

Literature, Theory, and the Question of Genders

Thaïs E. Morgan

*I write woman: woman must write woman.
And man, man; it's up to him to say where his
masculinity and femininity are at.*

—Hélène Cixous, “The Laugh
of the Medusa”

*And, as I am a man,
Instead of jutting crag, I found
A woman . . .*

—William Wordsworth, “The Thorn”

What does it mean to say that a male author writes the feminine? Is he writing as (identifying with) a woman? Or writing like (mimicking, and perhaps mocking) a woman? Or writing through a woman (an Other that confirms his own identity as the Same)? The present collection of twelve essays explores these crucial questions about men's role in the construction of femininity in relation to masculinity in literature and in critical theory. The interaction of writing and gender is complex and fraught with cultural significance when the author projects a voice from the imagined perspective of the opposite sex. *Men Writing the Feminine* focuses on novels and poems from three national traditions—British, French, and American—spanning modern (beginning with the 1600s), modernist (after 1900), and postmodern eras, in which male authors write the feminine by

speaking in the voices and describing the innermost thoughts and feelings of women. At the same time, the essays in *Men Writing the Feminine* intervene in current debates about gender by drawing upon postmodern theories in order to analyze how the feminine is represented and (re)created in literature. Are sex and gender separable in writing, or do both sex and gender have the epistemological status of fiction? What cultural effects does each literary instance of men writing the feminine produce? Ultimately, the essays in this collection raise questions about how literary critics and theorists position themselves in relation to today's politics of gender.

Men's Femininities

Part One of *Men Writing the Feminine* begins with four essays on how the feminine is constructed by men in canonical works of poetry and fiction. The first epigraph above, which comes from the work of the French feminist Hélène Cixous, serves to remind us of the long-fought battle between the sexes for the power of language, especially the power to define "woman" in relation to "man."¹ As feminist scholarship in both humanities and social sciences since the mid-1970s has emphasized, "sex," or the physiology of a male or a female body, is not the same as "gender," or the series of cultural distinctions made between persons displaying behavior categorized as either "masculine" or "feminine."² In a now famous article, "The Traffic in Women," the anthropologist Gayle Rubin argues that gender assignment governs the economic as well as the symbolic dimensions of life for both women and men: "The same social system which oppresses women in its relations of exchange oppresses everyone in its insistence upon a rigid division" between femininity and masculinity, or gender identities and appropriate roles in the division of labor.³ It is to the effects of this system of "sexual difference" that Cixous's statement refers: Only men live and experience as men, only women live and experience as women; therefore, only women can speak as/for women and only men can speak as/for men.

If separate worlds obtain for men and women, though, then why and how do men write the feminine? Like many feminists over the last two decades, Cixous is ambivalent about men's relation to feminism as a politico-cultural movement of, by, and for women. (On this topic, see especially Conversation One, page 189.) Having reaffirmed the division between the sexes ("woman must write woman. And man, man"), Cixous nevertheless implies that gender is negotiable and may be aligned with either of the two sexes ("it's up to him to say where his masculinity and femininity are at"). If men can write the feminine (and women the masculine⁴), what happens to the notion of sex as an absolute determinant of the writer's gender identity? Each of the four essays in Part One answers this question differently.

In fact, men have been writing the feminine ever since men began writing: think of Plato's Diotima and Ovid's Sappho, for instance.⁵ But which of the many

constructs of femininity informs each male-authored text? What Toril Moi has called “sexual/textual politics” can be seen in action when men write the feminine in poems and novels throughout the Western tradition.⁶ The first four essays here inquire into the sexual politics of literary texts, but they also reconsider the assumption, widespread in feminist literary criticism and theory, that men always reaffirm their masculinity—their superior placement in the “sex/gender system” or “patriarchy”—when they write the feminine.⁷ The challenge here is understanding the precarious balance between men’s appropriation of the category of femininity in order to strengthen their own authority and men’s attempt to critique masculinity through adopting a feminine (and, in some cases, potentially feminist) position in the system of sexual difference.

In the first essay, “The Mourner in the Flesh: George Herbert’s Commemoration of Magdalen Herbert in *Memoriae Matris Sacrum*,” Deborah Rubin interrogates the several stages in this male poet’s strategic adoption of a feminine persona. Rubin asks us to think about the cultural work of gender involved in the process of mourning a mother by (re)writing motherhood itself. The gender politics of William Wordsworth’s influential poetics is examined by Susan Wolfson in the next essay, “*Lyrical Ballads* and the Language of (Men) Feeling: Writing Women’s Voices.” Significantly, both Herbert and Wordsworth contest the dominant ideals of masculinity in their respective eras by speaking in what were (and still are) considered to be markedly feminine poetic voices. In doing so, however, they reconfirm the definition of “woman” as ineluctably different from “man.” Consequently, Herbert and Wordsworth’s poetry both preserves and crosses fixed boundaries between masculinity and femininity.⁸

In a reversal of the positions typically held by the male and the female writer in the literary tradition according to Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar in *The Madwoman in the Attic*, Carol Siegel, in “Border Disturbances: D. H. Lawrence’s Fiction and the Feminism of *Wuthering Heights*,” finds the male novelist writing the feminine after the model of a strong female precursor.⁹ By adopting Emily Brontë’s voice, Lawrence tries to revise the traditional symbolism that aligns men and masculinity with culture over and against women and femininity’s alignment with nature. But the feminine literary presence in Lawrence’s work also exacerbates his anxiety over the male writer’s loss of authority to the woman writer. The topic of authorship, cultural power, and gender is presented from a different angle in the concluding essay of Part One, Peter Murphy’s “‘To Write What Cannot Be Written’: The Woman Writer and Male Authority in John Hawkes’s *Virginie: Her Two Lives*.” This postmodern male novelist attempts to deconstruct masculinity by imagining a female writer who constantly eludes the traditional sex/gender system, as epitomized by a Sadeian pedagogy for women. But to what degree is the novelist himself implicated in the fictional schoolmaster’s voyeuristic pleasures as he teaches the young heroine how to think and write “as a woman”? And what is the reader’s part in upholding sexual difference as s/he watches—and possibly enjoys—these scenes of instruction in how to perform the feminine?¹⁰

The Gendering Gaze

Men's practice of writing the feminine raises several important questions about desire and power: Is a male author engaging in voyeurism when he writes in a feminine voice about (what he thinks are) the intimate thoughts and feelings of women? Sigmund Freud defines *voyeurism* as an act of sadistic looking in which the subject exerts power over someone else by regarding him or (often) her as a sexual object.¹¹ Looking never comprises just one action but always instigates a sequence of gazes. Thus, the subject of the gaze derives pleasure not only from looking at someone else as a sexual object but also from imagining himself as a sexual object for the gaze of a third party. Developing Jacques Lacan's theory of "intersubjectivity," which stipulates the psychological interdependence of desire for and power over others, Jerry Aline Flieger has suggested that literature involves a triangle of gazes between author, character, and reader.¹² This triangle, as Flieger shows, parallels the narrative structure or "masterplot" that organizes a wide range of literary texts. In psychoanalytic terms, the triangular structure that recurs in literature reinscribes the oedipal triangle of a powerful father (representative of ideal masculinity), a sexually desirable mother (representative of ideal femininity), and the typical subject (presumptively male), who is perforce acculturated into the dominant system of sexual difference.¹³ The theory of the gaze, therefore, has important implications for men writing the feminine and also for the reader of such texts. As a result of "the reader's identification with the writer's desire," which itself is "'misrecognized' as that of the novel's protagonist [or the poem's persona]," we ourselves are always implicated in the complex vectors of desire and power, gender identification and gender crossing, which are mobilized when male authors write the feminine.¹⁴

Part Two, "The Gendering Gaze," consists of four essays that consider the ambiguous positionings of male authors who write the feminine in terms of gender identity, orientation of sexual desire, and cultural power. Béatrice Durand opens this topic with her essay on "Diderot and the Nun: Portrait of the Artist as a Transvestite." Diderot's cross-voicing and cross-dressing as a young girl who is seduced by other women at a convent in *La Religieuse (The Nun)* is a well-known example of literary pornography. Less often noticed, maintains Durand, is the way in which Diderot's performance of the feminine provides the point of departure for his influential work on aesthetics as a philosopher of the Enlightenment. Diderot's writing the feminine thus raises provocative questions about the connection between aesthetics and voyeurism, or between legitimate and illegitimate modes of looking.

In contrast, in "'This Kind': Pornographic Discourses, Lesbian Bodies, and Paul Verlaine's *Les Amies*," Barbara Milech argues that Verlaine's ventriloquism in the sonnet sequence *The Women-Friends* serves as a strategic means of expressing his own homosexuality. Central to the genre of pornography, the voyeuristic gaze that asserts the male looker's absolute power over a female sexual object organizes

Verlaine's poems, too. Thus, Milech concludes, his celebration of feminine desire is suspect: Reinscribing the superiority of masculine over feminine subjectivity, Verlaine's texts implicitly reject the validity of female-female desire by offering lesbians as a spectacle for the male gaze.¹⁵

Yet another literary situation in which the gaze defines gender is discussed by Christopher Benfey in "The Woman in the Mirror: Randall Jarrell and John Berryman." As John Berger has pointed out concerning the representation of women in European oil painting, "woman" consistently appears as the object of desire for male (and heterosexual) artists and art viewers.¹⁶ One of the major motifs through which this construction of the feminine has been transmitted in art is the woman holding, or standing in front of, a mirror. What happens to gender identity—and to cultural authority—when a man poses before and looks at himself in a mirror, as Jarrell does in several poems? Motherhood, too, has been traditionally assigned to the feminine domain: What, then, are the psychological and political effects of Berryman's writing in the voice of a woman giving birth in *Homage to Mistress Bradstreet*? Is the male poet trying to understand the feminine as different and other, or to appropriate motherhood for masculinity (the poem as *his* baby)? Finally, we might ask about the role of the reader in the triangulation of gazes set up in Jarrell's and Berryman's poems: Who is looking at whom, and why?

Part Two closes with Frann Michel's analysis of the power of the gaze, the mobility of gender identities, and the struggle over literary authority in "William Faulkner as a Lesbian Author." As in Lawrence and Hawkes, so in Faulkner, the male novelist projects a feminine voice while retaining an authority that is still aligned with masculinity and its full range of cultural privilege. Also, like Diderot and Verlaine, Faulkner both invites and fends off the feminine in his writing. Indeed, gender-crossing for the male author may entail both misogyny and homophobia.¹⁷ (On these issues, see Conversation Two, page 192.)

Overall, the eight essays in Parts One and Two sound a note of cautious optimism about men writing the gender of the opposite sex. Recently, Jane Gallop, a feminist psychoanalytic theorist, has raised some crucial questions about the sexual/textual politics at stake in the works of influential male writers who attempt "critical thinking connected to the body."¹⁸ Agreeing with H el ene Cixous that "men too must be capable of crossing the divide" of sexual difference, Gallop nevertheless asks us to examine "the ways in which it is both easier and harder for men" than for women to do so: "Harder because men have their masculine identity to gain by being estranged from their bodies and dominating the bodies of others [that is, women]. Easier because men are more able to venture into the realm of the body without being trapped there [as women seem to be]."¹⁹

Postmodern Theories: Beyond Gender?

Men Writing the Feminine is an effort to extend and nuance the conversation between women and men about theories of sexual difference, feminism, and gender

identity which arose during the 1980s. Part Three of this book, "Postmodern Theories: Beyond Gender?," consists of two essays, a position paper, and a pair of conversations: All emphasize the need for further critical thinking about the ways in which gender has been theorized, in particular by psychoanalysis, deconstruction, and, most recently, postmodernism. (On postmodern theories of gender, see Conversation Two, page 192.)

A major theoretical issue throughout *Men Writing the Feminine* is the tension between the sexed body of the author (male) and the double gender-marking of his discourse: performatively feminine but politically masculine. In a well-known essay, "Signature/Event/Context," Jacques Derrida draws a series of distinctions between the person of the author (for example, a body with a penis) and the discourse signed with that author's name (for example, "Charles Dickens").²⁰ "The absence of the sender, the addresser, from the marks he abandons, which are cut off from him and continue to produce effects beyond his presence and beyond the present actuality of his meaning . . . belongs to the structure of all writing."²¹ Derrida's unravelling of the intimate bond between "the man and his work," which is assumed in much literary criticism, has several important implications for men writing the feminine.

First, the "iterability" of an author's signature, which must be detached from the man writing in order for the text written to circulate among readers and to survive his death, ambiguates the literary biographical question: "Who is speaking?" Iterability, or the deconstructive theory of the scission between signifier and signified, language and referent, textual meaning and authorial presence, also applies to the poetics of "voice," or individual style. Can sexual difference in the author's body be directly represented by voice in the language of the text? Yes and no. A text written "in a woman's voice" may be authored by a woman, but it might just as well be authored by a man (or, conceivably, by both together or alternately). When viewed as a conventionalized use of language, then, the feminine is an iterable, imitable gender-"mark" and, hence, not necessarily mimetic of, or equivalent to, the sex of the author's body. The paradoxically repeatable essence of femininity renders it central to the practice of what feminists, including Elaine Showalter and Marjorie Garber, have recently analyzed as literary and critical cross-dressing.²² From a psychoanalytic point of view as well, "womanliness can be . . . worn as a mask," so that no stable boundary can be established between being-a-woman and acting-like-a-woman: "They are the same thing."²³

A second aspect of Derrida's deconstruction of authorship that bears upon *Men Writing the Feminine* involves the "trace," or the idea that for any absolute value to function, it must silently include at least some elements of its very opposite. This necessary but "dangerous supplement" in every term leads to a situation of contradiction ("*aporia*") and to its eventual undoing as an absolute "ground" for truth.²⁴ When placed in the context of gender studies, Derrida's theory of the trace provides a useful way for understanding how hegemonic

masculinity, or “patriarchy,” works in relation to the supplementary category of femininity. Presupposing heterosexuality as a norm, the dominant category of masculinity throughout most of Western cultural history has defined itself as an absolute, superior category in opposition to the devalORIZED category of femininity. Although by definition comprising a set of traits innate in women, femininity is, in practice, also attributed to men who do not conform to the dominant code for masculinity; hence, the marginal category of “effeminacy,” which is a point of much anxiety among the male poets and novelists whose works are analyzed in this volume. In terms of deconstruction, therefore, effeminacy—specifically, the male author’s fear of becoming feminine himself through the act of writing the feminine—is an exemplary case of the trace: Masculinity “always already” bears strong elements of the very femininity from which it seeks to distinguish itself.

The logic of the trace in the politics of gender can be seen in each of the literary texts discussed in Parts One and Two of *Men Writing the Feminine* as well as in the contemporary theories of gender debated in Part Three. For example, Wordsworth (see the second epigraph, above) discovers the feminine—in his poetics, “the spontaneous overflow of powerful feeling”—where he expected to find the hard bedrock of his masculinity as a writer. From a psychoanalytic perspective, the way in which the iterability of writing severs language from physical presence provokes a continuous state of castration anxiety in the male writer. In this sense, his signature at the bottom of a literary or theoretical text written in the feminine becomes a displacement of the phallus—that symbol of cultural power which constantly circulates between men and women without ever being securely possessed by anyone—and thus a form of fetishism.²⁵ At the very same time, men’s activity of writing the feminine may serve to multiply male pleasure and power through narcissism and voyeurism. Certainly, several essays in this volume suggest that adopting a feminine persona enables the male author to feel, think, and say things that are otherwise forbidden to him as a masculine- and heterosexual-identified member of the patriarchy.

The initial pair of essays in Part Three of *Men Writing the Feminine* confronts these and other questions of gender by examining postmodern theories in relation to literature. In “Objects of Postmodern ‘Masters’: Subject-in-Simulation/Woman-in-Effect,” Martina Sciolino deconstructs what the feminist Alice Jardine has dubbed “gynesis,” or the practice of writing the feminine among poststructuralist male theorists, including Derrida, Lacan, and Gilles Deleuze.²⁶ As they “attempt to create a new *space* or *spacing within themselves*” in response to the crisis of the subject and the crumbling of master narratives in the West after the 1960s, leading male theorists seem to have appropriated the feminine once again for their own purposes.²⁷ Like the heroes of postmodern novels by Thomas Pynchon and John Barth, theoretical gynesis depends on a fantasized bigendered male body. Thus, Sciolino argues, such postmodern writing of the feminine ends up establishing a zone for the free play of gender, desire, and power for men only.

Another viewpoint on contemporary debates about gender is offered by

Charles Bernheimer in "Against Aversion: Closing the Gaps in Theory." Like Sciolino, Bernheimer is interested in the sexual politics implicit in deconstruction, which he rethinks through psychoanalysis. This line of inquiry leads him to wonder about the kind(s) of gendered subjects produced by psychoanalytic theory and literary criticism as discourses that assume, and thereby promote, ideals of masculinity and femininity for men and women, respectively. Above all, Bernheimer asks his readers to reconsider the important role that the male body of the writer himself plays in the production of literary theory and criticism. What does a man writing the feminine by engaging in feminist discourse finally mean?

As we in the 1990s continue to ponder the material and cultural effects of the ways in which genders have been represented in literature and in theory, we need to remind ourselves of the recent history of this discussion. One milestone is *Men in Feminism*, a 1987 collection of position papers written by female and male literary critics and theorists.²⁸ (For discussion of this work, see Conversation One, page 189.) Included here, Jonathan Culler's paper, "Five Propositions on the Future of Men in Feminism," delivered on a panel at the Modern Language Association meeting in 1988, is an important document in the ongoing controversy about men's and women's relations to feminism. In order to encourage further discussion, *Men Writing the Feminine* ends with two conversations between myself and Robert Con Davis on the range of issues raised in the present volume. While Conversation One focuses on connections between "Women's, Gay & Lesbian, and Gender Studies," Conversation Two looks at various "Postmodern Theories of Gender," considering their political implications as well as areas for research and debate. The selected bibliography that follows the conversations provides a short list of recent books of interest to those working on literature, theory, and gender.

When men write the feminine, or what they imagine to be women's voices and bodies, their discourse becomes what Mikhail Bakhtin has termed "dialogical": "It serves two speakers at the same time and expresses simultaneously two different intentions."²⁹ Of central importance to the project of *Men Writing the Feminine* is dialogue between women and men in an effort to understand representations of gender in the past and their possible revision for the future. We invite our readers to join us in this venture.

Notes

1. Hélène Cixous, "The Laugh of the Medusa," trans. Keith and Paula Cohen. 1975; reprinted in *The Signs Reader: Women, Gender, and Scholarship*, eds. Elizabeth Abel and Emily K. Abel (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 279–97.

2. See, for example, Nelly Furman, "The Politics of Language Beyond the Gender Principle?," in *Making a Difference: Feminist Literary Criticism*, eds. Gayle Greene and Coppelia Kahn (New York: Methuen, 1985), 59–79; and Cynthia Fuchs Epstein, *Deceptive Distinctions: Sex, Gender, and the Social Order* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988).

3. Gayle Rubin, "The Traffic in Women: Notes on the 'Political Economy' of Sex," in *Toward an Anthropology of Women*, ed. Rayna R. Reiter (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1975), 180.
4. For a theoretical discussion of women writing the masculine, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, "Across Gender, Across Sexuality: Willa Cather and Others," in *Displacing Homophobia: Gay Male Perspectives in Literature and Culture*, eds. Ronald R. Butters, et al. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1989), 53–72.
5. On the centrality of men writing the feminine to the French literary tradition, see Joan de Jean, *Fictions of Sappho, 1546–1937* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
6. Toril Moi, *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory* (New York: Methuen, 1985).
7. The term "sex/gender system" is still widely used in American feminist theory in the social sciences, as, for example, Epstein's book, *Deceptive Distinctions*, shows.
8. On the importance of boundaries in sexual politics, specifically from the perspective of the male writer "embattled with the patriarchal terms of [his] gendered construction," see *Out of Bounds: Male Writers and Gender(ed) Criticism*, eds. Laura Claridge and Elizabeth Langland (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1990). As the introduction states, this volume "concentrate[s] on language, voice, and form": if literature represents "the experience of individuals," then it is "formal innovation" that enables male writers to engage with "the feminine" (12, 17).
9. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic: The Woman Writer and the Nineteenth-Century Literary Imagination* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979).
10. On gender as a performance rather than a natural state, see Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 1990): "gender proves to be performative—that is, constituting the identity it is purporting to be. In this sense, gender is always a doing" (25).
11. See, for instance, Sigmund Freud, "Instincts and Their Vicissitudes" in *The Standard Edition of the Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. 14, esp. 125–40.
12. Jacques Lecan, "Seminar on 'The Purloined Letter,'" trans. Jeffrey Mehlman, *Yale French Studies* 48 (1976): 39–72. Jerry Aline Flieger, "The Purloined Punchline: Joke as Textual Paradigm," reprinted in *Contemporary Literary Criticism: Modernism through Post-Structuralism*, ed. Robert Con Davis (New York: Longman, 1986), 277–94.
13. For a feminist critique of the psychoanalytic theory of triangulation and the gaze, see Kaja Silverman, *The Subject of Semiotics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1983), esp. chapters 4, 5.
14. Flieger, "The Purloined Punchline," 283.
15. On the representation of lesbians as surrogates for male-male desire in nineteenth-century literature and art, see Thais E. Morgan, "Male Lesbian Bodies: The Construction of Alternative Masculinities in Courbet, Baudelaire, and Swinburne," *Genders* 15 (Winter 1992), 37–57.
16. See John Berger, *Ways of Seeing* (New York: Penguin, 1978), 36–64.
17. On the double force of misogyny and homophobia in nineteenth-century

literature written by men, see Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick, *Between Men: English Literature and Male Homosocial Desire* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1985).

18. Jane Gallop, "Thinking Through the Body," in *Thinking Through the Body* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1988), 1–9.

19. *Ibid.*, 7.

20. Jacques Derrida, "Signature/Event/Context" in *Margins of Philosophy* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 309–30. For another important critique of the relationship of author and works, see: Michel Foucault, "What Is an Author?" in *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, ed. and trans., Joseph Harari (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1979), 141–60.

21. *Ibid.*, 313.

22. Elaine Showalter, "Critical Cross-Dressing: Male Feminists and the Woman of the Year" in *Men in Feminism*, eds. Alice Jardine and Paul Smith (New York: Methuen, 1987), 116–32. Marjorie Garber, *Vested Interests: Cross-Dressing and Cultural Anxiety* (New York: Routledge, 1991). See also Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, "Cross-Dressing and Re-Dressing: Transvestism as Metaphor" in *No Man's Land*, vol. 2: *Sexchanges* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 324–76.

23. Joan Rivière, "Womanliness as Masquerade," rpt. in *Formations of Fantasy*, ed. Victor Burgin et al. (London: Methuen, 1986), 38.

24. Derrida focuses on the "trace" and the "supplement" in relation to "différance" in the section on "Writing and Telecommunication" in "Signature/Event/Context," 311–21.

Derrida discusses the "dangerous supplement" in connection with Jean-Jacques Rousseau in pt. 2, ch. 2, *Of Grammatology* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976), 144–64.

25. On fetishism in Lacanian theory, see Jane Gallop, *The Daughter's Seduction: Feminism and Psychoanalysis* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1982): "The phallus, unlike the penis, is lacking to any subject, male or female" (95).

26. Alice A. Jardine, *Gynesis: Configurations of Modernity* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1985), 25, her emphasis. A much discussed example of gynesis, or men writing the feminine in postmodern theory, is Derrida, *Spurs/Eperons*, trans. Barbara Harlow (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1979).

27. Jardine, *Gynesis*, 25.

28. *Men in Feminism*, eds. Alice Jardine and Paul Smith (New York: Methuen, 1987). In 1988, the Modern Language Association convention program featured a panel on "The Future of Men with Feminism, the Future of Feminism with Men" (chaired by Thais E. Morgan), which consisted of position papers by Alice Jardine, Leslie Rabine, Robert Scholes, and Jonathan Culler. Culler's paper is printed in Part II of this volume.

29. Mikhail M. Bakhtin, "Discourse in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination*, ed. and trans., Michael Holquist and Caryl Emerson (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981), 324.