

FLS

外國文學研究

全國中文(世界文學類)核心期刊 / AHCI 收錄期刊

Vol. 30, No. 5 October 2008



Foreign Literature Studies

中國武漢
WUHAN CHINA



Foreign Literature Studies (ISSN 1003 - 7519, CN42 - 1060 / I), one of China's top academic journals on foreign literature studies, is edited and published bimonthly by Central China Normal University, Wuhan, China. It is indexed in *The Arts & Humanities Citation Index (AHCI)*, *The MLA International Bibliography*, *Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (ABELL)*, *Chinese Social Science Citation Index (CSSCI)*, and *China National Core List of Journals*.

©Copyright by *Foreign Literature Studies*. All rights reserved.

International subscription is made through China International Book Trading Company, P. O. Box 399, Beijing 100044, China, at the annual rate of USD150 with postage included. International subscription code number: BM255.

Books for review should be sent to the editorial address below. All relevant books will be briefly noticed in the "Books Received" section of the journal.

Manuscripts must follow MLA Style and should not exceed 9000 words each. The manuscript should be submitted with a 200-word abstract and 3-5 key words included. Submission by e-mail or by mail is welcome; each manuscript, if submitted by mail, should be accompanied with a diskette containing the electronic version of the article, which is preferably in Microsoft Word format.

Please send manuscripts, books for review, and other communications to:
Editorial Office, *Foreign Literature Studies*, Central China Normal University
152 Luoyu Road, Wuhan 430079
People's Republic of China
Telephone: 86-27-6786 6042
<http://fls.cnu.edu.cn/>
Email: wwyj@mail.cnu.edu.cn

外国文学研究 目录

亚洲生态批评研究

- The Logic of Sustainability in Ikezawa Natsuki's Ecofiction Masami Raker Yuki(1)
- Feminine Writing and Naturalized Ethic of Mary Oliver Peter I-min Huang(10)
- The Ecocritical Unconscious: Early Modern Sleep as "Go-between" Simon C. Estok(20)
- Visions of Eco-apocalypse in Selected Malaysian Poetry in English:
Cecil Rajendra and Muhammad Haji Salleh Agnes S. K. Yeow(30)

陀思妥耶夫斯基研究

- 文化试错的民族寓言:《罪与罚》的一种解读 刘亚丁(43)
- 从“地下室人”到“群魔”
——陀思妥耶夫斯基与俄国虚无主义 朱建刚(50)

东方文学研究

- 历史叙述、人物塑造与话语权力:文化诗学观照下的扫罗与大卫王形象 王立新(58)
- 对《罗生门》的哲学解读 邱紫华 陈欣(70)
- 论朝鲜朝梦游录小说中的女性形象及其近代因素 孙惠欣(78)
- 从《徒然草》看吉田兼好的生命美学 隽雪艳(87)

美国文学研究

- “和”:谭恩美长篇小说伦理思想的核心 邹建军(92)
- 克里斯蒂娜·加西娅在《梦系古巴》中的历史书写 李保杰 苏永刚(104)

Contents

Ecocriticism in Asia

The Logic of Sustainability in Ikezawa Natsuki's Ecofiction

Masami Raker Yuki 1

Feminine Writing and Naturalized Ethic of Mary Oliver

Peter I-min Huang 10

The Ecocritical Unconscious: Early Modern Sleep as "Go-between"

Simon C. Estok 20

Visions of Eco-apocalypse in Selected Malaysian Poetry in English: Cecil Rajendra and
Muhammad Haji Salleh

Agnes S. K. Yeow 30

Dostoevsky Studies

A Trial and Error of Cultures as National Allegory: An Interpretation of *Crime and Punishment*

Liu Yading 43

From "Underground Man" to "the Devils": Dostoevsky and the Russian Nihilism

Zhu Jiangang 50

Oriental Literature Studies

The Narrative in History, Portrayal of Characters and Discourse Powers: A Cultural Poetic

Analysis of King Saul and King David in Hebrew *Bible*

Wang Lixin 58

The Philosophical Interpretation of *Rassymon*

Qiu Zihua Chen Xin 70

Study on Female Images and Modern Factors in Mongyurok of Chosen Dynasty

Sun Huixin 78

The "Aesthetics of Life" Revealed in Yoshida Kenko's *Tsurezuregusa*

Juan Xueyan 87

American Literature Studies

“Harmony”: the Crucial Ethical Thought in Amy Tan’s Novels

Zou Jianjun 92

Historical Writing in Cristina Garcia’s *Dreaming in Cuban*

Li Baojie Su Yonggang 104

A Literary Ethical Interpretation of *Island of the Blue Dolphins*

Guan Hefeng 111

Lolita: Nabokov’s Polymorphous Butterfly

He Yueqiu 118

Saul Bellow’s Criticism of Consumerism—*More Die of Heartbreak* as an Example

Ji Xiaohong 125

Review Articles

Tracing the Poetic Beauty in the Dialogue with Shakespeare: Mr. Fang Ping’s Translation and Study of Shakespeare’s Works

Li Weimin 131

The Moral Metaphor in *The Portrait of Dorain Gray*

Liu Maosheng 137

An Eco-feminist Interpretation of Atwood’s *The Handmaid’s Tale*

Zhang Dongmei Fu Jun 144

Dissemination of French Modernist Literature in the Early New Period in China

Ye Liwen 153

On the Language Strategy of *Foe*

Wang Chengyu 160

An Australian Who Hovers Between the Hell and the Heaven in *Bliss*

Peng Qinglong 168

Brief Introduction to Professor Cao Shunqing Back Cover

The Ecocritical Unconscious: Early Modern Sleep as “Go-between”^①

Simon C. Estok

Abstract: The author claims that although the matter of sleep (not to mention early modern representations of it) seems a very unlikely topic for ecocriticism, the topic does in fact connect with ecocriticism in several important ways. Sleep raises questions about the boundaries of “the human” and functions as a sort of “go-between” in the early modern imagination. It raises questions about what the early moderns imagined as “natural” daily patterns and about the imagined consequences for going against such patterns. Moreover, since musings on sleep almost uniformly share inherent antipathies toward diurnal wakefulness, conceptualizations of darkness as sites of evil that are associated with the natural world have obvious and compelling implications to questions about race. Finally, the author maintains that a strategic thematic ecocriticism has some functional value, since it can help lay conceptual foundations that might otherwise be overlooked—as has certainly been the case with sleep and its relations to ecocriticism.

Key words: Shakespeare sleep ecocritical theory ecophobia ecocriticism and animals

Author: Simon C. Estok is associate professor at Sungkyunkwan University in Seoul (Seoul, 110-745, South Korea). He specializes in ecocritical theory and Shakespeare. Email: estok@skku.edu

标题:生态无意识:作为“跨界”的早期现代文学中的睡眠

内容提要:尽管睡眠(更不用说早期现代文学对它的表现)看上去不太像是一个生态批评的话题,本文作者却认为它实际上与生态批评在若干个方面有着重要的联系。睡眠就“人类”的边界提出疑问,在早期现代文学的想象中起到了一个“跨界”的作用。它质疑的对象为早期现代人想象中“自然”的白日模式,以及想象中由于不遵循这些模式而导致的后果。不仅如此,人们对于睡眠的考虑几乎无一例外地表露出对不眠之夜的厌恶,黑暗被概念化成与自然界相联系的罪恶场所这一事实也因此引发了一些有关种族问题的思考。最后,论文作者提出,建立一个战略性的以主题为线索的生态批评模式具有一定的实用价值,因为正如我们通过睡眠与生态批评的关系这一例证所见的,它可以帮助建立极易被忽视的概念基础。

关键词:莎士比亚 睡眠 生态批评理论 生态恐惧 生态批评与动物

作者简介:西蒙·艾斯托克,韩国首尔成均馆大学副教授,研究生态批评理论和莎士比亚。

Variouly conceptualized as bestial passivity, dangerous inattention, sweet restoration, concord, preservation of life, imitation of death, the product of an insomniac mind, and, among other things, a wildly inconsistent motif, sleep in Shakespeare is bafflingly mercurial in early modern thinking, something that goes between different conceptual spaces, something that (for the main-

tenance of cultural stability) mediates between agonistic time categories (night/morning), themselves ideologically fascinating. Sleep, a go-between, a mediator of the very categories of "the human" and all that lies beyond, is one of the great unattended driving forces in the mapping of early modern culture—and it is an ecocritical issue acutely present in Shakespeare.

Preamble

The first published instance articulating a potential relationship between ecocriticism and Shakespeare appeared in the South Korean journal *Shakespeare Review* in 1998 (see Estok, "Environmental Implications"). Since that time, it has become an increasingly less provocative proposition that ecocriticism might have something to say about Shakespeare, increasingly less with every new conference session, article, and book (there are two) dedicated to the subject. So accepted have the unlikely partners become that by 2006, The World Shakespeare Congress was doing a whole panel on the topic in Brisbane, followed shortly thereafter by an article entitled "Theory from the Fringes: Animals, Ecocriticism, Shakespeare" (Estok 2007) in *Mosaic*, Canada's top literary journal. Indeed, as Karen Raber has scrupulously noted in her study of virtually all scholarship up to February 2007 that has anything to do with the environment in the early modern period, "some of the most promising and critically challenging work comes from efforts to reconsider in an ecocritical light historical contexts" for various issues that have been studied extensively from other angles (168). It is in the spirit of such efforts that the following argument proceeds.

First, though, it is important to note that doing ecocriticism with Shakespeare is something of a tight-rope balancing act between valid Shakespearean scholarship on the one hand and real ecological advocacy on the other. One starts to wonder about the actual ecocriticism; what exactly is it, what does it seek with Shakespeare, and how does it work? Is a Shakespearean ecocriticism at all useful to contemporary environmental discussions, and, by the same token, do literary theories about representations of environmental issues have any place in serious Shakespearean scholarship? Moreover, if we do agree to apply ecocriticism to works of a writer such as Shakespeare, is there a case compelling enough to persuade Shakespeareans of the usefulness of ecocriticism and to convince ecocritics that the growth and development of ecocriticism itself stands to gain substantially from readings of Shakespeare?

Sleep as either a thematic or a theoretical issue certainly seems an unlikely candidate for ecocritical readings of Shakespeare, but a guiding principle of ecocriticism is the need to connect issues that seem disparate, and ideas about sleep (in the early modern period generally and Shakespeare in particular) connect with ecocriticism in several important ways: 1) sleep intimates bestiality and thereby generates considerable literary representations of antipathy; 2) diurnal sleep is seen and represented as disturbing humanity's place in Nature's order; and 3) night and darkness (the proper covers of sleep) are consistently imagined as the flipside of everything good in Nature, indeed of much that constitutes an abhorred Nature. Let us, then, examine each of these categories in detail.

1. Against sleep

The prevailing morbid fear of impotence before forces natural that sleep represents in Shakespeare's England stems from the common belief that sleep was a cross-over into the animal world.

A direct and intimate link to Nature, thus, sleep represents in many ways unpredictability and the kind of loss of agency and control that so often generates ecophobia.² The most horrifying intrusion of Nature into human affairs that are mistakenly perceived to be separate from Nature is, of course, death. While there are many things about Nature and natural processes that we can con-

trol, obviously death is not one of them. Early modern understandings of sleep as a kind of death are very telling witnesses to the belief that sleep is a go-between, a mediator of the very categories of “the human” and all that lies beyond.

Michael Sparke’s 1638 comment that “Sleepe [is] a kind of middle thing betweene death and life” (24) echoes in Lady Macbeth’s comment that “The sleeping and the dead/ Are but as pictures” (2.2.56-57).^③ That sleep was a close sibling to Death was, according to Jean Robertson, “a commonplace from the time of Homer” (140), and it remains so in the early modern period. Sparke continues, but with growing antipathy toward sleep, arguing that “Sleepe is proper to the body, not the soule, (for even then are we to be awake in soule, when wee sleepe in body) so dieth man in respect of his body, not his soule” (25). The idea here is that the mind is above the sordidness and compunctions of Nature, the body dying while the mind remains alive (if not alert), or so the rhetoricians would have it.

The antipathy toward sleep recurs famously in *Hamlet*, when the eponymous hero speaks with contempt about sleep, asking “What is a man/If his chief good and market of his time/Be but to sleep and feed? A beast, no more” (4.4.33-35). The connection here of sleeping and feeding with animality—and, therefore, with the danger of boundary-blurring—could not be more clear.

Certainly in *Hamlet*, as George Walton Williams rightly notes, “one might go so far as to say that the image for the sleeper is the beast” (“Sleep in Hamlet” 18). The interstices opened by the obsession with marking the human/animal, culture/nature boundaries in the Renaissance are filled with the sometimes lurid, often animalized, and always fickle go-between that sleep came to embody. David Bevington maintains that “Sleep becomes a more ambiguous state in Renaissance drama than in its earlier manifestations; it grows more difficult to ‘read’ as a theatrical signifier” (53), and, indeed, the various Renaissance definitions themselves of sleep are multiple, ranging from claims that it is nothing but an imitation of death to it being “one of the chiefe poynts of well ordering and gouerning ones self: concerning which there are certaine generall rules to be observed of them which are desirous to keep back and hinder the hastie accesse of old age” (du Laurens, qtd. in Dannenfeldt 422), “death’s counterfeit” (*Hamlet* 2.3.76) or “chief nourisher in life’s feast” (2.2.37). So, while it is not always nor everywhere an indicator of animality, sleep, as a scapegoat or as a preserver, is often outside of the troubled (and heavily smeared) boundary that defines the “human.”

At one and the same time “swinish” (*Macbeth* 1.7.67) and a “Balm of hurt minds, great natures’ second course” (2.2.36), sleep is a thing natural. The stark contrast between the representations of sleep is, in some ways, a reflection of the acute ambivalence toward the natural world, a world beckoned both to validate and to invalidate epistemologies, as the occasion demanded; but, as, Jean-Marie Maguin has so meticulously (if a bit arithmetically) argued, it is beyond question that

Shakespeare’s interest in night is constant and manifold. He uses it for comedy and tragedy alike. The volume of nocturnal action per type of play is telling: 2 percent of nocturnal action in the romances, 12 percent in the history plays, 16 percent in the comedies. The figure climbs to 25 percent for the tragedies. . . . tragedy appears to have a natural affinity for it. This close accord between night and tragedy is no doubt an anthropological feature. (248)

But exactly what is it, then, that accounts for such a high association of nocturnal action and sleep with tragedy?

Joseph Meeker’s *Comedy of Survival* goes a long way to helping us answer this question. It

predates but leans heavily toward ecocriticism and has recently received substantial and positively glowing re-evaluations from the ecocritical community, largely (and rightly) on the grounds that it was far, far ahead of its time. Written in 1972, it argues that "literary tragedy and environmental exploitation in Western culture share many of the same philosophical presuppositions" (24). Meeker maintains that tragedy is a genre that strongly affirms the status of humanity over the natural world, a world which the genre figures as hostile. Trademarks of tragedy are impotence before Nature, a persistent inability to conquer, subdue, and maintain control over Nature. We see this, for instance, repeatedly in one of the greatest of all tragedies, *King Lear*, where we are lead dramatically into a profound fear of wild natures, human and nonhuman. The height of individualism in Shakespeare's tragedies marks the height of anthropocentric thinking and desires for control of Nature. Sleep is Nature's incursion—and a very intimate one—into the lives of humans, a bestial incursion with tragic potentials. In many ways, too, the bestial implications of sleep are indeed a prerequisite of the suffering tragic subject.

Dinesh Wadiwel has recently made the connection eloquently clear; the "greatest acts of violence against humans appear to be accompanied by a dehumanisation that is of commensurate intensity" (1, emphasis added). Inappropriate sleep bestializes. Yet, we perhaps do well to contest the notion of "dehumanization"; if the subject of tragedy is generally stripped to the core (as *Lear* certainly is), tragedy supports Giorgio Agamben's notion that "the animal" is not outside of but at the core of humanity,⁴ that "the animal" is the skeleton that must be clothed in human flesh, as it were. Either way, whether "the animal" is imagined outside of or at the core of humanity, it is an undesirable site to which "the human" is loathe to go, one, though, to which the tragic subject is conveyed, and not infrequently through sleep.

It would be a gross misrepresentation of the facts, however, to suggest that only tragedy dramatizes a philosophy against sleep. Even a more comic play such as *The Tempest* echoes the dangers of sleep (or, more precisely, of the things that can happen during sleep): Ariel warns, "If of life, you keep a care, / Shake off slumber, and beware. / Awake, awake!" (2. 1. 303-05). Richard Levin has recently put the case very simply: sleeping in general was dangerous because "it left the napper vulnerable" (13).

Sleep's removal of agency makes it a useful stage device: "when rhetorical persuasion or physical violence cannot succeed, putting someone to sleep is always a viable, albeit temporary, solution" (Lewin 186). Indeed, there is no shortage of examples of "the sleeping victim" on Shakespeare's stage, as David Roberts points out in his meticulous list (235). Sleep was a fascination to Shakespeare, no doubt because the loss of agency in the sleeper put all of the power in the wakeful. On stage, this puts a lot of power and responsibility into the audience. Writing sleep means writing a kind of voyeurism of somnolence. "Watching sleep," according to Roberts, "[...] was a matter of almost obsessive concern to Shakespeare. No dramatist represents the act of sleep more frequently or graphically than he does" (ibid). And the power relationship between sleeper and wakeful is rarely innocent in Shakespeare. Rarely are the representations laudatory of sleep; the contrary is more often the rule. At best, suspicious things happen when people sleep in Shakespeare; at worst, down-right malevolent things occur.

Antipathy toward sleep notwithstanding, though, sleep remains Nature's vehicle, over which people remain largely impotent. Sir Spencer St. John's comments of 1908 remain pertinent: "nature effects different purposes through the agency of sleep [in Shakespeare]: sometimes, as in the case of *Banquo*, stimulating to evil; more frequently, as in the case of *Macbeth*, inflicting chastisement for evil committed" (196). The key word here, though subtly understated, is "nature."

2. Against diurnal sleep

No less in Shakespeare's day than in our own, sleep is commonly held to be the natural property of night, not day, that it only happens diurnally by mischance, special circumstance, or more sinister and unnatural reasons. Henry the Fourth laments having offended a personified and gendered sleep, calling her "Nature's soft nurse" (2H4, 3.1.6-7), and wishing for the normalcy and naturalness of sleep to fall upon him at night, the time when so many of his subjects are asleep. It is a very common theme in Shakespeare that sleeping during the day is bad and goes very much against Nature.

George Walton Williams maintains somewhat more gingerly that "there is some indication that sleeping by day has pejorative associations in the plays" ("Shakespeare's Metaphors" 195). Williams argues extensively, noting that Shylock faults Launcelot Gobbo because he "sleeps by day" (2.5.45); that the Old Hamlet goes to sleep in the afternoon (1.5.59-60), with bad consequences; that Alonzo in *The Tempest* nearly loses his life by sleeping in the afternoon; that Falstaff, "wrong in many things... is also wrong in taking sleep in the day... is notable for his use of the night as the time of wakefulness and his keenest activity" (Williams, "Shakespeare's Metaphors" 196), and is, in short, guilty of "sleeping upon benches after noon" (1H4 1.2.3-4); that there are numerous examples of the corollary view that it is wrong to work at night; and that Hotspur also makes inappropriate use of the night by riding (2H4 5.3.129; 1H4 3.1.140) (196). And Shakespeare would have been well familiar with the Hippocratic ideal that people should "follow the natural custom of being awake during the day and sleep during the night," and any change in this pattern was a bad sign" (Dannenfeldt 417).

Whether or not Shakespeare had read Avicenna, his works were certainly in circulation and having influence in early modern England. One of the gems from Avicenna for early modern sleep doctors was the argument that: "[...] it was not good to sleep during the day, for this brought on illnesses associated with humidity, healthy coloring was lessened, the spleen became heavy, the sinews lost their tone, vim and appetite were lost, and fevers often appeared. If a person was accustomed to sleeping during the day, this practice should gradually be eliminated" (Dannenfeldt 419). The idea—and it was very commonly-held—was that sleeping during the day meant going against Nature, which meant nothing good. Just how common was this view?

There is a surprising abundance of writing on the subject. The prolific writer and physician Andrew Boorde maintains in 1562 "men, of what age or complexyon soever they be... , shuld take theyr natural rest and slepe in the nyght &... exchew merydyall slepe" (Regyment 246). Similarly, in 1599, the influential physician Andrea Du Laurens urges "Let euery man watch well ouer himselfe, that he use no sleepe at noone... It is good (saith Hippocrates) to sleepe onely in the night, and to keepe waking in the daytime. Sleeping at nooneday is very dangerous, and maketh all the body heauie and blowneup" (157; 189-90). There is no question that "There was general agreement" as Dannenfeldt claims, "that night-time was the best time to sleep" (424) and that, to borrow a phrase from Keith Thomas, "it was bestial to work at night" (39) in early modern England.

The invocation of Nature as the final arbiter for nocturnal sleep in early modern thinking finds expression in Tobias Venner's 1637 argument that

[...] we must follow the course of Nature, that is, to wake in the day, and sleep in the night: Dies enim vigiliae, nox somno dicata est. For the Sun by his radiant beames illuminating our Hemisphere, openeth the pores of the body, and dilateth the humors and spirits from

the Center to the circumferent parts, which to waking and necessary actions doth excite and naturally provoke. But on the contrary, when the Sunne departeth from our Hemisphere, all things are coarctated, and the spirits return into the bowels and inmost parts of the body, which naturally invite to sleep. Wherefore, if we pervert the order of Nature, as to sleep in the day, and wake in the night, we violently resist the motion of Nature, for sleep draweth the naturall heat inward, and the heat of day draweth it outward, so that there is made as it were, a fight and combat with Nature to the ruine of the body. (270-71)

Indeed, as Richard Levin has claimed, sleeping during the day "was regarded not only as abnormal and undignified but also as somewhat immoral (a violation of the emerging Protestant 'work ethic')" (13). If sleep is associated with evil and evil nature, no less so is night and darkness.

3. Against night

Much of the villainy and otherness of early modern literature depend for their full effect on the presence of an essentialized understanding of color, a chromotypic essentialism that defines residential evil in anything from clouds, yew trees, asses, dogs, and crows, to people, seasons, and hours. In John Webster's *The White Devil*, evil resides in nocturnicity, and because women are repeatedly associated with night, the essentialized understandings of night and of women form a kind of joint subjectification; moreover, since women are also associated with animals in the most unflattering of ways, it seems remiss to neglect ecocritical commentary.

In *The White Devil*, whatever "blurring [of] the play's black/white, good/evil polarities" (Luckyj, ns. d. 2-3, 52-53) occurs, unpleasant associations attached to blackness fall thick and heavy throughout: we get "black lust" (3.1.7); "black deed" (5.3.251; 5.5.12; and 5.6.300); "black concatenation" (3.2.29); "black Fury" (5.6.227); "black storm" (5.6.248); and "black charnel" (5.6.270). Francisco says in defence of Vittoria "I do not think she hath a soul so black/ To act a deed so bloody" (3.2.183-84). Monticelso keeps a "black book" (4.1.33) in which he keeps "the names of all notorious offenders/ Lurking about the city" (4.1.31-32); he calls Lodovico "a foul black cloud" (4.3.99) and talks about "the black and melancholic yew tree" (4.3.120); Flamineo, in disguise as "Mulinassar, a Moor," says he loves Zanche, "that Moor, that witch" (5.1.153) and several times compares her to a dog; Marcello compares Zanche to "crows" (5.1.196); Zanche says that she disliked her blackness until she met Mulinassar (5.1.213); "eternal darkness," Vittoria explains, "was made for devils" (5.6.63-64)—in short, images of darkness invoke the natural environment in the process of conveying meaning, and in so doing produce the natural environment as both an active participant in and passive victim of racism. In other words, invoking the natural environment as a discursive resource for vilifying blackness means including the natural environment in the project of racism; it also means producing the environment as an object analogous to the vilified black Other. There is nothing ecologically innocent about racism; plants, animals, time, and people are alike tarred with the same brush, producing a bi-directional assault—one leveling people to the same sphere of moral considerability as the environment, the other ascribing a set of values to an insentient and neutral Nature. Moreover, Flamineo complains that "women are like/ cursed dogs; civility keeps them tied all daytime, but/ they are let loose at midnight" (1.2.196-98), further entrenching the link between women and non-human animals and the danger that they represent at night if allowed liberty.

The writing of nocturnal alterity has implications for discussions about environmental ethics,

and there are heaps of examples of this kind of writing. In *The White Devil* alone, there are several noteworthy instances. We learn, for instance, that “your melancholic hare/ Feed [s] after midnight” (3.3.82-3), and we see a linking of nighttime life with madness, lechery, and bestialism. When Flamineo asks Lodovico if he had “to live [like] a lousy creature. . . Like one/ that had forever forfeited the daylight” (3.3.116-17), we understand that night life is undesirable. We might note that the othering of nocturnicity is still an issue, since the business world is geared to people who live diurnally. Nocturnal people have fewer entertainment opportunities, their shopping choices are often limited to expensive convenience stores, their jobs tend to be undesirable, and so on.

One of the world-inverting effects of 9/11 was that it happened in broad daylight. We do not expect evil under the garish eye of day. If, as Vittoria explains in *The White Devil*, “eternal darkness was made for devils” (5.6.63-64) in the early modern period, nighttime in the 21st century is no less the time for evil. Contemporary cultural representations of villainy seem in many ways to be associated with night: the Batman movies occur almost entirely at night (and we might note that the eponymous hero is a bestial hybrid—half human, half bat—ideally suited to fight the bestial crimes of the seemingly always dark Gothic City), Christian mythology never mentions a nighttime in heaven, ghosts and vampires don’t come up with the sun, and so on. The villains of cultural imaginations early modern and present in the West often do their work at night and sleep during the day; and as we have seen, sleep during the day is represented in terms of unnaturalness as a thing that cannot lead to any good.

Night is also associated with witches throughout the early modern period generally and Shakespeare specifically. It is more than a simple disruption of order^⑤ that witches promise; it is a thorough-going threat of confusion of the very boundaries that define the human. We see such confusion, for instance, in the transient corporeality of the witches as they melt into the air, “as breath into wind” (1.3.82) in *Macbeth*. These witches, who “look not like th’ inhabitants o’ th’ earth” (1.3.41), are, as Stallybrass observes, “connected with disorder in nature (not only thunder and lightning but also ‘fog and filthy air’)” (“*Macbeth*” 195). They are also associated with the undecidable meteorological conditions of “so foul and fair a day” (1.3.38), the likes of which *Macbeth* has never seen and, more importantly, with the surrealism sleep engenders. Part of this, and further distancing them from proper natural human form, was the belief that witches could control the weather, an unnatural power possessed by unnaturally powerful people (among them, Prospero)^⑥. *Macbeth*’s witches are creatures of the night that challenge the boundaries of the human through their associations with Nature, through their gender-bending and possession of beards, and through their seeming ability to be immune to the need for sleep. Indeed, it is through the witches that *Macbeth* comes to “murder sleep” (2.2.35), comes to kill “the death of each day’s life” (1.37), producing a metaphor that turns in on itself in an absurdly unnatural way.

The deformities here are as much physical as conceptual, disruptions on many levels of natural order and human thinking, with all of the bizarre implications that killing the death of day (sleep) might imply.

Implications

Though sleep seems an unlikely object for ecocritical readings of Shakespeare, sleep (both as a theoretical and thematic issue) connects with ecocriticism in several important ways. Authors have written against sleep because of the bestiality it evokes. Writers have railed against diurnal sleep because it is thought to disrupt natural order. And the associations of night, darkness, and

evil with sleep have filled the pages of early modern literature, with strong implications for how we understand early modern environmental ethics.

For ecocritical theorists, discussion of sleep in the early modern period is a very far cry from an activist ecocriticism, very far from the kinds of interventions against the very real and violent depredations that ecocritical readings seek to make. For all intents and purposes, discussions such as the ones offered above amount to little more than thematic ecocriticism, fall far short of the activist position that characterize the embryonic stages of ecocritical endeavor and, indeed, much of my own work. Thematic ecocriticism, though, must be defensible insofar as it offers foundational work on conceptual connections. Regarding sleep, both theoretical and thematic discussions about sleep have been sparse to date; have largely faltered because they have left unexplored the conceptual interfaces among such topics as race, night, crime, and safety; and have looked instead at image patterns, authorial dexterity, and matters of artistic cohesiveness. I have sought here to explore this largely unexplored in-between space of sleep more with an eye to making ideological connections than to foregrounding matters of imagery and thematicism (both of which, however, remain important both in the above discussions and in work yet to be done with sleep).

Recently, Timothy Morton has argued that lot of what claims to be ecocriticism is really a movement back to a different, earlier kind of criticism, that "just as the Reagan and Bush administrations attempted a re-run of the 1950s, as if the 1960s had never happened, so ecocriticism promises to return to an academy of the past" (20). Ecocriticism is potentially radical, if it does what it promises. The breadth and potential reach of its analytical scope, with its various commitments (social and environmental) make ecocriticism very different from other theories. Doing ecocriticism means facing those commitments.

Doing ecocriticism with Shakespeare means doing it with an eye to what was going on at the time, and this means seeing (not inventing) radical connections and explaining them. Part of this for ecocriticism has meant also using tools that are new. Ecocriticism is one such family of tools, and like screwdrivers that have different species, ecocriticism has different branches. Theorizing ecophobia, which has been at least a part of my project here, is one of the branches of ecocriticism, one that helps us to articulate a methodology that is both useful and necessary.

For Shakespeareans, the very mention of ecocriticism has brought strong responses—not only of interest. One of the problems in doing ecocriticism with Shakespeare is that, as Frederick Waage observes, "'ecocritics' seem to be held to higher standards than 'other kinds of theorists' in defining both their approach and its applicability to literature of the [early modern] period" (140). Perhaps these higher standards are a valid requirement, a requirement that spells the difference between purely thematic criticism that often comes very close to the work of ecocriticism on the one hand and work that actually does what ecocriticism seeks to do on the other. Take, for example, Jennifer Lewin's comments that "sleep can represent either the vulnerable lure of oblivion or the eerier attractions of seizing control over one's circumstances" (190). While there is nothing untrue here, the comments, though they come tantalizingly close to making radical connections, in fact, fail to do so. An ecocritical reading, far from rejecting Lewin's insights, though, will build on them. Thus, both scenarios Lewin notes are removals from the control that characterizes the rationalist pursuit of power and the humanist pursuit of realizing the self-governing individualist ego, pursuits increasingly characteristic of early modern values, values contingent on a rejection of nature's autonomy and agency in favor of control. Sleep, simply put, threatens that control. The "higher standard," then, of which Waage speaks, is perhaps to be expected, since ecocriticism seeks a much more sophisticated and developed set of responses than the "'other kinds of theorists'" he mentions.

This essay has sought those responses, to prove that sleep—and the ecophobia that supports and is supported by its representations in the early modern period—is clearly a complex issue, one acutely implicated and imbricated with discourses about environment.

[Notes]

- ① This paper was supported by the Seok Chun Research Foundation at Sungkyunkwan University (Seoul) in 2008.
- ② Arguments appear elsewhere (Estok 2001; Estok 2005) about the need to develop a paradigm through which we can discuss the fear and hatred of the natural world (animal and other); about the fact that there is no comparable word in the ecocritical vocabulary to words such as “misogyny,” “homophobia,” “Anti-Semitism,” or “racism;” and have suggested the term “ecophobia.” Clinical psychology uses the same term to designate an irrational fear of home; in ecocriticism, the term is independent of and in no way derived from the manner in which it is used in psychology and psychiatry. Ecophobia is an irrational and groundless hatred of the natural world, as present and subtle in our daily lives and literature as homophobia and racism and sexism. It plays out in many spheres; it sustains the personal hygiene and cosmetics industries (which cite Nature’s “flaws” and “blemishes” as objects of their work); it supports city sanitation boards that issue fines seeking to keep out “pests” and “vermin” associated in municipal mentalities with long grass; it keeps beauticians and barbers in business; it is behind landscaped gardens and trimmed poodles in women’s handbags on the Seoul subway system; it is what makes looting and plundering of animal and non-animal resources possible; it is something about which it is about power and control; ecocriticism needs to start theorizing.
- ③ All references are to *The Riverside Shakespeare*.
- ④ My intention here, however, is not to confirm and endorse Agamben’s rather naïve and simplistic idea that “Dasein is simply an animal that has learned to become bored; it has awakened from its captivation to its own captivation” (2004: 70); instead, without fully endorsing Agamben, we can understand that his continuing contribution to the on-going discussion about “the animal question” is one of a movement away from separation of human and animal.
- ⑤ See also Peter Stallybrass, “Macbeth and Witchcraft” and Stuart Clark, “Inversion, Misrule, and the Meaning of Witchcraft.”
- ⑥ In Middleton and Rowley’s *The Changeling*, Jasperino makes reference to the superstition that witches could control weather when he tells Alsemero that, even if he “could buy a gale amongst the witches” (1.1.17), he couldn’t hope for better winds than were prevailing.

[Works Cited]

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Ed. Werner Hamacher. Stanford, CA: Stanford UP, 2004.
- Bevington, David. “Asleep Onstage.” *From Page to Performance: Essays in Early English Drama*. East Lansing: Michigan State UP, 1995. 51–83.
- Boorde, Andrew. *The Fyrst Booke of the Introduction of Knowledge. A Compendyous Regyment; or, A Dyetary of Helth Made in Mowntpyllier. Barnes in the Defence of the Berde (1562)*. (Facsimile reproduction). London: Adamant Media Co, 2001.
- Clark, Stuart. “Inversion, misrule and the meaning of witchcraft.” *Past and Present* 87 (May 1980): 98–127.
- Dannenfeldt, Karl. H. “Sleep: Theory and Practice in the Late Renaissance.” *The Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 41 (October 1986): 415–41.
- Du Laurens, Andrea. *A Discourse of the Preservation of the Sight of Melancholic Diseases of Rheumes and of Old Age*. London: Felix Kingston for Ralph Jackson, 1599. STC 7304.
- Estok, Simon C. “Environmental Implications of the Writing and Policing of the Early Modern Body: Dismemberment and Monstrosity in Shakespearean Drama.” *Shakespeare Review* 33 (1998): 107–42.
- . “An Introduction to Shakespeare and Ecocriticism: the Special Cluster.” *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 12. 2 (Summer 2005): 109–17.
- . “A Report Card on Ecocriticism.” *AUMLA: The Journal of the Australasian Universities Language and Litera-*

- ture Association 96 (Nov. 2001): 220 - 38.
- . "Theory from the Fringes: Animals, Ecocriticism, Shakespeare." *Mosaic* 40. 1 (March 2007): 61 - 78.
- Levin, Richard. "Caught Napping or Sleeping on the Job in Shakespeare." *The Shakespeare Newsletter* 57. 1 (Spring/Summer 2007): 13 - 14.
- Lewin, Jennifer. "'Your Actions Are My Dreams': Sleepy Minds in Shakespeare's Last Plays." *Shakespeare Studies* 31 (2003): 184 - 204.
- Maguin, Jean-Marie. "Rise and Fall of the King of Darkness." *French Essays on Shakespeare and His Contemporaries: 'What would France with us?'* Ed. Jean-Marie Maguin and Michele Willems. Newark: U of Delaware P; London: Associated UP, 1995. 247 - 70.
- Meeker, Joseph. *The Comedy of Survival: Literary Ecology and a Play Ethic*. 3rd ed. Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 1997.
- Middleton, Thomas, and William Rowley. *The Changeling*. Ed. George Walton Williams. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.
- Morton, Timothy. *Ecology without Nature: Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: Harvard UP, 2007.
- Raber, Karen. "Recent Ecocritical Studies of English Renaissance Literature." *ELR: English Literary Renaissance* 37. 1 (February 2007): 151 - 71.
- Roberts, David. "Sleeping Beauties: Shakespeare, Sleep and the Stage." *Cambridge Quarterly* 35. 3 (2006): 231 - 54.
- Robertson, Jean. "Macbeth on Sleep: 'Sore Labour's Bath' and Sidney's 'Astrophil and Stella,' XXXIX." *Notes and Queries* 14 (1967): 139 - 41.
- Shakespeare, William. *The Riverside Shakespeare*, 2nd Edition. Ed. G. Blakemore Evans, et al. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1997.
- Sparke, Michael, Jr. *The Drousie Disease; or, An Alarme to Awake Church-sleepers*. London: I. D. for Michael Sparke, 1638. STC 254. 8.
- Stallybrass, Peter. "Macbeth and Witchcraft." *Focus on Macbeth*. Ed. John Russell Brown. London, Boston, and Henley: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1982. 189 - 209.
- St. John, Spencer Sir. "Philosophy: Character-Physical Science-Sleep and Dreams." *Essays on Shakespeare and His Works*. London: Smith, Elder, and Co., 1908. 182 - 98.
- Thomas, Keith. *Man and the Natural World: Changing Attitudes in England, 1500-1800*. London: Allen Lane, 1983.
- Venner, Tobias. *Via Recta ad Vitam Longam. or, A Plain Philosophicall Demonstration of the Nature, Faculties, and Effects of All Such Things as by Way of Nourishments Make for the Preservation of Health, with Divers Necessary Dieteticall Observations; as also of the True Use and Effects of Sleep, Exercise, Excretions, and Perturbations, with Just Applications to Every Age, Constitution of Body, and Time of Yeere*. London: R. Bishop, for Henry Hood, 1637. STC 24646.
- Waage, Frederick O. "Shakespeare Unearth'd." *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment* 12. 2 (Summer 2005): 139 - 64.
- Wadiwel, Dinesh. "Animal by Any Other Name? Patterson and Agamben Discuss Animal (and Human) Life." *Borderlands* 3. 1 (2004): 1 - 34. http://www.borderlandsejournal.adelaide.edu.au/vol3no1_2004/wadiwel_animal.htm (January 6, 2008).
- Webster, John. *The White Devil*. Ed. Christina Luckyj. London and New York: A & C Black and Norton, 1996.
- Williams, George Walton. "Shakespeare's Metaphors of Health: Food, Sport, and Life-preserving Rest." *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 14. 2 (Fall 1984): 187 - 202.
- . "Sleep in Hamlet." *Renaissance Papers* 1964. Ed. S. K. Heninger, Jr., et al. Durham, NC: The Southeastern University Conference, 1965. 17 - 20.