Who Chooses the One Who Chooses? On a Forced Choice of Shakespearean Epistemology and Textology

Jernej Habjan

ZRC SAZU, Institute of Slovenian Literature and Literary Studies, Ljubljana, Slovenia
jernej.habjan@zrc-sazu.si

The choices made by the dominant literary criticism on behalf of the readership are themselves made in advance by institutions that reproduce this criticism. The impact of such choices on the selections made by current Shakespeare studies is analyzed and an alternative reading of Romeo and Juliet *is outlined.*

Keywords: literary criticism / literary canon / Shakespeare, William / deconstruction / multiculturalism

UDK 82.09

Far from being a neutral system, institutional literary criticism is no less than its audience determined by relations within a given social formation. Rather than merely choosing on behalf of the readers via school, canon, or, say, book market, criticism itself has to abide by forced choices made in advance in order to reproduce itself as a part of these apparatuses and institutions. Hence, within the school as the dominant modern ideological state apparatus (Althusser 152), the book market as a part of the essential institution of the capitalist world-economy (Wallerstein 25), and the canon as a privileged mechanism of the institution of nation (Močnik 175), the domain of literary criticism is not so much selection as combination. The hegemonic criticism does the work of syntagmatization, be it sympathetic dissemination or critical evaluation, of paradigmatic forced choices that serve to reproduce the world-system.[1]

A recent clear example is the 1993 report to the American Comparative Literature Association. Known as the Bernheimer Report, it subjectivated such a forced choice as a dilemma between contextualism and non-contextualism instead of negating it by reclaiming textualism as its theoretical,

rather than ideological, practice. The authors of the report viewed the issue as an antinomy between contextual culturalistic approaches to literature and non-contextual hermeneutic or semiotic approaches; more precisely, the antinomy regarded the very status of literature as the object of literary studies. However, what seems to be a disjunction from the comparatists' point of view (in this case, "the native's point of view") can be theoretically grasped as a conjunction. From the perspective of the larger world-system processes, within which such a debate on the future of university departments and programs is placed, the contextualism/non-contextualism dilemma merely draws the limits of the field of comparative literature "in the age of multiculturalism," to use Bernheimer's own dating.[2]

In light of both the paradigmatic and syntagmatic contradictions of the report, one should assert not an opposition, but an identity between contextualism and non-contextualism. At the paradigmatic level, the report itself unwittingly resolves this seeming opposition as it tries to strengthen it by deeming contextualism pluralistic. However, because this pluralism designates both the positive pole, contextualism, and its relation to the negative one, it overdetermines the opposition, making it a non-antagonistic contradiction. At the syntagmatic level, this paradox of the report is articulated, for example, in the contradictory references to the economic situation. On the one hand, by replacing national literatures as an object of criticism with various minority identities, the report implicitly follows the interstate systemic apparatuses of world capitalism (e.g., the EU, NATO, and the WTO) in their substitution of neoliberal identity politics for the social democratic politics of class compromise. On the other hand, by recommending that literature departments make a conservative move back to national literatures, the report's closing "word of caution" explicitly acknowledges "the shifting economic and sociopolitical landscape" (Bernheimer et al. 47). Thus, the world-economy is used as an argument for opposite conclusions: the need to expand (41–43) as well as preserve (47) the object of comparative literature.[3]

We can resolve this contradiction between the report's general multicultural pluralism and particular nationalistic exclusivism if we view it as an instance of a general process of the modern world-system. This system, Wallerstein writes, "has made a central, basic feature of its structure the simultaneous existence, propagation, and practice of both universalism and anti-universalism. This antinomic duo is as fundamental to the system as is the core-peripheral axial division of labor" (Wallerstein 41). Within publishing and copyright-protected cultural production in general, to which the report pertains in its contextualistic reduction of art to culture, this "symbiotic" (38) relation between universalist liberalism and

anti-universalist racism and sexism is reproduced as a relation between the protectionist cultural politics of "*l'exception culturelle*" and the neoliberal politics of "cultural diversity" (Breznik 33, 37–38) – the relation projected into the latter of its own poles, represented therein as the ethnistic and even biologistic presuppositions of the pole's multiculturalism (31–32, 42). This projection, repetition of the protectionism/neoliberalism dyad within neoliberalism, turns the dyad into "symbiosis" and, moreover, indicates that this symbiosis is achieved by the typical institutional mechanism of disawoving knowledge in the name of belief. The knowledge of the antisocial effects of neoliberal politics is disawoved on behalf of, and has made peace with, the belief in neoliberalism, so that the institutions can endorse "cultural diversity" when normally practicing their belief as well as employ "*l'exception culturelle*" in the exceptional cases when that belief cannot be sustained by knowledge (see, e.g., 37).

The dependency of the 1993 ACLA report on this symbiosis is a result of the report's pre-theoretic, ideological practice. Namely, the report derives its guidelines from the current institutional situation of Complit, rather than from any epistemological break with institutional constraints. University departments should learn to switch between pluralistic multiculturalism and exclusivist nationalism in order to follow either the economic situation as such or all the other departments that are supposed to already be following this situation. Hence the report itself not only fails to produce such a break, but it reproduces the institutional contextualism/non-contextualism dilemma and, by extension, the universalism/anti-universalism conjunction. This spontaneous embeddedness of the report in identity politics is condensed in its belief that university teachers should make use of the multicultural composition of their classrooms for "class discussion" (Bernheimer et al. 46). That is, students should be addressed as natives of particular minority identities, not as Cartesian subjects able to participate in the production of knowledge.

That this replacement of the modern subject of science with postmodern identities has led to the emergence of the super-ego injunction to enjoy is evident, for example, in the Shakespeare and Schools Project, founded in 1986 at the University of Cambridge (Gibson 144). This project compels pupils to relish acting out on the loose basis of Shakespeare as script, instead of "grinding through the Notes" (142); that is, reading Shakespeare as subjectivizing text: "[T]ext implies the solitary, individual, desk-bound scholar. A script, like a rehearsal, implies that learning about and enacting drama arises from shared experience" (145).[4]

This substitution of "class discussion" *for class struggle* places the report within what Badiou dismisses as "cultural sociology" (Badiou 23),

the academic proponent of multiculturalism. For Badiou, multiculturalism enforces a nihilistic conjunction of, a false choice between, the conservative "external constraint" of the logic of Capital (31) on the one hand and the death drive of biopolitics on the other (30, 33–34, 38). A similarly radical critique of this conjunction was also put forward in Julia Reinhard Lupton's *Citizen-Saints*, a study of Shakespeare and political theology. Interpreting *The Tempest*'s Caliban as a creature rather than a minority identity of anti-universalist New Historicism, Lupton claims that "in response to the forced choice between universalism and particularism, the creature takes shape as their negative intersection, equal to neither" (Reinhard Lupton 177). Shakespeare's "decisive crystallization of a certain material moment within the theology of the creature might help us find a post-secular solution to the predicament of modern humanity, trapped in the increasingly catastrophic choice between the universalism of global capital on the one hand and the tribalism of ethnic cleansing on the other" (178). Following Lupton, we might add that this identity between universalism and particularism is achieved by their promotion, not of subjectivity, but precisely of "identity, whether subsumed in the macrocosmic totality of 'humanity' or the local habitation of 'culture'" (177).[5]

Although Lupton's identification of humanist and multiculturalist Shakespeare scholarship with respective positions in the contemporary ideological struggle may seem mere activism, it can be easily backed up by an analysis of the epistemological impasse of current *Romeo and Juliet* studies.

Since Kristeva's (Kristeva) and Derrida's ("Aphorism") readings of the play, the politics of *Romeo and Juliet* have become a *topos* of Shakespeare criticism. However, rather than subscribing to Nicholas Royle's claim that the balcony scene "isn't the same again after Derrida" (Royle 23), I am inclined, on the contrary, to concur with Derrida's own assurance that "everything is in Shakespeare: everything and the rest" (Derrida, "This" 67). "The rest," I claim, is a lack in Shakespeare studies inscribed in them as contradiction, a fidelity to a lack the ignorance of which makes Shakespeareans contradict themselves. On the one hand, Kristeva's and Derrida's "anti-essentialist" readings of the play inspire diametrically opposed further interpretations (from Greenblatt's to Bloom's); on the other hand, as I will try to show, they themselves form an identity with Girard's "essentialist" reading, for example. This false alternative should be rejected by the claim that the play is political precisely in its intimacy.

Under the influence of "a few French naysayers," to use Bloom's label (*The Western* 59), Shakespeareans are becoming "apostles of Resentment" (53). Their vicissitudes can be summed up in an antinomy between extrinsic and intrinsic approaches to the theme of naming.[6] The extrinsic approach

(Schalkwyk 151–177, Belsey, Ryan, Maguire 50–73) regards naming in *Romeo and Juliet* as external to, yet constitutive of, the self; and the intrinsic approach (Kristeva, Leggatt 29–58, Davis) projects this dualism into the self as ridden with ambivalent love-hatred. However, because both approaches unwittingly regard the lovers as victims of a certain constructed other (be it naming or love-hatred), they continually pass into each other (Leggatt 29–58, Davis).[7] As such they condense their own relationship to their essentialist adversary as they pass into them as well: reducible to each other, they can also be identified with essentialism. Namely, the victimization of the lovers is no less at work in Bloom, Girard, or Frye, who naturalize the constructed other of anti-essentialism as eternal "time's ironies" (Bloom, *Shakespeare* 87), "mimetic desire" (Girard 48–49), and "the tragic heroic" (Frye 33) respectively.[8]

Consequently, the play itself is victimized, absent from both Bloom's center of the Western canon (*King Lear*, *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*) and the multicultural Shakespeare of *The Tempest*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and, again, *Othello*.[9] A way out of this forced choice between the humanistic universalism of Bloomian deconstructive literary criticism and the humanistic particularism of Derridean deconstructive multiculturalism would traverse the very dichotomy of Bloomian "self-centered" non-contextualism and Derridean "other-centered" contextualism.[10]

If Shakespeare criticism is to avoid the double bind of the romantic cult of the Bard – due to which Bloom can write on Shakespeare extensively but does not identify himself as "a Shakespeare scholar" (Bloom, *The Western* 50), whereas Derrida wanted to become "a 'Shakespeare expert'" (Derrida, "This" 67) but wrote only "Aphorism" – it should radicalize, rather than transgress, the romantic cult in the direction of Lupton's political theology, for example. Only then would the universality of Shakespeare be conceptualized as something more than either a sum of particular selves (from Hamlet to Falstaff: Bloom *Shakespeare* 4–5, 745) or a particular universality among other universalities (from Plato's to Celan's: Derrida "This" 67). This would require, far from merely negating Bloomian or Derridean poststructuralism, fidelity to the event of structuralist psychoanalysis.[11]

Therefore, by regarding Romeo and Juliet as victims of particular naming, the contextualist readings unwittingly reiterate non-contextualist subsumptions of the character's action under universal fate. The lovers' missed encounter – the problematic of the play – is reified into an effect of either the Derridean "[i]rony of the proper name" (Derrida, "Aphorism" 432) or the Bloomian "time's ironies." Moreover, these multiculturalist interpretations reproduce the even more traditional exclusion of the play from the corpus of "mature tragedies" as well as the textological dilemma

between "any other name" and "any other word." They unknowingly collaborate with their conservative opponents in maintaining the commonplaces of *Romeo and Juliet* as a bad tragedy (Oz) and of its first quarto edition as a "bad" quarto (Farley-Hills).

Regarding the bad tragedy, the multiculturalists seem to agree with the standard judgment that the play is unable to meet the criterion of "character as destiny – the 'great man' undone from within either by an innate weakness or a fallible moral decision" (White 1). And as for the "bad" quarto, it is the sole version of the play among five quarto and four folio editions published between 1597 and 1685 that reads, "What's in a name? That which we call a rose, / By any other name would smell as sweet," not "What's in a name? That which we call a rose, / By any other word would smell as sweet" (2.2.43–44). The editor of the 1980 Arden Shakespeare, Brian Gibbons, glosses the second line, "Shakespeare calls a name, as a thing apart from a person, a *word* … Q2 makes sense and should stand, despite the irrational pressure of proverbial familiarity attaching to *name* as the choice in many earlier editions" (Shakespeare 129).

This rendition has since prevailed, with the Riverside, the 2007 RSC, the Cambridge, and other prominent editions choosing "any other word" over "any other name." It is worth noting that among conservative exceptions there is Bloom again, this time as author of the afterword to the 2004 Yale edition. Instead of taking sides and trying to solve a mystery that may as well have been a mystery to the Author himself,[12] let me stress that what has also prevailed is the notion already mentioned that this "thing apart from a person," be it "name" or "word," victimizes the lovers and thus makes the play a bad tragedy devoid of the "'great man' undone from within."

It can now be seen that particularist multiculturalism, far from refuting the universalist humanism of Bardolatry, reproduces the latter's choices regarding genre criticism, character analysis, and textual criticism. Instead of theorizing Bloom's center of the Western canon, these "power-and-gender freaks," to use yet another of Bloom's labels (*Shakespeare* 10), merely supplement it with the Jew or the Moor of Venice. It is this supplementary operation that makes the antinomy between Bloomian and Derridean Shakespeareans uncannily similar to the conjunction of universalism and anti-universalist racism and sexism that Wallerstein, Badiou, or Lupton attribute to today's ideological hegemony.

In order to negate this false alternative, one should replace the institutional antinomy with a theoretical debate by outlining a structuralist, anti-deconstructive and anti-humanistic, interpretation of the play as text. A return to text would allow readers to choose beyond the canon as well as its transgressions, which reproduce the notion of the canon instead of analyzing it.

Let me quickly revisit the problem of naming.[13] The action of the play is informed by Juliet's mistaking a name for a word, an empty signifier for an ordinary, relational element of the signifying chain. The initial hailing by both the Father's demand for marriage with Paris and the Nurse's transgression, the super-ego injunction to enjoy regardless of this demand, introduces to Juliet a lack within the Name-of-the-Father. She sutures this lack by following the binary logic of the signifier that brings her to *Romeo*, which in her mother's tongue (but not her mother tongue – that is, the Prince's) signifies "Montague, *ergo* the enemy of the Capulets, *ergo* Juliet's enemy, *ergo* not allowed, *ergo* non-Paris." The ego-ideal, symbolic Other, for whom she is acting out, is then her Father, Romeo remaining but her imaginary ideal ego. In the families' discourses that govern Juliet, if not Verona, *Romeo* signifies either "Montague, *ergo* friend" or "Montague, *ergo* enemy"; in the Prince's impotent "Third Way" it signifies "citizen." What remains a blind spot in this *dispositif*, and is as such retroactively instituted by it, is object as absence of any positive object: for Juliet, *Romeo*'s signified is ultimately "Juliet's lover"; that is, the object-cause of Juliet's desire is herself as "Romeo's lover," as Real-impossible.

Due to this retroactive activation of Romeo's appeal by the Father's demand, Juliet cannot address Romeo without reaching the Father. When the Father is present for the first time, feebly attached to the Name-of-the-Father, and Romeo banished, detached from his name (3.5.124–195), she tries to promote Romeo to the position of the ego-ideal. Her attempt to bypass the Father's discourse by enforcing her own discourse of apparent death upon Mantua, where the banished Romeo dwells, structurally fails. She blinds herself to the fact that her utterances depend on the Other, which in turn depends on Bakhtin's "arena of the struggle of two voices," on Vološinov's "arena of class struggle," in which Romeo is a peon. As subject to Verona, unable to insert the phallic signifier of Juliet's apparent death into the signifying chain of her letter, Romeo reads her acting out as conventionally as her Father. Only now, when the failure of Juliet's discourse of love is reiterated in the failure of her discourse of apparent death, does she subjectivate the nothing that her own question "What's in a name?" was referring to. Her final suspension of her acting out for her Father's gaze – that is, her refusal to escape to Paris or a convent – leads to suicide as a Lacanian suicide, the only possible passage from a signifer to an act.

Read as an element of a text, which, for Jakobson, is precisely a syntagmatic elaboration of the paradigmatic logic of the signifier, Juliet does become a tragic "character as destiny" and as such the quintessential textual critic and editor of her own utterance regarding any other name/word.

NOTES

[1] "'[H]istorical systems' … had existed up to now in only three variants: minisystems; and 'world-systems' of two kinds – world-economies and world-empires." (Wallerstein 16) "The world in which we are now living, the modern world-system, had its origins in the sixteenth century. This world-system was then located … primarily in parts of Europe and the Americas. It expanded over time to cover the whole globe. It is and has always been a *world-economy*. It is and has always been a *capitalist* world-economy … [A] world-economy is a large geographic zone within which there is a division of labor and hence significant internal exchange of basic or essential goods as well as flows of capital and labor … [A] capitalist system … gives priority to the *endless* accumulation of capital" (23–24).

[2] An account of how nationalism supplemented with cosmopolitanism has recently been replaced by multiculturalism as the dominant ideology of comparative literature is given in the closing arguments of Juvan, "'Peripherocentrisms.'"

[3] In her response to the Bernheimer Report, Mary Louise Pratt (59–61) also mentions the institutional compromises suggested by the authors of the report in order to embrace globalization without giving up Eurocentrism. However, what she effectively prescribes is simply more globalization.

[4] As part of the project, an edition of *Romeo and Juliet* was published that invites the pupils "to bring the play to life in your classroom, hall or drama studio through enjoyable activities that will increase your understanding … [Y]ou are encouraged to make up your own mind about *Romeo and Juliet*, rather than having someone else's interpretation handed down to you" (Gibson 144). Hence the question, say, of Paris' honesty in 5.3.12–17 "is left open for students to decide for themselves rather than emphasizing the weight of critical judgement of the lines. In the same scene students are invited to experiment with speaking … in different order to that of the script …Student judgement is similarly encouraged in the invitation to challenge longstanding stage conventions" (148). See also note 5 below.

[5] Another key reference for me is Moretti (42, 68–69), for whom Elizabethan and Jacobean tragedy stages the sovereign as split by an insolvable conflict of will and reason. With this negation of, on the one hand, the classical tragedy's sovereign as the neutralizing supplement to social contradictions and, on the other, the future of tragedy as such, Moretti's Shakespeare is among those that paved the way for Cromwell.

[6] By the early 1990s, the theme reached as far as the postmodern permissive High School Shakespeare: "The instabilities of post-structuralism, the problematics of language and reference, naming and identity, underlie an activity on 'What's in a name' where students speculate on what would happen if they habitually 'misnamed' either themselves or conventionally accepted signifieds" (Gibson 151).

[7] Again, the problem can be imputed to Kristeva's unmotivated move from Shakespeare's text (as informed by love-hatred) to biography (in which the love of Romeo and Juliet – suddenly detached from hatred – is the hapless Bard's fantasy).

[8] Girard's basically humanistic "mimetic desire" is the truth of both Kristeva's supposedly antihumanistic "love-hatred" and his own attacks on the "old humanistic" (Girard 45) Shakespeareans. Moreover, according to R. S. White, it has been so throughout the twentieth century, when the predominant appropriations of *Romeo and Juliet*, revisions of either Freud or Marx, unknowingly shared the presupposition that human freedom is impossible (White 4).

[9] Again, Girard is telltale: he explicitly (Girard 42) gives arguments for excluding *Romeo and Juliet* from his book, *A Theatre of Envy: William Shakespeare*.

[10] As a humanistic, canon-upholding appropriator of French transgressive deconstruction, Bloom is presented in Juvan, *History* 116.

[11] Bloom's *Western Canon* cultivates the traumatic polyphony of its object, the corpus of the Western canon, by condensing it in a single opus: Shakespeare is the center of the canon because by "inventing the human" (*Shakespeare* xx, 4, 714) it introduced all key Western commonplaces. Their polyphony is thus sublated in Shakespeare – which is itself rendered readable by Bloom himself, who in turn admits "Bardolatry" (728). As the center, Shakespeare must remain empty, a master-signifier, organizing the canon as its own context. Hence Bloom's aversion to "French" contextualizations of Shakespeare as merely one of the signifiers in the signifying chain. This quasi-structuralism of Bloomian canonizations and multicultural contextualizations alike can be suspended not by disavowing structuralism, but by radicalizing it via the theory of the Real as the impossible cleft between the master-signifier and the chain. This entails (re)turning to text as the object of analysis, something that has been ignored by Eagleton's or Greenblatt's syntheses, as well as Bloom's, Kermode's, and Girard's syntheses; more precisely, by the very contextualism/non-contextualism controversy.

[12] In his refutation of the commonplace that the first quarto is a memorial reconstruction of the play and that it was published by the printer, John Danter, without the authority of its owners, David Farley-Hills (43–44, 27) maintains that Q1 derives from Shakespeare's own working drafts, known as his foul papers, entertaining even Jay L. Halio's claim that Q1 is not a reported text, but an abridged version of Shakespeare's original.

[13] For a more detailed analysis of the play, see Habjan, "Canonization."

WORKS CITED

Althusser, Louis. "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses." Althusser, *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. London: NLB, 1971. 127–186.

Badiou, Alain. *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. London and New York: Verso, 2001.

Belsey, Catherine. "The Name of the Rose in *Romeo and Juliet*." *Romeo and Juliet: Contemporary Critical Essays*. Ed. R. S. White. Houndmills and New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001. 47–67.

Bernheimer, Charles, et al. "The Bernheimer Report, 1993." *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. Ed. Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins UP, 1995. 39–48.

Bloom, Harold. *Shakespeare: The Invention of the Human*. New York: Riverhead Books, 1998.

– – –. *The Western Canon*. London and Houndmills: Macmillan, 1995.

Breznik, Maja. "Culture between 'L'exception Culturelle' and 'Cultural Diversity'." Aldo Milohnić et al., *Culture Ltd. Material Conditions of Cultural Production*. Ljubljana: The Peace Institute, 2005. 15–43.

Davis, Lloyd. "'Death-marked love': Desire and Presence in *Romeo and Juliet*." *Romeo and Juliet: Contemporary Critical Essays*. 28–46.

Derrida, Jacques. "Aphorism Countertime." Derrida, *Acts of Literature*. Ed. Derek Attridge. London and New York: Routledge, 1992. 414–433.

– – –. "'This Strange Institution Called Literature': An Interview with Jacques Derrida." Derrida, *Acts of Literature*. 33–75.

Farley-Hills, David. "The 'Bad' Quarto of *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare Survey* 49 (1996): 27–44.

Frye, Northrop. *Northrop Frye On Shakespeare*. New Haven and London: Yale UP, 1986.

Gibson, Rex. "'O, what learning is!' Pedagogy and the Afterlife of *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare Survey* 49 (1996): 141–152.

Girard, René. "The Passionate Oxymoron in *Romeo and Juliet*." *Shakespeare et l'excès*. Eds. Pierre Kapitaniak and Jean-Michel Déprats. Paris: Société Française Shakespeare, 2007. 41–56.

Habjan, Jernej. "Canonization – Culturalization – Sanctification: *Romeo and Juliet* in the Western Canon, the 'French Resentment,' and Lacanian Ethics." *(a): The Journal of Culture and the Unconscious* (Fall 2010) [forthcoming].

Juvan, Marko. *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2008.

– – –. "'Peripherocentrisms': Geopolitics of Comparative Literatures between Ethnocentrism and Cosmopolitanism." *Les identités relatives des littératures*. Ed. Jusit Maar. Paris: Harmattan, 2010 [forthcoming].

Kristeva, Julia. "Romeo and Juliet: Love-Hatred in the Couple." Kristeva, *Tales of Love*. New York: Columbia UP, 1987. 209–233.

Leggatt, Alexander. *Shakespeare's Tragedies: Violation and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Maguire, Laurie. *Shakespeare's Names*. New York: Oxford UP, 2007.

Močnik, Rastko. "Toward a Materialist Concept of Literature." *Cultural Critique* 4 (1986): 171–189.

Moretti, Franco. "The Great Eclipse." Moretti, *Signs Taken For Wonders*. London and New York: Verso, 2005. 42–82.

Oz, Avraham. "'What's in a Good Name?' The Case of *Romeo and Juliet* as a Bad Tragedy." *"Bad" Shakespeare: Revaluations of the Shakespeare Canon*. Ed. Maurice Charney. Rutherford, Madison, and Teaneck: Farleigh Dickinson UP; London and Toronto: Associated UP, 1988. 133–142.

Pratt, Mary Louise. "Comparative Literature and Global Citizenship." *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*. 58–65.

Reinhard Lupton, Julia. *Citizen-Saints: Shakespeare and Political Theology*. Chicago and London: U of Chicago P, 2005.

Royle, Nicholas. *Jacques Derrida*. London and New York: Routledge, 2003.

Ryan, Kiernan. "'The Murdering Word.'" *Romeo and Juliet: Contemporary Critical Essays*. 116–128.

Schalkwyk, David. *Speech and Performance in Shakespeare's Sonnets and Plays*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Shakespeare, William. *Romeo and Juliet*. Ed. Brian Gibbons. London and New York: Methuen (*The Arden Shakespeare*, Second Series), 1980.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *World-Systems Analysis. An Introduction*. Durham and London: Duke UP, 2005.

White, R. S. "Introduction: What is this thing called love?" *Romeo and Juliet: Contemporary Critical Essays*. 1–27.