Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies

Reading the Past Across Space and Time

Receptions and World Literature

Edited by Brenda Deen Schildgen and Ralph Hexter

Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies

Series Editor

Robert T. Tally Jr.
Texas State University
San Marcos, Texas, USA

Aim of the Series

Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies is a new book series focusing on the dynamic relations among space, place, and literature. The spatial turn in the humanities and social sciences has occasioned an explosion of innovative, multidisciplinary scholarship in recent years, and geocriticism, broadly conceived, has been among the more promising developments in spatially oriented literary studies. Whether focused on literary geography, cartography, geopoetics, or the spatial humanities more generally, geocritical approaches enable readers to reflect upon the representation of space and place, both in imaginary universes and in those zones where fiction meets reality. Titles in the series include both monographs and collections of essays devoted to literary criticism, theory, and history, often in association with other arts and sciences. Drawing on diverse critical and theoretical traditions, books in the Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies series disclose, analyze, and explore the significance of space, place, and mapping in literature and in the world.

More information about this series at
http://www.springer.com/series/15002

Brenda Deen Schildgen • Ralph Hexter
Editors

Reading the Past Across Space and Time

Receptions and World Literature

palgrave
macmillan

Editors
Brenda Deen Schildgen
Comparative Literature
University of California, Davis
Davis, California, USA

Ralph Hexter
Classics and Comparative Literature
University of California, Davis
Davis, California, USA

Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies
ISBN 978-1-137-56543-3 ISBN 978-1-137-55885-5 (eBook)
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-55885-5

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016957888

© The Editor(s) (if applicable) and The Author(s) 2016
This work is subject to copyright. All rights are solely and exclusively licensed by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.
The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.
The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Cover illustration: Fra Mauro Mappa Mundi (1450) www.bing.com/images/search

Printed on acid-free paper

This Palgrave Macmillan imprint is published by Springer Nature
The registered company is Nature America Inc
The registered company address is: 1 New York Plaza, New York, NY 10004, U.S.A.

Acknowledgments

A collaborative project, this collection of essays emerged from a conference at UC Davis in 2013 titled "Receptions: Reading the Past Across Space and Time." The conference was the culmination of a two-year UC Davis Academic Senate Research funded initiative focused on "Receptions." In keeping with the National Endowment for the Humanities' call for interdisciplinary transcultural projects, this initiative chose "intercultural receptions" as its focus. Our particular interest was reception of literary works from earlier periods into later ones, and it included (1) transhistorical receptions, (2) transpatial receptions, (3) translation, and (4) post-"orientalism."

Reception studies confront us with the changing intellectual and cultural roles of sacred and profane canons of art and literature in the broadest sense. Indeed, tracking receptions requires an examination of the cultural setting of the reception in which the new work appears; the authority of learned environments and educational systems in general; and the relationship of culture and politics where canons and their reception are created, translated, promulgated, and preserved. Avoiding the contentious discussions about the "western" literary canon and its collusion with power elites that have permeated educational establishments in the United States in the last forty years, this initiative chose to examine how the various appropriations of earlier texts and cultural forms have responded to them as prompts, imitated or echoed them, inspired new cultural and artistic forms, deliberately swerved from them, misread them, selectively read or edited them, undermined them, or otherwise used them, all of which constitute their reception history.

Professor Ralph Hexter, Professor Wai Chee Dimock, and Professor Arturo Arias gave the keynote talks, all three discussing recycled epics. These talks are revised for this volume. The steering committee that supported the receptions initiative at UC Davis comprised Emily Albu and Rex Stem, Classics; Xiaomei Chen, East Asian Languages and Literature; Joseph Sorensen, East Asian Languages and Literature; Jan Szaif, Philosophy; and Archana Venkatesan, Comparative Literature and Religious Studies, who organized the conference. All participated in the selection of the original papers, of which nine (the three mentioned above and those by Professor Zina Giannopoulou (Classics, University of California, Irvine), Kevin Batton (Classics, University of California, Irvine), Professor Jan Szaif (Philosophy, University of California, Davis), Michael Griffin (Philosophy, University of British Columbia), Adam Siegel (Reference Librarian, University of California, Davis), and Professor Michelle Yeh, East Asian Languages and Cultures, UC Davis) are included in this volume. The remainder of the essays were delivered as part of either the receptions initiative at UC Davis—Professor Zhang Longxi (Comparative Literature, City University of Hong Kong) and Uwe Vagelpohl (Cambridge University)—or invitations to contribute as Kristen Bergman (Assistant Professor, Grove City College), Professor Chunjie Zhang (German and Comparative Literature, UC Davis), Robert Borgen (Professor Emeritus of Japanese History and Literature, UC Davis), and Professor Gisèle Sapiro (Gisèle Sapiro (Directrice de recherche au CNRS et directrice d'études à l'EHESS, Université Paris1-Panthéon-Sorbonne).

The general and final editing was the work of Brenda Deen Schildgen and Ralph Hexter, whereas primary editing of individual essays was divided among the steering committee. Thus, Joseph Sorensen edited the essays of Robert Borgen, Kristen Bergman, Chunjie Zhang, and Michelle Yeh; Rex Stem edited those of Zina Giannopoulou, Kevin Batton, and Adam Siegel; and Jan Szaif edited those of Uwe Vagelpohl and Michael Griffin. We thank Dr. Laura Pfuntner for her able assistance in compiling the index.

Contents

Reading the Past Across Space and Time: Receptions and World Literature 1
Brenda Deen Schildgen and Ralph Hexter

Part I Epic Receptions 21

Epic Worlds 23
Ralph Hexter

Recycling the Epic: *Gilgamesh* on Three Continents 39
Wai Chee Dimock

"Wheels Working Together: The *Popol Wuj* and *Time Commences in Xibalbá* as Markers of a Maya Cosmovision" 59
Arturo Arias

Reception Configurations: The Case of European Epic in India 83
Brenda Deen Schildgen

Formal Experiments in Margaret Atwood's *The Penelopiad* 103
Zina Giannopoulou

Part II Greek Philosophical Receptions 119

Disagreement and Reception: Peripatetics Responding to the Stoic Challenge 121
Jan Szaif

"Now We Must Consider That Some of the Ancients Discovered the Truth": Reception and Antiquity in Ancient Neoplatonism 149
Michael Griffin

Reading and Commenting on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Arabic 165
Uwe Vagelpohl

Part III Drama and Receptions 185

A Third *Antike*: Hans Henny Jahnn's *Medea* and the Introduction of the "Sumerian" to Modern German Literature 187
Adam Siegel

American *Bushido*: A Kabuki Play Transplanted 203
Robert Borgen

Tamil "Translation," French Orientalism, and Indian Dramatic Traditions in Louis Jacolliot's *La Devadassi* (1868) 223
Kristen Bergman Waha

Part IV Lyric Receptions 243

Goethe's *Chinesisch-deutsche Jahres- und Tageszeiten*: Vernacular Universal, *Erotica Sinica*, and the Temporality of *Nachträglichkeit* 245
Chunjie Zhang

The Mediterranean Metaphor 265
Kevin Batton

Inventing China: The American Tradition of Translating Chinese Poetry 285
Michelle Yeh

Part V Politics and Sociology of Reception 297

Meaning, Reception, and the Use of Classics: Theoretical Considerations in a Chinese Context 299
Zhang Longxi

The Sociology of Reception 321
Gisèle Sapiro

Afterword 341
Brenda Deen Schildgen and Ralph Hexter

Notes on Contributors 349

Selected Bibliography 355

Index 381

Reading the Past Across Space and Time: Receptions and World Literature

Brenda Deen Schildgen and Ralph Hexter

Introduction

Our philological home is the earth. It can no longer be the nation.
~ Erich Auerbach, *Philology and Weltliteratur* (1952)

This collection of essays examines receptions of ancient to early modern literary works from around the world that have circulated globally, that is, across time and space. Thus, in one sense, the collection starts with the premise of an enduring and revered cultural past, whether in the East, West, North, or South. The second premise is that the circulation of literature through translation and other forms of reception long predates modern global society. It is hardly a new phenomenon. If anything is new, it is the idea of national literary canons, which have existed just over a 100 years.

The idea of national literature was born alongside the development of national ideologies beginning in the eighteenth century, and most prominently argued by Johann Gottfried Herder (1744–1803), whose

B.D. Schildgen (✉)
Comparative Literature, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA
e-mail: bdschildgen@ucdavis.edu

R. Hexter
Classics/Comparative Literature, UC Davis, Davis, CA, USA

© The Author(s) 2016

B.D. Schildgen, R. Hexter (eds.), *Reading the Past Across Space and Time*, Geocriticism and Spatial Literary Studies,
DOI 10.1057/978-1-137-55885-5_1

encounter with James Macpherson's *Fingal, Ancient Epic Poem in Six Books, Composed by Ossian* (published in 1760), prompted his engagement with the idea of German literature. This led to his anonymous publication *Fragments on Recent German Literature* (1767–68). The Scottish writer Macpherson (1736–1796), while thwarting the idea of British national unity by his supposed turn to "authentic" Gaelic oral sources, nonetheless stimulated a trans-European search for national origins because Ossian was soon translated into several European languages. One of the main elements of nineteenth-century European cultural activity, this quest for national origins accompanied the individual European vernacular languages' and literatures' assertion of national identity over the legacy of classical Greece and Rome,[1] and Europe's simultaneous explorations into the literary and cultural legacies beyond Europe's borders.

Prior to the existence of powerful institutions like national or international presses, and before nationally and language-defined literary canons and school curricula were adopted into universities as the basis for most national literature departments, literary works crossed language and cultural boundaries in a tributary system of circulation that was, to some degree, independent and autonomous. A widely disseminated phenomenon, inter-language literary circulation occurs across space and time. It would be hard to imagine Chaucer, "father of English literature," for example, without French, Italian, Latin, and even Arabic resources; Shakespeare without his continental and ancient sources; Cervantes without Latin, Greek, Italian, French, Arabic, and other literary resources; not to mention Virgil and Ovid without Homer; the Tamil Kampan without the Sanskrit Valmiki; Japanese writer Lady Murasaki without Chinese classical poetry, or Goethe without an entire set of global literary resources, including those of Chinese, Persian, and Sanskrit origin. The receptions of these authors demonstrate the circulation of literary texts "beyond their culture of origin"; indeed, they represent circulatory patterns within networks or relationships that are often the creation of an autonomous author or reader.[2] This is not to deny that, in the cases cited above, the choices were from a select list of established works that in themselves often possessed enormous cultural power partly because of their ancient status but also because of their long-standing appeal.

The essays in this volume explore this kind of circulation of letters as the study of receptions, in other words, receptions—note the plural—study. Focusing on receptions that are invariably multiple kinds of "translation" of literary works into other literary contexts and genres is a way to understand

how literature belongs to a continuum of related forms and subjects connected across time, often the ancient past with the modern, and across space, often spaces constituted as colonial and post-colonial, East and West, North and South, politically subjugated and culturally independent or dependent, from centers of "symbolic capital" to peripheries and vice versa. While recognizing the realities of political and social pressures on cultural products, the approach to literary history adopted here stands apart from assumptions about asymmetrical relationships ruling the creation and reception of literary works. The focus here is on how writers or readers explore and use the reservoir of literary texts that constitute, because of the choice of these receivers, a world republic of letters, to invoke a term of Pascale Casanova's in her book *The World Republic of Letters*.[3] In other words, fundamental here is the idea that writers and readers, reading, receiving, "translating," and rewriting, are creating and responding in a semi-autonomous "republic" of letters.

The volume sets out to define a new way of conceptualizing world literature by examining the ways in which literary works cross arbitrary national boundaries, which are themselves subject to change, and circumvent cultural and language barriers as though in an autonomous zone of circulation, in liberated territories (figuratively speaking). The essays—and in this case, we are only discussing *literary* circulation—argue for an understanding of literary production and circulation as separate from national traditions and from conventional zones of literary interaction and reception (as area study formulations, for example, such as "the western tradition," Latin American Literature, Middle Eastern Literature, or South Asian Literature), and for reception that breaks from spatial and temporal limitations. The case studies examined here demonstrate how literary works are received across national, language, and cultural boundaries according to the choices of writers who themselves are readers. This is a phenomenon easily recognized (though often ignored) in the visual arts, which although restricted by the conventions of the media of expression, are not confined by language or national traditions. Just as Philosophy or Art is not examined as a product of linguistic or geographical regions, we want to show that literature too belongs to interconnected tributaries of cultural relationships. Looking at literary circulation in this way, even while recognizing the significance of the language in which a literary work might be written, highlights the limitation and artificiality of examining literature according to narrowly defined national canons.

Goethe's remark that "world literature is now at hand" came just as Germany was poised to enter the international literary domain, Casanova notes in *The World Republic of Letters.*[4] She argues that a "literature-world" exists as a literary universe relatively independent of the everyday world and its political divisions, whose "boundaries and operational laws are not reducible to those of ordinary political space."[5] Thus, Casanova's book, which addresses literature from the sixteenth century on in Europe and then in colonial and post-colonial settings, programmatically examines the circulation of texts in a "literary" as opposed to a "political" world. (Undeniably, making such a distinction, today as in the periods discussed, could itself be interpreted in "political" terms, but that is not our argument here.) Casanova writes in a summary sentence occurring toward the end of the book: "The cleavages characteristic of literary space that are the furthest removed from the center and the pattern of their multiple dependencies furnish perhaps the surest sign of *the incongruence of literary space and the political nation, which is to say of the relative autonomy of world literary space*"[6] (emphasis ours), an argument already made by Karl Marx in *Grundrisse* in 1858, although this remained unpublished until 1939.[7] This position profoundly modifies and complicates arguments that literary culture, meaning the literary works themselves as opposed to their reception by readers, is complicit with nationalism and imperialism and supports their modes of domination.[8] That is not to deny that in the modern era in Europe and elsewhere, that is, since the Enlightenment, state systems have empowered cultural engineers, including academies, boards of education (national, local, and peripheral), national and colonial educational planners, literary prize boards, publishers and editors, literary salons, literary magazines, and other kinds of communities of readers and cultural czars, to determine the shape and scope of canons, the designation of major works, and literary programs to educate national or colonial subjects,[9] aspects of which will be discussed in this volume by Gisèle Sapiro. But it is to argue that writers, as autonomous subjects, have participated in a global literary exchange that operates seemingly free of national boundaries, language limitations, and temporal and spatial distance.

Casanova's initial inspiration comes from Valéry Larbaud, who, in 1925 in *Ce vice impuni, la lecture: Domaine anglais* (*Reading, This Unpunished Vice: English Domain)*, argued that "the politics of literature" has its own ways and its own reasons, which transcend the politics of nations. He remarked on the great difference between the political map and the intellectual map of the world, a reality made only too current in

the wake of the First World War: “The one changes its look every fifty years; it is covered with arbitrary and uncertain divisions, and its major centers are constantly shifting. The intellectual map, by contrast changes slowly, and its boundaries display great stability … Whence an intellectual politics that has almost no relation to economic politics.”[10] Casanova also turns to Fernand Braudel who “noted a relative independence of artistic space with respect to economic (and therefore political) space.” Reviewing the major urban culture centers of Europe, he generalizes, whether correctly or not, when Amsterdam became the center of European commerce in the seventeenth century, Rome and Madrid were the core of creativity in the arts and literature. Culturally Paris, in the eighteenth century, surpassed London, the hub of the world economy. “Similarly,” Braudel remarked, “in the late nineteenth century and early twentieth, France, though lagging behind the rest of Europe economically, was the undisputed center of Western painting and literature; the times when Italy or Germany dominated the world of music were not times when Italy or Germany dominated Europe economically or politically; and even today, the formidable economic lead [enjoyed] by the United States has not made it the literary and artistic leader of the world.”[11] One of the most impressive examples might be Ireland, that once impoverished colonized island, which managed to produce some of the greatest English writers of the twentieth century despite its poverty, massive emigration, and relatively small population. Braudel’s premise, while adopting the geographical area of Europe as the case study, posits that the literary world possesses its own boundaries, capitals, and exchange systems that may not coincide with those of the political and economic powers.

Casanova further argues, again thinking in terms of literary circulation over the last 400 years, that “Over time, owing to the work of a number of pioneering figures remarkable for their freedom from nationalist prejudice, an international literary law came to be created, a specific form of recognition that owes nothing to political fiat, interest, or prejudice. The world of letters is in fact something quite different from the received view of literature as a peaceful domain. Its history is one of incessant struggle and competition over the very nature of literature itself—an endless succession of literary manifestos, movements, assaults, revolutions. These rivalries are what have created world literature.”[12] In other words, creative activity and new forms of expression emerge from the push and pull of cultural, social, political, and technological exchange and contest, convergence, divergence, and reception.

One of Casanova's most prominent examples of the world republic of letters as against the political domination of letters that demonstrates the literary power of the periphery to rise up is in fact the Irish writer James Joyce. Arguably one of the greatest English novels of the twentieth century, Joyce's *Ulysses* adopted the canonical Greek epic as its precursor model, deferred to the language of the colonial power, and to the revered ancient classical tradition, but as a product of an author from the colonized and perennially subjugated Ireland, it presented a richly detailed picture of Dublin and Dubliners while using the English language to expose Irish abjection.

From the perspective of a world republic of letters, then, this volume provides examples of a way to read literary works as belonging to a space–time continuum of related forms and subjects. The essays seek to overcome cultural notions of core and periphery, concepts that put certain nations (usually the former colonial powers or their shared consecrated and revered–and constructed–ancient heritage of Greek and Latin classics) at the core and the rest of the world as periphery. Similar patterns of cultural hegemony and proliferation exist in other areas of the world: China, whose culture was spread abroad as superior, or pre-Moghul India, where Sanskrit classics from northern India held a prestige that asserted cultural power over other regions of India.

But, this collection does not define reception as the means whereby literary models proliferated or as the mode in which symbolic capital (i.e., European culture) arrived in the colonial states as an instrument of cultural colonialism. Neither does it focus on reception as a critical reading strategy, as provocatively stated by William Batstone, rephrasing Martindale, "All meaning is constituted or actualized at the point of reception,"[13] even though several essays do address reader reception. Hans-Georg Gadamer, among others, has discussed this destabilizing aspect of reception and hermeneutical practice, which will be examined in this volume in Zhang Longxi's essay on the reception of European classics in a Chinese context. Gadamer's term "fusion of horizons" (the coming together of reader and text) has been vital for interpretive reception studies.[14] Frank Kermode,[15] Hans Robert Jauss,[16] and Wolfgang Iser[17] also stimulated discussion of readers and reception, but the primary focus here is on how writers explore and draw upon reservoirs of literary texts that come to define a world republic of letters, paradoxically filling rather than emptying the "reservoirs" by such usage.

An overriding theme of the arguments in this collection is that although the relationship between the author and his or her reservoir of models

may be both politically and culturally asymmetrical (with the models and languages in which they are written often having hegemonic cultural–and sometimes political–power, as for example, Ancient Greek or Sanskrit letters), authors set out to position themselves in a symmetrical cultural relationship to their repository of literary precursors. Thus, although peripheral in relationship to works that might occupy the hub of cultural power or powers, the writer nonetheless sets out to diverge from the established models, possibly in terms of style and genre, topic, and language, while also converging with an established literary form or canon of letters.[18] Clearly, works like Dante's *Commedia* or Milton's *Paradise Lost*, and even a prose work like Cervantes' *Don Quixote*, with their simultaneous convergence with the classical epic tradition and divergence from it in terms of language (vernacular), style (mixture of low and high), subject, and a host of other innovations, offer superb examples of this phenomenon. This quasi-sacred canon of literary forbearers,[19] absorbed into the current context, provides very important spurs for the contemporary work.

Still, the argument posed here limits itself to a rather unique community, because it addresses the interests of writers, those cultural innovators, who are almost always eccentric to social, political, and economic power, wherever they are located, and whose audience(s) may even be far in the future. They stand in contrast with the cultural engineers, what Casanova calls the "consecrating authorities,"[20] an "aristocracy" with "the considerable authority … to decide what is literary, and lastingly to recognize, or to consecrate, all those whom it designates as great writers."[21] This might be a national academy, an academic community, a government agency, or even a publishing house—whatever entity or entities have the power to design school curricula, regulate languages, create canons, banish and or promote books, and set up normative reading and study programs, as Gisèle Sapiro's essay will argue. In the context of colonialism, these authorities exercised considerable power over school and university curricula in the colonized societies.[22]

Discussions of literary receptions, whether of authors in a transcultural setting or within their own linguistic or national traditions have undergone extensive theoretical elaboration over the last 40 years. Reception as a practice, of course, predates the earliest texts incorporated into what would two millennia later be called "the western canon." The Hebrew Bible, for example, itself a product of multiple authors over more than a 1000-year time span, is a collection of recycled and reinterpreted texts with interlaced rephrasings and quotations that together create a web of relationships that

constitute the very interpretive—and interpretable—unity of this text. This intertextuality has been labeled a kind of "inner biblical exegesis," a type of reception in which subsequent passages quote or allude to prior ones (in terms of canonical or redacted order rather than an authorially chronological one), in a move that is intended to transform the original text but not to undermine or degrade it. This is distinct from Christian "supersession" of the Hebrew Bible, discussed immediately below. Here, wholly within the Hebrew tradition, these rephrasings, allusions, or reworkings bespeak some crisis or effort to reinterpret the original while retaining continuity with it, with the emphasis on continuity.[23] One could see the formation of the biblical canon, whether the *koine* Greek *Septuagint* in the third century BCE, or the Hebrew Masoretic text of the second century CE, or the Latin Christian Bible in the fourth century CE, as the conscious selection of a set of redactors and translators involved in an effort to reorganize, rearrange, and linguistically and culturally transform the collection of texts that are redacted into their new arrangement to create continuity with the past even while the new version appears in a new language for dramatically new social and cultural circumstances (including exilic, post-exilic, diasporic, and imperial).

The Christian biblical exegetical tradition, both as reading, plastic arts, and writing strategies, sought to tie the texts of the New Testament to the sacred texts of Israel by imagining typological patterns, and as with the Hebrew Bible, rephrasing or quoting from the earlier texts. In this case, both the writing and reading practices set out to demonstrate how the later texts were tied to the earlier ones and were a fulfillment of the promises of Hebrew Scriptures. This notion of "fulfillment" is the other side of the coin of the nineteenth-century philological approach to tracking sources, another variety of reception studies. In the case of fulfillment, the later text in a radical rereading supersedes the earlier, while for source criticism, the most recent text is denigrated because it lacks originality or "authenticity," often a substitute word for an essentializing notion of ethnic or national origins. The Christian teleological approach to literary reception would privilege the new as a fulfillment of the past. This led Harold Bloom, for example, to lament that this notion of "fulfillment" had made the Hebrew Bible, the "captive prize of the Christians,"[24] himself alluding to a tradition in which Christian exegetes themselves justified the use of *pagan* rhetoric by citing the example of the captive woman of Deuteronomy 21:11–13 (Jerome Letter 70.2). Nonetheless, while adopting the past as its own, and thus putting the past in an asymmetrical opposition to the present, where ultimate power (or revelation) resides, even if

dependent on the *longue durée* of the original texts, this approach at least offers a way of seeing reception as a conscious assertion of creativity on the part of the writer and reader.

The formulations of Harold Bloom, whose 1973 book *The Anxiety of Influence* challenged the reigning approaches to reception, went beyond erstwhile philological notions of influence and "source" studies that sought to attribute parts of works or an entire corpus to numerous precursor texts and their authors. Sometimes this was merely to identify the sources and sometimes more perversely, because of the romantic idea about originality, to condemn the new text because it had merely rewritten an earlier one. Bloom's systematic argument classified types of allusions to show how writers struggle against their literary forebears as they create their own literary work.[25]

Brian Stock and others have suggested yet another notion of textual and by implication authorial relationship in the idea of "textual communities," which are constituted as a "community of texts." This approach advances the notion that certain texts may be in continuity or collaboration with each other, most clearly a characteristic of medieval European literature in Latin and then later into the emerging European vernaculars.[26] One could make the same argument about the catena of texts redacted as a collection into what became the *Vulgata*, Jerome's Latin Bible, composed of the Hebrew Scriptures and the New Testament, in an effort to create continuity with the revered texts of the past, while privileging the new, as discussed above. Thus looking at the ancient Mediterranean and Europe as literary case studies, in the period before the advent of nations and long before European colonialism,[27] we see that ancient and medieval letters involve a flourishing borrow-and-exchange literary economy, a kind of tributary system, while territorial, cultural, and linguistic specifics are overcome in favor of literary adaptation.

In these cases, while clearly translation and transformation take place in the reception process, the emphasis falls on continuity rather than disjunction.[28] German literary scholars, writing in the wake of the Second World War, whose anti-nationalism led to the founding of many departments of Comparative Literature after the war,[29] have been especially insightful in this regard. Examining the "repertoire of a literary text," Wolfgang Iser (1926–2007) wrote that this repertoire "does not consist solely of social and cultural norms; it also incorporates elements and, indeed, whole traditions of past literature that are mixed together with these norms."[30] Iser's approach recognizes the syncretic quality of literary allusion and the

freedom of the writer to incorporate from diverse sources, thus remaking the original in the terms of the individual aesthetic product. Jauss (1921–1997), arguably the most important reception theorist writing in the wake of the Second World War, deliberately confronted ideas about literature that had dominated the nineteenth century, thereby fundamentally challenging the very notions of national literary traditions. For him, "a literary work is not an object that stands by itself and that offers the same view to each reader in each period. It is not a monument that monologically reveals its timeless essence. It is much more like an orchestration that strikes ever new resonance among its readers …"[31] Jauss focuses on the *historical* implication of a literary text, the understanding of the first reader and a chain of receptions from *generation to generation*, proposing an awareness of the global existence of the understanding and rewriting of a literary text that challenges a nation-based model of literary history. The consequence of such an understanding of creative reception unfolds how "the horizon of expectations" across the world might lead to endless dialogues and diverse reformulations of the original inspirational text.

Wai Chee Dimock's essay on Osip Mandelstam, who had a copy of Dante's *Commedia* in his pocket when he was condemned to the Russian Gulag, added to the reception debate with her argument about Mandelstam and Dante, "Mandelstam's love of Dante—the physical presence of the poetry inside his pocket—suggests that there is much to be said for literature as a continuum."[32] Dimock's idea of writers creating this cultural continuum has more in common with the argument presented here. In other words, when we look at how writers, not academic authorities, book reviewers, or book publishers, that is, the self-appointed authorities in the literary domain, determine a literary repertoire, we witness a pattern of circulation that both exploits diverse archives and simultaneously undermines the idea of national literary traditions. In fact, reception as simultaneous convergence and divergence in form, citation, and even theme, resulting from a shift in language and the cultural and historical circumstances of the receiving autonomous writer, constitutes a central feature of how literature circulates across national and cultural divisions.

* * * *

Reading the Past Across Space and Time comprises 16 essays, the vast majority of which examine specific cases of authorial reception of ancient or early modern literary works. While these essays could have been arranged in many different ways, the final arrangement reflects the editors' desire

to organize according to time and space while remaining attentive to the category of literary genre, itself construed with conscious simplicity as narrative (specifically epic), lyric, and drama. (Genre itself is an effect of reception.)[33] Thus, the arrangement features the *longue durée* of epic as a genre and as an inspiration for later works in new genres and new geographical contexts; rereading of a Greek philosophical corpus for wholly new cultural and temporal environments; the transnational reception of ancient and medieval drama, again from diverse origins; and the transformation of lyric in new environments when inspired by encounter with totally different forms of lyric expression.

The essays probe how writers (even if also readers) have received ancient and early modern classics and the contexts for this reception. The first section examines how ancient epics through translation, transformation, and revision have been and continue to be recycled into new forms and for new audiences. Ralph Hexter's "Epic Worlds" explores the ancient epic, a source of long-past story and history that seems to define a people, but the essay shows that, contrary to common assumptions, it was nonetheless never monolithic. The essay addresses what epic might be today, when people are in constant motion with hand-held devices that constantly flash before us not ancient memories, but the latest developments.

An answer to this question follows in Wai Chee Dimock's essay on the Gilgamesh epic. Epic, the genre that narrated the deeds of the social elite, leaders, warriors, and kings, has traveled around to address a popular audience thousands of miles and thousands of years from its place and time of origin. In actual fact, the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, perhaps the oldest literary text in the world, has only been known for 140 years, since the nineteenth-century discovery of ancient Nineveh, which was destroyed in 612 BCE as the Assyrian Empire fell. The archeological dig in Nineveh, the famed city of the biblical novella Jonah, the text that recounts the eponymous main character's encounter with a whale, led to the discovery of the cuneiform Gilgamesh tablets. Henry Layard and his archeological companions, as David Damrosch writes, "confronted a newly deepened antiquity beneath a shifting political landscape,"[34] this time as the Ottoman Empire was slowly declining. In this vignette alone, we have a remarkable case of ancient cross-temporal and spatial textual interconnections: ancient Israel, ancient Assyria, ancient Sumeria and Babylon, with nineteenth-century Turkey, Syria, and Britain. More recently, in fact, in 2011, 20 new lines of the epic have been recovered, which itself refutes some assumptions about the most dramatic encounter in the epic, that between Gilgamesh,

Enkidu, and Humbaba, the guardian of the forest. The Sulaymaniyah Museum in the territory of the Kurdistan Regional Government in Iraq has had a policy (since the mass looting that followed the US invasion and bombardment of Iraq in 2003) to purchase all artifacts (no questions asked) to prevent them from leaving the country. Among this loot, the Gilgamesh fragment appeared.[35]

The nineteenth-century discovery of the Gilgamesh tablets, translated and turned into *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, while deepening biblical study,[36] expanded the "great books of the west curriculum" to include ancient Sumeria (present-day Iraq) as the "west," and because of the epic's binary of civilization versus wilderness, it has played a role in the expansion of environmental discourse since the 1970s.[37] This new fragment, while deepening scholarly knowledge of ancient Sumeria and its premier text, will also produce a spate of new receptions in the form of translations that include the new fragment, which itself will encourage new interpretations, this time showing Enkidu and Gilgamesh's remorse over their transgressive defeat of Humbaba and his forest. The epic has also spurred the production of anime, videos, comics, and even tattoos. In this volume, Wai Chee Dimock's essay examines the epic's spiraling down to vernacular settings where grassroots organizations produce plays in which Humbaba, the forest nemesis of the heroes Gilgamesh and Enkidu, emerges as "the emotional focus." Locating a lapse in Mikhail Bakhtin's dismissal of the epic as a dead-end genre,[38] Dimock's essay explores how specific instances of translation, citation, and stage adaptation and instances of recycling, particularly of the world's oldest known literary work, restore the epic, bring it back, break it up, and redistribute it across a variety of places and genres, and as a consequence complicate our understanding of this particular genre and of "genre" as a planetary phenomenon, an evolving field spread across temporal as well as geographical coordinates.

In the following essay, Schildgen examines similar divergences in the Indian epics produced under the British Raj in India (1858–1947). In Michael Madhusudan Datta's Bengali epic, *The Slaying of Meghanada*,[39] based on the war between the god Rama and the demon king Ravana from Valmiki's *Ramayana*, Ravana not Rama, like Milton's Lucifer in *Paradise Lost*, becomes the hero. Sri Aurobindo's English epic, *Savitri* (inspired by Valmiki, Vyasa, Milton, Dante, and Virgil) and written when the author was in self-chosen exile in French South India (Pondicherry), in the tradition of southern Indian epic (as in Merchant-Prince Shattan's *Manimekhalaï* and Ilanko Atikal's *Cilappatikaram*), [40] makes a woman, not a male, the epic hero.

As an indirect consequence of colonialism, different and unrelated literary and religious traditions have intertwined to create startling syncretic new works as in the Gilgamesh drama or in the two Indian epics examined in Schildgen's essay. In another example of the legacy of colonialism, Arturo Arias' essay, "Wheels Working Together: The Popol Wuj and Time Commences in Xibalbá as Markers of a Maya Cosmovision" demonstrates how the cosmology of the Maya *Popol Vuh* informs Luis de Lión's foundational contemporary Maya novel *Time Commences in Xibalbá,* written in Spanish. Mayan civilization can be traced back to the Olmecs, who inhabited the Gulf coastal plain of Veracruz and Tabasco about 1200 BCE, in other words, contemporary with the putative historical date of the Trojan War, central to the Homeric epics, and likely with "The Song of Deborah," one of the oldest texts in the Bible (Judges 5:2–31). Thus, like the Homeric poems that are historically linked to Mycenaean civilization, the *Popol Vuh*, the "Bible" of the Mayas, written in Quiché, goes back to pre-writing times. But like the Sanskrit epics, *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana*, the *Popol Vuh* has both oral and written forms. Although its transmission was radically altered by the arrival of the Spanish colonial power, who undertook the destruction of thousands of Mayan books, the hieroglyphic version that pre-dated the conquest in the sixteenth century continued to be in use up to the eighteenth century in some areas of Guatemala. Four hieroglyphic books are still extant, three in European libraries (Madrid, Paris, and Dresden), and the fourth discovered in Chiapas in 1966. An alphabeticized *Popol Vuh*, the only survival of the Quiché text, was translated into Spanish by the friar Francisco Ximénez in the early eighteenth century, and it is this dual-language version that found its way to the Newberry Library in Chicago and in English translation to classrooms in North America. An oral version, however, continues to be performed to this day even if in a syncretic form that combines Christian prayers with Mayan rituals.[41] Maya cosmology is cyclical, in contrast to the linear teleological cosmic vision of Christian theology. Arias' essay examines how Luis de Lión's contemporary Guatemalan novel, the genre itself a received form, adheres to a Maya cosmovision to present a view of Central American subjectivity that transcends the subaltern status that resulted from colonialism.

In yet another reworking of epic that likewise turns the tables on the genre, Zina Gianoppoulou's essay looks at Margaret Atwood's "*The Penelopiad*," the most recent feminist recasting of Homer's *Odyssey*. Introducing topics of gender, class, and female subjectivity into what has

generally been considered a male genre, the essay argues that Atwood challenges and critiques the authority of Homer and of Odysseus. In an Underworld setting appropriate to dramatize the act of reception, argues Giannopoulou, Atwood has Penelope regain her voice to offer a corrective to her husband's story, while the former maids of the household, executed by Odysseus, seek revenge for his injustice in the form of feminist and revisionist mythmaking.

Turning from receptions of ancient epics, in yet another example of recasting the ancient canon, the following section "Greek Philosophical Receptions," explores the ways in which two canonical figures in the history of Western philosophy, Plato and Aristotle, have been recast over two millennia. In "Disagreement and Reception: Peripatetics Responding to the Stoic Challenge," Jan Szaif identifies and describes certain scenarios of *philosophical reception stimulated by disagreement and school rivalry* and applies the results of this analysis to developments that took place in the school of Aristotle (the so-called Peripatos) during the late Hellenistic period. Next, Michael Griffin's essay, "'Now we must consider that some of the ancients discovered the truth': Reception and Antiquity in Ancient Neoplatonism," examines two pivotal figures in the reception of Plato and Aristotle, Plotinus and Simplicius, whose role in receptions of the revered ancient philosophers cannot be underestimated. These public intellectuals, writing at the end of the Roman Empire, both summarize and hand over to the forthcoming millennium-and-a-half the Mediterranean philosophical movement now called Neoplatonism. Regarding their intellectual project as a recovery of the authentic philosophy of Plato, at that point nearly a millennium earlier, their "neo-Platonism" simply *was* Platonism into the eighteenth century and beyond: this was the Plato of Dante and Schiller, Wordsworth and Coleridge, Blake and Emerson. Thus, as linking figures in the work of recuperation and rethinking, they tie together more than two millennia of receptions. The final essay in the section, Uwe Vagelpohl's "Reading and Commenting on Aristotle's *Rhetoric* in Arabic," asks what happens when a "revered" ancient Greek and pagan author, in this case, Aristotle, whose work is deeply rooted in Greek culture, migrates via translation into a context where rhetoric, drama, tragedy, and comedy do not exist as either generic categories or systems of expression. A vigorous effort to decode it followed as Aristotle's *Rhetoric* became firmly planted within Muslim philosophical tradition and Aristotle's rhetorical thought was adopted into a wide range of different fields.

The third section examines specific cases of modern works that respond to classical or early modern drama. The first, Adam Siegel's "A Third *Antike*," articulates how Hans Henny Jahnn sought to widen the classical canon by incorporating elements from the (relatively recently available) Gilgamesh epic into his adaptation of *Medea* for the German stage in 1926. Against various sets of oppositions (the biblical and the Greek, the baroque and the classical, the Apollonian and the Dionysian), Siegel contends that Jahnn sought to incorporate the "Sumerian" as a new, third way that could resolve the tensions and lead to a greater enlightenment, all in the context of rising German nationalism and search for ancient roots. Robert Borgen's essay on the "transplanting" of a kabuki play for American audiences, like Dimock's examination of the recycling of the *Gilgamesh* epic into contemporary drama, engages popular audience reception of ostensibly eastern cultural elements on the stage. Again, anxiety and authenticity are key concerns as both the creators and consumers of these productions grappled with diachronically shifting and heavily laden concepts—in this case "bushido," or "the way of the warrior." Kristen Bergman Waha's essay, an analysis of Louis Jacolliot's 1869 play *La Devadassi*, itself a recycling of Kalidasa's classical Sanskrit play, *Śakuntalā*, is a revealing case study of the differences between manifestations of nineteenth-century French "orientalist" fantasy and the British "orientalist" ideals of local understanding and just colonial administration.

The final section of essays centers on the reception, transformation, and adaptation of Chinese and Japanese lyric, and how those borrowed materials and concepts came to have a life of their own as they were deployed for specific purposes by Western poets. These essays move beyond traditional "orientalist" critiques that focus on unilateral cultural appropriation in a post-colonial context to expose a more dynamic anxiety and ambivalence among the cultural "borrowers" as they sought foreign inspiration, as well as a degree of authenticity in their works.

Chunjie Zhang's essay on a famous poem cycle by Goethe shows both sides of this spectrum: the fashion for *chinoiserie* and "orientalist" fantasy that can be seen in the first part of the cycle, on the one hand, and the assimilation of English translations of famous Chinese love stories and poems to create a new vernacular universal, on the other. Kevin Batton's "Pan in the West: California and the Mediterranean Metaphor," explores how California, although facing away from an Atlantic Europe, was nevertheless conceived of poetically within a classically Mediterranean metaphor that rendered it beautiful but belated. Batton identifies the

twentieth-century poets Robinson Jeffers and, to a degree, Gary Snyder as the writers who transcended the old metaphor and invented a classical California that comprised both the Mediterranean and medieval Asia through their own independent engagement with a California sublime. Just as eighteenth-century *chinoiserie* was both imitative and interpretative, so was the *Japonisme* movement of the nineteenth century—both of which had wide-ranging effects on the reception of visual, verbal, and performance arts. Many of the above dynamics are nicely summarized in Michelle Yeh's description of the "invention" of China through American translations of classical Chinese poems.

The two contributions that conclude the volume both look at how official reception, the purview of governments, publishers, book prize competitions, school boards, and so on, functions sociologically and politically. Zhang Longxi's essay, "Meaning, Reception, and the Use of Classics: Theoretical Considerations in a Chinese Context," examines how China's reception of Greco-Roman classics, which began as early as the Ming dynasty in the late sixteenth and the early seventeenth centuries, changes as the social and historical conditions alter. The essay scrutinizes the role of "authority" in official reception and looks at the vexed receptions of ancient Mediterranean classics in China in the twentieth century. The essay with which the volume concludes, Gisèle Sapiro's "Reception Processes from a Sociological Perspective," looks to contemporary global practices in the literary field as it draws from Pierre Bourdieu's theory of the literary field and from Raymond Williams' program for cultural studies to review different aspects of the reception process based on empirical research done in sociology and history. Sapiro's essay addresses aspects of literary reception in modern times (since the printing press and the commercialization of book publication) that take into account the sociology of literary culture. Thus, she examines the material and intellectual aspects of a literary text's production, circulation, and capital value, to explore how books are selected, categorized, and evaluated; how critical reception assesses and grades with literary prizes, institutional consecration, sales, and lists of bestsellers. These developments in terms of reception began of course with the printing press and state institutions. Today, official cultural powers possess almost coercive power over the reception of literary works by the reading public. These include, for example, creative writing departments, as well as publications like the *New York Times Book Review*, *The New York Review of Books*, or *The London Review of Books*, various prestigious book prizes like the Booker Prize, National Book Award, and so on, not to mention the role some governments, like

Burma, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and China, among others, are still playing in censoring books. Indeed, because the essay examines how these powers operate in controlling and directing reception, this contemporary kind of reception may appear to abrogate all the kinds of authorial literary receptions discussed in the previous essays, and therefore it functions as a provocative conclusion to the consideration of literary receptions across time and space.

Notes

1. For the connection between national identity creation and national literatures, see Anne-Marie Thiesse, *La Création des identités nationales: Europe XVIIIe–XIX siècle^{e}* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1999).
2. See, for example, David Damrosch, "Introduction," in *What is World Literature?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), 3–5.
3. Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. M. B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 2004).
4. Goethe's notion of *Weltliteratur* has become critical for a number of theorists of world literary receptions besides Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, 9–44. See, for example, Damrosch, "Goethe coins a phrase," in *What is World Literature?*, 1–36; Franco Moretti, "Conjectures on World Literature," an essay in *Distant Reading* (London and New York: Verso, 2013), 43–62.
5. Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, xii.
6. Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, 207; Karl Marx, *Grundrisse*, in *Selected Writings*, ed. David McLellan (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), 399.
7. Marx, *Grundrisse*, 359.
8. See, for example, Edward Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage, 1993) and Barbara Herrnstein Smith, *Contingencies of Value* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1988).
9. See Gisèle Sapiro, *La sociologie de la littérature* (Paris: La Découverte, 2014).
10. Valery Larbaud, *Ce Vice impuni, la lecture: Domaine anglais* (Paris: Gallimard, 1925), 33–34; Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, 10–11.
11. Ferdinand Braudel, *Civilization and capitalism: 15th–18th century*, vol. 3: *The Perspective of the World*, trans. Siân Reynolds (Berkeley: UC Press, 1992), 68; Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters,* 10–11.
12. Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, 12.
13. William W. Batstone, "Provocation: The Point of Reception Theory," in *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, ed. Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 14.

14. Hans-Georg Gadamer, *Truth and Method* (New York: Crossroad, 1986), 273, f.
15. Frank Kermode, *History and Value* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988); also *Forms of Attention* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1985).
16. Hans Robert Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, trans. Timothy Bahti (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1982).
17. Wolfgang Iser, *The Act of Reading: A Theory of Aesthetic Response* (Baltimore, Maryland: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978).
18. Basically, the argument of Moretti in the essays, "Conjectures on World Literature" and "More Conjectures," in *Distant Reading*, 43–62; 107–119; he writes, "Four continents, two hundred years, over twenty independent critical studies, and they all agreed; when a culture starts moving towards the modern novel, it's always as a compromise between foreign form and local materials," *Distant Reading*, 52.
19. See Harold Bloom, *The Western Canon* (New York: Harcourt Brace, 1994).
20. *World Republic of Letters*, 354.
21. *World Republic of Letters*, 21–22.
22. See Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
23. See Michel Fishbane, *The Garments of Torah: Essays in Biblical Hermeneutics* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1989), 3–18. See also Schildgen, "Mark's Retrieval of Esther," *Poetics Today* 15:1 (1994), 115–31, which discusses all of these approaches to intertextuality.
24. Harold Bloom asserts that Christians like Northrup Frye have made the Hebrew Bible the "captive prize of the Gentiles." *The Book of J*, trans. David Rosenberg and interpreted Harold Bloom (New York: Grove & Weidenfeld, 1990), 14.
25. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).
26. See Brian Stock, *The Implications of Literacy: Written Language and Models of Interpretation in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983), 522–31; Jacob Neusner, *Canon and Connection: Intertextuality in Judaism* (Lanham, Maryland: University Press of America, 1987), 147–59.
27. See Janet Abu-Lughod, *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D.1250–1350* (New York: Oxford University press, 1989); Samir Amin, *Eurocentrism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 1989).
28. See Wai Chee Dimock, "Literature for the Planet," *PMLA* 116:1 (2001), 173–88.
29. See, David Damrosch, Natalie Melas, eds. *Princeton Sourcebook in Comparative Literature: From the European Enlightenment to the Global Present* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009); for the current

trends in the discipline, see Haun Saussy, *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006) and César Dominguez and Haun Saussy, *Introduction to Comparative Literature: New Trends and Applications* (London: Routledge, 2014).

30. See Iser, *The Act of Reading,* 79.
31. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 21.
32. Wai Chee Dimock, "Literature for the Planet," 174.
33. Jauss, "Theory of Genres and Medieval Literature," in his *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*, 76–109; Mikko Lehtonen, *The Cultural Analysis of Texts,* trans. Aija-Leena Ahonen and Kris Clarke (London: Sage Publications, 2000); Michael Garner, *Romanticism and Gothic. Genre, Reception, and Canon Formation* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000); Mathilde Skoie, "Passing on the Panpipes: Genre and Reception," in Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas, eds., *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, 92–103.
34. Damrosch, "Gilgamesh's Quest," *What Is World Literature?* 40.
35. See www.openculture.com2015/10/20-new-lines-from-the epic-of-gilgamesh [sourced 10/1/2015]; also, see F.N.H. Al-Rawi and A.R. George, "Back to the Cedar Forest: The Beginning and End of Tablet V of the Standard Babylonian Epic of Gilgamesh," *Journal Cuneiform Studies* 66 (2014), 69–90.
36. See Alexander Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1946), a translation and interpretation of the Gilgamesh epic and related Babylonian and Assyrian documents; see also *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, trans. and intro. Maureen Gallery Kovacs, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1985), which takes into account discoveries since Heidel's edition.
37. In terms of animals alone, Charles Magel's bibliography on animals cites only 94 books treating the moral status of animals up to 1970, with thousands of books having appeared since that time. See Charles Magel, *Keyguide to Information Sources in Animal Rights* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 1989).
38. M. M. Bakhtin, "Epic and Novel," in *The Dialogic Imagination*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin: Univ. of Texas Press, 1981), 3–40.
39. Clinton B. Seely, trans. Michael Madhusudan Datta, *The Slaying of Meghanada: A Ramayana from Colonial Bengal* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004).
40. Merchant-Prince Shattan, *Manimekhalaï*, trans. Alain Daniélou (New York: New Directions, 1989); Ilanko Atikal, The *Cilappatikaram*, trans. R. Parthasarathy (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
41. For the history of the Maya and the transmission of the Popol Vuh, see "Introduction," *Popol Vuh: The Mayan Book of the Dawn of Life*, trans. Dennis Tedlock (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1985), 21–60.

PART I

Epic Receptions