AARON BARTELS-SWINDELLS

The Metapragmatics of the "Minor Writer": Zoë Wicomb, Literary Value, and the Windham-Campbell Prize Festival

IN THE FESTIVAL PROGRAM FOR THE 2013 Windham-Campbell Prize for Literature, Zoë Wicomb, a South African writer primarily known for her work during the postapartheid era, construed her success as "impossible. For a minor writer like myself, this is a validation I would never have dreamt of" (see fig. 1). The prizes, given by Yale University, are among the most lucrative individual cultural awards in the world, worth $150,000 each, and the honor was well publicized: in addition to generating global media coverage, Yale hosted a four-day festival that included a prize ceremony and reading. Wicomb's self-identification as a "minor writer" seems slightly paradoxical in light of such publicity and remuneration. What, then, does "minor writer" signify? How is that significance shaped by broader frameworks that change throughout time and space?

My approach to these questions understands signification as the effect and effectiveness of social action.[1] My adoption of language-in-use methodologies is inspired by Wicomb's pragmatist analyses of contemporary South African literature and culture, which demonstrate an acute sense of how utterances interact with contexts fashioned through social action.[2] In one such essay, "Shame and Identity: The Case of the Coloured in South Africa," Wicomb examines how contemporary discursive formulations are produced by and engender "coloured" shame.[3] She uses the past and present of coloured shame to consider the fate of South Africa's "youthful postcoloniality," analyzing "ethnographic self-fashioning" and "discursive construction by others" in relation to "the narrative of liberation and its dissemination in the world media that constructed oppression in particular ways."[4] This formulation provides the impetus to consider how narratives about oppression

ABSTRACT   How does the significance of Zoë Wicomb's description of herself as a "minor writer" in the 2013 Windham-Campbell Prize festival program contrast with her other uses of the term? Arguing that the term's usage at different times and places indexes distinct schemata of value, I examine the program as an artifact that sediments a certain formulation of Wicomb's literary persona and provides affordances for parsing her literary works.

Zoë Wicomb

Zoë Wicomb's subtle, lively language and beautifully crafted narratives explore the complex entanglements of home, and the continuing challenges of being in the world.

ZOË WICOMB WAS BORN IN SOUTH AFRICA AND LIVES IN GLASGOW, Scotland. Her fiction demonstrates an ongoing preoccupation with and deep insight into apartheid and its legacies. In prose hailed by Toni Morrison as "seductive, brilliant, and precious," Wicomb's first book of stories *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town* articulates the experience of mixed-race ("coloured") South Africans under apartheid. In her two subsequent novels, *David's Story* and *Playing in the Light*, and her most recent story collection, *The One that Got Away*, Wicomb widens her focus to explore the persistent influence of race and gender in shaping South African life in a post-apartheid society and an increasingly interconnected world. Wicomb is an emeritus professor at the University of Strathclyde. She has just completed a new novel.

"Impossible. For a minor writer like myself, this is a validation I would never have dreamt of. I am over-whelmed – and deeply grateful for this generous prize. It will keep me for several years, and it will speed up the writing too since I can now afford to go away when the first draft proves difficult to produce in my own house."

ZOË WICOMB

TUESDAY
5 pm
Prize Ceremony
Sprague Hall
98 Wall Street

WEDNESDAY
4 pm
Branford
Master's Tea
Branford
Master's House
80 High Street

7 pm
Prizewinners
Reading
Yale University Art
Gallery Auditorium
1111 Chapel Street

THURSDAY
12 pm
Writing after
Apartheid:
A Conversation
with Jonny
Steinberg and
Zoë Wicomb,
moderated by
Daniel Magaziner
Whitney
Humanities Center
Room 108
53 Wall Street
Brown Bag Lunch

1:30 pm
Booksigning
Yale Bookstore
77 Broadway

30

FIGURE 1. Profile of Zoë Wicomb from the festival program. *Above left,* prize citation; *below left,* biographical segment; *above right,* Wicomb's response; *center right,* Zoë Wicomb; *below right,* events at which Wicomb appeared. Image courtesy of The Donald Windham-Sandy Campbell Literature Prizes at the Beinecke Rare Book & Manuscript Library, *Windham Campbell Prizes: Festival 2013* (New Haven, 2013), 30–31.

emanate and are taken up in ways that effect localized articulations of identity. Wicomb's paper encourages us to examine the significance of the "minor writer"—and its poetic resonances with "minority"—in relation to her claim that "the newly democratized South Africa remains dependent on the old economic, social, and also epistemological structures of apartheid, and thus it is axiomatic that different groups created by the old system do not participate equally in the category of postcoloniality."[5] We should also think about how the term "minor writer" functions in relation to Wicomb's literary works, following her discussion of the deleterious influence that these epistemological structures and narratives about oppression have on metropolitan reading strategies that stress cultural hybridity.

Wicomb's second novel, *David's Story*, from which she read at the Windham-Campbell Prize (henceforth WCP) festival, stages many of her concerns about shame, cultural hybridity, the effacement of history, and the past and present status of women in the struggle for justice in postcolonial society.[6] The novel, according to critic Dorothy Driver, is "self-consciously positioned as a postmodernist text" and "dramatize[s] the literary, political, philosophical and ethical issues at stake in any attempt at retrieval of history and voice."[7] Set in 1991, after the release of Nelson Mandela, and told by a nameless amanuensis, the narrative weaves a number of related plots that imply connections between past and present around that of David Dirkse, a former guerilla of the African National Congress (ANC), who, after the unbanning of the movement, researches the history of his coloured roots. The segment that Wicomb chose to read does not mention David and is drawn from the second narrative of *David's Story*, which is about a "minor Griqua chief."[8] How does this excerpt from the narrative function in relation to Wicomb's self-description as a "minor writer"?

This article considers postapartheid narratives of liberation and the activity of parsing a text in relation to the creation and circulation of literary and social value. Thus, while I focalize my discussion through the term "minor writer," my aim is to understand how the expression functions in relation to the schemata of value to which its usage points.[9] The article proceeds in two parts. The first examines how two distinct usages of "minor writer" index different schemata of social knowledge. From Wicomb's use of the phrase in an interview from 2002 about writing and nation, I explicate how "minor writer" articulates a self-reflective orientation to the intersection of literary and social value in South Africa.[10] I then contrast this usage with the section on Wicomb from the WCP program, which effects a transformation of social value by yoking representations of Wicomb's literary persona and voice to a particular kind of chronotopic formulation of South Africa. My reading of this artifact demonstrates how microdescriptions of Wicomb and her work evoke macroconstructions of South African society,

a process that occludes Wicomb's self-positioning in the earlier interview. The second part asks how discourses from the WCP festival concerning value circulate beyond it, and whether they affect how we read texts that move between schemata of value. At stake throughout is how the power to consecrate literary value is metapragmatically constituted and contested in relation to the term "minor writer."

Social Value and Literary Persona

In the text attributed to Wicomb in the WCP festival program, "minor writer" points to Wicomb as its object and indicates the existence of a schema of value. In other words, Wicomb's object formulation of self has, in addition to its referential function, nonreferential indexical properties, the knowledge behind which is socially specific and locatable. Once we know that the text is Wicomb's written response to notification of the award, we see how the indexical "this" in her response points to a specific interaction and creates the presupposition of a shared context.[11] The negated, subjunctive verb in the perfect tense ("I would never have dreamt") is tied to receiving the award in the main clause, transforming "this" into the temporal anchor of the utterance: she would not have dreamt of this validation until it arrived. The subordinate clause—"For a minor writer like myself"—insinuates that there is a group of people ("minor writer[s]") with characteristics embodied by Wicomb ("like myself"). In this stretch of text Wicomb provides a metapragmatic commentary on herself in relation to the validation that is being offered to her and proffers a stereotypic definition of the "minor writer": they do not win major international awards. Wicomb uses "minor writer" denotatively, to pick herself out as a social type, while conjuring a schema of value related to literary prizes. We need to untangle the utterance's referential and nonreferential functions if we are to understand how "minor writer" signifies in relation to Wicomb's work more broadly.

At this point we could turn to literary sociological theories of value and canon formation, many of which have built on the insights of Pierre Bourdieu.[12] This is particularly true of James English's work, which focuses on cultural prizes as "the single best instrument for negotiating transactions between cultural and economic, cultural and social, or cultural and political capital—which is to say that they are our most effective agents of *capital intraconversion*."[13] English cogently exposes the stakes of literary prizes as sociocultural institutions by investigating "the whole middle zone of cultural space" made up of functionaries, agents, administrators, and artists, but his project does not develop the tools to interpret the more granular utterances of an award ceremony.[14] In recent work that connects the critical project of

literary sociology to types of dynamic microsociological processes, Michael Lucey contends that Bourdieu was amenable to thinking about how the meaning of a literary text is the product of interactions between authors, publishers, and critics, which take place in "extended 'realtime'" and are shaped by a literary field's preexisting structures.[15]Augmenting Bourdieu's insights with tools derived from linguistic anthropology, Lucey enables a closer look at "cultural objects": "To perceive the way in which interactions between all these figures are shaped by the field in which they occur involves reconstructing the indexical relations between text and field; it involves reconstructing the collectively reproduced *interactional* text of which cultural objects are a part."[16] I draw together English's and Lucey's insights to comprehend how utterances and actions effect capital intraconversion within extended real time. Before I use this method to unpack how "minor writer" both refers to Wicomb and indexes a schema of value, I explicate another of her utterances concerning literary prestige as both a comparative case and an illustration of how to read an interactive text.

The WCP festival program was not the first time Wicomb described herself as a "minor writer": she also used the term in a 2002 interview with Stephan Mayer and Thomas Olver titled "Writing and Nation."[17] Wicomb was asked: "How would you place *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town* and *David's Story* in the South African literary tradition by way of saying what you see as some of the main issues of 'the canon,' and your position regarding these issues?"[18] In her reply, Wicomb considered the reception of her own work:

I'll necessarily be placed as a "coloured writer," and so I'll be read in relation to Abrahams, La Guma, Rive and Head. And as a minor writer, like all the other contemporary coloured writers, I'll be unfavourably compared to them—and not only because they're dead! What we have in common are concerns such as identity, subjectivity, the problem of writing itself, born out of our common social and political conditions.[19]

Wicomb metapragmatically frames her remarks as projections of how others will schematically categorize her. "Minor writer" stands in a complex relationship with "coloured writer" and "contemporary coloured writers." Only contemporary, living "coloured writers" are minor, yet they are still read as part of a tradition that includes Peter Abrahams, Alex La Guma, Richard Rive, and Bessie Head. That "minor writers" do not compare with those who tackle similar issues suggests a temporalized schema of literary value. Wicomb also implies a racialized schema of value: the writers that she lists all rose to prominence during the struggle against apartheid, yet they are not the "three major writers," as Wicomb labels "Coetzee, Gordimer, [and] Brink," who "for different reasons, and whether they like it or not, constitute the new anti-apartheid canon."[20] "Minor writer" in this instance, then, projects Wicomb's

understanding of how the social history of literary value in South Africa intersects with the reputation of "contemporary coloured writers."

Although Wicomb's comments are anchored within the enunciative present of the interview and do not look beyond South Africa, they offer a broader theory of value that formulates how "minor writer" functions metapragmatically. As part of her response, and prior to her characterization of her own reception, Wicomb reflected on the nature of the canon:

It's obviously a critical construct, what the dominant culture chooses to value because such works coincide with its interests. That choice is always about exclusion, so it is intrinsically discriminatory, conservative. In the past, women and blacks were routinely excluded. But canon making also always produces resistance in the culture it purports to serve, then there comes a revision that leads once more to the sedimentation and so the merry-go-round continues.[21]

If canonical value coincides with the "interests of dominant culture," then schemata of social and literary value supervene on one another. By highlighting the past exclusion of "women and blacks" as examples, Wicomb implies that works produced by members of these groups did not coincide with the interests of the dominant culture. However, by referring to the "new anti-apartheid" canon, a relatively recent formation when the interview took place in 2002, and the valorization of Abrahams, La Guma, Rive, and Head, she implies that these modes of exclusion have been superceded by new intersections of social and literary value and, we could presume, new types of minorness. Wicomb's comments on how the field has transformed reveal her understanding of and orientation toward an ongoing state-of-affairs, which creates a context through which readers of the interview can construe "minor writer." To refer to oneself as a "minor writer" is to perform a cultural location in relation to what one thinks are works that coincide with dominant interests. To the extent that the term marks Wicomb's relationship to South African society and letters for a certain set of readers, it functions metapragmatically in relation to the metadiscursive commentary that surrounds it.[22] As a result, "minor writer" comes to be voiced as the speech of "the dominant culture" and its referent as one who potentially faces the political challenges of literary representation in postapartheid South Africa.

Thus far, I have been drawing on frameworks found in Michael Silverstein's three-tiered model of *signification*, *circulation*, and *emanation*.[23] Acts of signification either presuppose or create something related to their context-of-occurrence.[24] As with Wicomb's usage of "minor writer," when acts of signification refer to social value, their construal is an index of schemata of knowledge concerning value, and the participant's orientation toward them.[25] Following Asif Agha, I call orientations toward schemata of knowledge "uptake formulations."[26] These uptake formulations help form chains

of discourse, linking events of signification to prior performances, the former recontextualizing the latter as responses.[27] They need not always take up circulating, citable discourse in the same way: in fact, the metaphor of circulation relies on the construal of one event of signification as the token of a prior event.[28] Thus, recognizing the effects of capital intraconversion requires that we link homogeneous uptake formulations one to another via acts of signification. Of course, signification could also produce opposite results: "minor writer" could be subject to another uptake formulation that recontextualizes it in relation to a different schema of knowledge and value. How an utterance indexes the same something about context in multiple places is at the heart of Silverstein's idea of emanation, which I turn to in the second part of this paper. For now, it is enough to say that this model allows us to understand performances at authorized value-assigning events like literary prize festivals as language-in-use: by segmenting instantiations of literary prestige into smaller social processes, Silverstein's semiotic allows us to analyze how capital intraconversion and its subsequent dispersal depends on utterances that invoke and create orders of knowledge within an interactive setting designed to generate new and activate existing institutionalized trajectories of emanation. In this section, I would like to linger over how these conceptions of signification and circulation permit us to rethink utterances as stable objects of study.

Wicomb's two references to minority—in the WCP festival program and the interview from 2002—are phase states in an ongoing process of literary self-fashioning, each coordinated in relation to the pragmatic context of the interaction: either winning a major award or being interviewed about the relationship between writing and nation in South Africa. By phase states, I refer not to a teleology of canonization, but to how object formulations of self are consistently subject to processes of metapragmatic refashioning that, when revealed, disabuse us of notions about the intrinsic value of literary objects or personas. While these two instances of the same phrase, "minor writer," are interdiscursively related to one another, in that the same biographic person uses the same noun phrase to talk about her work, they are nested within interactional texts where their "context-defining and -transforming indexicality" yields different effects.[29]

This understanding of the relationship between utterance and context diverges in important ways from previous work on the alterity industry, such as Graham Huggan's *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins* (2001), which examines how institutions mediate the production and consumption of postcolonial texts. Huggan's concern is that the field of postcolonial studies "has capitalised on its perceived marginality while helping to turn marginality itself into a valuable intellectual commodity," fostering a "postcolonial exotic."[30] This particularization of exoticism, which "may

be understood conventionally as an aestheticizing process through which the cultural other is translated, [and] relayed back through the familiar," addresses the repoliticization and redeployment of exoticism in a "postcolonial context."[31] A struggle "over the value of cultural difference" occurs, and mainstream culture attempts to define the margins as part of "an exoticizing strategy."[32] Yet, the identification of phase states undercuts Huggan's claim that the postcolonial exotic "occupies a site of discursive conflict between a local assemblage of more or less related oppositional practices and a global apparatus of assimilative institutional/commercial codes."[33] For language-in-use, discursive conflict occurs at "sites of interaction," which "can be recognized as nodes of signifying practice indexically revealing knowledge and values . . . that people instantiate and contest in the semiotic production of a genred cultural event."[34] Huggan's model papers over performative contests within the South African domain of literary value and their imbrication with other schemata of social value, preventing us from critically comparing them. This is not to say that there are no disparities of power at stake in usages of "minor writer"; rather, it is to recognize with Asif Agha that "to ignore the performativity of value projects, their felicity conditions and fragility under conditions of uptake, is to allow anxieties about hegemony to inflect moments of decontextualized reflection, even as our actual conduct remakes what we fear."[35] Agha's comments encourage us to look more closely at how exoticization emerges at sites of interaction, often ones where competing value projects come together, and to examine the performativity of interventions by writers, intellectuals, and publishers.

My analysis so far has presumed that Wicomb is in control of the significance of "minor writer" both at the WCP festival and the interview. However, because "minor writer" is a sign that functions metapragmatically, it is easily cited within a new context in a way that transforms its social indexicality. In the absence of a metadiscourse about minor writers, those ignorant of Wicomb's past usage of the term can interpret the sign only in relation to the co-occuring and subsequent discourse of the festival public. The WCP festival was a site of interaction where acts of signification indexed different types of social knowledge that then circulated between the festival's events. The limits of this site's domain were set by the attendees of the festival who constituted its public, "a space of discourse" that "exists by virtue of being addressed."[36] The WCP festival program addressed attendees, demanded their attention, and constituted them as a public. The program, available at all the festival's events, is also an index of its script.

Wicomb's literary persona was formulated as the justification for her success through a series of performances related to the program: Peter Salovey, president of Yale University, read out the prize citation at the "Prize Ceremony" event listed in figure 1, and moderators at other events also made

reference to the same text while introducing Wicomb.[37] The program sediments the performances that made the festival into a scene of "poetic world making," where a public instantiates understandings of social value.[38] The three text segments in the section devoted to Wicomb are part of an artifact that indexes the schemata of social knowledge at the festival. I read these text segments as co-texts for one another that form a poetic structure of mutually presupposing reflexivity. In concert they provide an uptake formulation through which those at the festival could orient themselves to Wicomb's work and literary persona.

The prize citation and biographical segment graft together propositions about Wicomb's writing and persona. The biographical segment describes how *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town* "articulates the experience of mixed-race ('coloured') South Africans under apartheid," while stating that in her "two subsequent novels, *David's Story* and *Playing in the Light*, and her most recent story collection, *The One that Got Away*, Wicomb widens her focus to explore the persistent influence of race and gender in shaping South African life in a post-apartheid society and increasingly interconnected world." This text segment emplots the publication of Wicomb's books in relation to South African history. The gloss of "coloured" as "mixed-race" translates an identity category for the largely American audience in attendance at the prize festival and fails to mark a form of cultural hybridity with a specific history.[39] "Mixed-race" has a poetic effect in relation to Wicomb's attempt to "explore the persistent influence of race" in postapartheid South Africa, which implies continuity between the two. At the same time, the segment implies either that Wicomb's earlier collection of short stories was not concerned with gender, or that gender has become a more salient issue during the postapartheid era.[40] This emplotment of Wicomb's work, punctuated as it is by the fall of apartheid, could also be interpreted in relation to the prize citation as a type of poetic parallelism: the durative adjectives describing both the narratives that explore "the continuing challenges of being in the world" and the "persistent influence of apartheid and its legacies" forge a tight connection between the two. This structure leaves "the complex entanglements of home" free to characterize *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town* as narrating a particular type of unelaborated experience. As metasemiotic processes of emplotment and parallelism typify Wicomb's work, she is identified as the writer of the "beautifully crafted narratives" and the agent whose focus widens *in* texts. Wicomb's literary persona comes to be characterized via its connection with the representation of these texts.

To understand the specificities of the participation framework conjured around Wicomb, we can turn to Agha's explanation of how figures of personhood make available "voicing structures to which actual people orient in a variety of ways."[41] Figures of personhood are "contingent, performable

behaviors effectively linked to social personae for some determinate population; or, in a semiotic idiom, behaviors that convey icons (or images) of personhood to those for whom they function as signs (i.e., those able to infer these personae from these behaviors)."[42] I am concerned with how these behaviors, such as calling oneself a minor writer, are metapragmatically typified such that a figure of literary personhood comes to be associated with a voicing structure.[43] There is a dialectical relationship between figures of personhood and voicing structures: types of voicing can index an image of personhood, just as evoking a figure of personhood can typify the voice, while both processes can self-reflexively work to bind a voicing structure and figure of personhood to one another. Building on Mikhail Bakhtin's work on varieties of novelistic discourse, Agha's theorization of voicing structures is a way to understand how behavioral diacritics become associated with types of personae via uptake formulations.[44] Unlike the sort of face-to-face interaction Agha has in mind, the persona developed for Wicomb in the WCP program is derived from descriptions of her writerly behavior.

The characterization of Wicomb's literary personage across the prize citation and biographical segment creates a pragmatic context though which to construe "minor writer," at the same time that "minor writer" provides a context in which to construe the other text segments. In other words, "minor writer" neither determines nor is solely determined by the other two blocks of text, but works in concert with them to create a rich poetic texture. All three segments of text point to Wicomb as their referent, yoking Wicomb's literary persona to her self-characterization as a "minor writer." This characterization becomes the uptake formulation through which the festival public encounters Wicomb's work: it is the voicing structure associated with her entry into the interactive text.

In Wicomb's case, the voicing structure that permits "minor writer" to function metapragmatically is inseparable from the chronotopic formulation of South Africa. As Agha reminds us, a chronotope is "a semiotic representation of time and place peopled by certain social types," an essential aspect of which is that "it links representations of time to those of locale and personhood."[45] His reading illuminates connections across the Bakhtinian oeuvre, revealing how "the concepts of 'voice' (persona, characterological figure) and 'chronotope' are intimately linked," in part because "both link a frame of representation to a frame of performance."[46] The representations of Wicomb's behavior construct both the program's chronotopic image of South Africa and her voicing structure, because the emplotments that typify her behavior all occur within a specific time and place. The production of voice and chronotope is dialectical: the typification of her voice as South African cannot be separated from its location within the program's chronotopic depiction of South Africa. Thus, the uptake formulation from

the Wicomb section of the program binds images of Wicomb's persona and voice to a chronotopic representation of South Africa, the latter providing the former with the time and space in which to function.

Thus far, my reading of the Wicomb section of the program has focused on the forms of coherence developed between its three segments of text. While we can begin to see how the function of minor writer differs at the WCP from Wicomb's earlier formulation just by looking at this poetic structure, we also need to examine how it activates types of knowledge that precede the festival. The poetic structure of the festival contains representations that tap into constructions of South Africa that circulate globally.[47] These constructions tend to lack historical specificity, "convert[ing] particular moments of the country's history into a timeless backdrop suggestive of the long antiapartheid struggle or, increasingly, conditions in the postapartheid nation."[48] Sometimes the backdrop recites a postapartheid break, a grand narrative of the "overcoming" of and "liberation" from apartheid.[49] The WCP program presupposes such a break in its emplotment, but it also deviates from it slightly: according to the biography, the work that Wicomb has released since 1994 "explore[s] the persistent influence of race and gender in shaping South African life in a post-apartheid society." The persistent influence implies continuity over the break, indexing a condensed image of apartheid as a transparent system, "comprehensible simply as the extremity of racism."[50] The simple notion of rigid racial boundaries cannot comprehend how apartheid "created sites of porosity" that sometimes produced "a mobile and porous dialectic of racial proximity and distance," nor can it account for the variegated forms of postapartheid liberation that produce effects like shame.[51] "Minor writer" functions in relation to this emplotment, locating Wicomb in relation to the epistemological structures of apartheid.

The two text segments authored by the WCP also function nonreferentially to activate registers associated with prestige. The prize citation describes Wicomb's language as "lively" and "subtle," and her narratives as "beautifully crafted." This type of "prize talk" sounds similar to Toni Morrison's praise for *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town*, cited in the biographical segment, as "seductive, brilliant, and precious." While one might expect the quote to come from a review, Morrison's remarks appear only on the cover of the first US edition of *You Can't Get Lost in Cape Town*.[52] The prize citation and the biographical section not only effect capital intraconversion by communicating Wicomb's achievements; they also utilize registers already associated with literary value. By citing and mimicking Morrison's book-jacket blurb, the WCP's "prize talk" enregisters an image of an entity with literary credentials that can recognize value.[53] This enregisterment works with the poetic structure of the program to achieve the aim of the prize to "recognize . . . writers with bodies of work

that deserve a wider audience"—or, in other words, another way to construe "minor writer."[54] Thus we see how capital intraconversion depends on uptake formulations that effect the indexical salience of "Zoë Wicomb."

When we compare the social indexicality of "minor writer" in Wicomb's interview and the WCP festival, we get a different picture of what Huggan calls exoticization. In each case, the metapragmatic function of "minor writer" develops out of locally contested schemata of value. Perhaps the most surprising thing about these schemata of value is that, despite occurring in discrete sites of interaction, they appear to be related: the uptake formulation developed at the WCP festival resembles the schemata of literary value that Wicomb bemoans in her interview with Mayer and Olver. Perhaps this should come as no surprise given that the presentation of a South African canon can be attributed to transnational processes orchestrated by publishers and institutions of cultural prestige.[55] These processes, which link South Africa to other parts of the globe, suggest that the two similar schemata of value are actually uptake events in related chains of circulating discourse. In each case, then, "minor writer" functions metapragmatically in relation to the local interactive text. Work that does not belong to a site is made familiar through uptake formulations that index the utterance's cultural location within a socially specific schema of knowledge. Rather than exoticization, then, it might be profitable to speak of "minorization"—ways in which Wicomb is made "minor," possibly at the same time as she is valorized—a process whereby persona, voice, and chronotope create different phase-state meanings of "minor writer" in distinct but related sites of articulation.

Books as Mediatized Artifacts

The prize citation appears on the rear cover of Wicomb's latest novel, *October* (2014), while her quote was cited on the website of one of her publishers, Feminist Press.[56] Both citations are framed by references to the WCP: the rear cover announces that *October* has won the prize, and the web page repeatedly names the prize. As repetitions, they index an attempt to extend the circulation of the festival script, without which the WCP's performances of capital intraconversion would be ephemeral, and its power to consecrate value would pass unrecognized.[57] The literary prize, then, aspires to create recognizable interdiscursivity between the prize festival and forms of uptake beyond it, in order to secure the effect of capital intraconversion and its power to consecrate value. These citations are uptake events in a chain of circulating discourse, indexing the prize ceremony citationally and discursively, and reporting and recognizing the change in value and the prestige of the prize. I would like to consider briefly how the prize citation

on the back of *October* circulates and functions, with a view to asking how discourse at the festival and beyond affects how we parse Wicomb's literary works.

If the WCP aspires to circulate discourse from the festival more widely, it does so in the hope that the prize citation on the back of *October* will enregister literary prestige in the same way that it did at the festival. To return to the terms of Silverstein's three-tiered model, the literary prize aspires to *emanate* nonreferentially indexical discourse. Although emanation has a discursive component, it differs from circulation in that it concerns institutionalized patterns of uptake, which create the sense that certain nodes in a network of circulation are loci of particular authority.[58] In the case of books like *October*, this structure is defined by interactions between literary agents, publishers, printers, and booksellers, commonly known via metonyms like "the publishing industry."[59] In addition to these trajectories of communication, emanation in the publishing world relies upon processes of mediatization: the uptake and rescaling of an act of communication— examples may include a narrative, an afterword, or a prize citation—in a mediatized artifact.[60] *October*, as a mediatized artifact, physically carries indexes of social value created at the festival to those who were not present. How, then, do processes of emanation and mediatization help the indexical functions of WCP to perdure?

The prize citation formulates different ways of both orienting oneself toward *October* and orienting the book toward an audience. We can imagine the case of the latter if we translate the function of "prize talk" from the WCP festival into a new situation. Whereas before the prize citation enregistered an image of an entity with literary credentials, now the book is oriented to a certain audience because its description enregisters an image of a person of certain tastes. The register can even be repeated by actors who want to indexically create a social identity related to award-worthy fiction. The nature of that social identity depends on how actors orient themselves to *October* and different roles like purchaser, reader, or critic. It is easy to envisage how *October* functions as a commodity: purchasing the book entails inhabiting the role of consumer within a set framework of interaction that far exceeds the mediatized artifact. Yet, the prize citation plays a part in getting people to orient toward the book as a commodity: it functions like an advertisement by enregistering an image of prestige to a certain target market. The prize citation appeals to someone, encourages her to act as a purchaser, and thus links the book to patterns of commoditized exchange. These are just two examples of how *October* passes through different uptake formulations predicated upon the prize citation. These multiple functions allow us to grasp how discourse emanated via mediatized forms reenters dialogic situations and becomes entangled in the everyday transmission of literary prestige.[61]

October only reproduces a fraction of the poetic structure from the WCP program, yet that fraction indexes uptake formulations that permit us to frame our actions or construe the book's significance. Put differently, when the prize citation is activated within a new context, it develops new relationships of appropriateness and effectiveness to its surroundings that impact how the book functions as an object. We may be inclined to ask, then, what would happen if the entirety of the uptake formulation from the WCP program were emanated? How might a segment of text responsible for circulating indexes of capital intraconversion and enabling actions associated with commodification provide affordances for how we parse the novel?

Addressing these questions, the rest of this paper examines two textual forms related to the WCP. The first is a reading that Wicomb gave as a part of the WCP festival on Wednesday, September 11, 2013. She read a selection from her novel, *David's Story*, that functions in a reflexive relation to the Wicomb section of the program I have examined. The second textual form is derived from the novel *David's Story*; I examine how the text of the narrative functions in relation to the "material givenness" of the book.[62] Both Wicomb's reading and narrative could be considered parts of other wholes—either the text of the narrative or the form of the novel—but in my examples these stretches of discourse are transformed into discrete texts, thanks to a process called entextualization.[63] Wicomb noted that the portion of text that she read at the festival came from *David's Story*, metapragmatically lifting a distinct textual structure from a larger unit, inserting it into a new context. The narrative of the actual novel *David's Story* is entextualized somewhat differently: in that it is not the front material or the afterword by Dorothy Driver, it is typographically and bibliographically distinct from other parts of the book and stands in contextual relationship to them. Although my speculative comparison does not draw on *October* directly, I use the WCP reading as a limit case for the prize's effects on how we read Wicomb's work.

My examination of these two textual forms will not offer a conclusive reading of either: language-in-use argues against the possibility of a final interpretant, and does not offer a singular model for parsing a text.[64] Indeed, as recent work in literary studies has persuasively argued, the production of meaning from a text is a function of various types of reading ideologies.[65] Instead, my comparative method addresses the "texture" of each narrative, as it becomes a text that coheres due to the duplex process of entextualization and contextualization. Rather than proffer an interpretation, my goal is to apprehend via comparison how entextualization and contextualization serially produce an overall construal that limits possible parsings of the text.[66] These limits permit me to hypothesize about how narratives develop their texture, or "the felt sense of the indexical relations

that always *potentially* exist between the work, the world from which it emerged, and the world in which it is circulating."[67]

In "Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel," Bakhtin theorizes the relationship between chronotope, entextualization, and contextualization, albeit not in those terms. Much of his essay investigates the chronotopes of novels, but the final pages argue that "the world of the author, of the performer, and the world of the listeners and the readers . . . are chronotopic as well."[68] These "real people" are

located in a real, unitary and as yet incomplete historical world set off by a sharp and categorical boundary from the *represented* world in the text. Therefore we may call this world the world that *creates* the text, for all its aspects . . . participate equally in the creation of the represented world in the text.[69]

Chronotopic representations outside the text, which we could call a type of context, create the text, both in the sense that the distinction between them marks the difference between world and text, and in that they create the possibility of meaning and value ascribed to the text. Bakhtin explores how uptake formulations link the novelistic world to the interactional text in which it occurs, "connect[ing] the chronotopes they depict to the chronotopes in which they are experienced."[70] If chronotopic representations are functions of experiential chronotopes, then we can use the corollary relationship between text and context to focalize the discussion of texture.

The novelistic chronotope of *David's Story* is rendered via the reflections of an unnamed narrator, who writes,

This is and is not David's story. He would have liked to write it himself. He has indeed written some fragments . . . but he was unwilling or unable to flesh out the narrative. . . . He wanted me to write it. . . . His fragments betray the desire to distance himself from his own story; the many beginnings, the many flights into history, although he is no historian, show uncertainty about whether to begin at all. He has made some basic errors with dates, miscalculating more than a hundred years, which no doubt is due to the confusing system of naming centuries; but then, as I delighted in anachronism, he was happy to keep it.[71]

Wicomb's narrator is an unreliable author, who foregrounds the narrative as a representation of her conversations with David and the fragments that he has previously written. These fragments bespeak David's "eagerness to historicize, to link things—his own life with the lives of [Saartje] Baartman and the Griqua Chief."[72] Thus the narrative's movements between concrete dates and times, the majority in the present, and less concretely located moments in the history of the Griqua people seem to be related. The narrator, who characterizes herself as an "amanuensis," also provides commentary on David's attitude to the narrative. She observes that David viewed "the story of his life as a continuous loop that never intersected itself," and notes that he

"will not say how [the various times and locations of the narrative] are connected."[73] Some events in *David's Story*, then, can be located in recognizable time and space, while the relative position of others is vague and the connections between them is indeterminate. The novelistic chronotope is one in which the connection between times and places that might share a historicizable relationship hovers between significance and banality.

The fragment of *David's Story* that Wicomb read at the WCP festival does not entextualize the same novelistic chronotope as the actual novel.[74] Wicomb introduced her reading by saying:

I'm reading from a novel called *David's Story*, where I have two narratives interwoven: the first is of David—it's 1994—and it's the story of David, who is an ex-commander in the military wing of the ANC; and the other, from which I'm going to read now, is of a minor Griqua chief at the beginning of the twentieth century.[75]

Wicomb's prefatorial remarks gesture toward the potential relationship between the two narratives, but her reading only briefly mentions David's unreliability and leaves the narrator's credibility untarnished. The segment is anchored in the narrative's past and reports the birth of two of David's possible ancestors, Rachel Susanna Kok and Andries le Fleur (who later becomes the Griqua chief). The short genealogy skips over six generations of Koks, while the account of le Fleur's birth moves through the first years of his life. The narration of each birth refers to the loss of Griqualand West, and the former details the future marriage of the two characters, locating them within the historic chronotope of the Griqua in the Western Cape. Wicomb closes each narration by offering a sense of predetermined mythic time—for Rachael, an allusion to her "destiny," and for Andries, an encounter with a prophetic voice in the "old Griqua tongue"—further distinguishing this historical chronotope from that of David's story.

The differences between the in-text chronotopes are magnified when schemata of knowledge, which are also chronotopic, are projected onto them during processes of contextualization. The audience of the reading was part of the same public addressed by the festival program, and thus Wicomb's reading voice and the extract evokes the representations of her literary persona and its South African chronotope. The novelistic chronotope of *David's Story* could be contextualized differently, by an essay printed alongside it. The 2001 edition of *David's Story*, printed by Feminist Press in New York City, was published with an afterword by Dorothy Driver. The afterword locates "the narrative present of David's story" in relation to the time that Driver was writing, in 2000, when, "six years after the country's first ever democratic elections, one hears Wicomb's voice warning about the future."[76] Driver's interpretation of South African history recalls Wicomb's in "Shame and Identity," which she uses interdiscursively to interpret Wicomb's work.[77]

Driver avers that "the concerns of *David's Story* stand somewhat apart from the black-white antagonisms often focused on in South African literary history"; rather, "much of the plot centers specifically on Griqua self-definition rather than on this more general grouping, which, again, has been a more standard focus of South African writing."[78] These glosses address the specificities of Wicomb's writing, and relate them to a chronotopic formulation of South Africa in which the events of 1991 augur the historical challenges still unresolved in 2000.

So, what textures do these two sets of chronotopic relationships create? Before we even begin to use them to construe their texts, we notice that the two contextual chronotopes are quite distinct: Driver's afterword shows fidelity to an assumed context of production, which it attempts to crystallize and circulate, while the uptake formulation of the WCP sediments a view of Wicomb and her published work congruent with the project of capital intraconversion. These representations of experience create their respective narrative texts in quite different ways. While the WCP reading and context do not indicate that the narrator is an amanuensis, for example, references to her as such abound in the novel, while Driver's afterword also contextualizes the narrator's behavior and various reflections on "the boundaries of my task."[79] Driver's afterword makes available a way of understanding this scripted history in the context of Wicomb's work on writing and representation, where Wicomb addresses "coloured complicity, the ethnocentric mythologizing which excludes other cultural and political groups, the replacement of 'the narrative of assimilation' . . . by the 'ambiguous coloured exclusion and self-exclusion from national liberation politics,' and the erasure of slavery and the loss of 'all knowledge of our Xhosa, Indonesian, East African, or Khoi origins.'"[80] The work of David's amanuensis becomes a commentary on these issues, as the afterword permits us to construe her metapragmatic dilemmas, concerning taking dictation or copying David's text, in relation to the political issues facing coloured people in the experiential chronotope.

The WCP reading and context also create parsings beyond the limits of the novel and the afterword. Andries's "caul" in Wicomb's reading, which connotes prophetic powers of sight and is compared to a guerrilla's disguise, could be contextualized in quite divergent ways. In the fullness of the novel, it amounts to being born "with a complete, already printed history book in his head, so that his behavior amounted simply to a matter of reading aloud," a symbolic and historical representation of how shame begets shame.[81] By contrast, the uptake formulation of the festival program offers a way of connecting the temporality of prophecy to emplotments of collective oppression, a grand narrative of overcoming, or the "persistent influence of race" after that liberation has supposedly taken place.

Comparing the possibilities of construal between uptake formulations allows us to speculate about their limits, which illuminates the aesthetic function of social indexes. Different processes of entextualization and contextualization necessitate distinct modes of reading in order to create and maintain forms of coherence. For instance, to project the uptake formulation of the festival program onto the chronotope of the narrative requires a type of allegorical reading that can make sense of the past in relation to the present. By contrast, reading between Driver's afterword and *David's Story* entails understanding the pragmatics behind Wicomb's "postmodernist" techniques. In both cases, the relationship between experiential and novelistic chronotopes creates a sense of texture, as sedimented indexical meanings force us to animate the texts in certain ways in order to do things with them. Consequently, texture is an index of the various sociocultural relationships and processes that engender it. These relationships and processes take many forms, including as circulating indexes of capital intraconversion that provide affordances for parsing literary genres of text. These affordances emerge from the relationship between the text and the worlds it moves through as a result of mediatized forms of circulation and emanation.

Postcolonial Literary Fieldwork

To locate how "minor writer" functions in different contexts to different effects dislodges the semi-finalized meaning that the term has for discrete sets of users. This sort of literary fieldwork entails drawing contrasts to see how "minor writer" points to its context, telling us something new about its usage. We could also undertake another type of literary fieldwork that would solicit uptake from attendees of the WCP festival about how "minor writer" functions in conjunction with the photo of Wicomb in the program or permits them to construe "Griqua" during the reading. In contemporary South Africa, where social actions and utterances are being shaken loose from the significance they hold from a reified past and in an uneven present, a combination of these methods may reveal how meanings undergo different types of agitation and settle into new forms; practiced between South Africa and the world in which these signs travel, literary fieldwork may address how temporalities and spaces are linked. Moreover, at a time of uncertainty about the future of postcolonial studies, literary fieldwork can help us understand how we use "postcolonial" in relation to such phenomena.[82]

To unsettle sedimented meanings and draw contrasts concerning indexical terms like "minor writer" is not to endorse one mode of contextualization over another—although we may have good reasons for doing so. Rather, the

aim is to understand how we fabricate texts with varying degrees of stability and different types of texture. This project involves examining the materially discursive and infrastructural elements that constrain signification and construal, in addition to how stretches of text pass through channels of circulation and theories of value become uptake formulations. Protean phases of entextualization that undergird our conception of ongoing action allow us to describe the surfaces of the resultant fabric, but rarely are the metapragmatic limits of the situation transparent enough for us not to examine more phase states. Indeed, when we look at how terms like "minor writer" are repeated across sites over time, we begin to see how different discursive agents struggle to make them function as tokens of a type of semiotic routine. These struggles—these events—in extended real time can too easily produce strategic frames for and hegemonic types of social action that distort our own conduct and analyses.

N o t e s

1. My definition of signification is taken from Michael Silverstein, "Discourse and the No-thing-ness of Culture," *Signs and Society* 1, no. 2 (Fall 2013): 329. For an expansive explanation of language-in-use, see Michael Lucey and Thomas McEnaney, "Introduction: Language-in-Use and Literary Fieldwork," in this issue of *Representations* 137 (Winter 2017).

2. See Zoë Wicomb, "Motherhood and the Surrogate Reader: Race, Gender, and Interpretation," in *Gendering the Reader*, ed. Sara Mills (New York, 1994), 99–127; Zoë Wicomb, "South African Short Fiction and Orality," in *Telling Stories: Postcolonial Short Fiction in English*, ed. Jacqueline Bardolph (Amsterdam, 2001), 157–70; and Zoë Wicomb, "To Hear the Variety of Discourses," *Current Writing* 2 (1990): 35–44.

3. Zoë Wicomb, "Shame and Identity: The Case of the Coloured in South Africa," in *Writing South Africa: Literature, Apartheid, and Democracy, 1970–1995*, ed. Derek Attridge and Rosemary Jolly (Cambridge, 1998), 91–107. Note that "coloured" has a specific meaning and significance in South Africa. While the term was officially codified by the South Africa apartheid government in the Population Registration Act of 1950, signifying "a person who is not a white person or a native," it also has a longer history. For further discussion, see *Burdened by Race: Coloured Identities in Southern Africa*, ed. Mohamed Adhikari (Cape Town, 2009); and Mohamed Adhikari, *Not White Enough, Not Black Enough: Racial Identity in the South African Coloured Community* (Athens, OH, 2006).

4. Ibid., 93, 94.

5. Ibid., 94.

6. Dorothy Driver, afterword to Zoë Wicomb, *David's Story* (New York, 2001), 257–58.

7. Ibid., 216.

8. Zoë Wicomb, "Windham Campbell Prizewinners Reading," YouTube video, 49:48, from a reading hosted by the Windham-Campbell Prize on September 11,

2013, posted by "Yale University," September 16, 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=y6tfTFIKjTw.

9. This purpose constellates my treatment of the subject with other approaches to minorness, such as those of Shu-Mei Shih, Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, and Pascale Casanova. While I share many of their concerns and aims, my methodology makes indexicality the primary analytic node of analysis and critique. Shu-Mei Shih, "Comparative Racialization: An Introduction," *PMLA* 123, no. 5 (2008): 1347–62; Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Toward a Minor Literature*, trans. Dana Polan (Minneapolis, 1986); and Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, MA, 2004).

10. Stephan Meyer and Thomas Olver, "Zoë Wicomb Interviewed on Writing and Nation," *Journal of Literary Studies* 18, no. 1–2 (2002).

11. Michael Kelleher (Program Director, Windham Campbell Prizes), e-mail message to the author, August 1, 2016.

12. James F. English, "Everywhere and Nowhere: The Sociology of Literature After 'The Sociology of Literature,'" *New Literary History* 41, no. 2 (Spring 2010): ix.

13. James F. English, *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value* (Cambridge, MA, 2008), 10; emphasis mine. Intraconversion is predicated upon the idea that "every form of 'capital' everywhere exists not only in relation to one particular field, but in varying relations to all other fields and all other types of capital," and is thus at least "partly fungible."

14. Ibid., 12.

15. Michael Lucey, "Proust and Language-in-Use," *Novel* 48, no. 2 (2015): 273. My intention is not to critically intervene in Bourdieusian scholarship, but merely to indicate how the work of language-in-use can be linked to the criticism that I have found most useful in understanding Wicomb's utterance in the context of a literary prize.

16. Ibid.

17. Meyer and Olver, "Zoë Wicomb Interviewed," 187.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., 188.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., 187.

22. This insight draws on the distinction and relationship between metapragmatic discourse and function. See Michael Silverstein, "Metapragmatic Discourse and Metapragmatic Function," in *Reflexive Language: Reported Speech and Metapragmatics*, ed. John Lucy (Cambridge, 1993), 36; and Lucey and McEnaney, "Introduction."

23. Silverstein's model segments culture into three regimes: one of "evenemential *signification* immanent in the very experience of situated social practice," another of "implied paths or networks of *circulation* of signifying value across event-nodes in an intuited socio-spatial-temporal structure," and "one of multiple centers and peripheries—polar coordinated geometries—of circulatory *emanation* of signifying values"; Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 328.

24. An utterance "either presupposes (hence, indexes) something about its context-of-occurrence, or entails ['creates'] (and hence indexes) something about its context-of-occurrence, these *co-present* dimensions of indexicality being sometimes seen as essential properties of the signs themselves, 'appropriateness-to-context-of-occurrence' and 'effectiveness-in-context-of-occurrence'"; Silverstein, "Metapragmatic Discourse," 36.

25. "With respect to . . . context, the word and expressions in . . . grammatical and co-textual configurations do effective social work by drawing upon or

presuming—indexically presupposing, we say—schemata of socially locatable knowledge of the universe . . . rendering each participant's interactionally relevant relative position a consequence of location within and perspective on such knowledge. The knowledge is, as it were, 'made flesh' in the interactional here and now as participants co-construct an interactional text, a coparticipatory 'do[ing] things with words'"; Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 333.

26. Asif Agha, "Meet Mediatization," *Language & Communication* 31, no. 3 (2011): 167n2.
27. For more, see Asif Agha, *Language and Social Relations* (Cambridge, 2007), 84–144.
28. Circulation describes how "(type-level) semiotic material is then an inferred effect or consequence of (token-level) interdiscursive links across interactional sites"; Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 335. For more on iterability in relation to language-in-use, see Constantine V. Nakassis, "Citation and Citationality," *Signs and Society* 1, no. 1 (Spring 2013): 51–77.
29. Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 334.
30. Graham Huggan, *The Postcolonial Exotic: Marketing the Margins* (London, 2006), vii, viii.
31. Ibid., ix. For a critique and alternative account of the postcolonial exotic, see Sarah Brouillette, *Postcolonial Writers in the Global Literary Marketplace* (Basingstoke, 2007).
32. Ibid., 13, 22.
33. Ibid., viii, 28.
34. Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 329.
35. Asif Agha, "Commodity Registers," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 21, no. 1 (2011): 28.
36. Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York, 2002), 67.
37. "Windham Campbell Literature Prize Ceremony," YouTube video, 29:48, from the prize ceremony held for the Windham Campbell Prize on September 10, 2013, posted by "Yale University," September 12, 2013, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ci90ZHopDEY. The author attended the "Writing After Apartheid" event listed in figure 1 and noted that the moderator's introduction cited material from the program.
38. Warner, *Publics*, 67.
39. See note 2.
40. In an interview from 1990, Wicomb noted that gender issues had often been subordinated to the struggle against apartheid. When asked to "comment on your awareness of the importance of matters of gender within the South African racist social structures," she explained that "if you are involved with the national liberation struggle then gender, they say, has to be put on the back-boiler. The idea is that it is subsumed by the national liberation struggle; I prefer to think that it is suppressed by the national liberation struggle"; Zoë Wicomb, "Interviewed by Eva Hunter—Cape Town, 5 June 1990," in *Between the Lines II: Interviews with Nadine Gordimer, Menán du Plessis, Zoë Wicomb, Lauretta Ngcobo,* ed. Eva Hunter and Craig Mackenzie (Grahamstown, South Africa, 1993), 90.
41. Asif Agha, "Large and Small Scale Forms of Personhood," *Language & Communication* 31, no. 3 (2011): 171.
42. Ibid., 173.
43. Asif Agha, "Voice, Footing, Enregisterment," *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology* 15, no. 1 (2005): 39.

44. Ibid., 38–59. Agha uses "participation frameworks" throughout his paper, but I have used the term "uptake formulations" for the sake of continuity.

45. Asif Agha, "Recombinant Selves in Mass Mediated Spacetime," *Language & Communication* 27, no. 3 (2007): 321.

46. Ibid., 330.

47. It is beyond the scope of this paper to do justice to all of the research in this field. See, in particular, Andrew van der Vlies, "South Africa in the Global Imaginary," in *The Cambridge History of South African Literature*, ed. David Attwell and Derek Attridge (New York, 2002), 703; Andrew van der Vlies, *South African Textual Cultures: White, Black, Read All Over* (Manchester, UK, 2007); Rita Barnard, "Oprah's Paton," *Safundi* 7, no. 3 (2006): 1–21; Rob Nixon, *Homelands, Harlem, and Hollywood; South African Culture and the World Beyond* (London, 1994); Veit Erlmann, *Music, Modernity, and the Global Imagination: South Africa and the West* (New York, 1999); Loren Kruger, "Apartheid on Display: South Africa Performs for New York," *Diaspora* 1 (1991): 191–209; and Jeanne Colleran, "South African Theatre in the United States: The Allure of the Familiar and of the Exotic," in *Writing South Africa: Literature, Apartheid, and Democracy, 1970–1995*, ed. Derek Attridge and Rosemary Jolly (Cambridge, 1998).

48. Barnard, "Oprah's Paton," 7; Van der Vlies, "Global Imaginary," 703.

49. "Overcoming" from Barnard, "Oprah's Paton," 17; "liberation" from Wicomb, "Shame and Identity," 94.

50. Deborah Posel, "The Apartheid Project, 1948–1970," in *The Cambridge History of South Africa*, vol. 2, *1885–1994*, ed. Anne Kelk Mager, Bill Nasson, and Robert Ross (Cambridge, 2011), 319–21.

51. Ibid., 320.

52. Driver, afterword to Zoë Wicomb, *David's Story*, 215n1.

53. For more on "enregisterment," see Agha, *Language*, 145–88.

54. "Zoe Wicomb Wins Prestigious New Prize," Feminist Press, accessed March 25, 2015, http://www.feministpress.org/news-events/zoë-wicomb-wins-windham-campbell-prize. The news item has since been removed.

55. Van der Vlies, "Global Imaginary," 707.

56. Zoë Wicomb, *October: A Novel* (New York, 2014), rear cover; "Zoe Wicomb Wins Prestigious New Prize."

57. According to Warner, *Publics*, 67, the address that constitutes a public has an "autotelic" function. The material circulation of the program, in that it was only available at the events listed in between its covers, set the boundaries of temporality of its circulation and ability to effect schemata of value beyond it.

58. Social knowledge emanates "through the socio-spatio-temporal structures that are defined in and by the trajectories of communication." These are "institutionally regular trajectories of what is recognized as circulation," which "strengthen and culminate in emergently fixed and tiered structures of emanation from certain centers of value production"; Silverstein, "No-thing-ness," 329.

59. See Agha, "Forms of Personhood," 175n9.

60. For an overview of mediatization and mediatized artifacts, see Agha, "Meet Mediatization." For an explanation of how mediatization entails "the lamination of a process of commoditization upon a process of communication," see Agha, "Personhood," 173.

61. My understanding of how discourse orients objects to audiences and vice versa is indebted to Agha, "Personhood." For an illustration of how objects "acquire (or lose) commodity formulations as they pass through criterial frameworks of semiotic engagement," see Agha, "Commodity Registers," 25.

62. According to Mikhail Bakhtin, the "material givenness" belongs to "the work in the totality of all its events"; M. M. Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and the Chronotope in the Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Michael Holquist (Austin, 1981), 255. Bakhtin's affinity with language-in-use suggests that it could be productively connected to the fields known as book history and material texts. This is not the place to suggest specific convergences between a set of methodological tools and such a heterogeneous field, but a good place to start would be with D. F. McKenzie's claim that "the book, in all its forms, enters history only as an evidence of human behavior"; D. F. McKenzie, "The Sociology of a Text: Orality, Literacy and Print in Early New Zealand," in *Bibliography and the Sociology of Texts* (Cambridge, 1999), 126. For a general overview, see Leslie Howsam, *The Cambridge Companion to the History of the Book* (Cambridge, 2015). In the South African context, see Andrew Van der Vlies, ed., *Print, Text and Book Cultures in South Africa* (Johannesburg, 2012); and Isabel Hofmeyr and Lize Kriel, "Book History in South Africa: What Is It and Why Should It Interest Historians?," *South African Historical Journal* 55 (2006): 1–19.
63. Entextualization is one side of a duplex process, which depends upon "the dialectical relationship of entextualization to its complementary phase, 'contextualization,' the ever-changing 'appropriate-to/effective-in' relationships that concurrently develop between text and nontext"; Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, "The Natural History of Discourse," in *Natural Histories of Discourse*, ed. Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban (Chicago, 1996), 15. Also see Lucey and McEnaney, "Introduction."
64. See Michael Silverstein, "Improvising Culture Through Discursive Practice," in *Creativity in Performance*, ed. R. Keith Sawyer (Greenwich, CT, 1997), 272.
65. To name but a few: Janice A. Radway, *Reading the Romance: Women, Patriarchy, and Popular Literature* (Chapel Hill, 1984); Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier, eds., *A History of Reading in the West*, trans. Lydia G. Cochrane (Amherst, 1999); Michael Warner, "Uncritical Reading," in Jane Gallop, ed., *Polemic: Critical and Uncritical* (New York, 2004); and Michael Allan, *In the Shadow of World Literature: Sites of Reading in Colonial Egypt* (Princeton, 2016). For a general overview of work on conceptualizing and studying the "reader" and reading, see Leah Price, "Reading: The State of the Discipline," *Book History* 7 (2004): 303–20.
66. Agha argues that "there is *never* any moment of reception," because "'reception' formulates a model of what happens to incumbents of role 'receiver' based on a series of elisions." Thus, the notion of reception makes it hard to see how messages mediate social relations while engendering the possibility of roles. Instead of trying to model reception, I examine the range of parsings rendered permissible by the interaction of text and context. See Agha, "Meet Mediatization," 167.
67. Lucey and McEnaney, "Introduction"; emphasis mine. My conception of "texture" utilizes Lucey and McEnaney's reading of Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's *Touching Feeling*.
68. Bakhtin, "Forms of Time," 252.
69. Ibid., 253.
70. Agha, "Recombinent Selves," 322.
71. Wicomb, *David's Story*, 1.
72. Ibid., 2.
73. Ibid., 2, 34.
74. The fragment is also slightly abridged from the novel and interpolates a paragraph from earlier in the text.

75. Author's transcription from "Windham Campbell Prizewinners Reading."
76. Driver, afterword to Wicomb, *David's Story*, 215.
77. Ibid., 218.
78. Ibid., 216.
79. Wicomb, *David's Story*, 151.
80. Driver, afterword to Wicomb, *David's Story*, 218, 218n8. Quotations from Wicomb, "Shame and Identity."
81. Wicomb, *David's Story,* 57.
82. I develop this idea from Wicomb's critical practice, which "locate[s] the meaning of the term *postcolonial* not in etymology, but rather in discursive fields where it has been shaped through usage and has acquired a variety of meanings, including, for instance, oppositionality, resistance, the practice of radical readings, neocolonialism, as well as the interrogation of the very term"; Wicomb, "Shame and Identity," 92n.