

UC Berkeley

UC Berkeley Previously Published Works

Title

Real-time literary texts

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/77k9010p>

Journal

College English, 82(1)

ISSN

0010-0994

Author

Lucey, M

Publication Date

2019

Peer reviewed

Real-Time Literary Texts

Michael Lucey

INTERACTION AND SOCIAL INDEXICALITY

When linguistic anthropologists examine scenes of verbal exchange, they are usually interested in parsing the coconstruction by the participants in some such scene of what we could call a *real-time interactive text*.¹ That is, they view participants as drawing on a repertory (shared to an undetermined degree) of languages (one, or more than one), speech genres, linguistic registers, cultural forms and concepts, recognizable social roles and agendas, in order to arrive at an exchange that constitutes a coherent text, an interaction that makes sense, even if, quite conceivably, it makes a different kind of sense to different participants. Linguistic anthropologists are thus, like literary critics, analysts of texts, and what follows is an effort to imagine what literary and cultural critics might learn about their own critical and textual practices by observing the way linguistic anthropologists work with texts and the concepts and methods they use to explicate them.²

Linguistic anthropologists observe verbal interactions and record and/or transcribe them. Often, they will want their transcriptions to reveal more than just words. Aspects of prosody, the pace of an utterance, the way utterances overlap, where and how long silence occurs, when speakers make eye contact, when they avert their gaze—these are only a few of the aspects of a verbal interaction occurring in real time that linguistic anthropologists might wish somehow to notate in their transcripts (see, for example, Auer) in order to indicate how various elements in the interaction between speakers are contributing to the

Michael Lucey is a professor in the comparative literature and French departments at the University of California, Berkeley. He is the author of *Someone: The Pragmatics of Misfit Sexualities, from Colette to Hervé Guibert* (University of Chicago Press) and *Never Say I: Sexuality and the First Person in Colette, Gide, and Proust* (Duke University Press), along with several other books and numerous articles in modern French literary studies, sexuality studies, and literary and social theory.

shared production of a text that feels coherent (or perhaps that ultimately fails to cohere). Their transcriptions look quite different on the page from many of the texts that literary critics deal with. Despite that difference, we might think there are at least two “real-time” moments in the history of a text that literary critics might want to be attuned to. In seeking that attunement, it may be that linguistic anthropological tools and perspectives can prove useful. The first such moment is the extended one covering the production and initial reception of the text. The second is any salient moment of uptake, some moment when a particular reader takes up a text and somehow responds to it. It is the second moment that will mostly interest me here.³

For linguistic anthropologists, key to understanding the coherence that participants in a real-time verbal exchange aim to achieve collectively and interactively is the semiotic phenomenon of *social indexicality* that is put into play by the participants, the way bits of their contributions to the exchange point to (index) the genres, forms, concepts, roles, agendas, registers that are immanent in the social world and that might be mutually recognized by the participants in the encounter upon their successful actualization by some utterance.⁴ Both the idea of a *real-time interactive text* and the concept of *social indexicality* have interesting ramifications for the way people in different times and places have approached literary artifacts. (I set aside for the purposes of this article the problem of how an artifact earns and holds on to the designation of *literary*.) For instance: What are the different ways in which the readerly encounter with a literary artifact could be said to produce a variant on some kind of real-time interaction? How might answering this question produce new insights into literary textuality, into the experience and the functioning of all the different things that we sometimes include in the term *literary form*? Readers of literary texts, to the extent that they can also take a linguistic anthropological perspective on the encounter in which they find themselves caught up, might thereby discover new ways of thinking about what constitutes form for them (how they have learned to notice something that can be referred to as part of a text’s “form”), about the historicity of the objects they engage with, and about their own sociohistorical formation as agents equipped with certain readerly capacities that allow them to perceive literary objects in certain ways, and to find certain features of those objects to be particularly salient.

I will pursue my exploration here of some issues related to the uptake of literary texts by way of the example of two thinkers about literature whose work reveals how certain kinds of approaches to literary textuality echo with, but also might be pushed in new directions by, linguistic anthropological concepts and methods. I am aiming to sketch out a stance toward literary objects and their uptake that is not only semiotic and pragmatic (i.e., based on an understanding

that linguistic texts, even literary ones, remain instances of language-in-use, where language use is understood as a productive and practical form of action), but also phenomenological in a sociologically rich way (viz., receptive to how phenomenal experience—including of things in the world like books—is conditioned by sociohistorically produced categories and instruments of perception). My two examples are Ross Chambers, who taught French and comparative literature for many years at the University of Michigan, and the renowned French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu, who published extensively on what it means to understand literary and cultural artifacts. (I will mention a few other figures in a number of parenthetical remarks meant to provide a bit of clarity and contrast. Throughout this essay, I will be using these digressions to enlarge the context of the discussion, to index other related discussions with which certain readers may be familiar, to encourage or enhance the interactive potentials of this text.) One reason for choosing Chambers and Bourdieu is that they both had a pragmatic bent in their approach to culture and to literary texts. They also shared an interest in the novelist Gustave Flaubert, and that shared interest will help focus my analysis here.

OPPOSITIONALITY: READING FLAUBERT WITH CHAMBERS

Chambers wrote in the preface to his book *The Writing of Melancholy* (1993) that for him,

texts are understood not as énoncés, statements that might be studied objectively, but as énonciations, utterances whose essential trait is to produce—as a necessary precondition to their existence as texts—a certain interpretive context, without which the communicational act they presuppose cannot take place.

Texts, we might hear Chambers saying, are not just passive objects that a reader picks up and reads passively. Reading is somehow interactive, and the texts themselves participate in that interaction. Chambers continues:

we must therefore have confidence in texts. They know, they respond. They understand far more than we do about the issues we debate; and if one questions them with a minimum of tact and attention, the answer they provide is substantial, profound, and at times surprising. (xii)

Such assertions may at first sound mystical, or they may, on reflection, be taken to contain an implicit understanding of the semiotic relationships that necessarily obtain between written texts, the variety of cultural universes through which they circulate throughout their existence, and the variety of social agents (readers) who interact with them in any number of ways over time. Chambers's understanding of literary uptake is, we could say, dialogical. He was particularly

drawn to texts that he called “oppositional,” ones that in some way “stand in opposition to their context of production” (xiii).⁵ This was because he felt such texts contained an intriguing form of address to a certain kind of reader who would take them up and reactivate them in a later or more distant context that was perhaps better suited to an understanding of the oppositional stance they wished to convey. (Pierre Bourdieu recalls in one of his seminars that the notion of “reactivation” can be found in Husserl [*Reaktivierung*], and that such a reactivation can only happen when a cultural object is “actively reappropriated by a social agent endowed with specific instruments of reappropriation” [*Sociologie générale* 2, 331].)

We can see in Chambers’s model a claim that texts in certain situations of uptake can signal indexically a stance the reader is encouraged to take toward some aspect of their context of origin, and, in parallel fashion perhaps, to some aspect of the context in which they are being taken up. Chambers’s own pedagogical intent in *The Writing of Melancholy* is to encourage an interpretative sensibility to the particular stance signaled in the oppositional texts by figures such as Baudelaire, Flaubert, and Nerval that he studies in his chapters. That is, his effort is to inculcate his readers with, in Bourdieu’s words, “specific instruments of reappropriation” so that the oppositional stance offered in the works he studies can be understood, reactivated in the interaction between the reader of today and the nineteenth-century French text. Chambers works mainly from internal textual evidence, but his goal is to establish that even texts such as *Madame Bovary* that strive for a certain kind of *autonomy* (which might be taken to mean a desire to exist independently—relatively speaking—of any too explicit attachment to or reference to their immediate cultural surroundings) are somehow “duplicitous” in their relation to their surroundings:

When one knows how to read them. . . these texts. . . bear witness against a social system and a political regime that together constitute the ruling order: the cultural hegemony of the bourgeoisie, the reign of capitalism in the economic sphere, and an authoritarian style of government. The duplicity of these texts can be described as “oppositional”. . . for though they do not directly challenge the dominant social order, they nevertheless offer “readable” evidence of fidelity to alternative values. (9)

Understanding what it means to “know how to read” (in Chambers’s words) a novel like *Madame Bovary* in a certain way, to possess the necessary technical skills, is one part of apprehending the ways in which the act of reading can itself be seen as the production of a real-time interactive text.⁶ I will return to this part of the problem in a moment. We should also notice that there is a further order of critical activity we might need to undertake—and this would also be

a linguistic anthropological one—that consists in demonstrating the existence of an oppositional stance (or, indeed, any other kind of stance) in a novel like *Madame Bovary* by reconstructing a set of social-indexical relationships for that text, situating it within a sociotextual array that somehow accounts for—that, in fact, helps to enable—a certain kind of reactivation of the text. Not just studying what is known in literary critical circles as “intertextuality” then, and not just providing basic forms of historical contextualization, but studying the sociosemiotic processes by which a text comes to be, comes into use, acquires meaning, holds onto that meaning, or loses it. Constructing such arrays is perhaps not an act of textual interpretation *per se*, not an act of what we often refer to as “reading,” so much as it is an effort to capture—to reconstruct—an earlier moment in an ongoing semiotic process and to see how that moment in that process might count in the history of what a text is and what it becomes, the history of what it could be said to mean or to have meant.⁷ Based on such arrays, one can argue for or against the plausibility of this or that way of reading a text, or analyze how something that clearly seems to be a misunderstanding about a text at one point in time could have been taken to be a possible approach to it at another moment in time.

To return briefly to Chambers’s pedagogical intent regarding *Madame Bovary* in *The Writing of Melancholy*: it is related to a particular way of reading (or perhaps we could say of “hearing”) the effect of that novel’s use of free indirect discourse (FID).⁸ Before hearing a particular effect—say an ironic or a melancholic one—within an instance of free indirect discourse, it is, of course, first necessary to *notice* the technique itself, to *recognize* it. As Brian McHale wrote some decades ago,

there is of course no question of FID functioning in a given context. . . unless it can be recognized by the reader and interpreted appropriately; recognized, that is, not necessarily as “free indirect discourse” as such (except by stylisticians), but at least as the intrusion of some voice other than (together with) the narrator’s. (264)

Even once a reader is equipped to recognize and appreciate the deployment of free indirect discourse in a given novel, there is still the question of establishing the *feeling* the technique might be meant to produce, the *intonation*, we might say (after Vološinov), that a given instance carries.⁹ (Austen’s free indirect discourse does not feel the same as Eliot’s, and the feel of Flaubert’s is different still, as is that of Zola’s or Beauvoir’s or Sartre’s.)¹⁰ Chambers’s aim is to plead the case for a particular readerly response to the free indirect discourse of *Madame Bovary*, a response that recognizes the “ironic writing of free indirect style” (179) that for him is characteristic of that particular novel and productive of what he is referring to as both melancholy and opposition.

Chambers's pedagogical goal could only be achieved if he successfully made the case that *Madame Bovary* itself stands in a certain relation to its world of origin and if he successfully produced in his reader the capacity to hear what he claims is there to be heard in Flaubert's writing. He stages an interaction between text and reader and invites his own reader to participate in it. A further prong of linguistic anthropological activity might consist not so much in placing the text in a particular sociotextual array in order to provide the support for it to "speak" and be "heard"—to become interactive—in a certain way, not so much in the actual pedagogical reading of the text in a way that produces the ability to hear the oppositional stance it could be said to be voicing, but in a further reflexive examination of the condition of possibilities for that staging of the text, for that act of reading it. Possibilities here might include an examination of the institutional situation—or the sociohistorical moment—in which acts of reading in that manner seem likely to occur; they might include an examination of the circulation of critical discussions of free indirect style itself: How would Flaubert have understood and talked about what he was doing? Why did Beauvoir and Sartre end up learning the practice from Dos Passos instead of from Flaubert? How do the different feelings associated with the different practice come to be experienced by different kinds of readers? How does the use of the practice distinguish one writer from another? How does extended attention to this kind of formal feature distinguish certain reading practices from others? Outside of university classes in literary analysis, how does knowledge of the practice circulate?

INTERACTIVE PROCESSES AND LITERARY TEXTS

Both texts and their readers are, we could say, the product of human labor, produced under certain social circumstances, and somehow responsive to those circumstances. When interactions between texts and readers themselves leave textual traces, those traces become part of a record that can be used in a kind of fieldwork interested in understanding cultural processes of which texts can be taken as precipitates. (For instance, when people turn to discuss transcripts from the 1857 trial for offenses to public decency that *Madame Bovary* provoked, searching for evidence regarding the novel's reception and the early interpretative work that happened around it, this is what they are doing.) In general, as Tom McEnaney and I wrote in our introduction to the special issue of *Representations* on language-in-use and the literary artifact,

seeing literature as language-in-use entails readings focused on the interactivity of literary texts within a broad range of social affiliations and cultural processes. Such "pragmatic" reading involves shifts in attention from solidified text-artifacts

to ongoing interactive processes of utterance and uptake, or from the semantic or representational to the pragmatic and social indexical. (9)

One finds in Proust the description of a point of view that resonates interestingly with Chambers's work and I digress here for a moment to explore this resonance. "Works written for posterity," Proust's narrator tells us at a certain moment, "should be read only by posterity" (105). What he seems to mean is that certain works do not initially encounter a public that is capable of allowing their meaning to unfold, to happen, to come into being, to be heard in a way that does them justice. For certain works, a satisfactory form of uptake is something that can only occur later in time or across time. In fact, such works, Proust's narrator insists, must inevitably be misperceived for a long period, although, as he has it, throughout this period of misperception, the works themselves are slowly performing the additional work of producing people capable of understanding them, or, we might say, of producing people capable of allowing some version of their meaning to be activated. "The work has to create its own posterity" (106). Proust's narrator, we might say, understands the array of meanings that accrue to a cultural object to be a collective production, a sociological phenomenon, one that unfolds over time as a work is exposed to the different publics that accrue to it.¹¹

Proust's novel shows an endless fascination with the sociological ins and outs by which aesthetic objects are used and misused by different publics as their meanings unfold, develop, happen in time. The narrator does, of course, speak in this particular passage as if he believes the future-oriented work's meaning is somehow harbored within it, awaiting the proper moment to blossom once it has produced readers who are the appropriate medium for that blossoming, as if, when the implied reader comes along, such a reader will allow a fully adequate expression (to foreshadow an expression we will see Ingarden using) of the work to emerge. A study of other passages in the novel might lead us to believe that in fact the narrator understands that works, by producing different responses in different readers or listeners, not only interactively contribute to producing their own reception, but they also become a kind of diagnostic instrument providing information regarding the way manners of reading are distributed across the social topography around them. They serve to reveal the way different kinds of publics are distinctively positioned in that topography by their manners of reading.

It might also be the case that works sometimes attract readings that have little or nothing to do with what they harbored for their producer. At the end of his essay "The Production of Belief," Bourdieu cites an interview with Marcel Duchamp in which Duchamp was informed of the work of a critic who had taken

the signature on his readymade urinal “The Fountain”—R. Mutt—as a pun on the German word for poverty, *Armut*. Duchamp disputes this interpretation. Bourdieu takes this as an example of “the injection of meaning and value by commentary and commentary on commentary—to which the naïve but knowing exposure of the falsity of the commentary contributes in its turn.” As Bourdieu goes on to observe:

the work is indeed made not twice, but a hundred times, by all those who are interested in it, who find a material or symbolic profit in reading it, classifying it, deciphering it, commenting on it, combating it, knowing it, possessing it. Enrichment accompanies ageing when the work manages to enter the game, when it becomes a stake in the game and so incorporates some of the energy produced in the struggle of which it is the object. (293)

Let me offer another digression, this time regarding a possible contrasting point of reference with the concept of a real-time interactive literary text that I am laying out here. I am thinking of the confusing distinction that Roland Barthes makes between *work* and *text* in his oft-cited 1971 essay “From Work to Text.” That essay, which held pride of place in an influential anthology from 1979, *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, edited by Josué V. Harari, had an outsized influence on a generation of critics, exerting a shaping force on the way some people distinguished between different kinds of writing. While it might seem to some that what I am discussing here has a relation to notions of textuality that have often been associated with the term *post-structuralist*, I don’t believe that to be the case. Barthes, for example, wrote, in distinguishing between work and text, that “the work is a fragment of substance, occupying a part of the space of books (in a library for example), the Text is a methodological field. . . the work can be seen (in bookshops, in catalogues, in exam syllabuses), the text is a process of demonstration” (156–7). Sometimes it seems in Barthes’ essay that certain printed matter had no chance of ever achieving the status of text: “there may be ‘text’ in a very ancient work, while many products of contemporary literature are in no way texts” (156). Sometimes it seems Barthes suggests that certain writers could only produce “text” and never a “work”: “literary manuals generally prefer to forget about Bataille who, in fact, wrote texts, perhaps continuously one single text” (157). Sometimes it seems that Barthes suggests that some readers were only suited for, or some acts of reading were only appropriate to, “works.” Such readers might demonstrate an incapacity to see “text” where it existed: “The work is normally the object of a consumption. . . In fact, *reading*, in the sense of consuming, is far from *playing* with the text” (161–2). Barthes is making, it would seem, a somewhat incoherent normative distinction. The passages from Proust cited earlier, like Chambers’s

particular interest in oppositional literature, might also seem to suggest that some works, perhaps particularly difficult ones, ones that are formally challenging, are most given to being interactive; but in fact the point to hold onto is that all acts of uptake of written material—not just literary, and not just prose, although that is my focus here¹²—are subject to these interactive conditions involving the social history of both the text and the reader. The oppositions Barthes worked with in the early 1970s—not just work/text, but also the distinction between readerly and writerly from *S/Z*—seem to lack pertinence here.¹³

BOURDIEU AND BOOKS AS SOCIAL OBJECTS

In October 1982, in one of his early seminars at the Collège de France, Bourdieu noted that a book is merely a physical object until it is in the process of being read. Then it becomes a social one:

The physical object that a book is only turns into a social object when it meets its other half, the incorporated half that is the reader or, more exactly, the social subject or the social agent endowed with the dispositions that prompt them to read and that give them the capacity to decipher it (for these are the two dimensions of the habitus: the “inclination to” and the “capacity to”). (*Sociologie générale* 1 231–2)

A bit later, Bourdieu will reflect upon the question as to who has (or had or will have) the capacity and the inclination to read this or that book along the lines it proposes or to listen intently to this or that musical performance and catch elements unprepared ears have missed. “If you always keep in mind that this object is, in and of itself, made to function in relation to a habitus, you can then seek in the object lots of clues or indexes [*indices*] through which it attempts to manipulate in advance a habitus or to satisfy it” (260). On the one hand, a book is a mere physical object before it encounters a reader; on the other hand, it contains the capacity to direct the reader—assuming the reader has the appropriate capacities to be open to direction. Remember Chambers’s assertion that “we must therefore have confidence in texts. They know, they respond” (*Writing* xii). A linguistic anthropological approach to the interaction of a book/text with a reader might thus find in any record left by a reading of a giving text evidence as to the text’s own indexical capacities.¹⁴

In fact, during one of his later seminars devoted to Manet, Bourdieu observed:

There is a social effect of the work, which is not a blanket effect, but is differential, since a work does not have the same effect on everyone. This differential social effect may be analysed from the standpoint of a knowledge of the principles behind the differentiation of the public on whom this effect is exercised. This differential effect provides insights into the work of art. . . . saying that there is

an effect of the work of art is to say that some of the causes of this effect can be found in the work of art. The question then is whether we might not be able to use these effects to try to trace their causes, to try to see in these works something that will allow us to explain these effects. (*Manet* 27)

Both Chambers and Bourdieu could be said to have an understanding of the fact that works hold social-indexical potential and that a reading encounter involving different readers will activate different parts of that potential. This helps explain why, in both their cases, the reading encounters they describe or enact could be taken to be similar to the production of the real-time interactive text of which linguistic anthropologists speak.

A final digression, now, on some figures from what is known as reader-response criticism, for there might appear to be some overlap between the kind of theorizing of reading proposed by thinkers such as Roman Ingarden and Wolfgang Iser and that being proposed here. Iser notes, for example, in his well-known essay, “The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach,” that “reading causes the literary work to unfold its inherently dynamic character” (280). Ingarden observes that “certain works of art, and, in particular, certain literary works of art, require appropriate *training* on our part if the developing concretizations of work are to be adequately expressed” (349). Sounding a bit like Proust’s narrator, Ingarden observes that “there is a period (especially in ground-breaking works) in which the work cannot be fully expressed in its concretizations because the reader cannot yet fully understand it, a period of preparation, of containing in embryo, what later will be fully developed or at least can be developed” (350). Yet Ingarden’s presentation lacks an interest in the sociological specificity of certain modes of appropriation of an artwork, often competing ones; he associates evolving “concretizations of a literary work” much too generally with “the atmosphere of a given era” (350). Chambers and Bourdieu are more attentive not only to the shifting indexical capacity of a work over time, but also to the sociological import—and to the social causes—of the differences in the ways different readers actualize a text’s indexical capacity within the same historical moment. There can also be a normativity to the way in which Ingarden sometimes construes a reading encounter: “the wealth and complexity of subjective operations and experiences that are to be effected in the apprehension of a literary work require—if the reading and the apprehension of the work are to be at all successful—the apprehending subject to shield himself from all disturbing influences” (334). A more sociologically robust phenomenological approach might wonder, rather, how the differently shaped habitus of different readers provide evidence of the “influences” that produce different modes of apprehension.

INDEXICAL CAPACITY

There is both a temporal and a spatial, as well as a social, component to a text's indexical capacities. Capacity is being both lost and gained as texts circulate through time and space, as well as through different parts of a social world.¹⁵ One could imagine certain texts, written in languages that are no longer spoken, that have lost all or nearly all their indexical capacity. One can also imagine that, even in close proximity to the text's temporal and spatial points of origin, different aspects of that capacity are actualized by differently equipped social agents. What Bourdieu suggests in observing that the "social effect of the work" is "differential" rather than a "blanket effect," is that a text or book or painting or performance can, in its actualization, be a kind of sociological or anthropological instrument that reveals something about the structure of the sociocultural field in which it is actualized that might otherwise be invisible. At least a twofold analytical project emerges from this suggestion: firstly, if a work of art produces sharply different reactions within a given set of people, or acquires a public made up of an unusual set of social agents, its reception or its public(s) can be studied for what they reveal about the structure of the larger social field in which it is embedded. Further, the work itself must have something "in" it that produces this reception, something that analysis of the work itself (within its various contexts) might uncover, and so "this aesthetic of the effect implies an exhortation to look for the effects of the work, the foundations of the effect of the work—what we might call the symbolic charge of the work—within the work itself" (27).¹⁶

Find a cross-section of the readers of any book that has provoked divergent readings or some kind of controversy, either upon publication or at some later time. Those readers might have held similar artifacts in their hands, with more or less the same words printed on the page, but their differing acts of uptake help establish the ways in which a book being read is more than artifactual.¹⁷ As a text is taken up, it is recreated, recontextualized, reactivated differently in one set of hands, at one place and time, than it is in another. If we think about works in relation to the real-time interactive texts that are produced from them, it doesn't seem difficult to understand, for instance, how aspects of a work that may have been almost too ordinary and unremarkable to be noticed at one point in time take on relevance to the meaning of the work for particular readers only after it has passed through a certain amount of space and time and found its way into a particular set of hands.

To attempt to understand a book as a social object is to attempt to reconstruct the habitus of the reader(s) to whom it might have been (or might still be) addressed. It is also to attempt to reconstruct how, in different times

and places, different readerly habitus have responded to and appropriated the book in different ways. Readers from a different time and a different place will have, somehow, to account for their own set of readerly and social dispositions, abstracting themselves from them, in order to attempt to understand how a habitus contemporary with the work's production might have reacted to it (or, in the case of the oppositional texts of which Chambers speaks, to account for how a text calls for a habitus it might not be expecting to find in its immediate moment). "It is important to be reflexively aware of what a scholarly habitus is and what a practical habitus is, and thereby to leave room for a social history of various habitus of reading, of various habitus for perceiving works of art, of various habitus of economic behavior, and so on" (*Sociologie générale* 1 261). How, as teachers concerned with helping students understand cultural artifacts, can we assume the responsibility not merely of helping students understand an artifact, but also of helping them understand the situatedness of that understanding and the existence of other understandings? Such is the difficult path to discovering what we have seen Bourdieu call the causes of a work's effects (*Manet* 27). And yet it is not precisely within the work itself, I hope it is now clear, that we can find the causes of its effects, but in what I have been referring to as the work's *indexical capacity*. For whatever is there in the work itself to enable a certain way of taking it up is not precisely *there* in the object. It is there interactively.

NOTES

1. "In order to fix our specimens for analysis, we students of the social life of language make recordings of events of language use, and then we transcribe such recordings in fine detail in order to study at analytic speed what was, in the real-time of interaction, flying by in words, facial and other body cues, bodily alignment and orientation shifts, and so on. In addition to fine-grained linguistic analysis, we also generally get native language-users' reactions to and understandings of specific contributions to the interaction that may be salient to them; this sharpens, but does not determine, our analytic account" (Silverstein, "The Voice of Jacob" 492).

2. For other efforts in this direction, see Lucey, "A Literary Object's Contextual Life" and Lucey and McEnaney, "Introduction."

3. For more on the first moment, see Lucey, "Proust and Language-in-Use," 269–74.

4. See Silverstein, "'Cultural' Concepts," or his contribution to this issue, "Texts, Entextualized and Artifactualized: The Shapes of Discourse," for an exposition of this disciplinary perspective.

5. In *The Writing of Melancholy* he deals with writers such as Flaubert, Baudelaire, and Nerval, although in later work (e.g., *Untimely Interventions: AIDS Writing, Testimonial, and the Rhetoric of Haunting*) his temporal and geographic range is much greater.

6. "Knowing how to read" in this or that way turns out to be a skill with a certain social distribution—and also a history—that one might inquire into.

7. For examples of what it might mean to construct arrays like this, see chapters 4 and 5, on texts by Simone de Beauvoir and Marguerite Duras, in Lucey, *Someone*.

8. Free indirect discourse, roughly speaking, is when a character's thoughts (or a group's collective thinking) are reported indirectly by a narrator and when some aspects of the utterance reporting

those thoughts seem to be assignable to the character and others to the narrator, or when, somehow, the version of the character's thoughts provided seems to be potentially evaluative of those thoughts from some other perspective. An example from early in *Madame Bovary* is a moment shortly after Charles Bovary's first wife dies: "When everything was over at the cemetery, Charles went back to his house. He found no one downstairs; he went up to the second floor, into the bedroom, saw her dress still hanging at the foot of the alcove; then, leaning on the writing desk, he remained there till evening, lost in sorrowful reverie. She had loved him, after all" (18). In that last sentence, in the way it sounds in relation to what has come before, can we hear a critical response to some *quality* (flatness, mundanity, superficiality?) of Charles's emotional life?

9. For Vološinov, a given utterance can carry multiple intonations that might either complement or conflict with each other. See *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* 138.

10. On the feel of free indirect discourse in Beauvoir, see chapter 4 of Lucey, *Someone*.

11. "In one of his catalogues Manet insisted on the fact that if the public did not see the works, they would not be able to get used to them and acquire the eye that would allow them to understand them. This is a genuine insight into the fact that the function of the exhibition is to bring the public face-to-face with the work, and above all to allow the public to acquire the categories of perception that the work incorporates, and which it attempts to impose. A work is intrinsically performative in the sense that it requires to be viewed in a certain fashion, in such a way as to strike the observer as necessary" (Bourdieu, *Manet* 133).

12. For historically inclined work on poetry that might be relevant to the kind of approach I am laying out here, see Backscheider; Jackson, "Specters of the Ballad" and *Dickinson's Misery*; Martin; Prins; and Warner.

13. "The writerly text is not a thing, we would have a hard time finding it in a bookstore... The writerly text is a perpetual present. . . the writerly text is *ourselves writing*. . . But the readerly texts? They are products (and not productions), they make up the enormous mass of our literature" (Barthes, *S/Z* 5).

14. For an exploration along these lines of various reactions across time to Gide's *The Immoralist*, see Lucey, "On André Gide's *The Immoralist*."

15. Texts also circulate across media, and moving from one medium to another can produce dramatic transformations in indexical capacity. See, for example, McEnaney, *Acoustic Properties* and McEnaney, "Real-to-Reel."

16. For work in this vein, see chapter 2, "Sexuality and the Literary Field," in Lucey, *Someone*.

17. A striking example might be the divergent groups of readers of Marguerite Duras's *The Malady of Death*, who either understood it to be a text about male homosexuality or didn't. See chapter 5 of Lucey, *Someone*, for more on this example.

WORKS CITED

- Auer, Peter. "Introduction: John Gumperz' Approach to Contextualization." *The Contextualization of Language*, edited by Auer and Aldo Di Luzio, John Benjamins, 1992, pp. 1–37.
- Backscheider, Paula R. *Eighteenth-Century Women Poets and Their Poetry: Inventing Agency, Inventing Genre*. Johns Hopkins UP, 2005.
- Barthes, Roland. "From Work to Text." *Image—Music—Text*, translated by Stephen Heath, Hill and Wang, 1977, pp. 155–64.
- . *S/Z: An Essay*, translated by Richard Miller, Hill and Wang, 1974.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *Manet: A Symbolic Revolution*, edited by Pascale Casanova et al., translated by Peter Collier and Margaret Rigaud-Drayton, Polity, 2017.

- . “The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods,” translated by Richard Nice. *Media, Culture and Society*, vol. 2, no. 3, 1980, pp. 261–93.
- . *Sociologie générale, volume 1: Cours au Collège de France, 1981–1983*, edited by Patrick Champagne et al., Raisons d’agir/Seuil, 2015.
- . *Sociologie générale, volume 2: Cours au Collège de France, 1983–1986*, edited by Patrick Champagne et al., Raisons d’agir/Seuil, 2016.
- Chambers, Ross. *Untimely Interventions: AIDS Writing, Testimonial, and the Rhetoric of Haunting*. U of Michigan P, 2004.
- . *The Writing of Melancholy: Modes of Opposition in Early French Modernism*, translated by Mary Seidman Trouille, U of Chicago P, 1993.
- Flaubert, Gustave. *Madame Bovary*, translated by Lydia Davis, Penguin Books, 2011.
- Harari, Josué V., editor. *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*. Cornell UP, 1979.
- Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*, translated by George G. Grabowicz, Northwestern UP, 1973.
- Iser, Wolfgang. “The Reading Process: A Phenomenological Approach.” *New Literary History*, vol. 3, no. 2, 1972, pp. 279–99.
- Jackson, Virginia. *Dickinson’s Misery: A Theory of Lyric Reading*. Princeton UP, 2005.
- . “Specters of the Ballad.” *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 71, no. 2, 2016, pp. 176–96.
- Lucey, Michael. “A Literary Object’s Contextual Life.” In *A Companion to Comparative Literature*, edited by Ali Behdad and Dominic Thomas, Wiley-Blackwell, 2011, pp. 120–35.
- . “On André Gide’s *The Immoralist* (1902).” *Fiction and Film for Scholars of France: A Cultural Bulletin*, 2016, h-france.net/ffh/classics/on-andre-gides-the-immoralist-1902/.
- . “Proust and Language-in-Use.” *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2015, pp. 261–79.
- . *Someone: The Pragmatics of Misfit Sexualities, from Colette to Hervé Guibert*. U of Chicago P, 2019.
- Lucey, Michael and Tom McEnaney. “Introduction: Language-in-Use and Literary Fieldwork.” *Language-in-Use and the Literary Artifact*, special issue of *Representations*, no. 137, 2017, pp. 1–22.
- Martin, Meredith. *The Rise and Fall of Meter: Poetry and English National Culture, 1860–1930*. Princeton UP, 2012.
- McEnaney, Tom. *Acoustic Properties: Radio, Narrative, and the New Neighborhood of the Americas*. Northwestern UP, 2017.
- . “Real-to-Reel: Social Indexicality, Sonic Materiality, and Literary Media Theory in Eduardo Costa’s Tape Works.” *Language-in-Use and the Literary Artifact*, special issue of *Representations*, no. 137, 2017, pp. 143–66.
- McHale, Brian. “Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts.” *PTL: A Journal for Descriptive Poetics and Theory of Literature*, vol. 3, 1978, pp. 249–87.
- Prins, Yopie. *Victorian Sappho*. Princeton UP, 1999.
- Proust, Marcel. *In the Shadow of Young Girls in Flower*, translated by James Grieve, Penguin, 2004.
- Silverstein, Michael. “‘Cultural’ Concepts and the Language-Culture Nexus.” *Current Anthropology*, vol. 45, no. 5, 2004, pp. 621–52.
- . “The Voice of Jacob: Entextualization, Contextualization, and Identity.” *ELH*, vol. 81, no. 2, 2014, pp. 483–520.
- Vološinov, V. N. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*, translated by Ladislav Matejka and I. R. Titunik, Harvard UP, 1986.
- Warner, Michael. “Whitman Drunk.” In *Publics and Counterpublics*, Zone Books, 2002, pp. 269–89.

Reproduced with permission of copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.