View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by DigitalCommons@USU

Utah State University

From the SelectedWorks of Gene Washington

January 2014

PROLOGEMENA TO AN FUTURE RHETORIC OF SHADOWS, SHADES AND SILHOUETTES

Contact Author

Start Your Own SelectedWorks

Notify Me of New Work

Available at: http://works.bepress.com/gene_washington/157

PROLEGOMENA TO ANY FUTURE RHETORIC OF SHADOWS, SHADES AND SILHOUETTES

> Man that is born of a woman hath but a short time to live, and is full of misery. He cometh up, and is cut down, like a flower; he fleeth as it were a *shadow*, and never continueth in one stay. In the mid of life we are in death (1662 Anglican Church "Burial of the Dead").
>
> ***
>
> But mark, madam, we live amongst riddles and mysteries—the most obvious things, which come in our way, have dark sides, which the quickest sight cannot penetrate into; and even the clearest and most exalted understandings amongst us find ourselves puzzled and at a loss in almost every cranny of nature's works. Laurence Sterne (1713-68)

Stepping out of the shadows…I….

Rhetoric, as a subject of investigation, is perhaps older than the invention of writing. One piece of evidence for this is its root in the Indo-European word, *aera*, "to say (something) with a specific intention" (Greek □ρ□ in direct descent to the modern

age; please see Buck, entry under "speak, say,"). Another kind of evidence is the abundance of treatises on rhetoric, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, Burke, Booth and Ong to mention some of the most prominent. Despite their differences in method, all these authors would perhaps agree that the key ingredient of rhetoric is author/speaker intentionality— the power of minds to be about, to represent, or to stand for, things, properties and states of affairs plus non-existent things. Whenever we speak, even if only to ourselves, we have some purpose in mind. This includes, as Brentano has it, not only to speak about things that exist, but also things that do not. When we talk about Obama or Putin, for example, we are talking about things that exist. When we talk about Sherlock Holmes, by contrast, we take as our subject something that does not exist (Brentano, Husserl, Crane).

> Gabriel Garcia Marquez conjured up the miraculous in his fiction: plagues of insomnia and forgetfulness, a cluster of magical grapes containing the secret of death, an all-night rain of yellow blossoms, a swamp of lilies oozing blood, a Spanish galleon marooned in a Latin American jungle, cattle born bearing the brand of their owner" (Obituary, *The New York Times* April 18, 2014: A1.)

My purpose here is to meditate, from different perspectives, on the question: What, if any, is/can/should be the rhetorical intention of the word "shadow," and other members of that family. (Later on I use the word "textual shadow" to distinguish the word from real-world shadows).

As "prolegomena" suggests, I do not intend here to actually construct a rhetoric of shadows. (What may turn out to be an actual construction is a work in progress). Rather, I would like to describe some of the *potential* elements of such a future rhetoric. Such elements, it will turn out, are *normative* ones, ones that would have to be there for the rhetoric to work properly.

Consequently, what the reader can expect to find in this short essay is a thin and shallow beachhead on the shadowy land of shadows—plus an invitation to push the beachhead further inland to perhaps conquer the whole country.

Please keep in mind I everywhere take the meaning of rhetoric to be "to say something with a specific intention about something either existing or non-existing." More generally, I will occasionally take existing as "presence" and non-existing as "absence." The relationship between presence and absence is asymmetric. It is easier to "think present" or "find" a presence than an absence:

> People search for an orange figure in a field of red figures more efficiently than they search for a red figure in a field of orange figures (Relative to red, orange involves the *presence* of yellow. Relative to orange, red involves the *absence* of yellow) (Sorenson 224).

Most people dislike absences (as only negative facts). They prefer to think that presences (as only positive facts) form reality. But from logical point of view absences provide a more powerful statement of what X is or can become. The *lack* of something, rather than its possession, is far more like to start a story (think of *Genesis*) and end one

(think of death as the basis for obituaries, elegies and epitaphs (for more on this see below, "negative versus positive facts").

We can treat X *only as* Y or X *as only Y*. The first does not treat all the aspects of X or exhaust its meaning. If we take our best friend as only a good skier we demean h/h. "Only as," by contrast, allows for other aspects of our friend to appear.

In this essay I treat textual shadows "only as," not as 'as only." That is, I do not give an exhaustive treatment of them. (for more on the differences between "only as" and "as only," please see Michael Rea:

https://www3.nd.edu/~mrea/papers/What%20is%20Pornography.pdf

In order not to run my "meditation" off the rails too quickly, I take as the main constraint on my thoughts the work of Roy Sorenson. At this time (2014) his book, *Seeing Dark Things*, is the definitive work on real-world shadows. If Sorenson does not discuss such and such aspect of shadows, than neither do I—I do not take them as being relevant to textual shadows. A further constraint, self imposed, is then to use here only *salient* aspects from *Seeing Dark Things* as a starting point for numbered sections in this essay. .

The reader of Sorenson may conclude that his account of shadows is more about light and dark than about shadows, shades and silhouettes. But wait! Is there any better place to start than with the foundational units of shadows? The presence and obscene of light.

Real-world shadows *cause*, by means of language, to become textual shadows. Since we experience shadows more by what they *lack* than what they *possess*, we are

forced to say that absences are more privileged in our proposed rhetoric than presences —"the perception of absences is a phenomenon general to all the senses" (Sorenson 4).

On the subject of recognizing a shadow (or one of its "family members") by what is missing from it. The answer: the missing primary colors of red, blue, yellow. (See below for what I mean by "family member").

In strictly evolutionary terms, the primary colors come into being to maximize mammals finding, and consuming, the *right* kind of food. Any animal lacking the ability to see these colors is severely handicapped in this regard (Miller and Johnson-Laird 337).

I will have little to say about the evolution of language and its contact with the extra-linguistic world. Or, in other words, how does a *representational* system like language refers to, or replicates, a prior *presentational* one, the objects of our senses? In particular, how does language represent the perception of the senses, especially sight and to a lesser degree, hearing. No doubt a principle problem here, one discussed by many thinkers, is why language represents objects that don't exist. An example is Sherlock Holmes versus existents like Obama or Putin. (For more on the famous detective please see below).

(Certain readers might want to explore this topic by examining studies like Calvin and Bickerton's L*ingua ex Machina: Reconciling Darwin and Chomsky with the Human Brain*, MIT press; Peter Burke, "Res et Verba in der Renaisance" or any number of works on "reference," such as Marga Reiner, "Reference" in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*).

(For readers who want to study the effects of shadows in painting I recommend as a place to start is Sir Joshua Reynold's portrait of David Garrick standing between figures

representing comedy (on Garrick's right) and tragedy on his left. More than half the picture is shadowy fading into dark. This is the part occupied by tragedy. The other half, with the figure of comedy, has her standing and smiling in bright sunlight.

Notice Garrick is looking at tragedy. Does this suggest that he favors that genre over comedy? When we look at shadows do we think tragedy? Do we define tragedy, as we do shadows, by what it lacks?

Now please google "chiaroscuro.")

1. Usage: It seems reasonable that we should start with demonstrating with specimens *that* language users *use* the word "shadow" (its close kin, "shade" and "silhouette" and other family members. Please see below)? With this we have a long list of writers to choose from: Plato, Dante, Shakespeare, Hemingway, Hans Christian Anderson, John Donne, Austin Pendleton (play, "Orson's Shadow") to cite a few.

Here are three specimens:

> Each substance of a grief hath twenty *shadows*,
>
> Which shows like grief itself, but is not so;
>
> For sorrow's eye, glazed with blinding tears,
>
> Divides one thing entire to many objects;
>
> Like perspectives, which rightly gazed upon
>
> Show nothing but confusion, eyed awry
>
> Distinguish form: so your sweet majesty,
>
> Looking awry upon your lord's departure,
>
> Find shapes of grief, more than himself, to wail;
>
> Which, look'd on as it is, is nought but *shadows*

Of what it is not. (*Richard 2*: II ii).

* It was late and every one had left the café except an old man who sat in the *shadow* the leaves of the tree made against the electric light (Hemingway, "A Clean Well-Lighted Place.").

* The hills across the valley of the Ebro were long and white. on this side there was no *shade* and no trees and the station was between two lines of rails in the *sun*. Close against the side of the station there was the warm *shadow* of the building and a curtain, made of strings of bamboo beads, hung across the open door into the bar, to keep out flies. The American and the girl with him sat at a table in the *shade*. (Hemingway, "Hills Like White Elephants")

* Between the idea/And the reality/*Between* the motion/And the act/Falls the *shadow* (T. S. Eliot "The Hollow Men.")

1a. Wittgenstein's "family-resemblance" (*Familienähnlichkeit*) In his *Philosophical Investigations* Wittgenstein says that "things which may be thought to be connected by one essential common feature may in fact be connected by a series of overlapping similarities, where no one feature is common to all" (Item #66).

With this in mind we can say, based on their lack of primary colors, and their consequent epistemic uncertainty, that words like "mist," "fog," "smoke," "dust," "ghost," "phantom," "gray" and others belong to the same "family" as "shadow," "shade," "silhouette."

They all have the same rhetorical intentionality. To set, as Aristotle has it, "the object before the eyes" (*Rhetoric* 3:10). Please recall, for example, Dickens use of fog as confusion and fraud in *Bleak House* or dust in Ford Madox Ford's *Parade's End*. In one of Ford's accounts of the camp where Tietjens has been posted, the massed soldiers take on the same value as dust that blows away—in the case of the soldiers blown away by the war:

> Brown….
>
> And faces, two and two, in a coil round the huts…like *dust*
>
> Like a cloud of dust that would approach and overwhelm a
>
> Landscape; every one with preposterous troubles and anxieties
>
> ….like dust" (Alfred Kopf 1961: 319)

In Cather's *Death Comes to the Archbishop, s*hadow imagery becomes more and more numerous as we approach the end of the book and the death of Bishop Latour.

1b. Foreshadowing. All the members of this "family" often hint (predict?) at what's to come.

1c. Nuclear/non-nuclear family. Members of the above "family" (1a) constitute a nuclear one, echoes and reflections a non-nuclear.

1d. Sorting out uses of textual shadows can be done by past, present, future. But the sorting would have to be done by verbs.

1e. One varies the visual intensity, and informational content, of textual shadows with noun-anchoring adjectives, "light," "faint," "dim," "black" and so on.

2. Should we make a distinction between "shadow" and "shade"? Please notice Hemingway's use of "shade" above. Does "shadow" call to mind something temporary,

with no fixed location? "Shade" a more permanent, perhaps more stable, position? If there is this difference, then it is more likely based on either the movement, or lack of it, of the blocking agent of light. To us, moving objects, like clouds and birds, always cast shadows, not shades or silhouettes: "The shadow of a cloud moved across the field of grain and she (Jig) saw the river through the trees" ("Hills Like White Elephants"). We say "shade tree," not "shadow trees," but we can sit in the shadow of a tree. (Here one might be reminded of the difference between the uses of the verb "to be" as given, mostly noticeably in Spanish, "to be," "estar" (temporary location) versus "ser" (permanent existence and location). But there are exception to this general distinction.

But this is a semantic account. Sorenson's account is ontological. A blocking agent, like a brick wall, casts a shadows on a surface. A shade "begins only when the brick ends, for only at that point do we reach an appropriate medium for a shadow (in this case air)" (28).

Figure 1.6 in *Seeing Dark Things* is a graphic illustration of the differences between shadows, shades and silhouettes (28).

2a. Do shadows "terrify" more than shades or silhouettes?

> Still Gates's agents of evil also appear to possess, like The Shadow,
> The power to cloud men's minds (the reference is to a character in Joyce
> Oates' *The Accursed*. *The New York Review of books,* May 8, 2014: 45)

2b. Agency. If shadows have more agency, than shades or silhouettes, then are they more likely to be personified, given human (usually sinister) characteristics? Please see Donne's "Lecture Upon The Shadow," Pendleton's "Orson's Shadow," Hans Christian Andersen's "The Shadow."

3. Textual shadows. With the word, "textual," we encounter the word "shadow" in a textual context, for example in Donne's "Lecture on The Shadow" or the specimens above. How is this different from our encounter with a real-world shadow? One important differences is the lack of intentionality in real-world shadows and its presence in textual shadows. If we take evolution seriously, then we have to say that every natural phenomenon does not have an intention. If we go with Aristotle then we do have to claim that everything, the animate and inanimate, have an "end" (*telos*) in mind: the end for an acorn is the "perfection" of an oak tree. (See Campbell *Man,* 266-279). Another difference between a real-word shadow and a textual one is that the former *always* require a *surface* for a shadow, shade or silhouette to complete its journey into reality. Textual shadows often have a surface but not always:

> The surface is where most of the action is. The surface is where light is Reflected or absorbed, not the interior of the substance. The surface is What touches the animal, not the interior. The surface is where chemical Reaction mostly takes place. The surface is where vaporization or diffusion Of substances into the medium occurs. And the surface is where vibrations of the substance are transmitted into the medium (J. J. Gibson; quoted by Sorenson 45).

Shadows can also be the cause of a variation of temperature. If the surface is the ground, than one will feel colder under a shadow or shade than outside them. Shadows have a tactile effect.

Do you feel colder when you read a line like "X was sitting in the shade?" Or do you simply feel *for* X?

3a.. By the above account we can then say that textual shadows are known more by what they lack (relative to real-world shadows) than what they possess. A text replete with textual shadows does not change the temperature in the room. Their only surface is a two-dimensional inanimate one. They do not set up chemical reactions in the interior of the text or cause it to rotate or vibrate.

Due to its intentionality, the effect of a textual shadow is an informational one. They say something with a specific intention to inform someone, the reader or listener.
3b. Charles Hockett, a well know linguist, says that one of the sixteen "design features" of language is prevarication, or lying. To some extent we can lie with body language. And it can sustain and amplify language. But the scope, and power, of language is far more extensive than what we can express with our body.

So. Is it possible for a textual shadow to lie, convey false information? Or, more in harmony with the theme of this essay, the *lack* of truth? Only, we suppose if that is the writer's intention with it.

Is this one of Plato's intentions with his allegory of the cave? Perhaps not to lie but to dramatize the absence of truth? Plato was perhaps inspired by the shadow plays of puppeteers. Recall that in the allegory men are shackled together in a way that keeps them facing a cave wall. Behind and above them there is a walled path and a fire. The wall conceals person who walk by with figurines above their heads. They figurines cast shadows on the cave wall. This shadow-play is the only realty for the prisoners who have never seen things under normal conditions. The prisoners consider the shadows as objects in their own right. They do not view them as signs of other things. When the prisoners view the shadows in this fashion, they do not see the figurines. If they could turn and see

the figurines they would know that the figurines are blocking light from the fire and that the shadows cast on the wall do not convey the reality of the figurines.

Plato is then saying, in short, that the ignorance of the prisoners is due to their not seeing the source of the blocking agents of light. In Sorenson's language, "nonepistemic seeing has no belief content; learning cannot increase what one sees (42).

4. The Ideal Reader of Textual Shadows. In the real world of reading it is likely no such person exists. But here, taking h/h as a thought-experiment, h/h would be able, following experiences with real world shadows, to correctly identify the rhetorical intention of a textual shadow as encompassing potential information about the temperature of X, its status as a surface, its existence, location and duration.

In short, h/s would be able to determine exactly what the writer is up in locating X in a shadow or under a shade. S/h would be able to read the mind of the writer as regards h/h use of a textual shadow. H/s would be able to distinguish objective information about X from subjective knowledge if X is a person. Most importantly, if X is a person, our ideal reader would be able to draw correlations between what the writer "shows" with textual shadows and what, if any, "tells" about X as a surface for shadows.

With that in mind let us substitute for X the old man in Hemingway's in *A Clean Well-Lighted Place.* We know that the old man is a surface for shadows: "It was late and every one had left the café except an old man who sat in the *shadow* the leaves of the tree made against the electric light." The story continues with Hemingway telling us that the old man is deaf and had tried to commit suicide because of "nothing."

> 'Last week he tried to commit suicide,' one waiter said.
>
> 'Why?'

'He was in despair.'

'What about?'

'Nothing.'

On the terrace where the old man sits the chairs are empty. The narration continues with information about the marital status of the old man (he is a widower), about his loneliness and drunkenness.

The story then "shows" and "tells" in a relationship of what linguists call linguistic "redundancy." Showing and telling "back up" each other. If one fails to get the rhetorical intention through to the reader, than the other (it is hoped) just might. The context for each instance of show and tell is vital to the meaning of the whole.

The overall context of the story is the ontology of light versus dark and how Hemingway associates each with traditional correlates like:

Light: youth, hope, life

Dark: old age, despair, death.

In between these two contexts is the world of shadows, neither absolute light or dark, neither a full life nor a final death. This is the world of the old man.

For more on showing and telling please see #6 (below).

4a. How then should think of this in-between state. Speakers often characterize our species as being in-between things and states, heaven and earth, life and death and so on.

5. Booth suggests that Jane Austen "distances" the reader from her characters in order for us to "judge" their motives more objectively (247-53). Can this be one use of textual shadows? Is this an intention of either Plato with the cave allegory or Dante in the Purgatorio? Recall, for example, this passage from that work (3: 73-4).

> When those in front saw the light on the hillside, broken, on my right, by my *shadow,* falling from me as far as the rock, they stopped, and drew back, a little: and all the others that came after them, did the same, not understanding why. My Master said: ‘Without your asking, I admit, to you, that this is a human body that you see, by which the sunlight is broken on the ground (la luce del sole rotto sul terreno).Do not wonder, but believe, that he does not try to climb this wall, without the help of power that comes from Heaven.’ And the worthy people said: ‘Turn, then, and go in front of us,’ making a gesture with the backs of their hands (my translation).

Since the "people" Dante encounters in the underworld are shadows themselves they cannot, as Dante himself does, cast a shadow. The dead are "distant" from the living. Evidence? Only the living can cast a shadow.

The main distinction between the living and the dead, at least according to Dante, is not absolute presence nor absolute absence, but the in-between state of presence of an absence (a shadow) and the absence of a presence (the inability to cast a shadow).

My hypothesis about this is that Dante begins with meditating on what it means for something to be absent, not present. A presence can be reduced to an absence but not the other way around.

6. Showing versus telling. I can talk about old age as a state of privation. But in the same context can I use textual shadows to "show" it? For Booth "telling" is essentially a writer/speaker conveying information "never obtained about real people, even about our

most intimate friends. Yet it is information that we must accept without question if we are to grasp the story that is to follow." Booth's reference is to the Book of Job. (3). Similarly, showing is "artistic…telling…inartistic" (8).

If showing and telling are about information, then can we say that textual shadows *always* convey information? What kind of information? About what? If there is such a thing as shadow information, can we say that textual shadows always show, but never, or seldom, tell?

6a. Is using textual shadows as information, in short, *economical*?

7. In our rhetoric "made out of words" (μ Plato on *The Republic*) should we constantly keep in mind the nature of real-world shadows?

Here are some salient comments from Sorenson that might have application to the rhetorical intentions of the author of textual shadows:

> Shadows cannot beget shadows. Shadows cannot power photoelectric cells. Shadows are absences rather than positive entities. Shadows cannot do anything on their own. Nor can they be projected or directly acted upon. When I cast a shadow, I interact only with the light. Nevertheless, shadows inherit the subtleties of light.

The basic structure of a shadow (or shade) is then, as most of us have observed, triadic. There must exist a light source, say the sun, a blocking object, a tree perhaps, and a surface for the shadow made by the blocking (or casting) object to fall on as a shadow (or shade).

Please notice that Sorenson is saying, in effect, that shadows are, depending on one's perspective, either *something* or *nothing*; either the *presence of something* or the

absence of something. This, as the following attempts to demonstrate, stands as the foundation of many, if not all, the *uses* the writer makes of textual shadows as informants.

8. Privation (*steresis*) In his *Metaphsics* (5:22) Aristotle introduces the concept of "Privation" into rhetoric as "saying something about something with a specific intention."

> We speak of 'privation' (1) if something has not one of the attributes which a thing might naturally have, even if this thing itself would not naturally have it; e.g. a plant is said to be 'deprived' of eyes. - (2) If, though either the thing itself or its genus would naturally have an attribute, it has it not; e.g. a blind man and a mole are in different senses 'deprived' of sight; the latter in contrast with its genus, the former in contrast with his own normal nature. - (3) If, though it would naturally have the attribute, and when it would naturally have it, it has it not; for blindness is a privation, but one is not 'blind' at any and every age, but only if one has not sight at the age at which one would naturally have it. Similarly a thing is called blind if it has not sight in the medium in which, and in respect of the organ in respect of which, and with reference to the object with reference to which, and in the circumstances in which, it would naturally have it. (4) The violent taking away of anything is called privation. Indeed there are just as many kinds of privations as there are of words with negative prefixes; for a thing is called unequal because it has not equality though it would naturally have it, and invisible either because it has no color at all or because it has a poor colour, and apodous either

> because it has no feet at all or because it has imperfect feet. Again, a privative term may be used because the thing has little of the attribute (and this means having it in a sense imperfectly), e.g. 'kernel-less'; or because it has it not easily or not well (e.g. we call a thing uncuttable not only if it cannot be cut but also if it cannot be cut easily or well); or because it has not the attribute at all; for it is not the one-eyed man but he who is sightless in both eyes that is called blind. This is why not every man is 'good' or 'bad', 'just' or 'unjust', but there is also an intermediate state.

Here the general context is change in, and of, X and the effects of its change (see also *Physics* books one and four).

Sorenson gives, while keeping privation as absence, it a different context:

> Scientists, like philosophers, are uncomfortable with privations. The Discomfort issues from a deep conviction that reality is *positive*…thus Scientists and philosophers have a tendency to substitute positive Entities for nonentities….Whenever we look into the mirror we a Para-reflection. Our pupils are holes in our eyeballs that tap light.
> As a consequence, our pupils are very black. Indeed they approximate Blackbodies. Since the pupil fails to reflect light while the iris does Reflect light, the mirror para-reflects the pupil….No dark object Could be seen without a para-reflection of it.
> To describe para-reflections accurately, we need to take privations Seriously (144-45).

6. Vacuum or the void. An extreme form of absence? Does nature abhor a vacuum? The answer is an emphatic no. In contrast, nature loves a vacuum. Space is full of vacuums, "space is a far better vacuum than anything we've been able to create back on Earth." Vacuums are responsible, acting like gravity, in keeping the atmosphere from escaping into space. Neil DeGrasse-Tyson, 11 September 2013; vacuumhttp://www.rawstory.com/rs/2013/09/12/neil-degrasse-tyson-explains-the-vacuum-of-space/

6a. For Sorenson, vacuum is compelling evidence that absences are necessary to explaining natural phenomena, like shadows. He gives an example of Otto von Gueriche (1672) and his air-pump:

> After evacuating the air from attached two copper hemispheres, he had two team of eight horse try to pull the hemisphere apart. After the horses Failed, Guericke let air into the hemispheres by opening a stopcock. The hemispheres then separated easily (145).

One might be able to escape a presence, but there is none from an absence.

7. Death communicated as the lack of all the primary colors. Please focus your attention on the word "grey" in this scene. In it we witness Tietjens' first sight of a dying soldier who was once alive (*Parade's End*: 356):

> And at the thought of the man as he was alive and of him now, Dead, an immense blackness descended all over Tietgens. He said To himself: *I am very tired*. Yet he was not shamed….It was the Blackness that descends on you when you think of your dead. It comes

In the *grey* of evening, in the *grey* of the dawn, at mess, on parade.

7a. Perceiving a member of the "family" of shadows evokes the same general feeling, and information flow, as perceiving and thinking "shadow."

8. How things lacking, missing or deprived of their "natural" properties may be explained. The task here would be to make "presence and absence complementary"—in this context light as presence and shadow as absence. In the following passage, the writer seems to have this structure in mind:

> Certainly his [T. S. Eliot] poetry…owes its strength to the constant play of *light and dark* that runs through it and that must, of necessity, be lacking in the linear exposition of philosophical or religious 'positions.

Other, two more famous examples, of this light/darkness structure are, in order, these from the *Bible*:

> *Truly the *light* is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the *sun*: but if a man live many years and rejoice in them all, yet le him remember the days of *darkness*, for they shall be many (*Ecclesiastes* 1:3)
>
> *I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life. (*John* 8:12).

In short, life (light, sun) and the negation of it (darkness) are equally essential facts of existence. Each has its own ontology. But words like "light" and "dark" represent their ontology by what linguists call "full" and "empty categories" (Calvin and Bickerton 45).

However the fullness of light can be made empty by its movement out of the

picture. One can compare this to an actor, representing certain characteristics, who exits the stage after h/h performance.

9. Correlative of awareness and contrast is uniqueness. Uniqueness, in turn, is related to novelty, expressing the new or putting the subject in a *new light*. Implied here is "oneness" or a single thought about the subject where such a thought is roughly akin to the text-thesis. So the question becomes how can a shadow reference (or help reference) a single thought about the subject? The question, in all fairness, reasonably requires a long and detailed answer, one which I attempt to give in my longer account of textual shadows. Here, given the space I have, I can only sketch out a few of its salient features. The passage from Shakespeare (above) is a place to start. Shakespeare tells us, in effect, that grief, although it comes in twenty different forms, is essential a shadow. That is, all the forms it can take, as "confusion," as "what is not," as something "eyed awry" and so forth are the effects of a single cause. A shadow causes things to appear that normally wouldn't appear on their own. The things that appear *for the first time* are unique. Their uniqueness then causes the subject (in this case grief) to appear in a new light. No doubt Shakespeare could have given grief a non-causal, or different, causal power. He might have said that grief is like a force of nature, a hurricane or an earthquake, something that shatters familiar objects or displaces them from their natural location. But, in addition to that not being Shakespeare, it would have robbed the passage of its singular thought—that shadows are *always* the effect of something else, something prior in time and energy.

The uniqueness of a single thought is what we attempt to achieve with a thesis statement—or, more generally, what issues shape the atmospherics of the text. The single thought, one might say, is the arrow we fire into the object we see, not the net we cast for what we do not see. The first text-location for the thesis is usually in the title. Here are three prose examples:

> **In Sunlight And In Shadow*. 2012 Novel by Mark Helprin. Set in New York, just after the Second World War, the story follows the love affair between a paratrooper returned from service in Europe and a young heiress he meets on the Staten Island Ferry. This is the "sunshine part." The "shadow" is the disruption in their affair by a vindictive fiancé of the woman and a gangster out to ruin the man's leather business. (Note that the words of title of the Helprin book are from a line in the Irish folksong, "O Danny Boy").
>
> *"New Trading Case Casts a Deeper Shadow on a Hedge Fund Mogul." (*The New York Times* November 23, 2012: B1).
>
> *"A Stalking Monster In The Shadows Of An Apartment Building." (*The New York Times*, Oct 26, 2012: C5). Review of the movie "Sleep Tight." The story is about a concierge in a Barcelona apartment building who stalks young female residents.

10. Idioms. Should our rhetoric have a section on idioms constructed from those like the following?

2. Without a shadow of a doubt.

3. Five o'clock shadow.

4. Substance and shadow.

5 Shady lady.

6. Afraid of one's own shadow.

7. A shadow of oneself.

8. Shadow boxing.

The intention of idioms involves a perceived need for informational economy, to say much with little. Their infrastructure, like a shadow, is triadic. They have a source, the perception of something, a highly rigid syntax, and (hopefully) imageable effect— in all a process of encoding information (speaker) and decoding information (listener). Because the code is known only to a native speaker, idioms cannot be translated without losing original intentionality or gaining an alien intentionality: syntax high-jacks intention. (please see "Idioms" *The International Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. Ed. William Bright: Oxford UP 1992).

11. Default state. I have mentioned several times that textual shadows, in order to be such (or a member of its family) has to lack, at a minimum, the three primary colors. Consequently, we "know," assuming that we have normal color vision, what a shadow is mainly by what it lacks. In Sorenson's words, shadows are things, produced by, and known by, "privation."

We can then say that the default state of shadows is a lack of primary colors. The state is steady unless "interrupted" by colors. To understand this better, please consider an analogy from biology. "It has been known for a long time" that the X (female) chromosome is the default state of the embryo. If the Y (male) chromosome does not reverse this state, then everyone born would be female. But, of course, that is not what

happens. Nor does it happen that everything in the universe is gray, lacking in the three primary colors. (please see *The New York Times*, "Researchers See New Importance in Y Chromosome," April 24, 2014: A4).

I suggest that the metaphorical meanings of textual shadows comes, in part, from a continuing struggle between a reality that intends (and is) gray with that which counter-intends (and is) colored and colorful. This claim extrapolates from evidence that color vision, for certain animals, evolved to meet survival needs. In a gray world prey would be harder to find than in a colored one and it is easier, with color vision, to identify what is edible from what is not (Please see Bowmaker, 541–547).

We have here conditions for what philosophers call a counterfactual thought experiment. What if everything was gray? What if everything was shadowy? What would be the effects?

12. Do negative facts exist? If so, how, and for what purpose, do they exist? Perhaps Laurence Horn gives the most authoritative, certainly the most comprehensive, account of linguistic negation and arguments *against* the existence of negative facts. After spending 34 (45-79) pages describing how various groups of thinkers, for example, Parmenides, Plato, Strawson, and Katz, have struggled to eliminate negative facts, Horn grudgingly admits that it cannot be done. Like gravity, taxes or the magnetic field of the earth, they are part of our linguistic descriptions of the world. Horn observes, in passing, that God Himself, in six of the Ten Commandments ("thou shall not…") seems to believe in negative facts.

Horn's summary of failed attempts to eliminate negation and negative facts goes, in part:

> We have seen negation survive enough attempts at liquidation—negation as positive difference, negation as incompatibility, negation as dissimilarity, negation as true disbelief, negation as the affirmation of a negative predicate, negation as falsity—to qualify as the Rasputin of the propositional calculus (59).

We can add to this Sigwart's and Gale's statements about the difference between the affirmative predication of a subject and negative predication:

> *Only a *finite* number of predicates can be *affirmed* of every subject, while an *incalculable* number can be *denied* (Sigwart 119; *emph mine*).
>
> *Every positive fact or event seems to carry on its back an *infinite* number of *negative* fleas (Gale 2; *emph mine*).

For an elegant argument for the existence of negative facts and their relationship with positive facts, one should also consult Bjornssan's "If You Believe in Positive Facts, You Should Believe in Negative Facts." Bjornssan's basic claim is that negative facts, along with positive facts, are the "internal" constituents of all objects and their properties. Negative facts "occur no additional cost" in giving an account of objects of and their properties. Moreover, by acknowledging the existence of negative facts, one does not need any "third thing" (which might lead to an infinite regress) to identify how objects stand to "natural or expected properties."

It is important to note here that in a textual context negative facts have "causal efficacy." The lack of certain expected properties, in short, causes things to happen in

storytelling: "We think that people die from *lack* of oxygen, that they have accidents caused by *inattention*, and that they *fail* an exam for *lack* of sleep (Bjornssan 18; *emph mine*).

13. Narration/Counternarration. A Tentative summary of the above. Writers/speakers employ textual shadows to convey 1) epistemological uncertainty about X; 2) mystery, terror and fear, about X; 4) to lie about X; 5) to "show" the privations of X, what's missing about X; 6) to use them as a "backup," and reinforcement, for what h/s "tells" about X and 7) to expand and amplify h/h narration about X by exploiting the potential information latent in the triadic structure that textual shadows inherit from real-world shadows—namely, light source, blocking agent, and the surface of the shadows.

All of these uses take place as a narrative versus a counternarrative. Using a military metaphor, we can say that shadows war against being taken captive by primary colors and by taking colored things captive. The goal for each side is to "protect," and keep whole, its intentionality. The field of battle takes place in all forms of writing and speaking and ebbs and flows in different parts, beginning, middle, end, of the text. The writer/speaker plays the part of both strategist and tactician. The reader/listener, if h/s understands the goal of each side, judges which side occupies the field at the end.

Stepping Back into the Shadows…I….

REFERENCES PRESENT AND ABSENT

Aristotle, *Rhetoric, Metaphysics, Physics.* Ed. Jonathan Barnes. Oxford UP 2000.

Armstrong, David. *Truth and Truthmakers*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP 2004.

Beall, JC. "On Truthmakers for Negatives Truths." *Australasian Journal Of Philosophy* 78:2: 264-68.

Benfey, Christopher: "Bend Sinister in Wales" *The New York Review of Books* p. 40, August 15, 2013).

Bjornssan, Gunnar, http://www.phil.gu.se/gunnar/Negative%20Facts.pdf

Brentano, Franz. *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*. Keyword, "inexistence."

Boyd, Brian. *On the Origin of IW: Evolution, Cognition and Fiction*. Cambridge: Harvard UP 2009.

Booth, Wayne. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago UP, 1989.

Bowmaker, J. K. (1998). "Evolution of colour vision in vertebrates". *Eye* **12** :541–547

Brandom, Robert B. *Making it Explicit. Reasoning, Representing, and Discursive Commitment*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994.

Brownstein, Donald. "Negative Exemplification." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 10:1: 43-50.

Buck, Carl, *A Dictionary of Synonyms in Selected Indo-European Languages*. Chicago UP.

Burke, Kenneth. *A Grammar of Motives and A Rhetoric of Motives*. New York: Prentice-Hall 1950.

Calvin, William and Derek Bickerton. *Lingua ex Machina*. MIT press, 2003.

Cather, Willa. *Death Comes to the Archbishop*. New York: Penguin, 1927.

Campbell, Jeremy. *Grammatical Man.* New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

Cheever, John, (http://www.theparisreview.org/interviews/3667/the-art-of-fiction-no-62-john-cheever)

Crane, Tim, *The Objects of Thought.* Keyword "non-existence."

Engelberg, Edward. *Elegiac Fictions. The Motif of the Unlived Life*. University Park: Pennsylvania State UP 1989.

Ford, Madox Ford. *Parade's End*. New York, Random House, 1951.

Gekoski, Rick. *Lost, Stolen or Shred: IW of Missing Works of Art and Literature* (London: Profile 2013).

Gottschall, Jonathan. *The Story Telling Animal*. New York: Houghton-Miflin Harcourt 2012)

Hockett, Charles. *A Course in Modern Linguistics*. New York, McMillan, 1958.

Hofstadter, Douglas. *Godel, Escher, Back.* New York: Basic Books 1979.

Horn, Laurence. *A Natural History of Negation*. Chicago: Chicago UP, 1989.

Howell, A. C. "Res et Verba," *English Literary History*, 13, June 1946: 238-245.

Husserl, Edmund. See entry "Husserl" in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy.* Keyword, "phenomenology."

Isserman, Maurice and Stewart Weaver: *Fallen Giants. A History of Himalayan Mountaineering* frontispiece New Haven: Yale UP, 2008. Failure, an absence, is more interesting than success

Jaeger, Werner. *Aristotle: Fundamentals of his development*. Oxford UP, 1962.

Kahn, Charles. *Foundations of Language* 2 (1966) 245-265.

Livington, Paisley and Andrea Sauchelli. "Philosophical Perspectives on Fictional Characters," *New Literary History*, 42, 2 (2011):337-60.

McConachie, Bruce. *Theatre and Mind* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

McGovern, Una, ed. *Dictionary of Literary Characters.* Edinburgh: Chambers 2004).

McGurl, Mark. *The Program Era: Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing*. Harvard UP 2012.

Kiš, Danilo, *A Tomb for Boris Davidovich.* Trans. Mikić-Mitchell, Duska, 1978)

Overbye, Dennis. "Finding Higgs Merely Opens More Puzzles." *The New York Times,* November 6, 2013),

Miller and Johnson-Laird, *Perception and Language*: Harvard UP, 1976; "color vision."

Phillips, Colin. http://ling.umd.edu/~colin/research/papers/phillips2012_islands1.pdf

Sartre, Jean-Paul. *Being and Nothingness.* Trans Hazel E. Barnes. (2003)

Sorenson, Roy. *Seeing Dark Things*. Oxford UP, 2008.

Weinberg, Steven. "Physics: What We Do and Don't Know." *The New York Review of Books.* November 7, 2013: 86-88.

One aspect of shadows, in Sorenson's account, is the absence of a certain amount of photons. From this we might want to say that shadows can be taken as images of "privation" or "impoverishment." The shadows that fall on the old man in "A Clean Well Lighted Place" might then reinforce the idea that he has lost hope. (There is a line on this in the story). If so, then "shadow of the leaves of the tree" might be taken as another way of reminding us that he has tried to commit suicide—also mentioned in the story. If we feel uncomfortable with this interpretation, we might want to say that the shadow information of "A Clean Well Lighted Place" corresponds to that of the other Hemingway passage (from "Hills Like White Elephants"). That is, "shadow" and "shade" mentioned at the beginning of the story suggest that something is either lacking, or to become lost, in the relationship between the two characters of "Hills," the American and Jig.

8. It takes two to make textual reality. In Hans Christian Anderson's "The Shadow" the shadow is, like in Donne, a character. In the course of the action, the shadow move,

change, and sometimes speak to their owner. Is this a viable strategy for the user of textual shadows to employ? For h/h set in motion a dialogue, something impossible (if one has an intact mind) with the real-world shadows?

Please compare of the 2014 movie, "Jack Ryan, Shadow Recruit."

9. Is one intention with textual shadows to exploit the triadic nature of real-world shadows? The mathematician and philosopher C. S. Peirce makes much of this possibility with what he calls "Thirdness" and "Triadicity." He thinks of Thirdness not only as an important structure in analyzing complex theories (and systems), but also as a strategy for discovery. One of Peirce's succinct definitions of Thirdness is this:

> The First is that whose being is simply in itself, not referring to anything nor lying behind anything. The Second is that which is what it is by force of something to which it is Second. The Third is that which is what it is owing to things *between* which it mediates and which it brings into relation to each other.[i]

Obviously, there is a lot of subjectivity in this. What one person may think, for example, what constitutes a First ("what is simply in itself not referring to anything") may be a Second or a Third to someone else. Or, perhaps in other possible ordering of three objects, events or movements of the mind. But I ask students, not only to take Peirce's ordering as a given and to think of First, Second and Third In the case of shadows, we might want to say that the First is a light source, the Second a blocking object. So what is Third? The answer is the shadow cast by the blocking agent. By bringing the light source into relationship with a blocking object, the shadow makes all three elements a complete

and intelligible "system." From another perspective we can say that First, Second and Third form a procedure for giving an "account" of a subject as a system with discrete parts.

10. Echoes, reflections, like shadows, are "parasitic." They don't exist independently of other sources. They differ only by their source, sound versus light, hearing versus seeing. Can we then say, in our future rhetoric of shadows, that echoes, reflection and shadows form a "family" of informants? If so, then we might want to exploit the rhetorical strategy implicit in Wittgenstein's concept of "family resemblance": (*Familienähnlichkeit*). In his *Philosophical Investigations* Wittgenstein says that "things which may be thought to be connected by one essential common feature may in fact be connected by a series of overlapping similarities, where no one feature is common to all" (Item #66). With this in mind we can claim that "echoes," "reflections" and "shadows" are textual terms with essentially the same rhetorical intention: to convey information that X presupposes a triadic infrastructure; that X is in a state of privation as well as other proposed features mentioned in this essay. .

11. The "democracy" of shadows; or their literal individualism. In his book, *Inventing the Individual,* Larry Siedentop he demonstrates how the emergence of Christianity "detonated" the "suffocating hierarchy, saturated with assumptions of natural rank, with ancestor worship and with patriotic cults of the 'fatherland' (15-48). In the Gospels and St. Paul Letters nature became separated from culture, presenting a moral world (not perfectly realized) of equal individuals. Master and slave, Jew and Gentile, father and son emerged reborn as individual souls sharing a common fate and endowed with equal moral status. The Christian Middle Ages, Siedentop further claims, invented secularism and by

so doing "unshackled human reason from the exterior world and associated it with individual experience and choice rather than a timeless nature of things" (291-379).

By analogy: should we treat every textual shadow equality,

12. Choices, choices, choices. Rhetoricians are, obviously enough, faced with many alternatives. Should I do this, but not that? Should I use a question here, but not there? Should I mention the thesis in the title? And so on.[ii] The alternatives, suffice to say, can be enormous, the choices wrong, the writing a failure. Still, there is no choice about making choices. The necessity of choosing determines whether or not the writer's text is informative. If the writer chooses to inform the reader of something h/s already knows, then the text stands a chance of bring uninformative. If the information is just 'noise," then this too can result in rhetorical failure. To avoid these possibilities, the writer must attempt to "tell" the reader something new, something h/s does not know or something that will increase h/h knowledge of the subject. In most cases, we would expect that the informative text is one that reveals the author's intentions with the choices h/s has made—one that conveys *new* information about the subject or expands given information.

13. Shadows and their location. To the observer, real-world shadows are always "local." They are always in h/h sight. Local, as the apposite of global, suggests that whatever rhetorical intention we attribute to them only has local significance. Here we might go further and say that textual shadows, much like metaphors, "set things before the eyes" (Aristotle). They serve as a backup, helping to clarify what may be temporally obscure.

Your own shadow, I have often said to students, is perhaps the best demonstration of their localism. Notice how, as you stand, sit or walk along, that your shadow always has a local position, before, after, beside, you. In all the scenarios you and your shadow "cooperate" to create a unified whole conveying *useful* information about yourself to others and to yourself.

14. Shadows and Duration. Do shadows mark time? John Donne certainly thinks so.

A LECTURE UPON THE SHADOW.
by John Donne

STAND still, and I will read to thee
A lecture, Love, in Love's philosophy.
These three hours that we have spent,
Walking here, two shadows went
Along with us, which we ourselves produced.
But, now the sun is just above our head,
We do those shadows tread,
And to brave clearness all things are reduced.
So whilst our infant loves did grow,
Disguises did, and shadows, flow
From us and our cares ; but now 'tis not so.

That love hath not attain'd the highest degree,
Which is still diligent lest others see.

Except our loves at this noon stay,
We shall new shadows make the other way.
As the first were made to blind
Others, these which come behind
Will work upon ourselves, and blind our eyes.
If our loves faint, and westerwardly decline,
To me thou, falsely, thine
And I to thee mine actions shall disguise.
The morning shadows wear away,
But these grow longer all the day ;
But O ! love's day is short, if love decay.

Love is a growing, or full constant light,
And his short minute, after noon, is night.

15. Tragedy and shadows. Are textual shadows more representative of tragedy than comedy or tragic-comedy. Shakespeare certainly employed more textual shadows in his

tragedies and tragic-comedy than he did in his comedies. One might also mention here the ending of Beckett's "Waiting for Godot."

15a. Chairoscuro tragedy and shadows. Please have a look at Sir Joshua Reynold's portrait of David Garrick standing between figures representing comedy (on Garrick's right) and tragedy on his left. More than half the picture is shadowy fading into dark. This is the part occupied by tragedy. The other half, with the figure of comedy, has her standing and smiling in bright sunlight.

Notice Garrick is looking at tragedy. Does this suggest that he favors that genre over comedy?

16. Shadows, colors,

17. Shadows and ambiquity.

19. Shadows and twilight.

20. Ockham's Razor. Ockham or Occam Franciscan friar (1285-1349). The "razor says that one should not multiply entities beyond necessity – *Entia non sunt multiplicanda sine necessitate* – although this statement does not appear in any of his writings. What is there, that essentially the same meaning, reads, "For nothing ought to be posited without a reason given, unless it is self-evident (literally, known through itself) or known by experience or proved by the authority of Sacred Writings."

Sorenson's statement "Nevertheless, shadows inherit the subtleties of light" will turn out, as we will see (under "contrast below) to be an important feature in a writer's use of textual shadows.[iii]

Perhaps the most compreh

ng, to implies One of the tasks of a writing teacher, it seems fair to say, is making h/h students *aware* of what they have experienced but have not, presumably, thought much about or *consciously used with a specific rhetorical intentions* in their writing. These "experiences" might include writing, with a specific intention, about a crisis in their life, learning to ski or perhaps the ingredients of a particular dish they like. The role of the instructor is, roughly speaking, to make explicit (or more explicit) what is implicit—with the ultimate goal of increasing the *usefulness* of what has been largely implicit.

In this essay I describe some of the ways "shadow-information" can be made more explicit and consequently put to good (or at least better) *use* in writing.[iv] I often characterize such *use* on a "skills-analogy." The idea here is that using shadow-information is analogous to practical skills such as playing the piano, tennis or golf. Such skills, I tell students, must be learned by practice. We learn, as writers, how to use shadow-information by *using* it with a specific purpose.

Before going into the significance of such information for the writer I need to mention a distinction between a real-world cast shadow and what I call a "textual" one.

"Textual shadows," as I introduce them to students, are word-images transferred by a writer from h/h experience of material (real world) shadows (or textual shadows in other texts) to the pages of h/h text. Another way to describe them is an "abstraction" from real world shadows. In this sense they transcend concrete particularity or sensuous experience. Used in just this way, "abstract" is a term from metaphysics and implicit in mathematics. The father of abstraction, at least in western culture, is Plato. One implication of textual shadows being an abstraction, I remind students, is that they should not expect more precision in their uses than their nature permits. We may not always know, as a reader, what intention lies behind a writer's use of textual shadows—nor can we always determine the exact reason, as writers, we use them. My use and yours may not converge to one meaning. But, still, "shadow information" should always be part of a writer's toolbox of rhetorical strategies.

I return to this topic below under the heading "uniqueness."[v]

(One of the most famous examples of the use of textual shadows in western literature appears in Plato's Allegory of the Cave.[vi] I give a general composite classroom discussion of it below under the heading of "the localization of shadows.").

Here are some specimens of textual shadows. (*emph mine*):

* Before we engage with writers' uses of textual shadows (like the above) I like to propose to students three "models" of ways to use shadows, one of method, and two others, of information transfer and strategies writers can employ in their writing. Each of these models, I hasten to add, is a simplified one from other sources, namely from Peirce (method), Lyons (information) and Sorenson (shadows).

The American philosopher and mathematician, C. S Peirce, is known for his system of thinking in thirds, what he variously calls "Thirdness" and "Triadicity." He thinks of Thirdness not only as an important structure in analyzing complex theories (and systems), but also as a strategy for discovery. One of Peirce's succinct definitions of Thirdness is this:

> The First is that whose being is simply in itself, not referring to anything nor lying behind anything. The Second is that which is what it is by force of something to which it is Second. The Third is that which is what it is owing to things *between* which it mediates and which it brings into relation to each other.[vii]

Obviously, there is a lot of subjectivity in this. What one person may think, for example, what constitutes a First ("what is simply in itself not referring to anything") may be a Second or a Third to someone else. Or, perhaps in other possible ordering of three objects, events or movements of the mind. But I ask students, not only to take Peirce's ordering as a given and to think of First, Second and Third as a starting place and a way to "keep going on," on gathering, and organizing, information about the subject. I invite them, more specifically, to ask themselves the question "what must first exist (First)" before I can discover what comes next (Second and Third). In the case of shadows, as I show in more detail below, the First must be a light source, the Second a blocking object. So what is Third? The answer is the shadow cast by the blocking agent. By bringing the light source into relationship with a blocking object, the shadow makes all three elements a complete and intelligible "system." From another perspective we can say that First,

Second and Third form a procedure for giving an "account" of a subject as a system with discrete parts.

Please note that in the following I use Thirdness to describe how I present the uses of textual shadows to students. That is, salient in our discussions is a shifting focus on a light source (First), blocking (casting) object (Second) and the surface the shadow falls on and the information the surface conveys (Third). The uses writers make of textual shadows are also grouped below into three categories.

With the information model (communication between writer and reader) one is always aware of making choices, selecting between alternatives: should I do this, but not that? Should I use a question here, but not there? Should I mention the thesis in the title? And so on.[viii] The alternatives, suffice to say, can be enormous, the choices wrong, the writing a failure. Still, there is no choice about making choices. The necessity of choosing determines whether or not the writer's text is informative. If the writer chooses to inform the reader of something h/s already knows, then the text stands a chance of bring uninformative. If the information is just 'noise," then this too can result in rhetorical, or intentional, failure. To avoid these possibilities, the writer must attempt to "tell" the reader something new, something h/s does not know or something that will increase h/h knowledge of the subject. In most cases, we would expect that the informative text is one that reveals the author's intentions with the choices h/s has made—one that conveys *new* information about the subject or expands given information.

The other "model" I suggest to students is a simplified version of Sorenson's account of real world shadows.[ix] The basic structure of a shadow (or shade) is, as most of

us have observed, triadic. To repeat what I said earlier: there must be a light source, say the sun, a blocking object, a tree perhaps, and a surface for the shadow made by the blocking (or casting) object to fall on as a shadow (or shade). The passage from Hemingway (specimen #2 above) is an example. The shadow of the tree the old man sits in "starts" with light from an "electric" light.[x] A tree then blocks some, but not all, the light waves (or photons) to produce a shadow that falls on the old man. Shadows then are, in Sorenson's words, "parasitic."[xi] They cannot exist on their own. They owe their existence to a light source and a blocking object that absorbs part, but not all, the photons in the light. As a result, real world shadows can be seen as having the following general characteristics:

> Shadows cannot beget shadows. Shadows cannot power photoelectric cells. Shadows are absences rather than positive entities. Shadows cannot do anything on their own. Nor can they be projected or directly acted upon. When I cast a shadow, I interact only with the light. Nevertheless, shadows inherit the subtleties of light.[xii]

Please notice that Sorenson is saying, in effect, that shadows are, depending on one's perspective, either *something* or *nothing*; either the *presence of something* or the *absence of something*. This, as the following attempts to demonstrate, stands as the foundation of many, if not all, the *uses* the writer makes of textual shadows as informants. Using textual shadows these ways, in short, is *economical*. [xiii]

Sorenson's statement "Nevertheless, shadows inherit the subtleties of light" will turn out, as we will see (under "contrast below) to be an important feature in a writer's use of textual shadows.[xiv]

No student writer, I should say at this point, is required to use textual shadows in any given essay or story. Their use is strictly optional. Still, an option presents a choice, the first choice of use. If I use, like Plato, Shakespeare or Hemingway, textual shadows, what should be the reason for my use or uses? Where should they go in the text? How many should I use? Should I repeat a certain use? I find that help for questions like these mainly come, not only from the instructor and specimens like the above, but also from students peers. Peers are especially valuable in evaluating the informativety of the text. Will, for example, shadow imagery in the title or opening lines of the text hint (foreshadow) at what is coming next? Is the intent with a writer's use of textual shadows to influence the reader judgment about the text-subject? Do they help to clarify the rhetorical or authorial intention of the text as a whole?

I ask students to think of shadow, both real-world and textual, as "local" shadows. To be sure, shadows also have a "global" significance—they appear everywhere. But at this time and place we limit them to a local significance. Your own shadow, I say to students, is perhaps the best demonstration of their localism. Notice how, as you stand, sit or walk along, that your shadow always has a local position, before, after, beside, you. In all the scenarios you and your shadow "cooperate" to create a unified whole conveying *useful* information about yourself to others and to yourself.

My examples of textual shadows in this essay are almost exclusively from literature. But journalists also often use them, especially in titles:

> *Top Shadow Warrior's Influence Goes On. (*The New York Times,* October 3, 2012: A1).

* But Gypsy Rose Lee Never Had a 5 O'Clock Shadow. (*The New York Times,* November 15, 2012: C4).

3. Living Standards In The Shadows As An Election Issue. (*The New York Times,* October 24, 2012: A1).

Here, in summary form, is a sampling of recent discussions of textual shadows. The general context was making choices, to use or not to use textual shadows followed by reasons for using them. These, not necessarily in the order they were discussed, are: 1) Awareness/Contrast/Uniqueness; 2) Shadowing/Foreshadowing; 3) Privation/Localization/In-Betweeness.[xv] Although there is a considerable amount of overlapping with these categories, each of them can be seen as a starting point for discussion.

Many more starting points are forthcoming in a larger account of using textual shadows in pedagogical contexts.[xvi]

Awareness/Contrast/Uniqueness. Here the purpose is to make students "aware" of the vast potential of textual shadows to convey information, not only about the subject, but the structure of a text—to propose, as it were, possible answers to the question, how shall I shape information in this text? The task here, in short, is to make "presence and absence complementary"—in this context light as presence and shadow as absence.[xvii] In the following passage, the writer has this structure in mind:

> Certainly his [T. S. Eliot] poetry…owes its strength to the constant play of *light and dark* that runs through it and that must, of necessity, be lacking in the linear exposition of philosophical or religious 'positions.[xviii]

Other, two more famous examples, of this light/darkness structure are, in order, these from the *Bible*:

> Truly the *light* is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the *sun*: but if a man live many years and rejoice in them all, yet le him remember the days of *darkness*, for they shall be many (*Ecclesiastes* 1:3)
>
> I am the light of the world. Whoever follows me will never walk in darkness, but will have the light of life. (*John* 8:12).

In short, life (light, sun) and the negation of it (darkness) are equally essential facts of existence.

As discussed above, shadows presuppose the existence of a light source and a blocking object. What blocks the light also "casts" the shadow.[xix] In the passages above from Hemingway, the light source in specimen #2 is an "electric light"; in #3 it is the sun. So the foundational and structural image is light versus dark. In "A Clean Well Lighted Place" (#2) light occupies the space inside the café. Outside the café, where the old man sits, it is shadowy, a state somewhere between full light and full darkness. Does this mean that Hemingway wants to associate the old man with an in-between state, one closer to an end state than a beginning one? Closer to death than to birth? What about the waiters inside the café? They sit in light. Is this meant to emphasize their relative youth? Or perhaps a state of heightened enlightenment?

Correlative of awareness and contrast is uniqueness. Uniqueness, in turn, is related to novelty, expressing the new or putting the subject in a *new light*. Implied here is "oneness" or a single thought about the subject where such a thought is roughly akin to

the text-thesis. So the question becomes how can a shadow reference (or help reference) a single thought about the subject? The question, in all fairness, reasonably requires a long and detailed answer, one which I attempt to give in my longer account of textual shadows. Here, given the space I have, I can only sketch out a few of its salient features. The passage from Shakespeare (above) is a place to start. Shakespeare tells us, in effect, that grief, although it comes in twenty different forms, is essential a shadow. That is, all the forms it can take, as "confusion," as "what is not," as something "eyed awry" and so forth are the effects of a single cause. A shadow causes things to appear that normally wouldn't appear on their own. The things that appear *for the first time* are unique. Their uniqueness then causes the subject (in this case grief) to appear in a new light. No doubt Shakespeare could have given grief a non-causal, or different, causal power. He might have said that grief is like a force of nature, a hurricane or an earthquake, something that shatters familiar objects or displaces them from their natural location. But, in addition to that not being Shakespeare, it would have robbed the passage of its singular thought—that shadows are *always* the effect of something else, something prior in time and energy.

The uniqueness of a single thought, as I mentioned above, is what we attempt to achieve with a thesis statement—or, more generally, what issues shape the atmospherics of the text. The single thought, one might say, is the arrow we fire into the object we see, not the net we cast for what we do not see. The first text-location for the thesis is usually in the title. Here are three prose examples:

**In Sunlight And In Shadow*. 2012 Novel by Mark Helprin. Set in New

York, just after the Second World War, the story follows the love affair between a paratrooper returned from service in Europe and a young heiress he meets on the Staten Island Ferry. This is the "sunshine part." The "shadow" aspect the disruption in their affair by a vindictive fiancé of the woman and a gangster out to ruin the man's leather business. (Note that the words of title of the Helprin book are from a line in the Irish folksong, "O Danny Boy").

*"New Trading Case Casts a Deeper Shadow on a Hedge Fund Mogul." (*The New York Times* November 23, 2012: B1).

*"A Stalking Monster In The Shadows Of An Apartment Building." (*The New York Times*, Oct 26, 2012: C5). Review of the movie "Sleep Tight." The story is about a concierge in a Barcelona apartment building who stalks young female residents.

One aspect of shadows, in Sorenson's account, is the absence of a certain amount of photons. From this we might want to say that shadows can be taken as images of "privation" or "impoverishment." The shadows that fall on the old man in "A Clean Well Lighted Place" might then reinforce the idea that he has lost hope. (There is a line on this in the story). If so, then "shadow of the leaves of the tree" might be taken as another way of reminding us that he has tried to commit suicide—also mentioned in the story. If we feel uncomfortable with this interpretation, we might want to say that the shadow information of "A Clean Well Lighted Place" corresponds to that of the other Hemingway passage (from "Hills Like White Elephants"). That is, "shadow" and "shade" mentioned at the beginning of the story suggest that something is either lacking, or to

become lost, in the relationship between the two characters of "Hills," the American and Jig.

One can use textual shadows, in brief, to project information about the subject beyond themselves. Textual shadows *always* function as foreshadowing.

Writers use language, among other things, to "animate" what is normally taken as inanimate or partially animate. With animation the writer projects the power, and authority, of X (state, event, object) out of its original space into other active realms. Such is the case with "the substance of grief" in the passage above (specimen #1) from Shakespeare. He projects "the substance" first as the progenitor of "twenty shadows" and then as an impotent, and imaginary, as "confusion," "of what it is not." The general argument then correlates with a appearance versus reality one. Shadows are not real. They are simply the appearance of the real. The movement of the passage goes, consequently, from the reality of the "substance of grief," a positive state, to a final negative one, "of what is not," or what I have called "privation" above. In this movement shadows are the "bridge" between the positive and the negative states. Without them there would not be a coherent "geography" of the passage.

In a poem by John Donne, "A Lecture Upon The Shadow," the poet discourses on the contingencies of love. Here again the general infrastructure is triadic. The source of the "two shadows" cast by the two lovers (who are walking along) is the light of the sun. Embedded in this infrastructure are other triads, for example, shadows at morning, noon and evening; early love, love at a later age (noon) and love in the evening. Unlike many textual shadows, where the atmospheric quality is obscurity, confusion, or privation, here

shadows represent a potential negation of love. They presage night, the image of annihilation:

> The morning shadows wear away
>
> But these [evening shadows] grow longer all the day ;
>
> But O ! love's day is short, if love decay.
>
> Love is a growing, or full constant light,
>
> And his short minute, after noon, is night.

The Localization of Shadows. I like to start this topic with a short description of how language represents and "localizes" information, and often with it, time. Linguists and philosophers have long noted that temporal expressions come from "locative expressions."[xx] Nearly every preposition or linguistic form that has a spatial organization as its purpose (one that orients the subject in "local" space) can also have a temporal meaning. Forms like "here," "there," "before" and "after" obviously do the work of time and space. But one can also demonstrate that seemingly "pure" temporal forms like "for," "since," and "till," all have their origin in spatial terms.[xxi] The same linguistic form, say "before" and "after," can, in short, convey both temporal and spatial information about the subject. Only the specific domain of discourse can tell us which (spatial or temporal information) is salient over the other.

Of the six or seven kinds of wh-words (who, what, when, etc) "where" ("wo" [German], "donde" [Spanish], and so on) is by far the most used information eliciting category. Speakers in all languages presumably want to know first of all "where something is or is not." The intention here, among other things, includes the need to find X, avoid X, or report X's location to Y and Y.

So the question in this context is where the shadows are and why are they there and not some other possible place. This is equivalent to asking what surface the shadows fall on and why that surface and not another. But included in the "where" of shadows and their surfaces are who sees the shadows (including the person who may cast the shadow) and, if any, interpreter of the information conveyed by the shadow. Possible interpreters can be the person casting the shadow or someone else.

Textual shadows always have the reader as an interpreter.

Our discussions of this issue usually starts, and continues throughout the term, by reference to Plato's use of shadows in his allegory of the cave. Any other specimen of textual shadows can also be used. But they tend, even those of Shakespeare and Donne, to lack the richness of Plato's allegory.

Please note that the setting of the allegory is that of the interior of a cave. Its inhabitants are prisoners who have been chained and held immobile since childhood: not only are their legs (but not arms) held in place, but their necks are also fixed, so they are compelled to gaze at a wall in front of them. Behind the prisoners is a large fire, and between the fire and the prisoners is a raised walkway, along which people walk carrying things on their heads including figures of men and animals made of wood, stone and other materials. The prisoners cannot see the raised walkway or the people walking, but they watch the *shadows* cast by the men, not knowing they are *shadows*. There are also echoes off the wall from the noise produced from the walkway.

In our discussions of this allegory, we start with what the chained prisoners see and what they don't see. What they don't see is roughly equivalent to what we, as readers, see. Seeing and not seeing, as emblematic of knowing and not knowing, is (as many

commentators say) the point of the story. The prisoners see, and consequently know, only the shadows of reality. We see and know both reality and its shadows. Plato nails this down with a thought experiment about an ascent from the cave to the sun outside the cave. The sun and the light it casts represent, obviously, the "real" world, the one that only philosophers, or more generally, the enlightened ones, can experience. So the allegory, as a whole, employs, like textual shadows generally, a light versus dark infrastructure.

I said above that Plato's allegory is a good example of the localization of shadows. Notice that he sets the scene by a heavy use of locative terms, such as "behind," "before," "up" and so on. The shadows are "on" a wall; the source of the shadows (a fire) is "behind" the chained persons; and the "real world" is "up," outside the cave. Donne, in "Lecture," also localizes shadows, behind, above and behind the moving couple. These locations bring time into the picture, morning, noon and twilight and the changing nature of the couples' relationship. The localization of shadows is also implicit in the common expression "out of the shadows." Whatever or whoever was "in' the shadows had to go "into" it in order to "come out" of it. So the expression embodies three movements, "out," "in," and "out." Ontologically, shadows, as Sorenson discusses in great detail, represent "absence"—in the Platonic example, the lack of knowledge of the truth of the "real" world. But notice that the source of the shadows in Plato is not the sun (as in Donne's "Lecture") but a fire behind the chained prisoners in the cave. The use is strictly spatial. In Donne's poem, by contrast, the use is both spatial and temporal. Shadows help to orient us to the scene. The scene then becomes the arena where the author creates meaning.

The Somewhere In-Betweenness of Shadows. To say that X is "somewhere in-between" Y and Z, or any number of things, is for the speaker to say that X is something s/h cannot identify, classify or in general be sure about. Here are two examples:

> *The subject is "self-similarity" a characteristic of fractals. "Georg Cantor cut chunks out of a line, and chunks out of what remained, to make a self-similar 'dust.'…Such constructs seemed unclassifiable, *somewhere between* solid and gossamer-and impervious to the traditional tools of geometers.' (*The Economist,* October 27, 2012, p. 84).

> *It is funny, with so much media and stuff, it's kind of like zero or a hundred….But I know realistically it's going to be *somewhere in between*." Jeremy Lin talking about his basketball career with the Knicks and his trade to the Rockets. (*New York Times* November 19, 2012, p. D5).

If we take textual shadows as an in-between state, then we have to ask "between what"? In the real world shadows are "between" their casting body and the surface they fall on. So what are textual shadows "between" and what rhetorical intentions does this betweenness convey? This is a complex subject and I don't have space to discuss it fully. But here are a few points I have raised with students in class and conferences:

Think in terms of a neither/nor construction. Shadows are neither completely a presence nor completely an absence. As such, they might symbolize, in terms of knowledge, incompleteness, uncertainty, even ignorance. In one sense they are real, but in another there is something lacking in their reality. The Greek and the Christian concept of the dead as "shades" (or souls) is an example. What missing with them is life. To give them textual reality, as Homer, Virgil and Dante do, one has to give them such properties

as speech, moment, shape, color, location and sometimes duration—even though they are, in the conventional sense, dead.

Think in terms of time. The time between day and night is twilight. The time between night and morning is dawn. Now visualize them. Notice how shadows play a role in defining the size and shapes of objects. Without shadows, there would be no discernible edges, and so no boundaries, between objects like clouds, buildings and trees. We would not see a horizon between the sky and earth.

The shadows and shades of twilight and dawn thus have causal powers. They help bring objects into being, not in a material way, but in a sensuous way. They cause us to "see" these times of day a certain way.

Think in terms of space. Walking through a door, a tunnel, or along a corridor one typically cross into, or from, an area of light and darkness. At some point one crosses a "boundary" that is neither light nor dark, an area of shadows. Two TV shows that played on this experience were Rod Serling's *The Twilight Zone* (1959-64) and *Night Gallery* (1969).

To heighten further the significance of textual shadows, I ask students to respond to the question, "what if textual shadows were not an option for writers?" "If one widely used tool of the writer's trade were lost, then what would be the consequences?" This question has yielded many fruitful comments, in both written and verbal forms and in the classroom, conferences and peer-groups. Here, in skeleton form, are a few (I give many more in my longer account of textual shadows). "Loss" here does not always imply complete loss; it can also signify "reduction in use, efficacy, or substance."

Loss of localization. We use (real-world) shadows to establish shapes, and movement and relationships between objects and the rest of the environment…shadows

are used to construct the visual field. I hope, with my brief discussion of localization of shadows, to show, if only in a sketchy way, how textual shadows do essential the same thing with textual meaning.

Loss of contrast. Without the triadic structure of textual shadows we would lose the representation of possible relationships—for example, that between a past state and a present one ("stepping out of the shadows"), possession:privation ("he is just a shadow of himself now"), objective:subjective ("he's afraid of his own shadow") and so forth.

Loss of one kind of cause and effect: Everything, it seems fair to say, can be represented by cause and effect. One can reasonably claim that smoke is the effect of fire; that smoke can be taken as a "sign" of fire; that my poverty is the result of laziness; that an excess of alcohol may cause liver disease and so on. Since the cause of every shadow is both a source of light and a casting body, then by using textual shadows we *presuppose* both the source and the casting body. We don't need, that is, to mention them. Such presupposition is an aspect of the economical use of textual shadows.

Loss of "mass." In particle physics, 2012 was all about the discovery of the Higgs boson, something that had been predicted to exist 48 years before its discovery. It is, presumably, the particle that gives mass to other particles—that, in short, makes matter itself. Can we say that shadows do not so much as give mass to their source or the surface they fall on, but more that they "help" give them mass? Make them "more" than they would be without their shadows? This seems to be Shakespeare take on shadows in the passage above. Without the "twenty shadows" it casts, grief would have reduced "mass."

Here are some more specimens of textual shadows and a few suggested topics for an instructor to discuss with h/h students and/or students to discuss with their peers—discuss as starting points for the written text.

A. Choose one of the following from the list and compose a paragraph (story, poem, exposition) from it. Each item in this list is from a published source. That is, it has served the writer as a textual shadow:

1. The unchanging shadow of Adam.

2. Without a shadow of a doubt.

3. Five o'clock shadow.

4. Substance and shadow.

5 Shady lady.

6. Afraid of one's own shadow.

7. A shadow of oneself.

8. Shadow boxing.

B. Describe, in a short essay, how a famous painter (for example, Raphael, Brueghel, Salvador Dali or Francis Bacon) uses shadows. Focus on how the painter uses shadows to create edges, shapes, contrast and the like. Look up the meanings of the painterly word, "chiaroscuro."

C. Write a short dialogue between you and your shadow. Consult Donne's "The Lecture Upon a Shadow" for hints on how this can be done.

D. Write a short essay, or story, in which a person is "troubled" or "frightened" by shadows or a particular shadow. Who or what casts the shadow? Who or what (an animal) is frightened by the shadow? Why is the shadow frightening?

E. In Dante's *Purgatorio* (canto III:73-102), one part of his *Divine Comedy*, the "spirits" he meets are troubled by Dante's shadow:

> When those in front saw the light on the hillside, broken, on my right, by my shadow, falling from me as far as the rock, they stopped, and drew back, a little: and all the others that came after them, did the same, not understanding why. My Master said: 'Without your asking, I admit, to you, that this is a human body that you see, by which the sunlight is broken on the ground. Do not wonder, but believe, that he does not try to climb this wall, without the help of power that comes from heaven.' And the worthy people said: 'Turn, then, and go in front of us,' making a gesture with the backs of their hands.

Write an interpretation of this passage or use it as a model for a short, short story.

F. Write a short critique of the author's use of "shade" in these lines from "Upon Nothing" a 17th century poem (1679). The author is John Wilmot, Lord Rochester.

> Nothing! thou Elder Brother ev'n to Shade,
> That hadst a Being ere the World was made,
> And (well fixt) art alone, of Ending not afraid.

G. The English writer, C. S Lewis wrote a memoir, *A Grief Observed* of his grief resulting from the death of his wife, Joy Gresham. Brian Sibley wrote a biography of Lewis under the title of *Shadowlands* (2005). The move "Shadowlands" was based on the book. Write an essay explaining why Sibley may have used that title. Is there an echo of

Shakespeare's "the substance of grief hath twenty shadows" (*Richard 2*: II, ii) in the title? Or does the title "Shadowlands" suggest something different, or something more?

H. "Take a step out of the shade and give your heart away." Write a short explanation of the use of the word "shade" in this line from the popular song, "On The Sunny Side of the Street." Pay special attention to its role in contrasting with images of the sun and their meaning in the song.

I. Note the appearance of "shadow" in these last lines of Poe's *The Raven* and explain, or just speculate on, its use there:

> And the raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting
> On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber door;
> And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming,
> And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his *shadow* on the floor;
> And my soul from out that *shadow* that lies floating on the floor
> Shall be lifted - nevermore! (*emph mine*)

L. Google "indirect lighting in painting." Then google "The Penitent Magdalen" by the 17th century French artist, Georges de La Tour. Note how outlines of the central figure rely on contrasts between light and shadow. Note particularly how shadows, by creating edges, shape, and size, focuses the eye on the skull the woman holds in her lap.

M. Dante, as mentioned earlier, uses shadow information often in his *The Divine Comedy*. Here is a commentator's remarks on this. The reference is to the *Purgatorio* (cantos 25.85-108).

The Italian word *ombra* in Dante's lexicon means both "shadow" (as in the

shadow cast by a body) and "shade" (a term for the form of the soul in the afterlife). On the terrace of lust, as Dante's very real body prepares for its most challenging test, the poet shows--via a lecture by Statius--how the two meanings of *ombra* combine to encapsulate the fundamental relationship between life and afterlife. When the soul leaves the body, Statius explains, it "impresses" the body's form on the surrounding air (as saturated air is adorned with colors of a rainbow), and the resulting "virtual" body follows the spirit just as a flame follows fire. This new form therefore goes by the name of "shade" / "shadow" (*ombra*): as a "shadow" follows--and repeats the form of--a real body, so the "shade" takes on all bodily parts and functions (25.85-108).The word *ombra*, by exemplifying the relationship between real bodies and their virtual representation after death, points to a basic premise of the *Divine Comedy*, the reciprocal bond between this world and the hereafter: individuals, through their actions, determine the state of their souls for eternity, while Dante's vision of the afterlife reflects and potentially shapes the world of time and history (http://danteworlds.laits.utexas.edu/purgatory/09lust.html#top).

N. "Schatten" in German means "shadow." In a new play (2013) by the German writer, Elfriede Jelinek, the Greek myth of Eurydice is transformed into a feminist story. Eurydice, who dies from a snake bite, speaks from the underworld about here relationship to her husband Orpheus. The title of the play is "Schatten (Eurydike Sagt)" or "Shadow (Eurydice says)." Google the plot of the play and explain why it can be interpreted as a feminist text. If the *Times Literary Supplemtn* (February 1, 2013) is available read the review of the play on p. 18. The title of the review is "No thanks for the memory."

O. The general opinion about shadows (and shades) is that they are "parasitic" on their casting bodies. They lack something the casting bodies have. If you agree with this,

think about the relationship between things that also seem to be parasitic on other things, things that are dependent on other things for their existence. Here is a partial list: echoes, reflections, allusions and illusions.

P. Read Chloe Aridjis's *Book of Clouds* as an example of how shadows can be used to create strangeness.

.

NOTES

---

[i] Charles Sanders Peirce, *Collected Papers,* Ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. 6 Vols. (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1965): 5:248. Peirce's work on Thirdness, it should be said, owes some of its substance to the work of Victoria Alexandrina Marie Louisa Stuart-Worley-Mackenzie Lady Welby-Gregory (born 1837). See her *What is Meaning* (1903) and *Significs and Language* (1911). Thinking in thirds seems almost universal, and of great historical depth. For details on this please see Heinrich Usener "Dreiheit," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 58 (1903): 1- 161; 208; 321-362. See also Leon J. Niemoczynski. *Charles Sanders Peirce and a Religious Metaphysics of Nature*. (New York: Lexington Books 2011).

[ii]Please see John Lyons, *Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977): 2 vols. V 2: 574-577.

[iii] On the significance of *using shadows*, I often read this passage to students, usually to graduate students. Please notice the repletion of "use" and the focus on information from shadows: "Philosophers and physicists often assume that they can reduce shadows to patterns of illumination. However, we *use* shadows to establish illumination levels—and to establish shapes, and movement, and relationships between objects and the rest of the environment. Talk of shadows is not *used* to summarize the scene before us, shadows are *used* to construct the visual field. Efforts to paraphrase away shadows are circular" (Sorenson, 15-16).

A correlative of this is the significance of shadows as absence and the *usefulness* of negative information (see Sorenson, 17-20).

[iv] See Chloe Aridjis *Book of Clouds* (shadows used to create "the strange")*;* see also her novel of *Asunder*

On strategies for making experience more explicit, and useful, please see Robert Brandom, *Making It Explicit* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1994).

[v]A discussion of how painters *may* use cast shadows can be found in Ernst Hans Gombrich. *Shadows: The Depiction of Cast Shadows in Western Art* (London, Faber and Faber, 1995).

[vi] Book VII 514a–520a of *The Republic.*

[vii] Charles Sanders Peirce, *Collected Papers,* Ed. Charles Hartshorne and Paul Weiss. 6 Vols. (Cambridge MA: Harvard UP, 1965): 5:248. Peirce's work on Thirdness, it should be said, owes some of its substance to the work of Victoria Alexandrina Marie Louisa Stuart-Worley-Mackenzie Lady Welby-Gregory (born 1837). See her *What is Meaning* (1903) and *Significs and Language* (1911). Thinking in thirds seems almost universal, and of great historical depth. For details on this please see Heinrich Usener "Dreiheit," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 58 (1903): 1- 161; 208; 321-362. See also Leon J. Niemoczynski. *Charles Sanders Peirce and a Religious Metaphysics of Nature*. (New York: Lexington Books 2011).

[viii]Please see John Lyons, *Semantics* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1977): 2 vols. V 2: 574-577.

[ix] Roy Sorenson, *Seeing Dark Things* (Oxford: Oxford UP 2010).

[x] This is no place to render an extended literary interpretation of shadow imagery in the story, "A Clean Well Lighted Place." But seen strictly as an informant, the shadow of the leaves reinforces the sense of privation, lack and negation, transmitted by the age of the man, the night, and above all by the eight-fold repetition of "nada." I also like to suggest to students that textual shadows can help the writer to "go on," go on in a coherent, focused, way. To get this across some instructors might want to use a variation of the Pythagorean Theorem: $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$: I suggest, reading a^2 as shadow, b^2 as night, old age, we can go on to read c^2 as death, the meaninglessness of life, at both the individual and collective levels—in short as "nada." This would mean, in effect, letting $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$ stand

for various privative states (old age, despair, death) that accumulate as the story progresses. That final, and most privative state, is, of course, "nada," the one that builds in intensity by repetition and one that ends the story.

[xi] Sorenson, p.37.

[xii] Sorenson, p. 172.

[xiii] Due to the relative unfamiliarity of some students with textual shadows, some instructors might want to caution them not always to find clarity in their uses. Here I find it useful to read this passage, from Aristotle, to the students: "It is the mark of a trained mind never to expect more precision in the treatment of any subject than the nature of that subject permits " (*Nicomacheon Ethics*, I.1094b24). In other words, as instructors of writing, we should expect from our students *awareness* of the uses of textual shadows as much as their *precise* uses.

[xiv] On the significance of *using shadows*, I often read this passage to students, usually to graduate students. Please notice the repletion of "use" and the focus on information from shadows: "Philosophers and physicists often assume that they can reduce shadows to patterns of illumination. However, we *use* shadows to establish illumination levels—and to establish shapes, and movement, and relationships between objects and the rest of the environment. Talk of shadows is not *used* to summarize the scene before us, shadows are *used* to construct the visual field. Efforts to paraphrase away shadows are circular" (Sorenson, 15-16).

A correlative of this is the significance of shadows as absence and the *usefulness* of negative information (see Sorenson, 17-20).

[xv] As the presence of something missing (absence) shadows (shades) share an ontogeny with other phenomena like echoes, reflections, mirages, ghosts and the like. Each of these, in most cases, refers to *something there but something missing the reality (substance) of what causes it to be there*.

[xvi]My longer work on the uses of shadow-information in the written text contains a fair amount of discussion about "negative facts" and their usefulness to the writer. These discussions are based, not only on the substantial body of literature on the subject, but also on the negative aspects of shadows, on shadows as "absence" (Sorenson, 220-236). One can also google "shadow," "shadow imagery," "chiaroscuro" to find other contexts and uses of textual shadows.

[xvii] Sorenson, 19.

[xviii] Gabriel Josipovici. *The Times Literary Supplement* October 26, 2012: p. 5.

[xix] Sorenson has many visual representations of the triadic structure of shadows. But one can give a classroom representation of it with a diagram like this:

A: Light source (sun, streetlamp, etc)

B: Blocking (casting) object (tree, one's own body, etc)

C: Cast shadow

By rotating this diagram one can represent the diagonal and horizontal variations of the triad.

[xx]Lyons, I:37-46.