

Mosaic

Vol. 40 No. 4 December 2007

208 Tier Building
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada R3T 2N2
t: 204.474.9763
f: 204.474.7584

mosaic_journal@umanitoba.ca
www.umanitoba.ca/mosaic

Mosaic 2007. The University of Manitoba

Contents

Introduction <i>Dawne McCance</i>	v
Falling for Dante: The <i>Inferno</i> in Albert Camus's <i>La chute</i> <i>Harriet Hustis</i>	1
Mutilated Selves: Pauline Melville, Mário de Andrade, and the Troubling Hybrid <i>Albert Braz</i>	17
The Wages of Weight: Dorothy West's Corporeal Politics <i>Meredith Goldsmith</i>	35
Neo's Kantian Choice: <i>The Matrix Reloaded</i> and the Limits of the Posthuman <i>Dana Dragunoiu</i>	51
The Rhetorical Function of Comedy in Michael Moore's <i>Fahrenheit 9/11</i> <i>Aloys Fleischmann</i>	69
Picture This: Space and Time in Lisa Robertson's "Utopia" <i>Ian Davidson</i>	87
"Diamonds of the dustheap": A quoi servent les journaux des femmes? <i>Valérie Baisnée</i>	103
The Politics of Dashiell Hammett's <i>Red Harvest</i> <i>J.A. Zumoff</i>	119

Mr. Ramsay, Robert Falcon Scott, and Heroic Death	135
<i>Allyson Booth</i>	
Environmentalism and Imperial Manhood in Jim Corbett's <i>The Man-Eating Leopard of Rudraprayag</i>	151
<i>Jesse Oak Taylor</i>	

Introduction

DAWNE McCANCE

The term roman can now be applied to poetic writing incorporating a narrative element. It can also be applied to récits of a journalistic type that integrate the possibility of narrative, provided the category can be expanded. It can be applied as well to the intermingling of autobiographical elements with essays and theoretical texts. These are all romans—as long as we understand “novel” as an intersection of genre and as a generalized form of intertextuality. —Julia Kristeva, “Intertextuality and Literary Interpretation”

It is hard to believe that almost forty years have passed since Julia Kristeva introduced the term “intertextuality,” and with that, “revolutionized” our understanding of the text, which could no longer be considered something fixed or finished, a representation of presence, an object over which a reading subject takes control. Intertextuality belongs initially to Kristeva’s so-called *structuralist* or *semiotic* period, to works such as *Sémeiôtiké. Recherches pour une sémanalyse* (Paris: Seuil, 1969) and *Le texte du roman. Approche sémiologique d’une structure discursive transformationnelle* (The Hague/Paris: Mouton, 1970), where her method of “semanalysis” is not yet fully informed by psychoanalytic theory. But to look back at “Le mot, le dialogue et le roman,” for example, or at “Pour une sémiologie des paragrammes,” both of which are included in *Sémeiôtiké*, is to recognize that, as Toril Moi remarks, Kristeva, the structuralist, was “post-structuralist *avant la lettre*” (3). With her approach to the role played by “poetic” language across various genres and discursive practices, Kristeva, from her earliest writing, was radically interdisciplinary; and by exploring intertextuality through the notion of the “paragram,” the linguistic unit that is always at least double, she held out the promise of “dynamizing” interdisciplinary work.

By the time she joined intertextuality to psychoanalytic theory, this dynamism extended to the subject of language. For Kristeva, precisely because of intertextuality, the subject, no longer an individual or an identity, became, on every level of the text—

semantic, syntactic, phonic—a polyphony, a kaleidoscope, what she called a *subject-in-process*. If we are readers, as well as writers, of intertextuality, we must be capable of putting our identities *into-process*, “capable of identifying with the different types of texts, voices, and semantic, syntactic, and phonic systems at play in a given text,” she remarks in a 1985 interview. “We must also be able to be reduced to zero, to the state of crisis that is perhaps the necessary precondition of aesthetic pleasure, to the point of speechlessness as Freud says, of the loss of meaning, before we can enter into a process of free association, reconstitution of diverse meanings, or kinds of connotations that are almost undefinable—a process that is a *re-creation* of the poetic text” (“Intertextuality” 190).

Julia Kristeva was only one of those who contributed to the post-structuralist movement that could have, or should have, given new impetus to interdisciplinarity. To what extent post-structuralism succeeded in “untying the text,” to use the title of Robert Young’s 1981 anthology, I leave for you to decide. In pondering the question, you might want to consider *Mosaic*, in particular, this issue of ten essays, where, as you enter *into-process*, you will find, among other things: a permutation of genres and of modes of analysis; a notion of text that exceeds the “written” and that encompasses corporeality (not only human); an awareness of the radically political nature of reading and writing; and, not the least, several examples of what Kristeva called paragrammatical practice.

WORKS CITED

- Kristeva, Julia. “Intertextuality and Literary Interpretation.” An interview with Margaret Waller. Trans. Richard Macksey. *Julia Kristeva: Interviews*. Ed. Ross Mitchell Guberman. New York: Columbia UP, 1996. 188–203.
- Moi, Toril. “Introduction.” *The Kristeva Reader*. New York: Columbia UP, 1986. 1–22.
- Young, Robert. *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*. Boston: Henley, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981.