Metamodern Motifs: Cycling and Recycling Myth

Table of Contents

Cognitive Joyce by Sylvain Belluc and Valérie Bénéjam [Cognitive Studies in Literature and Performance, Palgrave Macmillan, 9783319719931

This collection is the first book-length study to re-evaluate all of James Joyce's major fictional works through the lens of cognitive studies. Cognitive Joyce presents Joyce's relationship to the scientific knowledge and practices of his time and examines his texts in light of contemporary developments in cognitive and neuro-sciences. The chapters pursue a threefold investigation—into the author's "extended mind" at work, into his characters' complex and at

times pathological perceptive and mental processes, and into the elaborate responses the work elicits as we perform the act of reading. This volume not only offers comprehensive overviews of the oeuvre, but also detailed close-readings that unveil the linguistic focus of Joyce's drama of cognition.

Excerpt: There seems to be a hierarchy implicit in our understanding of the relation between literature and cognition: according to a prevailing model of literary history, modernist writers are better than others at representing cognitive processes; and among modernist writers James Joyce is the best. That Joyce thoroughly explores the workings of the human mind across his work is evident from the very opening of Dubliners, where a child finds himself reflecting on his perception and interpretation of a "lighted square of window" (D 9), up to Finnegans Wake, which dramatizes the problematic sensations from—and expression of—the surrounding world. Joyce's last work conveys our complex apprehension of "the audible-visible-gnosible-edible world" (FW 88.6). Whether we can ever be "cognitively conatively cogitabundantly sure" of anything (FW 88.7-8), and whether we are capable of conveying such cognition, is the wider question constantly broached through Joyce's writing. To put it in plain English: what we know and how we know it is the focus of Joyce's literary know-how.

In Ulysses, the exceptionally detailed, true-to-life portrayal of the human mind is a constant concern of the narrative, whichever character we may be following. Whether it be Stephen imagining that the two women he spots on Sandymount Strand are midwives ("[n]umber one swung lourdily her midwife's bag," U 3.32), Bloom deducing from his spatial position that the sound he hears at the end of the "Calypso" episode are the bells of the nearest church ("[a] creak and a dark whirr in the air high up. The bells of George's church," U 4.544-5), or Molly mocking atheists for turning to God on their deathbeds ("atheists [...] go howling for the priest and they dying and why why because theyre afraid of hell," U 18.1566-8), the novel continually focuses on uncovering the different cognitive functions which enable human beings to build up their store of knowledge—such as, in the previous examples, categorization, contextualization, and generalization. Significantly, the very first organ

associated with Joyce's modern Odysseus as he comes to life in the novel is "his mind," in which we are informed that, following some absurd anatomical configuration, there are "[k]idneys": "[k]idneys were in his mind" (U 4.6). In "Ithaca," the catechistic narrator is still wondering "[w]hat reflections occupied [Bloom's] mind" (U 17.1408), and this concern is maintained up to the last pages, in which Molly and Leopold's romance is revealed to have been, from the start, a cognitive interaction: "yes that was why I liked him because I saw he understood or felt what a woman is" (U 18.1578-9). In Finnegans Wake, the word "mind" appears more than eighty times, but it is not uninteresting that in many of these occurrences, it is employed as a verb rather than as a noun, in the familiar turn of phrase meaning to pay attention, to heed (as in "[m]ind your hats goan in," FW 8.9; "[m]ind the Monks and their Grasps," FW 579.12-13), or to object (as in "[w]ould you mind telling us, Shaun honey,..." FW 410.28). Although it seems less explicitly focused on cognitive processes, the verbal form may paradoxically be more significant, for it is always in action, in progress, that Joyce's writing probes minds at work.

Unsurprisingly, cognitive approaches have proven particularly valuable to illuminate the thoughts and behaviour of Joyce's characters, and several literary critics have already summoned them to examine Joyce's works. In this respect, cognitive literary studies are no exception to the habitual Joycean critical draw: with its boldly experimental quality and nevertheless uncontested canonical status, the oeuvre stands out as a flagship of literary modernism and even of literature as a whole—testing the limits of what literature is and of what it can do. As such, it often becomes an early touchstone for new trends in criticism and theory (feminist studies, Lacanian psychoanalysis, structuralism and narratology, post-structuralism, post-colonialism, for obvious instances among many others). This Introduction will present how Joyce's works have interacted with the development in literary cognitive studies, and then set forth the latest ways in which the contributors to this collection elaborate on these interactions and develop new angles of their own.

* * *

Significantly, one of the first reviews of Ulysses was written by a neurologist: Joseph Collins's "James

Joyce's Amazing Chronicle" was published in the New York Times Book Review on 28 May 1922. It was also one of the first positive reviews of the book to emerge from outside the already favourable modernist literary circles. " Ulysses is the most important contribution that has been made to fictional literature in the twentieth century," Collins claimed, founding his praise on Joyce's capacity to "let flow from his pen random and purposeful thoughts just as they are produced" (Critical Heritage 1224), and to "relate the effect the `world'...had upon him" (222). His only reservation—and he was careful to open his review with the warning—lay in the work's complexity: although "a few intuitive, sensitive visionaries may understand and comprehend" Ulysses, "the average intelligent reader [would] glean little or nothing from it" unless it was "companioned with a key and a glossary" (222). In other words, the book was an "amazing chronicle" of cognitive processes, but the reader's cognitive apprehension of the book itself was problematic.

From the beginning, this cognitive double bind was to form the literary consensus over Joyce's work. In her famous 1919 essay on "Modern Fiction," Virginia Woolf celebrated the new young writers—of whom James Joyce was her chief example—who "record the atoms as they fall upon the mind in the order in which they fall" and "trace the pattern, however disconnected and incoherent in appearance, which each sight or incident scores upon the consciousness". Woolf 's "modern fiction," and Joyce as its chief exponent, focused principally on cognitive processes, at the possible cost of an apparent disconnectedness and incoherence that taxed readers' mental capacities. Cognition thus constituted both the object of modernist fiction and a problematic condition of its apprehension and interpretation: readers experienced within themselves the limits of sensory knowledge and of literature's capacity to convey conscious experience in the very process of reading about those limits. In this modernist model, the aesthetic and the cognitive processes are complementary; both are probed and perfected in parallel. The mind reads, and reads a complex mind, and therefore experiences the limits of mind-reading.

The concern for human cognition in Joyce's fiction was thus not lost on its contemporaries. Joyce's first readers, however, principally focused their attention on the insight he provided into the psychological life of his characters. Even Joseph Collins—although he notes the discrepancy between the rather commonplace narrative contents of Ulysses and the extraordinarily complex operations required from its readers' brains—devotes the bulk of his review to praising what he somewhat awkwardly describes as the apparent lack of mediation between Joyce's thoughts and the shape they find on the page. In other words, Collins perceives that Ulysses provides a window onto the unconscious. After noting the apparent absence of any attempt to give "orderliness, sequence or interdependence" to Joyce's thoughts as they are directly transcribed into his book, the neurologist remarks that:

> [h]is literary output would seem to substantiate some of Freud's contentions. The majority of writers, practically all, transfer their conscious, deliberate thought to paper. Mr. Joyce transfers the product of his unconscious mind to paper without submitting it to the conscious mind, or, if he submits it, it is to receive approval and encouragement, perhaps even praise. (Critical Heritage 1224)

Collins's stress on how Joyce reveals his innermost thoughts, fears, and desires without sifting or censoring them requires historical contextualization in light of the explicit reference to Freud. Such insistence on the novel's apparent psychological realism is, in fact, typical of the reviews Ulysses received by contemporaries. The book was widely seen to offer a literary illustration of the ground-breaking discoveries achieved in the field of psychoanalysis, and therefore to present a picture of mind processes much more faithful to reality than that provided by nineteenth-century fiction. In his manifestly disgusted piece, another reviewer, Holbrook Jackson, similarly reveals that, although the novel was deemed to blaze a new trail and its narrative techniques to afford more thorough knowledge of the central characters, the revolution was still exclusively perceived in psychological terms: You spend no ordinary day in [Bloom's] company; it is a day of the most embarrassing intimacy. You live with him minute by minute; go with him everywhere, physically and mentally; you are made privy to his thoughts and emotions; you are introduced to his friends and enemies; you learn what he thinks of each, every action and reaction of his psychology is laid bare with

Freudian nastiness until you know his whole life through and through; know him, in fact, better than you know any other being in art or life—and detest him heartily. (Critical Heritage 1199)

Beyond the amusingly dated reference to "Freudian nastiness," Holbrook Jackson's 1922 review employs phrases that would nevertheless seem perfectly adequate in relation to what Erich Kahler famously termed "the inward turn of narrative"—the phrase serving as the title for the 1973 English translation of the two essays originally published in German in 1957 and 1959.' The 1950s saw a series of critical studies attempting to describe and theorize this new departure in English literature, a historicized view which Kahler clearly sets forward in his Preface:

> If we wish to understand what has happened to the novel, we must grasp both the transformation of our reality and the transformation within man's consciousness. Literary history will be considered here as an aspect of the history of consciousness.

For Robert Humphrey (1954), Leon Edel (1955), and Melvin Friedman (1955), the new techniques devised by Joyce and by his most illustrious contemporaries made it possible to represent the inner workings of the human brain as unmediated, transparent, and true-to-life.

Although such subjectivity could at first be construed as contradictory with the objectivity of nineteenth-century realism and naturalism, more recent critics have tended to consider modernism the logical outcome of the realist movement. Instead of being opposed to realism, modernism has in fact expanded the acceptation of reality itself, which now included consciousness and the unconscious—in other words cognitive, mental events:

> the view that modernism marks a break from realism is consistent with both positive, negative, and neutral assessments of that break. [...] But it is also possible to hold that modernist narratives move from external reality to an inner mental domain without viewing modernism as being fundamentally discontinuous with realism. (Herman 2011, 252-3)

Other critics, such as Jesse Matz (2001) or Sara Danius (2002), have also interpreted modernism as a prolongation of the realist project. Similarly, in the book he recently devoted to Ulysses, studying

some of the later, more boldly experimental episodes (namely "Oxen of the Sun" and "Circe") and their apparent departure from traditional realism, Patrick Colin Hogan (2014) reflects that:

> these episodes do show a change. But the change is not a matter of shifting from realism. It is a matter of reunderstanding just what constitutes realism. The point is particularly important for the relation of these episodes to our understanding of human psychological processes.

Whether continuous or discontinuous with nineteenth-century realism, however, the "inward turn" theory seemed to find particularly strong backing in some of the great modernist masters' own critical writings. Thus, in another passage from her "Modern Fiction" essay, Virginia Woolf praises Joyce for being:

> concerned at all costs to reveal the flickerings of that innermost flame which flashes its messages through the brain, and in order to preserve it he disregards with complete courage whatever seems to him adventitious, whether it be probability, or coherence, or any other of these signposts which for generations have served to support the imagination of a reader... (Woolf 151)

A few paragraphs later, she explicitly heralds human psychology as the new artistic object and objective: "for the moderns [...] the point of interest [...] lies very likely in the dark places of psychology" (Woolf 152). Such statements contributed to the consensus over modernist writing as predominantly determined by its "inward turn," and critics were consequently challenged to describe the different literary techniques elaborated to plumb the depths of human psyche. This enterprise was closely followed by—and is even inseparable from—the rise of narratology as a distinct branch of literary criticism. For instance, "Discours du récit," one of the key sections of Gérard Genette's seminal Figures III (1972), provides an elaborate typology of the different modes of focalization employed in Marcel Proust's Ala recherche du temps perdu (1913-27). Genette analyses the varying levels of proximity between the narrator's and the main character's voices, and thus the degree of faithfulness with which the wanderings of the latter's inner thoughts are registered. Soon after, in Transparent Minds (1978), Dorrit Cohn delineated six "narrative

modes for presenting consciousness in fiction," all (whether first- or third-person) marked by specific shades of narratorial presence. Although explicitly dismissive of the idea that the evolution of narrative technique in European fiction constituted a relentless progression inward, Cohn helped promulgate the notion that the modernists' narrative strategies aimed at mimetically reproducing the thought processes of their characters' minds, and that modernism gradually developed "to its full Bloom in the stream-of-consciousness novel and beyond" (Cohn 8). In her view, the "Penelope" episode of Ulysses, with its technique of "autonomous monologue," represents the classical example of complete fusion between narrative voice and character consciousness.

In the years that followed the publication of Cohn's study, however, there appeared a new interdisciplinary approach, which would ultimately lead its practitioners both to refine and redefine the concepts provided by classical narratology. Borrowing their tools from new developments in linguistics, philosophy, psychology, computer science, neuroscience, or anthropology, a number of critics started to draw on frameworks for inquiry that had been either inaccessible to, or ignored by, structuralist theorists, and thereby developed a new cognitive method of literary analysis. Thus, literary criticism followed a "cognitive turn" to parallel what Kahler had termed the "inward turn" of its literary objects of study and, unsurprisingly, modernism found itself a favoured focus of such approaches. These scholars began to examine all the aspects of storytelling relevant to the functioning of the brain, especially its capacity to acquire, store, and use knowledge. Their goal was to investigate the mental and neurophysiological mechanisms, such as sense perception, attention, reasoning, or memory, which are involved not only in the representation of fictional characters' experience, but also in the construction by readers of the worlds those characters inhabit.

Alan Richardson (2010) has usefully classified the studies falling within that domain into six categories, and although he himself considers his categories to be porous, for the sake of this Introduction we shall borrow his clearly drawn taxonomy. Mark Turner is the most prominent theorizer of the first category, "Cognitive Rhetoric and Conceptual Blending Theory." In 1996, he

published The Literary Mind (1996), in which is explored the role played in our day-to-day interactions with reality by the different aspects of reading activity, such as sequencing, projection, prediction, and evaluation. Focusing in particular on The Arabian Nights and Dante's Divine Comedy, Turner shows how micro-stories, by blending into larger narrative units which can in turn be projected into various domains of experience, act as the true building blocks of cognitive activity. Literature thus becomes the empirical testing ground of the mind's ordinary work, a sort of user manual for real life: read it done by others before doing it yourself. In a thought-provoking demonstration that places reading and literary thinking at the core of cognitive sciences, Turner envisages language itself as born from storytelling. Although his modernist examples are drawn from Proust rather than Joyce, it is probable that such argumentation would have delighted the author of Finnegans Wake.

By comparison, critics working in the field of "Cognitive Poetics" attempt to define the exceptional features of literary works, whose structure and reception they study in the light of information-processing models. Renewing the methods of "reader-response" criticism, their studies are varied. Reuven Tsur (1992), for instance, sets out to prove that literary language disturbs or delays ordinary cognitive processes. Other researchers are concerned with the factors contributing to the creation of key effects of narrative such as suspense, curiosity, or surprise. Richard J. Gerrig (1993) thus draws upon a large psycholinguistic literature to relate the operation of inference-making to the feeling of being "transported" by a narrative. In Why Do We Care about Literary Characters? (2010), Blakey Vermeule argues that reading fiction fulfils a fundamental social function: novels present to us in condensed and elaborately wrought form the puzzles of moral and practical reasoning we encounter in our daily interactions with people. The reason for our intellectual and emotional investment in fiction thus lies in the sheer usefulness of literary characters that teach us how to detect cheaters and navigate the ins and outs of social systems. At the core of Vermeule's thesis lies the idea that fiction directly benefits survival and that our capacity and taste for narrative have been inherited through natural selection.

Blakey Vermeule's work shows the extent to which the field of "Cognitive Poetics" overlaps with the third area of research identified by Richardson, "Evolutionary Literary Theory." The champions of the latter approach take issue with the post-structuralist argument that discourse constructs reality. They argue that genetically transmitted dispositions constrain and inform discourse, and study cultural artefacts in this new light. They thus explain the products of human imagination with the help of theories derived from evolutionary biology. Literary works become cognitive maps to understand the relations of organisms to environments, reflecting the adaptive mechanisms regulated by larger biological principles. Some critics, such as Joseph Carroll (1995) or David and Nanelle Barash (2005) thus identify basic, common human needs—such as survival, sex, or status—and employ these categories to describe the behaviour of fictional characters. Barash's evocative title—Madame Bovary's Ovaries, subtitled A Darwinian Look at Literature—is one that probably would not have disappointed Gustave Flaubert, the son of a famous surgeon, well versed in the medical theories of his age, nor Joyce himself, who when he first left Ireland had gone to Paris to study medicine.

The defenders of this approach, however, have been widely attacked for their propensity to discard conflicting evidence, their unwillingness to allow for the existence of any aspect of behaviour that would not be genetically programmed, and their determination to regard the world of fiction as answerable to exactly the same biological rules as the real world (Richardson 2010, 12-14). This last accusation, however, is one that cannot be levelled at the exponents of the fourth trend identified by Richardson, namely "Cognitive Narratology." Drawing on computational theories of mind and making extensive use of the concepts developed in artificial intelligence—such as "schemata," "scripts," and "frames"—these critics examine the cognitive strategies through which we negotiate narrative texts. In particular, they identify the specific cues seized on by readers to order certain sequences into stories, to relate the formal features of a text to judgements about its type of "narrativity" and, more generally, to create in their minds a broad temporal and spatial environment in which a series of events can unfold. This approach has been illustrated by Monika Fludernik (1996), Manfred Jahn (1997), and Alan

Palmer (2004). In her seminal Why We Read Fiction (2006), Lisa Zunshine applies the Theory of Mind developed in evolutionary psychology to literature. In the present collection, Lizzy Welby's article (see Chap. 11) offers a reading of Ulysses in the light of this theory.

CONTENTS

<>

[Useless Joyce: Textual Functions, Cultural Appropriations](#) by Tim Conley [University of Toronto Press, 9781487502508]
Exceptionally perceptive criticism and a delight to read. Nearly a chuckle on every page with intriguing new insights and hints toward unseen vistas. Conley's work will rise to the top of the Joycean heap of literary goads for *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake*.

"There is little question that this is an outstanding production in the field of Joyce studies, and of very high standard. Tim Conley's knowledge of the existing critical literature is excellent; his close readings rich and sound. Useless Joyce is also an extremely agreeable book to read — well written,

TO DISCOVER THE VARIOUS USE OF THINGS IS THE WORK OF HISTORY. KARL MARX, *CAPITAL*

never boring, always thought-provoking, and at times particularly witty." — VALÉRIE BÉNÉJAM, Maitre de conferences, Université de Nantes

Tim Conley's [Useless Joyce](#) provocatively analyses Joyce's *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* and takes the reader on a journey exploring the perennial question of the usefulness of literature and art. Conley argues that the works of James Joyce, often thought difficult and far from practical, are in fact polymorphous meditations on this question. Examinations of traditional textual functions such as quoting, editing, translating, and annotating texts are set against the ways in which texts may be assigned unexpected but thoroughly practical purposes. Conley's accessible and witty engagement with the material views the rise of explication and commentary on Joyce's work as an industry not unlike the rise of self-help publishing. We can therefore read *Ulysses* and *Finnegans Wake* as various kinds of guides and uncover new or forgotten "uses" for them. *Useless Joyce* invites new discussions about the assumptions at work behind our definitions of literature, interpretation, and use.

Excerpt: Effectual Reading

"All art is quite useless" (Wilde, Picture 4). Wilde's notorious aphorism is remarkable precisely because of its frequent use out of context both by those who salute it as an artistic credo and by those who fret about the social effects and responsibilities of art. In fact, this slippage between polarized understandings of the aphorism underscores its implicit point about "all art" as a rhetorical and conceptual figure that disallows context. Rather than simply the rejection of a social function for art, the careful sequence of propositions and provocations that acts as preface to The Picture of Dorian Gray identifies art as a matter of affect in action, as a relation between "use" and "admiration": "We can forgive a man making a useful thing as long as he does not admire it. The only excuse for making a useless thing is that one admires it intensely".

If we can look past the too-dandified caricature of Wilde that might make us forget his socialist thinking, it can be argued that Wilde anticipates — one might even go so far as to say prefigures — Horkheimer and Adorno, for whom "[c]ulture is a paradoxical commodity. So completely is it subject to the law of exchange that it is no longer exchanged; it is so blindly consumed in use that it can no longer be used". In this context it is crucial to observe that, in Wilde's novel, Dorian Gray uses the enchanted picture of himself: he hides it away, not unlike a stash of pornography, for his own private and shameful viewing. (Octavio Paz writes that a poem's "value and usefulness cannot be measured; a man rich in poetry maybe a beggar. Nor can poems be hoarded: they must be spent". Dorian is a would-be miser of time and pleasure.) Wilde, an ironic pragmatist, literalizes the idea of art as a means to immortality, a formula whose own longevity indicates how unobjectionable it has been to even the most fervently anti-utilitarian humanists and artists. As biographers and annotators habitually remind us, Joyce himself adopted (and adapted) it: "I've put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant, and that's the only way of insuring one's immortality". Everyone who uses this line is being used by Joyce.

When Marjorie Garber claims that "poems and novels do not have answers that are immutably true; they do not themselves constitute a realm of knowledge production", she (perhaps inadvertently) posits a misleading equation between knowledge

and immutability. What one knows is unavoidably circumstantial and contingent, and this is precisely what poems and novels avow. There is knowledge in the hidden portrait of Dorian Gray and in the missing letter of Finnegans Wake, but more important is how they engender knowledge that is multiple, subjective, and often contradictory in the minds of people. Rita Felski observes that it is a predicated understanding of literature as ideology that determines "that literary works can be objects of knowledge but never sources of knowledge".

To sidestep the inhibitions implicit in privileging the question of intention or "design" (whether it be intentio auctoris, intentio operis, or intentio lectoris), we can instead — and to no insignificant liberation — ask about what a text does, what its effects are. Yet as deft a strategy or countermove this seems, it invokes another, equally troubling problem, of what distinction may be made between an effect and a function. Put another way, if a certain poem in my view does X (and X can be as superficial or as sophisticated as you like: the poem makes me sad, or the poem parodies the hegemonic suppositions of normative linguistics), to what extent is my view shaped by utilitarian assumptions about what language, texts, or poems can do, in general or in particular? Do I observe that the poem does X because I perceive X to be useful to me? If I cannot perceive any usefulness in X — that is, if I cannot see how or why the poem should sadden me, if I cannot conceive of a purpose for which I might observe such an effect — can I even perceive X?

Such questions have deep and disquieting phenomenological, ideological dimensions, and by the same token they may seem absurd — if or when they seem useless. In reading the rationale given in "Ithaca" for Bloom's shaving at nighttime, a reader might judge this as a practical notion and take up the practice, but there are many more reasons why a reader might not (not everybody shaves, for one). This example points to why the monkey-read, monkey-do conception of literature is flawed: use is contingent in ways that meaning is not. The example is simple and pragmatic, but the point applies to representations of other behaviours and even moral principles that readers are encouraged to emulate. The hermeneutics of Finnegans Wake depend upon what connections or allusions readers may find "useful," what interpretive suggestions give coherence of context,

however provisional, local, or momentary, to a text defiant of any other kinds. Whether that transitory meaning has any "use" outside of the text is another question again, but it is the use (of words, of images, of sounds, of associations) that allows for meaning, a reversal of the customary understanding of interpretation preceding and governing use.

Adapting Vico's cyclical stages of history, readings of the Wake — and, I would suggest, readings of any text, though I will retain the Wake as an illuminating because extreme case study — can be classified as theocratic, aristocratic, and democratic. Their differentiation lies in how the reading manifests itself, how it responds to the degree and kind of authority that the author locates in or bestows upon the text. In a sense, what I am proposing is a "new science" of the phenomenology of reading, albeit realized in broad strokes. This taxonomy of the "uses" of texts, like Vico's cycles, points both to the social and political immediacy and specificity of these manifestations of reading and to how they are inseparably part of a continuum of readings.

Theocratic readings, first of all, find an urgency in a work of writing that may overpower all other ideas and considerations. Noel Riley Fitch recounts how in 1954 a young man sent dozens of letters and telegrams to his family and friends as well as to Sylvia Beach, warning them to evacuate Paris. He explained that "he had 'solved the riddle' of Finnegans Wake: When would World War III break out?". Joyce's book was a coded prophecy, a "new science" for an atomic age, and this alert reader acted upon this interpretation. Any chuckling we may be tempted to do at this instance might rightly be somewhat nervous, for the force behind this interpretation is enviably zealous, even righteous, in a way that other readings are not, and yet lunacy is not exclusive to such a reading. The reader electrified by the word-for-word truth of scripture and the reader who throws down a mystery novel to call the police and report the murder are both theocratic readers, for they see the text before them as an invasion into the world at large, a new reality that expands or irrevocably alters their own. Censorship is invariably a product of theocratic reading: it is very much an inspired act. In connecting poetry with the sacred, Georges Bataille points to the essence of theocratic reading:

"[S]acrifice returns an element of use value to the world of sensibility".

The aristocratic reading, in effect the default mode of academia, reifies rather than deifies the authority of the text, and treats the text as an invitation to share that authority. The aristocratic reading transforms a reader into an author, and its typical fruits are the lecture, the essay, the monograph (though also, less directly, other forms such as the biography, the novel, and so on). Blogs and book reviews and even private diary entries about one's impressions of a given book all belong to this category. Where theocratic readings instigate changes to the reader's relationship with the world in which he or she lives, aristocratic readings primarily seek to change the reader's relationship with the text (not as separate or distinct from the world, but as another way of being in it).

Finally, democratic readings prompt changes to relationships between readers. Such readings are multiple, non-monologic, contradictory, aggregative. Embodied by conversation, the open exchange of ideas and interpretations, democratic readings do not typically yield publications precisely because they are by definition at odds with the investment of stabilized authority into a particular person, as the publishing industry has come to expect. The most obvious example in this context is the phenomenon of the Finnegans Wake reading group. Such groups are, in my experience, strikingly egalitarian spaces that can feel at once utopian, frustrating, and not unlike a group therapy session. (Not all such reading groups are equally or even functionally democratic, of course, and within any group dynamic there is the possibility of aristocratic or even theocratic tendencies.) A really good Wake reading group empowers readers together. Democratic readings primarily seek to change the reader's relationship with other readers.

Despite what valences, attractive qualities, or problems that political systems designated as "theocratic" or "aristocratic" or "democratic" might hold, none of these three modes of readings is inherently superior to the others (the interpretive insights of an online chat group, taken together as a democratic mode of reading, are not by definition any more or less profound than those of a sermon, nor any more or less prone to folly). In fact, because these Viconian terms suggest a graduated and shifting spectrum of readings, the distinction between one and the next can in some cases be rather hazy. A scholarly monograph could conceivably venture into theocratic pronouncements (though he demurs that he is no academic, John P. Anderson's obsessive study of Finnegans Wake and Kabbalah - at the time of this writing in its tenth volume! - is an example to behold, an enterprise which explicitly says that the Wake "fits no known category other than wisdom literature", and so reads it accordingly). A university seminar discussion is often a site of struggle between aristocratic and democratic tendencies, while the decision to tattoo another's poetry onto one's body is a more or less theocratic gesture, depending on whether and how that tattoo is shown to others.

Cyclicality is also important to this appropriation of Vico, for just as interpretation is ongoing, always in revision, and constantly supplemented and qualified, so too are the terms of "use" for whatever "things" come to hand. Bloom, observing the newspapers in production in "Aeolus," thinks forward to the afterlife of the stuff, the reuse and recycling of information and matter: "the obedient reels feeding in huge webs of paper. Clank it. Clank it. Miles of it unreeled. What becomes of it after? O, wrap up meat, parcels: various uses, thousand and one things". Joyce encourages an understanding of both production and use as co-dependent but not synonymous, one ever and continuously imagining the other, and vice versa.

As I have already suggested, "literature" is not customarily thought of as material that can be either purposed or repurposed, but is instead reified by many writers and readers as some more mysterious or metaphysical phenomenon that

Hand that can grasp,

Eyes that can dilate, hair that can rise if it must, these things are important not because a high-sounding interpretation can be put upon them but because they are useful. MARIANNE MOORE, "Poetry"

cannot be harnessed to base "use." The tautological thinking of "art for art's sake" was never confined to nor laid to rest in late nineteenth-century aestheticism, but finds comfortable refuge in postmodernism. In conversation with Osvaldo Ferrari, Jorge Luis Borges explains how to answer a question of use with useless questions: "Last week I was asked in several places - two people asked me the same question - what's the use of poetry? And I answered them with: What's the use of death? What's the use of the taste of coffee? What's the use of me? What's the use of us?" (Borges and Ferrari). But if the notion that literature is "useless" is likewise too much to bear, one can always celebrate the freedom of literature from mastery. Garber, for example, writes: "[a]t times when meanings are manifold, disparate, and always changing, the rich possibility of interpretation — the happy resistance of the text to ever be fully known and mastered — is one of the most exhilarating products of human culture" (Use and Abuse 30). The rhetorical swelling of this assertion almost obscures the fact that possibility is itself being presented here as a product.

Bloom sounds like the advertising man that he is with the jinglish "various uses, thousand and one things, but he does not sound so very different from Garber's promise of ever further acts of interpretation. Beyond the fact that we do use books - to keep records and extend memory, to furnish a room, to divert and entertain, to teach us, and to make yet more books - lurks the possibility that uses not yet thought of may await their moment, just as death or the taste of coffee or even Borges may yet prove useful. Marx's formula can be tweaked to imagine an alternative history composed of the various times and ways in which certain things have been reckoned useless. In a sense Finnegans Wake is just this sort of history, a rubbishy archive of disjecta, an overgrown midden heap of verbigeration, words nobody knew they needed. If literary history is to map the "various uses" that comprise its subject, the boundaries of "plurabilities" must not be peremptorily fixed and the "useless" ought to be recognized as an undiscovered country. There is always a lesson to be had from the carefully discriminating and shockingly practical Molly Bloom, who thinks of her husband as not "much use" but "still better than nothing" (U 18.999).

About This Book

This book's central axiom is an extrapolation of the powerful refrain from William Carlos Williams's Paterson, a poem considerably influenced by Joyce. To Williams's assertion, "no idea but in things" can be added no interpretation but in use. How readers interpret this book will materialize in their uses of it - whether that's as fodder for a dissertation or as kindling for a fire. By extension, an inability to find any use for it represents a kind of interpretation, albeit a disappointing and uninteresting one. In any event, there are more uses of a text than are dreamt of in an author's philosophy.

The first of this book's two parts is devoted to specifically textual questions of use, distinguished as "Textual Functions." It examines the activities that might be most readily understood as "uses" of a text in the context of textual production, as it may be broadly conceived. These activities include quoting and citing ("using" a text by transplanting it), editing (shaping a "useable" version of a text), annotating and translating (transforming text for use by readers otherwise unable to "use" it), each of which constitutes a chapter's slippery subject.

"Guidance Systems," the first chapter, examines how populous is the crowd of guidebooks jostling to stand next to Joyce's books on the shelves, and asks about the nature of and assumptions behind this relentless endeavour to introduce and explain this author to a hypothetical, benighted audience. This book's second chapter is called "Misquoting Joyce" - the first word may be a gerund or an adjective - because Joyce challenges what it means to use another's words, and whether accuracy has anything to do with the activity. As I have already suggested, the quoter of Joyce is also a means to Joyce's ends, a way in which a text can count on the further dissemination and longevity of his work. Editing, the processes by which a "useable" text is shaped, is the province of the third chapter, "Limited Editions, Edited Limitations." The textual travails of Ulysses have been repeatedly chronicled elsewhere, so this chapter compares two recent editions of Finnegans Wake not merely to appreciate the more than slightly intimidating job such work represents, but to consider what purposes such editions have for what readers. Translation and annotation, intertwined processes of magnifying (and thus inevitably distorting) a text,

are the subjects of chapter 4, "Translation, Annotation, Hesitation," which takes as its focal study the case of Philippe Lavergne's singlehanded translation of the Wake. Like editing, translation and annotation prescribe and to no small degree circumscribe subsequent uses of a given text.

"Cultural Appropriations," the second part of the book, turns from textual production to textual consumption. Declan Kiberd has acclaimed Ulysses as a "modern example of wisdom literature", a "sort of 'self-help' manual" (245), and the second part of this book not only happily accepts this suggestion but adopts it as a kind of reading practice. If we understand Joyce as a self-help author, what advice and instruction await in the pages of not just Ulysses, but Dubliners, A Portrait of the Artist, and Finnegans Wake? These chapters may be approached as kinds of jeux d'esprit in cultural studies, and collectively as an ironic (but not dismissive), self-reflexive assessment of a critical disposition of time past, when fiction and poetry were held to offer readers directives (usually moral) for living. By asking what uses these books may have and stooping to consider uses which may well seem improbable or irreverent - and, equally important, without set or predetermined conceptions of what uses literature as an institution might be supposed to have (a careful provision meant to prevent teetering into such chasms as Leavisite moralism) - we find ourselves reading these books in ways that enable unexpected and sometimes stimulating interpretations and connections.

In probing such hermeneutic questions, the titles of this section's chapters themselves make precisely the kinds of extravagant promises made in the titles of guidebooks like How to Win Friends and Influence People, A Guide to Rational Living, and Teach Yourself Tantric Sex - and my own inventions may even seem more modest by comparison with real titles such as these, while the subjects at issue in them are both typical and popular in self-help

books. The first of these chapters, "Make a Stump Speech of It," whose title comes from some mock-encouragement in the "Circe" episode, reads Joyce's work as a (kind of) guide to public speaking, a subject whose fascination for the author can be seen in the various ways he returns, again and again, to dramatizing. The next, "Win a Dream Date with James Joyce," consults various guides to dating against the courtship rites and wrongs represented in Joyce's works, and in turn weighs what special attractions someone with a knowledge of Joyce might be able to flaunt. Diet is the subject of the seventh chapter, "The Stephen Dedalus Diet," re-examining our understanding of Ulysses as a book of gastronomic extravagances with questions about what exactly Stephen Dedalus eats, how Joyce composes his text, and what narrative and political significance lies in eating choices. It can be chastening to ask whether literary criticism might or can be one of the "useful arts." How applied are its methods and insights, does it have functions apart from textual ones? Bloom's reading of Matcham's Masterstroke in the jakes, itself a kind of use (a diversion from the operation under way and "his own rising smell" [4.513]), ends with what might well be an interpretation: "He tore away half the prize story sharply and wiped himself with it" (4.537). Whether this constitutes a theocratic, aristocratic, or democratic reading I leave to others to judge, but if this can be seen as a gesture of literary criticism, a masterstroke of its own, then our own acts of criticism may be uses of texts not yet recognized as such. One function begets another.

> CLANK IT. CLANK IT. MILES OF IT UNREELED. WHAT BECOMES OF IT AFTER? O, WRAP UP MEAT, PARCELS: VARIOUS USES, THOUSAND AND ONE THINGS.
>
> JAMES JOYCE, ULYSSES

Contents
Acknowledgments
Note on Abbreviations
Introduction
Part One: Textual Functions

How Writing Works: From the Invention of the Alphabet to the Rise of Social Media by Dominic Wyse [Cambridge University Press, 9781107184688]

From the invention of the alphabet to the explosion of the internet, Dominic Wyse takes us on a unique journey into the process of writing. Starting with seven extraordinary examples that serve as a backdrop to the themes explored, it pays particular attention to key developments in the history of language, including Aristotle's grammar through socio-cultural multimodality, to pragmatist philosophy of communication. Analogies with music are used as a comparator throughout the book, yielding radically new insights into composition processes. The book presents the first comprehensive analysis of the Paris Review interviews with the world's greatest writers such as Louise Erdrich, Gabriel Garcia Márquez, Ted Hughes, and Marilynne Robinson. It critically reviews the most influential guides to styles and standards of language, and presents new research on young people's creativity and writing. Drawing on over twenty years of findings, Wyse presents research-informed innovative practices to demonstrate powerfully how writing can be learned and taught.

Written language is a supreme achievement that distinguishes humans from animals. For many millions of people across the world, being literate gives access to vital parts of social and cultural life, and being illiterate results in more limited opportunities. For employment as an academic, journalist, and of course writer, writing is central to the work. For professional people, writing is a main vehicle for getting work done. For other jobs, writing is vital to efficient practices including health and safety. And for many people, writing as a source of pleasure, recreation, and reflection is what they value most. One thing all writers have in common is the challenge to write well. The challenge for a tiny minority is to reach `immortality' in their writing, but for most people the challenge is making writing effectively reflect the meanings and messages they want to create and communicate. For children, the challenge is learning to write in the first place, and for teachers the challenge is helping their learners to do this. But in spite of the thousands of years of history of writing, and in spite of its global use today, writing has attracted less attention from researchers, particularly compared to oral language and reading.

The beginning of my exploration of writing was informed by both seminal and more recent books written by people with different kinds of relevant expertise, for example by classicists (e.g. Eric Havelock, The Muse Learns to Write), philosophers (Aristotle, On Interpretation), anthropologists (Jack Goody, The Interface between the Written and the Oral), cognitive scientists (Steven Pinker, The Language Instinct), psychologists/educationalists (David Olson, The World on Paper), linguists (David Crystal, The Stories of English), literary/media theorists (Marshall McLuhan, The Gutenberg Galaxy), journalists (Lynn Truss, Eats, Shoots & Leaves), and accounts by writers (Stephen King, On Writing). In answer to a question about the origins of his poems the poet Ted Hughes said:

> Well, I have a sort of notion. Just the tail end of an idea, usually just the thread of an idea. If I can feel behind that a sort of waiting momentum, a sense of some charge there to tap, then I just plunge in. What usually happens then — inevitably I would say — is that Igo off in some wholly different direction. The thread end of an idea bums away and I'm pulled in — on the momentum of whatever was there waiting. Then that feeling opens up other energies, all the possibilities in my head, I suppose. That's the pleasure — never quite knowing what's there, being surprised. Once I get onto something I usually finish it. In a way it goes on finishing itself while I attend to its needs. It might be days, months. Later, often enough, I see exactly what it needs to be and I finish it in moments, usually by getting rid of things.'

Hughes was not only a great poet, he was also interested in how people learn to write, so much so that he published a book on the matter, Poetry in the Making, subtitled A Handbook for Writing and Teaching. The aims behind Hughes' book prompt a wider question about the ways in which writing and language might be taught and learned. If people are to learn, there needs to be some agreement about things to be taught and the best ways of doing so.

One of the first examples of a book designed to teach English language use was published in no less than 100 editions. The author became a household name in the UK and in the USA, and a citation to his name was even used by Charles Dickens in Dombey and Son. And the title of this book?:

WALKER' S
PRONOUNCING DICTIONARY
OF THE
ENGLISH LANGUAGE.
ABRIDGED
FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS
CONTAINING
A COMPENDIUM OF THE
PRINCIPLES OF ENGLISH PRONUNCIATION
WITH THE
PROPER NAMES
THAT OCCUR IN
THE SACRED SCRIPTURES
TO WHICH IS LIKEWISE ADDED,
A SELECTION OF GEOGRAPHICAL PROPER NAMES AND
DERIVATIVES.

The author, John Walker (1732-1807), had a first job as a professional actor, including a run in London's Covent Garden. But his second career was as an educator: initially setting up his own school. After a disagreement with the cofounder of the school, Walker took up the teaching of elocution, at which he excelled. So much so that he was soon educating royalty. His major contribution was a theory of inflections. His attention to the pitch of the voice built on the work of Joshua Steele who had investigated vocal pitch in relation to music. As is clear from the title of Walker's book, he was concerned that young pople should learn to use language `correctly' as he saw it. However, his wasn't a 'book about the composition of writing but more about other important elements of language. Books directly about writing were to come later.

How Writing Works is about the process of writing: the place of meaning as the driving force of writing; and the 'ear of the writer' that enables writing The work on the book was driven by the following questions:

> In what ways does meaning drive writing?
> How should we understand writing theoretically?
> How do key moments in the history of writing enable us to reflect on writing now?
> What are the relationships between the composition of meaning, and the technical elements of writing such as structure, sentences, words, letters, and sounds?
> What are the relationships between oral and written language?
> How are conventions and standards of language established and applied, and in what ways do and should they impinge on writing?
> What is the nature of creativity in writing?
> And consequently: how does writing work and therefore how is writing best taught?

Although the book does make occasional comparisons with other languges, when appropriate, its main focus is on writing in English. My intention is to present a new and more complete account of the process of writing. By way of introduction to some of the themes of the book, and I hope as a means to engage you, I begin with seven short stories of writing.

It was a cold morning and the sky was brilliant blue. The crowd waited expectantly. A countdown commenced. At `zero' the roar of rocket engines vibrated through people's chests. The shuttle moved slowly at first, as if the shackles would stop it escaping, but then with gargantuan force its forward momentum quickened. The white of its tiled hull, and the white smoke frog the rockets, contrasted strongly with the blue sky. In a few short minutes, the shuttle was out of sight and had left the earth's atmosphere. At NASA's Mission Control the pictures of the Columbia Space Shuttle's orbit were clear, and radio contact with the crew was fully functional.

While one of the NASA mission control team had been watching the launch, he thought he spotted something. On playback of the launch video, 82 seconds in, the scientist saw what looked like a small object bouncing off the wing of the shuttle. He alerted his manager. Emergency meetings were convned. PowerPoint presentations of technical information were discussed.

The Mozart Requiem mass and the example of the Columbia disaster that began this introduction, show us writing used to enact and record significant moments in human history. There is writing at our death, and there is writing to record our birth. Because writing is such a powerful part of being human it is also part of the lives of very young children. For the new-born baby, text is just another thing to be observed in the baby's environment, but surprisingly soon it becomes something with which to explore and experiment. And after only a few short years, most young children begin the life-long journey to represent meaning in marks and writing.

Esther was about six years old. She had been asked by her teacher to write a story to prepare for England's national tests in writing. She decided to call the story The Tooth Fairy', and it was written along these lines:

> One day the tooth of a little girl called Chloe came loose then fell out of her mouth. Chloe noticed that the tooth was an unusual colour so she decided to show her mum.
> 'Oh look, it's orange', said her mum. 'That reminds me of a story. When I was a little girl like you the same thing happened to me. So I said to grandma, shall I throw my tooth away?'
> 'Oh no,' said grandma, 'you should throw it into a fire.'
> `Why', I said.
> 'Try it and see.'
> So I threw my orange tooth into the fireplace, and the fire went out.
> The next day Chloe was playing in her garden when she smelled smoke. She looked towards the smoke and saw that the house next door had flames billowing out of the downstairs window. She ran to the low garden fence, pulled her orange tooth out of her pocket, and threw it through the fiery window. And you can guess what happened, the fire went out. A group of worried onlookers shouted, WELL DONE CHLOE!

Esther, as is typical of a girl her age, had enjoyed creating a story that required her to play with ways of making meaning. But it was in the process of the writing that another remarkable story was revealed. The first thing Esther wrote on her blank piece of paper was the title, and she spelled `Tooth Fairy' as The Toth Fire. Her friend took one look at it and said, `That's not how you spell

"fairy"' ! Quick as a flash Esther's combative reply was, `It doesn't say "fairy", it says "fire"'. And, quickly rejecting her first idea for the writing, she proceeded to construct a completely new story that combined the ideas of a tooth and fire. In Esther's mind, it was far better that she did this than concede that her friend was right about the spelling error!

The seven stories of writing were selected because they demonstrate the power, richness and diversity that characterise writing and its processes. The seriousness of the impacts of writing was evident in the space shuttle disaster, but also the ways in which text structure is profoundly linked with the expression of very precise meanings. There appeared to be a lack of clear understanding by some at NASA about the ways in which the communication of specific messages requires command and knowledge of not just the words but also the written form and the links between both. The failure to highlight the most important information prominently in a presentation, while also retaining important technical information, is a problem with balancing structural constraints of written form with the need to ensure meaning is clear. This problem is not with PowerPoint per se, it is one of the challenges of all writing.

In the second of my stories the mathematician's struggle with a 300-year-old riddle that began life as a handwritten note in an obscure margin reveals a different form of written communication, mathematical proof, and the seven-year solitude of the lone writer ultimately transformed through engagement with the community of scholars. Because of this written note, the child Andrew Wiles had a dream. As an adult, his writing of a mathematical proof communicated a very special kind of meaning. This meaning was temporarily doubted by his peers, but finally his success was communicated in the writing of the world's media. And the reason I know these stories? Because Simon Singh thought that the story of the solving of Fermat's theorem could be told: and Singh's wonderful book shows the way in which powerful storytelling is not just the preserve of fiction writers.

In recognition that all writers have personal histories of writing, but also to point to a different form of writing, the third story, of my experience of learning to code the computer language BASIC when at school, is a recognition that we are only at

the beginning of a profound moment in the history of writing, and we continue to experience these digital developments.

The experiences and reflections of expert writers is an important element of the analysis underpinning the book, and the example of Mark Twain, as both exceptional author but also someone so seriously engaged with the processes of writing and publication that he tried to market a printing press, is a glimpse of what we might learn from such writers.

The fifth story, Mozart's Requiem, is profoundly interesting for so many reasons. As a creative masterpiece that combines words and music to make meaning, it is in my view unsurpassed. The story of the processes of Mozart's composition are so interesting in their own right that they have provided the stimulus for a play and a film, and repeated engagement by scholars of music. The torn and stolen fragment of manuscript lends yet another depressing story. Forms such as writing do not exist in some decontextualised world. They live and breathe through their meanings and their connections. Connections between composition of music and composition of text are necessarily part of work that combines the languages of music and words, but the connections are also important as a means to reflect upon writing more generally. The history of human creativity shows how powerful stories are realised through multiple reinterpretations that exist in many combinations of forms.

The wonder of the native American Indian's solution to memory, in the sixth story, provides a link with the graphical forms that characterised some of the earliest forms of writing. The history of writing that I address in the second chapter of the book reveals how key developments took humans from pictures to the alphabet and into the digital age.

And finally, in the seventh story the driving force of meaning lies in so many places. The unusual stimulus of the friend's observation provoked real creativity in the establishment of the overall meaning of a completely new story. Meanings were playfully expressed through orange teeth, stories within stories, and a classic childhood rite of passage: losing `baby' teeth. And the true story about the process of writing showed how spelling is far from a mundane technical feature of writing but instead

is inextricably bound up with effective expression of meaning. The example was also chosen as a reflection of our fascination with children's development but also as an early signal of my intention to think about how literacy education might be better, including how governments set literacy policy, and the extent to which such policies reflect rigorous and robust evidence about what works in the teaching of writing.

The Chapters of How Writing Works

In many areas of research, there is growing recognition that advances in knowledge over the next 100 years will come from sophisticated

understandings that draw across different academic disciplines and areas of human endeavour. This book's analysis of how writing works draws on philosophy, psychology-neuroscience, social science, education, and the arts. As part of the multidisciplinary focus, and as part of the focus on arts, comparisons with music are drawn periodically throughout the book. Music is an interesting comparator because, like language, it exists in oral and written forms.

`Sing to me of the man, Muse, the man of twists and turns'.

Debates continue on the place of orality and writing in Homer's Odyssey, but long before Homer's epic there were marks and pictures made by human beings that communicated meaning. Starting with the philosophers of Ancient Greece, Chapter 1 presents key theoretical ideas about language and writing, and outlines the multidisciplinary theoretical backdrop to the book's arguments. Humans not only express meanings directly through writing but also have the unique capacity of metacognition, to actively and deliberately reflect on writing, and the ways in which meaning is expressed. Even as the ancient Greeks' invention of the alphabet grew in use, they started thinking about what changes writing would bring. Plato suggested that the change was nothing short of revolution: an oral state of mind was to be replaced by a literate state of mind, and the key role in this was played by the Greek alphabet. Socrates explicitly discussed writing with his student Theaetetus, including the minutiae of syllables and letters, in the context of their conversation about knowledge. In modern times, findings from neuroscience suggest that the development of

writing (and literacy) in young children permanently changes the brain, a further outcome of the influence of writing on thinking. And more recent thinking in philosophy, from the perspective of pragmatism, also offers important possibilities for understanding writing.

Chapter 2 is a history of writing. Some of the earliest known paintings, depicting animals to be worshipped and hunted, were seen on the walls of caves. The pictures and marks that were the beginnings of writing led ultimately to human beings' greatest invention of all: the alphabet. Without the alphabet most other inventions would be impossible: no general theory of relativity; no jet engine; no solving of Fermat's last theorem. The history of writing, from pictures through to the alphabet, is a story of incremental steps: first, hieroglyphs and pictograms to represent financial transactions; then, the move from rebuses to abstract determinatives; and finally, the supreme addition by the Greeks, of five characters to represent vowels added to the Proto-Canaanite alphabet of consonants. All these historical developments were driven by humans' constant need to express meaning more clearly, less ambiguously, and in increasingly diverse ways.

The history of writing is also a story of technological changes. A change as important in magnitude as the internet, the invention of the printing press, occurred in the fifteenth century. This was revolutionary for many reasons. It transformed a world of anonymous writers and scribes into a new kind of consumer world with, for the first time, a reading public. The profound changes stimulated by printing included the standardisation of language, the beginnings of the concept of literary fame, the idea of intellectual property, and the change from knowledge controlled by elites towards democratisation of the written word. These trends would continue hundreds of years later, as part of the digital revolution.

If we accept that understanding writing requires a sense of the ways that language changes over time, appropriate ways of thinking about writing, and research from different disciplines, what are the practical lessons for improving writing? As I reveal in Chapter 3, interest in this area, and advice, is not in short supply. There are thousands of texts giving advice about writing (including one I've written myself). What is less common is an

analysis of the patterns of guidance that the range of these texts offer. The modern guides to language and writing addressed in this chapter are descendants of John Walker's Pronouncing Dictionary, which share the intent to describe and prescribe standards of language and writing.

The accounts of writing by eminent writers are a relatively untapped source of knowledge. From the complexities of creativity and composition, to the pragmatics of the room where writing takes place, there is the potential to learn a great deal. The writing processes of some of the greatest writers, that I analyse in Chapter 4, reveal their attention, first and foremost, to meaning at the level of the whole text. The generation of ideas for writing, the `problems' that authors invent, the themes of their writing, the creative processes, and ultimately the precision of meaning that is expressed in their careful choice of words, phrases, and sentences, are processes that all writers can learn about and consider applying to their own writing.

Fiction or non-fiction writing is built on creativity, which consists of the pillars of originality and value, the subjects that are explored at the beginning of Chapter 5. Creativity is not unique to writers. Composers of music, artists, choreographers, architects, also create, and in some different ways so do mathematicians and scientists. Like writers, all meaning-makers use their craft to communicate particular meanings, with intended effects, to a desired audience.

Writing's primitive origins teach us much about the central place of meaning. But there is another source of primitive writing: children's writing. The genetic echoes of humans' development of writing are still present in every young child's journey to learn how to write. It is clear that children's natural play with written marks is centred on meaning and its expression. Just as humans moved from oral language to pictures to alphabets, so too do children as part of their development. Research on how children best learn to write, and how they (and older people) can be taught t0 write, provides another powerful source of knowledge about writing and how to improve it. This is the knowledge from the discipline of education which is the central focus of Chapter 6.

The final chapter of the book features one last analysis of data: my own reflections as a writer of

this book, and some of the biography of my work as a writer. The end of this chapter, and the book, draws conclusions about how writing works, and as a consequence how the teaching and learning of writing in a wide range of contexts might be improved.

Contents

Yeats

The Image of the Feminine in the Poetry of W.B. Yeats and Angelos Sikelianos by Anastasia Psoni [Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 9781527505827]

Tradition and Romanticism: Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats by B. Ifor Evans [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138190023]

The Critical Thought of W. B. Yeats by Wit Pietrzak [Palgrave Macmillan, 9783319600888]

W. B. Yeats: A Critical Introduction by Balachandra Rajan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687554]

Yeats, Folklore and Occultism: Contexts of the Early Work and Thought by Frank Kinahan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687233]

W. B. Yeats: The Tragic Phase: A Study of the Last Poems by Vivienne Koch [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687110]

Essay: Toward a Twentieth Century Poetry

The Image of the Feminine in the Poetry of W.B. Yeats and Angelos Sikelianos by Anastasia Psoni [Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 9781527505827]

Modernism, as a powerful movement, saw the literary and artistic traditions, as well as pure science, starting to evolve radically, creating a crisis, even chaos, in culture and society. Within this chaos, myth offered an ordered picture of that world employing symbolic and poetic images. Both W.B. Yeats and Angelos Sikelianos embraced myth and symbols because they liberate imagination and raise human consciousness, bringing together humans and the cosmos. Being opposed to the rigidity of scientific materialism that inhibits spiritual development, the two poets were waiting for a new age and a new religion, expecting that they, themselves, would inspire their community and usher in the change. In their longing for a new age, archaeology was a magnetic field for Yeats and Sikelianos, as it was for many writers and thinkers. After Sir Arthur Evans's discovery of the Minoan Civilization where women appeared so peacefully prominent, the dream of re-creating a gynocentric mythology was no longer a fantasy. In Yeatss and Sikelianoss gynocentric mythology, the feminine figure appears in various forms and, like in a drama, it plays different roles. Significantly, a gynocentric mythology permeates the work of the two poets and this mythology is of pivotal importance in their poetry, their poetics and even in their life as the intensity of their creative desire brought to them female personalities to inspire and guide them. Indeed, in Yeatss and Sikelianoss gynocentric mythology, the image of the feminine holds a place within a historical context taking the reader into a larger social, political and religious space.

Excerpt: This book has traced the image of the feminine in the poetry of W. B. Yeats and Angelos Sikelianos and explored ways in which the two poets constructed a gynocentric mythology, the energy that drove them to continue with their pursuit and develop their poetry around the idea of the feminine.

I chose to explore Yeats's and Sikelianos's poems in pairs, in order to bring out their similarities and differences in all areas as the poets express their romantic views or their historical, political and religious concerns.

Although they were lyric poets, drama was very important for Yeats and Sikelianos. Being aware of the potential of drama as an educational force, they employed a dramatic form in much of their poetry. In some of their dramatic poems the image of the feminine appears like a beatific vision, which sets in train the transformation of both poet and reader, as explored in Chapter One.

There were certain forces that directed the late nineteenth and twenty century poetry (and art) and these appear to have been very influential on Yeats and Sikelianos. The development of ethnology was one of those forces. A sense of 'the nation' was being formed and folk tradition became a major factor in that process. Yeats and Sikelianos felt national pride in being Irish and Greek respectively, as both their countries were trying to liberate or heal themselves; the two poets, investing in their folklore, composed early epic works in which their heroes after a 'holy sleep,' return to save their country, as discussed in Chapter Two.

The nineteenth century had also seen the re-emergence of the esoteric-occult tradition in Britain, Europe and the USA. Among the various schools of thought that emerged, Theosophy was the best known, and Yeats and Sikelianos along with many other poets and artists, were, influenced by Theosophy and other Mystical traditions. Yeats was openly involved with the Theosophical Society, while Sikelianos developed his spiritual and esoteric side in private discussions with friends and books as seen in Chapter One. During the nineteenth century the study of ancient Greek Philology (literature, language, philosophy), which had long been a major preoccupation in Germany, developed in Britain and throughout the western world, and Yeats and Sikelianos were among those inspired by ancient Greek thought and religion. Naturally, for Sikelianos ancient Greek thought and religion was a core part of his education and culture; for Yeats ancient Irish culture did not seem very different from the ancient Greek, and a number of classicists among his friends encouraged his interest in Ancient Greece.

The study of the classical world gave a new prominence to archaeology, which became a new source of inspiration. Yeats and Sikelianos were fascinated by archaeology; Yeats spent time in The British Museum or The Victoria and Albert Museum in Kensington, talking to statues and sculptures and listening to their story; Sikelianos, who believed in the significance of the natural landscape, sought communication with statues as he visited archaeological sites in Greece. Inevitably, the re-emergence of ekphrastic poetry inspired them, but the two poets went further; they created poems that form a whole sculptural structure where the image of the feminine is at the centre. With their sculptural poetry Yeats and Sikelianos created works of art in which the image of the feminine, as a three-dimensional statue, becomes real and tactile, and where the intense erotic connection between the artist and his work of art, in this case the image of the feminine, becomes alive, as we saw in Chapter Three.

Opposed to scientific materialism, Yeats and Sikelianos dreamt of a new era, with a new religion, gynocentric in essence, that would replace the present society with its established religion which, as many intellectuals thought, no longer served the needs of the people.

The image of the feminine in Yeats and Sikelianos's poetry, a goddess or a beloved woman portrayed as a divinity, became an important symbol of cohesion; and both poets believed that their visionary poetry and the energy produced by the presence of the feminine could bring in a change by awakening people's consciousness.

In 1900 the discovery of the Minoan Civilization by Sir Arthur Evans, became a rich source of inspiration to artists, poets and intellectuals. Apart from important information about various aspects of life in pre-historic Crete, the world of Knossos struck some people as a model for a new gynocentric culture — new, but rooted in the religion of pre-historic societies where the main divinity was the Great Mother Goddess. To construct a gynocentric culture Yeats and Sikelianos had to re-establish a gynocentric religion. As discussed in the Prelude and in the Introduction, the Mother Goddess archetype carries basic feminine functions — warmth, nourishment, protection and loving kindness. The relationship between the faithful and the Goddess can, then, be a mother-child relationship expressing in microcosm the relationship between nature and humanity. Frequently in their poems Yeats and Sikelianos contest Christianity and, through syncretism, find refuge in the Dionysus-Christ image; sometimes they

describe how the new Divine Child is expected by his mother, whether she is Athene, Demeter or Panagia, the Virgin Mary. It is their way of bridging the gap between the ancient religion and the Christian heritage. The Divine Child is of great significance for the two poets; it could bring a new consciousness in the world and the possibility of change: the revival of the old religion in a different, modem form.

Yeats's and Sikelianos's later work reflects a deeper perspective in the human condition; they came to realize that to bring about social change they needed to awaken people by revealing to them the great cosmic truths: life, death and rebirth; such a preparation could lead to inner transformation and illumination. The two poets' late visionary work, Yeats's Per Amica Silentia Lunae followed by A Vision and Sikelianos's The Delphic Idea enhanced, later, by the Eleusinian Testament, are loosely based on the Eleusinian Mysteries. Yeats's revelation of cosmic truths comes in A Vision, a guide towards initiation and transformation, based on 'The Great Wheel' of life. Sikelianos's revelation of important truths appeared first in lectures and later in essays. Like Graves's White Goddess, these essays sound more like a manifesto in tone and intensity and the public could have been confused or remain indifferent; but, in Sikelianos case, Eva's production of Greek Drama raised The Delphic Idea to higher levels. The two poets' late works were intended to inspire readers, raise their consciousness and guide them in a journey of initiation and transformation.

On this path of preparation and initiation the two poets realized that their own transformation was a vital step. Such transformation was possible by invoking and honouring the feminine aspect in them, the anima. This transformation is an alchemical process which affects the individual physiologically and psychologically. In the Hermetic Art of Alchemy the subject of transformation is man and 'self knowledge is at the root of all alchemical traditions'. Such a transformation leads to what Yeats calls Unity of Being and Sikelianos Organic Unity; the feeling of being one with the consciousness of whole creation, which can end to enlightenment.

After their marriage, Yeats and George worked closely together and A Vision is the result of this cooperation. The poet achieved this alchemical self

—transformation, the union of the animus and anima, physiologically first through the experience of Tantric sexual energy, while the

psychological conjunction followed, after the destruction of the ego. Crazy Jane is a collection of poems demonstrating a woman's perspective. I chose not to explore these poems for two reasons: I was not aware of any similar long poem in Sikelianos's poetry; and, as the poems present an unusual — even radical — sequence, I thought that more space would have been needed to explore them.

In his essays on The Delphic Idea Sikelianos expressed his desire to create a spiritual centre in Delphi that would illuminate the world, reviving the ancient Amphictyony. The Delphic Idea culminated with the two Delphic Festivals in 1927 and in 1930; they were a great success and for the audience, they functioned as an experience of a mystical initiation process while Eva's pioneer work in the production and direction of Greek drama was admired internationally.

Sikelianos's mature poems `Imeroi' (Desires) express the poet's desire to transform and the poet accepts the anima as part of him. Sikelianos appears determined to transform himself, but he is still unable to give voice to the feminine inside him. In the `Imeroi' the woman is present but she is almost voiceless; she appears either accommodating or glorifying the male ego, but she does not really speak. Perhaps it was not easy for the poet to dissociate himself from the idea of the traditional patriarchal Greek man, especially at times particularly troublesome in Greece, historically and politically. And yet, his brave attempt for soul unification is a significant step towards a real gynocentric consciousness. Yeats, on the other hand, by becoming Crazy Jane, reveals — in her voice — the difficult soul journey of a poor, fallen woman held in contempt by society. Under this misleading exterior Yeats-Crazy Jane delivers a masterclass for aspiring initiates: a beguiling minor-key adaptation of ideas from A Vision, suggesting that under this unlikely disguise a real mystic may be concealed. And with Crazy Jane, Yeats does succeed in espousing his gynocentric mythology.

In the end, the two poets' attitude in embracing their anima constitutes, perhaps, a main difference

in the way Yeats and Sikelianos construct a gynocentric mythology.

CONTENTS

Tradition and Romanticism: Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats by B. Ifor Evans [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138190023]

First published in 1940. This title examines the tradition of Romantic literature, and the conception of poetry held by poets and critics throughout the centuries. Evans explores the writings of Chaucer, Shakespeare, Wordsworth and Coleridge, up until the modernist movement and the works of W. B. Yeats and T. S. Eliot. This title will be of interest to students of literature.

Excerpt: Modern poetry has made a break with the past, and in consequence many have turned upon the past with either contempt or disdain. Often the attack has centred upon some interpretation of the terms `romantic' and `romanticism', which have been used with a hostile and disparaging effect. F. L. Lucas went as far as to name a volume of criticism, The Decline and Fall of the Romantic Ideal. Mario Praz in The Romantic Agony," a remarkable study of erotic sensibility in romantic literature, left the impression that he had been traversing a territory fantastic, perverse, and obscene. Earlier, T. E. Hulme, viewing the romantics more generally and philosophically, wrote with unqualified condemnation: 'They had been taught by Rousseau that man was by nature good, that it was only bad laws and customs that had suppressed him. Remove all these, and the infinite possibilities of man would have a chance.... Here is the root of all romanticism: that man, the individual, is an infinite reservoir of possibilities.' He found that the romantic tradition had run dry, yet the critical attitude of mind, which demands romantic qualities from verse still survived. `I object', he wrote, 'even to the best of the romantics. I object still more to the receptive attitude. The American `humanists' had reached the same position. Irving Babbitt's Rousseau and Romanticism was published in 1919, a year of too many preoccupations for its immediate or adequate reception in England. Babbitt had his own conceptions of tradition, and of a cultural and moral order. Though these belonged to American rather than to European controversy, his long and insistent attack on romanticism is the ultimate source of much in contemporary debate. While his conclusions were to apply to America, his illustrations and the development of his concepts arose from his study of French literature. He never indicates how far the generalizations drawn from French literature are to be applied elsewhere. From England, he seems to choose isolated examples, which adjust themselves to his argument, without considering whether the whole tradition of our poetry may not differ from that of France.

By his influence on T. S. Eliot, Babbitt has been largely responsible for the revival of `classical' and `romantic' as contrasting terms : the classical had 'a general nature, a core of normal experience', the product of the esprit de finesse in Pascal's definition. From this central reference to normal experience derived the doctrine of imitation, and from imitation in turn the doctrines of probability and decorum. T. E. Hulme had also affirmed a similar conception of the classical: man is an extraordinarily fixed and limited animal, whose nature is absolutely constant. It is only by tradition and organization that anything decent can be got out of him.' T. S. Eliot helped to increase the sense of a conflict between `classical' and `romantic' by a phrase in the introduction in 1928 to an early

volume, For Lancelot Andrewes. He spoke of himself as `classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and Anglo-Catholic in religion'. Eliot obviously experienced some unhappiness in using these terms. `I am quite aware', he wrote, 'that the first term is completely vague, and easily lends itself to claptrap ; I am aware that the second term is at present without definition, and easily lends itself to what is almost worse than clap-trap, I mean moderate conservatism; the third term does not rest with me to define.

Later, Eliot modified the phrasing, fearing that it might be misleading, but that the attack on romanticism remains can be seen by his republication in 1932 of The Function of Criticism,' with its assertion that the difference between `Classicism' and `Romanticism' is the difference `between the complete and the fragmentary, the adult and the immature, the orderly and the chaotic'.

This modern use of the terms, with the consequent disparagement of the `romantic', has led to an unyielding conflict in criticism which has affected judgments on the whole past of our literature. Seldom have so many great names, or whole generations of writers, been dismissed with such summary disapproval. It is almost as if the absolute oppositions of party goverment had lodged themselves upon criticism. For the attack has led some defenders of romanticism to speak out with equal severity. A. E. Housman's reputation as a great Latinist obscured the fact that in his lecture on The Name and Nature of Poetry he was affirming aggressively a romantic position: `there is', he wrote, 'also such a thing as sham poetry, a counterfeit deliberately manufactured and offered as a substitute. In English the great historical example is certain verse produced abundantly and applauded by high and low in what for literary purposes is loosely called the eighteenth century—the period lying in between Samson Agonistes in 1671 and the Lyrical Ballads in 1798, and including as an integral part and indeed as its most potent influence the mature work of Dryden.' Herbert Read in a suggestive revaluation of the terms `romantic' and `classical' reached a conclusion almost as arbitrary in its relation to the past of literature. Poetry which is organic' begins, he suggests, with Chaucer and finds its final culmination in Shakespeare. It is contradicted by

most French poetry before Baudelaire, by the so-called classical phase of English poetry culminating in Alexander Pope, and by the late Poet Laureate. It was re-established in England by Wordsworth and Coleridge, developed in some degree by Browning and Gerard Manley Hopkins, and in our own day by poets like Wilfred Owen, Ezra Pound, and T. S. Eliot'. Apart from Browning and Hopkins, the achievements of the nineteenth century are described as `minor tinkerings'.

The present study has been written in the belief that this controversy is misleading, and that it results from a misguided approach to the past of our poetry. The conclusions of the protagonists in the modern debate, when not governed by prejudice, are derived largely from generalizations about French and German literature, arbitrarily applied to England. The tradition of our poetry and of our criticism denies the sharp distinction of `schools'. We have no `movements' in the sense in which France had a romantic movement, and Germany a romantic school. Apart from our contemporaries, only twice in England has poetry been written to a program; by Wordsworth and Coleridge in Lyrical Ballads, and by Rossetti in his application to poetry of the manifesto of the `Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood'. The most distinctive verse of both poets denied the principles which they set out to support. The disastrous result of the contemporary discussion is to narrow our conception of the tradition and continuity of our verse at a time when an emphasis on their existence would be valuable. The literature of the German romantic school is founded on a critical theory, and is in part its conscious illustration. In England this has no parallel, for in England there is continuity, not the break and recovery which can be seen in Germany. The conflicts in English poetry have largely been the inventions of later criticism. The alleged `schools of poetry' have not existed in England. Changes in the conception of poetry have been usually accompanied with a tolerant attitude to the past, or at least to great writers in the past. With two or three exceptions all our major poets have found merit and enjoyment in the verse of their predecessors, even when they themselves have written in a different manner. This sense of compromise, with a consequent mingling of one form with another, has been one of the most distinctive features of our poetry.

This can be seen in any attempt to define romanticism in English poetry. So much in our verse has had elements which would answer some definition of `romantic', and so little in our verse answers the more extreme conceptions of the term. `Romanticism', however it be defined, does not mean the same for English poetry as for French or German. In one way we invented the term, long after we had had the thing. We gave it to others to use with a different meaning, and then readopted it, only when it had acquired a sharpness of definition inappropriate to our poetry. Contemporary criticism is tending to obliterate the compromise from which the best in our poetry has come. Many poets who were once thought of with honour are now written down to support a theory, and the past in our poetry is reduced to something narrower than it used to be. I have attempted therefore to examine the tradition of our poetry, or rather the conception of poetry held by poets in successive centuries. It is inevitable that the function of the poet, his relationship to experience, to belief and to his audience must change from one age to another. This arises most often from causes that are deeper than any opposition of `classical' and `romantic'. At the same time the polarity of `classical' and `romantic' remains often as the most tangible way in which the problem 'the progress of poetry' can be approached. This study is not an attempt to rewrite the history of English poetry, but rather to study those artists who have modified the conception of poetry. It leads mainly to the work of those whom the poets themselves have from one generation to another judged as important, with some attention to writers who modified the outlook for poetry without achieving any work of masterly quality themselves.

[The Critical Thought of W. B. Yeats](#) by Wit Pietrzak [Palgrave Macmillan, 9783319600888]

This book focuses on W. B. Yeats's critical writings, an aspect of his oeuvre which has been given limited treatment so far. It traces his critical work from his earliest articles, through to his occult treatises, and all the way to his last pamphlets, in which he sought to delineate the idea of a literary culture: a community of people willing to credit poetry with the central role in imagining and organising social praxis throughout society. The chapters of this study investigate the contexts in which Yeats's thought developed, his many disputes over the shape of Irish cultural politics, the future of poetry and the place literature occupies in the world. What transpires is an image of Yeats who is strung between the impulses of faith in the existence of a supernatural order and ironic scepticism as to the possibility of ever capturing that order in language.

This study is distinguished by its grounding of Yeats's critical agenda in a broader context through textual analysis. In addition, it organises and systematises his conceptions of poetry and its social role through its approach to his criticism as a fully-fledged area of his artistic practice.

Excerpt: W. B. Yeats has been in every respect an enduring imaginary presence in world poetry generally' and in each of Ireland's poetic generations particularly. Whether it is Louis MacNeice's struggle with time as a `disintegrative force', Patrick Kavanagh's oscillations `between the two poles of identification with community and an almost anarchic Romantic individualism', Seamus Heaney's idea that 'the more admirable work is that which is. most extensive and provocative in resisting the desolations of human realities' or Paul Muldoon's `sense of the formal complications and possibilities involved in writing out [...] difficult and historically painful material'—for all those and many others Yeats has offered a point of departure. However, Yeats's influence on the Irish imagination goes beyond the immediately poetic, touching on the idea of Irish nationhood. The present study sets out to explore the ways in which Yeats at various points of his life conceived of Irish society in his critical and theoretical (including philosophical and occult) writings.

Recalling the performance of one of John Todhunter's pastoral plays that was given in 'a red-brick clubhouse' in Bedford Park in the latter part of the 1880s, Yeats describes the first time he saw Florence Farr, accompanied by amateur actor Heron Allen, recite verse on stage: `Their speech was music, the poetry acquired a nobility, a passionate austerity that made it akin for certain moments to the great poetry of the world'. But 'when they closed their mouths, and some other player opened his, breaking up the verse to make it conversational, [...] I listened in raging hatred'. It was then, says Yeats with hindsight, that he `discovered for the first time that in the performance of all drama that depends for its

effect upon beauty of language, poetical culture may be more important than professional experience'. I propose viewing `poetical culture' in a broader sense, as denoting a distinctive mode of social organization that is founded by poets rather than by statesmen, religious pontiffs or economic principles. Throughout his non-literary prose Yeats distinguishes poets from other cultural leaders by highlighting the fact that their visions are based on a dual impulse of conviction and irony: conviction as to the existence of a supernatural realm of transcendental truth; and an ironic skepticism of the chances for expressing this truth.

The shift of the primary focus from Yeats's poetry and drama to his essayistic work has been made by Vinod Sena and (less insightfully) by Kartik Chandra Maiti. More recently Bernard McKenna has approached Yeats's critical and theoretical texts, placing them in their historical and cultural context. While we have witnessed a marked trend to grant Yeats's essays and articles an equal privilege to his poetry, they have generally been regarded as `shedding more light on his own work than any critic's commentary'. Conversely, his poetry, as Jahan Ramazani observes, `furnishes and unsettles its own ars poetica', thus becoming a form of criticism of its own raison d'être. It is my contention, however, that his non-literary texts, more than just ancillary to his artistic writings, represent a body of work that seeks to intervene in the process of creating modern Ireland by laying emphasis on the central role that poets and poetry should play in the nation's cultural but also political praxis. Some of the ideas regarding Yeats's conception of Ireland that are here taken up have been explored in a number of excellent books like Kiberd's sweeping Inventing Ireland, Yug Mohit Chaudhry's Yeats: The Irish Literary Revival and the Politics of Print, Michael North's chapter on Yeats in The Political Aesthetics of Yeats, Eliot, and Pound, the papers collected in Yeats's Political Identities and most recently and pertinently Ronald Schuchard's The Last Minstrels. On the other hand, the faith-skepticism conflict that takes many different guises in Yeats's work has generated a lively critical debate over the past fifty years. Whereas Yvor Winters's The Poetry of W. B. Yeats, Conor Cruise O'Brien's `Passion and Cunning' and lately W. J. McCormack's Blood Kindred have stressed what may be called an essentialist side to Yeats and found it reprehensible, the line

extending from Joseph Hone, through Richard Ellmann, A. N. Jeffares, Elizabeth Cullingford, Marjorie Howes, Terrence Brown all the way to R. F. Foster has paid careful attention to the ironic side of the malleable poet.

Yeats's tendency to seek the final truth via the `stitching and unstitching' of his verse has been given ample treatment over the last decade. The tension is aptly expressed by Michael Wood in his painstaking reading of `Nineteen Hundred and Nineteen': `[Yeats's] firmest assertion [...] is that although the spirits are real (the miracle is a miracle, that's not in question) they speak to us in metaphors, and that to take them literally, as one has to in the midst of miracle, is actually to misunderstand them'. Therefore `Yeats pretends to make a concession to reason while inviting reason to reach beyond itself; and especially beyond its bad habits of literalism'? What this implies is that for Yeats, literalism of faith in the final truth is always a misunderstanding of the process whereby this truth is gleaned in the first place. Ironic skepticism towards the evocative power of language allows a glimpse of truth as it also undermines that which is actually glimpsed. As Stan Smith insightfully put it, `Yeats's poems [...] deconstruct themselves as we read, their masterful narratives inscribing in image and trope a plurality of voices which say, slyly or shyly, vehemently or with reserve, "So you say, Willy..." . While Smith makes this point specifically about Yeats's poems, this idea seems to underpin the poet's understanding of all writerly endeavours.

Such elusiveness on Yeats's part determined his complex relationship with the Ireland of his time. A skilled and ambitious organiser, Yeats made inroads into the public sphere early and never shunned controversy, which quickly brought him into the centre of cultural and political battles that raged across Ireland since the early 1890s. From his first major quarrel with Charles Gavan Duffy all the way to his notorious On the Boiler, Yeats proved his skill at casting his opponents in the roles, which he oftentimes simplified to suit his agenda, that he could then attack from various positions. Thus he would play a progressive intellectual to Duffy's outmoded reactionary, a nationalist nativist to Edward Dowden's provincially-minded cosmopolitan, a nationalist activist to Unionists and a spokesman for high culture and experimental

literature to D. P. Moran's and Arthur Griffith's duplicitous moralists, or the last romantic to the defeatist generation of modem poets. Some of these altercations are revisited in this study with a view to demonstrating Yeats's attempts at promoting his agenda at the expense of oversimplifying that of his adversaries. Moreover, I seek to place Yeats's public ideas in the context of his private opinions and the circumstances in which his various pronouncements were formulated. Throughout, the dual nature of Yeats's thought, strung between conviction and doubt, is investigated against that of his friends and of his enemies, from cultural leaders through politicians all the way to other poets. The image of Yeats that emerges here is multi-faceted and riddled with irreconcilable tensions but despite the various transformations that he underwent and the many paths that he simultaneously trod, the idea that the poet is the central point of the cultural and political domain rises to prominence. This poet-figure is repeatedly seen as being on the verge of a great revelation, as he speaks to spirits, discovers the long-forgotten systems of thought, beholds visions, and yet those moments of illumination scud away and he is left with a troubling feeling that `Surely some revelation is at hand'.

Noticing that duality within Yeats, Louis MacNeice compared him to `Lancelot who nearly saw the Grael. He believed in the Grael, divining its presence [...], [Yeats] made great efforts to achieve direct vision. But it was perhaps just because he lacked this direct vision that he was able to write poetry'. In uttering his faith, Yeats questions it but this questioning allows him to continue to have faith. In Reveries Over Childhood and Youth, he remarked, `I was always discovering places where I would like to spend my whole life'. That permanent home of his dreams was never to last and so he came to dwell in what Heaney, referring to Thoor Ballylee, called the place of writing', a symbol of the eternal ideal but apprehensible only insofar as it is embodied in the temporal: the crumbling stone, the ephemeral word.

W. B. Yeats: A Critical Introduction by Balachandra Rajan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687554]

This chief aim of this title, first published in 1965, is to present a comprehensive picture of Yeats's achievement and some of the means for an evaluation of that achievement. To this end both the

poems and plays have been examined and some of Yeats's critical ideas have been briefly discussed. Professor Rajan's study provides a compact introduction to Yeats's work, and will be of interest to the general reader as well as to students of literature.

Excerpt: The volume of literature about Yeats has now reached mountainous proportions. This book adds little to the size of the mountain and does not greatly alter its shape. Its chief aim is to present a compact and reasonably comprehensive picture of Yeats' achievement and some of the means for an evaluation of that achievement. To this end both the poems and plays have been examined, some of Yeats' critical ideas have been briefly discussed and the System has been given such attention as it deserves.

In contrast to some recent studies of Yeats this book regards Yeats as a writer firmly and centrally in the tradition of English poetry whose concern is with the fundamental patterns of human experience, whatever may be his means of approach to these patterns. Yeats' achievement cannot but be diminished by attempts to regard him as primarily a metaphysical Irish nationalist, a neo-Platonic mystic, an occultist, a symbolist, a nostalgic aristocrat, an exponent of the magic world-view, or as anything less than a poet of the human condition. It is because of the depth and inescapable relevance of his concerns that he is successful in creating a language both eloquently public and authentically personal.

My debts to other Yeatsians are sometimes too fundamental to be stated, but I have tried to acknowledge them as far as is possible in a book of these dimensions and in the process to give some indication of the findings of current Yeats scholarship. Space has not permitted my disagreements to be fully reasoned but I hope the reasons are implied in the point of view I have attempted to develop.

The Two Trees, a poem in the second collection that Yeats published, begins as follows:

> Beloved, gaze in thine own heart,
> The holy tree is growing there;
> From joy the holy branches start,
> And all the trembling flowers they bear.

Nearly fifty years later Yeats ends a very different poem, The Circus Animals' Desertion, as follows:
I must lie down where all the ladders start,
In the foul rag-and-bone shop of the heart.

The lines, with their characteristic mixture of self-respect and self-contempt, define both the dramatic difference between Yeats' earlier and later poetry and the deep continuity which underlies the difference. The reader of Yeats must keep firmly in mind these two aspects of the poet's achievement. He must decline to see the later poetry as a disowning of the earlier and he must also be reluctant to see it as the mere reformation of what has already been said, the throwing away of an embroidered cloak. Thus, in The Countess Cathleen, the tree grows like the 'holy tree' from the heart, but it is fundamentally not a tree of joy but of protest, imagined in terms that approach the hyperbolical:

I have sworn,
By her whose heart the seven sorrows have pierced,
To pray before this altar until my heart
Has grown to Heaven like a tree, and there
Rustled its leaves till Heaven has saved my people.

[Yeats, Folklore and Occultism: Contexts of the Early Work and Thought](#) by Frank Kinahan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687233]

This lively introduction to the poems of W. B. Yeats, first published in 1988, provides a series of intriguing new readings of his work in relation to his profound involvement with occultism and folklore. During Yeats's formative years as an artist, two compelling movements were emerging: the revivals of interest in Irish folklore and in the magical tradition. Yeats later named folklore and occultism as the chief intellectual influences on his youth, and [Yeats, Folklore and Occultism](#) sets out to test this claim. This is an important critical book for Yeats scholars and all those concerned with understanding of twentieth-century poetry.

Excerpt: Lloyd R. Morris was perhaps the first critic to argue for a radical disjuncture between the spirit of Yeats's early work and that of his later, the precedence his by virtue of the fact that his The Celtic Dawn (1917) was written at a time when Yeats's career was finally far enough along to tempt division. Of the pre-1900 poetry, Morris said that "Yeats's unique contribution to poetic feeling lies in Ethel dream-like, haunting, other-world spirit that his poetry evokes", a spirit based in "Yeats's disbelief in the life of actuality, and his conviction that the life of dream is the life of reality". Against this stands the "later work", and Morris's claim that Yeats was gradually turning his back on states of pure dream was to be reaffirmed by many a later reader: "In his later work he has dwelled less often in the land of the imagination, and more frequently dealt with reality".

Inasmuch as Morris was burdened by the disadvantage of assessing a career that was still very much in progress, it is surprising how long views like those advanced in The Celtic Dawn remained in currency. Though the details of the formulation were to vary from critic to critic, a striking of the average would have produced a picture of a career that comprised three basic phases. The early work, ran the argument, was that of a man in flight from the world he lived in, a lover of worlds beyond. An older Yeats reversed those priorities, came back to basic touch: decided for the earth. The middle work built the bridge between the first and final phases; in it there began to emerge an artist who, as Morris had it, dwelt "less often" in the world of the imagination, and "more frequently" dealt with reality.

Inevitably, this appealingly symmetrical vision would begin to succumb to more complex descriptions of the Yeats canon; and when the reaction began to form, it took the prevailing views of the early career as its most frequent target. For one example, it is by now more than twenty years since Edward Engleberg, taking his cue from an essay written by Allen Tate more than twenty years earlier still, put into plain terms what readers before him had sometimes hinted at: that "Yeats simply never was the total romantic or aesthete that provides critics with a label for his `early period'". And other critics have offered readings of individual poems that are in accord both with Engleberg and with the bias of the readings offered herein. The fairy lyrics, "The Wanderings of Oisin", and the Rose poems will all provide

centers of attention in the pages to follow; and there will be no quarrel here with the comments of (for instance) David Daiches, who correctly sensed that "The Stolen Child" was a poem that imaged a "warm, familiar, human world" that is "rashly given up" by the child of the title in exchange for "something

cold and inhuman", or with those of Dwight Eddins and Daniel Albright, whose interpretations of "The Wanderings of Oisin" have shown them in sympathy with Daiches, or with those of William H. O'Donnell, who has extended readings like these to cover central lyrics such as "To the Rose upon the Rood of Time".

Yet, despite the accuracy of analyses like these, the book on Yeats's artistic beginnings is far from closed. For one thing, it remains to be shown that readers like those named above have managed to touch not simply the centers of specific poems, but the underlying attitudes of the early work as a whole; and the early work is an extensive body of poetry and prose that, taken en bloc, has never been assessed as thoroughly as it could have been. For another, it even now needs to be shown that this assessment of early Yeats is the more correct one. In 1971, Eddins observed that critical opinion had "of course" swung "completely" away from the "extreme" early position that was content to label the young artist as an aesthete and let matters go at that. Correct on many another count, Eddins is wrong on this one. More recent books from major presses continue to argue that "Yeats's earliest work" betrays "a tendency to flee into dreams", while "in the first decade of the twentieth century...he was able to admit more of reality into his work", a point of view with which The Celtic Dawn would have been in entire agreement. And the most recent book to take the early career as its focus describes the poems on the sidhe and the Rose in terms directly opposed to those of Daiches or O'Donnell or, for that matter, those of the chapters to follow. "The Stolen Child" it sees as grounded in an impulse towards "escapism"; and if it admits that the author of the Rose poems may be described as a man "aware of the dangers he courts", it none the less describes the poems themselves as "mystical, escapist".

Readings like these cannot be lightly dismissed. They make it clear that the critical, consensus that Eddins spoke of is by no means complete; and this

lack of consensus in turn suggests that the recent attempts to revise the long-standing view of Yeats's early career have not been as persuasive as criticism might like to think. A majority of critics once assumed that Yeats's youthful works were mystical, escapist; a majority of critics now assumes that they were not. The school that viewed the young Yeats as escapist had some excellent arguments to advance, as have the critics who have taken this received opinion and recommended a full turn. But neither side has advanced an argument that might fairly be called conclusive. Recognizing that no discussion of Yeats's complex work and thought is likely to contain final words, these chapters none the less aim to show that there are compelling reasons why the critical pendulum should be swinging in the direction that it is, and conclusive reasons for a new and more widespread consensus.

In sum, this book focuses on Yeats's work as it appeared between the beginning of his career and the mid-1890s. It assumes that the early poetry and prose, for all its technical flaws, is the product of a sensibility less refined but every bit as intricate as that of the more mature artist; and its opening reference point is Yeats's emphatic 1921 claim that "our intellects at twenty contain all the truths we shall ever find". If that remark proves accurate, then these works of a man in his twenties should by rights reveal themselves as turning upon precisely the same kinds of tensions that made the later work so rich, and thereby reveal themselves as an integral part of a body of writing that was from start to finish of a single piece.

With subject matter and argument thus defined, there remains a brief word to be said about critical approach.

Even as readers of the early verse have tended to focus more on particular poems than on a body of poetry, so the early work as a whole has generally been regarded in isolation from the forces that shaped it; and this is perhaps the primary reason why the spirit of these writings was so often mis-assessed. It would be hard to lay too brisk an emphasis on the fact that early Yeatsian concerns that later came to seem uncommon were standard topics of discussion among the men and women that a younger artist knew and the manifold sources he drew on. No strange choices, the sidhe and the Rose were rather the natural subject matter of a man who had been deeply marked by two

movements that were coming to fruition as Yeats came into his twenties. The first of these was the revival of interest in Irish legend and folklore; the second was the revival of interest in occultism and practical magic.

To assign these two movements pre-eminence in the growth of Yeats's thought is only to follow his lead. In 1904 he asserted that the "stories" and "old epic fragments" that the Irish revival had made available in English had been "the chief influence of my youth"; and a dozen years later he wrote of how the "form of meditation" he had learned from his studies in magic had been "the intellectual chief influence on my life" from the time he was in his mid-twenties "up to perhaps my fortieth year". A later stage in this work will discuss how Yeats could name both these diverse interests as the "chief" influence on his formative years and yet feel that he had in each case spoken the truth. But for the purposes of this preface, two briefer points will serve.

The first is that the young poet's researches into folklore and occultism were voluminous. As early as 1889 he declared that he had worked his way through "most, if not all, recorded Irish fairy tales"; and in the 1902 draft of The Speckled Bird he had Michael, his fictional portrait of the younger man he had been, claiming to have read "all the old magical books he could find". If these ambitious claims are valid and a retracing of the paths Yeats cut through his early readings will make it plain that they are — then studies thus wide in scope could not have helped but have a profound impact on the early poetry and prose; and apart from its concern with reinforcing a given overview of Yeats's career, the primary goal of this work is to measure how profound that impact was.

The second is that a reading of Yeats's work in its primary contexts must lead to the conclusion that Yeats spoke rightly when he named folklore and occultism as the primary influences on his emerging thought, and that his researches in these areas therefore bear the chief share of responsibility for having moulded the early works into the angular shapes that they took.

The method of the present book, then, is contextual; and, because its original aim was to take Yeats at his word, or at least not to dismiss his claims until they had been put to an adequate test, the central

contexts considered here are those of folklore and magic, and the central emphasis is on the effect that his widespread rangings into ancient stories and old magical books had upon his early thought and work. Inasmuch as I will be relying on the early versions of these poems and tales — less perfected, more revealing — I should emphasize at the start that there will be less stress than usual laid upon technical inadequacies: partly because the imperfections are obvious when they appear, and partly because they have often been stressed at length, but most of all because these chapters are as interested in what Yeats was attempting as in what his early works achieved. In a sense this is an experiment in recreation, a test of whether following Yeats's labyrinthine crossings through his known sources can give a reader an idea of what the poet was thinking as he pondered the blank page. Thus regarded, as if from the inside out, these works emerge as more complex and more interesting than most reports would have had us believe; and if it be objected that folklore and magic were but two of the many influences on the young Yeats, and that a relocation of his writings in other of their contexts might reveal those writings to be more interesting still, we can only nod assent and ask a blessing on all future studies of influence. The areas of Yeats's concern that go unremarked herein would have repaid consideration; but life is short, and this book is already long, and Yeats's folklore sources were unmistaken in their claim that "if one was to count all the threads in a coat, it would never come into the tailor's hands".

The introductory chapter surveys the central sources of the early poetry, the ways in which Yeats went about trying to bind these varied interests together, and the ways in which the revivals of interest in magic and Irish folklore encouraged him towards his search for unity. Chapter 2 examines the early essays and lyrics that grew out of Yeats's excursions into Irish folk and fairy lore; chapter 3 looks at "The Wanderings of Oisin", chapter 4 at the poetry and prose that center on the symbol of the Rose. The argument in each case is that, far from positing the supernatural world as an ideal state, Yeats saw it as incapable of satisfying the complex needs of man. The argument resumes in chapter 5, a reading of those of the early works that center, not on the supernatural, but on the images of the warmer human hearthside and the sheltering natural world: images that best

epitomize the motivating spirit behind Yeats's early enquiries into realms both supernal and mundane. Chapter 6 discusses the ways in which and reasons why these favored early images — the sidhe and the Rose on one hand, home and nature the other — had by the mid-nineties been banished from the poetry or, if not banished, altered to suit a maturing artist's steadily maturing vision.

W. B. Yeats: The Tragic Phase: A Study of the Last Poems by Vivienne Koch [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687110]

In this study, first published in 1951, the author examines the poetry of Yeats's last years, that poetry which reached and held to the 'intensity' which he had striven for all his life. Vivienne Koch explores the ways in which the great but troubled poems derive their energy from suffering, and examines thirteen of his last poems in detail, each with a slightly different focus. This title will be of interest to students of literature.

Excerpt: I have made the following readings of what I consider to be the most interesting and the most difficult of Yeats's Last Poems with the end in view of making them more immediately accessible both to readers of his poetry and to those who read poetry but do not know the Last Poems. The fact that the Last Poems were almost unavailable during the war and post-war years has left a gap of ignorance concerning them even among the many readers of Yeats's earlier work. While his publishers in England have recently released a new edition of the Last Poems, as part of the long-awaited and definitive Collected Poems, the final proof of which Yeats corrected on his death-bed in 1939, considering the great demand for these poems both in England and the United States, this edition may not at once meet the public need. Partly to alleviate this situation, but more primarily to make the job of continual textual reference (without which I do not believe poetry can be profitably discussed) more convenient for the reader.

My method of reading these poems can be best seen in the readings themselves, and I do not think it useful to recapitulate here the critical values which such a method, of course, implies. There is certainly no longer anything 'new' in this way of reading a poem, and I do not think it is necessarily the only way to read one. But I do think it the best way to read a poem as poetry, and not as a number of other things like `philosophy', `history', `sociology', `ideas', or anything else which poems are sometimes taken to be. It will be seen that my method varies a little from poem to poem, and I hope this will be judged to be the result of necessities set up by the individual poem.

While I do not think we should want to read all poems as I have read these poems of Yeats, I do believe that this approach may suggest one for the reading of other poets as well. The chief things in it are, first, a willingness to let that particular poem take hold of the imagination as if it were—at the moment of scrutiny —the only poem in the world; second, to let only that particular poem and no other source—whether in poetry or in prose—determine, in so far as is possible, what its meaning is. This means a trust in the poem, which, if we cannot give it, should make us suspect it as poetry.

But, it will be pointed out, I say in these pages that there is a direction, a `theme', to these last poems of Yeats. This does not violate the essential empiricism of my method. The fact that each poem must first be thought of as an entity, as that thing and no other, does not mean that together a number of poems do not suggest a pattern. The pattern I have found is that these great but troubled poems derive their energy from suffering, describe the process of suffering, and, in the end, celebrate suffering not only as the inevitable condition of living, but as a sign that we truly live. I have indicated that for Yeats this pattern was most observable in the paradox of sex, and that from the configuration and incidents of sexual conduct he was able to construct a field of meaning upon which he drew, in these poems, for subject, language and imagery. While this direction can be seen in all the circumstances surrounding this period in Yeats's life, it is the poems themselves that first evoked it for me, and I have referred to the circumstances only where they had some verifiable and relevant assistance to offer to the poem.

In this study I wish to consider chiefly two aspects of the poetry of Yeats's last years, that poetry which reached and held to the `intensity' which he had striven for all his life. I see its prevailing tragic quality as a revelation of Yeats's final bitter vision that the creative conflict in which he centred the dynamics of all cosmic and human relations could not be resolved. In the curious little document called

`Geneological Tree of Revolution' which his recent biographer, Dr. A. Norman Jeffares, appends to his work,' Yeats made an outline for a socio-cosmological work which he never wrote. The common philosophical sources of his `Tree' are Nicholas of Cusa, Kant and Hegel. Two chief branches depending from them are `Dialectical Materialism (Karl Marx and School)' and `Italian Philosophy (influenced by Vico)'. Under a fourth heading, 'A Race Philosophy', a title which betrays the naïve character of Yeats's thought, he writes: 'The antinomies cannot be solved.' The antinomies are those he has lumped together under the heads of `Dialectical Materialism' and `Italian Philosophy'. The significance of this for readers of his poetry is that for Yeats the antinomical nature of human experience was pervasive whether in the individual, the State, or in the cosmic forces—environment, history, or 'Body of Fate', to use his eccentric terminology—which surround man.

Another feature in the last poems to which I wish to draw attention is intimately related to the first. Indeed, it is a nice question, but one which I will not presume to settle, just which is cause and which is effect. It is that the profound agony of Yeats's conflict (`The antinomies cannot be solved') is at once the source, energy and theme of his last poems. In old age, Yeats became a great poet but he was more than conscious that he had not become a great man. What gives a tragic cast to the work done in his seventies is his own perception of the gap between aspiration and achievement, between the source and the end which is the created object. It was the 'foul rag-and-bone shop of the heart' which he knew to be the raw material of the nobly resolved didacticism of his poetry.

While I do not for a moment wish to direct this study to a biographical reconstruction of Yeats's last years, it is impossible to read these poems without reading the spiritual biography of those years. But, if we do this, we must always remember that we read the poem only incidentally for the biography and primarily for the poetry. Other men have no doubt suffered as Yeats suffered; other men have found in old age no resolution for the multiplicity of choices open to experience. In Four Quartets Eliot testifies:

> It was not (to start again) what one had expected.

What was to be the value of the long looked forward to,
Long hoped for calm, the autumnal serenity
And the wisdom of age?
Had they deceived us
Or deceived themselves, the quiet-voiced elders,
Bequeathing merely a receipt for deceit?

But Eliot discovers for himself a solution which is beyond time, having its locus in mystical experience, and so beyond the exigencies of the specific issues posed by age, itself, as a problem. This is not so with Yeats. His terror is not the terror of a Christian; his suffering does not transcend its source and become the suffering of a saint or a religious. But the suffering itself becomes the great human motive and dynamic of his work. And, at the end, it is the burden of his words as well.

Now the terms in which Yeats expressed this suffering in the last seven or eight years of his life were very largely sexual. One could go further, but it would not add to the poems' value, and say that the cause of his suffering was sexual. The one critic of Yeats who alone has properly tackled this grave and portentous area of his work, Dr. J. Bronowski, is not primarily interested in Yeats's technical achievement but in placing him in a geneological line which connects him with Blake and Swinburne. His argument is this: all Yeats's poetry was dominated by the value of Purpose; not just Christian purpose, but any purposive energy. Yeats lost faith in purpose because he lost faith in his own purpose. After Responsibilities (1914) Yeats 'sets living against poetry and above it'. This opposition now becomes the theme of Yeats' poems. From about 1929, as suggested in the second Byzantium poem:

> Yeats sees the mystic life as the sexual life. He who had sailed to Byzantium because the sexual world belongs to the young in one another's arms now praises Byzantium because he finds there a spawning and sexual life more exciting than that which he has left. There "Godhead on Godhead in sexual spasm begot Godhead". The love of women has at last come into its own.... Everything he writes now is to say this: that the ideal lives because it is sexual.... He has made the abstract life more real by making it sexual. And, while taking his

symbol for this from Blake, he has gone farther because he 'has taken the social beliefs of the nineteenth century into mysticism. He has made the social life the life of the senses alone.... He has made the life of the senses the ideal from which poetry takes its worth.

The conclusion Dr. Bronowski draws from these interesting observations seems to me at once over-simple and over-inclusive. At the end, he says, `Yeats stands against the line of poets whose ideal was poetry. ... He is a great poet of living and of the senses... . Yeats is a poet great enough to stand against poetry.' Earlier, Dr. Bronowski had made an opposition between poetry and living. Now one sees he is fitting Yeats into an antinomy of his own. But, it is possible even at the start of this inquiry, to say that Dr. Bronowski's is a superfluous antithesis. There is nothing in the identification of the mystical with the sexual experience to preclude the poetic act, which, in the passionate style in which Yeats wanted it, is to temporarily transcend the ordinary modes of experience.

Yeats's biographers have been casual about this. Hone is aware of Bronowski's point, and while he himself defines Yeats's work into three periods and says 'much of his verse of all three periods is mystical and amatory. ... It is important to emphasize that the preoccupation with love so apparent in his last poems was evident, just as his mysticism was evident, in his early work', yet he does not make adequate use of even this summary generalization in looking at the poems of the decade 1929-39. Dr. Jeffares, is even less perceptive and makes only the most banal and perfunctory reference to the tormented, sex-obsessed work of the last years: `There was no restriction on the expression of his feelings. If anything interested him then he wrote about it.' Academic thin-bloodedness could hardly falsify reality more seriously.

Richard Ellman, in his now classic biography, Yeats: The Man and The Masks, takes his cue from Dr. Bronowski's early essay and makes it central to his exposition of Yeats's `ideas' in A Vision. He notes that:

> In the dedication to A Vision in 1925 he had admitted that the book was not really finished, since he had said "little of sexual love" and nothing about the "Beatific Vision". The juxtaposition of the two

subjects was not accidental for in sexual love he had an excellent symbol for the conflicting, interpenetrating gyres, while in the "conflagration of the whole being" of the sexual act he saw the antinomies resolved and the window open momentarily upon the Beatific Vision.... With Yeats the reader suspects that the poet may prefer the symbol of beatitude to beatitude itself. He had developed amazing power over his metaphors: the interpenetrating gyres are symbolic of sexual love, but it would be equally true to say that sexual love is symbolic of the gyres....

But what Ellman, like other critics sensitive to these features in Yeats' thought, has shirked is the demonstration of how in the range of gesture and action provided by sexual experience Yeats had defined for himself a field of interest upon which to improvise and from which to draw imaginative sustenance. Like the religious poets of the Christian tradition, of whom he is certainly not to be considered one, Yeats found in the language of sexual emotion a universally meaningful language for translating his apprehension of good. But once said, even this is inadequate. The critic's real responsibility is to show how all this works in the poems.

That this must be a more serious challenge than we sometimes allow is shown up by the most recent critical study of Yeats, Mr. Donald Stauffer's The Golden Nightingale.' Only one of the last poems, 'The Gyres' is studied at any length and that for obvious reasons. For the rest, Mr. Stauffer contents himself with a series of generalizations about 'some principles of poetry in the lyrics', generalizations which reveal how far the critical task yet is from completion. Perhaps the most extraordinary assertion made by Mr. Stauffer is that the principle of Yeats' poetry is `lyrical stasis'.

Further, that

> The appreciation of his lyrics demands a criticism acknowledging that some forms of poetry are not essentially dramatic, that some poets cannot be considered as pastiches, that irony is not the sole secret of intensity or even comprehensiveness, and that analytical methods and the assumption of complexity (in the sense that a magpie's nest is complex) may betray

the lyrical drive towards intense simplicity and compressed form.

Since Mr. Stauffer's book will undoubtedly fall into the many eager hands awaiting help with Yeats's later work, it is necessary to question this passage proposition by proposition. Now, while some forms of poetry are not essentially dramatic, almost all of Yeats's poetry, to a singular degree, is. Second, no poems should ever be considered as pastiches; if they can be so considered, the critic can be sure they are not poems. Third, while it is true that irony is not the sole secret of intensity or even of comprehensiveness, I cannot remember that this touchstone has been over-applied to Yeats's poetry, with the possible exception of Mr. Cleanth Brooks's study of one poem, `Among Schoolchildren'. Most serious of all, is the shocking evasion of the critical task implied by Mr. Stauffer's curious statement that `analytic methods and the assumption of complexity ... may betray the lyrical drive toward intense simplicity and compressed form'. What other methods but analytic ones is the critic to use in the exploration of a work of art? And why should an `assumption' of complexity be made about Yeats's poems, when they are, in fact, complex?

The oddest non-sequitur of the passage, which, one hopes, may stem from Mr. Stauffer's unhelpful syntax, is the statement that analytic methods in the critic, or his `assumption of complexity' `betray the lyrical drive'. Surely, it is only the poet himself who can betray the lyrical drive. Moreover, if what Mr. Stauffer is saying is that analysis of Yeats's lyrics (which sought an effect of simplicity), as if they were complex, will tend to abrogate the real nature of the poems, I think the experience of most persons with Yeats's poetry will refute that. Their simplicity is the simplicity of any self-contained work of art which is `simple' in its unity and complex in its parts. How the complexities which all readers of Yeats have found in the poems, and especially in the last poems, get resolved by the technical process of art into an intense and single unit of experience—the poem—is something which Mr. Stauffer disappointingly does not show us in his study.

Considering the overwhelmingly biographical cast of recent Yeats studies, it seems incredible that no one has explicitly connected the temporary

increase of sexual vitality resulting from the Steinach glandular operation, performed on Yeats in 1934, with the upsurge of interest in physical vitality to be seen in the last poems. And yet Yeats was dying. The real significance of the operation is not in its quite debatable effects on Yeats's personality, but the symptomatic gesture of his voluntary submission to an unorthodox operation whose aim was specifically to increase both longevity and sexual power. The extraordinary readiness with which Yeats accepted the validity of the then quite radical operation, and arranged for its performance only two weeks after he had first heard of it, is effectively suggested by Dr. Jeffares, although he is not concerned either to assess Yeats's motives or the operation's after-effects. Yet every scrap of the surrounding evidence, if the evidence of the poems themselves is not enough, in Yeats's letters, recorded remarks to friends, and direct statements shows that sexual energy was the source, subject and theme of the major poems of the last decade. It was only with difficulty that Mrs. Yeats persuaded him not to include the terrifyingly frank songs of 'The Three Bushes' in the small group of his own poems in the Oxford Book of Modern Verse he was compiling in 1935.

But to see in this poetry only a simple `affirmation' of sex, or worse, of sensuality is narrow, when it is not vulgar. In sexual experience, as I have suggested, Yeats found the energy, the imagery and the basic antinomies of mortality organized into an intricate and tragic nexus. The man who at seventy-one could write from his sick-bed to his younger friend, Lady Gerald Wellesley: 'The first and last sense, and the second mystery—the mystery that touches the genitals, a blurred touch through a curtain ...', was not musing aimlessly. For the very next day, (9th November 1936)

the observation has translated itself into a poem. Yeats writes to Dorothy Wellesley: `After I had written to you I tried to find better words to explain what I meant by the touch from behind the curtain. This morning, this came.' Then is quoted the first version of the Lover's song in the moving sequence which later became 'The Three Bushes'. A few days later Yeats was writing the strange, sensual music of the Chambermaid's two songs. The sequence, about which there has been an extraordinarily critical silence considering both its

length and its merit, shows Yeats following the sexual theme through its various manifestations. Out of the seemingly random observation of 9th November had grown a sequence of seven powerful poems, at least three of them among the boldest `love' lyrics ever written.

But it is essential to see Yeats's sexuality only as the source and not as the end of the last poems. The `animal wisdom' which he attributes to Dorothy Wellesley's poem, `Matrix', and which makes him `jealous' of it, he sees as a philosophical attribute. It was, he wrote, 'the most moving philosophic poem of our time precisely because its wisdom bulked animal below the waist....' Out of the great pain of his early sexual frustration (the moving confessions concerning his seven years' celibacy in the unpublished autobiography quoted by Dr. Jeffares are unforgettable: 'I was tortured with sexual desire and disappointed love. Often as I walked in the woods at Coole it would have been a relief to have screamed aloud.') Yeats arrived at a compensatory and perhaps desperate over-emphasis on the sexual good in his old age. But he made it, as he made all his themes, into something more than the revelation of a personal agony.

Still, the personal roots were deep. He could write to Dorothy Wellesley just before completing 'The Three Bushes': `Forgive all this my dear but I have told you that my poetry all comes from rage or lust.' And of the poem he wrote and named for her, he explains: `I did not plan it deliberately. That conflict (of the poem) is deep in my subconscious, perhaps in everybody's. I dream of clear water, perhaps two or three times (the moon of the poem), then come erotic dreams. Then for weeks perhaps I write poetry with sex for a theme. ...' Only two years before his death, Yeats, in a letter which shows the fevered intensity of his feeling, had been subdued into a chaster one, touchingly writes that he had come out of the `Darkness' [he had been ill] with the recognition that he has lost her. `For part of my solitude was that I felt I would never know that supreme experience of life—that I think possible to the young—to share profound thought and then to touch.' When Dorothy Wellesley comes to edit these letters her own laconic notes, made during Yeats's visits to her home during the time of the friendship, say much: 'Sex, Philosophy and the Occult continue to preoccupy him. He strangely intermingles all three.' It is useful to notice the order

of her list. The significance of `intermingles' is self-evident.

The preoccupation is everywhere. When some broadcasts on modern poetry were proposed for the BBC in 1936 Yeats wrote, in accepting: 'My preliminary statement would explain that the theme was love.' And, later, when he was about to broadcast with the painter Dulac, he presented his thesis with a disarming naïveté: 'That it is not the duty of the artist to paint beautiful women is nonsense. That the exclusion of sex appeal from poetry, painting and sculpture is nonsense (are the films alone to impose their ideas upon the sexual instinct?) that, on the contrary, all arts are an expression of desire—exciting desirable life, exalting desirable death.'

But when one uses words like `preoccupation' the impulse to examine Yeats's work in the light of these facts may, to the careless, seem clinical rather than critical. Nothing, in fact, could be further from my intention. The sexual theme is of significance as the final symbolic statement of that creative conflict which Yeats had early posited as the dynamic of the universe. In the Autobiographies he had written: 'All creation is from conflict, whether, with our own minds or with that of others, and the historian who dreams of bloodless victory, wrongs the wounded veteran.' By the time of A Vision Yeats had extended his early notion of strife as the principle of the artistic process (the idea of the Mask was one term of this conflict, standing for the willed image of the self) to a more universal principle. In the cosmological system of A Vision Phase 1 and Phase 28 are described as being without human incarnations because human life is impossible without strife between the `tinctures'. And Unity of Being, the most desired state in the hierarchy of personality, is significantly centred in the sexual life:

> Hitherto we have been part of something else, but now discover everything in our own nature. Sexual love becomes the most important event in life, for the opposite sex is nature chosen and fated.... Every emotion begins to be related to every other as musical notes are related.

The marriage-bed alone is seen as the `symbol of the solved antinomy' of the irreconcilable conflict at the heart of living. It 'were more than symbol could

a man there lose and keep his identity, but he falls asleep. That sleep is the same as death'. And death cannot solve this Kantian antinomy whose thesis is freedom, and antithesis, necessity. For in Yeats's view, death and life are themselves the expression of the opposition. The young man who had vexed his father by defining truth as 'the dramatically appropriate' became the poet who saw in sex the dramatically appropriate range of speech, gesture and feeling to exploit the irreconcilable strife which he saw as the fulcrum of the human condition. It is this deep motive which gives the imagery of the last poems such a tremendous hold on our hearts and our imaginations. For 'we begin to live when we conceive life as tragedy'.

Even the abstract and conventional symbols of gyres, cones, phases, of A Vision' referred, in the end, to the human situation. After developing an elaborate terminology, elucidated by ingenious and equally arbitrary diagrams, Yeats tells us at the end of his work:

> All these symbols can be thought of as the symbols of the relations of men and women and the birth of children ... all the symbolism of this book applies to begetting and birth, for all things are a single form which has divided and multiplied in time and place.

It is this interest which is at the centre of Yeats's last poems. But the limits of this symbolic order are hinted at in more than one place. And not the least of these is in Yeats' reported remark to John Sparrow: 'The tragedy of sexual intercourse is in the perpetual virginity of the soul.'

When we come to the last poems, then, we must not forget that Yeats was writing out of the deepest necessities of his personality. The early `Mask' was no longer an actively operative ideal. It is Yeats who is looking through the eyes of all the Lunatic Toms and Crazy Janes and Wild Old Wicked Men. Contrary to the notion Eliot has made so persuasive in our time, the man who suffered and the man who wrote were, in the most creative sense of suffering, one. But what was precipitated by this purgative fire—the poems—is the real pretext for my comments.

Essay: Toward a Twentieth Century Poetry:

Towards the Twentieth Century: Gerard Manley Hopkins and T. S. Eliot

The contemporary Twentieth Century poet is in a situation which parallels in some ways that of Dryden. A war separates him from the ways of thought of an earlier generation; he is conscious that poetry has been reformed, and proud in a knowledge of the material world and of the workings of the mind itself superior to that possessed by his predecessors. In one important particular the comparison with Dryden will not hold. For Dryden, while he saw the difference between the literature before the Civil Wars and that of his own age, admired the `giants before the flood'. Contemporary comment, beginning with dispraise of nineteenth-century poets, has often carried the disparagement against other writers in the past. Whatever the stature of a poet he can only achieve what there is in him to achieve, his verse seeming often to contradict the conclusions of his intellect, or to be in contrast to his temperament as this appears in his other activities. So William Morris, who had such gusto in his life, often writes dreamy and intangible verses. In our own age T. S. Eliot, who in his prose has advocated tradition, has in his poetry been more responsible than any other writer for the break with the past. The poet may at times find a hostile attitude to the past necessary to effect his own purposes, as Wordsworth with the `gothic tales', or Keats with Pope. This seems to be the condition of some poets in the twentieth century.

It is far wiser to accept the criticism of poets when they praise, than when they condemn. The best criticism comes from poets interpreting their predecessors in relation to their own work. When the poet condemns it is usually with a passionate assertion, arising from some necessity in the work which he is himself creating. As has already appeared, English criticism has been free on the whole from such violence as far as the greater poets are concerned. The exceptions have been noted, but even with them the condemnation concerns usually not the great in the past, but the lesser figures who have masqueraded themselves into greatness. Nor in the contemporary period has this practice of tolerance wholly disappeared. It is true that certain young writers, who have gained a spurious reputation from their attachment to a political ideology, have played a guerilla warfare with the dead, which is at best a one-sided game.

This is not an unusual activity, as can be seen from Byron's English Bards. Whether these young writers develop into poets remains to be seen, the journey from English Bards to Don Juan is a long one. Whether they achieve this or not, their aggressive tactics in prose comment need not be mistaken for criticism, nor need we be called upon to sacrifice our past to satisfy the subjugation of poetry to some political creed, itself only half assimilated. Not that the tolerance which has so long been a characteristic of our criticism has been entirely lost, for nowhere, not even in Dryden, is there a more disengaged open-mindedness than in W. B. Yeats, and it may be that posterity will judge this age in poetry more through W. B. Yeats than any other name.

With Gerard Manley Hopkins, and later with T. S. Eliot, the break with the nineteenth century declares itself with distinctness. Though they both in their time bring new ways into poetry, they have a degree of tolerance which is beyond that found in much contemporary comment. When their prose criticism is compared it can be seen, however, that Eliot has a certain mannerism in criticism which is preparing the way for dissension and disparagement. Hopkins's criticism is to be found mainly in his letters, and they are often reminiscent of the letters of Keats, not in their conclusions but in the continuous and intense investigations of the poet's aim. Hopkins may even have stretched tolerance too far, as Gray did, in his appreciation of the work of his friends. His mind seems too valuable an instrument to be engaged in the minute criticism of Canon Dixon's poetry, and though he and Robert Bridges gained much from their friendship, it is clear that Bridges had only a limited sympathy with what Hopkins was attempting. It is instructive for the historian of literature that the least tolerant letter in Hopkins's criticism is one in which he attempts to set out poets as belonging to different schools of poetry : 'This modern medieval school is descended from the Romantic School (Romantic is a bad word) of Keats, Leigh Hunt, Hood, indeed of Scott early in the century. That was one school. The letter is a long one, and is wholly made up of such generalizations, which it is strange to discover in such an acute mind. When he comments on individual poets he employs far greater understanding, discovering their separate virtue, and what he has found enjoyable within them. It must be remembered that he finds his own poetical

intentions in sharp contrast with those of his contemporaries, particularly with the nineteenth-century romantics. This does not prevent him from making a judicial estimate of their technical achievement. He expresses what he has found unacceptable in their verses without disparagement or contempt. This is the more remarkable because he is separated from nearly all of them, not only by a division of poetical method but by a more profound conflict in belief. Hopkins, like Langland, with whom he has some superficial technical resemblances, is secure within a Catholic faith which his poetry must serve. His tolerance can be seen in his comments on Keats whose genius he described as `so astonishing, unequalled at his age and scarcely surpassed at any that one may surmise whether if he had lived he would not have rivalled Shakespeare'.[13 June, 1878] His many references to Tennyson show his appreciation of his craftsmanship and his enjoyment of individual poems, and this is the more interesting for it is through Tennyson that he comes to distinguish his own contrasting methods in diction and theme. He may feel that imitation of Tennyson would be sterile, but this does not lead him to speak with disdain. Rather he looks upon Tennyson as Chaucer looked upon the Roman de la Rose: `Come what may he will be one of our greatest poets.' With Browning he was more severe, but it must be remembered that, poetical considerations apart, there was much in Browning openly to wound his faith. Of Browning's poetry he writes to Robert Bridges : `I greatly admire the touches and the details, but the general effect, the whole, offends me, I think it repulsive.' [10 September, 1881] The main reason for this distaste, as far as it was poetical, arose from Browning's wilful disregard for tradition. At the same time he fmds that he does not share Coventry Patmore's contempt of Browning : `I suppose I am more tolerant or more inclined to admire than he is, but in listening to him I had that malignant satisfaction which lies in hearing one's worst surmises confirmed.' The general tolerance in Hopkins's opinions, his desire to discover all that is possible from the past, is accompanied not unnaturally with a modesty about his own achievement. His passages on his own verse would be a salutary lesson to much in contemporary comment, and might be read along with his praise and understanding of Milton's genius and skill in verse.

Hopkins's own statement on his achievement is a far truer summary than the exaggerated praise of some contemporary comment which has attempted to elevate him by reducing his predecessors. In one passage, addressed to Bridges, he detected at once his own virtues and deficiencies : 'No doubt my poetry errs on the side of oddness. I hope in time to have a more balanced and Miltonic style. But as air, melody, is what strikes me most of all in music and design in painting, so design, pattern or what I am in the habit of calling "inscape", is what I above all aim at in poetry. Now it is the virtue of design, pattern, or inscape to be distinctive and it is the vice of distinctiveness to become queer. This vice I cannot have escaped.' Hopkins was seeking a way from nineteenth-century romanticism to the older traditions in English poetry. Not that he wished his poetry to deal with the past, for he came to feel that much nineteenth-century verse had become petrified with antiquarianism : `the poetical language of an age should be the current language heightened, to any degree heightened and unlike itself, but not (I mean normally: passing freaks and graces are another thing) an obsolete one. This is Shakespeare's and Milton's practice and the want of it will be fatal to Tennyson's Idylls and plays, to Swinburne, and perhaps to Morris.

There is little in Hopkins's verse or in his criticism that can be explained by the classical or romantic contrast. As has already been seen, he was in reaction against the romanticism of the later nineteenth century, but this did not mean that he was against the early nineteenth century, or that his own verse or his principles conform to any definition of classical'. He was an advocate of tradition, as is Eliot later, but it is difficult to see that his verse is traditional, in any meaning of the term that will easily admit of interpretation. He may seem to reach back towards Langland, but the verse itself is very unlike Langland's, and their relationship to their audience is very different. Langland was using a measure and a vocabulary which his audience would recognize as an accepted medium for poetry. Hopkins is driven to construct a vocabulary and a method which is so individual that it becomes almost a private language at times. This is not done for wantonness, but it is part of the increased self-consciousness of the poet, which the modern poet finds it difficult to avoid. The study of Hopkins suggests that the poet's relationship to belief, and to a mythological world, is more fundamental than any `classical' and `romantic' contrast. For him, the issue of belief is settled, and he is firm in his Catholic faith.

Poetically the matter is not so simple. For Christianity has never yielded to the poet the world of mythology which Greece and Rome gave so generously. Had Langland's tradition continued, or had the native miracle and morality plays been refashioned by the genius of Shakespeare or Ben Jonson, there might have existed in England this missing element, a religious poetry which could work itself out in epic and tragedy, for these were the forms which Hopkins considered as the highest in poetry. Had our religious history been continuous, the content of our poetry would have been different. As it is, Milton makes the nearest approach to that religious poetry presented in action, but the Renaissance has intervened between Milton and Langland, and bitter disruptions in Christendom, to encumber him in his great task. Religious poetry, as Dryden foresaw, became more the poetry of the individual experience, introspective and contemplative; its natural forms were the lyric, or discursive poetry. Such it had already become with Donne, with Herbert and Vaughan. This interpretation of religion through the individual experience led naturally to the poetry of Wordsworth, and Shelley and Keats. They may disregard in varying degrees the orthodox tenets of a Christian faith, but they discover whatever they are to define as spiritual from their own intuitional contacts with the world. With such an assertion of his own personality, and an emphasis on the individuality of the experience, Hopkins is not concerned. In what is best in him he reaches out beyond the personal, to the dramatic narrative, as in The Wreck of the Deutschland. Even in the lyrics, where he is expressing his religious experience, it is something which he regards as common to any Catholic, not that isolated experience which Wordsworth presented. Yet he was conscious that in his own time in England his experience was not a common one. He was aware of how he contrasted with so much else in his age, particularly in the poetry of his age. While he was aware of a religious tradition, and he was seeking after a poetical tradition, he had something of the self-consciousness of the convert. This was emphasized by the great originality of his mind, not unaccompanied by an element of eccentricity. His values at least, were secure, and he knew that

poetry could not substantiate the vaunting claims made for it by Shelley, nor could it regenerate the world as Arnold had hoped. He saw it first as an art, as his numerous comments on the technique of poetry show so admirably. For him the purpose of that art, apart from the delight in the practise of it, remained in rendering the experiences of the faith within which he lived.

No writer has presented the break with the nineteenth century more clearly than T. S. Eliot, though his own statements in criticism must be weighed in the reckoning rather than all that has been said or done under his influence. It would be difficult to recall a poet who has effected such a change of taste within his own lifetime, or a critic, since Johnson, who has been heard with such deference. He is an innovator who has used as his password `tradition', and possibly it is his American origins which have made him more self-conscious and explicit in this matter of tradition, which earlier English poets had interpreted in a less formal and more instinctive way. In T. E. Hulme and Irving Babbitt he had models in criticism which might have led him to excessive statement. Hulme's importance as a critic, if this is to be assessed solely from his published work, has been exaggerated, but his downrightness has set the tone for much contemporary comment on literature. Babbitt's Rousseau and Romanticism obviously had a powerful effect on Eliot, and not unnaturally, for it is the first reasoned and philosophical attack on romanticism to appear in the English language. Unfortunately, the least worthy sections in Babbitt's volume were his references to English writers, which were frequently petulant and sometimes misinformed. Occasionally, Eliot has imitated Babbitt's manner and the similarity increases in his later volumes of criticism where, like Babbitt, he is maintaining a faith, though not the same faith. Passages such as Eliot's comment on Meredith are unfortunate: `Meredith, beyond a few acute and pertly expressed observations of human nature, has only a rather cheap and shallow "philosophy of life" to offer, Hopkins has the dignity of the Church behind him, and is consequently in closer contact with reality.' Such venomous thrusts are far less frequent than the casual reader of Eliot's criticism might imagine. Compared with his younger contemporaries he is tolerant, though he has given in some unhappy passages a model for summary

condemnation, spoken with every appearance of judicial authority and of irrevocability.

However much his verse may seem to break with the past he has in his prose, on more than one occasion, emphasized tradition: 'No poet, no artist of any art has his complete meaning alone. His significance, his appreciation, is the appreciation of his relation to the dead poets and artists." Nor must it be forgotten that he has brought back into more general appreciation writers and dramatists, known to the scholar, but beyond that neglected. The Jacobean dramatists, and the metaphysical poets, and some prose writers, such as Lancelot Andrewes, have so been served by him, and their work has entered into the contemporary imagination not least through Eliot's own poetry. He has been the most powerful influence in gaining a wider recognition for the work of Pope and Johnson, though the influence of their steady and measured lines is less to be found in his own poetry. No one who has studied his work can have failed to make adjustments in his own values, or in his interpretation of individual writers. Unfortunately, in his praise of one great writer there is often inserted a crabbed, dispiriting reference to another. In his Homage to John Dryden Eliot compares Dryden to Milton : 'For Dryden, with all his intellect, had a commonplace mind. His powers were, we believe, wider, but no greater, than Milton's; he was confined by boundaries as impassable, though less straight.' There is no open attack, but a quiet assumption that we will concur in a diminution of Milton's greatness, with, further, some hidden suggestion that unless we agree there is something opaque or disordered in our critical insight.

Of his verse it is dangerous as yet to speak, for his work as a poet is unfinished. Already it can be seen that his later verse is far removed from the intentions with which he began. The Love Song of J. Alfred Prufrock has little, or nothing, in common with Murder in the Cathedral. The earliest poems are pre-war, and like Wordsworth's contributions to Lyrical Ballads they have attracted more attention than they merit, partly because they challenged attention in such an aggressive way. In some of those early verses Eliot used his technical skill, not for its own sake, or for the theme, but as a weapon of attack against the romanticism which preceded him. The poems themselves were not only poems but

a satirical commentary on the prevailing fashions in poetry. Yet in some of those early poems his own underlying attitude was romantic, and in a sense of the term which in his prose criticism he would have condemned. For he was contrasting the inadequacy of contemporary life with some dreamland made out of phantasies of past beauty.

> I have heard the mermaids singing, each to each.
> I do not think that they will sing to me.

Byron, who sometimes saw life as a `lazar-house of human woes', would have understood this disgust, though he would have been less patient of Eliot's fretful contemplation of his own misery. Even as late as Burbank with a Baedeker Eliot is exploring a romantic malaise, in the difference between the post-war world, and some belief in the experiences which were once possible. As far as the central underlying emotion is concerned, there is little that is new in the early verses: in part it is the mood of Byron, but still more that of Matthew Arnold.

The novelty lies not in the central emotion but in what Eliot himself has named the `objective correlative'. The passage, which occurs in his essay on Hamlet, is among the most suggestive in his criticism: 'the only way of expressing emotion in the form of art is by fording an "objective correlative", in other words a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events, which shall be the formula of that particular emotion; such that when the eternal facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked.' Rossetti 's Burden of Nineveh, Arnold's Forsaken Merman and Burbank with a Baedeker, all arise from a similar type of emotion. In all of them the poet is aware of inadequacy in contemporary experience as compared with the magnificence or appeal of some moment in the past or in the world of fabled things. But with Eliot the `objective correlative' is different. Instead of portraying the beauty of some lovely and antique world, Eliot, to mask his discontent, gives a satiric picture of contemporary life, and contrasts it, sometimes regretfully, but more often cynically, with departed splendours.

The emphasis passes from the emotion itself to its expression, reversing the conclusion which Wordsworth had reached in his preface to the Lyrical Ballads. With Donne as his main example Eliot had revived a poetical vocabulary which would have the appearance of colloquial language

and a natural rhythm. But in contrast to the apparent simplicity of the diction, and mocking it, as it were, he employed a quick, elliptical expression and an imagery newly minted and modern in its reference. The ear might receive the words and the movement of the verse easily, but the mind was held alert and taut. The sources of this language have often been investigated with the result that justice to its originality has seldom been fully conceded. Eliot knew Donne, and the Jacobean dramatists, Webster and Tourneur particularly, and obviously he had studied Mallarmé, and Laforgue. But influences have been overstressed, for this language of wit, where the intellect keeps crowding out the lyric poet who is ever at hand if wanted, is an original and individual medium. In contrast to the earlier `metaphysical' poets Eliot is far more self-conscious of the effects that he is making. He has assimilated some of the modern psychological studies, and by abandoning a logical sequence in his verse he attempts to make his lines image the very quick and wayward movement of a mind in action.

The development of Eliot as a poet is marked by the increasing importance of the subject in his verse, while he maintains a maturing control upon his technique. The stages from the early verse can be marked by Gerontion, The Waste Land, and The Hollow Men. In Gerontion, in his image of the old man, he discovered the exact dramatic theme for the personal emotion which had dominated the early verses. Then liberated from himself he attempted to elicit a poetic image of the distress of modern civilization, nor can any poet of our time stand in comparison with him in this hazardous attempt. His prose criticism shows how he valued such a theme in contrast with the expression of a personal emotion, and the change, not always noted, is his movement from a romantic to a classical conception of subject.

The reference in The Waste Land is not to the individual but to the whole contemporary life of Western man. As far as theme is concerned, it is a return to Pope's way, though Pope is limited to man in his relationship with society, while in Eliot's poem, without any assertion of belief, there exists the consciousness of man as a spiritual being. The difficulty in any such poem must rest primarily with the fable, or the incidents through which it can be recorded. That problem, if my assessment has been

just, has been the concern of powerful poetical minds since the seventeenth century. Dryden, had he wished to solve Eliot's problem, would have had recourse to epic poetry, though, as has appeared, he found that he could not proceed beyond the discussion of the project. Eliot has no traditional mythology, no widely known group of fables which he shares with his reader, and can use as centres of reference. He has to create 'a heap of broken images' from Jessie L. Weston's From Ritual to Romance, from Frazer's The Golden Bough, from the Upanishads and a number of other sources. The poem may be enjoyed without an awareness of these sources, but it cannot be interpreted unless they are understood. Some critics have condemned Eliot for a wilfulness in this creation of symbols, without suggesting any possible alternative. Already, when Arnold was writing in 1865, the command to return to classical fable seemed mechanical and inapt; nor could the poet be any longer certain that a classical theme would be intelligible to a wide audience. Eliot is not attempting to create a secret language, as some of his contemporaries have done, for his own criticism shows that he desires to communicate with the reader and that he realizes the value of some myth or fable for that end: `In using the myth,' he wrote of Joyce's Ulysses, 'in manipulating a continuous parallel between contemporaneity and antiquity, Mr. Joyce is pursuing a method which others must pursue after him.... It is simply a way of controlling, of ordering, of giving a shape and a significance to the immense panorama of futility and anarchy which is contemporary history. It is a method already adumbrated by Mr. Yeats, and of the need for which I believe Mr. Yeats to have been the first contemporary to be conscious.' In The Waste Land, Eliot has made his symbolism out of fragments many of them unfamiliar, and none with the same degree of intelligibility as a traditional fable or mythology. It may be that nothing in the past matched his purposes, for he cannot be suspected here, as in some of the earlier poems, of delighting in obscurity for its own sake. In his later verse, after the consummation of this middle period with The Hollow Men, Eliot has turned to Christian themes, and to dramatic verse. As with Shelley, the application of verse to drama has brought inevitably a greater simplicity into its texture : also it has brought intelligibility. The Journey of the Magi and Murder in the Cathedral may mark the

beginning in Eliot of a new poetry, though it is difficult to see that as works of art they have strength comparable with The Waste Land, and The Hollow Men.

Eliot has spoken of `tradition' more often perhaps than any other poet in England. In this it must not be forgotten, as already emphasized, that he is an American by birth and more accustomed to a written constitution than to judgments from precedent. English writers, and the greater English poets, have valued the past without having to speak too vehemently about it. Eliot's verse, like that of Wordsworth, refuses to be held in by the prescriptions of his prose criticism. Much in it grew out of his antagonism to the poetry that immediately preceded him. Some reaction against the romanticism of the nineteenth century was inevitable, and in its time salutary. In another and more subtle way, and against

his own will, possibly, he has helped to destroy the sense of tradition. Every reader of his verse will recall his device of inserting into his own lines a complex and interesting reference or phrase from older writers. This practice of allusiveness is not new in poetry, but Eliot's way of manipulating it is different from that of any English writer. When Milton captures a Virgilian phrase into his verse, the reader who recalls the original will return to it with some additional pleasure. For in employing the phrase Milton interprets it in such a way that its original meaning is left, certainly undamaged and often enhanced. Eliot, on the other hand, employs lines from older poetry savagely, satirically, so that the magnificence of the original passage is torn down and trampled, and all that our contemporary confusion may be more clearly displayed. As the Freudian child wishes to murder his father, so often the modern poet wishes to murder the past, and wherever he discovers beauty therein, or magnificence, to ravage and destroy it. The most deliberte example is in 'A Game of Chess' in The Waste Land, and very effectively is the contrast manipulated. A more obvious instance is in Burbank with a Baedaker:

> The horses, under the axletree
> Beat up the dawn from Istria
> With even feet. Her shuttered barge
> Burned on the water all the day.
> But this or such was Bleistein's way:
> A saggy bending of the knees

> And elbows, with the palms turned out,
> Chicago Semite Viennese.

Eliot is not respecting the past, or manipulating it, but devouring it.

W. B. YEATS AND THE CONTINUANCE OF TRADITION

Throughout this study, from Chaucer onwards, it has appeared that in English verse a certain compromise between extreme doctrines has existed. Further, that while `romanticism' has never reached in England the same precise and emphatic definition as in France and Germany, elements of `romanticism' have been found in English poetry over a longer period and in more varied ways than elsewhere. For the very reason that the `romantic has been mixed and diluted in England, there has been possible a marked continuity of tradition. Such an assertion need not obscure the changes which have come over the nature of poetry, but these arise from changes in mental environment and social circumstance. They are inevitable, therefore, and not manufactured to defend a `school' or support a programme. Nor have the greatest of our poets looked upon their predecessors with bitterness : Dryden and W. B. Yeats can both compare Chaucer's poetry with their own, each knowing the inevitable differences, but both conscious of what Chaucer achieved. The historians of literature have helped with their vitiating vocabulary of `schools' and `periods', to emphasize distinctions which are sometimes nonexistent, and seldom operate as they would have us believe. Chaucer did not know that he lived in 'the dawn of the Renaissance', and Gray would have been surprised and probably severely displeased to hear that he was a `pre-romantic'. Poetry—and the malicious will rejoice to find such a comment at the end of a work such as this—has suffered more than any of the arts from an excess of criticism. Above all, it has had to endure the activities of a categorizing mind. The only satisfactory criticism is not of an age or of a period, but of a single work of art, studied in relationship to all that is relevant for its interpretation. So studied, the minor writers, out of whom the `periods' and `schools' are often manufactured, sink to their proper place.

In the contemporary period, criticism has often spoken with harshness; many a great name has been referred to with disparagement, and the contrast of `classical' and `romantic' has been resurrected in order to condemn, under the name of a formula, elements which in some form or another have always been present in English verse. Against all this Yeats stood in contrast. He has himself confessed to the romanticism of his earlier years:

`I was in all things Pre-Raphaelite." Nor did he ever regret the decorative grace of his early lyrics. He knew that a poem such as The Lake Isle of Innisfree had been too often heard, and imitated, so that it had grown stale, like a fashion shared by everybody:

> But the fools caught it,
> Wore it in the world's eyes
> As though they'd wrought it.
> Song, let them take it,
> For there's more enterprise
> In walking naked.

He realized, no one better, that verse must take to new ways, and Paddington Railway Station became a theme for verse instead of Tristram and Iseult. But very much as Chaucer had done, he looked with respect on what had been abandoned. He came in those four volumes, The Wild Swans at Coole, Michael Robartes and the Dancer, The Tower, and The Winding Stair, to a verse, bare, taut, austere, but beautiful, with a beauty purified:

> Though the great song return no more
> There's keen delight in what we have:
> The rattle of pebbles on the shore
> Under the receding wave.

In one of his comments on verse he defined the antagonism between the poet and his world as rhetoric, and between the poet and himself as poetry. So in his own work he will not permit argument to replace vision. It is true that in this he has a degree of self-consciousness which modern poetry can seldom avoid. One may sometimes suspect that he would have preferred to be a poet in the days when Christendom was united: `Morris had never seemed to care for any poet later than Chaucer ; and though I preferred Shakespeare to Chaucer I begrudged my own preference. Had not

Europe shared one mind and heart, until both mind and heart began to break into fragments a little before Shakespeare's birth?" The problem of belief, and of some fable or mythology adequate for his purposes, the two recurring problems which face the poet, possessed him as they had done Milton, Dryden, Blake and so many others. His solution was individual and, like so much else in his

work, seems to combine a number of loyalties from the past. He found that he had to create his symbols but more than once he suggests that he would have been happier to fmd them in some established tradition. He seems to be thinking of himself when he writes of Blake : `he was a man crying out for a mythology, and trying to make one because he could not fmd one to his hand. Had he been a Catholic of Dante's time he would have been well content with Mary and the angels.'l His own attempts to build up a mythology are at times a little self-conscious, but when his imagery is only dimly intelligible the verse has such mastery, that the poems can be accepted as music is accepted.

In so constructing a group of symbols, he was influenced by Blake and Shelley. In his prose he has made statements about the nature of experience as mystical as anything in Blake, and he has made claims for the potency of poetry which transcend anything in Shelley's work. So in his essay on The Symbolism of Poetry he writes : `I am certainly never certain, when I hear of some war, or of some religious excitement or of some new manufacture, or of anything else that fills the ear of the world, that it has not all happened because of something that a boy piped in Thessaly. This boldness of assertion is not linked, as it is in Blake and Shelley, with a reforming zeal. Always his mysticism seems well under control, as if it were something which he knew to be good for his poetry, and in his later verse it is combined with an economy of expression, of bareness and strength, comparable to the prose of Swift. This control of the medium, always secure, was sometimes audacious, as if he picked up simple words at random and, without changing their order or their meaning, set them casually into his verses, only to discover that they had acquired a rugged power, or a strange and intangible beauty.

Blake's art becomes obscure from the very pressure and originality of his vision, but with Yeats the poet remains in control. At times this impression is so strong that Yeats seems to remain in a position similar to that of Rossetti or the early Swinburne of cultivating art for its own sake. His language in his essays is sometimes reminiscent of the early letters of Keats. Yet he had always the belief that while poetry was a craft it was also part of a secret wisdom. The poet, through his symbols, might disclose this ancient and hidden revelation. To this idea Yeats frequently recurs, never more

impressively than in the conclusion of his essay on The Philosophy of Shelley's Poetry: `there is for every man some one scene, someone adventure, some one picture that is the image of his secret life, for wisdom first speaks in images, and this one image ... would lead his soul, disentangled from unmeaning circumstance and the ebb and flow of the world, into that far household, where the undying gods await all whose souls have become simple as flame, whose bodies have become quiet as an agate lamp.'

His verse derives from a wider experience than that of any of the Pre-Raphaelites or of Keats. If his attempt to build a new Irish drama and a new Irish folk-literature may seem at times a little unreal, it is because it can now be seen in comparison with the later verse. His tragic experiences in the Easter Rebellion and in the events of the Civil War give to some of his later poems the sense of an experience highly individual and yet intelligible from its wide contacts with common humanity. To the last much in his verse is drawn from the elements that have been called romantic at one time or another in English poetry, but they have at their centre this continuous contact with the normal. In this union of opposite qualities the distinctive and most valuable features of his later verse can be found.

The profession of poetry may become increasingly difficult, and Yeats's self-consciousness is an indication that he himself found this in his relation with the modern world. With all his contemplation of the possible themes for poetry he never discovered his way to a poem of action, or to a poem as wide in its contemporary reference as The Waste Land. He remained with his images and his symbols in that bare lyrical beauty which still haunts us so strongly that we are unable to see what it omits. It exists rather as the individual vision than as a general human vision, yet ever his mind, even when most aloof, is reaching out towards traditional wisdom. But in the quest of traditional elements he becomes continuously aware of some antagonism between the poet and contemporary society, and the dominant ways of thought. Such a conclusion recurs frequently in his prose : `I am very religious, and deprived by Huxley and Tyndall, whom I detested, of the simple-minded religion of my childhood, I had made a new religion, almost an infallible church out of poetic tradition : a fardel

of stories, and of personages, and of emotions, a bundle of images, and of masks, passed from one generation to another, by poets and painters, with some help from philosophers and theologians ... I had even created a dogma: "Because those imaginary people are created out of the deepest instinct of man, to be his measure and his norm, whatever I can imagine those mouths speaking may be the nearest I can go to truth."

The traditional becomes involved at times in a secret language, a hidden reference, which was not necessary for Chaucer, or Shakespeare or Milton. He is aware that the merchant and the Puritan have, together with the materialist, produced a view of the world in which the poet can only function with difficulty: `Puritanism ... had denied the sacredness of an earth that commerce was about to corrupt and ravish.' 'The hurried and successful' nations had lost vision, and even the `greatest poets see the world with preoccupied minds'. It was for this reason that Yeats, in an age which had disparaged so much in the past, looked back to earlier times determined that nothing valuable in the tradition of poetry should be lost. On one occasion he described how he had been reading Boccaccio and Cervantes and come to feel that they belonged to the same world: `It is we who are different.' He attempted to explain that difference by the intrusion of 'the newspapers, all kinds of second-rate books, the preoccupation of men with all kinds of practical changes', which 'have driven the living imagination out of the world'. Boccaccio and Cervantes 'had not to deal with the world in such great masses that it could only be represented to their minds by figures and by abstract generalizations. Everything that their minds ran on came to them vivid with the colour of the senses, and when they wrote it was out of their own rich experience, and they found their symbols of expression in things that they had known all their life long'. In Yeats himself, despite the difficulties, experience never degenerated into habit, and this was possible mainly because he was strengthened by this generous understanding of the past. The profession of poetry may become still increasingly difficult, in an age that, unlike that of Yeats, has no memories of a pre-war world. While poetry cannot exist solely in the past, or in its memory, the long tradition of our verse, and the sense of its continuous development, increases in importance. At no time can we afford less to destroy for the sake

of a critical formula, or a political creed, what we have inherited. B. Ifor Evans <>

Investigating Turkey: detective fiction and Turkish nationalism, 1928-1945 by David Mason [Ottoman and Turkish studies, Academic Studies Press, 9781618116284]

It is estimated that a third of the fiction currently published in English detective fiction. That, in addition to the tremendous number of detective and crime fiction serial television programs broadcast today, attests to the popularity of the genre. This is by no means a new development. From the beginning, detective fiction has been very popular. This popularity, in addition to certain specific aspects of the genre, has helped detective fiction to develop and maintain an intimate relationship with propaganda. Propaganda was at the heart of the development of the genre; its subsequent popularity ensured that it would continue to be an effective vehicle for propaganda for generations to come.

In searching for the first example of a genre, one encounters a few key obstacles. Some of these obstacles include questions such as: (1) when did the genre officially begin?, (2) does the work in question contain all the elements of said genre?, and (3) how does one account for parallel developments in disparate parts of the world? It is the third question that interests this study with regard to the development of detective fiction as a genre.

Some claim that the earliest known murder mystery that contained all the key elements of detective fiction was "The Three Apples" (Arabic: "Hikayat al-sabiyya 'l-muqtula," which is literally translated as "The Tale of the Murdered Young Woman"), one of the tales in One Thousand and One Nights, which was compiled during the Golden Age of Islam (eighth to thirteenth centuries) and first translated into French in 1704 and English in 1706. In this tale, a fisherman discovers a heavy locked chest that is painted pink with flowers along the Tigris River and sells it to the Abbasid Caliph, Harun al-Rashid, who then has the chest broken open only to find inside it the dead body of a young woman who was cut into pieces. Harun orders his vizier, Ja'far ibn Yahya, to solve the crime and find the murderer. This whodunit mystery may be considered an archetype for detective fiction. Yet, it cannot be considered a

true detective story because Ja'far makes no effort to solve the case. Beyond this, we know that "Arabic literature never produced an indigenous detective fiction genre."

Others discuss some eighteenth-century Chinese novels as being examples of early works in the history of the detective fiction genre. I, however, will limit my discussion of the development of detective fiction to the European/American form for two reasons. First, it is this strand that most scholars accredit with the development of modern detective fiction; second, and more important for this study, whether or not the Europeans and Americans did develop detective fiction, the detective fiction in the Ottoman Empire and the Republic of Turkey arises and develops out of translations of European/American detective fiction.

As these stories were originally written in Europe for the most part and, accordingly, are an outgrowth of European culture, I will begin by looking at the culture from which they emerged by addressing crime, punishment, and public attitudes toward both beginning in the eighteenth century. Following that, I will look at socioeconomic realities that impacted on the development of these stories. This will be followed by a discussion of how the works of specific English, French, and American writers led to the development of detective fiction as a genre. Finally, I will discuss the Ottoman Empire into which these stories were transmitted with an eye to what cultural impact they had.

More specific to the study of Turkish detective fiction, the works of Seval Sahin, Banu Öztürk, and Didem Ardali Büyükarman analyze detective fiction from a more literary perspective than this study and do not focus on Turkish nationalism, as does this study. That said, they provide interesting and useful insights both for this work and the broader study of Turkish detective fiction.

In addition to these practical studies in the field, this work also benefits from the theoretical studies of the role of the press and popular culture in the construction of national identity. Such studies include Jürgen Habermas's The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society, Eric Hobsbawm's The Invention of Tradition, and Benedict Anderson's Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.

In this book, I will be analyzing five series of detective fiction that were published in Turkish between 1928 and 1945, the dates corresponding to the Turkish language reform and change of alphabet in 1928, which encouraged a dramatic increase in literacy rates, to the end of one-party rule in Turkey, after which there were competing ideas of identity. I will reveal the ways in which these works of fiction supported Kemalist efforts to solidify conceptions of Turkish identity among the population of the relatively new Republic of Turkey (founded in 1923).

I will focus on the messages communicated in these texts. As there is virtually no information on the identity or any kind of biographical material on any of the authors I am studying, I will show that the messages in the detective fiction novels adhere very closely to the key points of Kemalist Turkishness and, accordingly, aid in the spread of the concept of Kemalist Turkish nationalism. As there is very little information about the circulation of these detective fiction novels, I am unable to comment on either the number of works sold or the number of people affected by these works of fiction.

Brummett clearly states that she cannot comment on the intent of the editor with regard to the cartoons she studied. I, however, can comment on both the messages communicated and tacit government approval of said intent for the following reasons. First, as Brummett is analyzing isolated individual comics, there is no context for determining editorial intent. I, on the other hand, am studying series of detective fiction which, in every case, adheres unbendingly and without exception to certain specific ideas. This uniformity of message allows me to state with confidence that each author was working to communicate specific messages to his or her readership. In addition to this, each author uses reader address on a regular basis as if to say "Attention reader! Read carefully because I am writing this for you."

As mentioned before, this study is limited by the lack of information regarding publication figures. I have only tentative evidence with regard to publication numbers: first, Erol Üyepazarci estimates that each printing was likely 10,000 copies. Second, Omer Türkes says that there is no definitive answer but that "it was very likely a large number." To back up these estimates, Türkes

refs to an anecdote in which well-respected and famous Turkish author Peyami Safa, on being asked where he lived, answered "I live in the home of the famous Server Bedi"—Server Bedi being the pseudonym under which he chose to write detective fiction. Adding to this anecdotal evidence is Sahin, who informs us that Peyami Safa wrote the Cingöz Recai series for forty-six years in order to earn money and that this series was extremely well received. That is to say that, while a famous author of Turkish literature cannot afford it, the writer of detective fiction is able to purchase a nice house in Istanbul. This speaks to the number of detective novels sold at the time. The final piece of evidence comes from Samancigil. In his Hizir Kaplan

series, which I will analyze later, Samancigil organized some contests for his readers. In one of these contests, readers were encouraged to write in to vote for whether the series should be published with greater frequency; 3,736 votes were tabulated. This makes this author predict that the number of novels sold would certainly have exceeded 3,736, as not every reader would have voted. Moreover, the readership may have been even greater, as these stories were likely shared among friends.

In addition to the preceding anecdotal evidence regarding circulation numbers, we must also consider the literacy rates of the Turkish-speaking population. Census data confirms that the rate of literacy of the total population in 1927 to 1928 was 10.6 percent. Now, as I mentioned earlier, concepts of Turkish nationalism were conceived by the elite, who were highly educated. The literacy rates on the eve of the language reform and, most significantly, the change in alphabet, indicate that the literate would almost exclusively be part of the elite. As a result, literature would not be an effective method by which to spread these concepts to the general population. The argument that this language reform was "catastrophic" certainly has merit, as it did cause great upheaval in Turkish society, but what is undeniable is that literacy rates, which had never exceeded 11 percent of the total population before the reform, began to increase dramatically. Census data for 1935 to 1936 shows that the literacy rate of the total population had jumped to 20.4 percent, the rate increased more modestly in the next census to 22.4 percent (1940-1941), and at the end of the period that this study

considers, the literacy rate was 30.2 percent (1945-1946).91 These literacy rates are significant and show that approximately one-third of the population would have had access to the works of detective fiction that this study analyzes. This does not include the fact that these stories may have been read aloud in reading rooms (kiraathaneler), People's Houses (Halkevleri), and coffeeshops (kahvehaneler), as was common during the period. But, to repeat, this study will not be drawing any conclusions with regard to effects on individuals in the general population, but will speak to the messages within the novels and tacit governmental approval of the content.

This leads me to explain my rationale for the choices I made when selecting the detective series I chose to study. To begin, I must confirm that gaining access to resources is always difficult—especially when the resources are seventy-year-old works of debated value. Commonly considered to have lower cultural value, works of detective fiction often are not included in library collections. In addition to the difficulty in accessing these resources, there were certain specific criteria I was seeking in the works: (1) that the detective series be written in Turkish; (2) that the works be set (at least for the most part) in Turkey; (3) that the works make some tangible statements about Turkish identity; and (4) that they be written, not simply reprinted, between 1928 and 1945 so as to be part of the zeitgeist of the time. With this set of criteria in mind, I was able to locate five series of detective fiction to analyze.

Following my analysis of these five detective fiction series, it will be evident that they make clear statements about Turkish identity and, while each develop positive characteristics of Turks, they also focus on a different aspect of Turkish nationalism. Cemil Cahit Cern is the author of the two detective series of the 1930s that I study. Writing as Behçet Riza, Cem explores the concept of the self-hating Turk in his Pire Necmi series of the 1930s. Following that, Cem—this time as Oguz Turgut—elucidates the subtle play between the idea of pure Turkishness and its evil twin, xenophobia, in his Cemal Dogan detective series. We then move on to address three series of detective fiction of the 1940s. First, Murat Akdogan provides both a comprehensive look at the positive character traits to which all Turks should aspire and juxtaposes this with a clear statement of negative traits that should

be avoided by Turks as embodied by the criminals of his Orhan Çakiroglu series. A. Samancigil follows this with a specific project in mind: he is very clearly targeting Turkish youth with the aim of teaching them the importance of rationalism and skepticism in his Hizir Kaplan series. Finally, Ziya Çalikoglu rounds out my study by promoting women's rights in the Vefa Polad detective series.

I have also said that we can see the publication of these works as a tacit governmental approval of the message(s) contained within. I make this claim with the 1931 Press Law (Matbuat Kanunu) in mind. This law, "which imposed strict measures on press freedom" and required that any publisher be fluent in Turkish, and that anyone who had worked toward realising enemies' goals would not be allowed to publish, was used to close down a number of publications.94 With a close and watchful eye, the Kemalist government followed publications carefully and if the work was allowed to be published—especially in serial form—it is safe to conclude that the government tacitly approved of the content. Moreover, we have already seen that Kemal made speeches praising many of the character traits I will show to be embodied in the detectives in this study.

Before beginning this study in earnest, there are a few points of order I need to mention. First, I will be using the convention whereby I will refer to an entity by its accepted acronym only after writing the full name on first usage. Second, I have endeavored to provide the Turkish original for a number of translations I have made. I have done this in cases in which finding the original is difficult and in cases for which I feel that providing the original is important. Third, as the Turkish Surname Law (Soyadi Kanunu) was enacted in 1934, and as I will be referring to individuals before they adopted a last name, I will, in all cases before 1934, write the full name with the last name in parentheses. With regard to Mustafa Kemal (Atatürk), for stylistic reasons, I will refer to him as Mustafa Kemal, or simply Kemal, when discussing him in respect to the detective fiction series of the 1930s and most often as Atatürk, except in cases in which it was clearly before the Surname Law, when discussing him with regard to the series of the 1940s.

The works of detective fiction that I have studied here have demonstrated the vigor with which the authors supported the Kemalist project. Each and every one has provided an exciting Turkish detective hero to which positive character traits are attached and would certainly have aided in the spread of the messages supporting Kemalist concepts of Turkish nationalism to the general population. This is a unique study that addresses the hitherto unstudied propaganda value of Turkish detective fiction. Further studies that attempt to make definitive claims about the actual impact of these and other works will require firm data on publication and circulation numbers as well as accounts, if extant, of whether or not these types of works were, in fact, read aloud in reading rooms, People's Houses, and coffeeshops. This study reveals both the fidelity with which these authors adhered to the Kemalist line and the clear messages with regard to Turkishness found within these works. As it combines the fields of history and popular culture, this study is one of the few that have been completed in the field of Ottoman and Turkish studies. As such, it unmistakably offers a valuable new lens through which Ottoman and Turkish cultural history can be studied.

Contents
Acknowledgments

Interweaving myths in Shakespeare and his contemporaries edited by Janice Valls-Russell,

Charlotte Coffin, Agnes Lafont [Manchester University Press, 9781526117687]

[Interweaving myths in Shakespeare and his contemporaries](#) edited by Janice Valls-Russell, Charlotte Coffin, Agnes Lafont [Manchester University Press, 9781526117687]

This volume proposes new insights into the uses of classical mythology by Shakespeare and his contemporaries, focusing on interweaving processes in early modern appropriations of myth. Its 11 essays show how early modern writing intertwines diverse myths and plays with variant versions of individual myths that derive from multiple classical sources, as well as medieval, Tudor and early modern retellings and translations. Works discussed include poems and plays by William Shakespeare, Christopher Marlowe and others. Essays concentrate on specific plays including The Merchant of Venice and Dido Queen of Carthage, tracing interactions between myths, chronicles, the Bible and contemporary genres. Mythological figures are considered to demonstrate how the weaving together of sources deconstructs gendered representations. New meanings emerge from these readings, which open up methodological perspectives on multi-textuality, artistic appropriation and cultural hybridity.

Interlude

This volume by far shows displays the online, open-source website [A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology](#) that also includes [Early English Mythological Texts Series (EEMTS)](#); [Studies in Early Modern Mythology (SEMM)](#).
This website is an ongoing research project on the ways in which Shakespeare and his contemporaries engaged with classical mythology, a fascinating and fruitful area of investigation at all levels, with ongoing work around the world. It offers access to three major, related resources—all in open access—centred on Shakespeare, early modern English mythological texts and classical mythology.
Browsing will yield up a wealth of information from the Dictionary, the edited texts, articles and reviews. The way early modern works quote, conjure up, parody, blend references to classical mythology is inexhaustible. Some myths are well-known, others less so. Some are recurrent, others barely discernible.

Contents this volume:
Introduction: 'Ariachne's broken woof' by Janice Valls-Russell, Agnès Lafont and Charlotte Coffin

1   Shakespeare's mythological feuilletage: A methodological induction by Yves Peyré

2   The non-Ovidian Elizabethan epyllion: Thomas Watson, Christopher Marlowe, Richard Barnfield by Tania Demetriou
3   'This realm is an empire': Tales of origins in medieval and early modern France and England by Dominique Goy-Blanquet
4   Trojan shadows in Shakespeare's King John by Janice Valls-Russell
5   Venetian Jasons, particoloured lambs and a tainted wether: Ovine tropes and the Golden Fleece in The Merchant of Venice by Atsuhiko Hirota
6   Fifty ways to kill your brother: Medea and the poetics of fratricide in early modern English literature by Katherine Heavey
7   'She, whom Jove transported into Crete': Europa, between consent and rape by Gaëlle Ginestet
8   Subtle weavers, mythological interweavings and feminine political agency: Penelope and Arachne in early modern drama by Nathalie Rivère de Carles
9   Multi-layered conversations in Marlowe's Dido, Queen of Carthage by Agnès Lafont
10   Burlesque or neoplatonic? Popular or elite? The shifting value of classical mythology in Love's Mistress by Charlotte Coffin
11   Pygmalion, once and future myth: Instead of a conclusion by Ruth Morse

Contributeurs:
Charlotte Coffin is senior lecturer at Université Paris-Est Créteil Val de Marne (France) and a member of the Institut des mondes anglophone, germanique et roman (IMAGER). She has published articles on classical mythology, the mythographers, Shakespeare and Heywood, and is preparing an edition of Heywood's Golden Age for the online Early Modern Mythological Texts Series. She has contributed to the Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology and is a member of the editorial board (www.shakmyth.org).

Tania Demetriou is lecturer at the Faculty of English at the University of Cambridge (UK). She works on the reception of classical texts in the early modern period, especially on literary responses to Homer. She co- edited The Culture of Translation in Early Modern England and France, 1500– 1660 (2015) together with Rowan Tomlinson, and two collections of essays together with Tanya Pollard: Milton, Drama, and Greek Texts, The Seventeenth Century , 31:2 (2016) (special issue) and Homer and Greek Tragedy in England's Early Modern Theatres , Classical Receptions Journal , 9:1 (2017) (special issue).

Gaëlle Ginestet teaches at the English Department of Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier (France), and is a member of the Institute for Research on the Renaissance, the Neo- Classical Age and the Enlightenment (IRCL). She holds a Ph.D. on classical

mythology in Elizabethan love sonnet sequences. She has published entries for A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology and edited Cantos VI and VII of Thomas Heywood's Troia Britanica , in the Early Modern Mythological Texts Series, both online (www.shakmyth.org).

Dominique Goy- Blanquet is professor emeritus at the Université de Picardie (France). Her works include Shakespeare's Early History Plays (Oxford University Press, 2003); Shakespeare et l'invention de l'histoire (Garnier, 3rd edn 2014); and Côté cour, côté justice: Shakespeare et l'invention du droit (Garnier, 2016); and the editions of Richard Marienstras's Shakespeare et le désordre du monde (Gallimard, 2012); of Lettres à Shakespeare (Marchaisse, 2014); and, with François Laroque, of Shakespeare, combien de prétendants? (Marchaisse, 2016).

Katherine Heavey is a lecturer in early modern English literature at the University of Glasgow (UK). Prior to this, she held a Leverhulme Early Career Fellowship at Newcastle University. Her first book, The Early Modern Medea: Medea in English Literature 1558– 1688, was published by Palgrave Macmillan in 2015. She has published journal articles in Literature Compass, Renaissance Studies, Translation and Literature and the Journal of the Northern Renaissance.

Atsuhiko Hirota is an associate professor of English at Kyoto University (Japan). He is currently working on representations of Circe and Circe- like characters in Shakespeare, in connection with early modern discourses on the vulnerability of English identity. He has published essays on related topics for The Shakespearean International Yearbook, the Société française Shakespeare (http://shakespeare.revues.org) and Cahiers élisabéthains , and entries for A Dictionary of Classical Mythology (www.shakmyth.org).

Agnès Lafont is senior lecturer in early modern English literature at Université Paul Valéry, Montpellier (France), and a member of the Institute for Research on the Renaissance, the Neo- Classical Age and the Enlightenment (IRCL). She is currently researching the reception of Ovidian Myrrha in sixteenth- century translations. She has published articles on mythology and edited Shakespeare's Erotic Mythology and Ovidian Renaissance Culture (Ashgate, 2013). She is a contributor to A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology (www.shakmyth.org).

Ruth Morse has taught at Paris- Diderot (Sorbonne Paris Cité); she spent a year at the National Humanities Center in the United States, where she completed Imagined Histories: Fictions of the Past from 'Beowulf' to Shakespeare. Among her books are

The Medieval Medea (D. S. Brewer, 1996) and Selected Poems of A. D. Hope (Carcanet, 1986), as well as Medieval Shakespeare: Pasts and Presents (Cambridge University Press, 2013) and Great Shakespeareans, Vol. XVI (Continuum, 2013), in which she wrote the introduction and the chapter on Les Hugo.

Yves Peyré is emeritus professor of English literature at Université Paul-Valéry, Montpellier (France). He is general editor of the online Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology and an online edition of Thomas Heywood's Troia Britanica , with 15 cantos published to date (www.shakmyth.org). He is the author of La voix des mythes dans la tragédie élisabéthaine (Paris, 1996); William Shakespeare: 'Venus and Adonis' (Didier- Erudition,1998); and essays on the classical reception, published in the UK, the USA and France.

Nathalie Rivère de Carles is senior lecturer at the University of Toulouse Jean- Jaurès (France). Her research focuses on theatre history, literary analysis of early modern plays, and cultural and political exchanges. She edited Forms of Diplomacy (Caliban: Presses Universitaires du Midi, 2015) and Early Modern Diplomacy, Theatre and Soft Power: The Making of Peace (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016). She is textual editor for the Norton Shakespeare, Third Edition (2015) and the author of several articles and chapters.

JaniceValls-Russell is employed by the French National Centre for Scientific Research (CNRS) at Université Paul- Valéry, Montpellier (France). The author of a Ph.D., and articles and chapters on classical mythology and the early modern world, she has edited Canto II of Thomas Heywood's Troia Britanica , and is project coordinator of A Dictionary of Shakespeare's Classical Mythology and the Early Modern Mythological Texts Series (www.shakmyth.org). <>

Mnemosyne by Ruth Morse

One final reflection, reader, before we invite you to turn our pages. Scholars, too, have debts, and it is a rare privilege to be able to thank those to whom we owe them, as well as the usual duty to acknowledge their writing. Much in this volume pays homage to Yves Peyré, who has done so much to expand our knowledge of intertextual engagements between early modern writers and their classical reading. In the plenary lecture he gave at the 2013 European Shakespeare Research Association (ESRA) Conference in Montpellier (France), he selected a phrase — one just long enough to be identifiable — and then demonstrated its longevity through centuries of reuse.

He has taught us to listen better, to attend to detail, and to read marginal notes and commentaries such as the moralised Ovids, some of which were not available in modern editions when he began his work. There was no line to be on, no search engines, no Wikipedia, none of those searchable texts that have so transformed our work. Early English Books Online was a dream for the future. Yves's example was simple: read the books, carefully, listening for echoes; remember. We would not have wanted to create this book without his presence. It is said that those who forget the past are doomed to repeat it, but it is just as true that without memory we cannot repeat it. Mnemosyne was the mother of the Muses; her name is inscribed above the door to the Warburg Institute of the University of London, a gift from a Hitler refugee and a library of delight. We confess, all of us, to keeping this whole project a secret, and for several years. Perhaps, Professor Peyré, you have thought yourself forgotten. Not while Memory lives and reads.

Introduction: 'Ariachne's broken woof' by Janice Valls-Russell, Agnès Lafont and Charlotte Coffin

In TROILUS AND CRESSIDA, when Troilus sees Cressida yield to Diomede's advances, he reacts that his certainties 'are slipp't, dissolv'd and loos'd'. His references vacillate and fragment as he attempts to reconcile the Cressida he thought he knew in Troy and the one he has just observed in the Grecian camp. The effort required to rethink past knowledge in the light of present observation leads him to compress the mythological stories of Ariadne and Arachne:

> ... This is, and is not, Cressid!
> Within my soul there doth conduce a fight
> Of this strange nature, that a thing inseparate
> Divides more wider than the sky and earth,
> And yet the spacious breadth of this division
> Admits no orifex for a point as subtle
> As Ariachne's broken woof to enter.
> Instance, O instance, strong as Pluto's gates,
> Cressid is mine, tied with the bonds of heaven.
> Instance, O instance, strong as heaven itself:
> The bonds of heaven are slipp'd, dissolv'd, and loos'd,
> And with another knot, [five]- finger- tied,
> The fractions of her faith, orts of her love,
> The fragments, scraps, the bits and greasy relics
> Of her o'er- eaten faith, are given to Diomed.
> (V.ii.146–60)

Ariadne's clew, intended to guide the lover safely through labyrinths of danger provided it does not break, has become Arachne's woof, drawn through the warp to weave stories of love that a mere snapping of the yarn can disrupt. Yet, perhaps Troilus attempts to cling to the reassuring story of Ariadne as a saviour, even while the evidence clashes with the story he had believed in: the tracery of erstwhile bonds has been erased in a moment of cognitive dissonance. Starting from this instance of mythological texturing, this introduction sets the scene for the following chapters and their reinterpretations and explorations of the ways William Shakespeare and his contemporaries worked mythological material on their looms.

Yves Peyré's analysis of the resulting mythological cluster ('Ariachne's broken woof') shows how it brings together two Ovidian stories that Shakespeare suffuses elsewhere in his work with Petrarchan imagery of the beloved woman's hair as an imprisoning net and labyrinth. In Troilus and Cressida, the resulting image of male dependence on and fearful fascination with female erotic agency carries intimations of self- destruction in the larger context of Troy's impending fall. It also encapsulates the dramatist's own art of creative interweaving. Shakespeare encases this enmeshed reference to Metamorphoses in epic material that he refashions by injecting the medieval tradition of Troy and its historical reverberations into the classical tradition. Cressida herself — her persona and her name — is an invention created by a misreading, conflating two figures from the Iliad, Briseis and Chryseis, given life by Boccaccio, by Geoffrey Chaucer, by Robert Henryson and, eventually, Shakespeare. The 'overlapping' of texts and sources from different authors and different strata of cultural history combines the activities of a weaver's (Arachne's) production, with threads that suggest patterns and constitute guiding or teasing clews (Ariadne's) for the reader/ spectator — a method that results in those tensions that Troilus finds so unsettling: 'this is, and is not'.

That classical mythology should be at the heart of this joint creative process between authors and their publics is not accidental. No myth exists in isolation, nor stands alone. 'Ariachne's broken woof' and the complex heritage of reception associated with Cressida's name exemplify the ways early modern authors make the most of classical mythology's lability, its potential for versatility and its inherent capacity to invite shifting interpretations: it simultaneously suggests analogy and tension between Arachne's enmeshing process within a web and Ariadne's liberating guidance out of the labyrinth, itself a stone web. Individually and collectively, readers and writers grasp allusion, identify or reinvent genealogies, retrace ramifications and recycle what they have inherited — as they understand or misunderstand, reinterpret or misinterpret. So doing, they engage in a process that a Franco-Flemish tapestry of the late fifteenth century captures in its depiction of Penelope, reproduced on the cover

of this volume: as she weaves by day and unweaves by night, gaining a form of agency through her shuttle, which Nathalie Rivère discusses in Chapter 8, so her story – like other myths – travels through time, acquiring, shedding and refashioning content, and shifting in focus. Thus, in this design, a tapestry embraces medieval design and Renaissance perspective in its staging of a figure in the process of creating a tapestry, with yet another tapestry hanging as a backcloth in the background.

The contributors to this volume share Peyré's concentration on historically informed close reading in order to identify and understand the multiple layers that modify mythological texts from generation to generation. In their discussions of canonical texts alongside less frequently explored works, the following chapters offer fresh perspectives on classical mythology as it informed the writings of Shakespeare and his contemporaries over a period that ranges from the 1580s to the 1630s, from Christopher Marlowe to Thomas Heywood. Focusing on interweaving processes in early modern appropriations of myth, the chapters draw on a variety of approaches to ask how the uses of mythological stories enabled writers to play with representations of history, gender and desire. Building on recent research in different areas of early modern studies (classical reception, history of the book, medieval heritage, theatre history), this volume seeks to heighten awareness of multi- directional interactions in the perception and reappropriation of classical mythology in Elizabethan and Jacobean culture.

Reading and studying mythology: performative rhetoric and 'a tract of confusion'

Fascination with mythology enabled 'the survival of the pagan gods' (to borrow Jean Seznec's title) and offered a series of proxies to writers and artists otherwise constrained by censorship and self-censorship in what topics they could explore and what interests they could express. As is well known, mythographers, from Boccaccio and Pictorius to Natale Conti and George Sandys, collated, referenced and glossed underlying meanings of myths, juxtaposing multiple interpretations. Across Europe, humanists used myths to explain the world and human activity. Classical mythology served both as a form of shorthand and as a springboard for invention, with poets, pedagogues and preachers drawing upon figures and tropes, reworking and reassembling them according to their aesthetic, rhetorical or ideological agendas. Thus, in his Heptameron of Civill Discourses , George Whetstone illustrates the ways love 'transgresseth every law' with 'Pigmalion [who] doted upon

an image: Narcissus [who] was drowned in imbrasing his owne shadow: & mightie Jove, many times, [who] cast aside his divinitie, to dallie with simple country trulles'. In a sermon preached in 1612, Thomas Adams explains God's legitimate desire to make man in his own likeness, 'as Apelles was delighted with his Tablets, Pigmalion with his Yvorie Statue, Narcissus with his forme in the Fountaine'. The Apelles and Narcissus images resurface in Stephanus Luzvic's recusant Devout Heart, in a hymn in which Jesus is compared to Apelles and invited to paint a figure that the faithful 'may imitate, and love, / As did Narcissus'.

John W. Velz and John Lewis Walker's annotated bibliographies show how much work has focused on the reception of the classics – more particularly of classical mythology – in early modern England, in and around the works of Shakespeare. While it is well known that he and his contemporaries had direct access to Ovid as well as Seneca, Virgil, Horace and other classical authors, critics have more frequently considered the classics alongside each other, rather than through their interactions. Research on the reception of leading authors has left in the background the influence of others, such as Appian, Lucan, Lucian, Ausonius: the fact that they were not all readily available in English translation was no impediment to access. Students and scholars had access to Greek texts through primers and editions printed on the Continent: bilingual Latin– Greek editions and Latin translations of Euripides, Homer, Pausanias or Musaeus, whose Hero and Leander was one of the first texts printed in Greek, by the Aldine press in 1494. Gordon Braden has shown how Marlowe used one of these editions to write his own Hero and Leander. In Chapter 2 Tania Demetriou shows how, like Musaeus' Hero and Leander, Colluthus's Abduction of Helen attracted interest as a pedagogical text, as well as inspiring poets. Ongoing research informing this volume confirms that the presence of Homer and other Greek sources in the early modern period was more important and influential than was once thought, nuancing the picture of classical reception and opening up new perspectives.

The swift, cumulative diversification of texts broadened readers' and writers' horizons well beyond what they were exposed to in the classroom or at university. Classical poetry and drama reached a widening audience through print: in Greek, in Latin and in vernacular translations. Ideas and texts circulated, and writers were very much aware of what was being produced in other countries, with Abraham Fraunce, for instance, as Demetriou recalls, presenting the Spanish poet Juan Boscán as a literary model alongside the Italian Torquato Tasso, and England's own Philip Sidney.

Links among learning, reading and orality remained strong, in keeping with a tradition of teaching in which

texts were recited and exercises in rhetoric had a performative dimension: 'the study of books did not constitute a separate pedagogic sphere but one interwoven with their performance ... Those who could not perform what they knew, but knew it only from books, had no kind of learning at all.' Marginalia and annotations framed source texts, offering interpretative guidance, drawing on (other) classical sources, mythographical commentaries or elucidations by Erasmus and others. Reciprocally, examples drawn from mythology illustrated adages and sententiae; and dictionaries provided encapsulated accounts of myths. All this catered for different levels of readership, and nourished readers' own handwritten annotations, and commonplace books, as they sought to make sense of interpretations that could at times appear confusing: in his dedicatory letter to the countess of Bedford, which precedes his masque The Vision of Twelve Goddesses, Samuel Daniel complains about 'the best Mytheologers, who wil make somewhat to seem anything, are so unfaithful to themselves, as they have left us no certain way at all, but a tract of confusion to take our course at adventure'. Yet this 'tract of confusion' also contributed to the emergence of distinctive forms and voices; and it nourished readers' and audiences' receptivity to allusions and rewritings that could seem at once familiar and novel.

Texturing classical mythology, Roman politics and English history

The presence of classical mythology tends to be underplayed in religious texts such as those quoted above or in plays that dramatise the history of England. Yet, as essays in this collection analyse in detail, Shakespeare and his contemporaries converse – and are conversant – with sources and influences indiscriminately across the board: they invite classical texts into their writings along with medieval commentaries, Tudor refashionings and humanist glossings, reworking all this with and into material drawn from medieval chronicles, biblical writings, romances, Italian novelle, and the works of fellow poets and dramatists.

Let us briefly consider Suffolk's downfall in 2 Henry VI , which provides a case study of overlapping uses of material, as Shakespeare draws from a variety of classical authors and genres, injecting them into a plot lifted from English chronicles. Two moments are striking in the course of a scene where fighting and unnatural portents blur in the 'loud- howling wolves', 'misty jaws' of graves and bloodstained shore (IV.i.3, 6, 11). The Lieutenant insults Suffolk, punning on his name, William de la Pole:

> Lieutenant. Poole! Sir Poole! lord!
> Ay, kennel, puddle, sink, whose filth and dirt

Troubles the silver spring where England drinks.
Now will I dam up this thy yawning mouth
For swallowing the treasure of the realm.
...And wedded be thou to the hags of hell,
...By devilish policy art thou grown great,
And like ambitious Sylla, overgorg'd
With gobbets of thy [mother's] bleeding heart.
(IV.i.69–85)

The second moment occurs some thirty lines later, shortly before Suffolk is beheaded:

> Suffolk. I charge thee waft me safely cross the Channel.
> Whitmore. Come, Suffolk, I must waft thee to thy death.
> Suffolk. [Pene] gelidus timor occupat artus: it is thee I fear.
> (IV.i.114–16)

This Latin phrase – which may be translated as 'Icy fear seizes my limbs almost entirely' – has been identified as a misquotation from Virgil and Lucan. It also functions as a conflation. In the Aeneid, Virgil uses the phrase 'subitus tremor ocupat artus' (VII, 446) to describe Turnus's horror at the sight of Allecto, with her foaming mouth and hydra- like head of snakes, come from the underworld to wage war and death. 15 In Lucan's Pharsalia , an unfinished account of the civil wars of Rome, the inhabitants of Ariminum quake with fear on discovering that Caesar has crossed the Rubicon: 'deriguere metu, gelidos pavor occupat artus' (Pharsalia , I, 246), which Marlowe translated as 'They shooke for feare, and cold benumm'd their lims'. And thus we see English dramatists plundering Latin historical sources in order to lift their plays into something more than chronicle. Some spectators would have recognised the mythological references; others would not, but all would be aware of the hags of hell, Suffolk's arrogance and fear. These may suggest Virgil, in connection with the earlier evocation of portents of disaster, while intersecting with the Pharsalia , available in a Latin edition published in 1589 and read in schools. In Marlowe's translation of the Pharsalia , Pompey is compared to 'arch- traitor Sulla' (I, 326), and depicted as 'having lickt / Warm gore from Sulla's sword [and] yet athirst; / Jaws flesh'd with blood continue murderous' (330– 2). Memories of the earlier civil wars fuse graphically with portents that are shot through with Senecan evocations of tyrants and ghosts: the sight of monstrous, 'prodigious births ... appals the mother' (560– 1); 'foul Erinnys stalk'd about the wals, / Shaking her snaky hair and crooked pine / With flaming top' (570– 2); and in the 'black night' of Rome, 'Sulla's ghost / Was seen to walk, singing sad oracles' (579– 80).

In 2 Henry VI Shakespeare transforms Sulla's dictatorship into monstrous jaws dripping with flesh and blood: Suffolk is a 'yawning mouth' (IV.i.72),

'ambitious Scylla' is 'overgorg'd / With gobbets of thy mother's bleeding heart' (84–5); feeding and ambition are a form of pregnancy – 'By devilish policy art thou grown great' (83) – which in turn harks back to 'sink'. Parallels between English and ancient history informed Elizabethan representations of civil strife. Written just before 2 Henry VI, Thomas Lodge's The Wounds of Civil War, which dramatises Appian of Alexandria's account of the struggle between Marius and Sulla (variously spelled Sylla, Scilla and Scylla in early modern texts), carries its own share of bloodshed and portents. In the 1578 translation of Appian, a marginal note alerts the reader to the '[m]onstrous tokens' that announce Sulla's massacres. Around the same time, Marlowe's Tamburlaine compares his tyranny to 'Jove's dreadful thunderbolts' (1 Tamburlaine, II.iii.6– 24, 19) and himself to Jupiter (II.vii.12– 29), a posture that Suffolk seeks to imitate when he is captured, without achieving his rhetorical oneupmanship: 'Jove sometime went disguised, and why not I?' (2 Henry VI, IV.i.48), 'O! that I were a god, to shoot forth thunder / Upon these paltry, servile, abject drudges' (103– 4). Reading this scene in the light of enmeshed source materials and the context of the London stage, one observes dramatists drawing on a common cultural background and reworking it in a shared environment, emulating and inspiring one another's dramatic and rhetorical effects even while sharing tricks of the trade, such as multiple beheadings. In a culture better at listening than today's audiences, a word or phrase that passed in a matter of seconds on stage might be remembered or recognised as echoes in subsequent plays or inserted into epic poems.

Fears of civil strife feed back into mythological narratives: in Lodge's Scillaes Metamorphosis (1589/ 90), which revisits Metamorphoses, XIII (898– 968), Ate punishes Scylla by unleashing 'Furie and Rage, Wan- hope, Dispaire and Woe' (715), who chain her to the rocks while the waves echo her howls. Fury is war, '[h]is hands and armes ibathed in blood of those / Whome fortune, sinne, or fate made Countries foes' (719– 20). Considering the marine setting in 2 Henry VI , the references to 'loud- howling wolves', the prophecy that Suffolk would die by water and '[a]gainst the senseless winds ... grin in vain', one may speculate that audiences received the homophony of Sulla the dictator and Scylla the transformed maid as a composite monster. This conflation might seem less far- fetched when one reads in Marlowe's translation of Pharsalia how, among the recorded portents, 'Coal- black Charybdis whirl'd a sea of blood; / Fierce Mastives howled' (I, 546– 7). The texturing of material lifted from classical mythology, Roman history and medieval English chronicle releases a transformative process that has a generic impact: as Barbara Everett writes, '[i]n his history plays, Shakespeare turns chronicle into history, then history into drama, and then ... historical drama into

something almost like myth: free- standing, undocumented and legendary works of art'.

'Honest thefts', borrowings, blendings and recursions

As this case study illustrates, the underlying approach of this volume is to apply to the area of classical mythology practices of reading and writing that Robert S. Miola describes as thinking 'analogically, i.e. across texts, as well as logically' – the 'complex intertextual junction' Raphael Lyne traces in the Ovidian subtexts in The Faerie Queene. It also builds on Oliver Lyne's notion of 'further voices' – of classical authors as receptors and crafters as well as models of multi- faceted figures and tropes – and explores the implications of this in early modern writing. Translators, authors and scholars grew increasingly aware of this process as their knowledge of the classics expanded. Through Silver Age poets such as Lucan and Statius could be heard the voices of Virgil, Seneca and Ovid. In the fourth century CE, Ausonius admits his debt to Virgil in Cupid Crucifi ed and Colluthus displays his own debt to Homer in the Abduction of Helen. The perceived direction of these interactions was not always predictable: Tania Demetriou recalls in Chapter 2 how early modern commentators thought that the fifth- century CE poet Musaeus taught Homer his craft. As Peyré notes in Chapter 1, when inviting Ovid into his writing, Shakespeare is also playing host to Virgil and, through him, Homer, thereby incorporating a subtle layering of meanings – an intertextual feuilletage , to use Roland Barthes's term – that reverberates through the text and beyond. And even when figures such as Europa or Pygmalion seem to derive from a single or predominant source (such as Ovid), or, in the case of Medea, a combination of classical sources (mainly Ovid and Seneca) and their early modern translations, similar processes are at work.

From the late fifteenth century onwards, Elizabethans and Jacobeans accessed antiquity in the original text and in contemporary translation, alongside medieval texts, which provided printers with some of their earliest material, as A. E. B. Coldiron has shown. Circuits of penetration also included indirect channels via Italy, France and Spain. Several chapters in this volume demonstrate how 'the persistent medieval' continued to shape readers' apprehensions of, say, the Troy story through the Renaissance reprint culture.26 In Reading the Medieval in Early Modern England , Gordon McMullan and David Matthews underline a new 'sense of continuity and dependence' from the fourteenth to the seventeenth century, and invite 'reassessments of periodicity', which question traditional literary history and allow fresh insights into literary texts. Curtis Perry and John Watkins warn of the dangers that lie in 'the lure of a neo-

Burckhardtian idea of early modernity'; to the 'narratives of rupture' that developed in the wake of Burckhardt's study of the Italian Renaissance, Coldiron prefers 'narratives of continuity', 'the continuing presence of copious and vividly present pasts' in a 'reprint culture'. Combining literary analysis and book history, she argues that literature of the fifteenth, sixteenth and seventeenth centuries changed in fluid, unpredictable ways, drawing on textual continuity even when asserting novelty. Even authors claiming to exhume an ancient past relied directly on a more recent past's texts.

The contributors to this volume show how understanding modes of creativity and reception in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries requires flexibility about timelines. While the availability of source texts in new editions and the humanist work they generated inspired diversified approaches to classical material and released new forms of aesthetics in the arts that cannot be minimised, the slate was not wiped clean of intermediary influences: 'medieval mediations' (to borrow Coldiron's phrase) were reactivated in the Tudor period, which looped back to earlier texts to usher them into the next decades through print and translation. Coldiron agrees with William Kuskin that '[t] exts do not emerge simply by linear means'. She suggests combinations of patterns of production and circulation that interact in 'a vast, a very complex web', with implications for the mythological material under discussion here. The linear organisation of transmission as translation is complicated by patterns that move forwards, backwards and sideways, across cultures and periods. Kuskin's Recursive Origins: Writing at the Transition to Modernity is another contribution to this redefinition of periodisation. Imported from computer science, recursion designates the principle of reiterating one small operation again and again, gaining further complexity every time. An essentially dynamic process, it enables Kuskin to deconstruct illusory origins and identify the small 'loops' that have often been neglected in favour of huge leaps (as scholars addressed the relationship between Shakespeare and Chaucer, for instance, or Shakespeare and Ovid): 'the so- called moment of origins is less a comprehensive return to the classical past than a cycling through of local recursions on immediate precedents'. Thus, the medieval and Tudor heritages remained very much present, through chronicles, romances and mythological texts; through printed editions of Chaucer, William Caxton or Geoffrey of Monmouth; as well as translations of authors such as Christine de Pizan, whose portraits of exemplary ladies Brian Anslay translated and published under the title Boke of the Cyte of Ladyes in 1521.

Recursive, relocated Troys

Classical mythology helped authors (and their publics) bend and challenge the genealogies of transmission and the boundaries of genre. This was particularly true of the 'matter of Troy', a supreme illustration of 'new narratives loosely based upon classical originals'. 36 Caxton's Recuyell of the Historyes ofTroye, now famous for being the first book printed in English, in 1473– 74, is itself a highly 'recursive' text, decisively contributing to the early modern fascination with Troy, which ranged across literary, historical and political agendas. The Recuyell loops back through an impressive number of texts. Caxton translated Raoul Lefèvre's Recoeil des hystoires de Troyes , completed a decade earlier, which adapts Boccaccio's fourteenth- century Genealogia deorum gentilium in the first two books; the third book follows Guido delle Colonne's late-thirteenth-century Historia destructionis Troiae , itself based on Benoît de Sainte-Maure's twelfth- century Roman de Troie , which adapts two sixth-century Latin texts that passed for eye-witness accounts of the Trojan conflict, Dares the Phrygian's De excidio Trojae historia and Dictys of Crete's Ephemeris Belli Troiani .

Caxton's Recuyell coexisted in print alongside universal chronicles, which interwove Trojan, Roman and 'English' matter, as well as more directly inspired narratives of Troy, and derivative romances and cautionary tales. Seventeen editions ensured its survival right into the eighteenth century. It influenced William Warner's Albions England and George Peele's Tale of Troy, and contributed to the dramatic texture and language of Troilus and Cressida .

Around the same period, in the 1610s, Thomas Heywood drew on it as a major inspiration for Troia Britanica and his Age plays, alongside classical sources, which he diversely accessed firsthand and through commentaries. In parallel, the Troy material acquired dramatic resonance with the translation of Seneca's tragedies in the 1560s and the availability of Euripides's Greek playtexts, as Tanya Pollard has shown through her study of Hecuba.

The story of Troy provided examples of fluidity, linking mythological material with the matter of history and politics, which in turn justified and reinforced its centrality: the story runs through Roman and European history, or rather through chroniclers' (and kings') ongoing concern to fashion and legitimate their myths of origins. Just as Rome founded its legitimacy and ancestry in Troy, England rooted its royal genealogy in the continuity of the Roman-Trojan lineage — Troy rising phoenix- like from its ashes in Rome before being relocated to England and, more specifically, London as Troia Nova, Troynovant, or Troynovantum. This historico- political appropriation of the myth, initiated by, among others, Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia regum Britanniae, was still current nearly 500 years later, in Thomas

Dekker's 1612 pageant, Troy Nova triumphans. It was further enriched by topical diplomatic and economic concerns: Andrew Duxfield argues that in the continuity of 'mytho- historical antecedents' that arch back to Rome and Virgil, Troy informed the legitimisation of Elizabethan England's colonial ventures, pointing to the example, in Dido, Queen of Carthage, of 'Aeneas's account of the fall of Troy'. There were, then, different ways of inviting the myth of Troy into the early modern world and onto the stage: in terms of setting and story, as in Troilus and Cressida ; through the power of rhetoric, as Agnès Lafont demonstrates in her discussion of Marlowe's Dido in Chapter 9 ; as a clew running through the dramatised history of England, as Dominique Goy- Blanquet shows in Chapter 3 ; and, within that context, as a cultural capital shared by dramatists and spectators, as Janice Valls- Russell suggests in her discussion of King John in Chapter 4 . The example of Troy encapsulates the fluidity noted by Coldiron in the ways literature evolved between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries; the encounters between medieval- Tudor texts and the classics, through the Latin authors and increasingly, Homer; the malleability per se of the mythological material; and the flexibility of the Elizabethan stage, where 'time and place of action are in constant flux'.
Whether directly accessed, or revisited by medieval and Tudor authors, this proteiform material was read and recycled alongside the early modern variations it inspired: epyllia, sonnets, sonnet sequences, epics, drama. Percolating through all levels of printing, Trojan material reached a widening range of readers, and the way it was packaged illustrates wider processes of reading and reception. Already in the Middle Ages, manuscripts by different authors were bound together, frequently revealing thematic correspondences. Paratexts also served to inflect reader response, such as the 'surprisingly vicious, misogynist Latin poem' that Caxton appended to his Recuyell and that was reprinted in most of the editions throughout the sixteenth century. Similarly, Wynkyn de Worde added to his illustrated edition of Chaucer's Troilus and Criseyde (1517) stanzas that associate the mythological heroine with falsehood, undermining Chaucer's nuanced point of view with an openly negative condemnation of Criseyde. And in 1532 Thynne printed Henryson's poem, Testament of Cresseid , as a sixth book added without attribution to Chaucer's poem, so that it reads as a sequel. Despite the differences between Henryson's (Scots) English and Chaucer's, his depiction of Cressida as a leprous whore influenced poets throughout the seventeenth century, who failed to remember that lepers were thought to have had their purgatory on earth, so that with death they went straight to heaven. Such juxtapositions foreshadow, Lindsay Ann Reid argues, Shakespeare's open treatment of Cressida, which turns her into 'an interpretative amalgam',

'compounding all prior readings of her text'. Thus, he summons into the epic framework of the Troy story the non- classical tradition of the Cressida story, with its variations on her inconstancy and Troilus's constancy, to explore the interstices between ideals and 'reality' and question all forms of reception. Troilus anatomises this process in the speech that opened this introduction, and he later sums it up: 'Go, wind, to wind: there turn and change together' (V.iii.110). Love and heroism seem equally impossible, gesticulation and professions equally ineffectual.

Print and stage: growing up together and moving forward

Plays performed within a few years of each other reflect shared concerns, allusions and tropes. Authors parodied each other's works: John Marston openly pastiched Kyd's, Marlowe's and Shakespeare's plays; their action; rhetoric; and the way they were performed and staged. Heywood had read and/ or seen Shakespeare and Chapman, who had read and/ or seen Marlowe and Lyly. They simultaneously engaged in 'acute intertextual manoeuvers' and indulged in intratextual self- referentiality, choosing to 'recollect' themselves.
Translations of other European contemporary authors enriched the process. One instance of such lateral influences is the translation of Robert Garnier's Senecan drama, Marc Antoine , by Mary Sidney Herbert, countess of Pembroke, which was published under the title Antonius in 1592 and later reprinted as The Tragedie of Antonie . Garnier's play, written before 1575 and printed in 1578, is based on Jodelle's tragedy, Cléopâtre , and Plutarch's Lives (translated by Jacques Amyot), and is in itself an instance of interwoven influences: while the overall rhetoric is Senecan, the amplification of Cleopatra's lamentation recalls Virgil's Dido mourning Aeneas's departure. Antony (ll.502– 13) and the chorus (ll.862– 5) establish parallels between Egypt and Troy while recalling other tragic tales, mostly from Ovid's Metamorphoses. Sidney translates faithfully, introducing subtle inflections by referring directly back to source material, essentially Plutarch, which she seems to have read in Amyot and Thomas North's translations. Her blank verse amplifies Garnier's sympathetic characterisation of Cleopatra, which marks a break with the frequently derogatory medieval exemplum in emphasising her single- minded loyalty to Antony. Sidney thus introduced to the English cultural scene the dramatic potential of the Antony and Cleopatra story, which had inspired writers in Italy and France. More widely, her contribution heightened interest in Senecan tragedy, with new emphasis on character through rhetoric, especially the use of soliloquy and the delineation of passions through mythological references. Responding

to Sidney's influence as both translator and patron, Samuel Daniel produced a sequel, The Tragedie of Cleopatra (1594); Samuel Brandon opted for a different perspective in The Tragicomedie of the Virtuous Octavia (1598); and Fulke Greville wrote a play that he destroyed. Sidney's play also influenced Shakespeare's Antony and Cleopatra.

Garnier's play 'generates unorthodox questions with respect to sexuality and political power'. In France as in England, it was proof that politically inflected classical tragedies could become a medium through which it was possible to comment on the contemporary scene from a safer historical and generic distance – even though Fulke Greville's 'act of cautious self-censorship' suggests the 'potentially loaded topicality of the tradition of the Antony and Cleopatra plays and, particularly, their potential to interrogate issues relating to politics and sovereignty'.

Such 'encounters' challenge the very notions of diachronic patterns, linearity or compartmentalised knowledge and culture, pointing rather to 'a creatively confused sense of literary chronology'. Cross-fertilisation is synchronic, and accelerated by two complementary economic and cultural vectors, the book trade and the theatre: to quote J. S. Peters, 'The printing press had an essential role to play in the birth of the modern theatre at the turn of the fifteenth century. As institutions they grew up together.' Colin Burrow shows how 'Shakespeare's references to classical authorities are theatrically motivated performances rather than scholarly citations': the classics are a 'changing and theatrically inflected resource'. Illustrations of classical scenes in translations of Ovid also played their part in fashioning the representation of affect on stage, as did 'illustrated Terences and Plautuses ... their woodcuts copied again and again in dramatic editions'.

Research into the economics, architecture and sociology of the theatre industry and the politics underpinning companies' agendas has cast fresh light on the conditions in which plays were written, staged, performed and received. All this helps us understand how creative habits were fashioned. If classical mythology left such marks on Shakespeare and his contemporaries, it is in part because the expanding availability of textual material occurred at a time of intense theatrical activity, with the development of outdoor and indoor playhouses, with their specific staging practices and targeted audiences. Not only was there fierce competition among the professional theatres, private patronage encouraged a wide range of cultural activities, within which women from aristocratic circles, such as Mary Herbert and Queens Anne of Denmark and Henrietta Maria, played a significant part. Whether performed in public playhouses or at court, plays and attendant genres such as masques provided an unrivalled arena for borrowings, blendings and parodies; for intergeneric experimentation and cross-generic transgressions; for

a relocation of mythological narrative, topography and figures, to dramatic or seriocomic effect, as Charlotte Coffin shows in her discussion of Thomas Heywood's Love's Mistress in Chapter 10.

Interweaving processes

The nature of the early modern playhouse made it particularly well adapted to forms of writing that blend history; romance and classical mythology; epic scenes; and individual trajectories of quest, loss or transformation. Successive chapters in this volume propose close readings that reveal various forms of mythological interweaving, jacquarded motifs, plots and political agendas. While taking in ongoing processes of circulation, elaboration and reception, contributors to this volume invite us to return to the heart of the texts themselves. The interweaving that emerges is fluid, reflexive, self-regenerative, engendering new patterns that simultaneously retain familiar features. Writing of Bernardo Tasso's Favola di Leandro e d'Hero (1537) in his study of the Renaissance fortunes of Musaeus's Hero and Leander, Braden notes: 'Neither a translation nor a substantially new work, it weaves continually in and out of the Greek poem during its 679 lines, with numerous substitutions, rearrangements, and interpolations; but it always returns to some unmistakable feature from Mousaios.'

What we term interweaving processes bring together complementary methods of investigation. Interactions, as we have seen, can travel back and forth in time, across cultures – radiate or come together. As previously discussed, they can be multi-layered – feuilletage – and entail proximity and displacement, overlayerings and palimpsests that are not quite so. Conflations of source materials, mythological stories, narrative conventions and symbolical motifs all have a liberating, expansive effect. When Ruth Morse analyses what she terms Shakespeare's 'deep imaginative collocations', which draw attention to textual and literary present absences, she shows how content can retain continuity while being remarkably malleable, expanding on the theory of memes. In the words of Helen Cooper, who has applied this theory to medieval romance, the meme is 'an idea that behaves like a gene in its ability to replicate faithfully and abundantly, but also on occasion to adapt, mutate, and therefore survive in different forms and cultures'. Authors engage with their audiences through a play on familiarity and variation: 'The very familiarity of the pattern of the motif, the meme, alerts the reader to certain kinds of shaping and significance, and sets up expectations that the author can fulfil or frustrate. The same motif will not always mean the same thing, or in the same ways; on the contrary, what matters most is the variations on the ways it is used.' 59 Variations can be simultaneous

within a text, interacting with other material, mythological or non- mythological – processes that Nathalie Rivère de Carles describes and analyses in Chapter 8 as internal and external forms of interweaving. In her discussion of the influence of the Greek epyllion, and the ways poems such as Marlowe's Hero and Leander deny all knowledge of the disaster to happen, Tania Demetriou draws attention to the 'recalibration of poets' classical interests', through which they play on generic affiliation, suggesting an intimate link with epic while also distancing themselves from it. All these approaches are dynamic; they stimulate experimentation with rhetoric and genre; encourage the emergence of new aesthetics; legitimise the revisiting of political, religious or historical contexts; involve reader and audience – then as now – in an ongoing process of collaborative recognition and reinvention that goes some way to accounting for the enduring success of so many of Shakespeare's and his contemporaries' productions.

Close readings

Starting from a timeless trope – blushing, more specifically the blushing of Hermaphroditus and Narcissus – Chapter 1 (Yves Peyré) draws on examples from Ovid, Homer, Shakespeare, Marlowe and Spenser. Travelling from Ovid back to Homer; forwards to Shakespeare, Marlowe, Spenser; and back again to Virgil, he sets the tone of the volume's investigation, organically evolving a methodology both from Roland Barthes's theory of feuilletage (multi-layering) and Shakespeare's own writing process. The dramatist's combined dynamics of trans-textuality and multi- textuality invites 'new types of dialogue ... beyond temporal and cultural differences'. The purpose is not to track source ramifications for their own sake: it is to investigate their impact on various forms of writing.

Chapter 2 (Tania Demetriou) deconstructs assumptions about the so- called 'Ovidian epyllion', an amatory mythological narrative genre that emerged as a vibrant focus of creativity in late Elizabethan England. Demetriou demonstrates that alongside the pervasive influence of Ovid, this tradition owed much to the interaction between pastoral poetics and the precedent of a number of late Greek short epics that enjoyed widespread visibility in the early modern period. The mode of reading that these brief epics invite as a genre shaped the English poetic tradition in ways that have not been properly appraised before. Across the chapter, Demetriou proposes a revaluation of the contribution to 1590s poetic culture of Thomas Watson, avant- garde versifier and exceptional Hellenist. The influence of Watson's citation, translation and imitation of ancient Greek epyllia and especially Colluthus's Abduction of Helen reconfigures,

she argues, the literary landscape that inspired Marlowe's Hero and Leander, and affords not only new ways of reading this poem, but also external evidence that it is finished.

Chapter 3 (Dominique Goy- Blanquet) considers the political use of foundational myths and explores the ambiguity of origins. As medieval France and England sought to assert a degree of autonomy from papal Rome, they used legends to sustain national pride and support their theories of empire. The chapter retraces the complex lineages that purportedly originated in Troy, in a context of competition among the respective courts and chroniclers of France, Burgundy and England. After recalling the increasing scepticism of early modern historians, Goy- Blanquet discusses Shakespeare's critical treatment of these tales of origins in his history plays, both classical and medieval. Their mythical background is one of mingled yarns – French and English, Celtic, Roman and Trojan – that Shakespeare further interweaves, sometimes with deliberate anachronisms, as he invites his public to find ways out of Britain's long and conflict- ridden involvement with continental culture.

Chapter 4 (Janice Valls- Russell) contends that in King John , the fall of Troy and the tragic fates of Andromache and Astyanax inform the staging of the siege of Angers, the rhetoric of conquest and destruction, the mother- and- child figures of Constance and Arthur, and the latter's death. Close readings suggest a rhetorical affinity with the translation of Seneca by Jasper Heywood, whose pathos is shown to derive from Homer via Euripides and Seneca. Stagings of the play provide instances of the way the audience is drawn into this cross-referentiality between an Elizabethan dramatist's depiction of medieval cities and the ruins of Troy.

Chapter 5 (Atsuhiko Hirota) shows how the myth of Jason and the Golden Fleece provides a subtext to The Merchant of Venice, where the staging of adventurous Venetians as Jasons, and rich daughters as either Medeas or coveted wealth, is fraught with ambivalence. The chapter shows how the myth gains additional layers of meaning in the economic context of sixteenth- century England, where the Golden Fleece is readily associated both with the exploitation of New World resources and with the all- important English wool trade. Hirota also shows how ovine metaphors are at the heart of a network of interactions between classical myth and biblical episodes, a syncretic combination that Shakespeare exploits to dramatic and symbolic effect.

Chapter 6 (Katherine Heavey) extends the discussion of the myth of the Golden Fleece, from the perspective of Medea's killing of her brother Apsyrtus. Shakespeare and his contemporaries knew the story through Ovid's Tristia and Seneca's Medea and their translations by Thomas Churchyard and John Studley, as well as Caxton's History of Jason . Heavey's discussion of various aspects of the myth (the

brother– sister relationship, Apsyrtus's youth, Medea's repentance or lack thereof, Aeëtes's grief) shows how early modern translators and authors were sensitive both to her transgression of conventional gender roles and to the grief of Aeëtes. This led playwrights and poets to reshape the myth so as to express culturally specific anxieties about proper male behaviour and the expression of emotions. Looking at passages from Thomas Heywood, Richard Robinson, Robert Baron and Robert Herrick, Heavey also analyses the political implications of the myth. Her investigation shows how a myth is continually reshaped through combinations of sources and adaptation to new concerns.

Chapter 7 (Gaëlle Ginestet) focuses on another feminine figure – Europa – and the story of her abduction, which finds one of its earliest sources in a Greek epyllion by Moschus and was popularised by Ovid. Europa's ravishment by Jupiter in the guise of a bull provides an example of multiple rhetorical and aesthetic influences and readings in love sonnets and Shakespeare. Converging and conflicting depictions of Europa's rape in classical sources were available in the sixteenth century (Moschus, Ovid, Horace), alongside medieval (Ovide moralisé , Chaucer) and early modern revisitings (translators, mythographers and emblematists). Dipping into Horace, recovering elements that Ovid had left out from Moschus (to whom they had access in Latin translation), poets remetamorphosed the story into an erotic play of tensions between desire and rape.

Chapter 8 (Nathalie Rivère de Carles) turns to the ambivalent Penelopean and Arachnean palimpsests – discussed in this introduction to the volume – by exploring their impact on early modern English dramatic characterisation in plays retracing love and political conquests. The two myths connect the three 'lives' Aristotle defines as the components of the human quest for happiness: sensual enjoyment, political achievement and intellectual contemplation. Analysing classical and Renaissance sources alongside a corpus of Shakespearean and non- Shakespearean plays, and looking beneath the mythographical cloth of a silent exemplarity so as to retrieve the political 'voice of the shuttle', the chapter shows how the figures of Penelope and Arachne enable a debate on disobedience and the creation of representations of female agency on the stage.

Chapter 9 (Agnès Lafont) reinscribes Marlowe's Ovidian handling of the episode he draws from Virgil of Dido's fated encounter with Aeneas in a cultural context that includes medieval and Tudor revisitings of the mythological Dido. Her study of Dido, Queen of Carthage traces the transmission of references to her problematic exemplarity, from Chaucer's Legend of Good Women to Caxton's Eneydos and sixteenth-century pamphleteers such as Thomas Feylde, broadening the scope of possible intertextual echoes. In transferring the story to the stage Marlowe plays games with his sources, and this generic shift creates another reversal: as performed by boy actors, Dido's classical plight becomes a parody of aristocratic love concerns.

Chapter 10 (Charlotte Coffin) explores the reception of Thomas Heywood's Love's Mistress, which dramatises the story of Cupid and Psyche, from Apuleius's Golden Ass. Through comparison with emerging trends and contemporary genres Coffin contends that the play demonstrates the complex ways in which classical mythology could be received within a cultured audience in the 1630s. She connects Heywood's treatment of myth with the vogue for burlesque that was beginning to develop in France, and may have reached England through the influence of Queen Henrietta Maria and her courtiers. She also argues that Heywood at the end of his career was not so much going back to his mythological plays of the 1610s, as emulating the innovations of his young rival, James Shirley.

Rounding off the volume, Chapter 11 (Ruth Morse) takes as its starting-point a reference to Pygmalion in Measure for Measure to engage in a methodological discussion of influences. Enlarging on medieval and early modern reception, and on the ensuing accretion of significances attached to the figure (and to his statue), this chapter surveys critics' involvement with Pygmalion from a variety of perspectives, and the metamorphoses the myth undergoes in critical thought. Morse draws attention to the simultaneous continuity and malleability of references. The significance of the Pygmalion story is questioned afresh through relocations in new forms of popular culture, which evidence how Shakespeare's reworking in turn inspires later authors. Thus Shakespeare becomes part of the interweaving, allusive process, enriching the tapestry with his own 'displacements' and 'ruptures' and thereby adding his own layer to the ongoing work of feuilletage , on which the volume opened.

This feuilletage of sources and influences was made strikingly apparent in Melly Still's 2016 production of Cymbeline for the Royal Shakespeare Company: design, action and script gave physical and textual immediacy to the ways Shakespeare reshuffles myth, history and gender in the play to explore issues of origins and affiliation, tossing all the pieces in the air, as it were, to have them finally fall into place in a dizzying cascade of revelations. Illustrating the process that Morse describes in this volume and elsewhere, this production absorbed works produced in a 'world consequent upon, as well as subsequent to Shakespeare'. This was a post- apocalyptic Iron Age Britain gone to ruin, ineffectually ruled by a queen wrapped in maternal grief. Memories of a former Golden Age were represented by a home video showing the royal family playing around a tree before the children's abduction, a tree stump centre stage, and graffiti on walls that read 'These were once trees' and 'Remember as it was'. The Roman

legions were an orderly formation and Iachimo's Renaissance Italy was a bling, sexist world. Cymbeline's subjects wore cross- gendered clothes recycled from blankets, army surplus and lace tutus in a style loosely evocative of 'shabby chic' punk that suggested an inventive potential for renewal through the integration of diverse source materials. The script reflected a layering of influences: Latin, Italian and French were spoken, with the English text projected upstage. Attention was drawn to mythological imagery in the bedchamber scene, through a screen projection of the lines in which Iachimo compares himself to Tarquin entering Lucrece's chamber, and the passage on Philomel that Innogen (or Imogen) was reading before going to sleep. Jupiter was flown down on the tree stump that had been uprooted earlier to reveal Belarius's grotto in the gaping hole left by the roots, which dangled overhead like a protective canopy; the god then morphed into a reinvigorated Posthumus. This production thus drew attention to cultural and textual hybridity, and the tensions underlying individual and collective trajectories of loss and recovery. The design also drew on the aesthetics of screen epics such as Hunger Games, which are influenced by Roman history and myth, as mediated to some extent by Shakespeare. Groping through scenes of darkness towards uncertain stability, this production showed that the interweaving of mythology and history within and with texts such as Shakespeare's is an ongoing creative process, one that remains deeply relevant to the expression of contemporary narratives.

Shakespeare, love and language by David Schalkwyk [Cambridge University Press, 9781107187238]

What is the nature of romantic love and erotic desire in Shakespeare's work? In this erudite and yet accessible study, David Schalkwyk addresses this question by exploring the historical contexts, theory and philosophy of love. Close readings of Shakespeare's plays and poems are delivered through the lens of historical texts from Plato to Montaigne and modern writers including Jacques Lacan, Jean-Luc Marion, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Jacques Derrida, Alain Badiou and Stanley Cavell. Through these studies, it is argued that Shakespeare has no single or overarching concept of love, and that in Shakespeare's work, love is not an emotion. Rather, it is a form of action and disposition, to be expressed and negotiated linguistically.

David Schalkwyk is a Professor of Shakespeare Studies at Queen Mary University of London. He was formerly Director of Research at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington DC and editor of the Shakespeare Quarterly. His books include Speech and Performance in Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays (2002), Literature and the Touch of the Real (2004), Shakespeare, Love and Service (2008), Hamlet's Dreams: The Robben Island Shakespeare (2013) and The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy (2018).

Excerpt: A young woman declares that she would rather die than "chose love by another's eyes". A young man threatens to "love" the woman he has idealized "against the nature of love" by raping her. Another young woman bewails the fact that love "sees not with the eyes but with the mind" while two young men switch between loving and loathing her without apparent rhyme or reason. A teenage girl is astonished that the more she gives her love, the more she has to give. An older man resolves upon hearing of his lover's death that he has no more reason to live; and then, when he hears that she lied to him about her death, asks simply to be taken to die in her arms. Another older man smothers his wife for supposed infidelity, and then excuses himself for loving her not wisely but too well, before he takes his own life in despair. An adult couple, believing that they hate each other, are brought by a theatrical trick into being "horribly in love"; a melancholic man gives his heart to enable his friend to pursue a "lady richly left"; a young woman in love with her master in the guise of a page acts as a go-between to help him secure his fantasy object of love, while another, also in the guise of a young man, plays love games with her lover in the free space of a forest before giving herself to him. Two men spend pleasurable nights with women other than those they desired and expected, making "sweet use of what they hate". And a common player-poet is torn between an idealized love for a young man and a "perjured eye" that drives him to self-loathing in his desire for an unconventional and promiscuous woman.

These are instances of erotic love and desire in Shakespeare: the large and impossibly complex topic of this book. They offer no discernible pattern; they comprehend no encompassing theory; they can be reduced to no single attitude. "Love" is a messy, indefinite concept, with rough edges and divergent uses, prone to historical change, personal variation and philosophical disagreement. It

encompasses a vast range of affective attitudes and forms of behaviour. Does such messiness reside in the inadequacy of the concept or the intractability of the phenomena that it is supposed to embrace? The Catholic philosopher, Jean-Luc Marion, is scathing about the philosophical poverty of our discourses on love: "We have no concept whatever of love. Without a concept, each time we pronounce the word `love' or reel off `words of love' we literally no longer know what we are saying and, in fact, we say nothing."' Encompassing but not differentiating the classical concepts of eros, philia, agape and nomos, the English word "love" is almost impossible to use with any kind of precision.

In Shakespeare, Love and Service I traced the relations of love and service by distinguishing the contours of these four cognate Greek concepts. Shakespeare, Love and Language focuses on love as eros, although it acknowledges that it is impossible to ignore the affinities of eros in the early modern period with philia (friendship) and nomos (service). Even eros, the examples from Shakespeare show, is impossibly complex. The greatness of Shakespeare on love lies not only in the range of his imaginative reach but also in his capacity to make each instance compelling. For analytical clarity I pursue one, classic bifurcation of the concept of eros: as love, on the one hand, and desire, on the other. Here Ancient Greek — which offers divisions among eros, philia, agape and nomos — is of little help, for the Greek word eros does not differentiate between love and desire. Indeed, from Plato onwards the Greek concept has tended to reduce love to desire. This reduction had profound consequences and continues to inform our current notions of love.

Three Stories in Plato
There is a decisive moment in Plato's Symposium when Socrates interrogates Agathon. "And now, said Socrates, I will ask about Love: — Is Love of something or of nothing?" Upon the crux of the preposition "of' Socrates turns love from a god into a concept. This move, which draws the essence of love out of the grammar of desire, has profound ramifications for the concept of love across its history. It pulls love into the orbit of desire. For that grammatical relation — of love to something else in the formula "love of something" — insists that love is essentially desire.

That love is always of something is true enough. But the ideology of desire insists that love is necessarily of something that it does not have: what is loved is a lacked object that the subject of love wants. Love's supposed identity to desire is nicely conveyed by the double meaning of this English word: one wants or desires something when it is wanting — missing, lacking, at a distance. If one wants something in the sense of not having it, and then goes about getting it, it is no longer wanting, and it makes no sense, therefore, to want it. Once it gets what it desires love will no longer lack what it wants — it will stop being wanting — and so will stop desiring it. This means, according to this story, that one will stop loving it. The twist that Socrates gives this corollary is that desire can be satisfied only in the final analysis: it moves ceaselessly from object to object until it is ultimately united with the Form or Idea of the Beautiful or the Good itself.

Plato's earliest dialogue on love, the Lysis, devoted to the nature of friendship rather than erotic love, demonstrates the limits of conceptual analysis with which Socrates begins in the Symposium and from which he draws his conclusion concerning the identity of love and desire. Socrates seeks to teach two young friends, Menexenus and Lysis, what friendship is. The Lysis is consistent with the other two dialogues in its insistence that friendship is a kind of desire. But the result of its bewildering quest for the relationship between friend and enemy, love and hatred, like and unlike — and especially the vexed question of reciprocity through the conceptual analysis of the relations between these terms — ends not in knowledge but in the confession of ignorance:

> O Lysis and Menaxenus — how ridiculous that you two boys, and I, an old boy, who would fain be one of you, should imagine ourselves to be friends — this is what the bystanders will go away and say — and yet we have been unable to discover what is a friend!
> (Plato, Works, 32)

Each of us knows indubitably that we are friends, Socrates concludes, but stipulating what a friend or friendship is, even after a long investigation, escapes all of us.

Once he has reduced love to desire through conceptual analysis in the Symposium, Socrates, however, turns away from grammar to myth — in

the story told by Diotima, who intervenes at the very point at which Socrates presses the dialectic upon Agathon. Here conceptual analysis is curtailed abruptly in favour of an anecdote: Love is by nature the lover of beauty because he was conceived on Aphrodite's birthday; but he is not a god, he is a daemon — he moves between man and the gods. He is the child of the union of Poros, who combines resourcefulness with ingenuity and cleverness, and Penia, the female embodiment of poverty. It is Penia (penury) who lacks and therefore desires: she rapes Poros while he lies in a drunken stupor. He therefore does not know that he is loved or desired by Penia. This lack of knowledge introduces an aspect of the conception of love of which Lacan will make much: Poros, like Socrates — like the beloved and ultimately the lover — does not know. This ignorance is central to desire. Eros does not know either why or what it desires. Nor does the beloved know what he (or she) might be desired for. He or she does not know how to answer the Lacanian question Che Voui? or What do you want?

On the basis of the lack that drives desire, Diotima tells the story of the metonymic chain of its progress from the desire for immortality through the production of children, "using these as steps only" (378-9), to the desire for the body of a single beautiful boy; from there the lover moves to the love of the boy as a beautiful soul; then through the recognition of the idea of beauty common to all beautiful boys; and finally to the pursuit of the ultimate "vast sea of beauty" (378), which will enable him to approach "the notion of absolute beauty, and at last know what the essence of beauty is" (379). Love or desire — they are the same thing here — moves along a metonymic chain, in a restless quest for the beautiful and the good, which cannot be embodied by any single earthly thing.

In the Phaedrus, as in the Republic, the soul is split. It is imagined as a charioteer trying to control two radically different horses, one white, the other black; the white horse is tractable and susceptible to reason and control; the other is wild and driven by passion. The charioteer's task is to drive his pair of contrary steeds through episodes of human desire so that the original wings of the soul might sprout again to soar upwards towards its original transcendental unity with Beauty and Truth. The black horse is consumed by the desire for carnal consummation and pleasure. One might therefore expect the white horse to represent the controlling measure of reason. But although this horse is tractable to the control of reason and amenable to the power of true beauty, it embodies a kind of divine madness that possesses the soul through its recognition of something of the ultimate ideal of Beauty in a specific encounter with a beautiful being. Such madness or mania is what the Phaedrus adds to the story of the ascent of love in the Symposium, representing this irrational impulse as a necessary component of the kind of love that seeks beauty through its love of discourse or philosophy.

Lysis's argument that the non-lover is better than the lover because his love is disinterested and rational desecrates the sanctity of love, which is a form of divine possession. This is a crucial move for the later traditions of eros, since it contradicts the idea that love could ever be expected to be rational. Love is by definition a kind of madness. But it is not any kind of madness. Its mania is directed at the recovery of a beauty dimly recollected by the soul and embodied imperfectly in its carnal form as the beauty of particular bodies. In this sense, then, it is driven. The passion to engender or reproduce beauty through beauty does not stop at the merely physical desire for sexual intercourse, but transcends or sublimates that passion into what A.W. Price calls called "educative pederasty". The love of beauty in a particular boy (the erastes) is channelled by the older lover (the eromenos) into a desire to bring the boy, through the educative discourses of philosophy, to an appreciation of the kinds of beauty sought by the soul in its erotic rapture.

About two-thirds of the way through the Phaedrus the dialogue seems to depart from the topic of love and turns to the nature of rhetoric and the superiority of speech over writing. As I read it, this suggests that a relationship between lover and beloved may be reduced to pure desire only with difficulty. This section of the Phaedrus is thus in tension with at least part of the story of the Symposium. For Socrates's disparagement of writing in the former stems from two things: first, its careless promiscuity and, second, its indifference to the moral development of the person who encounters it. The person who puts his faith in writing does not address his words to a specific

person or beloved, seeking to cultivate virtue and wisdom in his soul. Rather, he disseminates them indiscriminately, sowing them on barren ground, where they will neither take root nor flourish. Writings are "tumbled about anywhere, amongst those who may or may not understand them, and know not to whom they should reply, to whom not ... and they cannot defend or protect themselves" (324).

Speech, on the other hand, which knows what it is up to — which has developed into a proper art or techne — is capable of being "an intelligent word graven in the soul of the learner" (324) because it has mastered the "art of enchanting the soul" by "learn[ing] the differences of human souls". Speech can therefore attend to the specificity of a dialectic or conversation with a particular person. Such an engagement with the beloved cannot be reduced to the metonymy of desire driven by lack. The responsibility assumed by the lover through speech does not rest on something he lacks, but rather on his attention to the specificity of the soul of the beloved. By implication, at least, the beautiful boy is appreciated, loved, and addressed for the uniqueness of his soul, even if such attention is aimed at the begetting of truth in beauty as the Symposium describes the process.

In sum, then, Plato leaves us with three related but differently nuanced positions on love and desire in each of his dialogues. In logical, but not chronological, order: first, in the Symposium love is reduced to desire, which arises from a serial lack that leads to a series of substitutions on the path towards its culmination in the general Form of Beauty rather than a particular, beautiful body; second, the demonstration of the superiority of speech over writing in the Phaedrus produces a tension with the Symposium, since the responsibility of love towards the singular person in conversation celebrates the specificity and uniqueness of the beloved rather than his status as a point of absence or lack; finally, in the Lysis even Socrates is forced to admit the limits of the dialectical method — he does not know what a friend is, even though friends assuredly recognize their reciprocal friendship. In the later conversations of the Phaedrus and the Symposium this position is at least implicitly acknowledged by the fact that Socrates resorts to myth to explicate the nature of love. But he never

quite abandons the fundamental dialectical position that love is desire.

This essentialising of love as desire marks almost the entire tradition of the representation of erotic love: from the Roman philosopher Plotinus's aspirational "pang of desire" to become one with the ultimate Being in the third century BC;4 through the Augustan poet Ovid's transformational, uncontrollable violence of wanting in his Metamorphose; to the courtly tradition with its roots in St. Augustine's insistence on love's necessary transcendence of the world of flesh, manifest in forms of idealizing desire in the troubadours, Dante and Petrarch in the late Middle Ages. Roland Barthes sums up desire's essentialised basis in absence with a rhetorical question: "Isn't desire the same, whether the object is present or absent? Isn't the object always absent? — always, that is to say, elusive, unintrojected, unmastered, unpossessed?"

Each of the strands of this tradition finds expression in parts of Shakespeare. But Shakespeare is also concerned with a counter-view, in which desire is transformed into love. And this has significant implications for our understanding of the way in which desire and love are negotiated through language and action and language as action in Shakespeare's plays.

Love versus Desire
The large claim of this book, which is fully substantiated only in the final chapter, is that for Shakespeare desire is indeed an emotion or affect — "Unstaid and skittish in all motions" (2.4.20) — but, further, that love is not merely a feeling. Love involves emotion or affect, sometimes different and even contradictory affects, but it cannot be reduced to any emotion. It is a complex attitude or disposition established and developed over time through forms of behaviour in relation to another person who is regarded as unique and incapable of substitution. Love is not fungible. The forms of action and attitude that it encompasses are exemplified by what J. L. Austin calls performative speech acts. Such performative acts — what Stanley Cavell calls "passionate utterances" — are like Plato's notion of "speech" as opposed to "writing" in the Phaedrus, insofar as they single out another person for a response in kind. Love is therefore primarily a performative concept: love acts rather than simply is or feels. The theatrical

medium of Shakespeare's plays shows repeatedly that it is an embodied, performative concept.

Distinguishing between love and desire involves not a separation of the concepts, but rather the proper delineation of the relationship between them. Love is not radically separable from desire. Plato (or Socrates) is correct when he makes the grammatical or logical observation that love is always of an object. But Plato reduces that love of something to the desire for a thing that one does not have. The argument, which begins soundly, misleads by elevating the relational preposition into an absolute lack — one cannot love what one has, so one has to desire in a serial way, moving from one object that one lacks to another, similarly absent, one. The Platonic story turns this restlessness into a virtue: the lover moves step-by-step, object by desirable object, to attain a re-union with ultimate Beauty only in the ultimate instance, divorced in the end from any actual person. Furthermore, without Plato's teleological metaphysics, desire is trapped in an endless quest that by definition has to be carried along a chain of deferred satisfaction without end: what Jacques Lacan calls a metonymic chain of essential lack.

If desire is the expression of a permanent and ineradicable emptiness — of wanting what one does not have — then what is love? There are many historically divergent answers to this question, but the clearest one made in the name of humanism regards love proper as the dedication of oneself to a unique person who is cherished for themselves — for his or her singular, irreplaceable being. Desire is for something lacking; love is for a unique person who is an end in him- or herself. In his defence of humanism, Todorov pointedly calls this singularity "the finality of the you" (Imperfect Garden). This you stops the Lacanian regress at a specially regarded person who is not a pathway or lure to something else. But it has its own problems, of which Shakespeare is presciently aware, and which I will examine in due course.

All of Shakespeare's erotic relationships involve relations of desire, and such desire is not always convincingly transformed into love in the sense in which I wish to differentiate it from desire. The reasons are generic and conceptual. Drama, especially comedy, tends to rest on the uncertain intensities of desire rather than the extended and active behaviour required by love. Shakespeare's

comedies tend to end at the point at which desire is about to be satisfied but love has not yet had the time to settle (if it is ever settled). Many plays, notably As You Like It, Much Ado About Nothing, Twelfth Night, Romeo and Juliet, Troilus and Cressida and Antony and Cleopatra, offer a dialogical interplay of what I shall call, after Cavell, "passionate utterance" and action through which desire is incessantly embodied and re-embodied as love. Of all the romantic comedies, only Love's Labour's Lost breaks off unconventionally before the satisfactions of desire to gesture towards what is required for love to prove itself — as a form of sustained action rather than mere affective intensity, in a prolonged future of dedicated behaviour that extends beyond the limited timeframe of a play (or perhaps even a lifetime):

BEROWNE   Our wooing doth not end like an
old play.

                Jack hath not Jill. These ladies'
    courtesy
                Might well have made our sport a
    comedy.
KING   Come, sir, it wants a twelvemonth
and a day,

                And then 'twill end.
BEROWNE   That's too long for a play.
                (Love's Labour's Lost,
    5.2..947-52)

A striking feature of Plato's analysis of love and Lacan's meditations on desire is their shared interest in the imbrication of love/desire in language: the Socratic attempt to wrest the concept of love from grammar is echoed by Lacan's (in)famous pronouncement that the unconscious is structured like a language and by his claim that to speak is to demand to be loved. Neither holds that love or desire and language are identical, but each posits a compelling relation between love/desire and language in the sense that the elusive nature of eros may be discerned by following the turns of language. Rachel Carson's beautiful disquisition on desire via the classical Greek lyric poets (like Plato's Phaedrus) draws direct analogies between eros and language: from her argument that "as eros insists on the edges of human beings and the spaces between them, the written consonant imposes edge on the sounds of human speech and insists on the reality of that edge", to the ways in which desire and meaning never quite reach their

respective objects: "The words we read and the words we write never say exactly what we mean. The people we love are never just as we desire them. The two symbola never perfectly match. Eros is in between." Carson emphasizes the aspects of language that encompass difference and distance; Cavell the ways in which language in action may overcome difference. The two are always in tension; they always work together, as do love and desire.

I am thus prompted by this double cue at the two ends of the history of eros (Plato and Lacan) to explore love through the extraordinary intensities of Shakespeare's language and the fundamentally constitutive rather than merely instrumental force of discourse in the engagement between his characters in love. My concern is thus primarily conceptual: following Socrates's initiating analysis of the relation between love and desire, I trace that imbrication through the rich and complex dynamics of interactive dialogue in the plays and sonnets. Plato's initiating conceptual analysis and Lacan's account of the metonymy of desire, taken together with the linguistic turn of philosophy in the twentieth century,'° offer different conceptual frameworks for the exploration of eros in Shakespeare as an intertwining of emotion, thought, attitude and linguistic action that cannot be comprehended by any single theory or historical narrative, but which may be illuminated by the deep involvement of language in human subjectivity and its drives. Though it is a noun, Carson reminds us, eros acts as a verb."

One way of writing about love in Shakespeare would be to offer an historicist account that emphasized his distance from us. Such an account would seek to reduce the concept of eros in the poems and plays to what is assumed to be the theory of love as a passion or affect historically available to Shakespeare and his contemporaries — chiefly in the Galenic humoural psychology of writers such as Nicholas Coeffeteau, Thomas Wright and Robert Burton." Another would be to read Shakespeare through the lens of the contemporary Freudianism of Lacan, the renewed Humanism of Todorov, or the radical politics of Queer Studies. Yet another might treat "Shakespeare on Love and Lust" or "Love and Sex in Shakespeare" from the perspective of popular, modern notions of love, sex and desire,

untrammelled by historicist scholarship and the complexities of theory, philosophy or psychoanalysis.

Each of these approaches would produce, and have indeed have produced, illuminating studies. But none would do justice to the full range and dynamics of love and desire in Shakespeare. His age may well have been steeped in Galenic theory, but his wide-ranging insights into the intensities and complexities of eros continue to move readers and audiences who know nothing of Galenic philosophy or, if they did, would find it absurd. Shakespeare not only reaches beyond the historical limitations of humoural theory, he also subjects its incoherencies and limitations to ironical scrutiny. It is a resource to be drawn upon, not a doctrine to be followed. Nor is any single theory of love or desire, historical or contemporary, able to comprehend its rich representation in Shakespeare's poems and plays. While a non-theoretical approach may speak with uncomplicated directness to the ordinary twenty-first century reader or play-goer, it fails to acknowledge or bring to light the fact that much of Shakespeare's representation of eros is unintuitive or uncanny: it challenges and complicates commonplace notions of love or desire. It reveals in each aspects of death and violence, hatred and despair — the "transgression" in which Romeo, for example, discerns "much to do with hate, but more with love" (Romeo and Juliet, 1.1.1 80).

Shakespeare's representations of love are thus multi-faceted: there is no single theory or view of love in his plays and poems. He is responsive but not subservient to the concepts of love and desire that he may have inherited from Plato through sources as various as the Roman poet Lucretius; the courtly love tradition of the troubadours and Andreas Capellanus; the powerful Christian tradition of agape and the problem of the caritas synthesis that divides the Christian church in the Reformation; Renaissance theorists of love, neo-Platonic and otherwise; Galenic psychology; and figures as individual as Michel de Montaigne. He also anticipates notions of eros that may not have been explicitly expressed by his historical predecessors, but which are nevertheless illuminated by a range of modern philosophers and theorists, including those from whom I variously draw my argument and analysis: Sigmund Freud

and Jacques Lacan, Jean-Luc Marion and Alain Badiou, Rachel Carson and Tzevan Todorov, Stanley Cavell and William Reddy. Moreover, he represents the multiple ways in which love as eros is intertwined within the ancient Greek conceptual scheme of philia, nomos, autophilia, and storge, and the Roman notion of playfulness or ludus.

In my examination of eros in Shakespeare I thus combine close reading of his work with analysis of historical texts that have a bearing on his representation of love and desire. But I also discuss a range of twentieth and twenty-first century theoretical and philosophical treatments of the subject. My approach is critically eclectic: it interweaves textual analysis, the history of ideas from Plato to Thomas Wright and theoretical or philosophical thought from modern, French continental and the Anglo-American traditions. Each, I argue, offers some illumination of Shakespeare's extraordinarily multifaceted and nuanced vision of love and desire.

I have shaped my argument into five chapters, each divided into a comparative study of plays and the sonnets and framed by a historical or modern philosophy of love. Each chapter thus focuses on a particular theory of eros — historical or contemporary - that illuminates especially well love's representation and deployment in a cognate cluster of Shakespeare plays or poems. But I offer no single theory, historical or modern, as Shakespeare's view of love, other than to maintain the centrality of language in the pursuit of desire and the consummations and disappointments of love in his plays and poems.

Chapter 1, "Shaping Fantasies", provides readings of three romantic comedies united by a special emphasis on the role of fantasy in shaping the object of desire and affective responses to it. I open with A Midsummer Night's Dream, which lays the foundations for a conception of eros that runs throughout Shakespeare's work: that love involves a form of projective vision that bestows value upon the object of desire rather than being a response to the inherent qualities of that object. Drawing on Lucretius's unsympathetic view in De Rerum Naturum that love is a form of projective madness, I argue that eros in this comedy is akin to a translation machine, impulsively and repeatedly transforming its objects into the shapes of its own desire. No intrinsic quality of the beloved is the cause of love,

even though lovers are convinced that they are responding to such qualities. This projective force of love, which sees not with the eyes but with the mind, is akin to Irving Singer's notion of love's "bestowal of value". But A Midsummer Night's Dream is also built upon a characteristic of eros central to Todorov's humanist view, repeated almost obsessively in Shakespeare, and echoed in Heloïse's letters to Abelard in the early Middle Ages and by Montaigne almost five hundred years later, that the love object is not fungible. Eros will brook no substitute. This is a central feature of its subversive or resistant social or political power: it is impervious to command, decision or the will. Following my discussion of the shaping fantasies of A Midsummer Night's Dream, I argue that The Two Gentlemen of Verona is Shakespeare's most Lacanian play in its treatment of the nature of the role of fantasy in love and desire. The troubling near-rape at the end is not an aberration but rather the logical culmination of the male imagination — especially characteristic of courtly love — that turns woman into a hollow space, an empty creature within the symbolic and imaginary forces of an idealizing poetic tradition. In a discussion of Twelfth Night I complicate the notion of fantasy and the Imaginary by examining what I call the "structural imagination" of Shakespeare's theatre: its capacity, through the practice of cross-dressing, to re-imagine the possibilities of friendship between men and women and to cross such philia with eros by focusing on theatrical embodiment. I argue that the double figure of Viola/Cesario allows Shakespeare to embody woman as both desiring lover and constant friend.

Chapter 2, "Love's Troubled Consummations", examines two plays in which the consummation of desire ends in tragedy or near-tragedy. Extending the discussion of Lucretius from Chapter i, I argue that the inherently unsatisfying nature of physical consummation between Othello and Desdemona may account for what Cavell considers to be Othello's corrosive skepticism, Desdemona's unbridgeable distance from him, and his incapacity to live love in ordinary terms. Marion's reflections, in The Erotic Phenomenon, on the dark aspects of self-love reflect almost exactly the much-noted erotic nature of Iago's relationship to Othello and its corrosive destructiveness. Troilus and Cressida brings actual rather than imagined betrayal, but in a more complex, over-determined context of love's

"overvaluation", especially in love's paradoxical relation to the oath or promise: it is both impossible and necessary to promise to love. Marion's insistence on the necessity of the oath in love — that one cannot declare love "provisionally" — helps me to examine the degree to which the love between Troilus and Cressida may be considered as "love indeed" despite its brevity and the compulsion of its situation. A major force in my analysis of love in Shakespeare, hitherto lurking in the wings, takes centre stage at this point: the necessity of linguistic interaction in the development of love through desire, as feelings are navigated through the performative force of "passionate utterance". Cavell's and Reddy's related accounts of the centrality of language in the performance and negotiation of love and desire assume an increasingly central role in the rest of my argument about the ways in which the metonymical movement of desire may be transformed into the metaphorical identity of love.

Chapter 3 focuses on the gift of love in a discussion of As You Like It and The Merchant of Venice. I trace the different strands and embodiments of eros in the "country copulatives" of the pastoral world of As You Like It, developing through the performatively linguistic, ludic interaction of Rosalind and Orlando the ways in which interactive speech acts can navigate feelings of love that are much more fragile and vulnerable in Troilus and Cressida. The gift of love is made possible precisely through the playfulness of fiction in a condition of otium (in contrast to the driven necessities of war) and, paradoxically, the temporary suspension of unmediated desire through the play of imagination. In The Merchant of Venice, I argue, the impossibility of love as a gift is brought into sharper focus. Within Venice's mercantile economy, which highlights the entrapment of the gift in an economy of debt and exchange, Antonio's gift of love to Bassanio is embodied in the heart that figures in his "merry bond" with Shylock. Antonio can give his heart to Bassanio without his friend recognizing it as a gift.

The deep connections between of love and service in the early modern period (the focus of Shakespeare, Love and Service), return in Chapter 4, where I offer a comparative analysis of the love relationships in Much Ado About Nothing and Romeo and Juliet. Each play is set within contexts of service as retainer-band rivalry, where women are both objects of patriarchal exchange and agents with the power to disrupt homosocial bonding. Despite their unconventionality, Much Ado's celebrated lovers, Beatrice and Benedick, are unable to release themselves from the discourse of service, so destructive in The Two Gentlemen of Verona but paradoxically the enabling condition of love in Twelfth Night. The lovers' incapacity to move love beyond the discourse of service in Much Ado contrasts with Romeo and Juliet, where service has no place in the relationship of the young lovers even as it infuses their social situation with the antagonism and hatred of retainer rivalry. In Romeo and Juliet, Todorov's humanist account of love trumps Lacanian desire, so prominent in The Two Gentlemen of Verona. Shakespeare's young lovers' focus on the "finality" of the person loved — the uniqueness of the you — escapes the endless frustrations of Lacanian desire by transforming its metonymic restlessness into the metaphorical achievement of a shared identity that is not bound by the respective ties of their names. Shakespeare's most celebrated tragedy of love demonstrates that however much Shakespeare's lovers may be caught up in the social construction of subjectivity, they embody the fact that love makes individuals of us all.

My analysis culminates in Chapter 5, which poses the question, "Is love an emotion?" I return briefly to Twelfth Night to examine Orsino as the professor of Galenic accounts of eros, on the one hand, and Viola's embodiment of love as a mode of affective action that involves emotion but cannot be reduced to it, on the other. Far from being a representation of Shakespeare's views (or indeed those of a whole era), the duke's dicta on the nature of love and his professions of his own desire are placed ironically by the loving figure of Viola. Armed with Twelfth Night's concept of love as a form of action rather than affective intensity, I argue that Antony and Cleopatra is Shakespeare's most sustained representation of the navigation of feeling through the interactive speech acts of passionate utterance and modes of behaviour. The range of conflicting and often violent emotions embodied by the Egyptian queen and her lover — in stark contrast with conventional notions of love as a warm feeling of affectionate companionship — show that just as love cannot be reduced to desire, it cannot be encompassed as any single emotion, affect,

passion, or, indeed, set of chemicals in the blood or neural activity in the brain. It is rather a disposition or attitude, a form of embodied action and behavior that encompasses a range of often-contradictory emotions or feelings over time in its singular engagement with the whole being of the beloved.

Although love in Shakespeare passes through the defiles of desire and the fantasies of courtly service in some plays, it is negotiated and navigated through a series of dialogical performative speech acts that are always imbedded in the quotidian world of unequal power and difference. Shakespeare concedes, three hundred years before Lacan and two millennia after Plato, that desire is always metonymic, constituted along a chain of partial contiguities that never stops or is entirely satisfied. But he also recognizes that through desire love fixes a metaphorical union between two people while maintaining their separate identities. It passes along the defiles of desire, to be sure, through the performative uses of language in "passionate utterance", but such repeated, dialogical utterance may grow to something "of great constancy", even if, as in Antony and Cleopatra, such constancy is embodied and acknowledged only in the mutuality of shared death.

A final word: Roland Barthes's A Discourse of Love is arguably the most wide-ranging and trenchant commentary on love and desire after Stendhal's On Love. Like Shakespeare, Barthes offers no embracing theory of love — his Discourse is rather a series of observations and notes, intensely personal, on the diverse and contradictory phenomena we include under the concept of love and its relation to desire. In its wide-ranging but also penetrating scope it resembles Shakespeare's extensive mapping of modes and facets of loving and desiring. I have therefore refrained from trying to draw any systematic parallels between Barthes and Shakespeare. I have instead chosen pertinent observations from Barthes as epigrams to the sections and sub-sections of Shakespeare, Love and Language in the belief that they will resonate with Shakespeare and enrich my analysis.

Contents
Acknowledgements
Introduction
1   Shaping Fantasies

Shakespeare, Love and Service by David Schalkwyk [Cambridge University Press, 9780521886390]

Peter Laslett's comment, in The World We Have Lost [Routledge; 4 edition, 9780415315272], that in the early modern period 'every relationship could be seen as a love-relationship' presents the governing idea of this book. In an analysis that includes Shakespeare's sonnets and a wide range of his plays from The Comedy of Errors to The Winter's Tale, David Schalkwyk looks at the ways in which the personal, affective relations of love are informed by the social, structural interactions of service. Showing that service is not a 'class' concept, but rather determined the fundamental conditions of identity across the whole society, the book explores the inter-penetration of structure and effect in relationships as varied as monarch and subject, aristocrat and personal servant, master and slave, husband and wife, and lover and beloved, in the light of differences of rank, gender and sexual identity.

Excerpt: This book examines the interaction of two concepts. Both of them are messy. One is ostensibly a universal aspect of the human condition, the other a historically specific form of social organisation. Both are central to Shakespeare's work. Love, as the ordinary person exposed to the culture of the West in the twenty-first century would understand

it, is the driving force in more than half his plays, his complete sonnet cycle, and, arguably, all of his nondramatic poems. Service is the informing condition of everything he wrote. If we put love and service together, every symbolic act that Shakespeare committed to paper or through performance may be said to be "about" this interaction. Shakespeare's mimetic art depends in the deepest sense of the word on the conjunctive play of love and service.

This fact involves two almost insurmountable difficulties for a scholarly monograph. First, it demands a principle of selection that cannot be determined by the concepts themselves, severally or jointly. Second, it presents a difficulty that is now the defining parameter of early modern scholarship: how do we relate a concept now so distant from Western, twentieth-century forms of social and personal life as to be barely recognisable to one that we instantly claim as our own?

CONCEPTS

Before I answer that question, let me tackle the messiness of the concepts. Scientific or scholarly argument depends upon the organisation of concepts in a rational format such that the concepts themselves do not move or slide out of place. A recent study of an issue not unrelated to my own sets out to find a "common denominator" to explain why certain attitudes to concepts and their referents in early modern Europe — beggary and theatrical players — were systematically conjoined.' The author assumes that beggars and players were related in a series of criminal statutes because the concepts pertaining to each are united by a common factor or core meaning, or that their apparent differences may be reduced to a set of attitudes that discerned the same essential ingredients in each. I do not wish to criticise such an approach so much as point out the difference of its method from my own. Each has its virtues. In my attempts to trace the patterns of love and service in both Shakespeare's work and its context, I have found two things. First, that although the two concepts are inextricably imbricated both in literary texts and in their conditions of production, neither of the concepts can be reduced to the other in any universal or consistent way. This is to say, love cannot be shown to be the same as service, nor can service be said to be "really" love, even

though, in almost every instance of their embodiment or representation, they can be shown to be coterminous in some way. Nor is there any set of sufficient or necessary conditions that can be shown to join the concepts through a common denominator. Both concepts are constituted by what Wittgenstein called "family resemblances": each is made up of different strands that overlap each other in different places and for varying lengths, their concurrence being constituted by multiple and varying conjunctions, like the fibres of a rope.' No unifying fibre runs along the whole length, joining them via a common core.

Wittgenstein's metaphor of the conceptual relations as the fibres that constitute a rope has synchronic and diachronic aspects. The continuity of the rope suggests a certain degree of historical connection: the strands continue from one point to another, in the ways that the words "love" or "service" are used in the twenty-first century, the sixteenth, the fourteenth, or in Greek in 300 B.C. The fact that neither the strands nor their precise points of overlap coincide at each of these diachronic points indicates that continuity is not so much disrupted as constituted by differences. The respective family resemblances that make up the relationships within and between the two concepts will not be the same at each point in time. This is rendered especially complex (or messy) by the fact that each diachronic point is likely to be marked by a variety of related uses of the same word. It is not merely a matter of figuring out what "love" meant in Plato's time and then relating that to what it meant when Petrarch was writing his Canzoniere, and then to what it meant when Shakespeare wrote sonnet 116, and, finally, what it means in a twenty-first-century sitcom; or what "service" meant to Aristotle, and then to Pope Gregory, and subsequently to Lord Hunsdon, or to George Bush, or what the relationship between these two terms (if any) might have been at each point. The words would have meant different things at each time because they would have used differently, although it would doubtlessly be possible to relate such uses to each other in some way. This is why I claim that these are two messy concepts, but they may be no messier than any other concept used in the hurly-burly of human life. Wittgenstein remarks that concepts have the indefiniteness of human life because it is in the messy interactions of human life that they receive and pursue their vivacity: in varieties of

practice, use, and abuse — not in any ideal system or structure. This book is an attempt to make some sense of that messiness in the work of one poet and dramatist who self-consciously represented himself as a lover and bowed to the necessity of being a servant.

SERVICE: THE WORLD WE HAVE LOST

Until the recent proliferation of books and articles on master-servant relations in Shakespeare's England, the topic was almost completely ignored. Even twenty years after the great theoretical and political turn in Shakespeare studies of the 1980s, the only sustained work on what is now beginning to be recognized as the predominant form of social organization and personal experience in early modern England — service — was largely confined to two critics. Mark Thornton Burnett led the way with Masters and Servants in English Renaissance Drama and Culture, a compendious, scholarly account of the master-servant relations chiefly in the non-Shakespearean canon and popular literature. Drawing directly on the prevailing currents of the new historicism and cultural materialism and an impressive array of primary archival material, Burnett's monograph appeared a full decade after the new, politically conscious forms of critical writing had been established. Michael Neill followed shortly with a rich and perceptive series of essays — more questioning of prevailing modes of historicism — in which he established the centrality of master-servant relations to Shakespeare's great tragedies, King Lear, Othello, and Hamlet and in imaginative literature and social experience more generally. Then, simultaneously in 2005, three critics who had earlier published discretely, even tentatively, on the topic released significant monographs on service in Shakespeare's plays: David Evett, with The Discourses of Service in Shakespeare's England; Judith Weil, with Service and Dependency in Shakespeare's Plays; and Linda Anderson with Shakespeare's Servants. In the same year, the Shakespeare International Yearbook, with Neill as its guest editor, devoted its annual special section to "Shakespeare and the bonds of service". In a single year, the master-servant relation in Shakespeare's dramatic works had come of age — it was finally recognized as a major issue in its own right.

Critics and theorists may have overlooked the lived textures of these relations either because they seemed too obvious to deserve commentary or because an overriding concern with relations of power had obscured the possibility of affective interactions between masters and servants. In Shakespeare especially, master-servant relationships assume intimate, multifaceted, affective, and playful forms that cannot be reduced to mere relations of power and subordination or resentful resistance. In his recent study, Evett takes issue with the exclusive materialist interest in power, exploitation, and group politics by focusing on Shakespeare's representation of the individual subject's phenomenological experience of service as an act of will. He argues that a received theoretical and ideological inclination to discount personal aspects of what appear to be merely economic or legal forms of exploitation has rendered the human textures of Shakespeare's dramatic and poetic relationships critically uninteresting or even politically questionable. The new recognition of the multilayered human quality of service has thus exposed a degree of theoretically induced myopia in prevailing assumptions and critical practice.

The need to find a place in our critical discourse for affect, ethics, and agency does not mean that we should abandon our search for the historical conditions of Shakespeare's texts, still less that we should ignore their embodiment of material conditions of existence and asymmetrical forms of power. Yet we do need to rethink the terms of our enquiry. The investigation of service in Shakespeare's England requires the recovery of what Laslett memorably calls "the world we have lost". There is an otherness to the social and conceptual relations of that world that is in danger of being obliterated by our own historically and culturally conditioned experiences and professional preoccupations, despite the fact that historicism has been the major driving force of our discipline for at least twenty years. These are the questions: how do we best engage in that recuperation? What sets the "sociological imagination" in literary studies apart from what Laslett calls "statistical awareness", or rather, how may the two be combined to overcome the sense of acute alienation from and uncertainty about the human world of the past that he records from his position as a social historian. Despite Laslett's scepticism about the

capacity of literary texts to represent that world, the affective and imaginative scope of such texts as embodiments of what Raymond Williams calls the "structures of feeling" of a period invites us to inhabit them as if they were part of our lives. They demand a combination of historical imagination and present engagement.

There is a paradoxical tendency to judge writers who are historically different from us from the perspectives of present political values. All too often, the question directed at such texts is whether they are genuinely subversive or not. This tendency is paradoxical because it insists in being ahistorical in the name of history. The text is expected to have leapt beyond its historical constraints to conform to our settled ideas of political pro¬gressiveness, in anticipation of unreasonable presentist demands. Service and its strange connection with love in early modern England — and even more peculiarly in Shakespeare — needs to be taken on its own terms to be fully and critically appreciated. The otherness of the interaction between service and love marks our distance from Shakespeare and his world. We stand at a double remove from both concepts. Service has either been alien¬ated by its reduction in a post-capitalist world to the faux choices of the hamburger emporium or the empty smile at the bank counter (as in the "service industry"), or it has come to be seen as the abstract embodiment of economic exploitation and abuse of power.

LOVE: THE WORD WE HAVE LOST
Love has not fared much better. Reduced to the mawkish sentimentality of popular journalism or appropriated by apolitical readings of Shakespeare in the middle of the twentieth century, love — the word and the concept — has all but disappeared from current critical discourse. When I asked a colleague why this should be so, he answered: "Because love is not a critical concept." He is right. The word is impossibly general and vague. It's messy.

We are more comfortable with concepts such as power and desire, which, now thoroughly theorized, have promised to strip love of its obfuscating murkiness and mawkishness. They have enabled us to shift our attention from a relatively naïve and commonsense interest in feeling and morality to the structural conditions which allow such feelings to be manipulated in relations of power and subjection.

"Desire" and "power" thus promise entry into the history and politics of sexual relations that "love" positively debars. Their critical keenness gives them the capacity to reveal the structural reality underlying talk of love. We need to take care when we perform reductions of one concept to another, however. Such transformations, whereby one argues that "love is not love'" — it is actually desire, a formation of power, an ideological obfuscation of real relations, and so on — run the risk of simplifying or distorting the concept as it does its work in complex interactions, such as those in Shakespeare's poetry and plays." Such reductions may be analytically illuminating, but when they attain a certain level of generality and supplant the original concept, they lose more than they gain. Using a method committed to an historical understanding of texts, we have replaced words that Shakespeare uses with special frequency with ones that he does not use particularly often, the theoretical inflections of which he would have found strange.

It is important to see why in recent years we have tended to shun "love" in favour of "desire" or "eros". Apart from the critical softness of the concept, love has been tainted by its association with the uncritical sentiments of popular culture and, more specifically, by its idealist employment by Shakespearean critics writing before the 1980s: as a way of rising above the trammelling conditions of social, political, and economic relations. Yet this is no reason for more historically or materialistically inclined critics to abandon or shun the word or to substitute for its range of meanings other concepts that are related to but not identical to it. I explore ways in which love is indeed connected to social concerns — to the inequalities of political or economic power — to show that it offers no transcendental escape from these concerns. I also want to show, however, that love is concerned not just with the absences and inequities of desire. It also seeks the pleasures of intimacy, engages in the delights of reciprocity, and finds both pleasure and pain in living for another.

In Shakespeare's time, this combination of reciprocity and subordination in love was part of a set of relationships that extended from the most menial master and servant to monarch and subject, including the most powerful figures within the peerage: service. One of the methodological

strengths of combining love and service as the double lenses of analysis lies in the way the concepts complement each other in the weight that they give to what, with due care, we might call the public and the private, or the personal and the structural. Whereas love pulls us in the direction of individualized affect, service reminds us of the historical and social networks in which affect is shaped and has to find expression. Each negotiation happens at the intersection of these concepts. This reminds us, in the wake of sonnet 129, that the negotiations between power and powerlessness, desire and lack, involve not just "spirit" in the physical sense of the word but also its ramifying moral, affective, and volitional aspects. The sonnet reminds us that "waste" is as much a bodily place as a lamentable diminution of humane resources, "heaven" and "hell" conditions in which the physical, moral, and spiritual cannot be separated from each other.

One of the apparent advantages of reducing love to desire lies in the considerable narrowing and thus simplification of these relations in the reduced concept. Following Theodore Leinwand's exemplary discussion of affect in a different context, we need to see love not as a single state but as a complex of interwoven orientations to the self and the world, embodied in forms of action rather than confined to the inscrutability of an interior affect. Leinwand calls attention to Wittgenstein's argument that "a complex emotion ... is less an irrecoverable, private inner, state than it is a response deeply implicated in the social world, 'a pattern which recurs, with different variations, in the weave of our life'" The "weave of our life" means for Wittgenstein the ways in which words are connected through the relational practices of social life. "Love" is not merely a value produced within an abstract system of differences but is constituted out of its changing, lived relations with concepts such as desire and friendship, as well as tenderness and anger, indignation and generosity, want and repletion, satisfaction and resentment, pleasure and pain, exultation and grief. To trace and recover the strands of this text is an enormous task, even in the manifold of a single speech, a couple of lines of dialogue, or a telling silence. The advantage of working with literary texts, especially drama, is that they have the capacity to mobilise the same weave of life and language that constitutes the lived world from which they draw their material.

It takes an effort of the imagination to recover and inhabit the relationship between love and service in Shakespeare's work. It requires the capacity to recover not only the original resonances of these concepts individually but also the ways in which peculiar modes of social organization and personal intimacy made them work together and sound off each other. Love and service informed Shakespeare's daily life in both his personal and professional relations; they characterized the realities and fantasies of the people around him; and they were passed on in differently inflected forms by literary, performative, and imaginary conditions that formed the traditions from which he drew both his imaginative and his social life. Being part of existence as it was lived and represented at a particular time and place, they share the indeterminacy — the play — of life itself. As the vehicles of meaning in a complexly transforming world they are inhabited, used, resisted, and changed in ways that are critical in their own terms rather than matching the fantasies or demands of historically specific political value.

My investigation of service in Shakespeare's plays is organised by conceptual affinities and differences as they are worked out in the dramatic contexts of interaction. It assumes that the practices that underlay the use of concepts such as service in both Shakespeare's society and his imaginative work maintain a connection with us via the historical continuity of language. It also examines the way in which, in both present and historical use, the concept of service is intertwined with other concepts with which it bears a family resemblance through common forms of social and linguistic practice. Exploring in the concept of service the simultaneous product of situated social practice and the longue durée of language as an inherited and changing system of relationships, I trace the ways in which its use in Shakespeare demonstrates its cognate affinities with other concepts with which it is intertwined in the same forms of social practice: love, of course, but also friendship and loyalty, resentment and hatred, humility and ambition.

PLAYING THE SERVANT
I remarked in my opening paragraph that both the universal presence of love and service as conjoined concepts in Shakespeare's work and the messiness of the concepts make a principle of selection both imperative and difficult. In their examination of

service, others have chosen dependency (Weil), personal volition (Evett), or material relations of exploitation (Burnett) to drive their respective arguments. I have turned to the concept or condi¬tion that informs Shakespeare's representation of love and service at every point: the fact that he was in multiple ways himself a servant and that the theatre through which he represented love and service depended upon the embodiment of players who were also servants.

The most significant servants on the early modern English stage were thus the players themselves. Defined as vagabonds unless they could display the livery of a master of noble birth by the 1572 Vagabond Act and earlier statutes, those who played the parts of servant or master on the stage found it difficult to discard the stigma of the "common player". In an age when to be called someone's "man" indicated servility and dependency, the theatre companies would have proclaimed their subordinate status in the public nature of their names if not their liveries: the Lord Admiral's Men, the Lord Chamberlain's Men and, after James's accession, the Queen's Men and the King's Men. Technically members of the noble or royal household, players who had previously been classified alongside sturdy beggars or vagabonds —"masterless men" — because of their doubly unsettling and unsettled habit of "strolling" and "personation", now found themselves split across two arenas of service. They could be expected to provide entertainment for their master or even "swell a scene or two" by displaying themselves in his livery as part of his retinue, but at the same time they were increasingly beholden to the demands of a commercial theatre which imaginatively abrogated the hierarchical system upon which traditional service depended. The Prologue's ingratiating solicitation of the audience of Henry Vthrough the levelling appellation "Pardon, gentles all" places the Lord Chamberlain's man at the service of all who have paid, whether it be a penny or more, sitting on the stage or standing in the yard. The general shift from feudal bonds of service to cash relations in the society as a whole informed the theatre too, in the tension between an older relation of service to a patron and the newer commercial form of service to a paying audience. Even as the older bonds were being questioned on the stage by characters such as Iago and Bosola, new relations of dependency were being

developed with a more unpredictable set of paying "masters". These relations in tension exemplify the bond between master and servant as it is performed in Shakespeare's plays. Combining the ordinary, inherently histrionic dimensions of the roles of everyday life with the self-reflexive staging of such roles by the servants of the theatre, they allowed a degree of play (in both the ludic and flexible senses) in social and personal relationships that is both externally constrained and open to appropriation and adaptation by individual agents or actors.

The actor representing service on Shakespeare's stage thus looks in two directions and at two kinds of bond: as a liveried being, he embodies his enabling relationship to the master by whose grace his personations are permitted; as a member of a commercial theatre dependent on a paying audience, he enacts service in a more modern, market sense. The performance of service on Shakespeare's stage is thus complicated and enriched by the fact that when the player personated either servant or master, he continued to embody himself as servant. For even when actors as professionals had managed to transform themselves from itinerant beggars to legitimate servants and, finally, in some cases, to masters and gentlemen in their own right, they continued to be excoriated as mere beggars and vagabonds who had illegitimately transformed themselves into creatures beyond their proper station. Meredith Skura writes that "disgust about the city player's wealth never did counteract the old image of the strolling player as less than a servant — as a beggar, always ready to humiliate himself in public to earn a penny and `grovelling on the stage'". In her study of the coincidence of beggar and player in the proscriptions of vagabondage on the Continent and in England, Paola Pugliatti argues that what brought them together was their common practice of "(mis)representation and unregulated self-transformation". The wearing of livery was an indubitable sign of one's fixed station within a regulated social order. Shapeless beggar and protean player alike could therefore be "fixed" in a position of service which, as we see in Chapter i, was hemmed about with a plethora of expectations and commands, the overriding of which was a theoretical demand of total obedience to the point at which autonomous subjectivity might be entirely repressed.

The players' social condition of being (doubly) servants in the play of the world infused the world of the play with a form of dynamism peculiar to its theatrical representational space that was also a nexus of various social interactions. The multivocal nature of the theatre did not merely allow it to express the voices of a range of otherwise silent or overlooked servants: the stage and its environs were themselves the sites of contested representations of service, in the split between representing player and represented character but also through their respective relations to different sections of the audience. Robert Weimann continues to offer the best account of such doubled representation on the early modern stage, by which the actor's "self-resembling show" is placed in productive tension or in direct conflict with the character he is personating. This double character of the player informs Shakespeare's representation of servants at every level; it infuses the embodiment of the servant's role on stage with a degree of self-reflexivity that disallows a direct, mimetic reading of the performative nature of service. It means that the player's real status as servant is always potentially available to inform or disrupt his imitation of the master-servant relationship or even the representation of relations between members of the aristocracy.

The analysis of the representation of servants or service can consequently never remain at the level of character — of what the character knows or appears to know. Harry Berger has used the question of what a character knows to offer compelling analyses of a nonpsychological "unconscious" in the form of the limits and capacities of language. Yet even the broader forms of discourse analysis that show through the strategies of verbal interaction how "addressor and addressee are shaped as subjects within [their] interactions", such as is pursued in Lynne Magnusson's pioneering work, can on its own not reveal the dynamics of theatrical representation in Shakespeare's performance of service. The broader playing context of such interactions needs to be added to the immediate, mimetic exchange to take into account that what is said by any character to another may be charged with the self-expressive voice of the player as real servant. Although it is not apparent from the text of the plays, every performance would thus have been an example of service both in action and reaction: of

the player-servant who, embodying actions conventionally expected of servants, subverts settled magisterial relationships with his histrionic impertinence or conservatively endorses or extends settled conditions of mastery.

MASTERY AND SERVICE IN SHAKESPEARE'S THEATRE

I have been writing as if the status of players as servants was homogenous, but recent work in theatre history shows that in addition to the honorific status that "allowed them to `masquerade as members of the gentlemanly profession of serving men'", the material organisation of labour within the theatre meant that it was itself shaped by relations of service and mastership that informed social life and commercial enterprise and industry in the London that it represented in fiction. Although theatre companies were themselves not recognised as guilds, many of their members were free members of official guilds, such as the Bricklayers', or Grocers', or Dyer's corporations. Boy actors were apprenticed to the theatre companies by being attached to a master who belonged to one of these guilds; sometimes they were bought for a few pounds and indentured for periods as long as nine years. Those who played the roles of women were thus in the position of some of the most tightly bonded and lowliest servants in England. Scott McMillin casts new light on the possible ways in which boy actors might have been trained by a senior actor in an analysis of "restricted" and "wide-ranging" roles for boy actors, and Natasha Korda reminds us of the roles that women played, at all levels except as players, in sustaining the material enterprise of the theatre. "The visible and vocal presence of such commercial activity [i.e., of women] in the theatres", she writes, "makes it difficult to conceive of the theatre as a `world apart' from the market. For the relationship between the market and the theatre was not simply one of two abstract ideas, but incorporated innumerable material acts of exchange between and among male players and women workers".

Korda's intervention is welcome, both because it focuses on the materiality of the theatre as a set of practices and social relationships beyond the text of the play and because it restores women to that sustaining context. However, her conception of both labour and market exchange gives insufficient weight to service as its fundamental personal and

economic condition. Women would have been engaged not merely in commercial relations of exchange or isolated artisanal labour; their place of service would have retained older, decisive aspects of the family as Laslett defines it. Even amongst the adults in the company, ties of service and the deference of hierarchy prevailed in the social and professional distinctions between the contracted actors; the more elevated, wealthy, and powerful sharers; and finally, the all-powerful entrepreneurs such as Philip Henslowe who, as owners of theatres, controlled those who worked as actors and playwrights through strictly determined bonds of service. The stage may have made great things familiar, but it was not itself an egalitarian place. Historically, playing companies had moved from being a rabble of itinerant "beggars" to a more elevated position within a noble retinue, but even as they moved from the profession of neo-feudal "serving-man" into the market economy, they inhabited the social distinctions and unequal practices of master-servant relations of the society that provided their living. William Ingram observes that "we know less than we would like to know about how stage players, the abstract and brief chronicles of the time, were themselves affected" by the economic changes introduced by the market economy — "we should try to understand ... how the stage player, as free entrepreneur, was caught up in the clash of these attitudes, finding himself both used and abused, and how these circumstances shaped his sense of himself and his calling".

Within the ideology of service represented especially by Protestant writers such as William Gouge and John Dod and Robert Cleaver, who are discussed in the next chapter, service is amenable to performance in the way that an actor can personate a person or position that is at odds both with his real station and his inner condition. Gouge and Cleaver make much of the distinction between mere service apparent to the eye and real devotion, the former covering both a subtle form of parasitic dependency in which one serves to enrich oneself, and the latter a more destructive, Judas-like hypocrisy in which the outward show of proper service hides not merely an unwilling but a positively treacherous heart. The actor is the peculiar exemplum of the "eye-service" excoriated by these moralists. At least part of his service comes from the body rather than the heart, and his

work as servant involves putting on the habits of the master. On his back, the livery of service is continually, if temporarily, replaced by the sumptuary effects of a variety of different stations. Shakespeare's plays especially engage in the overtly self-reflexive display of this double relationship, and even the nontheatrical mode of his sonnets is informed by an indelible sense of being "subdu'd / To what it workes in, like the Dyers hand". The actor thus represents a more ominous sense of playing, especially of concern to the moralists, predicated upon a gap between the epistemology and ontology of service, in which the "outward show" of service fails to match the "inner man". A source of considerable anxiety among masters, we are told, this always possible gap is the obverse of the idea that a good servant constitutes the master's "other self".

The unreliable servant is a player, able to assume the gestures of obedience and compliance while undermining the master from within. This analogy has another aspect, however. If Hamlet can find the player monstrous because he can produce the signs of passion without the affective motions that, according to contemporary psychology, would normally move the body to such transformation, the player may reflect in caricature the eradication of subjectivity that obedience requires in the most conservative tracts on service. The player is the incarnation of the servant as the furthest reaches of ideology would have him: all gesture, outward show, the inward man reduced to nothing by being in every sense his master's man. I develop this idea and its dire implications for the master in my discussion of Othello in Chapter 6.

In brief, then, the representation of service of Shakespeare's stage is complicated by its embodiment of the player on three levels: (1) the player himself as servant, symbolized by his livery as part of the retinue of a member of the nobility or, subsequently, of the royal household; (2) the player as master or servant (or both) within the material relations of the theatre itself; and (3) the player as embodiment either of the "eye-service" that threatens master-servant relations at their core or its repressing corollary, the person reduced to mere performance, robbed of any independent subjectivity.

LOVE AND SERVICE

Peter Laslett's comment, in The World We Have Lost, that in the early modern period "every relationship could be seen as a love-relationship" presents the governing idea of this book. His qualification signals the need for a change of habitual ways of seeing to enable us to recognize "circles of affection" as a structural part of the organization of society which, as he demonstrates, was based wholly on relations of service. I propose to demonstrate the interaction of love and service in Shakespeare's work in light of the complication of their representation in a theatre which embodied the conjunction of neo-feudal relations, where love played a central role, and those of an incipient market economy, in which its personally affective ties appear to have been weakened. I argue that the representation of love is informed as much by the self-conscious performativity of the player as it is in the mimesis of service. Any of Shakespeare's texts might have been grist to a mill fed with a mixture of service and love. The texts I have chosen are united by their embodiment of the performative dimensions of these two concepts as they are taken up by Shakespeare's theatre and its own ties of service and love. As the framing matrix for this book, the conceptual affinities of love, service, and performance reveal deep continuities across all of Shakespeare's texts. However, they also span a variable range of personal and social conditions that cannot be reduced to any single thematic thread or ideological vision. I have organised chapters to develop contrasts and similarities between pairs of plays and, when appropriate, between the plays and the sonnets, where the interplay of love and service finds its most intense expression.

Contents
Acknowledgments
Introduction
1. "Thou serv'st me, and I'll love thee": Love and Service in Shakespeare's World
Performance and Imagination: The Taming of the Shrew and A Midsummer Night's Dream
"His man, unbound": The Comedy of Errors and The Tempest
"More than a steward": The Sonnets, Twelfth Night, and Timon of Athens
"Office and devotion": Henry IV Parts 1 and 2, the Sonnets, and Antony and Cleopatra
"I am your own forever": King Lear and Othello
"Something more than man": The Winter's Tale
Bibliography
Index

The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy
by Michael Neill and David Schalkwyk [Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, 9780198820390]

The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy presents fifty-four essays by a range of scholars from all parts of the world. Together these essays offer readers a fresh and comprehensive understanding of Shakespeare tragedies as both works of literature and as performance texts written by a playwright who was himself an experienced actor. The opening section explores ways in which later generations of critics have shaped our idea of 'Shakespearean' tragedy, and addresses questions of genre by examining the playwright's inheritance from the classical and medieval past. The second section is devoted to current textual issues, while the third offers new critical readings of each of the tragedies. This is set beside a group of essays that deal with performance history, with screen productions, and with versions devised for the operatic stage, as well as with twentieth and twenty-first century re-workings of Shakespearean tragedy. The book's final section expands readers' awareness of Shakespeare's global reach, tracing histories of criticism and performance across Europe, the Americas, Australasia, the Middle East, Africa, India, and East Asia.

WHAT IS SHAKESPEAREAN TRAGEDY?

The question 'What is Shakespearean Tragedy?' can understandably prompt one to start listing distinctive features of various plays by Shakespeare—as if a successful enumeration of its characteristics would amount to an understanding of the genre. To a certain extent, such inventories are probably unavoidable when talking about an entire body of work, about more than a particular scene or play. Moreover, many descriptions of what A. C. Bradley famously called the `facts' of Shakespearean tragedy are undeniably true and useful. It is illuminating, for instance, to observe with

Bradley that Shakespeare's tragedies present 'a story of exceptional calamity leading to the death of a man in high estate', where the protagonist 'always contributes in some measure to the disaster in which he perishes', and where this active 'contribution' means not just things done "tween sleep and wake' but 'acts or omissions thoroughly expressive of the doer—characteristic deeds'. Bradley's conclusions, like those of other perceptive commentators on Shakespeare, are important and worth discussing, and I will return to them.

However, rather than approach Shakespearean tragedy as the sum-total of certain features or 'facts', or as a generic object of study, I propose that we see Shakespearean tragedy as a discrete form of art—as the birth of a distinctive art form, the same way we think of 'painting on canvas' or 'symphonic music' as art forms that arrived on the world stage at a particular place and time. Whereas a 'genre' purports to be a collection of objects that share common, taxonomically graspable features or techniques, there is no exhaustive list of features that 'add up' to Shakespearean tragedy—since, for a start, it is up to us to discern, decide, or debate, what will even count as features of this art form. Moreover, if Shakespearean tragedies all shared certain inherent, generic characteristics, then it would be difficult to distinguish between Macbeth and Hamlet and Othello—but of course we all know that each of these is an entirely different play; each brings to light new features or expressive possibilities for Shakespearean tragedy, helping us to better discern the art form as such, to better see its purview or expressive task. Shakespearean tragedies show what they are, as an art form, in light of one another. For the same reason, though it is unconventional to say so, we should probably regard Shakespearean tragedy not just as a finite, canonical collection of plays by William Shakespeare (Hamlet, Macbeth, Othello, King Lear, and so forth) but as a novel, modern, artistic practice—instanced with special power in a range of works by Shakespeare, but still practicable by others afterwards. Shakespeare may have been the first, or the most successful or the most indispensable, to work in the medium of Shakespearean tragedy, but he was not the last.

To see Shakespearean tragedy as an art form, then, is to see it as a practice that, having originated somewhere and sometime (with Shakespeare, in this instance), takes on a life of its own by generating new features, techniques, and characteristics—thereby resisting any final taxonomy, at least so long as the art form remains vital as a human practice. If to delimit a 'genre' is to circumscribe a domain of objects or experiences according to constitutive traits or attributes, then art forms or practices take it upon themselves to 'work through', or make sense of, their own socio-historical and material pre-conditions—as if expressing a newly discovered need for such sense-making.

All this gets me to the question that I really want to raise in this brief essay: What does the art form of Shakespearean tragedy 'work through', respond to, and make sense of?

I will propose at least one answer to this: Shakespearean tragedy works through the loss of any 'given'—nature, or God, or 'fate'—that might explain human societies, histories, actions, destinies, relationships, and values. At the same time, Shakespearean tragedy works through the loss of social bonds on which we depend for the meaning and worth of our lives together—showing those bonds to be, in spite of that dependence, fully dissolvable. In this way, Shakespearean tragedy helps us make sense of how we interact with one another—without the help of any Archimedean standpoint, with only the interactions themselves as sources of intelligibility and meaning. In Shakespearean tragedy, our actions (must) explain themselves.

By this point you will have realized that my ambitions for this essay are hopelessly lofty. Although these ambitions are probably not realizable in these few pages, I want to try to convince you that they are not misguided, and they at least set us in the right horizon when it comes to thinking about Shakespearean tragedy.

How, then, does Shakespearean tragedy 'work through' the loss of any givens that might explain our interactions—or that might explain what happens in a Shakespearean drama?

Consider that all artistic practices are ways that we try to evaluate and make sense of our lives, of our social-historical world and its demands, of the claims of nature upon us (whatever those are felt to be at a given place and time), and of what we do (or might do) and say with one another. Artistic

practices are not the only way we do this, of course; there are also mythology, religion, education, science, and philosophy. Still, by defining art in this somewhat grandiose way, I mean to suggest that artistic practices are—like religion or philosophy—a fundamental way in which we find out who we are, and who we might become, in light of the material and social conditions we inherit.4 To put it the way that many German philosophers would once have put it, art is a historical practice through which we come to understand ourselves both as 'objects'—as bodies in motion, as finite or mortal creatures, exposed to the claims of social norms, nature, and the laws of physics—and as `subjects', capable of leading or directing our lives, and of reflecting on them as such. At the same time, artistic practices can be distinguished from religion and philosophy, in that their sense-making potential is tied to the way they work with (or through) specific media—stone, paint, sound, or speech—and to the way in which artistic transformations of these media reflect socio-historical transformations in our overall self-understanding.

Some readers will already have recognized that I am borrowing my terms for discussion from G. W. F. Hegel's discussion in his Lectures on Fine Art. Hegel's terms are useful in this context, I think, for two basic reasons. First, Hegel provides a way of talking about 'dramatic poetry', and about Shakespearean tragedy in particular, in terms of our `need' for particular art forms at a given place and time. By `need', I mean our need to carry out certain artistic practices in order to understand who we are, and what we might do together, in light of certain historical-material conditions? In this sense, Hegel's approach has the virtue of helping us to understand Shakespearean tragedy within a broader history of concrete artistic practices and works, with its internal transformations and innovations—rather than in terms of ahistorical `genres', or categorical `features' of aesthetic experience. Second, Hegel is useful here because he himself struggled to articulate the distinctiveness of Shakespearean tragedy (which he thought of as emblematically `modern') with respect to ancient tragedy, and above all with respect to his own powerful interpretations of Greek tragedies like Antigone or Oedipus the King. Towards the end of

this chapter, while taking account of the usefulness of Hegel's interpretation of tragedy for understanding Shakespearean tragedy, I also want to show how Shakespearean tragedy productively challenges Hegel's own claims about tragedy, in ways that might help us to better see what Shakespearean tragedy is doing.

For Hegel, the development of artistic practices—that is, of historically shifting, context-specific needs for different 'art forms' (e.g. the need for pyramids in Egypt, for classical sculpture in Greece, or for painting in Christian Europe, or for film in the twentieth century), as well as internal developments within those arts (from `symbolic to classical to romantic', for example, or from epic to lyric to drama)—presents an ongoing and increasing de-naturalization or `spiritualization' of our self-understanding. In other words, the more that we see ourselves as—or teach ourselves that we are—free and self-determining subjects, the less we are dependent upon, or needful of, artistic expressions that work with `natural' media (stone, wood, clay) in order to understand ourselves, and our world. The twist in Hegel's story is that artistic practices are (or 'have been') a primary way we teach ourselves this lesson—because by transforming natural material in modes that we can regard as `free' from material or instrumental needs, we express our own liberation and, in this way, become free. (Art, claims Hegel in at famous passage, allows a free human being to `strip the external world of its inflexible foreignness and to enjoy in the shape of things only an external realization of himself'.) And once this lesson is absorbed—that is, once we see ourselves as increasingly liberated from the demands of nature, inasmuch as the terms of our self-understanding depend less upon, are less limited by, something 'out there' called `Nature' or 'God' or the 'One' or whatever—we find ourselves less needful of artworks by which we `taught ourselves' this lesson.

Furthermore, Hegel observes, this ongoing de-naturalization unfolds (or has unfolded) through an increased awareness within artistic practices of artistic practices as medium-specific. Classical Greek architecture, for instance, manifests a higher awareness of its own status as 'architecture'—of itself as a freestanding, artificial, material construction—than does earlier `symbolic' architecture.'° Similarly, as Robert Pippin has

convincingly argued, the deepening self-reflexivity of modernist and abstract painting—paintings about painting as such—might be understood to fall within the purview of the overall narrative that Hegel offers." And—to move closer to Shakespeare—thinking along these lines also led Hegel himself, at the end of his Lectures on Fine Art, to consider dramatic poetry as 'the highest stage of poetry and of art generally'—first, because 'in contrast to the other perceptible materials, stone, wood, color and notes, speech is alone the element worthy of the expression of spirit'. If artistic practices are medium-specific modes of self-understanding, goes the thinking here, then what medium or form could be more adequate to our reflexive self-understanding than that which, so to speak, we know to be `ours' from the get-go? Not just elements ripped from an indifferent domain of nature (sound, colour, hard materials like stone or marble)—but what Giambattista Vico described in terms of `poetic wisdom:' elements of culture and history, words and deeds, social principles and passionate aims, conflicts between individual characters.* And—second—because such elements are the `stuff' of dramatic poetry, to work in the dramatic arts entails a degree of self-awareness (as a historical being or `people') that is probably missing, say, from most symbolic sculpture. Dramatic poetry is, in other words, inherently more self-reflexive than sculpture, painting or architecture because its medium—namely, speech and action—is from the start `spiritual', human, relatively de-naturalized.

Hence—and this is the point I want to underscore for my discussion of Shakespearean tragedy—drama is already `formally' freer from nature, from external determination, than the other arts and consequently freer when it comes to choosing its content.

To avoid confusion, I do not want to deny that Shakespearean tragedy required for its formal viability, at a minimum, the concrete, material resources of early modern performance spaces—the physical capacities of the playhouse or the court, the lungs of the actors, the `imaginary forces' of an audience prepared to receive and appreciate what they are seeing and hearing, the sensorial experiences afforded by the spatial and temporal limits of such performances, certain economic-financial conditions and so on. But these

requirements, I would argue, amount only to something like a prehistory for the art form of Shakespearean tragedy: its initial material, socio-historical conditions of possibility. For, while these elements allowed Shakespearean tragedy to come into the world, they have not amounted to ongoing limitations on, or exhaustive explanations for, the vitality of this art form and its expressive possibilities. Once brought to life, Shakespearean tragedy has proven capable of flourishing even in the absence of these initial material conditions: on celluloid, in classrooms, in the reflections of solitary readers, in a variety of foreign settings, in performance spaces that bear little or no resemblance to those Shakespeare himself knew and in many other ways. In short, because the material circumstances of the early modern world set up the conditions required for the `formal' viability of Shakespearean tragedy—but without governing or determining the course the art form has taken, once made viable—these original material conditions cannot be taken to wholly explain what Shakespearean tragedy `works with' or `works through'.

Pushing this thought a bit further, I argue that the vitality of dramatic poetry as such is—when compared to, say, sculpture, painting, or music—less formally restricted by the sensuous conditions that make up its prehistory. That is, the expressive life and creative possibilities of dramatic poetry are less determined by the concrete, material conditions that, initially, allowed it to become viable. In this sense, dramatic poetry in general is `freer', more modernist—capable of a more capacious, or less inhibited, expressivity—than the other arts. Drama can contain music without being reducible to a musical performance, can contain dance without being confused with an occasion to move one's body about, can contain spectacles of all sorts without being thereby reducible to mere show. Moreover, drama can purposefully show this containment—and, hence, supersession—of other media as essential to its own specifically expressive power. Hence, dramatic poetry enjoys a relatively broad formal freedom with respect to other artistic media. At the same time, this formal freedom that dramatic poetry enjoys with respect to other art forms is commensurate with its freedom to determine its own content. The vitality of dramatic poetry is tied—as is the vitality of all art forms—to the vitality of its content, to the vitality of what it is

`about', what it can take up and present to us. And the more that dramatic poetry decides for itself what it will or will not present, the greater its formal capacities for expressiveness, the less inhibited it is by this or that concrete-material prehistory.

Think of it this way: once artworks no longer need (due to the restrictions of a particular social world's self-conception) to be about this or that content 'out there' (a material purpose, an animal quarry, a `god', a creation myth, a moral lesson, `epochal' historical events)—they are freed up to determine for themselves their own content. And this 'freeing up' is perhaps most clearly manifested when artworks also start to be about themselves. Self-reflexive artworks and practices undeniably assert the autonomy of human artistry, of human activity. For all these reasons, Hegel not only ranks dramatic poetry as the highest (the freest, most prevalently `spiritual') artistic practice; he also thought that among modern dramatists 'you will scarcely find any ... who can be compared with Shakespeare'. And so, although Hegel does not say so explicitly, we can nevertheless infer—from the perspective of my highly condensed account here—that Shakespeare's pre-eminence in Hegel's account of the history of human artistic development should have something to do with the heightened self-reflexivity of Shakespearean tragedy, and its corresponding achievement of a kind of `formal' freedom. And if this same kind of formal freedom is understood—as in Georg Lukàcs' Theory of the Novel—to belong especially to novelistic writing, then we might remember Friedrich Schlegel's remark about Shakespeare's founding of the novel: `there is so little contrast between drama and the novel that it is rather drama, treated thoroughly and historically, as for instance by Shakespeare, which is the true foundation of the novel.

This formal freedom is moreover evident in the fact that—as Johann Gottfried Herder observed, taking issue with neo-classical objections to Shakespeare—'classical' rules are of no help for understanding Shakespearean tragedy, an art form that has had to solve, with each new work (and with each new interpretation or performance) what it is and what it might become. Hence, for instance, the sense of ongoing revisions in Shakespeare—the feeling that Cymbeline and The Winter's Tale revisit Othello and King Lear, or that

each new comedy is a self-critical vision of its predecessor. As Herder knew, at issue is not only Shakespeare's alleged lack of 'poetics'—for instance, his unravelling of `plot' as a consequential separation of deed from recognition—but rather the way in which Shakespearean tragedy shows how the historical conditions of human activity (social, political, economic) have been wholly transformed, and must therefore be seen as transformable still. Which also means that our formal depictions of those activities must be seen as shifting and alterable. Think, for example, of the way that Hamlet's inability to furnish an answer to his own rhetorical question—What is Hecuba to him, or he to her, that he should weep for her?'—necessitates and prompts Hamlet's reflection not on his or our connection to the events of the Iliad, but on the more self-reflexive question of how the sensuous performance of a mimetic action can (still) meaningfully grip a performer and an audience.

Along these lines, we should also recall the (often overlooked fact) that while earlier dramatic forms, like Greek and Roman theatre or English morality plays, were 'art forms' that were inextricable elements of essential social rituals—civic duties, liturgical practices, state-sponsored public entertainment, and so forth—Shakespearean tragedy cannot rely on (and thereby frees itself from) the essentiality of any such ritual culture. In this sense, Shakespearean tragedy shares the predicament of a great number of `modernist' artistic practices: it must be self-justifying, self-legitimating since it does not accomplish any other universally recognized cultural (social, civic, religious) task. All of this is evidenced, as so many have noted, in the precarious and ambiguous status of the theatrical practices in Shakespeare's London (and in the years since then). Shakespearean tragedy is forged in the collapse of a dominant, unified culture that can fully sustain or justify its existence.

Shakespeare offers, so says Hegel, 'the finest examples of firm and consistent characters who come to ruin simply because of this decisive adherence to themselves. Similarly Hegel's contemporary, the English critic William Hazlitt (1778-1830)—who, with his friend Samuel Coleridge, had been influenced by the German enthusiasm for Shakespeare—emphasized the

importance of character-type in his Characters of Shakespear's Plays (1813). A. C. Bradley's 1904 lectures on Shakespeare offer the most sustained and influential elaboration: in Shakespeare's tragedies, Bradley writes, `action is essentially the expression of character'. I understand Bradley's insight to be as follows: Shakespearean tragedy displays human beings not as representational figures acting on behalf of any way of life or `value' greater than themselves—but as staging themselves as potentially valuable to us, as agents in the world leading their lives rather than just suffering whatever befalls them. Rather than ask us to grasp what Antony's fate means for Rome, or what Hamlet's fate means for Denmark, Shakespeare invites us to determine why (or if) Antony's and Hamlet's actions matter, without relying on any external values or norms to anchor that meaning. And if Othello's fate seems reflected in the fate of Venice, in the structure of the republic's 'way of life', then this is only because we also perceive Othello to be acting on his own when he lays his hands on Desdemona—only insofar as we witness Othello's subsequent failure to explain the murder in terms that bear essentially upon Venice.

All of which forces us to ask: can we matter to one another not only in virtue of what we might represent, but also with nothing to offer but ourselves, our self-expressive deeds? Can we recognize one another, as individual actors in the world, in our very ordinariness, as of extraordinary worth?

These issues coalesce with particular intensity in King Lear. No other Shakespearean tragedy opens with a more firmly established and secure social world; and yet none finishes with a more profound sense of worldly loss—where the viability of any intergenerational social life is in question. At the same time, by the play's end, our concern for the fate of the Kingdom has been replaced by our efforts to understand the state of the relationships in the play—and by the characters' attempts to understand one another.

At the opening, Lear strives to outlive the necessity of his natural death for the transmission of the Kingdom—in order to definitively separate the intergenerational life of his society from its mooring in a natural cycle of life and death, growth and decay. By denying the necessity of his own `natural' death for the transmission of the Kingdom, he would denaturalize society, and free intergenerational devolution from the claims of nature. (`I will forget my nature' (1.5.33))

But to what end?

By liberating society from nature's demands, Lear would freely bring about his own rebirth, his own re-entrance into the world. He would make clear that his presence among others is a self-determining social reality, not a natural fact. With sovereign autonomy, he would lay his natural life at the feet of others, for their approval or disapproval. For the sake of testing—really testing—his daughters' love, he strips himself of accommodation in order to see if he will be accommodated. For the truest test of love will lie not in rhetorical demonstrations, but in whether or not his daughters—without being legally, ethically or ritually required to do so—will take his aging body into their homes, tolerate its inevitable failings, and let Lear crawl unburdened toward death.

In thinking to set his rest on Cordelia's kind nursery, Lear not only desired the chance to be loved as himself—rather than just as King or father—but he also wanted his desire to be seen in his otherwise puzzling action: his self-divestment as a demand for loving recognition. For Lear, the possibility of loving Cordelia, and of being loved by her is something that neither nature nor the Kingdom, with all its prerogatives and wealth, can furnish. And yet it is a possibility that might be achieved by Lear's letting go of the Kingdom—and that can only be achieved if, again, the Kingdom's durée is no longer tethered to the natural cycle of birth and death. Freeing the Kingdom from nature's authority would give Lear the chance to see how Cordelia responds to him, to his desire for her recognition.

For this same reason, things go awry for Lear and Cordelia whenever they misguidedly turn to some external social or natural justification for their actions, for their demands of one another: Because I am your father, a sovereign power, because 'I gave you all' (2.4.252), or—on Cordelia's part—Because I am your child, the fruit of your loins, because I know I am your 'joy' (1.1.82). In thinking that they already have the `right'—whether by natural or positive law—to be loved or respected or acknowledged, they set themselves up for the awakening that `being loved' or `acting on one's

own are not `rights' to which one can be socially or naturally entitled. What they fail to see in such moments, therefore, is that they have nothing to offer one another, no `reason. except themselves— and that 'they themselves' count as meaningful offerings only by being received, loved and recognized as such.

That loving and being loved make our worldly rights and social entitlements worth having, not the reverse, is something that can perhaps only of finding oneself unloved, rebuked, put down—or, conversely, through the remorse that comes from having injured a loved one. This is why, as soon as he feels himself unloved by Cordelia, Lear throws the Kingdom away. The world he was about to bestow was meaningful to him only so long as he thought that, by bequeathing it on his own terms, he might bring about the possibility of finally leading his own life with Cordelia, on their terms.

It is as if the worth of our shared world, of our lives together, were determined by our success or failure in being—or in somehow becoming—worthwhile for one another.

Success in this enterprise demands that we somehow inhabit others' lives, and imagine for ourselves what they would do, what they want from us, and why they act the way they do. Shakespearean tragedy responds to this demand.

[Shakespeare and Millennial Fiction](#) edited by Andrew James Hartley [Cambridge University Press, 9781107171725]

How do writers of contemporary fiction incorporate Shakespeare - the man, his work and his cultural legacy? This collection brings together some of the leading voices in the scholarship of Shakespearean adaptation and appropriation to examine the ways in which writers have used literary culture's most prominent historical figure to their own ends since the year 2000. The essays consider the representation of the man himself, the rethinking of his stories - often in pointed defiance of the original - and explorations of the plays radically repositioned in time and space. In the process the collection reveals which versions of Shakespeare are most current in contemporary culture and education, even as they remake them in the terms of the present, often exploiting the new notions of genre, of publishing technologies, and of political identity which have evolved so drastically since the turn of the last century.

Excerpt: Introduction: "Reason Not the Need!" by Andrew James Hartley

William Shakespeare has been a recurring preoccupation of the modern novel for almost as long as it has existed in English. Indeed, the rise of the English novel paralleled the rise of Shakespeare's own cultural star, so it is unsurprising that the fiction of the eighteenth century was peppered with Shakespearean allusions, quotations and epigrams, as scholars have noted. Kate Rumbold, for instance, observes that by 1777 the quotation of Shakespeare had already become (in the words of an anonymous "Impartial Reader" writing to the Public Advertiser newspaper) a "public nuisance," a phenomenon presented, with varying degrees of opprobrium, in the novels of Samuel Richardson, Henry Fielding, Sarah Fielding and Laurence Sterne. Megan Taylor also scrutinizes the period's use of Shakespearean quotation as epigram and bon mot in the novels of Jane Austen, treating them as carefully laid indexes of character and moral judgment. But Shakespeare's presence in fiction quickly moved far beyond mere quotation, as writers engaged consciously and directly with his stories, characters, perceived beliefs and cultural standing in new works of literature. Marianne Novy, for instance, has indicated the ways in which women writers from the eighteenth century to the 1990s utilized, rethought and countered elements of Shakespeare's work in their own fiction; authors such as the Brontës, George Eliot, Virginia Woolf, Margaret Drabble and Iris Murdoch established an expressly gendered dialogue with Shakespeare by reworking the specifics of his plots and characters into their fiction in acts of creative appropriation. Building on Novy's work in Novel Shakespeares, Julie Sanders has explored the ways female novelists of the twentieth century enact an appropriation (and reappropriation) of Shakespeare's work in ways performing "the refusal and positive deconstruction of moral and literary absolutes" (i l) while reimagining the lives of the women in the plays (particularly those in The Tempest and King Lear). Focusing on intertextuality and on more freely adaptive retellings (such as Jane Smiley's contemporary King Lear novel, A Thousand Acres), Sanders underscores the manner in which subsequent artistic creation refashions the original and makes it speak to new concerns.

The pun in Sanders's title (Novel Shakespeares) suggests the newness inherent to the genre, implying that these fictional appropriations go far beyond mere annexation of the original, making something which is itself fresh and independent but which also refreshes that original and makes it plural. This sense of novelization is not one which seeks a single definitive rereading of the originary text, but one which recognizes a fecundity to that text as it exists in culture, one which generates numerous new incarnations of that text, some more obviously derived from it than others, but each with its own legitimating claims to existence. It is in these more radically rewritten, reimagined and otherwise rethought approaches to Shakespeare — his works, his words, his plots, characters, ideas and cultural legacy — that we approach the subject matter of this essay collection.

Sanders's title emphasizes newness and plurality, both of which are watchwords for this collection. The chapters which follow are not finally about Shakespeare (singular) but about newly minted Shakespeares. As the many radically divergent — even contradictory — stage productions of a Shakespeare play might justify their existence according to a logic which is both internal and responsive to the printed text, so the fiction which grows out of Shakespeare's work is free to rethink, refashion and reimagine in ways which might be at odds with all other such fictions and even with the originary text itself. As Peter Erickson has demonstrated, when we rewrite Shakespeare we rewrite ourselves, and the plural pronoun there is not merely a rhetorical device to make a singular seem more inclusive; it recognizes that the we who are rewritten are different, particularly, for Erickson, in matters of race and gender. The nature of our identity and experience demands that in responding to Shakespeare we perceive him — and must therefore remake him — differently. Erickson is primarily interested in canon formation and pedagogy; his principle holds true for the literal rewriting of Shakespeare in fiction and the way we study it, treating Shakespeare not as the hallowed Bard to be either worshipped or struck from his pedestal but as a "richly complex reference point within the larger project of cultural change" (176).

There are many ways in which a novel might be considered "Shakespearean." Indeed, in popular parlance the term seems to have evolved to mean merely "grand" or "epic," although frequently it has connotations of "tragic" or even simply "complex." To use the term so broadly in a collection such as this one would be unhelpful, as would including works of fiction just because they are sprinkled with quotations from or passing references to Shakespeare. All the chapters in this book deal with works which seem to consciously engage with Shakespeare the man and/or his work, using direct allusion or other forms of evocation to recall the early modern component as, at the very least, a deliberate subtextual resonance, and frequently something fuller and more purposeful which inheres in the fiction's raison d'être. Some of them depict Shakespeare the author, some of them update the settings and language of particular plays, rethink his plots or shift the balance of perspective from the main character of the original, to someone else (the story of Hamlet, say, told from the perspective of Ophelia). Many do several of these things at once so that the original moves into the background, glimpsed only occasionally and through a distorting glass, but still clearly present and formative in the art work which has evolved from it. In the process they argue for what Shakespeare is and to whom he belongs even as they remake him.

In addition to those sources already cited, many of them expressly concerned with gender and, to a lesser extent, race, recent scholarship has reflected upon different aspects of Shakespearean fiction. Some critics have focused on the surprisingly frequent representation of Shakespeare the man in fiction and film (see Franssen): one recently created website claims to have located more than 500 instances of Shakespeare himself appearing in later artistic works.' Other scholars have turned their attention to the specific fictive use of particular plays (see, for instance, Zabus on adaptations of The Tempest), and on more antagonistic creative responses to Shakespeare in multiple forms and genres (see Rozett). In spite of recent interest in both adaptation theory and presentism, however, there is comparatively little which focuses solely on the use of Shakespeare in novels and short fiction. The richest seam concerns literature for children and young adults (see Miller and Dakin), but, as with Megan Lynn Isaac's Heirs to Shakespeare, the critical emphasis is on pedagogy and the use of modern adaptations to

open up the Shakespearean originals to young people, rather than on those originals or the subsequent adaptations as ends in themselves.

This book extends the logic of previous scholarship but focuses on a particular subset of the field: those works of literary fiction which have appeared since the turn of the twenty-first century.' The assumption of the book is that the novels, short stories, and flash fiction of the twenty-first century are not merely worthy of study because they came too late to be included in those previous critical analyses, but because they are essentially different from what has come before in subtle but striking ways. As our sense of Shakespeare is constantly evolving, so is our sense of the form and content of contemporary fiction, and where the two intersect they provide particular insight into the precise specifics of a previously unknown cultural moment.

Shakespeare, it seems, is always with us, though the forms in which his works are studied, disseminated, and taught vary constantly, and the ways in which artists respond to his work in their own adaptations, reformulations and other forms of creative engagements are perhaps even more dependent on trends and forces in the larger zeitgeist. While it is inevitable that a new century makes the one before it feel foreign and distant, it is rare to find a cultural landscape as radically altered as is that of the present literary marketplace compared to what is was only two decades before.

The United Kingdom and the United States — which provide most of the raw material for this collection — have found the days of the new millennium dominated by concerns scarcely on the popular radar of the previous century's final decades: economic depression, the terrorism of 9/11 and subsequent attacks, immigration — particularly where the immigrants might be Muslim — a new slate of foreign wars and conflicts, the perceived threat of Russian expansion unseen since the end of the Cold War, shifting attitudes to race (a black president in the United States, the rise of protests connected to police violence against black men, and a more vocally intolerant counter-response from the right), changing notions of gender, sexual orientation and the increased visibility of the LGBTQ community manifested by same-sex marriage and legal discrimination issues, the rise of the so-called Tea Party, of the Alt-Right, of Brexit, and whatever alarming peculiarities come in the wake of Donald Trump's inauguration as president of the United States. Maybe all times are strange, but these seem stranger than most, and it is inevitable that these fresh pressures on the cultural mindset are manifesting thematically in the fiction which that culture generates.

But the fiction itself has also changed. The twenty-first century is the age of the internet, an entirely new way of gathering, hoarding and distributing information, and it has generated the phenomenon of social media which has in turn radically altered both the way we communicate and what we talk about. Advances in the technology of desktop publishing, coupled with the rise of the internet, have had seismic consequences on the industry. With the rise of Amazon, bricks-and-mortar bookstores have been closing daily, and giants in the industry like Borders and Waldenbooks have folded without a trace, while the sole remaining US behemoth, Barnes & Noble, has seen its market share shrink year after year so that the company's continued existence is a constant source of speculation. More and more people read their books on Kindles and other electronic devices, opening up avenues of self-publishing which were previously unimaginable. The total domination of the US market by the "Big Six" New York publishing houses (reduced to five since the merger of Penguin and Random House) has been rocked to its core with the resultant production of hundreds of thousands of self-published and small press titles annually, directly cutting into the share of traditionally vetted, edited and printed books utilizing the time-honored system of advances on royalties to pay authors. The ability for writers to generate and sell (or give away) books outside the traditional publishing structures of the last century has created a different model of content as well as altering approaches to form and marketing.

Notions of genre have shifted, for instance, as the tyranny of what went where in a physical bookstore has given way to online tagging, leading to new hybrid forms and sub-subgenres with dedicated niche fans in online communities. As self-publishing for profit has changed the literary marketplace, so the free online sharing of fiction generated by fans in response to existing work has expanded in unprecedented ways, with sites dedicated to the housing of millions of titles in which writers play in extant "sandboxes": the universes

and stories created by traditionally published authors. Much of this fan fiction (some of it centering on Shakespeare's works) belongs in a field which barely existed in its present incarnation twenty years ago: young adult fiction. That the novel as a genre is different today than it was, more plural in form and voice, less dominated by realism, and more generically flexible, as well as targeting more specific tastes, seems self-evident. What consequences this has had for the use, examination and manipulation of Shakespearean plots, characters, language, and ideas is less apparent, and those questions form the guiding thrust of this collection. The volume also addresses the associated question of how such fiction confronts and negotiates Shakespearean cultural and political authority in contemporary terms. This book is like the camera roll function on a smart phone: a series of snapshots which fix and reveal for analysis a scattering of moments from the intersection of Shakespeare and contemporary culture, and, like that camera roll, it could not have existed only a decade and a half ago. The stories analyzed here, their sense of what Shakespeare is and might be, have grown out of the past, but are absolutely of a present which, for better and worse, is unlike anything which has gone before.

In 2012, I cowrote with David Hewson a novel based on Shakespeare's Macbeth. It was published as an audiobook by Audible, then printed by Thomas and Mercer, and its success led to a similar retelling of Hamlet. The year 2012 also welcomed the first two Shakespeare adaptations in Kim Askew and Amy Helms's Twisted Lit series, two novels in Michelle Mankin's independently published Shakespearean rock-and-roll trilogy, and Rebecca Serle's fictional reimagining of Romeo and Juliet, When You Were Mine (2012). Nicole Galland's I, Iago (2012) treated readers to a detailed account of Iago's youth and perspective on the events of Othello, while Deron Hicks offered readers aged nine to eleven a mystery-adventure, The Secrets of Shakespeare's Grave (zotz), in which the heroine follows clues to find new handwritten plays by Shakespeare. Stacey Jay completed her eponymous paranormal duology with Romeo Redeemed (2012), and Lori Handeland published the second book about Shakespeare's adventures as a vampire necromancer and zombie killer in her Shakespeare Undead series. And let us be clear: while a lot of these titles are not on the radar of many Shakespeare scholars, this is a lucrative revenue stream for publishers. The rise of small press and self-publishing has, after all, put more pressure on traditional publishing houses than anything since the invention of the television, significantly undercutting profits and forcing various kinds of structural reorganizing and downsizing; major presses would not be generating so many Shakespeare-related tides unless a lot of readers were prepared to pay for them. Publishers and authors guard hard sales numbers as if they are the Holy Grail, but while true blockbusters are rare among Shakespeare-inspired novels, many titles sell tens of thousands of copies, and some sell significantly more. There is a significant Shakespearean presence in contemporary fiction and it has an audience.

The year 2012 was by no means an anomaly, and with a high-profile series of novelization of Shakespeare's works just beginning from Hogarth (the subject of Douglas Lanier's closing chapter for this collection), the trend seems to be escalating, the forms and genres of these books going beyond the much-examined mysteries and literary fiction. Shakespeare's influence in the less explored types of story — dystopic fiction, urban (and other) fantasy, paranormal or young adult romance, and so forth — signals how differently post-2000 authors appropriate and examine Shakespearean cultural capital into their creative worlds. The chapters in this collection take up Lanier's challenge in "Recent Shakespeare Adaptation and the Mutations of Cultural Capital," in which he argues:

> individual works ... always participate in collective acts of Shakespearean adaptation, acts that considered as an aggregate are reshaping our conceptions of Shakespeare in response to the energies, paths of flow, tensions, pressures, and blockages within the larger social and cultural matrix, itself constantly in flux. (113)

As Graham Holderness's essay in Shakespeare's Creative Legacies (eds. Holbrook and Edmondson) implies, the compelling intersection of Shakespeare and contemporary fiction is partly rooted in a changing sense of what the novel is. As our culture sheds the assumption that the novel is an essentially realist form driven by the kinds of concerns which inspired Trollope and Austen, it has — in all its generically flexible and fantastic manifestations —

made itself more suited to the kinds of stories and narrative modes which formed the heart of Shakespeare's plays. Indeed, these are the kinds of stories set down in the Italian novellas of the Renaissance on which Shakespeare drew to build his plays. Holderness presses the matter further, arguing that the assumption that the novel is an essentially modern form growing out of the eighteenth century, is false, and that the mode of narrative fiction central to the form is infinitely more amorphous and malleable than the essentially realist, character-driven fiction which has been seen as defining the genre. He goes on to point out that if Boccaccio, Bandello and Cinthio produced, in fact, novels, then Shakespeare (who took his plots from such sources) incorporated the logic of the novel into his original writings:

> Shakespeare not only stands as a landmark in a much longer history of fiction, but was himself a significant practitioner in the very modes of artistic representation—psychological and social realism, formal experiment and innovation, stylistic heterogeneity, heteroglossia—that the novel later came to dominate as its own aesthetic territory. We might even say, paradoxically and with theoretical hindsight, that Shakespeare was himself a novelist. (95)

Moreover, as various forms of technological and cultural empowerment have facilitated a reconnection with a new and more excitingly nonrealist notion of the novel, Shakespeare's plays have been reconnected with this fundamentally populist form. The creative adaptations which form the primary texts of this collection are Shakespearean in multiple senses, not merely because, like those eighteenth-century novels which featured characters quoting the occasional line from Hamlet or Henry V, they allude to Shakespeare, but because they wrestle with him, they claim him, they tease at him, they revise and reconstruct him, fight with him and celebrate him, often approaching his plays not with laser scalpels but with hatchets, saws and wrecking balls, all of which are things Shakespeare did to his own source materials, things which are and always have been at the core of the writer's constructive enterprise.

As this collection shows, the numerous Shakespearean novels published since 2000 targeting significantly different readerships do not merely reconceive and preserve authority: they express, appropriate, reenvision, and challenge Shakespeare's contribution as a cultural touchstone for Western literary production. They wrestle with what Shakespeare is, what his work finally means for our present moment, and the extent to which the plays might be usefully invoked as mirrors of contemporary reality and possibility. In their wildly dissimilar ways, these novels meditate on Shakespeare's cultural impact in textual creation, on the problems his works pose for current ideologies, and on the imaginative and linguistic spaces he opens up for both authors and readers. This book strives to enact a similar range of approaches, advancing a broader and more complex sense of what Shakespearean fiction is and what it ultimately suggests. As such, it is more than the sum of its parts. The interest value of the various pieces of fiction considered here is both as individual acts of creative criticism and as part of a cultural phenomenon. As such, their specifics manifest larger ideas about how Shakespeare is perceived in the wider (nonacademic) world, how his works are invoked in a larger navigation of status and how they present a window on a particular moment in the evolving history of Shakespeare in education and popular literary culture. As a result, the chapters tend to focus on the plays which have the largest cultural footprint, particularly those (such as Hamlet, Romeo and Juliet, and Macbeth) which have also been central educational texts and which lend themselves to gendered analysis and other forms of political critique. These distinctly millennial novels engage with Shakespeare's inspirational original while simultaneously advancing their own ideas and aesthetics as is fitting for what are also new art objects. In other words, the chapters track the way these works of fiction function as both primary and secondary texts, the slippage between the two facilitated by Shakespeare as both actual literary work and pervasive cultural phenomenon.

In 1999 Christy Desmet and Robert Sawyer published a field-defining collection Shakespeare and Appropriation, whose afterword, by Gary Taylor, makes a compelling case for the decline of Shakespeare in contemporary culture except in adaptive forms:

> I come to measure Shakespeare, not to bury him. Here is my end-of-millennium

prophecy: as long as the English language survives, people will be reading or listening to Shakespeare. They will be doing to Shakespeare what Shakespeare did to Plautus in The Comedy of Errors, expropriating what they can use, often without acknowledgement. But the number of people attending to Shakespeare, the intensity of their attention, the frequency and complexity of their appropriations, will inevitably diminish. (205)

Eighteen years on, it seems fitting not just to test the accuracy of this prophecy but to scrutinize its implications, given the changes in technology, in notions of readership and creativity that Taylor did not — could not — anticipate in an essay focused largely on traditional notions of publishing, scholarship, and of performance. If Shakespeare's own works are indeed receding in the general cultural consciousness, as Taylor compellingly suggests, how is that decline manifested in the numerous fictional creations that grow — like Errors — out of them, and to what extent are they conscious and interrogative of that decline?

The volume, like the field itself, is diffuse and loosely organized, though the chapters are grouped in semantic clusters emphasizing the way they speak to each other. The first essays are concerned with the deliberate interrogation of what Shakespeare's work meant and how our sense of that value has altered. It begins with Graham Holderness on the evolution of the twenty-first-century novel and a series of Hamlet case studies; it is followed by chapters by Rebecca Bushnell (on the subset of detective fiction which focuses on lost Shakespeare texts), Ken Jacobson (on the evocation of Shakespeare's voice), and Regina Buccola (on the School of Night and other quasi-historicist incursions into the so-called authorship question). Each of these chapters — and the books that inspire them — interrogate what it is in Shakespeare that we continue to value as the raw material of subsequent artistic creation, and how we might imagine the Shakespeare "narrative" outside the limits of conventional criticism.

The second grouping explores Shakespearean fiction targeted at young adults (Millennials) in terms of one of the categories most visibly rethought and problematized over the last seventeen years in the English-speaking world. The authors of these chapters advance valuable new

arguments about, for example, "writer response" in current YA Shakespearean fiction which takes its starting point from Macbeth (Flaherty), and expand the discourse of gendered subjectivity to the largely ignored discourse of maleness in Shakespearean "boy books" (Sasser). Emily Detmer-Goebel considers new imaginings of Ophelia's moral agency, and Erica Hateley examines the way some young adult novels invoke Shakespeare as a way of reinscribing heteronormativity, though the results are often less traditional or orderly than might be expected.

The essays in the third cluster deal with the way that Shakespearean novels target a diverse spread of expressly contemporary issues. Lisa Hopkins, for instance, explores the part played by Macbeth adaptations in rethinking Scottish (and English) nationalism. Growing directly out of the era of human genome mapping, Sujata Iyengar considers the rise of the cancer narrative in fictions which use Shakespeare to explore the idea of the body (early modern and contemporary). Christy Desmet then studies those science fiction rethinkings of The Tempest which explore the nature of humanity by imagining the technological "life forms" which may outlast it. All draw on lines of inquiry with particular twenty-first-century resonance, exploring the way contemporary concerns extend and rewrite the Shakespearean originals.

The final group of essays deals with the future — real or imaginary — and Shakespeare's place within it. Michelle Yost's work on Shakespeare in the new and massive subfield of fan fiction and Laurie Osborne's chapter analyzing Shakespeare's immortality (sometimes in paranormally literal terms) engage the ways in which subgenres and emergent fictional modes enable authors (and readers) to test the balance between embracing Shakespeare as a cultural touchstone and rejecting his unnervingly persistent influence well beyond his cultural moment. Douglas Lanier extends the ideas implicit in these essays, using the phenomenon of the Shakespeare novels now emerging from Hogarth to reflect on larger issues of adaptation, appropriation and cultural afterlife particularly in terms of the "literary" qualities the press seems to find lacking in the more genre-driven fiction which much of this collection has been discussing.

All told, the book engages the immediate phenomenon of Shakespearean novels flourishing

across millennial textual forms in order to engage with the larger issues posed by adapting or appropriating Shakespeare in fiction. How has the balance between investment in the original and the impulse to revise changed with the rise of new narrative forms and methods, technological innovations and the other evolutions of the twenty-first century? What different functions do Shakespearean elements serve for authors and for specific reading groups? How do the envisioned audiences — young adults, romance readers, highbrow readers of literary fiction — interact with novelists' choices and artistic self-images? Are these novels treating Shakespeare and his work as a measure of value, as a means of projecting artistic aspiration, as mere out-of-copyright raw material for the pillaging, as a repository for cultural value or some complex combination of these? What does the recent proliferation of Shakespearean novels contribute to our understanding of "the evernomadic paths of Shakespearean cultural capital", and how do such books work as creative criticism offering genuine insight into Shakespeare's work?

Our collective goal is to understand Shakespeare's participation in the literary moment that has evolved over nearly two decades. The chapters herein aim to reveal the way today's novelists enact a (fittingly postmodern) hybridity of scholarship and artistic production within the special matrix which is Shakespeare, recreating rather than reproducing, using difference to both alter and reflect on the original in ways not entirely dissimilar from methods used by Shakespeare himself. Taken together, I hope, the collection expands our sense of the particular energies central to Shakespearean adaptation and appropriation, moving toward a greater understanding of how contemporary fiction manifests and interrogates the place of Shakespeare in twenty-first-century culture.

Contents

[The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance](#) by James C. Bulman [Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, 9780199687169]

Shakespearean performance criticism has undergone a sea change in recent years, and strong tides of discovery are continuing to shift the contours of the discipline. The essays in this volume, written by scholars from around the world, reveal how these critical cross-currents are influencing the ways we now view Shakespeare in performance.

The volume is organised in four Parts. Part I interrogates how Shakespeare continues to achieve contemporaneity for Western audiences by exploring modes of performance, acting styles, and aesthetic choices regarded as experimental. Part II tackles the burgeoning field of reception: how and why audiences respond to performances as they do, or actors to the conditions in which they perform; how immersive productions turn spectators

into actors; how memory and cognition shape and reshape the performances we think we saw. Part III addresses the ways in which revolutions in technology have altered our views of Shakespeare, both through the mediums of film and sound recording, and through digitalizing processes that have generated a profound reconsideration of what performance is and how it is accessed. The final Part grapples with intercultural Shakespeare, considering not only matters of cultural hegemony and appropriation in a 'global' importation of non-Western productions to Europe and North America, but also how Shakespeare has been made 'local' in performances staged or filmed in African, Asian, and Latin American countries. Together, these ground-breaking essays attest to the richness and diversity of Shakespearean performance criticism as it is practiced today, and they point the way to critical continents not yet explored.

Cross-Currents in Performance Criticism⁻

Essays in this volume represent the current attempts of critics to come to terms with that slippery entity called performance, wherein a Shakespearean text is made flesh by theatrical representation. Audiences just a few decades ago would not have recognized much of what now passes for Shakespeare in performance. New theatrical styles and techniques, often the result of intercultural exchange, have gained an authority once accorded only to the text; new modes of adaptation and unaccustomed performance venues have fundamentally altered the relationship between actors and audience; and the concept of `live' performance has been profoundly altered by the digital revolution. Shakespearean performance criticism likewise has undergone a sea change in recent years, and strong tides of discovery are continuing to shift the contours of the shore from which we spectators gaze out at that turbulent sea, into whose waves only the most foolhardy or daring among us venture to swim.

To introduce a volume that attempts to negotiate so many critical cross-currents, I begin with a brief myth of origins. I say `myth' because no account of how the study of Shakespearean performance arose and gained legitimacy in academe can explain the multiple approaches now encompassed by the term performance criticism; nor can any linear narrative do justice to the ways in which different disciplines have influenced how

performance is now understood. The staging of Shakespeare's plays began to be taken seriously as a subject of scholarly inquiry a century ago, when William Poel's experiments with Elizabethan staging sought 'to legitimate the interplay between scholarship and theatre through academic trappings' (Werner i; see also Shaughnessy), and when Poel's disciple Harley Granville Barker in 1927 published the first of his Prefaces to Shakespeare, an exploration of how modern theatre could use Elizabethan practices—an open platform stage, swift and fluid action and delivery, direct address to the audience, and symbolic rather than representational scenery—to unlock potentials of the plays that had long been buried under the weight of ornately pictorial Victorian stagings. A half-century later, performance criticism made new strides when scholars such as John Russell Brown and John Styan declared a revolution in the way Shakespeare's plays should be discussed: not through the lens of traditional theatre history, but as playscripts whose meanings are best realized in performance. In so doing, they treated performance as a mode of interpretation no less legitimate than the formalist principles then employed by literary critics to analyse the plays. Yet despite their recognition of theatre practitioners' freedom to experiment with different styles and aesthetics, critics such as Brown and Styan nevertheless measured the value of a performance by its representation of and fidelity to a presumably fixed and authoritative Shakespearean text.

A more radical approach to performance emerged in the 1980s and 1990s when scholars, influenced by French theorists whose work had been infiltrating literary studies, insisted that performance be regarded as less dependent on—or even independent of—the Shakespearean text, which was viewed as just one variable among many. With the notion of Shakespeare-as-author called into question, the meaning of a Shakespeare production was thought to be not immanent in the text, but radically contingent on a host of factors, from the material conditions of performance, to the medium for which the play was adapted, to the impact of political, economic, and social forces on audience reception. In other words, any performance involved a complex negotiation between cultural determinants and a decentred, but still present, `Shakespeare'.

Such criticism, however, paid little attention to those aspects of performance that made the theatrical event (or what came to be called the performance text) fundamentally different from the dramatic text. Concurrently, a movement that adopted the inclusive name `performance studies' emerged to provide a more theatrically invested discourse with which to discuss stagings of Shakespeare. Pioneering scholars such as Victor Turner and Richard Schechner, whose work was rooted in cultural anthropology, offered a definition of performance that encompassed a wide variety of social practices in which spectators were also players. In Schechner's words, the term performance embraced a '"broad spectrum" or "continuum" of human actions ranging from ritual, play, sports, popular entertainments, the performing arts (theatre, dance, music), and everyday life performances to the enactment of social, professional, gender, race, and class roles' (Schechner, Performance 2). Just as cultural studies borrows from an everexpanding array of ideological perspectives, so too performance studies absorbs the methodologies and discourses of many disciplines—gender studies, queer studies, race studies, postcolonialism, psychoanalysis, ethology, semiotics, and a number of politically inflected 'isms'—to provide what Barbara Hodgdon, in her brilliant account of the evolution of performance criticism, has called 'a more encompassing, expansive, expressive, and relational arena for rethinking performance'.

Performance studies has in effect marginalized dramatic theatre—that is, textbased performance—to advance a broader, more playful understanding of performance as cultural practice; and this has had a marked influence on recent writings about Shakespeare in performance. In a series of influential studies, W. B. Worthen has explored how accepting the importance of fidelity to the assumed `authority' of Shakespeare could constrain the work done by both performance practitioners (actors, directors, designers) and performance critics. Acknowledging the crucial role that theatre professionals have played in advancing the discourses of Shakespeare performance studies, Bridget Escolme, herself a director, has urged the value of studying `Shakespeare work that is inflected by contemporary practice because it is created by theatre practitioners whose work is not primarily

Shakespearean. It is in this work that we can find a Shakespeare that speaks freshly to our contemporary concerns' (175). Speaking to contemporary concerns is a catchphrase for cultural relevance: it raises the issue of how Shakespeare acquires meaning in performance. Can a play `mean' if text is subordinate to staging? Can it mean, or even be considered Shakespeare, if there is little or no text at all? Wherein lies the `Shakespeareness' of a performance in which the text is marginalized? These phenomenological questions leave behind the simple binary of page-versus-stage and probe instead the problem of what constitutes `Shakespeare' in the theatre today.

Adaptations of the plays focus the problem most clearly, because they often freely alter the Shakespearean text or, at an extreme, use so little of it that language becomes moot, the Shakespearean plot serving merely as pretext for experimental performance practices. To illustrate, one could point to a recent and internationally celebrated adaptation of Macbeth called Sleep No More by the British company Punchdrunk, in which the text of Macbeth inspires something radically different, an 'immersive' performance piece unmoored from its Shakespearean source, meticulously choreographed, designed like an art installation with the aesthetic of a Hitchcock film, and devoid of dialogue. What cultural work do such performances do if they are no longer anchored to the texts that make them `Shakespeare'?

Non-anglophone performances of Shakespeare sharpen the point of this question, because translation is always a form of cultural adaptation: it liberates directors from the original text and thus from the (oppressive) authority of `Shakespeare. Unsurprisingly, non-anglophone productions have introduced unconventional styles of performance to challenge the traditional aesthetics of Shakespearean production. New theories of acting and staging that emerged on the Continent during the second half of the twentieth century (by such seminal figures as Antonin Artaud, Bertolt Brecht, Jerzy Grotowski, Eugenio Barba, and Jacques Lecoq) continue to influence English and North American productions; and more recently, the practices of Asian theatre, seen especially in work by celebrated directors such as Yukio Ninagawa

and Lin Zhaohua whose productions have toured internationally, have made a considerable impact on European and North American stagings. This exposure to the theatre aesthetics of other cultures has had a liberating influence on anglophone productions of Shakespeare.

But a debate has arisen over the direction in which cultural influence moves: whether there is a reciprocity of influence between, for example, Asian and European theatre aesthetics—a genuine intercultural exchange that leads to a greater mutual understanding of difference—or whether a growing homogeneity of styles is symptomatic of Western imperialism, with European and American theatre companies appropriating elements of Asian theatre as a form of postcolonial theft and exporting their own productions as a form of cultural hegemony, making `global' a term connoting geopolitical power. Questions about the value of global Shakespeare inform discussions not only of the translation and adaptation of the plays into non-anglophone cultures, but also of recent international festivals, such as those sponsored by the Royal Shakespeare Company and Shakespeare's Globe, in which `foreign' companies have been invited to perform in the UK and elsewhere in Europe. What function do such festivals serve, and what do they reveal about performance as an intercultural exchange? How do they come to terms with the residual issues of a colonial past, with issues of power and privilege, of cultural identity? How does the legacy of racism inform responses by Western audiences to the casting of actors of colour in roles traditionally played by whites (see Thompson)?

Recent groundbreaking work on `foreign' Shakespeare has challenged the work of earlier performance critics who regarded intercultural aesthetics as important only in so far as they inform anglophone productions. The study of non-anglophone productions as significant in their own right began to gain legitimacy more than twenty years ago with Dennis Kennedy's anthology Foreign Shakespeare in which, symptomatic of that period, all but a couple of essays focused on European stagings. Since the millennium, the most remarkable proliferation of new work on performance has turned its gaze on Asia: Performing Shakespeare in Japan (Ryuta et al.); Shashibiya: Staging Shakespeare in China (Li); World-Wide

Shakespeares (Massai); Chinese Shakespeares (Huang); and Shakespeare in Asia (Kennedy and Yong). Crucially, these works abandon the totalizing discourse that has often marred discussions of postcolonial theatre. Instead, they draw fascinating distinctions among the ways Shakespeare is performed and understood in India, Japan, China, and other nations whose power, both economic and cultural, is becoming more insistently felt in the West.

In the past few years, performance critics have also turned their gaze inward, upon their own work, to investigate how they themselves `recreate' performance in their writings, and to what end. This investigation of their own critical practice becomes especially vital when one considers that often criticism is written in response not to performances witnessed (the experience of recording one's immediate responses to an event that is never the same, and never fully recoverable), but to performances recalled through aids such as reviews, interviews, essays and memoirs by actors and directors, and material remains (costumes, sketches, rehearsal photos, prompt scripts, programmes, stage properties)—the materiality of performance enshrined in archives. Scholars such as Peggy Phelan, Marvin Carlson, and Joseph Roach, influenced by Turner's and Schechner's work on anthropology and theatre, have discussed performance as loss and performance criticism as an act of cultural mnemonics, an attempt to recapture what is lost through an imaginary reconstruction aided by material leftovers.

If such criticism cannot capture the experience of live theatre with the urgency of eyewitness response, then how does it differ from traditional stage history? Peter Holland's anthology Shakespeare, Memory, and Performance and Barbara Hodgdon's richly documented Shakespeare, Performance and the Archive address this question by mapping the roles that theatrical remains play in histories of performance culture. They interrogate the archival work that performance critics do, reconceiving that work as itself a type of performance which not only draws on ghostly traces of stage productions, but also manifests the persistence of performance processes which are by nature transient, spectral, and, some would argue, unrecoverable. Critics themselves, in other words, become authors of the performances

they write about. Yet sceptics counter that such navel-gazing is symptomatic of a recognition that their post-structuralist agenda has played itself out: that in an attempt to decentre `Shakespeare', performance critics have substituted themselves as the central players. Is performance as unrecoverable as is sometimes claimed? Is there no value in the persistence of theatre historiography? What forces may determine reception and recovery? Such questions have recently been deepened by scholars who have used theories of cognition to explain how memory shaped the way in which actors learned their roles for the Elizabethan stage, how it affected reception among audiences then, and how it continues to shape acting and affect reception today. The groundbreaking work of scholars such as Bruce McConachie, Evelyn Tribble, and Lina Perkins Wilder on the neurological functioning of actors and audiences has demonstrated how cognitive science, judiciously used, can help to reveal the complexities of performance and reception.

Related to this critical enterprise, though distinct from it, is another form of historical recuperation: the attempt by theatre practitioners to recreate, as a form of cultural memory, the original conditions of early modern theatres—that is, to recover the Elizabethan moment by reconstructing its playing spaces and replicating its performance practices. This is not a new phenomenon. As mentioned earlier, it began early in the twentieth century with productions by William Poel and Harley Granville Barker, and its value has been kept alive by theatre historians such as Alan Dessen who have combed Elizabethan texts for clues about staging. But in the past twenty years this movement has gained new adherents, resulting not only in the construction of such replicas as Shakespeare's Globe in London and the Blackfriars Theatre in Virginia (cultural sites which have elicited considerable debate in works such as Kennedy, `Cultural Tourism'; Worthen, Force of Performance; and Bennett, `Shakespeare on Vacation'), but in the adoption of `original practices'—what are assumed to be historically verifiable staging practices that help to foster an understanding of how Shakespeare's plays may have been performed on the Elizabethan stage. Such practices function in ways analogous to the methods by which performance critics employ material remains to

spur the memory of an imaginatively recreated performance.

One type of `original practice' has proved particularly provocative and popular: the cross-gender casting of Shakespeare's plays. Where, in Elizabethan theatre, women's roles were played for the most part by boy actors roughly 12 to 22 in age, in contemporary productions gender crossing is more porous: men play women, women play men (there are now all-female companies), and both play roles re-gendered for the opposite sex. Such casting has been fuelled by a revolution in the way spectators view gender in Western societies. Influenced by the same cultural forces that gave rise to feminism and queer theory, and particularly by Judith Butler's articulation of gender as performative rather than innate, performances of Shakespeare have increasingly foregrounded the artifice of gender construction and challenged audiences to question conventional beliefs about the nature of sexual desire, gender identity, and gendered behaviour.

 memory and cognition shape and reshape the performances we think we saw. The third group addresses the ways in which technology has altered our views of Shakespeare, both through the mediums of film and sound recording, and through digitalizing processes which have caused a profound reconsideration of what performance is and how it is accessed. The final group of essays grapples with the hydra-headed issue of intercultural Shakespeare, considering not only matters of cultural hegemony and appropriation in a `global' importation of non-Western productions to Europe and North America or of English and American productions to strands afar remote, but also how Shakespeare has been made `local' in performances staged or filmed in African, Asian, and Latin American countries.

To a degree, the distinctions among these four categories are specious, because the essays cross borders frequently and speak to one another in many tongues and on different levels. A number of them might just as appropriately have been assigned to a different category. Together, however, they attest to the richness and diversity of Shakespearean performance criticism as it is practised today, and they point the way to critical continents not yet explored.

Memory and cognition shape and reshape the performances we think we saw. The third group addresses the ways in which technology has altered our views of Shakespeare, both through the mediums of film and sound recording, and through digitalizing processes which have caused a profound reconsideration of what performance is and how it is accessed. The final group of essays grapples with the hydra-headed issue of intercultural Shakespeare, considering not only matters of cultural hegemony and appropriation in a `global' importation of non-Western productions to Europe and North America or of English and American productions to strands afar remote, but also how Shakespeare has been made `local' in performances staged or filmed in African, Asian, and Latin American countries.

To a degree, the distinctions among these four categories are specious, because the essays cross borders frequently and speak to one another in many tongues and on different levels. A number of them might just as appropriately have been assigned to a different category. Together, however, they attest to the richness and diversity of Shakespearean performance criticism as it is practised today, and they point the way to critical continents not yet explored.

CONTENTS

The Copyright Guide: how you can protect and profiting from copyrights, Fourth edition by Lee Wilson [Allworth Press, 9781621536208]

This book is written for everyone who creates, acquires, or exploits copyrights. Copyright owners constitute an increasingly large segment of our society. This group includes painters; illustrators; photographers; filmmakers; sculptors; graphic designers; industrial designers; jewelry designers; textile designers; journalists; novelists; poets; screenwriters; playwrights; technical writers; copywriters; students; scholars; editors; researchers; songwriters; composers; record producers; recording artists; choreographers; computer software designers; and television and movie directors and producers; as well as newspaper, book, and magazine publishers; educational institutions; radio and television broadcasters; toy manufacturers; music publishers; record companies; movie studios; museums and art collectors; software companies; advertising agencies; poster companies; photo archives and stock photo houses; theatrical producers; dance companies; pop music tour promoters; and manufacturers of all sorts of consumer products. In fact, in today's world, unless you engage solely in a profession or occupation that produces and sells only tangible products, you must know something about the most common sort of intangible property—copyrights.

For anyone whose livelihood or avocation is centered in one of the US information industries, copyrights and the exploitation of copyrights are basic facts of life. No one in America escapes the effect of copyrights. There may be no spot in your house or school or office where you are not surrounded by copyrights. The copy and illustrations on the box your breakfast cereal comes in are copyrighted. Every book in your school locker, except for those published before 1923, is copyrighted. The professional journals or trade publications at your office are copyrighted, as is every single memorandum, letter, report, proposal, or other document you produce on the job. Copyrights float through the air as radio and television broadcasts and arrive in the mail as magazines and newspapers and show up in shopping bags as DVDs and bestselling novels and video games.

Of course, this proliferation of expression may be a mixed blessing. We are inundated by our own communications. Toddlers who can't read know the names of cartoon characters. College students who can't remember the date of the Norman Conquest can recite dialogue from reruns of TV sitcoms. Their grandmothers can recall the convolutions of plot from television soap operas for the last twenty-five years. And aging baby boomers can sing every word of popular songs from their youth, almost on key.

This is mostly because the United States is unique in its cultural affection for and legal protection of free expression. We forget that we are the only nation that has the First Amendment. Many other nations impose more restrictions on what their citizens can say and write and publish than we do. In fact, throughout history, during numerous periods and in various places, you could be imprisoned or killed simply for saying or writing the wrong thing; unfortunately, this is still the case in some places.

But not in America. The rebels and mavericks who sailed across the oceans in wooden boats to settle in what became the United States knew the value of free thought and free speech. They came here seeking both. They gave us the right to think what we want and say what we think.

But even before the enactment of the First Amendment, the men who wrote our Constitution acted to ensure the production of the works of art and intellect necessary to create and promote culture and learning in our infant nation. In article I, section 8, clause 8 of the main body of the original, unamended Constitution, they gave Congress the power "to Promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries." Congress carried out this mandate by passing the first US copyright statute in 1790 and also by enacting a succession of patent statutes. You may think from reading the language of the Constitution that only authors of books are protected by copyright law. That is not the case.

Historically, American copyright law has interpreted broadly the "writings" granted constitutional protection. At the time of the enactment of the first copyright statute, only "maps, charts, and books" were protected. During the two centuries since, US copyright statutes (there have been several) and court decisions have extended copyright protection to new subjects of copyright as previously nonexistent classes of works emerged, needing protection. This system of enumerating the classes of "writings" protected by copyright worked well enough until it became obvious that technology would create new methods of expression faster than the courts and lawmakers could amend the then-current copyright statute to include emerging technologies within the scope of copyright protection. The present US copyright statute abandons the effort to enumerate every class of work protected by copyright and simply states that "copyright protection subsists ... in original works of authorship fixed in any tangible medium of expression, now known or later developed [emphasis added], from which they can be perceived, reproduced, or otherwise communicated, either directly or with the aid of a machine or device." This language allows copyright to expand automatically to extend protection to new forms of expression, including many that the men who passed the first copyright statute could never have imagined. This is fortunate, because the revolution in communications that characterized the last half of the twentieth century shows no signs of abating. Indeed, it may have reached warp speed.

By recognizing property rights in creative works and awarding ownership of those rights to the creators of the works, our copyright statute encourages expression in every art form and medium. It balances the interests of creators against those of the public. Creators reap the profits from their works for the duration of copyright protection by limiting access to creative works to those who pay for the privilege of using them. The public immediately enjoys controlled access to the works artists, writers, and composers create, and, eventually, those works become public property, available for use by anyone. This is precisely what the founding fathers had in mind; James Madison cited copyright as an instance in which the "public good fully coincides with the claims of individuals."

So, the United States gives its citizens the right to say or otherwise express almost anything at all and rewards that expression, whether meritorious or mundane, by bestowing upon it a copyright. But what, exactly, is a copyright? A copyright is a set of rights that the federal copyright statute grants to the creators of literary, musical, dramatic, choreographic, pictorial, graphic, sculptural, and audiovisual works and sound recordings. Copyright law rewards creators by granting them the exclusive right to exploit and control their creations. With a few narrow exceptions, only the person who created the copyrighted work or someone to whom he or she has sold the copyright in the work or given permission to use the work is legally permitted to reproduce the work, to prepare alternate or "derivative" versions of the work, to

distribute and sell copies of the work, and to perform or display the work publicly. Any unauthorized exercise of any of these rights is called "copyright infringement" and is actionable in federal court.

But this is only the beginning of the story. The rest follows in what I hope is a logical progression. I have practiced intellectual property law for nearly half my life, but I still find the concept of copyright and the elaborate structures that our world community has erected around it fascinating. The law says that a copyright is a set of exclusive rights that belongs, in most instances, to the person who creates the copyrighted work. That's true, but what copyrights really are is magic. There's something wonderful in the fact that in a mass culture like ours, where individual voices are obscured by the noise of the rat race, you can create, all alone and out of thin air and your own brain, something that pays the rent.

I hope you find copyrights as interesting as I do. They are one of the last means by which an individual person, unaffiliated with any large organization or institution, can change people's minds, lift their spirits, and feed their souls. Where's your pencil?

Contents
Introduction

A Companion to Literary Theory edited by David H. Richter [Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, Wiley-Blackwell, 9781118958674]

Introduces readers to the modes of literary and cultural study of the previous half century

A Companion to Literary Theory is a collection of 36 original essays, all by noted scholars in their field, designed to introduce the modes and ideas of contemporary literary and cultural theory. Arranged by topic rather than chronology, in order to highlight the relationships between earlier and most recent theoretical developments, the book groups its chapters into seven convenient sections: I. Literary Form: Narrative and Poetry; II. The Task of Reading; III. Literary Locations and Cultural Studies; IV. The Politics of Literature; V. Identities; VI. Bodies and Their Minds; and VII. Scientific Inflections.

Allotting proper space to all areas of theory most relevant today, this comprehensive volume features three dozen masterfully written chapters covering such subjects as: Anglo-American New Criticism; Chicago Formalism; Russian Formalism; Derrida and Deconstruction; Empathy/Affect Studies; Foucault and Poststructuralism; Marx and Marxist Literary Theory; Postcolonial Studies; Ethnic Studies; Gender Theory; Freudian Psychoanalytic Criticism; Cognitive Literary Theory; Evolutionary Literary Theory; Cybernetics and Posthumanism; and much more.

- Features 36 essays by noted scholars in the field
- Fills a growing need for companion books that can guide readers through the thicket of ideas, systems, and terminologies
- Presents important contemporary literary theory while examining those of the past

The Wiley-Blackwell A Companion to Literary Theory will be welcomed by college and university students seeking an accessible and authoritative guide to the complex and often intimidating modes of literary and cultural study of the previous half century.

Excerpt: During the 1960s, when I was doing my degrees in English, literary theory was primarily studied as a set of historical topics, in which scholars investigated Aristotle's notion of mimesis, or Corneille's doctrine of the Three Unities, or the source of Edmund Burke's theory of the sublime. My own interest in theory as an ongoing as well as a historic concern, in quirky thinkers like Northrop Frye, Kenneth Burke, and Walter Benjamin, seemed a harmless oddity to my colleagues in the English Department at Queens College, who warned that I was wasting my time with theory because there was absolutely no future in it. By then, of course, the revolution was well underway that would end by making literary theory the roiling pivot point of my profession. The turbulence and clash of ideas had begun decades before on the Continent, but those of us in the provinces, who read French and German haltingly and Russian not at all, did not experience the explosion of theory until the mid-1970s, when Russian formalism, structuralism and semiotics, deconstruction, Lacanian psychoanalysis, Althusserian Marxism, and reception theory rode successive waves into our awareness. A profession that had been preoccupied with close and closer readings of canonical texts was now lit up with a rush of ideas, a dozen disparate systems with enormous philosophical reach and scope. Many of those systems were capable also of informing and channeling the social imperatives of women and minorities seeking an ideological manifestation of their desire for greater freedom and power. And even teachers like me, without any social imperative of our own, could become enthralled by the magnificent conversation going on about them.

This was a revolution that was reshaping our sense of intellectual history, forcing us to broaden our horizons and to read deeply, as well as broadly. Anglo-American feminist thought, like that of Elaine Showalter and Sandra Gilbert, needed to be read against the backdrop of Germaine de Staël, Virginia Woolf, and Simone de Beauvoir, forebears who served either as antagonists or as sources of inspiration. To read Derrida we needed to understand not only the structuralist theories against which he had reacted but philosophers like Plato, Kant, Hegel, Nietzsche, and Heidegger, most of whom were comparative strangers to traditional literary criticism courses. Meanwhile, the New Criticism, which for the most part had generated our close readings, could be seen as a single strand within an international formalism that also included disparate theorists like Victor Shklovsky and R. S. Crane.

Intellectual revolutions too have their Thermidors, and by 1990, it became clear that the Era of Grand Theory was coming to an end. Theory had moved into a period of consolidation, when it was being explored not for its own sake but to make possible a new sort of encounter with a text or a group of related texts. Critical practices that had emerged since the beginning of the revolution, such as gender studies (including queer studies), New Historicism, and, broadest of all, cultural studies, began to dominate the graduate and undergraduate approaches to literature. People began to engage in loose talk about the arrival of a post-theoretical age, and Terry Eagleton, who had cashed in on the critical revolution with Literary Theory: An Introduction (1983), published in 2003 a book titled After Theory.

But theory had by no means disappeared. The new critical discourses that had generated our encounter with texts were so thoroughly imbued with theory that they were essentially incomprehensible in isolation from their theoretical origins. When you read new historical essays on Shakespeare by Stephen Greenblatt, you couldn't really understand them properly without unpacking them, and you couldn't do that without reading the theorists who had influenced him — philosophers of history like Hayden White and Michel Foucault and cultural anthropologists like Clifford Geertz. And to do things properly you would also have to read the theorists who had most influenced them: not only Clifford Geertz on the semiotics of culture, but also Max Weber and Emile Durkheim and Claude Lévi-Strauss; not only Hayden White on the tropics of history, but also Jacques Derrida and Ludwig Wittgenstein; not only Michel Foucault on the genealogies of power/knowledge, but also Martin Heidegger and the later Nietzsche. The underlying sources for gender studies and cultural studies would be even more diverse.

The process of consolidating and simplifying the elaborate and difficult Grand Theories into workable critical practices involved creating a pidgin, in much the same way people manage to communicate across language barriers by forming a lingua franca for trade and barter during interludes between hostilities. This critical pidgin was encouraged by the way universities in the United States avoided the creation of "schools" of like-minded thinkers such as those we find on the Continent, and instead filled slots so as to create the greatest possible diversity. The tendency to isolate individuals using a particular theoretical vocabulary from one another had the consequence that, while they could speak their chosen critical language in all its purity at conferences, they had to use some other sort of discourse to talk with their colleagues. The result was a carnival of jostling jargons, in which purity of rhetoric took second place to the pragmatics of discourse. The discourse of one important postcolonial theorist, Gayatri Spivak, was an intricately modulated combination of deconstruction, Marxism, and feminism. And a gender theorist like Judith Butler could derive her notions about sex and society from Foucault, though her rhetorical moves were taken from Derrida and J. L. Austin, and never mind that these thinkers might otherwise be strange bedfellows.

From the 1990s up to the present day, these syncretic trends have continued to proliferate, as the study of literature has become just one area in a widening arena of textual criticism. The critical tools that we had developed for studying literature are being applied to other artistic and cultural productions like film and television, radio plays and comic books, painting and photography—and of course the influence flowed in both directions. The analytic approaches to narrative originally used to study novels and short stories have found application to memoirs and biographies, to medical case histories, and to the narratives judges create in writing legal decisions. Historical movements in architecture and home furnishing, such as the eighteenth-century vogue in England and France for chinoiserie—once considered capricious episodes of fashion—are now seen as part of a larger cultural plenum shared with other fine and useful arts, determined by changes in trading relationships and other economic and social trends. Cultural studies has, in effect, turned back upon itself in ecocriticism, which attempts to understand how Culture comes to define its opposite, Nature, and to explore the changing relationship between civilization and the wild. Science studies, legal studies, business studies: newly developed fields like these attempt to interrogate the paradigms of knowledge taught to and accepted by professionals in these areas. Most eclectic of all, perhaps, is the field of globalization studies, which uses every resource of the social sciences and humanities to analyze how the international forces of military power, finance, and consumer culture have shaped a planet that had begun to become one world when the European voyages of discovery began over five hundred years ago. The result of all this syncretism has been that, although institutional structures within academe have remained more or less stable—most professors still teach and most students still earn degrees within departments—my own research projects and those of most of my doctoral students, colleagues, and friends have become ever more interdisciplinary.

One other clear change since the turn of the century has been the slow disappearance of the traditional literary canon as a basis for the humanities curriculum. The persistent attacks on the traditional canon as a gentlemen's club for dead white European males provoked culture wars that began in the 1980s, but those wars are long over now. Ongoing research on the history of literary evaluation revealed that, apart from the general agreement on the significance of Homer and the Bible, the canon of the vernacular literatures had always been in flux. Since it was a presentist illusion that there actually existed a permanent list of what Matthew Arnold had called "the best that has been known and thought in the world," the job of the humanities would need to be redefined. What we have actually been doing, if we are honest about it, is teaching the most interesting ways of reading the texts that have the greatest cultural importance today. The emphasis on the contemporary and the postmodern did not mean eliminating all the old favorites—indeed, Shakespeare and Jane Austen probably have as many followers as they ever had, and many more than they ever had in their lifetimes. But the culture of the university had approved so many new writers, and so many new areas of study, that it became clear that undergraduate and graduate students could never study any more than a small selection of them, and it would be irrational to feel

guilty about what got left out. Nevertheless, living as they do in a postmodern culture that insistently recycles the cultural icons of the past, our students needed to read Defoe's Robinson Crusoe not merely for its historical importance in the development of the European novel, but in order to understand John Coetzee's Foe and Michel Tournier's Vendredi, or Charlotte Brontë's Jane Eyre in order to understand Jean Rhys's Wide Sargasso Sea.

With contemporary cultural value taking clear precedence over other versions of merit, the curriculum began to give greater attention to ethnic literatures, particularly by writers of African American, Asian, and Latino/Hispanic descent, and the contemporary anglophone literature of Africa, South Asia, and the Caribbean, where so much of the most innovative poetry and fiction since the 1980s has been written. With this shift, postcolonial theory has become a major growth area. Originating in the politics of nation-states carved out of former European empires, postcolonial theory can equally be applied to American literature: because even without an overseas empire the United States was formed by a process of internal colonization, absorbing into itself territories inhabited by indigenous populations. The theory behind contemporary and historical ethnic studies has tended to borrow and adapt from postcolonial theory and its sources. And, of course, such a program cannot be limited to the contemporary: it can be read back onto the past. It can be applied even to biblical texts, where Israelites appear first as enslaved immigrants, then as the conquering hegemons of Canaan, and finally as a conquered people at risk of cultural absorption by the Eastern empires of Babylon and Persia.

Having spoken of this period as an era of consolidation in the realm of theory, I would have to add, by way of correction, that this has also been an age of proliferation, during which theory has divided in order to multiply. Queer studies, which emerged in the early 1990s, with the work of Michel Foucault and Eve Sedgwick, was stimulated by the rise of feminist women's studies but also in partial opposition to it, and is now most usually referred to as LGBTQ (lesbian-gay-bisexual-transgender-queer). This acronym recognizes the fact that sexual attraction and behavior have many

variations, historically and at present, and that the chromosomes one is born with do not determine one's preferred partner, one's sexual behavior, or even one's gender. Further — not to leave out the men, gender studies has come to include historical and sociological studies of maleness and masculinity.

Similar proliferation has developed in the areas of race and ethnicity. Africana studies, which can trace its history back to the late nineteenth century, and which was given a strong theoretical basis by Houston Baker and Henry Louis Gates, among many others, in the 1980s, has given rise both to a general area of theory, usually called Critical Race Theory, and to numberless specific "studies" programs to analyze the literature and culture of other racial and ethnic groups that have been marginalized in various Western societies. And just as feminism ultimately spawned "masculinity studies," the ethnic and racial minority studies programs have generated "Whiteness Studies" in a spirit of critique, analyzing the defensive response of a powerful majority group that already sees itself under the threat of becoming, at some future moment, a marginalized minority.

These forms of identity politics have extended to the disabled, a set of disparate groups we will all join some day, if we are lucky, and to the traumatized, whose experience is less of having a specific identity than of losing its stability. Identity, in sum, has become a multidimensional vector space—of race, gender identity, sexuality, nationality, ethnicity, religion, and dis/ability—through which our imaginary individualities are determined. "Intersectionality" was the term Kimberlé Crenshaw coined in 1989 when she argued that certain combinations of vectors were more deeply discriminated against than others—as when Barbara Smith complained in "Toward a Black Feminist Criticism" (1977) that as a woman, a lesbian, and an African American, she had been triply marginalized. Ultimately, a coherent intersectionality theory will need to be developed to make better sense of our multiply determined selves.

If "intersectionality" is one overarching concept that helps us explain some recent developments in literary studies, another is "consilience." Coined originally by the Victorian polymath William Whewell, "consilience" was used by biologist E. O.

Wilson as the title of his 1998 book, which speculated that the sciences and the humanities would ultimately converge in their explanations of social and cultural phenomena. Whether or not such a genuine convergence fully occurs, several quite recent developments in literary theory are clearly inflected by the hard sciences of biology, physics, and chemistry and not merely by sociology, politics, and economics.

Evolutionary literary criticism explores the hypothesis that creating and consuming literature is not simply a delightful pastime but part of the reason the old world apes that became Homo sapiens succeeded and became dominant as a species. Telling stories was how our hominid ancestors communicated and bonded with each other as cooperative hunting and gathering societies living in competitive tribal groups, where the forces of both natural selection and sexual selection favored those who did it well and wiped out those who failed. It is clear that we are still telling stories, and evolutionary literary theorists would argue that narratives continue to have the same function: they enhance our abilities to survive by guiding the decisions we make about the work we do for a living, the friends we trust, and the prospective mates we select. Pride and Prejudice is a masterpiece of wit and irony, but it is also a primer on the danger to nubile women of succumbing to the attractions of superficially attractive young men, and of the rewards of seeking a mate whose solid worth may be obscured by defensive shyness—and this may be one reason so many subsequent romance novels have taken the bare bones of its plot as their model.

If evolutionary theory appears oriented toward the distant past, posthumanist literary theory is oriented toward the future, as our minds merge with the machine-minds that we have learned to create to assist our own. The cyborg—abbreviation for cybernetic organism—appeared originally in science fiction, but the merger has already occurred; we are already posthuman. We find ourselves helplessly dependent on the tablets and smartphones we carry about with us, but at the same time we are practically omniscient, with vast libraries of information available with a few clicks on a keyboard or taps on a touch screen. Household robots remain a theme of science fiction, but many of us own an invisible digital servant:

asked nicely, the disembodied Siri or Alexa will dial our friends, call us a taxi, turn on the lights or other appliances in our home, give us our precise global position in relation to the street grid, or tell us about the coming weather. Virtual reality technology allows us to "be" places we are not, with a 360° view of our surroundings in stereophonic sound. Posthumanist theory investigates the psychology and the politics of our immersion in the collective world of the internet, and its consequences for the social structures of our world.

Meanwhile, cognitive psychology seeks a new center within, exploring the functions and activities of the human brain and mind. It probably got its start when Noam Chomsky conjectured that natural languages are too similar in their deep structures to be the random product of culture, and are learned too quickly to be entirely the behaviorist result of the verbal stimuli children receive. Chomsky argued that human children are born with a "Language Acquisition Device" hard-wired into their brains. While this theory is still contested, the controversy sparked widespread investigations into the relationship of mind and brain, by which it became clear that, whether the tracks are hard-wired from birth or laid down by experience, the brain processes language in very specific sites. Neurologists examining patients with aphasias caused by brain lesions had long ago discovered that we store people's names in a different site from common nouns, and that certain lesions prevented people from understanding metaphor and others metonymy. Through advances in neural science, cognitive theory has enabled us, without creating brain lesions in healthy subjects, to correlate specific thought processes with activity in specific areas of the brain by mapping which sites demand greater blood flow or demonstrate greater electrical conductivity. Since we store short-term memories in different places from long-term memories, it is suspected that the vivid dreams we experience while unconscious may be, contrary to what Freud thought, an artifact of the process of sorting and then "dumping" the data of the previous day. Philology could reveal the poem and its patterns, and rhetoric could give us some inkling of how audiences reacted, but until recently the key aesthetic moment of reader response was a mystery, a "black box" whose workings were hidden to us. Experimental cognitive psychology,

however, has begun to shine light on both mind and brain, explaining how literary tropes (such as metaphor) are involved in all cognition, how empathy with fictional characters occurs, and how literary texts both engage and occasionally test the limits of cognitive functioning.

Digital humanities, finally, describes a wildly diverse group of projects that depend on the digital representation of texts and other data, and their distribution through the internet. Students of literature routinely consume the product of text digitization when they access both primary texts and criticism published in learned journals via the internet links provided by their university libraries. Digital images of rare or unique books make it possible for us to examine the manuscript of Beowulf while sitting at our desk; to view and read the printed versions of Shakespeare quartos; to compare the individually water-colored copies of William Blake's poems and prophetic books; and to view the poems and paintings on which Dante Gabriel Rossetti was simultaneously working.

Going beyond mere access, digital analysis of linguistic features has been used to test the ascription of texts published anonymously or under pseudonyms, like the Spectator essays and the Letters of Junius; scholars have also concluded that the first of the three narrative digressions in Henry Fielding's Joseph Andrews was probably written by his sister Sarah. A project at the University of Nebraska analyzes Jane Austen's use of free indirect discourse, with an eye towards specifying the linguistic features that mark its presence.

The availability of large corpora of texts from earlier centuries has theoretical implications that have been explored by scholars like Franco Moretti, who has advocated a "distant reading" to discover features and trends in a literature that by the eighteenth century had become far too massive for any single scholar to read more than a small fraction. Other critics like Sharon Marcus and Stephen Best have argued for a "surface reading" of texts to recover obvious features that have been temporarily obscured by psychoanalytical or Mandan searches for deeper meanings or latent content. All these manifestations of theory have taken us far beyond the search for close and closer readings that obsessed literary criticism in the 1950s.

The Blackwell Companion to Literary Theory has gathered together three dozen original essays, all by noted scholars in their fields, designed to introduce the general reader to the latest ideas about the literary and cultural theory of the last half century, focusing on the ideas that are still alive today. We have grouped the chapters for the reader's convenience into seven sections, but many of the chapters speak to more than a single aspect of theory. The chapter on Digital Humanities, for example, has been placed with the other essays on "The Task of Reading," but it might equally have been situated with "Scientific Inflections." Scholars who were writing about theoretical movements whose heyday lay primarily in the past, like the chapters on the New Critics and the Chicago Formalists, were asked to discuss what was dead and what was still living about their group of theorists. Those who were writing about fields that were new or emergent were asked to trace the pre-history as well as the current flowering of their area. Our aim was to allot proper space to all the areas of theory most relevant today, arranged by topic rather than chronology, in order to highlight the relationships between the earlier and the most recent theoretical projects.

Writers and Their Mothers edited by Dale Salwak
[Palgrave Macmillan, 783319683478]

Ian McEwan, Margaret Drabble, Martin Amis, Rita
Dove, Andrew Motion and Anthony Thwaite are
among the twenty-two distinguished contributors of
original essays to this landmark volume on the
profound and frequently perplexing bond between
writer and mother. In compelling detail, they bring
to life the thoughts, work, loves, friendships,
passions and, above all, the influence of mothers
upon their literary offspring from Shakespeare to
the present.

Many of the contributors evoke the ideal with fond
and loving memories: understanding, selfless,
spiritual, tender, protective, reassuring and self-
assured mothers who created environments
favorable to the development of their children's
gifts.

At the opposite end of the parenting spectrum,
however, we also see tortured mothers who
ignored, interfered with, smothered or abandoned
their children. Their early years were times of
traumatic loss, unhappily dominated by death and
human frailty.

Elegantly assembled and presented, Writers and
Their Mothers will appeal to everyone interested in
biography, literature, and creativity in general.

Excerpt: The idea for this collection goes back to
2013, when I was reading Alexander McCall
Smith's What W H. Auden Can Do for You and
came upon the following words: "There may be no
book on the mothers of poets, or artists in general,
but it might one day be written and would be, I
think, an enlightening read."

This book considers some of the provocative
questions he suggested: personal and anecdotal,
philosophical and practical. What were the early
maternal influences on an artist and how were they
manifested in the work? Was there truth in
Georges Simenon's claim that novelists were united
in their hatred of their mothers? Or of Gore Vidal's
assertion, "Hatred of one parent or the other can
make an Ivan the Terrible or a Hemingway; the
protective love, however, of two devoted parents
can absolutely destroy an artist"? What were, in
Carl Sandburg's words, the "silent working" of their
inner lives as children become writers? What
happened to writers who were wounded by their
mothers? What were the links between childhood
joy and sorrow and the growth of individual
genius?

I invited twenty-two prominent novelists, poets, and
literary critics from both sides of the Atlantic to
write a new chapter about the profound and
frequently perplexing bond between writer and
mother (and in one instance, stepmother). I cast my
net wide, providing the focus and theme, making
suggestions for possible approaches, but ultimately
leaving it to each contributor to decide on their own
methods. Thus prompted, the contributors bring to
life in compelling detail the thoughts, work, loves,
friendships, passions and, above all, the influence
of mothers upon their literary offspring from
Shakespeare to the present. Part I is biographical;
Part II is autobiographical. All but two of the essays
were produced expressly for this volume.

Many of the contributors evoke the ideal with fond
and loving memories: understanding, selfless,
spiritual, tender, protective, reassuring and self-
assured mothers who created environments
favorable to the development of their children's
gifts. At the opposite end of the parenting
spectrum, however, we also see tortured mothers
who ignored, interfered with, smothered or
abandoned their children. Their early years were
times of traumatic loss, unhappily dominated by
death and human frailty.

An edited volume is only as good as its contributors. I had a splendid field to choose from and am profoundly grateful to all of them. Some forged on through the demands of other deadlines, illness (their own or a loved one's) or in one instance the inexpressible sadness of losing a daughter. The late Kenneth Silverman, whom I have known as a very good friend and highly respected scholar for more than thirty years, produced his essay on Walt Whitman, his final piece of writing, while undergoing treatment for lung cancer. My own mother, now ninety-six and still living in her home, read with immense and varied pleasure each of these essays as they arrived. Their truthfulness and sensitivity moved her deeply, sometimes to tears.

Catherine Aird is the author of more than twenty detective novels and short story collections, most of which feature Detective Inspector C.D. Sloan. She holds an Honorary M.A. from the University of Kent at Canterbury and was awarded an M.B.E. Apart from writing the successful Chronicles of Calleshire, she has written and edited a series of local histories and has been active in village life. She lives in East Kent.

Martin Amis is the author of ten novels, the memoir Experience, two collections of stories, and six collections of non-fiction. He lives in New York.

Judy Carver is the younger child of William Golding and his wife Ann. Born in 1945, she was educated at Godolphin School, Salisbury, the University of Sussex, and St Anne's College, Oxford, where she did research into an eighteenth-century anthology of poetry. She married in 1971, and worked in publishing for several years until she had children. In 2011, the year of her father's centenary, Faber and Faber published her memoir, The Children of Lovers, which described life growing up in a household dominated by her father's extraordinary talent and her parents' intense, creative marriage. Further details: wwwwilliam-golding.co.uk

Anthony Daniels, born in 1949, is a retired psychiatrist who worked for many years in an inner-city hospital and prison. He is the author of many books, including Romancing Opiates, in which he traced the origins of modern attitudes to addiction to De Quincey and Coleridge. He has written literary essays and book reviews for many publications, including the TLS, the Sunday Telegraph, the National Review, the Spectator, The (London) Times and the New Criterion. His memoirs of his life in prison (as a doctor) were published in June, 2017, under the title The Knife Went In.

Rita Dove, recipient of the 1987 Pulitzer Prize in poetry, served as U.S. Poet Laureate from 1993 to 1995. The author of numerous poetry books, most recently Sonata Mulattica (2009) and Collected Poems 1974-2004 (2016), she has also published short stories, a novel, a play and, as editor, The Penguin Anthology of Twentieth-Century American Poetry. Among her many recognitions are the 2011 National Medal of Arts from President Obama and the 1996 National Humanities Medal from President Clinton. Rita Dove is Commonwealth Professor of English at the University of Virginia.

Margaret Drabble, DBE is a novelist and critic, born in Sheffield in 1939. After a brief and inglorious career as an actress with the Royal Shakespeare Company she became a full-time writer, and has published nineteen novels, most recently The Dark Flood Rises (2016). Her work has been translated into many languages. She has also published various works of non-fiction, including biographies of Arnold Bennett and Angus Wilson, and edited the Fifth and Sixth editions of the Oxford Companion to English Literature (1985, 2000.) She is married to the biographer Michael Holroyd, and has three children from her first marriage to the actor Clive Swift.

Lyndall Gordon is the author of seven biographies, including Lives Like Loaded Guns: Emily Dickinson and Her Family's Feuds, The Imperfect Life of T. S. Eliot and most recently Outsiders: Five Women Writers Who Changed the World. Amongst her awards are The British Academy's Rose Mary Crawshay Prize and the Cheltenham Prise for Literature. She has also written two memoirs, Shared Lives and Divided Lives: Dreams ofa Mother and Daughter. She is a Fellow of the Royal

Society of Literature and lives in Oxford, where she is a Fellow of St Hilda's College.

Rachel Hadas is the author of more books of poetry and essays than she can quite count. Her most recent poetry collection is Questions in the Vestibule (2016, Northwestern University Press); her verse translations of Euripides' two Iphigenia plays will be published by Northwestern in 2018. The recipient of honors including a Guggenheim Fellowship, an American Academy of Arts and Sciences Award in Literature, and the O.B. Hardison Poetry Prize from the Folger Shakespeare Library, Rachel Hadas is Board of Governors Professor of English at Rutgers University—Newark.

Adrianne Kalfopoulou has had work published on Sylvia Plath in Women's Studies, an Interdisciplinary Journal, and Plath Profiles. She is the author of two poetry collections, and a book of essays, Ruin, Essays in Exilic Living. A third poetry collection, A History of Too Much, will be published in 2018. She is a poetry and non-fiction mentor for the Mile-High MFA program at Regis University, and heads the English Program at Deree College in Athens, Greece. Some of her work is available at: www.adriannekalfopoulou.com

Reeve Lindbergh, a daughter of aviator-author Anne Morrow Lindbergh, was born in 1945 and grew up in Connecticut. She graduated from Radcliffe College in 1968 and moved to Vermont, where she lives near St. Johnsbury with her husband, writer Nat Tripp. Her work has appeared in a number of magazines and periodicals including the New York Times Book Review, The New Yorker and The Washington Post. She is also the author of two dozen books for children and adults. Her next book, Two Lives, about her family past and rural present, will be published by Brigantine Media in 2018.

Ian McEwan has written two collections of stories, First Love, Last Rites, and In Between the Sheets, and fifteen novels, The Cement Garden, The Comfort of Strangers, The Child in Time, The Innocent, Black Dogs, The Daydreamer, Enduring

Love, Amsterdam, Atonement, Saturday Solar, On Chesil Beach, Sweet Tooth, The Children Act and Nutshell. He has also written several film scripts, including The Imitation Game, The Ploughman's Lunch, Sour Sweet, The Good Son, The Innocent, On Chesil Beach and The Children Act. He won the Booker Prize for Amsterdam in 1998.

Gardner McFall is the author of The Pilot's Daughter and Russian Tortoise (poems), an opera libretto entitled Amelia (commissioned by Seattle Opera), and two children's books. She edited Made with Words, a prose miscellany by May Swenson, and wrote the Introduction for the Barnes & Noble Classics edition of Kenneth Grahame's The Wind in the Willows. For over a decade she taught Children's Literature at Hunter College/CUNY, and lives and works in New York City.

Jeffrey Meyers has written fifty-four books, thirty-one of which have been translated into fourteen languages and seven alphabets, and published on six continents. In 2012 he gave the Seymour lectures on biography at the National Libraries of Australia. He has recently published Remembering Iris Murdoch in 2013, Thomas Mann's Artist-Heroes in 2014, Robert Lowell in Love and The Mystery of the Real: Correspondence with Alex Colville in 2016.

Andrew Motion was the UK Poet Laureate from 1999 to 2009. He is the co-founder of the Poetry Archive, and now teaches at Johns Hopkins University; he lives in Baltimore. His book-length elegy for his parents, Essex Clay, is published in the Spring of 2018.

Martha Oliver-Smith was born in Rhode Island into a family of writers, scholars and artists. She earned an MA in literature from the University of Nevada at Reno and an MFA in writing from the Vermont College of Fine Arts. She taught high school English and college writing courses for 36 years before retiring to write the biographical memoir Martha's Mandala (2015), based on her grandmother's life as an artist who struggled with mental illness. She lives with her husband in Vermont where she is working on a second memoir about her mother, the author Martha Bacon.

Tim Parks is a novelist, essayist, travel writer and translator based in Italy. Author of fifteen novels, including the Booker short-listed Europa, he has translated works by Moravia, Calvino, Calasso, Machiavelli and Leopardi. While running a postgraduate degree course in translation in Milan, he writes regularly for the London Review of Books and the New York Review of Books. His many non-fiction works include the bestselling Italian Neighbours and Teach Us to Sit Still, a memoir on chronic pain and meditation. His critical work includes the essay collection Where I'm Reading From, and most recently, The Novel, A Survival Skill, a reflection on the relationship between novelists, their writing and their readers. His most recent novel is In Extremis.

Philip Pullen was born and brought up in Coventry and is familiar with most of the haunts of the young Philip Larkin. He studied at University College, Swansea and the University of Leicester and holds a PhD in the sociology of education. He spent most of his working life teaching in further and higher education and also served for 10 years as one of Her Majesty's Inspectors (HMI). He is a committee member of the Philip Larkin Society and is currently working on a biographical study of Eva Larkin, making use of the extensive Larkin Archive located in the History Centre, Hull. Reviewed, Shakespeare's Theatre, as well as Renaissance Landscapes, Puritans and Libertines, and The School of Love. The Program's two websites are Shakespeare's Staging and Milton Revealed.

Hugh Macrae Richmond has degrees from Oxford and Cambridge, and is Professor Emeritus of English at the University of California, Berkeley, where he heads the Shakespeare Program devoted to "Shakespeare in Performance" and staging some forty plays, with five video documentaries in national distribution: Shakespeare and the Globe, Shakespeare's Globe Theatre Restored, and Shakespeare and the Spanish Connection as well as Milton By Himself He has published Shakespeare's Sexual Comedy, Shakespeare's Political Plays, Shakespeare's Tragedies

Dale Salwak is professor of English literature at Southern California's Citrus College. His publications include Living with a Writer (Palgrave, 2004), Teaching Lift: Letters from a Life in Literature (2008) and studies of Kingsley Amis, John Braine, A.J. Cronin, Philip Larkin, Barbara Pym, Carl Sandburg, Anne Tyler and John Wain. He is a recipient of Purdue University's Distinguished Alumni Award as well as a research grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities. He is also a frequent contributor to the (London) Times Higher Education magazine and the Times Educational Supplement.

Kenneth Silverman (1936-2017), a native of Manhattan, was Professor Emeritus of English at New York University. His books include A Cultural History of the American Revolution; The Life and Times of Cotton Mather; Edgar A. Poe: Mournful and Never-ending Remembrance; HOUDINI!!!; Lightning Man: The Accursed Life of Samuel F. B. Morse; and Begin Again: A Biography of John Cage. A fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, he has received the Bancroft Prize in American History, the Pulitzer Prize for Biography, the Edgar Award of the Mystery Writers of America, and the Christopher Literary Award of the Society of American Magicians. He has loved the poetry of Walt Whitman since, at sixteen, he heard his English teacher read aloud, "Give me the splendid silent sun."

Ann Thwaite has spent her life as a writer, with two spells of teaching in Japan. She wrote and reviewed children's books for many years. She and her husband Anthony have lived in Tokyo, Richmond-upon-Thames, Benghazi and Nashville, Tennessee, but have been settled in Norfolk in East Anglia for the last forty-five years. Her five biographies, of Frances Hodgson Burnett, A.A. Milne (Whitbread Biography of the Year 1990), Emily Tennyson, the poet's wife, and the father and son P.H. and Edmund Gosse (Duff Cooper Prize, 1985) have all been highly praised. Goodbye Christopher Robin (from her Milne life) is now a major motion picture and mass market paperback.

Anthony Thwaite had early success as a poet, publishing widely while he was still at Oxford. His Collected Poems was published in 2007 and his most recent book, Going Out, when he was eighty-four. He was a BBC radio producer, literary editor of the Listener, the New Statesman and Encounter, and has lectured and taught in many countries. He was awarded an OBE for services to poetry, and both he and Ann are Fellows of the Royal Society of Literature and have honorary degrees from the University of East Anglia. Hull University awarded him an honorary doctorate for his work on Philip Larkin, whose poems and letters he has edited.

David Updike is Professor of English at Roxbury Community College, Boston. He is the author of two collections of short stories, Out of the Marsh and Old Girlfriends. His stories and essays have been published in The New Yorker, The New York Times Magazine, Newsweek, and The John Updike. He has written six children's books and a young adult novel, Ivy's Turn. He lives in Cambridge, Massachusetts, with his wife Wambui, and is the father of one son, Wesley.

Contents

The Law (in Plain English) for Writers, (Fifth Edition) by Leonard DuBoff and Sarah Tugman [Allworth Press, 9781621536284]

The First Amendment of the United States Constitution embodies the basic freedom to express oneself in writing in the statement, "Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press." Censorship has been constitutionally disfavored since the founding of the United States. Some historians suggest that the First Amendment was written specifically to prevent prior restraint of expression by the government. Prior restraints impose an extreme burden upon the exercise of free speech, since they limit open debate and the unfettered dissemination of knowledge. It is not surprising that the United States Supreme Court has consistently found that it is unconstitutional to restrain speech prior to a determination of whether the speech is protected by the First Amendment.

However, that is not to say that all speech is permissible. The courts uphold laws that protect consumers from false advertising, prevent incitements likely to cause immediate unlawful violence, and control distribution of pornography. Governmental restraint on speech revolves around the type of speech being made, the purpose behind the speech, and the time, place, and manner of the speech.

The art of writing dates back to the very dawn of civilization. Writers were active in dynastic Egypt, as well as in the emerging civilizations in the Tigris and Euphrates river valleys. As society became

more complex, the problems faced by writers increased. Today, the successful writer must also be a knowledgeable businessperson.

When I first began to practice law, I realized that it was important for clients to carefully evaluate all of the options available to them and then adopt the most prudent course. Later, as a law professor, I taught my students to use this same principle in counseling their clients. Many of my writer clients and students have asked me to recommend a book that would aid them in understanding the legal issues faced by writers and publishers. Unfortunately, I was unable to recommend any single volume that would serve this purpose.

During my career as a practicing attorney, I became aware of the dearth of practical law books for writers and publishers. It was for this reason that I wrote The Book Publishers' Legal Guide, initially published in 1984 and later revised.

After a friend read and critiqued the first edition of that book, he reminded me of the plight of writers and urged me to write a text for them that would be "user friendly." I thus began work on the first edition of this book, the fifth volume in my "(in Plain English)®" series. As with the other books in that series, my goal was to create an informative work that was readable, practical, and comprehensive.

When the law subsequently changed in several areas discussed within these pages, it became necessary to revise the earlier edition of this book. In fact, it has been revised and updated several times. This fifth edition therefore contains the most up-to-date discussion of corporate law, copyright law, and tax law as applied to writers. Defamation, the right of privacy, and the like have also been reconsidered to reflect the latest judicial pronouncements on those subjects. Throughout this book, there have been numerous subtle changes that were necessitated by the evolution of the law affecting writers.

As with any book on law, changes are inevitable and ongoing. The reader should therefore be careful to confer with competent legal counsel before undertaking the resolution of any issue discussed in this volume.

Table of Contents

<>

Bibliography

Cognitive Joyce by Sylvain Belluc and Valérie Bénéjam [Cognitive Studies in Literature and Performance, Palgrave Macmillan, 9783319719931

Useless Joyce: Textual Functions, Cultural Appropriations by Tim Conley [University of Toronto Press, 9781487502508]

How Writing Works: From the Invention of the Alphabet to the Rise of Social Media by Dominic

Wyse [Cambridge University Press, 9781107184688]

The Image of the Feminine in the Poetry of W.B. Yeats and Angelos Sikelianos by Anastasia Psoni [Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 9781527505827]

Tradition and Romanticism: Studies in English Poetry from Chaucer to W. B. Yeats by B. Ifor Evans [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138190023]

The Critical Thought of W. B. Yeats by Wit Pietrzak [Palgrave Macmillan, 9783319600888]

W. B. Yeats: A Critical Introduction by Balachandra Rajan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687554]

Yeats, Folklore and Occultism: Contexts of the Early Work and Thought by Frank Kinahan [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687233]

W. B. Yeats: The Tragic Phase: A Study of the Last Poems by Vivienne Koch [Palgrave Macmillan, 9781138687110]

Investigating Turkey: detective fiction and Turkish nationalism, 1928-1945 by David Mason [Ottoman and Turkish studies, Academic Studies Press, 9781618116284]

Shakespeare, love and language by David Schalkwyk [Cambridge University Press, 9781107187238]

Shakespeare, Love and Service by David Schalkwyk [Cambridge University Press, 9780521886390]

The Oxford Handbook of Shakespearean Tragedy by Michael Neill and David Schalkwyk [Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, 9780198820390]

Interweaving myths in Shakespeare and his contemporaries edited by Janice Valls-Russell, Charlotte Coffin, Agnes Lafont [Manchester University Press, 9781526117687]

Shakespeare and Millennial Fiction edited by Andrew James Hartley [Cambridge University Press, 9781107171725]

The Oxford Handbook of Shakespeare and Performance by James C. Bulman [Oxford Handbooks, Oxford University Press, 9780199687169]

A Companion to Literary Theory edited by David H. Richter [Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture, Wiley-Blackwell, 9781118958674]

The Copyright Guide: how you can protect and profiting from copyrights, Fourth edition by Lee Wilson [Allworth Press, 9781621536208]

The Law (in Plain English) for Writers, (Fifth Edition) by Leonard DuBoff and Sarah Tugman [Allworth Press, 9781621536284]