

The Place of writing: PLACE, POETRY, POLITICS IN THE WRITING OF SEAMUS HEANEY

'*The Place of writing: Place, Poetry, Politics in the Writing of Seamus Heaney*', *Hermathena*, Trinity College Dublin. Published: Number 161, 1998, pp.53-67.

Eugene O'Brien

5 keywords

Heaney, place, politics, Northern Ireland, violence

Abstract

This chapter examines Heaney's use of classical imagery as a literary device through which he can address issues of political and cultural identity in Northern Ireland. It looks at Heaney's prose, early poetry and some translations.

At the beginning of *The Cure at Troy*, Seamus Heaney's translation of Sophocles's *Philoctetes*, the chorus speaks on the function of poetry in the midst of political and cultural turmoil:

Poetry

Allowed the god to speak. It was the voice
Of reality and justice. The voice of Hercules
That Philoctetes is going to have to hear
When the stone cracks open and the lava flows. (*The Cure at Troy*, 2)

It is the contention of this essay that Heaney's use of classical imagery in his poetry serves to assert the voice of 'reality and justice' in the middle of a time when 'the stone cracks open and lava flows.' The imagery of stones and lava in this extract is, in my opinion thematic of a central concern in Heaney's work, namely the politics of place and culture in Northern Ireland. Attachment to place is a central

trope of politics in Ireland, and especially in contemporary Northern Ireland. The territorial imperative is a major factor in much of the violence with which our history is riddled. Indeed, in July and August of each year, that same possessive notion of place is the cause of tension and violence in Northern Ireland; the names of Garvaghy Road and Drumcree have been engraved on the consciousness of the world during July 1996 as signifiers of a violent linguistic attachment to place. The ideology of both Nationalist and Unionist traditions has politicised the land which they share by linguistic marks of possession. Paul de Man has termed this process of politicisation of place, of ethnic attachment to the land, 'aesthetic ideology,' and Terry Eagleton has given a concise definition of it:

aesthetic ideology involves a phenomenalist reduction of the linguistic to the sensually empirical, a confusing of mind and world, sign and thing, cognition and percept, which is consecrated in the Hegelian symbol and resisted by Kant's rigorous demarcation of aesthetic judgement from the cognitive, ethical and political realms. Such aesthetic ideology, by repressing the contingent, aporetic relation which holds between the spheres of language and the real, naturalizes or phenomenizes the former, and is thus in danger of converting the accidents of meaning to organic natural process in the characteristic manner of ideological thought. (*The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, 10)

This ideology of place, by introducing emotive aesthetic criteria into disputes, validates what John Montague has termed 'the vomit surge / of race hatred (*The Rough Field*, 45). When the aesthetic is prioritised within the political realm, and emotive issues of culture and ideology are foregrounded, then reason and debate have little chance of success. The writer can then either ascribe to this ideology of place, becoming part of the '*holmgang*' of Northern Ireland where, as Heaney noted:

two berserks club each other to death

For honour's sake, grieved in a bog, and sinking, (*North*, 70)

or can take a different route. In an essay appropriately entitled *The Place of Writing*, Heaney makes the point that 'the poetic imagination in its strongest manifestation imposes its vision upon a place rather

than accepts a vision from it'(20), and goes on to add that 'we are more and more aware of writing as a place in itself, a destination in art arrived at by way of art.' (19) In terms of *The Cure at Troy*, the writer can either become captivated by cracking 'stones' and flowing 'lava', or he can listen for the 'voice of Hercules.' It is the contention of this paper that for Heaney, the voice of Hercules stands for a broader concept of place, one that imposes a vision of 'reality and justice' on the ideology of place in Northern Ireland, and I will examine some passages from Heaney's writing to explore this viewpoint.

The first passage I would like to focus on comes from the beginning of *Preoccupations*. Here Heaney is describing his own home place and he does so in terms which foreground the place of classical thinking in his aesthetic. The passage that will be analyzed here is taken from the opening of 'Mossbawn':

I would begin with the Greek word, *omphalos*, meaning the navel, and hence the stone that marked the centre of the world, and repeat it, *omphalos, omphalos, omphalos*, until its blunt and falling music becomes the music of somebody pumping water at the pump outside our back door. It is Co. Derry in the early 1940s. The American bombers groan towards the aerodrome at Toomebridge, the American troops manoeuvre in the fields along the road, but all of that great historical action does not disturb the rhythms of the yard. There the pump stands, a slender, iron idol, snouted, helmeted, dressed down with a sweeping handle, painted a dark green and set on a concrete plinth, marking the centre of another world. (*Preoccupations*, 17-18)

This passage opens with the classical association of the word *omphalos*. Heaney begins with the 'word' which means the 'navel, and hence the centre of the world,' and only then points to the pump, on its 'concrete plinth' which marks 'the centre of another world.' The classical reference is used here, I would suggest, as part of a rhetorical chain of imagery which attempts to pose an alternative to the 'holmgang' of aesthetic ideology in Northern Ireland. By invoking the centre of the classical world, or more accurately, the word *omphalos*, Heaney is pointing towards a point of adjudication in terms of the present. By putting forth the idea of different worlds, the passage sets in motion an interaction which

will allow Heaney to impose a vision on the place, to interrogate the givens of aesthetic ideology, and to create a place of writing where reason and language might help, rather than hinder the process of change, and facilitate the dictum that ‘art can outface history’ (*Preoccupations*, 99).

Here, the voice (and one thinks of ‘the voice of Hercules’), as symbolic of the imagination of the writer, fuses the psychical centre of Heaney’s childhood world with a psychical centre of an imaginative world, the metaphorical soil of ancient Greece, the cradle of Western civilization, aesthetics and politics. In a real sense, Heaney is grounding himself as part of this world, as part of the classical world where the great emancipatory ideals of justice were first hammered out. He is looking for a point of reference from where he can locate Northern Ireland, and its problems, within the spatial and temporal categories of a broader worldview. Classical tropes give him this viewpoint as they are spatially and temporally distanced from the ‘ruminant ground’ of Northern Ireland. One could associate this process with the conceptual scheme of Spinoza, who saw that events could be viewed from the perspective of a particular culture *sub specie durationis* or from the perspective of eternity *sub specie aeternitatis*. The latter perspective is, of course, impossible, but it is seen by Spinoza as a regulative notion by which we can be guided.

By creating this dual vision for Mossbawn, Heaney is, through classical imagery, seeking a quasi-eternal perspective on his own place. This synthesis bears fruit in *Kinship*, in his volume *North*, where the modern and ancient, the Irish and the classical again coalesce imaginatively. This poem attempts to grant the intensity of racial drives, and also to seek a juridical warrant outside of the hermeneutic circle of those drives. Here, the aesthetic is being brought under the jurisdiction of classical values, in the shape of the apostrophised Tacitus.

In this poem, the racial and ethnic drives which power nationalistic identification with the land are given expression. The land, which allows him to 'step through origins' is imagined as alive:

kinned by hieroglyphic
peat on a spreadfield
to the strangled victim...

...I love this turf-face...

...each bank a gallows drop,
each open pool
the unstopped mouth
of an urn, a moon-drinker. (*North*, 40-41)

The third section of *Kinship* has the 'I' of the poem penetrating the land in a phallic manner, an image redolent of a quasi-sexual relationship with the land:

I found a turf-spade
hidden under bracken,
laid flat, and overgrown
with a green fog.

As I raised it
the soft lips of the growth
muttered and split,
a tawny rut

opening at my feet
like a shed skin,
the shaft wettish
as I sank it upright...

...I stand at the edge of centuries
facing a goddess. (*North*, 42)

Here, the land is imaged as alive, female, sexually active in terms of the 'I' of the poem – and given the nationalist background of the author, the fact that the implement that penetrates the land is overgrown 'with a *green* fog' is hardly accidental. This penetration of the land gives birth, or rather rebirth to 'a goddess,' and the voice of the poem, like that of the opening of *Mossbawn*, seems to be allowing itself to come under the spell of place, telling us that:

I grew out of all this
like a weeping willow
inclined to
the appetites of gravity. (*North*, 43)

Here, the power of aesthetic ideology is imaged in the almost gravitational pull of the 'I' towards the land, and the simile of the weeping willow, which grows out of the earth, before inclining back towards it. The rationality of the 'I' seems to have been diminished under the gravitational pull of aesthetic ideology. The persuasive power of such an aesthetic ideology is granted in this fine poem, reminding us of Heaney's comment in *Preoccupations*:

At one minute you are drawn to the old vortex of racial and religious instinct, at another time you seek the mean of humane love and reason. (*Preoccupations*, 34)

The final section of *Kinship* both grants the intensity of the aesthetic relationship with place, an intensity that seems to valorise a type of necessary 'slaughter', and brings such practices under external judgement, the 'mean' of 'reason.' It attempts to break the hermeneutic circle of place, in a manner similar to that of the *Mossbawn* piece, by an introduction of something to this particular circle both temporally and spatially. This classical referent, Tacitus, seems to point towards a time and place where

disputes were settled differently. In the middle of the bloodshed and verbs of violence – ‘*slaughter*’ and ‘*shave*’ – we note the two verbs associated with Tacitus and the legions – ‘*observe*’, and ‘*report*’.

And you, Tacitus,
observe how I make my grove
on an old crannog
piled by the fearful dead:

a desolate peace.
Our mother ground
is sour with the blood
of her faithful,

they lie gargling
in her sacred heart
as the legions stare
from the ramparts.

Come back to this
‘island of the ocean’
where nothing will suffice.
Read the inhumed faces

of casualty and victim;
report us fairly,
how we slaughter
for the common good

and shave the heads
of the notorious,
how the goddess swallows

our love and terror. (*North*, 45)

There is a different level of discourse being suggested by the address of these lines to Tacitus, and by the presence of the legions as a type of civilised audience to these barbaric rites. The suasive power of the earlier sections of the poem, with their intense relationship to the place, is lessened due to the framing device of the inclusion of a passive watcher, with whom the 'I' of the poem also has a *kinship* – that of a civilised user of language, and recorder of customs and practices. The injunctions to 'observe' and 'report...fairly' bring the rites of kinship under a different discursive regime. Tacitus stands in synecdoche for Rome, for the *pax Romana*, for the civilizing faith in art '*aere perennius*' (already quoted in *Whatever You Say, Say Nothing*, *North*, 59). The discourse associated with him embodies these civilised and rational values – 'observe...read...report us fairly', as Tacitus did in the *Agricola* and the *Germania*. It is the discourse of science, of justice, of objectivity. It symbolizes the perspective of eternity, *sub specie aeternitatis*. It is the discourse of the Forum, where laws were framed and disputes settled. By extension, and by analogy with the *omphalos* of the *Mossbawn* passage, it is the discourse of the Athenians who built their supreme court on Mount Areopagos where justice was dealt in the midst of a world where barbarism and violence, similar to that discussed in the rest of this poem, was rife. The very fact that these lines are addressed to a living Tacitus, in the present tense, makes it clear that the lines are symbolic. Sequential time and place cohere, as the classical figure symbolizes a different perspective, *sub specie aeternitatis*, a different use of language to that of terror and death.

The classical references allow for the symbolization of a different politics of place; they allow the poet to proffer a place of writing where values of reason and critique hold sway over the '*holmgang*.' The Hellenic enlightenment gestures towards a different way of dealing with disputes over territory. Of course, feuds and battles still continued in the classical age, but there was in place an alternative

paradigm –Heaney’s ‘mean of humane love and reason’ – which offered another option to the ‘vortex of racial hatred.’

It is this difference of language which is central to Heaney’s interrogation of the aesthetic ideology that pervades nationalist consciousness. The attractions of a quasi-sacral relationship to land are granted their fullest intensity in *Kinship*, but the placing of this ‘world’ in juxtaposition with the ‘world’ of Tacitus serves to place both views in an economy wherein they can interrogate each other. The presence of Tacitus and the legions (a historical anachronism as the Romans never colonized Ireland) does not stop the ‘slaughter / for the common good’; what it does is present a different world-view which may contain the violence, or at least offer a different perspective on these rites of kinship just as the *omphalos* presents a different conception of place.

The paradigm for such a containment of visceral forces, as noted by Conor Cruise O’Brien, is of course the *Oresteia* by Aeschylus. The furies are contained, by the Goddess Athena, as she attempts to break the cycle of blood feuds. They are given a special place within the temple, but their vengeful nature remains the same. They are reminded of a higher power than theirs (*On the Eve of the Millennium*, 92-93). Art, by creating a distancing perspective, offers some hope of containment of the violence inherent in aesthetic ideology by offering other aesthetic images which posit a different, more reasoned relationship with place. Such a relationship must be expressed in poetic terms because the central trope of aesthetic ideology, the personification of place, or the giving of face to a land (*prosopopoeia*), is an essentially poetic term.

The expression of names of places as part of complex cultural, religious and racial codes is a literary trope, with dangerous overtones when it oversteps the line of demarcation between literature and

politics, because when feeling and emotion enter the political realm, then atavisms do not lurk far beneath the surface: ‘the goddess swallows / our love and terror.’ The placing of the classical referents within this chain of aesthetic ideology, as seen in *Kinship*, serves the same function as the juxtaposition of the *omphalos* and the pump in *Mossbawn*, namely the postulation of a new politics of place wherein the *place* of writing will be to impose different visions of the relationship between people and place, using the symbolic discourse through which aesthetic ideology has come into being.

Heaney is attempting a process of visualising the same event through two different perspectives. The pump, in *Mossbawn* is part of a local environment, a central place in a parochial world, but it is also, due to the invocation of the Greek word *omphalos*, a pointer towards another worldview. The perspective of the ‘I’ of *Kinship*, deeply implicated in the aesthetic ideology of place (‘I stand at the edge of centuries / facing a goddess’), who sees the land as intimately connected with the language of *his* tribe (‘this is the vowel of earth / dreaming its root’) is framed within the perspective of the eye of Tacitus and the legions (‘observe...stare...read...report’).

I would argue that the classical tropes in these two pieces of writing by Heaney serve to represent a distancing perspective, *sub specie aeternitatis*, on aesthetic ideology. Such an outside perspective is necessary to offer a critique of the pieties of Nationalism and Unionism alike, especially when these pieties are generally given symbolic and iconic representation, as opposed to rational lines of argument. The almost sexual relationship between self and place posited in *Kinship* gestures towards the possessive nature of this ideology. To feel that one is ‘rooted’ in a piece of land, and that therefore no other tradition has any right to live, or even march there is to partake of this type of organicist ideology, and if there is no outside perspective to ask ‘Why is this so? Support your position with argument Where is your evidence?’ then the ideology becomes self-perpetuating, and any chance of a more rational or

enlightened political approach is denied. Without this perspective, the organicist notion of a special relationship between race and land has closure in terms of a politics of place in literature. This framing of the visceral by the rational, already noted in *Kinship*, is further explored in the two framing poems of Part 1 of *North, Antaeus* and *Hercules and Antaeus*.

One stanza from *Antaeus*, in *North*, can be read as a paradigm of this organicist aesthetic ideology as it attempts to give voice to these territorial pieties and possessive drives, without any outside perspective:

Down here in my cave

Girdered with root and rock

I am cradled in the dark that wombed me

And nurtured in every artery

Like a small hillock. (*North*, 12)

Here, the voice of the poem is imagined, through simile, as being part of the land. Such is the strength of the identification that the rhetorical strategy that is used is a type of inverted personification. The 'I' is stripped of the attributes of humanity, and instead becomes one with the land itself; the relationship with the earth is, in fact, the constitutive factor in the subjectivity of Antaeus. The fact that the land appears, symbolically, to represent his mother further strengthens this *subject-land-language* nexus. This pattern of imagery is sustained throughout the stanza, in a *leitmotif* of rebirth, a *leitmotif* which foregrounds the Romantic legacy of a sentient nature, to which access is gained by the language of poetry.

The womb-like 'cave' is the place where Antaeus, son of *Gé*, the earth mother, is 'cradled in the dark', and where he is 'nurtured'. Here, the imagery takes on symbolic overtones. Just as Antaeus is the son of the earth, so the individual who is the focus of aesthetic ideology is a son, or daughter of a particular

piece of earth, and likewise draws strength from this personified piece of land. Here, the writer seems to be seduced by the place, rather than imposing his vision on the place. In the discourse of *Antaeus*, there is no hint of escaping the seductive power of the land. This will not come until the mention of Hercules, in the companion poem, *Hercules and Antaeus*, who again symbolises the power of a different perspective to weaken the territorial imperatives of the land. Here, the debate between a politics which takes its vision from place and its people, and one which imposes a more rational vision upon place and its people, is symbolized in terms of a wrestling match, a grappling where different faculties struggle.

Here, Hercules:

...has the measure
of resistance and black powers
feeding off the territory. (*North*, 52)

He is 'sky-born,' and hence symbolic of that more rational perspective, and through his action in the poem, Antaeus is 'weaned' at last from:

...the cradling dark,
the river-veins, the secret gullies
of his strength, the hatching grounds

of cave and souterrain, (*North*, 52-53)

and becomes 'a sleeping giant / pap for the dispossessed.' Here, Hercules breaks the organic relationship between native and place; his, as *The Cure at Troy* explained 'is the voice / of reality and justice.' The twin metaphors for this relationship have been the sexual penetration, giving rise to rebirth, of *Kinship*, and the nursing child, feeding off the earth mother, *Gé* in *Antaeus*. Now, both bonds are severed, though Antaeus, symbol of aesthetic ideology is not completely vanquished. Like the furies in

the *Oresteia*, he is brought under some kind of containment, and that containment is enacted through that rational perspective which has been an ongoing trope in our readings. This is made explicit in *Hercules and Antaeus*, where it is ‘intelligence’ that causes the severing of the bond between native and place:

Antaeus, the mould-hugger,

is weaned at last:

a fall was a renewal

but now he is raised up—

the challenger’s intelligence

is a spur of light,

a blue prong graiping him

out of his element

into a dream of loss

and origins. (*North*, 52)

Here, it is the intelligence, the application of reason and thought to the relationship between people and place, that effects the metamorphosis of that relationship from organic bodily dependence, an almost umbilical connection, to that of thought, debate and the imagery of ‘light’. The different perspective subjects the unthinking dependencies of aesthetic ideology to a critique which posits a politics based on reason and ‘intelligence’.

The final piece of Heaney’s writing that I wish to consider in this context is *Personal Helicon*, the final poem in *Death of a Naturalist*. Just as his personal view of *Mossbawn* privileged the classical notion of the *omphalos*, so his personal *Helicon* will privilege classical sources as his personal Muse. From within

the place where he writes, the poet will create a place of writing, where ideas *sub specie aeternitatis* can offer a more objective line of vision on those which are *sub specie durationis*.

PERSONAL HELICON

As a child, they could not keep me from wells
And old pumps with buckets and windlasses.
I loved the dark drop, the trapped sky, the smells
Of waterweed, fungus and dank moss.

One, in a brickyard, with a rotted board top.
I savoured the rich crash when a bucket
Plummeted down at the end of a rope.
So deep you saw no reflection in it.

A shallow one under a dry stone ditch
Fructified like any aquarium.
When you dragged out long roots from the soft mulch
A white face hovered over the bottom.

Others had echoes, gave back your own call
With a clean new music in it. And one
Was scaresome for there, out of ferns and tall
Foxgloves, a rat slapped across my reflection.

Now, to pry into roots, to finger slime,
To stare big-eyed Narcissus, into some spring
Is beneath all adult dignity. I rhyme
To see myself, to set the darkness echoing. (*Death of a Naturalist*, 57)

At first, we seem to have come full circle, back to *Mossbawn*, with a piece of writing referring to the poet's early home, and to water imagery. However, the title of Heaney's poem immediately brings what

Roland Barthes would term a cultural code to bear on our reading of the poem. The complete text is framed by two proper nouns: ‘*Helicon*’ in the title, and ‘Narcissus’ in the final stanza. These proper nouns, both of Greek derivation, locate the poem in the abstract realm of myth, as opposed to the seemingly concrete world of Heaney’s childhood. In other words, they place the recounting of early experience, *sub specie durationis*, within a framing chain of classical imagery which represents the more detached view, *sub specie aeternitatis*. Hence, the very title of the poem undercuts any literal reading in terms of recalled referentiality and conscious intentionality. Michael Parker relates the etymological derivation of ‘*Helicon*’:

Helicon was a mountain in Boeotia, sacred to the Muses. From it two fountains flowed, the Hippocrene and the Aganippe, and those who drank from their waters were inspired with the gift of poetry. (*Seamus Heaney: The Making of the Poet*, 74)

The myth of Narcissus and Echo is well known; Echo was punished by Juno for talking too much by being denied all speech, except the power to repeat the final word of a sentence. Having fallen in love with Narcissus, but being unable to communicate with him, she eventually faded away into rock, and all that was left of her was her voice, still having the last word. Narcissus, seeing his own reflection in the waters of a fountain, immediately fell in love with it. At every attempt to make physical contact, the reflection disappeared; when Narcissus drew back, the reflection returned. He eventually faded away and died.

These two myths form a cultural nexus through which the poem may be read. The remembered child in the poem loves the ‘echoes’ that will transform his ‘call’ and then return it with ‘clean new music’. The use of ‘echoes’, in a text which foregrounds the myths of Narcissus and *Helicon*, points the common noun to its mythological antecedent, Echo. Echo, doomed to repeat only the final words spoken by an *other*, is a *locus classicus* of aesthetic ideology in that she exists within the confines of a place, and can

only repeat the final sound of a speaker. As the voice of place, her vocabulary is strictly limited, it is monologic, and can impose no vision on the place. Narcissus suffers the same fate; all he can see is his reflection, there is no widening of perspective, there is no outside to the relationship. Both figures are seen as victims of an over-determined relationship with place. In political terms both the Nationalist and Unionist traditions are locked in a similar time-bound perspective, *sub specie durationis*, which gives rise to the conflict seen at Drumcree during the Summer of 1996.

The external perspective, *sub specie aeternitatis*, in this poem, is the mature self of the poet, who is capable of seeing his earlier self at a distance, both temporally and culturally – the ‘child’ who could not be kept from wells could hardly have known about Narcissus and Echo. In terms of place, the poet sees that the two reflections of place symbolised by Narcissus and Echo, are flawed and one dimensional. Echo’s auditory repetition of the end of messages is far too limiting a concept for a personal poetic *credo*, as this poem surely is. What Heaney wants is a reflection which interacts with its medium and therefore brings about a change in both poet and attitude to place. While the pump in Mossbawn brought forth water, and some of the wells in *Personal Helicon* bring forth ‘a rich crash’ when a bucket ‘plummeted down’, the sound he values comes from other wells which:

...had echoes, gave back your own call
with a clean new music in it. (*Death of a Naturalist*, 57)

This ‘clean new music’ has the same effect as the sound of the word ‘*omphalos*’ in *Mossbawn*, and the invocation of Tacitus in *Kinship* – it brings about a development in terms of perception of place. The perception of place is modified by the voice, just as the voice is modified by the perception of place. There is a dialogue, even something of dialectic between the two. The imagery of the echo as something *new*, like the image of Tacitus in Ireland, cannot be literally true; in the language of the poem, the lessons of the classics – myth, history, politics, debate – are vital if an enlightened approach, due to a

distancing of perspective, is to be taken with respect to place, if, in short, the ‘voice’ of place is to be silenced – because, when all is said and done, aesthetic ideology involves a transference and a projection into insentient molecules of attitudes and atavisms from the race or tradition in question. A critique of such ideology makes this clear, for as Heaney notes in *The Cure at Troy*:

And that’s the borderline that poetry
Operates on too, always in between
What you would like to happen and what will –
Whether you like it or not. (*The Cure at Troy*, 2)

At the level of visual reflection, Narcissus would also seem to be another *locus classicus* of the drive of aesthetic ideology, as when he looks at place, in this case water, all he sees is himself. He is captated by a vision of place and in no sense looks for a different perspective, a new vision. Here, Heaney refuses to be part of such a view of place, and looks for a blend of auditory and visual perspective which will not take images passively from the ‘darkness’ (symbolic of the atavisms so aptly described in *Kinship*), but rather will impose a new vision on the politics of place, will disturb and critique these dark forces of racial hatred, and give him a new sense of self, a self that is kinned to the norms of Tacitus and classical thought. The waters that flow from the *Hippocrene* and the *Aganippe* will inspire a writing that will impose a rational vision upon the politics of place, and will not adhere to the suasive power of the ideology of place:

Now, to pry into roots, to finger slime,
To stare big-eyed narcissus, into some spring
Is beneath all adult dignity. I rhyme
To see myself, to set the darkness echoing. (*Death of a Naturalist*, 57)

It is this clarity of vision that connects the examples offered in this essay. The *omphalos*, Tacitus, Hercules and *Helicon* function as images of the rational critique which, *sub specie aeternitatis*, will

bring the 'voice of reality and justice,' the 'mean of a humane love and reason' to bare on the dark atavisms of the pull of place. The politics of place espoused by this classical chain of imagery makes the place of writing the place of thought and reason. It imposes this rational vision on place. The place of writing then, is to lead the intellect from the depths of the 'sour' bog of *Kinship* and the 'slime' of *Personal Helicon*, to the heights of the hill of Areopagus where through reason and debate, as in the *Oresteia*, the furies of aesthetic ideology can be contained.

IBLIOGRAPHY

- Barthes, Roland *S/Z*. Translated by Richard Miller. (London: Jonathan Cape, 1975).
- Bullfinch, Thomas, *Bullfinch's Mythology: 'The Age of Fable'*. Forward by Robert Graves. (Chicago: Doubleday, 1968).
- Bernhart, Clarence L. (ed.) (1972) *The World Book Dictionary*. Two Volumes. Chicago: Doubleday.
- de Man, Paul, *The Resistance to Theory. Theory and History of Literature, Volume 33*. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986).
- Eagleton, Terry (1990) *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Heaney, Seamus, *North* (1975). London: Faber.
- Heaney, Seamus, *Preoccupations: Selected Prose 1968-1978* (1980). London: Faber.
- Heaney, Seamus, *Death of a Naturalist* (London: Faber, 1966)
- Heaney, Seamus, *The Place of Writing* (Georgia: Scholar's Press, 1989).
- Heaney, Seamus, *The Cure at Troy* (London: Faber, 1990)
- Montague, John, *The Rough Field* (Dublin: Dolman Press, 1972).

- Norris, Christopher, *Paul de Man: Deconstruction and the Critique of Aesthetic Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1988).
- Norris, Christopher, *Spinoza and the origins of Critical Theory* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1991).
- O'Brien, Conor Cruise, *On the Eve of the Millennium* (New York: Free press, 1994).
- Parker, Michael, *Seamus Heaney: 'The Making of a Poet'*. (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan. 1993)
- Tacitus, *The Agricola and the Germania* Translated by H. Mattingly, translation revised by S.A. Handford (Harmondsworth: Penguin Classics, 1970)