

PROSE POETRY

1. It's been suggested that to write poetry (that which is less-driven by narrative) in prose gets the person of the poet closer to the writing, assuming that verse has the automatic effect of distancing the poet as a topic from the language.
2. It's also been suggested that prose that is in no way poetry is nonexistent, and a realistic theory of prose would describe it as fundamentally poetic (being a series of spatial relations). The movement of characters and time, as in the novel, would be a bad trick.
3. In addition, it's been suggested that prose poetry follows thought (as in concepts), and the tracking and development of those concepts is not the domain of verse, which locates sentiment in plastic form.
4. This would possibly make the prose poem a reification (in other words an ideology) of the self, whereas fiction is mystification.
5. Prose poetry in such a case is philosophical in the large sense, where semantic units aren't determined by their forward movement, but their relations in the space of the parasyntactic unit.
6. If the prose poem gets the poet closer to the words, then the poet's a system of sorts. Does verse makes the poet an *a priori* interpretation, an ideology of the object?
7. But even if one agrees that poetry is "less-driven" by narrative, it would impoverish the imagination to either pretend that Paradise Lost (etc.) isn't poetry, or is in fact fiction. The claims on behalf of form in this case are less historical or empirical research than an idea of what poetry should be: the poetry of the future, which is more interesting than a summa of the form.
8. And poets are usually bad at hewing to instructions, pulled apart by the perceived demands of the form. Does this mean that much future poetry will not in fact be poetry?
9. Similarly, to cast prose poetry as "a reification of the self" is hard to agree or disagree with. It's not methodology (aside from prose writing, which is self-evident as a practice) but is description.
10. It's been said (and, since, disputed) that the poet's feeling is law. The emphasis, however, is often wrongly placed on "feeling" as in "whimsy." If the emphasis is on "law," then the reader can derive a system from that feeling in the form of a description (namely, what works best for the teaching or propagation of a historical form), and note that one cannot "break" the law except in mystification, i.e.: fiction.
11. If the poet follows or obeys the law, that is, if the poet obeys its feelings broadly defined, a methodology emerges.
12. For prose poetry, this is thought to be philosophical in the large sense of the poet's thoughts recorded or formed as semantic units (or as a plastic form, which de-forms the thought).
13. The plastic form in such a case physically appears to be an ideology of the object: it obeys the contours of external form.
14. What happens in the prose poem that renders it thought?
15. If verse is thought of as thought compromised by form, then prose poetry is assumed to be thought without tangible form, i.e.: pure thought. Is this thought without language, or language without contours?
16. Since prose is as determined by style, punctuation, image, etc., as anything else, transparency is another myth: writing in bad faith.
17. It's been suggested that certain languages or dictions, like Classical Chinese, are masculine, while others (Japanese) are feminine, and so on. Obviously that's untrue except in the manner in which a language corresponds to certain ideas of gender (etc.): language has no physical gender.

18. What I'm concerned with is the choice of the poet, or the belief the poet has, in its method. Belief aside, gender will only play a role in the representation of gender. To think in terms of correspondences is to think in terms of symbols.
19. It's been suggested that the symbol in poetry functions similarly to the synecdoche. Fine, except that poetry is in that case overdetermined by its supposed global content at the expense of its form.
20. Perhaps the strength of prose poetry here is to resemble an object or idea, but like all words never becoming the thing: literally existing as a shadow world, nothing tangible.
21. It's been suggested that symbol is not allegory, and that synecdoche is a supra-symbol, where the indexical stands in for the entire index.
22. It's been suggested that every point of contact in the world is conducive to an electric present.
23. It's been suggested that this (infinite) abstraction is revealed, shown, or experienced by the physical image of (infinite) abstraction. The finite or concrete would in this case not be signposts or transfigurations, but by sleight of hand the infinite would be revealed to be, in actuality, the signification of the infinite.
24. But then, without a physical difference between the (infinite) abstraction and the concrete, what is a system (of abstractions) except all things at once? Every point of contact is irreducible to an amount. The importance is the thing-ness of what is the (infinite) abstraction. Some call this the body of Darmakaya.
25. Some call the prose poem a shadow, but it can also cast shadows. All things cast shadows. Prose poems are immaterial; are shadows that cast shadows.
26. So far these are only analytic propositions or, rather, poetics. To signify the infinite, which is the thought of the thing, through language, appears to be nothing aside from appearing. It may also be likened to an appendage without use, but to which use is prescribed.
27. To do the same thing as what it is that's being signified, to perform or give a performative, as in "I'm sitting" as one sits — that doesn't work here.
28. To do the thing "I'm doing good" is to know the action is not only predicated upon itself for a model of goodness (not a "good" aside from the action). But that action is good but not an external quality. What in the world is doing good? Does doing only happen to others, or in other places?
29. To say, with Dogen, that sitting is the practice of enlightenment, is predicated upon what, other than enlightenment, is sitting. To say with him that this is a poem while having it translated into a physical thing — is that a mystification? An ideology?
30. It's been suggested that writing a poem is doing something. Isn't this a way to partition the done (history of the genre) from the future poem?
31. That a house should make apparent each step of the process of its construction, or that each step of the process is in fact the house, requires to think first that there is no such thing as a house; it's merely something revealed or signified by its material. That, or one has never built a house.
32. It's the same with the prose poem. Under the condition that the process of thought is revealed — either thought is not what it was, or we have never thought.
33. To consider lineation (as plastic form) is irreconcilable with prose thought in this case, if we consider thought a point of contact in which the product of contact is produced.
34. The disadvantage is language. The advantage of something like "Words and Ends from Ez" is its parody of this position.