Textual Anthropology and the 'Imagined Community'

Peter Kuch[*]

Abstract: *This paper enquires into 'textual anthropology' as a new way of reading Irish texts. It has been prompted by two papers given in Sydney last October by Antony Tatlow, Professor of Comparative Literature at TCD, and a passage from the Introduction to Declan Kiberd's Irish Classics (London: Granta Books, 2000), p. xiii, where Professor Kiberd says: 'Because there were two powerful cultures in constant contention in Ireland after 1600, neither was able to achieve absolute hegemony. One consequence was that no single tradition could ever become official: the only persistent tradition in Irish culture was the largely unsuccessful attempt to subvert all claims to make any tradition official. In conditions of ongoing cultural confrontation, most of the great works of literature produced on either side took on something of the character of anthropology.' In addition to testing this contention, this paper will enquire into issues such as: To what extent and in what ways does textual anthropology relate to previous approaches to reading Irish texts? What presuppositions underpin textual anthropology? and What benefits accrue from and what limitations attend such an approach?*

It was two papers given in Sydney last October by Professor Antony Tatlow, Professor of Comparative Literature at Trinity College, where he offered 'anthropological' readings of Shakespeare, that first set me thinking about textual anthropology and the 'imagined community'. They also prompted me to recall that passage from Declan Kiberd's splendid *Irish Classics* where he writes:

> Because there were two powerful cultures in constant contention in Ireland after 1600, neither was able to achieve absolute hegemony. One consequence was that no single tradition could ever become official: the only persistent tradition in Irish culture was the largely unsuccessful attempt to subvert all claims to make any tradition official. In conditions of ongoing cultural confrontation, most

*   University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia.

of the great works of literature produced on either side took on something of the character of anthropology. (Kiberd 2000, xiii)

As well, there were three further stimuli. The first had to do with a literary history of Irish poetry 1900-1940 that I have been working on for some time and my concerns about the theoretical/methodological approach I had adopted for this project. The second had to do with a very recent and most welcome invitation from the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences and the Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Education and Enterprise, at my university, The University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia, to convene an Irish Studies Program. And the third had to do with that passage from Benedict Anderson's *Imagined Communities: Reflections of the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, a work first published in 1983 and then revised in 1991 and subsequently reprinted numerous times; a highly influential book, not only in terms of post-colonial and cultural theory and the extent to which it has underpinned the Field-Day projects, but also, again returning to Declan Kiberd's work, as an approach to Irish Studies extensively explored in *Inventing Ireland: The Literature of the Modern Nation*.

Anderson in that memorable sentence, only part of which however is generally quoted, announces his willingness to risk a definition of the term "nation" – thereby taking firm hold of a concept that had hitherto been left lie or had slipped the grip of Marxist and Modern historians. 'In an anthropological spirit, then', he says, 'I propose the following definition of the nation: it is an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign'. (Anderson 1991, 5-6) The term 'imagined community' – the qualifier 'political' seems to have silently dropped out of sight – as well as the extent to which Anderson investigated, illustrated and valorized the word 'imagined', has become as much a mantra for post-colonial critics as an incantation for cultural theorists.[1]

But what about the word "community" let alone the words "political community"? How much attention has been paid to that part of the definition? Just as Anderson contended that the term 'nation' had been elided by Marxist and Modernist historians, I would like to submit that the term 'community' has been elided in what has been researched and written in Irish Studies for at least the last ten to fifteen years. Arguably, it is now time to look more closely at the term "community" before we continue to parade out post-structuralism, strut our semiotics, hypothecate our historicism, deploy our deconstruction, or posit ourselves as just plain readers. After all, of the three terms in Anderson's definition of the nation: 'an imagined political community – and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign', his definition of the term 'community' is the most cursory. To quote:

Finally, it is imagined as a *community*, because, regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship. Ultimately it is this fraternity that makes it

possible, over the past two centuries, for so many millions of people, not so much to kill, as willingly to die for such limited imaginings.[2] (7)

The gendered metaphors embedded in this definition – 'comradeship', 'fraternity' – are enough to make a sensitive critic, whether feminist or not, shudder. But more about Anderson, 'community', and the impact on Irish Studies *anon*.

The intersection of these five stimuli, provocations or whatever one might like to characterize them – Antony Tatlow, Declan Kiberd, my own literary history, convening the UNSW Irish Studies Program and Benedict Anderson – and the recurrence of the word anthropological, stirred me into thought. Though most of what I am going to offer remains teasingly preliminary, and though I am not going rigorously to distinguish between the two uses of the term anthropological in what I have referred to so far – that is anthropological as content *pace* Kiberd and anthropological as method or approach *pace* Tatlow – I want to explore various aspects of the way we have done, are doing, and perhaps should 'do', Irish Studies.

What follows then is an attempt to address issues such as: 'To what extent and in what ways does textual anthropology relate to previous approaches to reading Irish texts? What presuppositions could be said to underpin textual anthropology? And what benefits might accrue from and what limitations might attend such an approach? I hope that my attempts to address these questions will go some way towards providing the basis for a rationale for our new Irish Studies Program at the University of New South Wales as well as a guide to our own teaching and research.

Setting ourselves at ease with some of the terms intrinsic to thinking about Irish Studies in this way provides one entry point. Here Declan Kiberd's caution is instructive: 'that 'most of the great works of literature produced [...] took on something of the character of anthropology'. It is the 'character of anthropology' that is noteworthy here. As a discipline, as a systematic way of thinking about the world, anthropology only began to emerge towards the end of the eighteenth century as it disentangled itself from archaeology, in the sense of archaeology as the 'professional'[3] study of antiquities. Samuel Johnson's *A Dictionary of the English Language in which words are Deduced from their Originals, and Illustrated in their Different Significations by Examples from the Best Writers*, first published in 1755, defines anthropology as the 'study of man' – with 'man' being used in the generic sense and 'study' confined to the scientific observation of physical characteristics. Anthropology as the study of persons as social, spiritual, economic and political beings, as being formed by and forming societies, was still some way, though not a long way, off.[4] Not surprisingly, and here I am restricting myself to the English Enlightenment,[5] it is the travel literature of the eighteenth century, and the competition for status between the physical sciences and the human sciences, between the emerging yet powerful disciplines of mathematics, physics and astronomy and the more gentlemanly and often better funded enquiries made under the rubric of the Antiquities that urged on the development of anthropology. Both the competition and

the pressures disclose themselves in the debates that enlivened the Royal Society in England throughout the last quarter of the eighteenth century. Come the Industrial Revolution and the rise of the nation-state, and the competition and the pressures rapidly intensify, with the result that Sociology,[6] fostered by Utilitarianism, begins to emerge as the dominant human science, positioning itself as relevant and necessary by providing a methodology and seemingly objective rationales for social engineering and by focusing on contemporary society, on the present, thereby obliging anthropology to continue the process of disentangling itself from the antiquities, from a preoccupation with the past, the primitive and the exotic.

Arguably a similar development has taken place and a similar tension exists within Irish Studies – the tension between post-colonial and 'cultural studies' approaches (with their parallels with sociology) and what might be termed the traditional historical approaches (with their parallels with anthropology in the late eighteenth/early nineteenth century sense of the word). The practitioners of post-colonial theory and cultural studies claim relevance and feel they are more methodologically attuned; they are, as it were, the ones who produce the street directories and the lists of who's who and who isn't. For their part, the practitioners of historical studies image themselves as cartographers of source countries and hinterlands; they are, as it were, the ones who produce the topographic, physical and political maps. Not that these two approaches are entirely separate, or, for that matter, discrete. Nor do they simply exist as binary opposites. There are numerous cross-contaminations and leakages; much more, of which this conference is itself eloquent, of the inclusive 'both/and' rather than the divisive and exclusive 'either/or'.

And that is how it should be. We need both types of maps – the street directory and the topographical; the lists of who's who and who isn't and the spatial representations that show who has claimed what, when, and how. And this is one of the great strengths of IASIL, and here I pay tribute not only to the pluralist, tolerant and inclusive vision of Professor Derry Jeffares, but also to successive Presidents, who have discouraged proselytizing in the name of the *idée fixe* and encouraged pluralism. Such pluralism, I believe, needs to be practiced by individuals. To take two examples at random. As Elizabeth Butler Cullingford disarmingly admits in her most recent book: *Ireland's Others: Gender and Ethnicity in Irish Literature and Popular Culture*, Field Day Monograph 10, after feeling herself 'beached' at the beginning of the 'eighties was surprised to find as the decade wore on 'to [sense] the tide of the latest American paradigm shift lifting [her] off the shoals, and to be told that some people thought [she] was a New Historicist.' 'I hastened to find out what that was', she confesses, 'and was disappointed to discover that I was probably just an Old Historian in drag [...] though [this] in any case, proved perfectly compatible with my new feminism'. (Cullingford 2001, 3) Similarly, John Wilson Foster in *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture* narrates his own theoretical journey in the opening sentence to his *Introduction* when he says: 'These pieces written over a period of sixteen years, begin collectively as

articles in literary criticism and end as essays in cultural criticism'. (1) Ideological purity, for its own sake, can prove the most barren of all attainments.

What I encourage my students to do in the courses that will become part of the Irish Studies Program at the University of New South Wales is to think of literary theory in terms of Derrida's provocative reading of Plato's *pharmakon* – the way that in western metaphysics poison and antidote co-exist in binary opposition/relation. My argument is that theory is poisonous; that each approach is merely a variety of a toxin that if taken in sufficient quantities and over a sufficient period of time inevitably produces linguistic determinism in the unwitting victim. Injected with large doses of post-colonial theory, or with feminism, marxism, historicism, new historicism, post-structuralism or whatever, the student and the academic enter on that Faustian compact where empowerment to speak is accompanied by a hidden but nevertheless powerful and remorseless curtailment of speech. Theoretical discourses both facilitate speech/writing and limit it. I am sure we have all had personal experience of this when we have received essays from students which seem to have been written, not by the delightful free-thinking individuals we have met in lectures and tutorials or spoken with in our offices, but by impersonal jargon generators. So I require the students who take my courses to vaccinate themselves with theory against theory; in other words, if they find they are particularly attracted to new historicism to deliberately take a good strong dose of cultural theory or feminism. Poison and antidote. And to keep it practical I set exercises where I ask them to offer opposed readings of the one piece of literature – for example Yeats's "Easter 1916", first employing say a specific school of post-colonial theory and then say deconstructing the poem, setting both readings alongside one another and asking themselves what each theory has prevented them from saying even as it has enabled them to speak. Or Brian Friel's *Translations* – read with the aid of systemic functional linguistics and then counter-read through Terry Eagleton's brand of Marxism. Most of my students seem to find this rather challenging, but also very exciting and highly rewarding. Finally, to apply my own method to itself. The potentially toxic effect of what might be summarized as this dialogic double-ness is simplification; the antidotes I suspect are wide reading, deep thought, persistence and honesty. And I like to point this out to my students too.

But to return to the term 'community'. As I have indicated, it is time, I believe, to look closely at what is meant by this seminal term as we fix the compass and set off critically to chart, explore or simply traverse the 'imagined community' of Ireland/Irishness. The OED gives as its origin the Latin *cummunitat-em* f. *commun-is* and its coming into English via the Old French *com(m)uneté*, *com(m)unité*. The original Latin word was merely a noun of quality meaning 'fellowship, as in community of relations or feelings'; but in Medieval Latin the word was used concretely in the sense of 'a body of fellows or fellow-townsmen' – hence the sexism of Benedict Anderson's definition. The OED then goes on to list 9 current meanings for 'community', the meanings divided into two categories depending on whether or not the word is being used to describe 'a quality or state' or 'a body of individuals'.

Under the first category, 'a quality or state', the meanings listed are:

1. the quality of appertaining to or being held by all in common; joint or common ownership; **2.** common character; quality in common, commonness, agreement, identity; **3.** social intercourse, fellowship, communion; **4.** Life in association with others, society, the social state; and **5.** commonness, ordinary occurrence.

Under the second category, as pertaining to a 'body of individuals', community can mean:

6. the body of those having common or equal rights or rank, as distinguished from the privileged classes; the body or commons, the commonality; **7.** a body of people organized into a political municipal, or social unity as either **a:** a state or commonwealth or **b:** a body of men living in the same locality or **c:** as applied to those members of a civil community who have certain circumstances of nativity, religion, or pursuit, common to them but not shared by those among whom they live as the British or Chinese community in a foreign city, the mercantile community everywhere, the Roman Catholic community in a Protestant city etc; and **d:** the people of a county (or district) as a whole; the general body to which all alike belong, the public. **8.** a body of persons living together and practicing more or less community of goods such as either **a:** a religious society, a monastic body or **b:** a socialistic or communistic society and finally **9.** *Trans* and *fig* of gregarious animals or of things, a cluster, or combination.

For the most part Benedict Anderson concentrates on meanings **1, 3, 4, & 6,** arguing that nations became imagined into being through the rise of a print capitalism[7] which valorized even as it popularized vernacular speech, and valorized it in the sense that the vernacular became what he terms the 'language-of-state'. Such print vernaculars inexorably forged identity, established boundaries, created a sense of belonging, offered a means of transacting power (thereby transforming hierarchical structures into horizontal structures), and engendered new concepts of time (principally simultaneity and chronology – or what he terms calendrical time). Pivotal to this process, he argues, were the 'pilgrim creole functionaries and the provincial creole printmen' (65); or, to put it in other terms, the local bureaucrat and the local newspaper; though in a subsequent chapter he analyses passages from several novels to show how specific generic characteristics facilitated the processes of imagining that created the sense of community intrinsic to the formation and maintenance of national identity.

To reach this point Anderson relies on a number of theoretical works and theoretical approaches: firstly the work of the French annalists,[8] specifically Lucien Febvre's and Henri-Jean Martin's *The Coming of the Book. The Impact of Printing, 1450-1800* (London:

New Left Books, 1976 [Translation of *L'appartition du Livre*. Paris: Albin Michel. 1958]); secondly, a quasi Althussian/Marxist approach to develop the notions of print capitalism and the emergence of bourgeois reading publics that are quintessential to his definition of community; and thirdly on a mix of New Criticism, Chicago Aristotelianism (as a source for genre theory) and Reader Reception theory for analyzing a range of 'vernacular' novels to show how, at particular points in time, they created, through their deployment of various literary techniques, the illusion of community.[9]

The first two of these, I believe, are particularly helpful in thinking about ways of coming to terms with 'community'. Arguably writers inhabit a variety of these, which co-exist in relation to one another, for the want of a better visual metaphor, like a series of Chinese boxes. To work as it were from the outside in with perhaps the most basic of structures. There is the national/international community which comprises the way or ways writers negotiate, whether consciously or unconsciously, their ethnicity/ cosmopolitanism, their nativism/globalism. Then there is the professional community – which includes in one sense relations to fellow writers, to literary agents, to publishers, and to reviewers; as well as membership of literary and non-literary organizations, including perhaps affiliations with newspapers, magazines, journals, radio and television programs, projects, manifestos, institutions and 'movements'; and in another sense, genre, tradition, intertextuality, cultural discourses all the 'stuff' that makes good cultural/ literary history. So both writers and texts can belong to and be shaped by communities. More about textual communities *anon*. Finally, there is the personal community – to some extent able to be reconstructed through memoirs, autobiography, correspondence, manuscripts, as well as 'information' about the intellectual, social, spiritual, political and cultural milieu, all the 'stuff' that goes to make a good critical editions of letters and good critical biography.

Such communities, though they may impinge on one another and interact with one another, do have 'boundaries' in the sense that Anderson posits boundaries for vernacular speech/ vernacular print/language-of-state communities.[10] Thus, Edna Longley, whose perspicacious and polemical *The Living Stream: Literature and Revisionism in Ireland*, is mandatory reading for my students, critiques Heaney's account of the literary scene in Belfast during his formative years as follows:

> Heaney should be seen as generalizing from his own experience and, ironically, from too Anglo-centric a viewpoint, when he says: 'all of us in this group [he includes Mahon] were harking to writers from the English cultural background of the late 'fifties and 'sixties. That *Death of a Naturalist* (1966), *Night Crossing* (1968) and *No Continuing City* (1969) are such different first collections proves the range of influences at work. These early aesthetic differences have often been obscured or distorted by the political and theoretical batteries pounding away since 1970. If politics, as well as criticism, begins in aesthetics, close reading becomes all the more crucial.

Although distant constellations counted too – Baudelaire, Rimbaud, Frost, Stevens, Crane, Lowell, Wilbur, Penguin Modern European Poets – I suggest three immediate literary environments shaped Northern Irish poetry in the 1960s. (Longley 1994, 20)

Edna Longley is equally illuminating in the way texts can be thought of in terms of community /communities. In 'writing these essays', she observes of *The Living Stream*,

I found that I was often tracing a textual web, and that the term "intertextuality" applied to Northern Irish poetry in a special, living sense: not as a theoretical dead letter, but as a creative dynamic working upon mechanisms of tradition and cultural definitions alike.
Intertextual dialogues may be explicit variations on a theme: Heaney rewriting Hewitt from "The Other Side", Muldoon taking oblique issue with Heaney's "Punishment"; or they may unobtrusively tweak the threads of a word or image [...] But poems can ignore one another yet be in touch. Because of the themes that go with the territory, and the territory that goes with the themes, they participate in a shifting system of aesthetic and cultural relations. Here lyric poetry, often damned as upholding the egotistical sublime, clearly subscribes to a dispersed collectivity, and observes disciplines akin to the historians 'intertextual antagonism'. This is why we should take care not to collapse generational dialectics, as when Morrison and Motion [...] press Heaney into the post-modernist mould or mouldlessness. (51)

There are a number of instructive ways of thinking about community embedded in this passage – textual communities made up of poems, plays, novels and short stories in dialogue with one another, a dialogue than can be characterized either as "intertextuality" or "textual antagonism". Generational communities – as, in the case of Northern Ireland, the stately seniors: Heaney, Longley and Mahon and then the young turks: Muldoon, Ciaran Carson and Mebh McGuckian. Here it is worth remarking that the self-assessment of performance, the competitiveness that can come from being contemporaries, or the conflict of the generations, can be just as much a factor in the power politics of a literary movement as any agreements or disagreements about aims and manifestos and just as much a factor in the ways a writer writes. George William Russell (*AE*) once suggested that a literary movement could be defined as 'five or six people who live in the same town and hate each other cordially' (Moore 1914, 165) – "inter-urban" instead of "intertextual antagonism" as it were. In adapting this to our present discussion, I would like to suggest that any literary movement could be defined as any number of writers who, regardless of where they live, monitor one another instinctively. Informing this is Eliot's observation that: 'Between the true artists of any one time there is, I believe, an unconscious community'. (Eliot 1972, 24) So generational communities, communities

of exemplary practice can be fostered within and beyond cities or regions, periods or epochs. But as Edna Longley shrewdly cautions, if we are talking about generational communities: 'care should be taken not to collapse generational dialectics'. Communities do have boundaries; and it is in locating those boundaries that the second half of Anderson's definition comes into its own. If 'imagined' is the motor; then 'community' is the brake. If 'imagined' is the spur; then 'community' is the bridle. If 'imagined' stimulates us to think about what is produced within and for the cultural artifact that is the nation; then 'community' challenges us to determine the spatial reach of that imagining, the area of its effect, the dimensions of the resultant cultural artifact.

So to offer, in conclusion, some tentative answers to the questions I posed at the beginning of this paper. To take the first two questions together: 'To what extent and in what ways does textual anthropology relate to previous approaches to reading Irish texts?' And 'what presuppositions could be said to underpin textual anthropology?' It can offer one way of resolving the tension that Edna Longley, in the final paragraph of her essay on 'Revising "Irish Literature,"' felt was crippling Irish Studies:

> Perhaps Irish Studies, as we now call them, have inherited two broad modes of enquiry. One derived from the Enlightenment, is the empirical quest for data [...]. But this approach can never be wholly detached from another tradition: the discursive tradition of 'talking about Ireland' which grew up with nineteenth-century Nationalism and is, indeed, politics by other means. At the moment Irish literary studies [...] are uneasily caught between the two. (68)

Community can be the concept that grounds 'talking about Ireland' in empirical data. It can be the means for administering the antidote of fact to the poison of fancy.

Finally: what benefits might accrue from and what limitations might attend such an approach? To take the limitations first. These have been perhaps best summed up by Yeats in his condemnation of the mind that is too self-aware, too cautious, too conscious of its own processes, when he images the loss of *sprezzatura* in *Ego Dominuus Tuus* as the loss of that 'old nonchalance of the hand'. (*VP*, 368)

On the other hand, the greatest benefit that can accrue from thinking rigorously about community, I would argue, is that it can significantly improve our scholarship. A rather old fashioned term but perhaps one that needs to be revived. Community can be our safety device as we embark on that perilous journey from particular to general or general to particular. It can and should alert us to anachronism and fallacious analogy, to those legerdemain slippages that glittering metaphors half reveal and half conceal even as they enchant the writer equally with the reader. 'Just a moment', it should say to us, 'just what are the spatial and/or temporal dimensions of what you are about to relate?' Did X really know, read, correspond with Y? Was concept A available to, understood by writer B and audience C? Does text F really lie within the generic or theoretical paradigm G? Does J share sufficient characteristics of generalization K to qualify as an example? And so on. I suspect Irish Studies is still to some extent caught in the dilemma that Edna Longley identified; but if recent publications are anything to go by then perhaps

approaches associated with cultural studies are being obliged to take more account of empirical evidence, or 'stuff'; while historical approaches are becoming more conceptually daring. And if this is not happening, let's ensure that it does.

Notes

1 Not accepted however by Jim MacLaughlin, who writes in his *Reimagining the Nation State: The Contested Terrains of Nation-Building* (London: Pluto Press, 2001), 6: 'Nations, whatever their scale, were 'historical happenings' and geographical constructs. They were rarely abstract 'imagined communities' as Anderson implies. They were never the 'natural' homelands of 'people' as nationalists insist. They entailed a tremendous amount of social and environmental engineering [...]. They authenticated themselves, or more accurately had structures of authenticity imposed on them [...] nationalisms in Ireland were always expressions of practical politics. As such, nationalism, whether in unionist or nationalist separatist garb, was always rooted in concrete socio-historical formations and in well-defined geographical milieux'.

2 Freud, of course, came up with quite a different explanation for why thousands of young men were prepared to die for patriarchal nation-states.

3 I am using the word here in the sense of those people who were sufficiently wealthy and sufficiently devoted/obsessed to share their findings through Societies like the Royal Society.

4 OED defines anthropology as I: The science of man, or of mankind, in the widest sense. This seems to have been the original application of the word in English but for two-and-a-half centuries, to c.1860, the term was commonly confined to the sense b. Since that date, it has sometimes been limited by reaction, to c. **b**. The science of the nature of man, embracing Human Physiology and Psychology and their mutual bearing. **c**. The 'study of man as an animal' (Latham). The branch of science which investigates the position of man zoologically, his 'evolution' and history as a race of animated beings.

5 I am using the term for this article in the sense that it is defined by John Gascoigne in *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment: Useful Knowledge and Polite Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994, 33-4) where the English Enlightenment is distinguished from the French by characterizing it as 'a set of barely conscious social attitudes which coloured the actions and values of society'.

6 OED defines sociology as The science or study of the origin, history, and constitution of human society; social science. First recorded use **1843** *Blackwoods Magazine* LIII, 397: These are to constitute a new science, to be called Social Ethics or Sociology.

7 'If we consider the character of the newer nationalisms which, between 1820 and 1920, mark them off from their ancestors. First, in almost all of them "national print-languages" were of central ideological and political importance [...]. Second, all were able to work from visible models provided by their distant, and after the convulsions of the French revolution, not so distant, predecessors'. (67) 'Print-language is what invents nationalism, not *a* particular language *per se*'. (134)

8 The designation derives from the journal edited by Lucien Febvre and others from 1946, which appeared quarterly between 1946-1960 and then bimonthly from 1961. The title is sometimes cited as: *Annales, économies, sociétés, civilisations*, 1946-1993; then as: *Annales, histoire, sciences sociales*.

9 Eric Aurebach's *Mimesis* is quoted with approval on pages 16, 23-4 and 68-9; while much of the analysis of fiction in the section of chapter 3 entitled "Apprehensions of Time" (22-36) derives

from works like Wayne C Booth's *The Rhetoric of Fiction* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). Booth is not cited in the bibliography of Anderson's *Imagined Communities*. The theoretical work that Anderson does cite with approval that has a bearing on his anthropological approach to defining community but does not seem to have influenced his literary analysis is: Victor Turner, *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.

10 'We have also seen that for essentially administrative purposes these dynasties had, at different speeds, settled on certain print-vernaculars as languages-of-state – with the choice of language essentially a matter of unselfconscious inheritance or convenience'. (84)

Works Cited

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism.* London: Verso, 1893; 1991.

Aurebach, Eric. *Mimesis: The Representation of Reality in Western Literature.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953.

Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Cullingford, Elizabeth Butler. *Ireland's Others: Gender and Ethnicity in Irish Literature and Popular Culture Field Day Monographs No 10*. Cork: Cork University Press in association with Field Day, 2001.

Eliot, T. S. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1932; 1972.

Foster, John Wilson. *Colonial Consequences: Essays in Irish Literature and Culture*. Dublin: The Lilliput Press, 1991.

Gascoigne, John. *Joseph Banks and the English Enlightenment: Useful Knowledge and Polite Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Kiberd, Declan. *Irish Classics*. London: Granta Books, 2000.

Longley, Edna. *The Living Stream: Literature and Revisionism in Ireland.* Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books, 1994.

MacLaughlin, Jim. *Reimagining the Nation State: The Contested Terrains of Nation-Building*. London: Pluto Press, 2001.

Moore, George. *Vale*. London: William Heinemann, 1914.

Turner, Victor. *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors: Symbolic Action in Human Society*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1974.