

The Class Struggles of Ruth

特里·伊格尔顿：《路得记》中的阶级斗争

Roland Boer, translated by Zhang Jing

Published as: 2014 ‘特里·伊格尔顿：《路得记》中的阶级斗争’

(The Class Struggles of Ruth). 圣经文学研究 (*Journal for the Study of Biblical Literature*) 8: 297-325. Translated into Chinese by Zhang Jing.

Abstract: In this article I draw upon Terry Eagleton’s investigation of the intersections between class, gender, and ethnicity, in order to interpret the story of Ruth in the Old Testament. I argue that these three areas enable an ideological solution to the problem of succession, with the problematic result that the ruling class becomes the Israelites, and that Ruth’s foreignness, gender and class status all contribute to her co-optation and effacement in the text. In other words, the text provides a paradox: a text like Ruth in fact functions to remove women from the story by the very means of making them central to the story.

Keywords: Terry Eagleton; Ruth; Old Testament; gender; class; ethnicity.

What is most noticeable about Terry Eagleton is not only the immense readability of his prolific writing, but the catholicity of his interests. He writes both complex critical texts and readable introductions, essays and monographs, plays and novels, poetry and speeches, film scripts and

musicals, even travel books in his newly recovered home of Ireland, as well as a whole range of items that have never made it into print, at least with his name attached to them. But Eagleton is also a Marxist.

Coming from dirt poor Catholicism, with a solid dose of Irish genealogy, in the Lancashire Mill Town of Bacup, Eagleton arrived at Cambridge to work with Raymond Williams and quickly became his most famous student. From early on he wrote for the sake of writing, or rather, to develop a craft on which he still works. A fellowship at Cambridge gave way to Oxford, where after being fellow of Jesus College, he took on the Warton chair. Such an extraordinarily conventional career, from Cambridge to Oxford in the old imperial centre, has led finally to rediscovery of an Irish heritage in the moment of postcolonialism, an echo perhaps of an earlier, brief moment in which the priesthood seemed a good career move, as well as his central role in the Catholic left that resulted in two books on radical Catholic theology as well as the journal *Slant*.

Yet, it is as a Marxist that Eagleton has made his name. His Marxism insists on the central questions of class, ideology and ideology critique and, above all, a revolutionary politics. So much so that, in the midst, or perhaps as part of, his prolific writing, he has engaged and continues to engage in various forms of political activism, ranging from protests in the Catholic Left, through university politics to political interventions in the Irish republican struggle, especially through his plays – ‘St Oscar’, ‘The White, the

Gold and the ‘Gangrene’, ‘Disappearances’ and ‘God’s Locusts’ (Eagleton 1997) – with Field Day Theatre Company in Derry and Doublejoint Theatre in Belfast.

Class and Gender

My usage of Eagleton is quite specific, a focus on a particular issue within the catholicity of his work: the intersections between class, gender and ethnicity. Class, and the closely related class conflict, are staples of any Marxist criticism worthy of the name, although Eagleton has made it a central feature of much of his literary criticism and creative writing. As if the question of class were not interesting enough, he has been involved in debates in feminism, especially materialist and psychoanalytic feminisms that have insisted on the category of gender, or preferably sexual difference, in Marxism itself. In light of these debates, and especially Eagleton’s attempts to deal with both issues – class and gender, or class conflict and sexual warfare – in his work, the book of Ruth becomes an extremely interesting text. As with the previous chapters, I will also offer some criticisms of Eagleton’s own work.

The bulk of the debates within Marxist or materialist feminism, and between Marxism and feminism (where such a division is possible) concerns the so-called irreducibles of class and sexual difference. Conventional Marxists, if squeezed sufficiently, will not renounce class, however much else may have been relinquished on the way. Post-marxists may be as ready

to give up the faith as any Quisling, but Eagleton is hardly one of those. For feminism the unrelinquishable and untranscendable horizon is sexual difference, or as some prefer, gender. If sexual difference goes, then so does feminism.

I do not find either option – the assertion of one or the other as the primary category, as though we need a philosophical first principle or prime mover – any use whatsoever. One response to this impasse between class and sexual difference is to include the other hitherto forgotten or neglected category within one's critical and political inventory, assuming that such an inclusion is necessary for two overtly political forms of literary or cultural criticism. But even the inclusionary move, in some form of common front, doesn't get us very far. So a substantial part of my discussion will watch for the way Eagleton himself deals with this question.

But how is all this relevant to Ruth? I will certainly not be declared the most perceptive of biblical scholars by writing that these few chapters in the Hebrew Bible concern sexual difference, nor even that ethnicity (however qualified such a term might be) is central to the narrative. But class? If we remember that division of labour is both the pre-condition and necessary machinery of class, then Ruth, it will turn out, is very much concerned with class as well.

However, before passing over to consider Ruth in more detail, a few observations from Eagleton on class. He has insisted time and again that

Marxists at least keep the question of class in the foreground, particularly in light of attempts to shift the focus to various political micro-groups that operate in terms of identity politics – gender, race, sexuality, indigeneity, religion, ecology and so on. I am thinking here of the reconsiderations set in motion by the influential *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy* of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (1984). For Laclau and Mouffe, the poststructuralist critique of master narratives and essentialism must lead to a re-evaluation of older forms of political theory and action from the Left. This ‘micro-politics’, the development of a host of small political pressure groups, is a sign of a new political scene in which various groups move into alliances based on their drive for radical equality. Class is therefore suspect since it operates with essentialist assumptions, but so are the older identity groups who now need to reconstitute themselves in an anti-essentialist fashion. In many ways Laclau’s and Mouffe’s work foreshadowed the newer ways in which the massive protests came together at the World Trade Organization meeting in Seattle (November 1999), or at the World Economic Forum in Melbourne (September 2000). While Eagleton seeks not to dismiss such political groupings, he insists that class, specifically the Marxist notion of class, cannot be excluded so easily, that it has not in some way been superseded, but that it remains a crucial and viable category of thought and politics. In fact, it is dangerous to so, for an absence of the awareness of class conceals its operation all the more effectively.

This emphasis on class operates at a number of levels for Eagleton. Firstly, the fundamental division between the bourgeoisie and the working class is part of the structure of capitalism. This particular division of labour is crucial for the operation of capitalism, based as it is on the rational organization of the means of maximizing profit. A more specific description is between those who work and those who do not work but live off what is known as the surplus labour of the workers. The system can operate only if workers are not paid the full value of their work: there is something left over, a certain amount of labour power (which the worker sells to the employer), that is then appropriated by the employers so that they themselves can live. Rather than a mythical category – as it is so often dismissed by liberal economists – surplus labour has a material existence (surplus value) in the commodities the worker makes: when sold the workers receive only a portion of the money, much of it goes to the employers, wholesalers and retailers. Hence the notion of ‘surplus value’, in a myriad complex of overlays, on which capitalism relies. But such a division of labour also relies on a number of other divisions, many of which are older than capitalism: between manual and intellectual labour (the first ‘real’ division for Marx and Engels), between country and city, or rural and factory work, and between male and female. Although listed last, the division of labour according to gender is the crucial division for my discussion, particularly because Marx and Engels identify it as the primary division that is not yet a ‘real’ one.

Eagleton's insistence on class, then, is inseparable from the notions of division of labour and surplus labour/value. But this has implications for the kind of politics in which one engages: rather than activism within the various pressure groups seeking to influence the ruling forces of capital, politics must be class based. That is, political work against capitalism must take place within the context of the working class, creatively mobilising the deep, inchoate rage of this class against systematic exploitation. Specifically, such political effort must keep awake the sense that the various modifications of the working class -- minimal increases in standard of living, incomes, commodity fetishism and so on -- are merely there to counter the awareness of deeper patterns of exploitation, seen baldly in the maintenance of an army of unemployed people ready to take jobs at lower rates, in the pressure to increase working hours or give up hard won benefits.

Eagleton's insistence on class may also be seen as the result of his living and working in the same society that was the basis for Marx's analysis in *Capital*, albeit some 150 years later. For here class is an obvious feature of social relations, marked out sharply in terms of language, culture, politics, and above all in working conditions. That is not to say that class does not exist elsewhere; yet in England, and in other places in Europe with a longer history of the shift from feudalism to capitalism, one can make a class identification the moment someone opens his or her mouth, if not before. So Eagleton in his funeral oration for Raymond Williams:

I found myself marooned within a student body where everyone seemed to be well over six foot and brayed rather than spoke ... Williams looked and spoke more like a countryman than a don, and had a warmth and simplicity of manner which contrasted sharply with the suave, offhand style of the upper middle-class establishment (Eagleton 1989: 1).

It is no surprise then that Eagleton's political commitment to the supersession of capitalism is based on class politics, a revolutionary politics if necessary, whose viability remains, he observes, when it is widely asserted that such a process was no longer possible. For Eagleton the explosion of the largely non-violent revolutions in Eastern Europe in the late 1980s and 1990s are evidence that revolutions are indeed possible and happen with alarming regularity, at least for capitalism and its liberal apologists. But it is also no surprise that class and class conflict are the central categories of his literary method. An Eagletonian reading -- except that such a term suggests a literary movement -- remains incomplete if the dynamics of class do not appear in a particular interpretation. Thus, in my major example 'Heathcliff and the Great Hunger' (1995: 1-26), the final issue becomes the way class is both crucial to the organization of the text *and* how it is concealed through various strategies.

Eagleton engages in a large-scale allegorical reading of *Wuthering Heights* in terms of the Great Famine in Ireland. At times the suspicion creeps in that the novel is but an excuse for vast stretches on the

historiography of the famine, or of the tension between Nature and Culture (Ireland versus England) and so on. But what soon becomes apparent is that Eagleton is concerned with the question of ethnicity, along with economics and class, as part of the mix of British colonialist capitalism. For Heathcliff becomes an allegorical personification of the Irish, especially working Irish peasantry, even though it is unclear whether he is Irish in the novel, or indeed whether the timing of the writing of the novel with the Famine will pass close historical scrutiny (see 1995: 3). The plot itself runs through the tensions, class alliances and final triumphs and losses of the various classes and class fractions of the remnants of feudalism and a rampaging capitalism.

Yet the class dynamics are peculiarly English: the Lintons at Thrushcross Grange are the largest landowners in the district, the landed gentry, whereas the Earnshaws at the Heights are not squires – employing others to work their land – but yeomen, or at least a remnant of the yeomen, who prefer to dirty their own hands in their own soil. Central to the dynamics of class are the very materialist categories of law, property, kinship and inheritance that govern plot and narrative. Before we worry too much about the staple class categories, Lockwood turns out to be the middle class figure, and Heathcliff represents all that comes with the working class, especially the Irish. It is not for nothing that he is taken in at the Heights, where Nature dominates, for he is earthy, filthy, starving and dark. But the allegory runs deeper: ‘Heathcliff starts out as an image of the famished Irish

immigrant, becomes a landless labourer set to work in the Heights, and ends up as a symbol of the constitutional nationalism of Irish parliamentary party' (Eagleton 1995: 19). Unable to break the class boundaries that keep Catherine and he from ever connecting, Heathcliff sets off to appropriate the outer bearing and weapons of the ruling class (at heart he remains a boor, although there is nothing intrinsically wrong with that) in order to take over the Heights and the Grange, only to die before he can enjoy it all. He is, in the end, both oppressed and oppressor rolled into one, except that this is not such an uncommon situation in within capitalism, the current oppressor using a former oppression to justify his or her own species of brutality.

Not merely transformed rural working class, Heathcliff is for Eagleton also the threat of the middle classes on the landed gentry, as well as the embodiment of the ruling class fear of revolution: he must be beaten off, the landed gentry or squirearchy, the 'oldest landed capitalist class in Europe' (1995: 19), must defeat the yeomanry, so that Catherine may take up her rightful place as heiress of the Grange. In all its complexity, Eagleton settles for Heathcliff as the allegory of the rural (ie. Irish) revolution, in both its right and left forms, in its failure and near miss at triumph, Archaic and modern. 'From the gentry's standpoint, the novel recounts a tale of catastrophe just averted; from a radical viewpoint it records the loss of revolutionary hopes, now projected into a mythologized past but, like the

ghosts of Catherine and Heathcliff, still capable of infiltrating and disturbing the present' (Eagleton 1995: 21).

Yet, Eagleton remains with the conventional items of character, plot and narrative to argue for a class reading and attempted 'resolution' of class conflict, interspersed with reflections on the Famine as in some way the context for the novel. The class reading is distinctly materialist and it traces the complexity of class, especially in terms of colonialism and ethnicity, but only with regard to Heathcliff: the other characters, as well as plot, remain as ciphers. However, I will want to take up Eagleton's insistence on class and ethnicity for my reading of *Ruth*, arguing that it is not merely one concerning gender.

With all that Eagleton's argument has going for it in terms of class and ethnicity, there is a crucial absence that Eagleton himself marks, describing the relationship between Heathcliff and Catherine as 'genderless'. A strange comment, even if he is speaking descriptively, from one who has insisted on the importance of feminist criticism. And this comes after the long initial consideration of the opposition between Nature and Culture in terms of England's colonial domination of Ireland. In contrast to England, the economic appears without the aesthetic in depictions of Ireland. Thus, in the novel, Nature appears in the novel as both the English domain on the Heights, a vast region of land acquired through the enclosures by the first capitalist class, the landed gentry, and Heathcliff himself. (Culture is then the

transformed Nature of the Grange.) But, in contrast to the English Nature of the Heights, Heathcliff is hardly aestheticised in the novel, bearing all the uncouth and filthy wildness of Irish Nature that can only be aestheticised through his connection with the Nature of the Heights. Yet, is not Nature a conventional code for woman, in both aspects? If -- and here I move beyond Eagleton, the Heights provide the more aestheticised side of Nature, in all its untouched beauty, does not Heathcliff emerge as the wild and arid other side of woman in this text? In the same way, I would suggest, as the Irish were characterised as effeminate, dissolute and yet untameable. We could then read the impossible relationship between Catherine and Heathcliff as the failed effort to mediate this contradiction within Nature/Woman.

But what I want to do is turn to another study by Eagleton to see he does when sexual difference is at the centre of discussion. *The Rape of Clarissa* (Eagleton 1982), a brief monograph or long essay on Samuel Richardson's *Clarissa*, as well as *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, is an innovative as Eagleton's interpretation of *Wuthering Heights*. Eagleton's main thesis is that Richardson's three novels were central to the emergence of a dominant bourgeois ideology. In the long transition from feudalism to capitalism the bourgeoisie – regarded at the time as crass and uncultured – enacted an ideological shift away from the overt power and violence of public male relations. Richardson was instrumental in this shift through leading what

Eagleton calls the feminization of male relations. If *Pamela* is the first experiment, *Clarissa* foregrounds the moral and ideological bankruptcy of the older aristocracy, embodied in the libertine violence of Lovelace. Clarissa herself, at least as far as Richardson was concerned, exhibited all the desirable feminine virtues – tenderness, purity, kindness, piety and so on. Her rape and murder by Lovelace is the last gasp of an old order, for in *Sir Charles Grandison* the full appropriation of feminine qualities by its protagonist, Grandison, takes place.

Eagleton is also interested in how Richardson's activity of writing itself intermeshes with his three texts, *Clarissa*, *Pamela* and *Sir Charles Grandison*, among the most influential cultural and ideological texts in nineteenth century England. This practice operates with a profound contradiction that appears in its own way with Ruth as well. In a process comparable to the paradoxical way in which the 'new' values of love, choice of partner (by a woman) and companionship both enabled women to pick out their own husbands *and* rendered them completely dependent and bound to such a man within the emerging nuclear family, so also Richardson's practice of circulating drafts of his novels among a circle of educated women, for extended comment and revision, served to fetishize women as 'technicians of the heart' (Eagleton 1982: 13) through granting them a more authoritative and public voice. Undercutting the older forms of patriarchy, in which marriage was arranged and men assumed they knew

what women wanted, was a newer form that was simultaneously better and worse. Richardson writes at the time when the transition from an open and vigorous patriarchy to its subtler bourgeois forms is under way. He exploited 'his literary powers to tighten his hold over women' (Eagleton 1982: 13), fashioning an alternative to the patriarchal family. In short, the contradictions of Richardson's literary practice are those of the newly dominant bourgeoisie: a new father-daughter relationship that challenges older forms of sexual domination through comradeship; the canonization of women as 'specialists in sentiment' (1982: 13) at the moment of a substantial feminization of the mores of male bourgeois public relations. Not merely a reflector of social and cultural change, Richardson's small but highly influential press on Fleet Street, along with his novels, were major agents in that change. Eagleton wants, at least for the moment, to keep the contradictions open, as he does with his reading of *Wuthering Heights*, in order to identify the regressive and emancipatory potential of the work in question. But the suspension of ethical assessment cannot hold off forever: "The "exaltation" of women, while undoubtedly a partial advance in itself, also serves to shore up the very system which oppresses them. For the eighteenth-century woman, as indeed for women of any epoch, the pedestal is never very far from the pit' (Eagleton 1982: 15). As far as Ruth is concerned, my suspicion is that the foregrounding of women has a very similar agenda.

Unlike the interpretation of *Wuthering Heights*, Eagleton gives considerable space in *The Rape of Clarissa* to a feminist reading. I will consider the details in a moment, but what is noticeable in his interpretation is that he moves from a deconstructionist concern with writing, *écriture*, focused on the letters sent between Lovelace and Clarissa, through a feminist reading that is also heavily psychoanalytical, to a Marxist interpretation concerned with class and ideology. In these methodological shifts he unwittingly replicates the association of women with the personal and private and men with the public and political. Although he would not want to argue for the supersession of one by the other, the superiority of a Marxist to a feminist reading, that is in the end the effect. For all his concern with sexual difference – and he cites Irigaray at certain points – class is the ultimately determining instance.

Although the integration of feminist and Marxist questions is impressive, it is still ultimately a Marxist narrative that incorporates feminism. Thus, Eagleton makes the connection between deconstruction and psychoanalytic feminism by means of writing: Clarissa's is masculine, fully in control of her meaning, whereas Lovelace's is feminine, uncontrolled, exuberant and diffuse. As soon as he has established the point, however, the differences fade away. Here Freud comes to Eagleton's aid, so that he may interpret the letters and Clarissa's body via the categories of narcissism, eroticism, the letter as body, faeces, gift and exchange, in short as fetish –

the detachable items of the human body that are both personal possessions and public objects. Citing Irigaray – incorrectly it seems¹ – he picks up the suggestion that the prime object of exchange is not faecal, like money, but women. Thus the letter signifies not merely female sexuality but Clarissa herself as the exchange object that is crucial for male dominance. If Clarissa, especially her body, is the major item of exchange in the novel, then it functions for Eagleton as the transcendental signifier, the phallus, detachable and exchangeable. Yet Eagleton's reading of Clarissa as phallus misreads Irigaray, for woman is not the phallus, but that which ensures the abstract phallus its place as transcendental signifier. Phallic woman, fetish, Lacan's Law and Name-of-the-Father – all of these variously describe Clarissa, even though her body resists representation. This is why Lovelace rapes her, the act itself upon which Richarsdon's text revolves and which cannot be represented – Lacan's Real and lack, an empty space that is the source of meaning.

As intriguing as the argument is, it falls short of a full integration of feminist and psychoanalytic approaches. Perhaps Eagleton's well-known refusal of dialectics is at fault here, as also his somewhat superficial discussion of feminism and psychoanalysis – Clarissa cannot fill so many of the Freudian and Lacanian categories, such as fetish, phallus, faeces, Name-

¹ He cites 'Des marchandises entre elles' ('Commodities Among Themselves'), which first appeared in French in 1975 (see Irigaray 1985: 192-7). However, this essay develops the points of her key essay on Marx, 'Women on the Market' (Irigaray 1985: 170-91), which appeared in French in 1970 as 'Le marché des femmes'.

of-the-Father, Real, lack and so on. The surest signal is, however, the way Marxism comes in to provide the most comprehensive argument: Clarissa's death, in all its meticulous detail, unwittingly offers a critique and refusal of bourgeois ideology, which 'is made to stand shamefaced and threadbare in the light of its own doctrines' (Eagleton 1982: 77). And this in spite of the best intentions of Richardson to provide a model for such an ideology. I suspect that many biblical critics fall into the same trap with Ruth, seeing it as women's story that runs against the grain of the Hebrew Bible without noticing the systematic effacement of women throughout the text.

Richardson is hardly a willful agent in this critique of bourgeois ideology: his detailed defense of puritanism, itself an indispensable element of that ideology, over against the feudal-cavalier behaviour of Lovelace shows up, through its intensity, the contradictions of the very position Richardson espouses: 'his pen exceeds his expectations, conjuring a levelling sub-text from beneath the carefully policed script of his novel' (1982: 77-8). Yet, I want to give Eagleton his due, for it seems to me that a faithfulness to Marxism as the most comprehensive and insightful of critical and political approaches is the correct position to take. Eagleton does argue that sexual difference is not the displacement of class conflict, but in the end he assumes that sexual difference is the code in which such conflict registers in Richardson's text, the medium through class conflict is conducted. But cannot the alternative work just as well: that class conflict is the code

through which sexual difference is articulated? It seems to that this approach does not advance the discussion any further. For in the end the novel is about inter-class tensions, between the bourgeoisie and landed aristocracy – the Harlowes and the Lovelaces – who need to form alliances rather than bicker among themselves. Here the logic of *Sir Charles Grandison* appears, for in *Grandison* such an alliance is forged, an alliance that shows up already in the complicity between Clarissa's parents, who forced her into the relationship with Lovelace, and Lovelace himself.

At this Marxist level, all of the various elements of *Clarissa* may be read in terms of the tensions and alliances between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie: Clarissa's pacifism is an onslaught on the whole social system; her death is the violence of the system let loose on Clarissa herself, an inversion necessary for the patriarchal class alliance of bourgeoisie and aristocracy; Clarissa's forgiveness of Lovelace is a signal of the bourgeois need to make peace with the existing ruling class; and in abjection Clarissa signals the profound tension of this new class alliance, between Richardson's Christian piety and social aggressiveness.

What Richardson sought in *Clarissa* he achieved in the magnificent failure of *Sir Charles Grandison*. Here he realises the feminisation of public male relation: the criticism of Lovelace's aristocratic values, with all their public violence, which is carried out through the feminine figure of Clarissa – embodying the virtues of meekness, chastity, sentiment and benevolence –

come together in *Grandison*. For Eagleton, *Grandison* is a cipher for the class alliance of aristocracy and bourgeoisie in which the ideology of the latter – a mollified and subtler form of ruling class and patriarchal domination – wins through. Yet for Eagleton *Grandison* is a failure, showing all the contradictions of middle class ideology: chastity, altruism, piety and pacificity produce a new male subject who subtly alters the structures of sexual oppression so that they remain in place, as powerful as ever: ‘The contradiction of *Sir Charles Grandison* is that its blending of genders is inseparable from a synthesis of classes which simply reproduces sexual oppression’ (Eagleton 1982: 101). And the mark of this contradiction is that *Grandison* cannot but be removed from everyday life. *Grandison* is remote, pontificating on society, a womanly man who connects power and tenderness, and because of this emerges as ‘a prig of the first water’ (Eagleton 1982: 96). He is ‘Jesus Christ in knee breeches, a dreary paragon of goodness’ (1982: 96), whose unreality signals an ideological failure: *Grandison* can only be tender because he has power and riches, a patriarch who can, like Boaz in the story of Ruth, freely dispense moral and financial largesse. In such an unbalanced connection between public and private elements, he becomes more a private than a public figure, an aristocrat well past his time. The contradiction is that Richardson’s ideal male is nothing more than a social throwback, for virtue and success cannot blend so easily in public life. The harmony of *Grandison* in his remoteness shows up the

tensions of Richardson's ideological effort. In the end, however, it matters little whether Grandison the patriarch is chaste or not, for he has power and can use it as he chooses: morality has nothing to do with power.

Although Eagleton's argument has its difficulties – it structurally incorporates psychoanalysis and feminism within Marxism – my criticism should not detract from the fact that his analysis foregrounds the important questions of any effort to bring together feminism, psychoanalysis and Marxism. Any consideration of class, class conflict and ideology is inadequate without the dynamics of sexual difference and conflict. This much Eagleton takes as a given: his discussion is an effort to show how the three approaches work together without recourse to a dialectical argument. As far as my reading of Ruth is concerned, I follow Eagleton's lead in a resolute focus on class and gender. The persistent constructivist objection that it is extremely difficult to speak of either in such a vastly different time and place is of course valid, except that it ignores the Marxist origins of constructivism itself. And Marxism is certainly not afraid of historical continuities and the occasional irreducible category.

One of these is class, Eagleton's most consistent Marxist category. Even with the work of Gottwald, Sneed and Horsley, a most urgent task in biblical studies is a consideration of class in the texts of the Hebrew Bible and New Testament. This requires not only the effort to reconstruct what forms class took in the contexts from which the Bible emerged, and not

only an engagement with the theoretical work done of class under the Asiatic and Ancient modes of production outside biblical scholarship, but it also requires an investigation into the way class operates in the form and content of the texts themselves.

The Effacement of Women in Ruth

As Eagleton I will watch in my reading of Ruth for the contradictions and tensions that the shifting patterns of class and sexual dominance produce in the text. For all the space that women occupy in the narrative, what function do they fulfil? And what of the Moabite/Israelite distinction that has been discussed so much? Finally, does not Ruth occupy the lowest rung in the structure of work, gathering the leftovers after the reapers have been through the fields? Eagleton's reflections on the intersections between class and ethnic difference appear in his focus on Heathcliff in *Wuthering Heights*, whereas the issues of class and gender are the focus of his treatment of Richardson's novels. What I want to do is bring together all three – class, gender and ethnicity – in a way that is thoroughly Marxist and yet does not enable class to become the ultimately determining instance.

The path I tread bears the prints of those who have written on Ruth before me. Athalya Brenner has argued that the model which best describes Ruth is that of the foreign woman worker, common in Israel today (Brenner 1999). Women come into Israel to work at the lowest paid jobs – usually domestic – from countries where there is little work at all: because they are

women and foreigners they fill the lowest class stratum of unskilled workers. This is a finely balanced argument, much better than her earlier valorizations of Ruth as a woman's story (Brenner 1993),² for the questions of ethnicity and gender provide greater complexity for an implicit class analysis, and yet ethnicity and gender are not the determining factors of class. Except that Brenner does not offer a class analysis (hence my use of 'implicit'), notable more for her feminist criticism than any Marxist categories.

David Jobling, in his commentary on 1 Samuel (1998), divides his book into sections on class, gender and ethnicity. While this is one of the best and most astute commentaries I have read, partly because Jobling is interested in similar questions to me, and while there is a distinct value in the three sections of the book, studiously avoiding the favouring of one category over another, he curiously makes similar moves to Eagleton. The middle section on gender is where the most sustained use of psychoanalysis appears. The sections on class and ethnicity are less taken with psychoanalysis. In other words, where gender is an issue, psychoanalysis seems most appropriate, for they both speak of the individual and private, specialists in sentiment, to use Eagleton's phrase for the women of Richardson's circle. When the questions of class and ethnicity come to the fore, the modes of analysis move from the private to the public. And it does

² In fact, most of the essays in the first *Feminist Companion to Ruth* (1993) follow this line, some suggesting female authorship (Bledstein 1993; Van Dijk-Hemmes 1993).

not seem to me that Jobling provides an adequate reflection on the inter-relation between the three areas.

Before attempting precisely such a dialectical reading, I need to ask how class, gender and ethnicity work in the narrative of Ruth. Even though one should hesitate to apply the notions of gender that work today, in late capitalism, the question of sexual difference is one of the oldest divisions for both Marxism and feminism. In this respect, as Eagleton argues in regard to Richardson's texts, the story of Ruth attempts to deal with a problem, although the problem in Ruth is quite different from the one Eagleton identifies: whose mother is Obed's? He is not simply Ruth's child, for the story closes with the women of the neighbourhood saying 'A son has been born to Naomi (Ruth 4:17). And then the narrative closes with a male genealogy from Perez to David in which Boaz and Obed feature. In other words, the story faces the problem of succession, of transition from male to male, when there is no male to continue the line. What happens when only women are left?

As for ethnicity, the ambiguity of 'Moab' runs through the text and beyond. The Moabites are, for the Hebrew Bible, the descendants of Lot and his first-born daughter (Gen 19:32-3, 37). In this denigrating tale the Ammonites come from Lot and his younger daughter (Gen 19:34-6, 38). Ruth is therefore one of this incestuous brood, a secondary part of the lines that tie in with Abraham. In Ruth itself the ambiguity of Moab – a sign of

textual nervousness concerning Israelite identity? (see also Boer 2001: 120-49) – continues. Ruth and Orpah are Moabite wives of now dead Israelite men, Mahlon and Chilion. Ruth, whose Moabite identity is so much part of her character that it becomes an epithet, follows Naomi back to Judah, but it is she who marries Boaz and produces a child in the curiously ‘impure’ genealogical line that leads back to David.

Class, Eagleton’s most favoured category, is less obvious in Ruth, but only because it has been less of a focus in criticism than questions of gender and ethnicity. Yet the narrative, especially in chapter two, cannot be understood without a notion of class. As I outlined earlier, class is one of a cluster of terms in Marxist theory that explores the relations between productive and non-productive labour: those who control the means of production extract, in order to live, the surplus product, or value, from those who work for them but do not own the means of production. Within this basic description a host of particular variations exist in any political formation (see Marx’s famous analysis in *The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte*), so much so that the Marxist category of class becomes the name of a problem that must be addressed afresh on each occasion.

Like Eagleton in his discussion of *Wuthering Heights* and *Clarissa*, class emerges as an inescapable category for the story of Ruth; in fact, Eagleton’s own insistence on class hardly lets me avoid it in any reading that begins with his work. Thus, the return of Naomi and Ruth to Bethlehem takes place at

the 'beginning of the barley harvest' (Ruth 1:22), a crucial temporal marker that sets up the sequence that follows. Ruth begins, at her own suggestion, the task of gleaning after the reapers of the harvest. In the hierarchy of labour she is a long way from the wealthy Boaz, owner of the means of production: between them come the young man in charge of the reapers and the reapers themselves. Ruth follows the reapers in the field (Ruth 2:3). As far as the story is concerned, there is but one field in which the reapers work, for the text mentions that part of it belonged to Boaz. The word for reapers is masculine plural, although this does not necessarily refer exclusively to men. The suggestion is strong, however, that the young men (Ruth 2:9) are the reapers, but the mention of 'my young women' by Boaz (2:8) points to female workers in the field. Are they reapers also? Ruth 2:23 suggests most clearly that the young women glean rather than reap. The alternative term וְעַבְדָּת , that designates menial service, concubinage and connection to a female master, is one that indicates that for this story the women workers occupy the lowest rung in the work hierarchy (see 2:13). However, the ambiguity over, young men/young women, requires alternative signals in the text concerning any division of labour according to sexual difference. Is it the case, then, that the gender distinction between young men and young women only takes place in the Hebrew Bible when the division of labour becomes an issue? As for Ruth, she is also a young woman (Ruth 2:5, 6), clearly one of the labourers, yet she is one step down

from the lowest group, a female servant who is not like one of Boaz's female servants (see 2:13). Only after Naomi's instruction does she join the group of young women gleaning (2:22-23).

In this class microcosm, the mediation between the reapers and gleaners on the one side and Boaz on the other is but one 'young man' – often glossed as 'servant' – who is in charge of the reapers (Ruth 2:5). But Boaz himself is the singular male, like Grandison in Richardson's novels, who controls the means of production and for whom the rest labour. His wealth, the public activities of commercial exchange at the 'gate' (4:1), his age, the eating and drinking at the threshing floor (3:3-7), and the instructions given to his reapers as to how they should work (2:15,16), all indicate a man in charge of the means of production and labour. Only in this context can he, like Grandison, utter pieties – 'Yahweh bless you' (2:4) or 'May you be blessed by Yahweh' (3:10; a more indirect phrase for Ruth) – and appear incongruously generous (see below). But the most obvious signal is that nowhere does Boaz engage in any work as such, nowhere is he involved in the production of the necessary items for human existence. In other words, he lives off the surplus labour of those who do work. The only thing he does is tell others what to do: note the variations on the imperative and jussive in nearly all of his reported speech in the text.

A complication to this whole structure of social class lies with Naomi, for she is not factored into the economic equation of the narrative. She

remains in domestic space once back in Bethlehem. And her role for the rest of the story is to give Ruth directives (3:1-4: like Boaz, Naomi is given to imperatives and jussives), encourage Ruth in her decisions (2:2), utter pieties (2:19, 20), question Ruth's daily activities (2:20), urge her on in the back-breaking work of gleaning (2:22), gain ownership of Ruth's child (4:16), which is then recognized by the other women (4:14, 15, 17). Both Naomi and Boaz use the familiar 'my daughter' (1:11, 12; 2:2, 8), a distinct place marker in the hierarchy of kin structures. Naomi is then most like Boaz in this story, for she also does no work: she controls Ruth's actions, directing her to go out and glean, seduce a man on the threshing floor and bear a child. This legitimate Judahite is another who lives from the surplus value of those who work.

Yet, is not the representation of Boaz and Naomi fraught with difference? A valid objection to my reading is that the absence of Naomi's work is characteristic of the repression of women's work in domestic space. Surely Naomi engages in tasks of cleaning and cooking while Ruth is outside the domestic sphere, doing the work that does register in the text. And is not Naomi the one who cares for the son after he is born? Boaz, by contrast, controls the means of production to which and to whom Naomi herself is subject. At one level this absence in the text signals that Naomi is yet another enabler of the necessary patriliney with which the story closes. There

are, however, other signals in the text that indicate the deeper complicity of Naomi and Boaz.

To begin with, there is the question of kinship, which will itself devolve into that of patriliney. The story begins with the Judahite credentials of Elimelech, Mahlon and Chilion, ‘Ephrathites from Bethlehem in Judah’ (1:2). The issue returns in the narrator’s note in 2:1: ‘Now Naomi had a relative (Qere ‘relative’, Ketib ‘acquaintance’³) of her husband’s, a powerful man, of the family of Elimelech, and his name was Boaz’. After this note, Ruth’s encounter with Boaz is predetermined, although the economic factor of the division of labour becomes crucial in order to allow the connection to be made. Time and again the kinship of Naomi and Boaz recurs (2:3, 20; 3:2, 12) until the whole question needs to be resolved by the transaction at the gate with the unnamed ‘redeemer’ who is closer to Naomi than Boaz.

However, the connection of blood is but the mark of a deeper allegiance, of which the dealings in chapter 4 are the first element. Here the public transactions of men over property and women enable the first steps towards a narrative resolution. The issue here is who will act as redeemer for ... Elimelech, neither Naomi nor Ruth. Boaz or the assumed ‘redeemer’, most likely a closer relative? The concentration of various forms of the verb and noun that form part of the semantic cluster of ‘redeem’ (3:13, 4:1, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8) – to redeem lost property or inheritance – indicate a distinct economic

³ Although both words come from *yd'*, to know, the Ketib is interesting here, for it designates merely someone known, an acquaintance, rather than a relative.

transaction as the solution to the narrative problem of inheritance. Yet, when Boaz and the ‘redeemer’ in question have sat down together with other men, the surprise in store is that the key issue is a parcel of land that belonged ‘to our brother Elimelech’ (4:3). The negotiations begin and the dealings remain at the level of land. But when the nominated ‘redeemer’ agrees to buy the land, Boaz finally mentions Ruth: ‘On the day you buy the land from the hand of Naomi and from Ruth, the Moabitess, the wife of the dead; you buy to restore the name of the dead to his inheritance’ (4:5). At this the ‘redeemer’ withdraws his offer and allows Boaz to become the ‘redeemer’ of Elimelech, thereby relinquishing the legal duty of the next of kin to take the wife of the one who died so that he would not compromise his own inheritance.

There are a couple of things worth noting in Ruth 4:5. To begin with, the text stumbles at a couple of points, suggesting the problem that Ruth causes for the transaction. Her syntactical place in the sentence is unclear: while the phrases ‘from the hand of Naomi and from Ruth’ appear balanced as the indirect object of the infinitive construct ‘on the day of your buying’, the particle before ‘Ruth’ is different from the phrase, ‘from the hand of’, before ‘Naomi’. Of course, the problem, as the following verses make clear, is that Ruth is not the one from whom the property must be redeemed. And so, commentators suggest, following the Vulgate, that the text should be read as in verse 10: ‘also (you buy... Ruth)’, rendering Ruth the direct object

of the next verb. The syntactical ambiguity hints at a possible inheritance from Naomi to Ruth, outside the control of men, and it is this threat that must be closed down by the convoluted transaction at the gate. Further, the Qere/Ketib for the second verb, ‘you buy’ or ‘I buy’, disrupts the sentence yet further. Is it that when the ‘redeemer’ buys the land from the hand of Naomi and from Ruth, Boaz buys to restore the name of the dead to his inheritance? Or does Boaz buy Ruth and the nominated redeemer buy the land? Or is it as the Qere has it, that the one who redeems the land, along with Ruth, redeems the inheritance of the dead? Once again, Ruth disrupts the syntax of a sentence in which she is an object of exchange.

My second observation is the secondary status of Ruth to the ‘parcel of land’, found in both Ruth 2:3 and 4:3. It is as though her inadvertent wandering, while gleaning, onto Boaz’s ‘parcel of land’ (2:3) inextricably ties her to the exchange of land, now that of Elimelech’s in Ruth 4:3. So close is the connection between women and land – as producers of children and food that men perpetually seek to control – that a metonymy creeps in, suggesting that Ruth herself is the ‘parcel of land’ over which the men haggle. What is being exchanged here? Obviously a woman, her status as afterthought to the land overturned by the surrounding narrative in which she is the prime object of exchange. The ritual of the sandal, with which Boaz walks on the land and at which Ruth sleeps, makes explicit the purchase of both (4:9).

Again, Naomi, does not seem to fit the equation. Although the exchange of land and woman takes place between men, Naomi is the one who sells. On three occasions (4:3,5,9), each time in the reported speech of Boaz, Naomi is mentioned: once as subject of the verb (4:3) and twice as indirect object (4:5,9). In the presence of the elders the exchange takes place between Naomi and Boaz, even though the former is absent. From Naomi he buys ‘all that belonged to Elimelech and all that belonged to Chilion and Mahlon’ (4:9). And this, as verse 10 elaborates, includes Ruth: he has not, as the usual formula would have it, ‘taken’ her; rather, ‘and also Ruth, the Moabitess, the woman of Mahlon, I have bought as a woman’, says Boaz (4:10). In the end Naomi sells Ruth and the land: in fact it now becomes all that belonged to Elimelech, Mahlon and Chilion (4:9).

Naomi, it appears is one of the men with whom she exchanges various items, including the foreign woman. But not quite, for at this point the question of ethnicity – or more preferably, social boundaries – makes it clear that this is not merely exchange between (honorary) men. I am going to argue that such economic activity may take place, as far as the narrative is concerned, between Israelites, all of whom appear in this text as non-workers, as those who live off the surplus value of others and exchange it among themselves.

Before I consider this more closely, I want to return to chapter 2, where further complicity between Naomi and Boaz takes place. I have

already noted that they act in a similar fashion, controlling and directing Ruth's actions. But what interests me now is the apparent generosity of Boaz. It begins with his order to Ruth to remain with his own 'young women' (2:8), his report of the instructions to the young men not to molest her – as though this was the norm – and to drink from what the young men have drawn (2:9). Ruth herself comes to the party, uttering her thanks: 'May I find favour in your eyes, my lord, for you have comforted me and spoken kindly to your female servant, though I am not one of your female servants' (2:13). Not only does Boaz, in all his largesse, talk to her directly and offer her food (2:14), but he orders the young men to give her as much help as possible, allowing her to glean among the sheaves instead of after them, and to pull out some grains from the bundles so she can gather more (2:15-16). This incredible generosity – a virtue only for the wealthy, as Eagleton points out with respect to Grandison – finds ready support from Naomi, who responds to the information that Ruth has gleaned in Boaz's field: 'Blessed be he by Yahweh, whose kindness has not forsaken the living and the dead' (2:20). The elision between Yahweh's and Boaz's 'kindness' is not fortuitous in light of my comments about class earlier (is not Boaz closest to God?). But what we miss in the uniform chorus of Boaz and Naomi, as well as the smoothness of the narrative that lines up such generosity with Yahweh, is the sheer effrontery of the acts and support of both Boaz and Naomi. Not only is Ruth already engaged in the most back-breaking labour, but both

Boaz and Naomi enhance the working conditions – within strict limits – in order to make her work harder. Thus, as the ‘young man’ in charge of the reapers says: ‘she has continued from early morning until now’ (2:7). And all this before Boaz shows any ‘generosity’. Her work credentials are clear, so that by the time Boaz provides more incentive to work ‘she gleaned in the field until evening’ (2:17), after which she beats what she has gleaned into an ephah of barley. This work is for one day only: after Naomi’s encouragement, Ruth gleaned for the whole season ‘until the end of the barley and wheat harvests’ (2:23). This is hardly benevolence, but more like pure exploitation.

It seems, then, that Naomi and Boaz have multiple ties, in terms of kinship, economic exchange and the exploitation of labour. But to what end? A hint of this purpose comes already in chapter 2, when Boaz offers Ruth bread and wine in which to dip the bread: ‘So she sat beside the reapers, and he passed her the parched grain, and she ate and was satisfied, and she had some remaining’ (2:14). If this grain that is left over is ambiguous, the ‘gift’ after their night together makes it a little clearer. Boaz orders her to hold out her mantle, he places in it six measures of barley, ‘laid it upon her’ before she goes out into the city (3:15). Apart from the play on garments (see 3:3, 9) and uncovering (3:4,7) – would not a deconstructive reading make the most of such items? – is this to be understood as a bridal price – if so, a poor one – or a signal of her more significant productive role later? I would suggest

that here the connection between the ‘part of the land’ and Ruth in 2:3 and 4:3 has its sense, for the relation between women and land is not merely that they are exchange items. Rather, the left over parched grain and the six measures of barley placed in her mantle (so that she was virtually naked) signal a deeper association between the productivity of land and women: both produce ‘fruit’ for others to appropriate. Ruth labours on the land for the gleanings of barley in a way comparable to her production of a son, both burdens and ‘gifts’ from Boaz.

There remains the final narrative of the book itself. The blessing of ‘all the people’ – note the expansion from the ten elders of 4:2 – ‘who were at the gate’ (4:11) concerns productivity, now in terms of child-bearing. But not any form of child-bearing: the bearing of sons like Rachel and Leah (although Leah also bore Dinah), ‘who together built up the house of Israel’ (4:11), and, of all people, the house of Perez, born of the somewhat dubious union of Tamar and Judah (Genesis 38), like that of Ruth and Boaz.

Nevertheless, the result is what counts: ‘because of the seed that Yahweh will give you from this young woman’ (4:12). Ruth’s purpose in the narrative is to produce ‘seed’, both the son to be born, Obed, and as the closing genealogy shows, *his* descendants. Note the word used again for Ruth: she is no longer the Moabitess but the ‘young woman’, the gleaner and worker from 2:5,6 (where only those who work are designated as ‘young men’ and ‘young women’). Linguistically, at the moment of her immanent son-bearing,

the terminology links her inextricably with her role as field-worker and gleaner.

However, in the narrative of conception and birth (a perspective from Boaz, for these moments neglect the long period of gestation) there is a curious twist. Boaz, now in conventional terms, ‘takes’ Ruth and she becomes his wife, Yahweh enables conception (not Boaz!) and she gives birth to a son (4:13). The narrative has, of course, been moving to this point, but Naomi has not had her last word. In a reversal or rescue of Naomi’s bitter words in 1:20-21 at the dereliction by Yahweh, the women point out Yahweh’s blessing for Naomi by means of Ruth: ‘He shall be to you a restorer of life and a nourisher of your old age; for your daughter-in-law who loves you, has borne him’ (4:15). Not only is the blessing for Naomi, for she ‘takes’ him, with the same word that is used for Boaz’s ‘taking’ of Ruth (4:13), and puts him in her own bosom, becoming a wet-nurse to him (4:16). With the words of the women – ‘A son has been born to Naomi’ – the appropriation is complete, although Ruth’s status lingers in his name, Obed.

Like Clarissa in Eagleton’s analysis of Richardson’s texts, Ruth becomes a pure ideological means to an end: the resolution of an ideological anomaly. For Richardson this is the feminization of bourgeois relations, whereas for this narrative the disparate identity of Israel and its patriliney is ensured through the appropriation of Ruth’s labour and body. And the

narrative closes with the lineage of Obed through Jesse to David, backtracking to Perez (now his appearance in 4:12 makes sense) only to finish with the same final three.

In my exploration of the working out of this ideological anomaly the three concerns I have taken up from Eagleton – ethnicity, class and gender – all draw together. As far as ethnicity is concerned the epithet ‘Moabites’ is crucial, for Ruth’s foreign status is reiterated over and over again. She is and remains a foreign body within Israel, so much so that, despite all her protestations of loyalty (1:16-17), she cannot be the mother of the son. In the narrative Obed belongs to Boaz and Naomi: Ruth is merely the vessel by which the son is born. For what it is worth, this nervous concern over the dynamics of social boundaries appears to relatively late, when the identity of ‘Israel’ was very much an obsession. How can an older woman, Naomi, beyond child-bearing age, and a man without a son have an heir? Or rather, how can a threatened inheritance, that of Elimelech, be rescued? But the whole question of ethnicity in this text concerns the establishment of the clearest boundaries between legitimate Israelites and those who are not.

As for gender, only a woman can fill the narrative role, for Ruth must both work in the field and give birth to a son who becomes crucial for the unfolding patriliney. Yet, what happens to Ruth is that she must both work the fields and produce a son, only to disappear when her tasks are done. Thus, after the short narrative of her giving birth to a son, the characteristic

yet anomalous formula of men giving birth returns: ‘Perez caused to bear Hezron, Hezron caused to bear...’ (4:18-19). The indirect object – the woman – disappears and men give birth to men. Ruth’s effacement is complete. As for Naomi, she becomes an honorary male, operating in the world of men, trading land and living off the surplus labour of Ruth. Like Ruth, she also disappears, although in a somewhat different direction.

But we must bring class back into consideration, for neither Naomi nor Boaz work in this story. They, the Israelites, do not labour but appropriate the surplus labour and value – the grain from the fields and the son from Ruth’s body – of one who does work far too hard. The terminology here is, I have argued, class driven: if the ‘young men’ reap, overseen by another ‘young man’, are at one remove from Boaz, the owner of the means of production, then what status have the ‘young women’ who follow the reapers and glean after them? While the young men and women may be Israelites, the only named worker in the narrative is Ruth, the ‘young woman’. And the term appears both when she works in the field and when she is about to give birth. This means that the pernicious economic picture that emerges in the book of Ruth is that the Israelites – above all Naomi and Boaz – are those who do not work, who exploit and live off the surplus labour of others. Naomi, then, disappears into the world of Israelite men, owners of the means of production, whereas Ruth, Moabitess, woman and worker, is gone when her body has been used up.

As for Eagleton's final arguments in his analyses of both *Wuthering Heights* and Richardson's novels concerning the class transitions that these texts both mark and enable -- class alliances between an older landed gentry and the new bourgeoisie in the former or the feminization of bourgeois public relations in the latter -- it seems to me that Ruth is both a text of an ideological status quo and that it also sees the emergence of an ideological position that identifies Israel's superior status, as 'chosen people', in terms of class. That which distinguishes Israel from other states is not merely ethnicity but also as a class of the owners of the means of production. Although this may be impossible in economic terms, it is nevertheless an ideological position that is but one aspect of the contested ideologies we find in the Hebrew Bible.

References

Bledstein, Adrien J.

1993 'Female Companionships: If the Book of Ruth were Written by a Woman...?', in A. Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Ruth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 116-33.

Brenner, Athalya

1993 'Introduction' in A. Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Ruth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 9-18.

1999 'Ruth as a Foreign Worker and the Politics of Exogamy' in A. Brenner (ed.) *Ruth and Esther: A Feminist Companion to the Bible (Second Series)* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 158-62.

Eagleton, Terry.

1982 *The Rape of Clarissa: Writing, Sexuality and Class Struggle in Samuel Richardson* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press).

- 1989 (ed.) *Raymond Williams: Critical Perspectives* (London: Polity Press).
- 1995 *Heathcliff and the Great Hunger: Studies in Irish Culture* (London: Verso)
- 1997 *Saint Oscar and Other Plays* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Irigaray, Luce.
- 1985 *This Sex Which is Not One* (Trans. Catherine Porter; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).
- Jobling, David
- 1998 *1 Samuel* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press).
- Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe.
- 1985 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (London: Verso).
- Van Dijk-Hemmes, Fokkelein
- 1993 'Ruth: A Product of Woman's Culture?' in A. Brenner (ed.), *A Feminist Companion to Ruth* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press): 134-9.