

# A Poverty of Objects

*The Prose Poem and the Politics of Genre*

JONATHAN MONROE



Cornell University Press • Ithaca and London

## Introduction: The Prose Poem as a Dialogical Genre

Les meubles ont l'air de rêver . . .  
(The furniture seems to be dreaming . . .)

—BAUDELAIRE, "La chambre double"

The prose poem today is a genre that does not want to be itself. In a sense, of course, the prose poem has always been the genre that wants *out of* genre and still finds itself, for all that, inscribed *in* genre. In keeping with the prose poem's fundamentally polemical function within the network of genres it seeks to undermine and transform, my own discussions in the chapters that follow are designed expressly to call into question among other things the still prevalent dichotomization of aesthetics and politics, and to present these two categories as a dialectical interpenetration. The descriptions offered here of the genre called the prose poem are thus understood from the outset to be particular *representations* of that genre. Although my procedure involves extensive close readings, I have not intended these readings to be ends in themselves or to serve merely for the elucidation of especially difficult passages. Such passages are numerous in many of the texts I have chosen to discuss, and although I would of course hope my readings might contribute toward their elucidation in ways previously unconsidered, my primary intention has been to examine individual texts as, in Fredric Jameson's words, "'utterances' in an essentially collective or class discourse."<sup>1</sup> Measuring what the genre has been and is against what it has gestured toward becoming at crucial moments in its history,

1. Fredric Jameson, *The Political Unconscious* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1981), p. 80; hereafter cited as *PU*.

this book offers a reading of the prose poem which sees its literary-historical significance as above all that of a critical, self-critical, utopian genre, a genre that tests the limits of genre.<sup>2</sup>

In *The Political Unconscious*, Jameson identifies two types of hermeneutic, a positive hermeneutic that emphasizes affinities and identity, thereby tending to filter out historical differences, and a negative hermeneutic that would seek, by contrast, "to sharpen our sense of historical difference" (*PU*, 130). I have attempted in what follows to balance both projects and to take advantage of the "twin reopenings upon history" made available by both approaches to genre (*PU*, 129). If I have tended at times to place a somewhat greater emphasis on connections and continuities among various writers and texts than on discontinuities and ruptures among them, I have done so in part as a response to those kinds of historiography that place too great an emphasis on a given text in isolation, thereby making a fetish of individual differences. In part too, I have done so to brush against the grain of manifest discontinuities, to see strikingly disparate texts as part of what Jameson has called "a single great collective story" (*PU*, 19). In this case, the story concerns a genre fascinating in part precisely because of what has been called its "polymorphism, indescribability and elusiveness."<sup>3</sup> Given those qualities and the highly varied, complex, often close to impenetrable texts I have sought to account for—those of Rimbaud, Max Jacob, Gertrude Stein, and Francis Ponge, in particular—I have been conscious throughout of the difficulty of preventing the often radically nondiscursive language of literature from seeming at times superfluous through the rationalizing discursiveness of critical commentary.<sup>4</sup> This difficulty, common to some extent to all criticism, is

2. I am indebted for the latter phrase to Dominick LaCapra's *History and Criticism* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), in which LaCapra uses a similar formulation with specific reference to Bakhtin's view of the novel (116): "For Bakhtin the novel was a genre that tested the limits of generic classification." As I will argue below, the anti-generic function Bakhtin ascribes to the novel is manifest in the prose poem as well, though on a more microcosmic level.

3. Michel Beaujour, "Short Epiphanies: Two Contextual Approaches to the Prose Poem," in *The Prose Poem in France*, ed. Mary Ann Caws and Hermine Riffaterre (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), p. 49.

4. Seeking to avoid this obstacle in his essay on Rimbaud's *Illuminations* in *Les genres du discours* (Paris: Seuil, 1978), p. 210, Tzvetan Todorov has written that the meaning of Rimbaud's prose poems is precisely that there isn't any meaning (*il n'y en a pas*). Such a reading seems as reductive in its way, however, as the "totalizing" interpretations to which he seeks to offer an alternative, and very much opposed to the "complication de texte" he calls for (207) to replace the standard "explication de texte." Although I agree on the importance of taking seriously what Todorov calls "la difficulté de lecture" (207)

nowhere more evident than for large-scale generic-historical investigations such as the present one, especially for those concerning poetry, which has always been, in part for this very reason, "a step-child of literary sociology."<sup>5</sup>

My project in any case has been to map out what in Jameson's terms might be referred to as the "ideology of form" of the prose poem, to isolate and examine the "essentially antagonistic collective discourses" ("ideologemes") of gender and class which have played such a crucial role, indeed a defining role, in the genre's history. A paradigmatic example of what Jameson has called the "symbolic enactment of the social within the formal and the aesthetic" (*PU*, 76–77), the prose poem dramatizes real antagonisms of gender and class as a conflict between and among various modes of literary discourse as directly and explicitly as any other genre *qua* genre. Apparently a contradiction in terms, the prose poem is, first and foremost, a mode of discourse that speaks against itself in the very act of defining itself. It marks a determined effort to display socio-aesthetic oppositions, conflicts, and apparent contradictions and play out the question of their possible or impossible resolutions. As a paradigmatic genre of *concentrated dialogical struggle*, resembling what Mikhail Bakhtin calls the "novelistic" in its discursive heterogeneity but differing from the novel more narrowly defined by virtue of its brevity and concentration, the prose poem offers a self-

in texts such as the *Illuminations*, I have also attempted to put forward interpretations that would be in keeping with Baudelaire's dictum that criticism should be "partiale, politique, et passionnée." As Theodor Adorno points out, "Actually, art works, notably those of the highest calibre, are waiting to be interpreted": *Aesthetische Theorie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1970), p. 193; *Aesthetic Theory*, trans. C. Lenhardt (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1984), p. 186. All subsequent references will be indicated by AT followed by page numbers for both the original and the Lenhardt translation. Translations have occasionally been modified.

5. Hans Robert Jauss, "La douceur du foyer—Lyrik des Jahres 1857 als Muster der Vermittlung sozialer Normen," in *Rezeptionsästhetik*, ed. Rainer Warning (Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1975), p. 401. The English version of Jauss's essay, "La douceur du foyer: The Lyric of 1857 as a Pattern for the Communication of Social Norms," originally appeared in *Romance Philology* 65 (1975), pp. 201–20; the essay is now available in Jauss's *Aesthetic Experience and Literary Hermeneutics*, trans. Michael Shaw (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982), pp. 263–93. In contrast to the novel, which has been widely considered a paradigm for the literary communication of sociopolitical realities, the lyric is characterized, says Jauss, by a high degree of self-reflexiveness and linguistic overdetermination that make it the most resistant of genres to "the illusion of referentiality" and to referential/discursive modes. Despite this fact, as Jauss goes on to argue, even the lyric does often play a definite and identifiable role in the communication, formation, and legitimation of social norms (pp. 401–34). Rarely, if ever, is poetry *only* nondiscursive, nonreferential.

conscious attempt to offer imaginary/aesthetic resolutions to real contradictions and conflicts. It thus lends itself particularly well to a critical/interpretive rewriting of the discourses of class and gender it so often takes as its objects of investigation and exhibits in intense relationships of dialectical interpenetration and struggle.

Presupposing, with Jameson and Bakhtin, that the normal form of the dialogical is essentially antagonistic, I have examined the individual texts considered here as utterances of a system of class discourse in which class, gender, and generic struggle manifest themselves through the interaction of opposing discourses wrestling with one another for positions of dominance and/or for self-preservation. The prose poem is that place within literature where social antagonisms of gender and class achieve *generic* expression, where aesthetic conflicts between and among literary genres manifest themselves concisely and concretely as a displacement, projection, and symbolic reenactment of more broadly based social struggles. These struggles are themselves constituted by and in the struggles of various discursive practices, including those of gender and class which will be the focal points of the analyses to follow. Accordingly, since the prose poem is itself the genre of a kind of class struggle within literature (a struggle also of gender and/as genre), the prose poem will be considered here as a particularly amenable site for an examination of antagonisms of class and gender generally and the kinds of exclusions that are the preconditions of such antagonisms.

The proper use of genre theory is, as Jameson has remarked, to "project a model of the coexistence or tension between several generic modes or strands," to define the specificity of a given text or code "against the other genre, now grasped in dialectical opposition to it" (*PU*, 141–42). I have therefore attempted in all my readings to focus on the prose poem less in isolation from other genres than as a nexus of generic interactions. In particular, I have tried to show to what extent the prose poem's power has been due to its historically bound subversive relation to competing, better established genres such as the verse lyric and the novel. Formally as well as thematically, the prose poem is a genre, as Tzvetan Todorov has said, "based on the union of opposites." As the "appropriate form . . . for a thematics of duality, contrast, and opposition," it functions as a nexus for the confrontation not only of "prose and poetry, freedom and rigor, destructive anarchy and constructive art,"<sup>6</sup> but also of the individual and the collective, the aesthetic

6. Tzvetan Todorov, "Poetry without Verse," trans. Barbara Johnson, in *The Prose Poem in France*.

and the political. In part because it does so within such a confined space, the prose poem seems exceptionally well-suited for detecting the traces of what Jameson has called the "uninterrupted narrative" of class struggle (*PU*, 20). Exemplifying the symbolic, "counter-discursive" resistance to dominant culture which Richard Terdiman has recently examined in nineteenth-century France,<sup>7</sup> the prose poem is the literary genre in which the repressed and buried reality of this struggle manifests itself most explicitly in terms of the ongoing struggles *among* genres. Such struggles are not merely analogous to the ongoing generic struggles (struggles of class and gender) in society at large. They are rather, as both Bakhtin and Jameson have indicated, the very locus of class struggle within literature.<sup>8</sup> If the uninterrupted narrative of class struggle is accessible, paradoxically, only in fragments, then the prose poem offers itself, by virtue of its rigorously constricted form, as a model for the apprehension of fundamental social as well as more narrowly "aesthetic" conflicts. The prose poem's deliberate formal fragmentation, together with the inclusion of prosaic content it shares with the novel, suggests an awareness that any gesture toward *unmediated* apprehension of the social totality is itself highly problematic and potentially misleading.

In its self-definitions and self-thematizations, the prose poem rejects literature's (especially poetry's) dream of itself as a pure other set apart in sublime isolation, like the idealist/lyrical self, from the more

7. Richard Terdiman, *Discourse/Counter-Discourse: The Theory and Practice of Symbolic Resistance in Nineteenth-Century France* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), p. 343; hereafter cited as *DCD*. Terdiman's conceptualization of the "counter-discourse" stems most directly, as his introduction indicates (42–43), from the Gramscian notions of "hegemony" and "counter-hegemony," notions that have figured in my own approach to the prose poem as genre as well. As the focal point of Terdiman's final two chapters, the model of what he calls *absolute* counterdiscourse, the prose poem occupies a privileged position in his argument. In contrast to the investigation of the prose poem that the present work offers, which was close to completion when *Discourse/Counter-Discourse* appeared, Terdiman's analysis of the genre is devoted primarily to Mallarmé (with a fair amount of attention as well to Baudelaire and considerably less to Rimbaud and Lautréamont). Despite this major difference—as the underlying importance to both our projects of the key notions of hegemony, ideology, and discursive resistance in part suggests—Terdiman's general theoretical arguments converge in a number of significant respects with the view of the prose poem I develop in this introduction and in subsequent chapters (see especially note 18 below and additional references in the Introduction, the chapters in Part II on Baudelaire and Rimbaud, and the Conclusion). Calling attention to the extent to which, in the prose poem as in other counterdiscursive texts, "the marginal reveals itself as central" (342), Terdiman also draws on the theoretical insights of Jameson and Bakhtin.

8. See also Michel Foucault, *L'ordre du discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971), p. 12 (cited in Terdiman, *DCD* 55), and Terdiman, *DCD*, p. 80.

↑ prosaic struggles of everyday life which all too often "go without saying." Because it demonstrates with such force the utopian desire of both literature and society to open itself up to previously excluded forms of discourse and the social groups associated with them, the prose poem offers a unique opportunity for the study of efforts to absorb, in both the ideological and utopian senses of the word, the previously marginalized. Like the severely constricted *Jetztzeit* that Walter Benjamin projects as the only possible medium for a socialist revolution, the highly compact space of the prose poem and the compressed, even explosive tension it permits are all the genre allows itself for the realization of its aspirations. Both prose and poetry, but neither prose nor poetry exclusively, the prose poem is, as Barbara Johnson has pointed out, the place of confrontation between inside and outside where the distinction between these threatens to collapse. It is also the place where this distinction doggedly maintains itself despite itself. Whether we are speaking of the two words "prose" and "poem," or even of the collapsing of these two words into Ponge's "proème," the prose poem depends for its very existence not only on the continued difference of its two defining terms but even on their continued oppositional status.

It is in this sense especially that the prose poem is, as I have already claimed, a genre that does not want to be itself. Although on the one hand the name "prose poem" suggests a synthetic utopian third term, it also implies the continued irresolution of the two opposing terms that constitute it. To study the prose poem is thus to attend to the desire for a resolution of existing contradictions and antagonistic relations, including what Jameson calls "the reaffirmation of the existence of marginalized or oppositional cultures" (*PU*, 86). It entails an examination as well, however, of the process of the reappropriation, neutralization, and cooptation of a form that originally gestured toward achieving within literature, in the space called poetry—traditionally literature's most exclusive realm—the representation of subordinate or dominated groups. The prose poem marks a crucial moment in literature where the coexistence of various modes of literary production (read genres) becomes, in Jameson's words, "visibly antagonistic" (*PU*, 95).

To approach the prose poem in this way, to examine what we may call after Jameson and Louis Hjelmslev the content of the prose poem's form and of the prose poem as form, is to effect a dialectical reversal whereby the form of the prose poem may be said to carry its own ideological messages. "The strategic value of generic concepts," Jame-

son has said, "clearly lies in the mediatory function of the notion of a genre, which allows the coordination of immanent formal analysis of the individual text with the twin diachronic perspective of the history of forms and the evolution of social life" (*PU*, 105). If, as I believe, Jameson is right in maintaining that the simplest and most accessible demonstration of the kind of reversal mentioned above may be found in the investigation of the notion of genre in general and of one literary genre in particular, then the prose poem offers an especially auspicious place for such a demonstration. Given that the relationship of form and content is finally, as Jameson has indicated, one of interpenetration and mutual dependence, the two may be provisionally regarded as distinct from each another for the sake of analysis. Thus, although I would not disagree with Jameson's assertion that a form's ideological messages may ultimately be identifiable in themselves (*PU*, 99), I have based my own selection and analysis of individual texts and passages on the premise that the persuasive abstraction of such messages depends in large part on the possibility of identifying the manifest or repressed content that accompanies and shapes these messages from within, the content, in short, that informs the form.

Such an emphasis on content as an integral, defining feature of form itself seems especially important for the prose poem, which is, as Todorov and others have noted, a genre remarkable in part for its relative paucity of formal requirements. Accordingly, the prose poem also seems an especially well-suited place to practice a reversal of the formalist emphasis on technical and formal analysis as an end in itself. Although my own readings are grounded in such analysis, with attention as well to what Jameson has called "the active presence within the text of a number of discontinuous and heterogeneous formal processes," my principal interest in the prose poem and my interpretive priorities in approaching it remain inextricably bound up with the special potential I believe the genre affords for an analysis of the interpenetration of the aesthetic and the sociopolitical. This potential may be located especially, as I have suggested, in the prose poem's frequent self-thematizing figurations of the struggle of literary genres and by means of a contentual/thematic focus on concrete manifestations of gender and class struggle. Thus, for Baudelaire, prose (the prosaic) comes to represent something like the intractable medium of what Jameson calls history (*PU*, 102), that "experience of necessity" which imposes inexorable limits on individual as well as collective praxis. By contrast, poetry represents the desire to transcend such limits and

achieve a more authentic integration of the individual and the collective. The prose poem's projected synthesis of the two modes designated by its name—the one the privileged medium of the collective, the other, that of the individual—symbolically enacts the desire to realize such an integration in the more broadly sociopolitical as well as the more narrowly aesthetic sense. By means of its overtly dialogical self-designation and the coexistence its collections establish among discrete individual texts that in themselves enact particular struggles of genre, gender, and class, the prose poem directs our attention to the varying degrees to which dialogue remains latent, manifest, or actualizable, antagonistic, discontinuous, or sequential, the various ways in which dialogue does and does not take place. In this context, it is instructive that, for example, in *Tender Buttons* Stein rewrites the struggle between men and women as a struggle between prose and poetry. These struggles of gender and genre are themselves figured in Stein's text by objects of household labor that are the signs not only of the sexual subordination of women but of their economic subjugation as well, the signs, in other words, of a struggle pertaining directly to class as well as to gender and genre.

Because it gestures toward opening up literature to prosaic speech, themes, and subject matter previously considered unworthy of aesthetic attention, the prose poem serves to legitimate and, at the same time, to undermine literary culture. It legitimates literature most directly by exemplifying literature's willingness to include, if only to a certain extent and on its own terms, what had previously been excluded, its willingness to adapt itself to an increasingly prosaic world—bourgeois, antiaristocratic—in which economic modes of production develop so rapidly that modes of literary production can scarcely hope to keep pace with them. By absorbing what had been considered *other* than literary or “poetic,” the prose poem in Baudelaire's time had the affirmative function (in the Marcusean sense) of displaying literature's openness to the newly hegemonic bourgeoisie, which by the mid-1850s had showed clearly its preference for prose as a literary medium. Writing on the prose poem's entanglement in what he calls the “paradoxes of distinction,” Terdiman points out that one important dimension of the genre's “dialectic of exclusion and approbation” manifests itself in its marked ambivalence toward the widespread, fully functional association of prose with “intellectual egalitarianism” and “literary democratization.”<sup>9</sup> As a critical site of counterdiscursive/class struggle, prose

9. Terdiman, *DCD*, pp. 60, 266–67, and 261–305. On the material basis of this association, see Foucault, *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (Ithaca: Cornell University

offers a forum where social distinctions play themselves out and where the newly ascendent bourgeoisie may *impress* itself with the false image of its own universality. The distinction between poetry and prose in the mid-nineteenth century was thus, as Terdiman indicates, historicized, socialized, and even politicized—as it remains even today—in such a way as to designate “a structure of social power organized around the competition for class hegemony.”<sup>10</sup> Although in this respect the prose poem had a manifestly ideological function at its point of emergence, its function was not merely ideological. Of equal if not greater importance was the utopian potential the genre suggested for an authentic restoration of history's lost voices (I am thinking especially of Baudelaire's poor) and for the dismantling of the rigid barriers of class, gender, and genre all the more firmly in place following the failed revolution of 1848. By problematizing the supposed validity of such barriers, the prose poem also gestured toward the undermining of privilege, including the privilege of the spiritual aristocracy of literature and the man (n.b.) of letters.

Genres are, as Jameson points out, “essentially literary *institutions*, or social contracts between a writer and a specific public, whose function is to specify the proper use of a particular cultural artifact” (*PU*, 106). Seen in this light, the prose poem may be regarded as offering quite an unusual contract as literary contracts go, a contract that seeks to dismantle the very principles of exclusion and property on which contractual agreements—and other literary genres—are based. Although not all writers have approached literature with equal attention to the fact that forms of *literary praxis* are themselves specific forms of *social praxis*, it is nonetheless true that to choose to write in or on a particular genre is also to choose a particular mode of social, not just narrowly aesthetic intervention. Such a choice inevitably involves a struggle with the resolution of social as well as aesthetic problems that

Press, 1977), p. 200 (cited in *DCD*, 56) and the extremely useful and informative chapter in *Discourse/Counter-Discourse* (117–46) on the rise and proliferation of newspaper culture (see also my references to the latter in chapter 3 below).

10. Terdiman, *DCD*, p. 267; see also pp. 274 and 311: “The opposition between ‘poetry’ and ‘prose’ might have remained abstract, purely descriptive, and theoretically reversible in some imaginary conjuncture. But in the nineteenth century it carried a highly charged and irreducibly normative signification”; “Oppositions like these are never created *ex nihilo*, this one had already been broadly institutionalized (and had thus been constituted as an unavoidable social meaning) as early as *Illusions perdues*.” On the difficulties inherent in attempts to define poetry and prose in purely formalistic terms and the fundamentally normative character of the notion of “literature,” see chapter 1 of Mary Louise Pratt's *Toward a Speech Act Theory of Literary Discourse* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1977); cited in Terdiman, *DCD*, pp. 60, 296.

are finally not separate problems at all, even if we often tend to see them as such because of the reified specializing consciousness capitalism has so contributed to developing.

In its very beginnings the prose poem anticipated the kinds of reversals of hierarchically dominant oppositional terms which the work of Jacques Derrida and his followers exemplifies. Such reversals may have, as Jameson has indicated, both an ideological and a utopian function. To the extent that prose had already become in the mid-nineteenth century the clearly preferred genre of the bourgeoisie, Baudelaire's turn to prose poetry merely acknowledges the power of the tastes of the newly ascended class. By turning to the prose poem, Baudelaire participates in the bourgeoisie's triumph and extends the field of its dominance to encompass the previously sacrosanct terrain of the lyric. Prose now occupies the terrain of poetry, and its conquest may itself be seen as an aesthetic projection of the bourgeoisie's triumph over the aristocracy. The prose poem thus served ideologically, in Baudelaire's day, as evidence both of the prosaic triumph of the class of prose par excellence and of the bourgeoisie's poetic self-image and aristocratic pretensions. On the other hand, from a utopian perspective the prose poem's incorporation of marginalized prosaic discourse may be seen as gesturing toward a salutary reinsertion of the "sovereign" lyrical subject into a sociopolitical context, a willingness to see this subject, in contrast to more conventional lyric poetry, as irrevocably inscribed in aesthetic and sociohistorical spheres of struggle. Printed in the same block format and of approximately the same length as a short newspaper article—the mode of printing against which Mallarmé would later direct his *Un coup de dés*—the prose poem offers, from the look of it, a more accessible medium than, say, the alexandrine-based verse lyric. The prose poem's apparent democratization, however, like that of the bourgeois society in which it is born, shows itself almost immediately for the *formal* contract it is, a *paper* contract both real and imaginary. If the prose poem's block print and brevity make it look accessible, like a newspaper article, to those with only minimal literacy and verbal sophistication, the genre's polemical tendencies risked from the very beginning making potential bourgeois readers decidedly uncomfortable, if not openly hostile. Already apparent in the suppression during his own lifetime of poems such as Baudelaire's "Assommons les pauvres!", this risk becomes even clearer in the genre in the work of such later writers as Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Stein, and Jacob.

Proffering and withdrawing its democratizing formal gesture in

one and the same motion, the prose poem is utopian because and in spite of being ideological, ideological because and in spite of being utopian. As the conspicuous other of aristocratic/poetic discourse, the "prosaic" functions in a similar way within the prose poem. In its role as the bourgeoisie's very image of a one-dimensional, linear, uncomplicated use of language, prose is allowed by the prose poem to enter into literary language—of which poetry may be regarded as the "purest" mode—and participate in it more or less fully, to enjoy, as it were, its privileges. In its role as the language, on the other hand, of the mass of oppressed people left behind by the bourgeoisie's ascendancy to power, prose remains the marginal or else coopted speech of the house of literature where only those may enter who, as the poor of "Les Yeux des pauvres" put it, are *other* than they. For all this, Baudelaire's prose poetry does gesture toward including the speech of the marginal and the oppressed previously excluded from poetry. This gesture has a manifestly utopian as well as an ideological function, and the one is not less real or less significant in its effect than the other at the historical moment of its emergence. Even if the ideological does win out for the moment of the prose poem's appearance with Baudelaire and afterwards, it is still possible to retain glimpses of the genre's status as what Bloch might call a repository of (albeit largely unrealized) utopian possibilities.

The novel, for Bakhtin, is not just one genre among others. It is the genre where genre's autocritique takes place through the parodying of other genres *as genres* and through the exposition of the conventionality of their forms and their languages.<sup>11</sup> In those eras when the novel becomes the dominant genre, Bakhtin writes, all literature gets caught up "in the process of 'becoming,' and in a special kind of 'generic criticism'" (*DI*, 5). In this sense, the prose poem at its emergence in the hands of Baudelaire under the sign of the ascendancy of the mid-nineteenth century realist novel and the daily newspaper may well be considered a paradigmatic "novelization" or "prosification" of the verse lyric. Although the prose poem's polemic later shifts to some extent, in the prose poems especially of Rimbaud and Jacob, toward a

11. Mikhail Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist, ed. Michael Holquist (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981); hereafter cited as *DI*. My thanks to Satya Mohanty for insights gained in discussions of Bakhtin's work pertaining to the arguments contained herein.