

*Reply:*

James Hirsh aptly calls attention to the key distinction between Einsteinian relativity and one of its offspring, quantum physics. I too invoked Einstein's assertion that "God does not play dice" as a sentiment that would have rung true with Bakhtin's rejection of the moral relativism that can be attributed to the scenarios aroused by quantum mechanics (418n13). The indeterminacy of the age of relativity I referred to was not ambivalence, in which Schrodinger's cat is at once alive and dead. Such a picture would have troubled Bakhtin as much as it did Einstein. Nevertheless, both did champion an indeterminate point of view. As theoreticians, Einstein and Bakhtin were deeply invested in how one approached and observed the world. In their works, they sought to revolutionize the process of taking measurements (in Einstein's case) and reading (in Bakhtin's). I was attempting to argue that indeterminacy, while not a constituent element of either's reality, was indispensable to the ways in which they understood the role of viewer and reader. This indeterminacy affirms and preserves the individuality and humanity of each observing subject and is thus at home in both men's worldviews.

I would join Hirsh, as well as Einstein and Bakhtin, in asserting the longstanding awareness of the relative nature and subjectivity of perception. Bakhtin drew on a wide array of texts—classical, Renaissance, and modern—in formulating his theories of the novel. Bakhtin did not invent subjectivity but rather discovered or saw it from a reader's point of view. Two key points must be made. The true hero of Bakhtin's work is the novel. In his desire to understand this

genre better, the one he viewed as most reflective of reality, he devised his theoretical model (most important for my discussion, the chronotope and polyphony). In the process, Bakhtin refuted the relevance of other genres, including epic, lyric, confessional, and drama. He would have viewed Montaigne's essays as pure subjectivity and Shakespeare's plays as pure dialogue—neither of which correspond to the world as Bakhtin saw it.

Additionally, the key to Bakhtin's discussion of polyphony, and to his use of Einsteinian relativity therein, is a shift of focus onto the reader as an essential and active participant in literature's capacity to generate meaning. At times, this shift imperils the author, since Bakhtin was less concerned with identifying the creator of polyphony than with incorporating it into the interaction between text and reader. Far from claiming that polyphony followed relativity (since all the polyphonic works he examined precede Einstein, some by decades, others by millennia), Bakhtin embraced the epistemological possibilities of Einsteinian physics to reread and reinterpret works of the past. In this respect, the physicist and the literary theorist initiated what can best be described as a paradigm shift—Thomas Kuhn's term for the radical reevaluation of an existing system through a slight shift in perspective. What Bakhtin contributed to our understanding of the literary landscape was not polyphony itself but a realization (or in his terms an "illumination") of polyphony's centrality in comprehending the complexities of the novelistic universe, a universe that strives to mirror faithfully our own.

*Jonathan Stone*

University of California, Berkeley