§ Conclusion

In sum—if one can honestly write summarily—the work of writing above has theorized that dialectics can be unbound of the violence of closure and reinstated as a new form of the total in writing, and that this can be accomplished first by the concept of totalization without totality, and second by the deployment of the figures of aphorism and parataxis into the work of writing. Given Adorno’s assertion of nonidentity and its dialectical justification, and given Kristeva’s fourth term (which may truly be Hegel’s), it is possible to overcome the fear that closure or termination is inherent in the dialectic itself. It may instead be the case that we have yet to be entirely faithful to the contradictory iconoclasm of dialectical thinking, and by this I mean to say that the lineage of the dialectic as a concept is properly dialectical in itself, moving from its early stages as a dialogical concept, to the tripartite form and its critique, and through dialectical materialism to an ever new formulation. The future of the dialectic, as Jameson states in his work, is open, and my hope here is that this openness can be borne out, ontologically and symbolically, in the work of writing.