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Abstract:
In this poetic monologue, a speaking “I” confronts the fluid “you” of three deceased and/or otherwise “lost” writing mentors. The I asks, how can writers and/as teachers of writing pass on gifts of influence without also passing on the gifts’ problematic – perhaps even violent – potentials? In other words, what can one do with gifts that, though precious, seem cursed? In search of possible approaches, the I (re)considers Derrida’s and Bloom’s different-yet-relatable responses to revelations about de Man’s wartime writings. This leads to reflection on Derrida’s reputed influence on Butler’s Gender Trouble (1990), which in turn prompts speculation about the possible influence of Althusser’s The Future Lasts a Long Time (1993) on Butler’s Giving an Account of Oneself (2005). With reference to Edmond’s (2014) suggestion that ‘the dead’ can ‘speak’ through writing, the I ultimately ponders the feasibility of a “generous apophrades”: a writerly approach based on rethinking ‘apophrades’ (Bloom 1973) in connection with Derridean works on gifts, ghosts and the im/possibilities of hospitality (Derrida 1978/2002, 1986, 1988, Hillis Miller 1977, Mikics 2009).
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Obsessed! With? Her… Self. Obsessed with herself! Obsessed. With her. Self obsessed. With herself. Obsessed with herself. Obsessed with her. (self (self (her (self (self (ob (sessed (ob (sessed (ob (sess (ob (sess -i-on-and-on-an-on)))))))))))

YES! (ob (sess (I) on) and on) and on)

I AM (and on anon anon)

Therefore I Think (ink-ink, ink-ink, ink-ink)

I write (ink-ink, imprint, in print)

about my self (ob-sessed, ob-sessed, ob-sessed)

which means I think, I write about You, You, You.

My writing mentors: three youse who made me me, for there can be no her, no I without some one to whom to speak, or write, to give… an account… or at least some sense, thought, feel…ing of, feeling for… accountability. So says Judith Butler.⁴ And I agree. Why try account for a self if not for the sake of some o/Other…s? The very notion of I depends on You (and You, and You). But if that’s true, one can’t account for oneself, for if I depends on you then the self is forged in, formed from o/Otherness, always-already⁵ is, as Ricoeur and Rimbaud both knew, an o/Other to itself.⁶ Because of this, Butler insists, the self cannot know itself.⁷ All “I”s are blind, their accounts doomed to fail. The books just plain don’t balance.

So I can’t account for myself – or even her, let alone our obsessions, least of all to You… and You, and You… you men who tore my words with yours in ways I loved like blood, for those critiques hurts good. Not like later…

Fine! I don’t want to. Account. Not for me, nor her, nor self. You said, after all, she’s obsessed with herself. All three of you said it, in different ways. You made me believe… I wanted to be not that, wanted to be, to write, be read as something Other, something that might matter,⁸ might seem significant as opposed to petty, vain, insular. Yet that very want was all about self – my self as seen by o/Others.

Is there any escape? One sounder than those You and You and You opted for, I mean –suicide, addiction, silence. Is there any way to write without inciting self and all its unsightly baggage? Paul de Man says no.⁹ Although autobiography is impossible, it is equally inevitable. All writing partially portrays, betrays the de-faced face of a being being written by its own words which are never really its own.


What am I doing? Talking Butler one minute, de Man the next. She’s a queer theorist who defends precarious life.¹⁰ He was a crusty Yale nazi… or so it’s said.¹¹ There’s arguably not any connection between them…

Ah, but in every “arguably not” lurks a sneaky “arguably is” – a gun, bullet loaded, trigger waiting…

You know the deal in theatre: the gun is drawn, it must go off… but not straight away. Is this theatre? Yes. Albeit of the cheap and hackneyed kind. It’s a play of and on
words and their implications for selves and other o/Others. If not quite a play per se, a monologue – a dramatic account from an I who re-presents her, re-presents self… Or is it the other way round? A monologue about a her who has lost three writing mentors to three kinds of silence – suicide, addiction and the unspeakable – and who, from the looks of things so far, might well be losing her mind. At any rate, she has lost her ability to write, has descended, like her mentors, into silence, paralysed by fear of seeming obsessed with herself in ways offensive, maybe even unknowingly cruel, to o/Others. She has become that great cliché – the teacher of writing who no longer knows how to put pen to paper or fingers to keys. As they say, those who can, do…12 This breeds in her a deeper fear, one that feeds like a yeast on the first. Martin Edmond says the dead can speak through writing.13 By that logic they can also refuse speech, can mute what would could should have been spoken. In short, what if silence is contagious? What if she, having caught it from her mentors, is a carrier set to infect whole classes of eager young writers – infect them not just with silence but with things that led, may lead to suicide, addiction, and worse?

There are two issues at stake: one, the unavoidability, in writing and in teaching, of self and self-representation, which entails re-presentation of o/Other things, things to which the “I” is blind, things that perhaps enact violence; and two, in relation to these o/Othered, o/Othering things of the self, how / can a writer-turned-teacher practice ethicality with-and-in greater chains of influence, especially if they have been influenced by, and thus bears influences of, men who tore themselves apart in the worst kinds of ways? This second issue grows stickier if the situation is – like hers, I mean mine – one in which the mentors were in other ways oh so wonderful, if their guiding critiques were gifts that still seem precious, albeit cursed – gifts worthy of sharing, of passing on, re-gifting… to my students, I mean. Can I convey the gifts without the curses? And is there meanwhile a way to thank my mentors for their kindnesses, to forgive them some accidental sideswipes? Or, since their silences are of the kinds that also deafen, is there at least some way to pay respect, to honour what was and forget, set free what was not, thereby freeing what is, can, will be?

Let’s reconsider the gun… shortly. First, let’s reflect on the friendship of Jacques Derrida and Harold Bloom.14 Yes, blooming Harold Bloom, that damn champion of dead white males refusing to die. Harold Bloom who calls performance poetry, would call this, the death of art, who refers to postcolonialists, feminists, queer theorists and endless o/Others concerned with the plights of big Oh Others as members of a ‘school of resentment’.15 Derrida, meanwhile, was himself in ways a member of that school – pursued the im/possibilities of hospitality, gifts, responsibility, the plights of those seeking to rebuild themselves, their lives, in the face of defacement, death, o/Otherness.16 Yet Derrida and Bloom were friends once – at Yale, in the 1970s – friends with one another… and with Paul de Man.17 That demon. That ghost.

Three key theories from the three thinkers can be summarised as follows: In his criticism of and on and as literary criticism, de Man purported that critics are blinded by language and thus make misinterpretations that bring bright insights to texts never interpreted but re-interpreted, re-made in and through the act of interpretation itself.18 Bloom cited this as a direct influence on his account of misreading – the process via
which poets produce new poems by unknowingly misinterpreting and rewriting the works of their predecessors: ‘the strong dead return, in poems as in our lives, and they do not come back without darkening the living.’ Acc to Bloom, this produces anxiety for the poets, plunges them into battles for the spoils of literary inheritance, pitting so-called latecomers against formidable predecessors and/as sources of influence. These operations are largely unknown, unknowable and unavoidable: even doing the opposite is, Bloom attests, a mode of influence. Derrida meanwhile developed his theory of difference: a French pun on differ and defer, reflecting the notion that any iteration – including but not limited to iterations of writing, speech, the body, movement, architecture, noise and/as silence(ing) – is a re-iteration that cannot be traced to its origin, one link in a long, long chain each chink of which is faulty, warped in that it changes, deranges and redirects that which it is meant to passively pass down the re-production line.

Critical blindness and insight, misreading and difference: three different, differing concepts, yes. Yet all involve some sense of taking up and passing on – of inheritance. And of failure. Failure to know in full what one has been gifted by ancestors – by ghosts, maybe demons. And failure to treat the gift properly, to pass it on in tact. In this passing-on, this gift, sits the question: What to do with gifts one didn’t request, perhaps never wanted – gifts that, though precious, seem broken, haunted, cursed?

In a slightly later work, Bloom reflected upon how, as ‘a young man setting out to be a university teacher,’ he experienced a mix of ‘uselessness’ and ‘solace’ in the thought that ‘while a scholar-teacher of literature could do no good, at least he could do no harm’ – a thought Bloom later came to challenge:

I under-rated my profession, as much in its capacity for doing harm as in its potential for good works. Even our treasons, our betrayals of implicit trusts, are reasons of something more than of the intellectual, and most directly damage our immediate students, our Oedipal sons and daughters (Bloom 1975: 29).

Some of us would indeed suggest that, as both a teacher and a critic, Bloom has done some harm indeed.

What about Derrida – who were his sons and daughters, the re-citers of his theories, the heirs to his gifts? Derrida became, among other things, what Sara Salih describes as an implicit ‘presence’, a ghostly guest in… Yes. Judith Butler’s early writings. Remember the un/spoken “is” in my earlier claim that there’s arguably “not” any relation between her ideas and those of de Man? (a demon un/seen, a paranormal parasite, haunting by-proxy, via inference, in def…erance). What’s more, he’s arguably not Butler’s only poltergeist. She claims her account of giving accounts was inspired by Foucault’s late interviews, but it’s hard to imagine she never thought about Althusser who, like Derrida – and Foucault – informed her early works, and who was at any rate among Foucault’s teachers, as Foucault was among Derrida’s.

Althusser who tried so hard to account for himself, for whichever self he was, became, that strange morning he quietly strangled his wife. Althusser’s actions raise questions of if and how readers – especially writers – can face, maybe re-face influential texts and textual makers as figures that seem stained,
tainted, rife with literal violence, assaults on life and living, those things so precious, so precarious. These are questions like those Althusser perhaps pondered as he sought reconciliation with and for Marx in a world where communism had bred slaughter – sought to read Marx symptomatically, in search of possibilities the latter’s writings may have reached for, though not arrived at. They are questions, too, that connect with those I ask as I turn, re-turn, back to You and You and You – my mentors, not to mention all the Youse who are now my students, Youse who may in turn become writers and teachers of writing – questions that connect, furthermore, with those Bloom and Derrida might have asked themselves when they learned what de Man did in the war. Because even if he learned from his youthful mistakes – if his theories were reactions against Nazi atrocities – to react, to do the opposite is in itself to be influenced, to scatter more seeds from the very vine one seeks to strike down, to destroy.

For students and readers of Althusser, the questions are of how to salvage his theories, his visions of ethicality, a more compassionate world, meanwhile knowing them to be the visions of someone in so many ways blinded, mad, brutal, a strangling who inflicted violence, silence, death upon his most significant o/Other, and thereby himself. But by re-interpreting Althusser re-interpreting Marx, those who drew on his inheritance re-invested it with generosity, with the idea – paraphrasing Timothy Bewes – that it is best to work with problems, not against them, for to work against, to battle, is to stay stuck, ingrained, burying ever deeper like a worm in wood, under the influence of opposition. With, on the other hand, is a path to beyond – to arrival at things previously reached for, not quite grasped – arrival and/as simultaneous departure, that is, continuation, reaching for even more and carrying all the remainders, the un/reached, un/graspable, even un/known More to o/Others, future links in a chain extending not down just one path, but many, a chain that meanwhile reaches back, breaks and remakes the very metaphors of inheritance, of chains, of armour like that Bloom thought poets need don for fighting, for overcoming tradition.

The ultimate battle was, Bloom claimed, the apophrades – those ‘dismal’ days when ‘the dead return’ to re-inhabit their houses – and strong poets those successful in exorcism, in relaying o/Other’s foundations as their own, anew. Instead of letting history haunt them, strong poets manage to turn it on its head, give the impression that they gave influence to predecessors, that Oedipus birthed his father… and (it follows) Antigone Oedipus.

If generosity means seeing something more than what precursors were able to give, then maybe it’s a means for enacting… re-enacting the apophrades… But not in battle – not by snatching or shouting victory – rather by recognising… re…cognising… re-thinking precursors – ghosts – as friendly presences re-presenting presents, gifts perhaps cursed, but nonetheless workable, re-giftable. Re-gifting, in this instance means passing something back, paying respect and offering thanks, even forgiveness… for-give-ness… for the self as much as any o/Others.

As a teacher of writing, I must break my silence. If not for me, then for my students. To break it, I must remake peace… with You… and You… and You… and so with my self… with her and her selfish obsessions. This is my generous apophrades, my
chance to accept that I, I have to give… way, give it away, meaning her, meaning self, and obsession (anon anon anon). My I, I has to give, give to You and You and You what you must gift me so my students can receive what they and maybe their readers, their future students need.

But what, precisely, does I have to give? Let’s start with something she learned from You and You and You – not to mention all of Youse – something that goes with and beyond silence, violence, fear, the unspeakable: there can be no self without o/Others, no guest without a host\textsuperscript{30} and vice versa. To deny “I” is to choke You – not to mention him and/as her, all the thems that are us. Generosity towards o/Others requires kindness, or at least patience with the self, however petty. And what could be more patient than poetry? Meaning all the poetries of theatre, of criticism, of writing and even beyond. Poetry has stood, since Plato’s days, outside the gates of that Republic where things are made and happen.\textsuperscript{31}

This is no longer a battle with gone mentors. But that doesn’t mean swallowing the sword. I has to give, yes. But there’s endless diverse gifts it can offer.

Research statement

Research background

The impetus for I Has to Give was a desire to engage (with) critical and/as literary theory in order to re-consider dilemmas of self-(re)presentation and influence in my situated practice(s) as a writer and teacher of creative writing. The piece draws on seemingly disparate, potentially opposing sets of ideas – primarily from Butler (2004, 2005), Althusser (1971, 1993), Derrida (1978/2002, 1986, 1988), Bloom (1973, 1975), de Man (1971/1983, 1979) and Bewes (2010) – using aspects of those ideas to connect them with one another and with my situation, or at least, with the (shifting) situation(s) of an “I” that narrates and (re)depicts my singular-yet-shared context, my internal-yet-relationally-focused conflicts over writing, teaching and the ways in which writers and/as teachers are simultaneously influenced (by their own mentors or precursors) and capable of influencing (their students and/or readers). Because of the shared, relational nature of this “singular” situation and its “internal” conflicts, the issues the “I” explores are issues pertinent to many of us who write and/or teach writing. This pertinence is reflected through extensive work(s) regarding self, influence and pedagogy in the academic field of creative writing (Brook 2014, Pattinson 2014, Strange & Hetherington 2014, Martin 2014, Carlin 2013, Brophy 1997, de la Harpe, Mason & Brien 2012) – the field to which I Has to Give primarily offers what it has to give.

Research contribution

As the background statement noted, I Has to Give primarily contributes to the academic field of creative writing by poetically exploring themes of self-(re)presentation and influence as relevant to writing and/as creative writing pedagogy. The piece confronts two related dilemmas of writing and/as teaching: one, the arguable unavoidability, in writing and teaching practice(s), of self-(re)presentation
and/as of the (re)presented self’s capacities for violences against o/Others and/as itself (Butler 2005: 41); and two, if and how writer-teachers can exercise ethicality with-and-in greater schemes of literary and/as theoretical (thought and/as knowledge and/as learning-related) ‘influence’ (Bloom 1973). The self and its (re)presentation are issues of present and longstanding concern(s) in the field of creative writing (Pattinson 2014, Brook 2014, Martin 2014, Lawrence 2011, Webb 2009, Brien 2002). Influence’s complexities have meanwhile been raised, in recent years, by Carlin (2013), whose work appropriately builds on (draws influence from) Brophy’s (1997) early inquiries into ‘originality’-as-‘unoriginality’ in and beyond university-based creative writing classrooms. As for pedagogy broadly, it remains a perennial topic for creative writing researchers and/as academics (Brook 2014, Beveridge, Musgrave, Rickett, Northcote & Williams 2014, de la Harpe, Mason & Brien 2012, Gerrard 2013, Caldwell 2005, 2011, Caldwell & Brophy 2012, McLoughlin 2008, Mitchell 1997, Harrison 1997). The cited works valuably inform current knowledge(s) regarding self, self-(re)presentation, influence and pedagogy, but they also reflect the complexities therein, and thus the need for ongoing investigation(s). *I Has to Give* aims to play a part in those investigations by broaching self, influence and pedagogy in connection with one another (which distinguishes it from existing literatures that generally approach just one or sometimes two of the three sites). It does so via the method/ological processes\(^1\) of a poetic monologue that puts into practice the (diverse) cases Webb (2010, 2012), Webb and Brien (2006), Boyd (2009), Avieson (2008) and Richardson (1994) – to name but a few – have developed for creative writing as a mode of inquiry, that is, a way to generate academic knowledges significantly different from the knowledge contributions predominantly developed through more conventional modes of scholarly writing and/as thinking.

**Research significance**

Research significance often entails ‘filling’ some specified ‘gap’ (Northcote 2012: 107, Martin 2014). However, emulating the broadly fictocritical spirit expounded by Pattinson (2014), Abblitt (2012), Quinn (2012a, 2012b), Kerr (1996) and Gibbs (1997, 2005), and building on ideas presented in the AAWP’s Minding the Gap papers (Pittaway, Lodge & Smithies 2014), *I Has to Give* seeks not to close gaps but rather to make something of them, to play with unanswered, arguably unanswerable questions as ‘space[s] between’ (Kerr 1996: 93). Its play(ing) entails articulations (Hall 1985: 2-4)\(^2\) between multiple sites of theory and/as research that might otherwise appear unrelated (for example, the connection of Butler (2004, 2005) and two of her major sources of influence, Derrida (1978/2002, 1986, 1988) and Althusser (1971, 1993), with Bloom (1973, 1975) and de Man (1971/1983, 1979)). Like swinging bridges, these articulations maintain gaps and/as possibilities for play(ing) while working across – simultaneously in and between – different, differing sites, importantly not without a good degree of ‘precariousness’ and the responsibilities implicated therein (Butler 2004). Of greatest significance to the research context(s) in and for which *I Has to Give* is produced are the articulations between creative writing (the field and/as its literatures) and the (diverse) critical and/as literary theories noted earlier (Butler 2004, 2005, Derrida 1978/2002, 1986, 1988, Althusser 1971, 1993, Bloom 1973, 1975, de Man 1971/1983, 1979). That significance takes the form of...
expanded possibilities (open(ed) gaps and/as play-spaces) for (re)considering issues of self, influence and pedagogy in creative writing research and/as practice(s) – possibilities arising from how the (themselves articulated and/as re-considered) theories can inform the ongoing work(s) of creative writers engaging with issues of self, self-representation, influence and pedagogy in contemporary university contexts. Or, citing Hall once more, I Has to Give’s significance entails, in my view, the broadened scope it offers for ‘going on theorising’ (Hall in Grossberg 1986: 60).

Note on delivery and formatting of the script
Bracketed italics indicate a quieter mode of speech, something akin to a whispering background chorus or unspoken thoughts. Non-bracketed italics indicate a stress or emphasis. An ellipsis (…) signifies a pause, a beat, or, if occurring within a word (such as “feel…ing”), the stretching out of that word in ways designed to emphasise and estrange its parts.

Endnotes
1 Methodological is a term I borrow from Clough, Goodley, Lawthom and Moore (2004), who explain, methods are ‘directly influenced by the methodological persuasion’ and are ‘never used by researchers within a theoretical vacuum’ (2004: 96).

2 Hall posits articulation as a means of living ‘in and with difference’ (1985: 92, emphasis in original) by forging alliances between things that are seemingly distinct but potentially connectable, the purpose being ‘not to substitute difference for its mirror opposite, unity, but to rethink both’ (1985: 93) and/as to ‘think about complex kinds of determinacy without reductionism to a simple unity’ (Hall 1985: 94).

3 ‘I am not interested in theory, I am interested in going on theorising’ (Hall in Grossberg 1986: 60).

4 ‘I exist in an important sense for you, and by virtue of you. If I have lost the conditions of address, if I have no “you” to address, then I have lost “myself” (Butler 2005: 32).

5 In an earlier work, drawing on Althusser (1971) as well as Foucault (2002), Butler (1993: 69) argues that ‘the subject’ (a figure that perceives itself to possess a self) is ‘always-already’ (Althusser 1971: 50) (re)formed in relation to its circumstances and/as o/Others. Althusser (1971: 50) hyphenates ‘always-already’. Butler (1993: 69) does not. The poet in me likes how the hyphen emphasises connectivity, so I retain it.

6 This alludes to Ricoeur’s Oneself as Another (1992) and to Rimbaud’s reflection, in a letter to Georges Izambard, that ‘Je est un autre [I is somebody else]’ (Rimbaud 1871/2007: 64, 2004: 28).

7 Butler reflects that ‘self-knowledge is surely limited’ (2005: 46). However, this is ‘not a reason to turn against it as a project,’ for ‘[t]o know oneself as limited is still to know something about oneself, even if one’s knowing is afflicted by the limitation that one knows’ (2005: 46). These remarks reflect, I suggest, ideas evolved from Butler’s earlier work in response to Foucault’s What is Enlightenment? (Butler 2001, Foucault 1984).

8 My use of the word “matter” alludes to Butler’s punning on materiality and significance in Bodies That Matter (1993).

9 (de Man 1979).

10 To describe Butler as “a queer theorist who defends precarious life” is, I acknowledge, somewhat of a reductive misreading of a writer-thinker whose works include but extend well beyond those concerns. In a previous version of this work, I summarised Butler’s theoretical oeuvre as “including but not limited to subjectivity, discourse, gender, ethicity, violence, responsibility, how to make life more liveable – or at least less unliveable – finding kinder patterns of and for relations… all those things and
“I” has to give

However I removed this when I was developing the script for performance because it seemed a too clunky distraction from the main point being made: the major differences between Butler and de Man, and the unlikely nature of the articulations between their works. Also, the “I” of this piece is, at the end of the day, a character – albeit an autobiographically-derived one – and I consider it fittingly in-character for the “I” to misread Butler (and other theorists) in ways that reflect her own biases, blindnesses and concerns. For a more fulsome explication of Butler’s major ideas and areas of influence, I recommend Salih (2002) and/or Brady and Schirato (2011).

Describing de Man as a “crusty Yale nazi” is flippant and reductive. As per endnote ten’s explanation of the comments about Butler, the original version of this script included a longer and perhaps more sensitive reflection on the revelations about de Man’s youthful wartime writings (for a Nazi newspaper in occupied Belgium). However I again felt that in this instance, less would be more, and that a reader / viewer should be able to recognise the remark as a reflection of the “I” character’s headspace, and not a genuine attempt to judge or account for de Man’s life and writings. For deeper discussion of de Man’s wartime writings, a reader may consult Felman (1989: 704), Culler (1989: 779) and/or Derrida (1986).

Those who can, do, and those who can’t, teach’ (George Bernard Shaw in Bowden 2011: 533).

Although it was of a volatile nature, and although they later fell out, Derrida and Bloom reputedly did, during the time that both were at Yale, share something resembling a friendship (Mikics 2009: 192-193).

My claim here regarding Derrida’s support for “the plights of those seeking to rebuild themselves…” reflects my readings of Baring’s (2010) and Schep’s (2014) discussions of the contextual influences the Algerian struggle for independence (from French colonisation) may have had upon Derrida’s theories.


(Bloom 1973: 139).

(Bloom 1973: 31).


(Salih 2002: 91).


(Althusser 1993).

“For Marx” alludes to For Marx (Althusser 1965/2005), which informs this passage. See also the concept of ‘symptomatic reading’ in Althusser & Balibar (1979: 32) and discussion in Bewes (2010).

The “students and readers of Althusser” I allude to here include, as earlier noted, Foucault, Derrida and Butler, but also the many others who have attempted to re-read Althusser in ‘generous’ ways (see discussion in Bewes 2010).

(Bewe 2010).

Apophrades is named for the notion, in Greek literature, of the ‘the dismal or unlucky days upon which the dead return to inhabit their old houses’ (Bloom 1973: 139-141). In Bloom’s version of apophrades as a mode of literary influence, ‘the tyranny of time almost is overturned, and one can believe, for startled moments, that they are being imitated by their ancestors’ (1973: 139-141, emphasis in original).

(Hillis Miller 1977).
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