroglossia.

Iskra Tasevska Hadji Boshkova works as an assistant at the Faculty of Philology “Blazhe Koneski”, Ss. Cyril and Methodius University in Skopje, Republic of Macedonia. Her researches and articles are mostly focused on literary theory and cultural studies, and on discursive theory, prose historical and fictional narratives in the 19th century Macedonian literature. Some of her key publications are: *The Novel “Konakchii” as a Center of Interpretative Interferences*. Prilep: Stremezh 3-4, LIV, 2008, 29-40; *The Masked Carnivalization in “Sermon on Festivals” by Kiril Pejchinovik*. Skopje: Annual Collection of the Faculty of Philology “Blazhe Koneski” of the University “St. Cyril and Methodius”-Skopje, vol. 35, 2009, 331-338; *Feministic-Psychological and Cultural Aspects of Femininity*. Skopje: Literaturnen zbor 1-3 и 4-6, год. LV, 2010, 103-112; 131-139; *The Voice of the Other (Heteroglossia) and Its Formal-Discursive Elements Through Mikhail Bakhtin's Theoretical Ideas*. [www.mirage.com.mk](http://www.mirage.com.mk), 24 October 2010; *The Carnavalesque “Monde a l’Envers” and the Parody in the Novel “The Burlesque of Master Perun, God of Thunder” by Rastko Petrovic*. Serbian Studies Research, vol. 1, no. 1, 2010. Novi Sad: Association for the Development of Serbian Studies, 2011, 131-141; *Identity as a Reintegrated Cultural Heritage in Gjorgija Pulevski’s “History”*. Skopje, Spektar (International Literary Science Journal), no. 57, vol. 1, year XXIX, 2011, 199-210.