

Ted Hughes and the Divided Brain

‘The intuitive mind is a sacred gift and the rational mind is a faithful servant. We have created a society that honours the servant and has forgotten the gift.’ Albert Einstein.

When the first scientist opened a human skull to see what was inside, he must have had a shock. From battle wounds he would have known to expect a lump of greyish-pink stuff. He would not have expected to see what looked like three brains, the small cerebellum or old brain, at the base, which we have long known to control the instinctive and automatic systems, and the huge hemispheres of the cortex, almost completely divided by a deep vertical fissure. This feature has been known for millennia. Yet it was not until the last few decades that science has begun to make any progress towards explaining its purpose and workings. Progress was long hampered by the impossibility of performing experiments on living human brains. Research was limited to the study of the few sufferers from accidental brain damage. This paucity of experimental data resulted in many controversial and often contradictory theories. Most neurologists carefully avoided the subject. But split-brain procedures, and techniques which can temporarily disable one hemisphere at a time, reveal much that is fascinating, and recent advances in technology have made it possible to record very accurately exactly what is going on in specific areas of the brain. Research has burgeoned but little attempt was made to understand the basis of hemisphere differences before Iain McGilchrist’s 2009 book, *The Master and his Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World*.¹

This book is also split down the middle. The purpose of the first half is to collate the large body of experimental knowledge which now exists to describe the very different function of each hemisphere. The second half speculates on how this knowledge might account for much of the history of Western civilization and its present crisis.

What is now known is that each hemisphere has a completely different way of looking at the world.

Left hemisphere:

The general.
Prefers what is known and familiar.
The abstract, theoretical, virtual.
Concerned more with man-made objects. Mechanistic.
Signs substituted for experience.
Centrifugal. Seeks to grasp, compete, control and master
Denies 'the mucky world of emotion and the body'
Instrument of will
Value in terms of utility
Narrow focussed analysis
Unscrupulous
Inner life a distraction
Rigid, linear, predictable
Analytic and abstract language
Logic
Discredits the senses
Favours the definite, contained and unidirectional
Gathers information
Ultimate objective power

Right hemisphere:

The particular.
Attuned to anything new.
The concrete, sensory and personal
Concerned more with living individuals. Empathic.
Prioritizes lived experience.
Centripetal: Seeks to relate, participate, collaborate
Accepts what Yeats calls 'the foul rag-and-bone shop of the heart'.
Recipient of the given
Value in terms of fulfilment
Broad vigilant attention
Truthful
In touch with inner life
Tentative, flexible, exploratory
Imaginative, metaphoric language
Humour and irony
Prioritizes the senses
Favours the undefinable, cyclic or limitless
Accumulates wisdom
Ultimate objective wholeness

McGilchrist's sympathies lean heavily to the right. He takes his title from a story in Nietzsche. A wise spiritual master is selflessly devoted to his people; but as his domain spreads he is obliged to trust emissaries to act on his behalf in the administration of the more distant regions. Eventually, however, the most trusted and powerful of these emissaries comes to lose respect for the master, and seek more power for himself. Being both efficient and unscrupulous the emissary displaces the master and becomes a tyrant. McGilchrist interprets this as an allegory of the history of human consciousness.

The left hemisphere evolved as the executive wing of the brain, specialized for organization, security, and power, processing the right hemisphere's raw experience of the world for practical purposes. The phenomenal growth of the frontal lobes enabled us to stand back from our world:

But this development, permitting as it does a far greater capacity to speculate, to consider the lessons of the past and to project possible worlds into the future, to build projects and schemes for the better governing of the state and for the increase of knowledge of the world at large, requires the ability to record: to make externalised, therefore more permanent, traces of the mind's workings, to fix, to freeze the constantly passing flow of life on the wing. It requires, therefore, a huge expansion of the realm of the written word, as well as the development of diagrams, formulas and maps; records of observations of nature; and records of the histories of people and states.

[259]

These functions were necessary if mankind was ever to develop such things as philosophy, law, systematic bodies of knowledge, civilisation itself. But the contribution of the left hemisphere must be returned to the larger purview of the right, where everything is understood within its larger context. Sanity is this dynamic equilibrium.

But it seems that the left hemisphere at some point near the beginnings of civilization began to enforce its own single vision, dismissing the functions of the right hemisphere ('the lunatic, the lover and the poet') as symptoms of some mental illness. Disconnected reason came to be the only reliable witness of reality and the only arbiter of truth. (According to Plato the body evolved purely in order to support and transport the head.)

McGilchrist's demonstration of the damage which has been done and is increasingly being done by the dominance of left hemisphere operating alone shows how perfect a template this map of the mind now provides for understanding 'the making of the Western world'. It accounts for the decline of Rome, which 'depended more on codification, rigidity and solidity than it did on flexibility,

imagination and originality' [291]; for the dark ages when intellect was deployed in constructing 'a legalistic framework for divinity', and Christianity was transformed into 'a force for conformity, abstraction, and the suppression of independent thought' [295]; for the Reformation, when the Flesh was made Word; for the hubris and 'dissociation of sensibility' of the Enlightenment, which divorced consciousness from body and feeling, and spawned 'the large-scale, rootless, mechanical force of capitalism' [346] and the inhumanity of the industrial revolution.

In its neglect of context philosophy in the West is essentially a left-hemisphere process; and so is post-modern critical theory:

The left hemisphere's grasp of the world is essentially theoretical, and is self-referring. In that respect it gives validity to the post-modern claim that language is a self-enclosed system of signs – but if, and only if, it is a product of the left hemisphere alone. By contrast, for the right hemisphere there is, as Johnson said of theories of literature, always an appeal open to nature: it is open to whatever is new that comes from experience, from the world at large. [164]

The left hemisphere, dealing as it does with the familiar, quantifiable and predictable, suffers, when cut off from the stimulus of new experience from the right hemisphere, from boredom and alienation, which are characteristic of modernism in the arts. Denied the pleasure which derives from creativity and emotional experience, it seeks happiness in the form of entertainment and cheap thrills. The symptoms of many of the forms of mental disorder which have become prevalent since the Industrial Revolution, most notably schizophrenia, are exaggerated manifestations of 'normal' left-hemisphere dominance in the modern Western World.

The right hemisphere is the seat of religious experience; but religious experience defined as unique, personal, and grounded in life in the body and the world. It is the proper job of the left hemisphere to make sure that the right does not stray into superstition and irrationality. But the disconnected left seems to appropriate religious experience, dehumanize it, codify it, and transform it into theology, doctrine, dogma, and ultimately, in line with its habitual aggressive exclusivity, into fanatical fundamentalism.

The right hemisphere is the seat of imagination. This new knowledge of the two hemispheres vindicates many unorthodox imaginative thinkers who deduced

the split consciousness: Montaigne, Goethe, Hegel, Nietzsche, Scheler, Spengler, Heidegger, Wittgenstein, Jung, Merleau-Ponty. The left hemisphere has marginalized the arts as mere entertainment, but Schlegel called the warring world-views the poetic and non-poetic:

The non-poetic view is the one which considers that once the senses have perceived things and intellect has determined what they are, everything is settled once and for all. ... The poetic view is the one which continues to interpret them and never assigns any limit to their plenitude.

Wittgenstein came to believe that poetry was truer than philosophy. Jung valued the symbol highly as providing the necessary third ground on which the otherwise polarized halves of the psyche could meet:

What the separation of the two psychic halves means, the psychiatrist knows only too well. He knows it as the dissociation of personality, the root of all neuroses; the conscious goes to the right and the unconscious to the left. As opposites never unite at their own level, a supraordinate 'third' is always required, in which the two parts can come together. And since the symbol derives as much from the conscious as the unconscious, it is able to unite them both, reconciling their conceptual polarity through its form and their emotional polarity through its numinosity.²

Indeed for thousands of years poets have accurately described the split in the human psyche. Most of the greatest writers in the Western canon have written about it; in some cases about little else. Of course they knew nothing of the two hemispheres, but they knew from experience, their own and the inherited racial experience of myth and literature, that man is an almost fatally split creature — hence the primacy of tragedy. Had they known what we now know of the hemispheres it would have made no difference to the way they wrote, since abstractions and generalizations are death to imagination. They would still have expressed their ideas (possible even conceived them in the first place) as characters and metaphors.

There is a perpetual dialogue or conflict throughout Western literature between opposites, each of which embodies several characteristics we can now associate with the hemispheres. Prometheus is an embodiment of left-hemisphere hubris, unable (for all his fabled foresight) to see beyond short-term usefulness, that the gift of fire would inevitably lead to atom bombs. Creon versus Antigone, and Oedipus versus Tiresias, in Sophocles, Pentheus versus Dionysos, in Euripides, are all dialogues between left and right hemispheres, with the

sympathies of the writer invariably with the right. That dialogue has continued ever since, between the Round Table and the Green Knight, for example. It is central in Shakespeare, between Adonis and Venus, Malvolio and Sir Toby, Angelo and the Duke, Greeks and Trojans, Romans and Egyptians, and within all the tragic heroes, culminating with Prospero versus Sycorax. Blake calls the two hemispheres Heaven and Hell, Urizen and Los, single and fourfold vision. It is Coleridge's dialogue with his banished 'natural man', who insists on being heard as the Ancient Mariner. It is the basis of Yeats' journey to and retreat from Byzantium. It is a constant theme in Lawrence, who wrote:

Man is a creature of dual consciousness. It is his glory and his pain. Because though the two streams of consciousness can never be identified with one another, though we are divided between them, very often torn between them, still we are whole and integral beings in which the two streams can be harmonised and reconciled, each being left to its own full flowing. There *need* be no war-fare.³

It is the battle between Piggy and Simon within the mind of Ralph in Golding's *Lord of the Flies*, between the New Men and the Neanderthals in *The Inheritors*.

What all these writers and thinkers were talking about, without, of course, realizing it, was the battle between the hemispheres. Now their prescience is substantiated with the evidence that the split of which they wrote is not only a metaphor.

McGilchrist, now a consultant psychiatrist, has taught English at Oxford. He quotes many of the great English-language poets who, without knowing anything of the hemispheres, described the divided brain with remarkable prescience. Several of these I discussed in similar terms, but without reference to the hemispheres, in my 2005 book *Literature and the Crime Against Nature*. I now see that what I there called the crime against nature was in fact the usurpation of the right hemisphere, which grounds us in nature, by the left which alienates us from it. The culminating and longest chapter was on Hughes.

Reading *The Master and His Emissary* I found myself writing TH in the margin every few pages. Yet McGilchrist never mentions Hughes. When I pointed this out to him, he replied:

Now you say it, I am not sure why I did not mention Hughes, who is a good exemplar, as you say. I do think you are incontestably right that what

Hughes – and Lawrence and many others – were writing about was the difference between the two hemispheres.

As early as 1956 Hughes had written:

Brain in deft opacities,
 Walled in translucencies, shuts out the world's knocking
 With a welcome, and to wide-eyed deafnesses
 Of prudence lets it speak. [‘Egg-head’]

This is an exact description of the brain's *left* opacities. Since the left hemisphere, according to McGilchrist, ‘cannot accept the existence of anything that lies outside itself’, it is ‘unnaturally ruptured from the lived world’ [255]. A man thus alienated is, as Shakespeare expressed it, ‘disbranched from his material sap’.

By 1958 Hughes had independently come up with his own theory of the bicameral split. He had been looking at the *Journals of the Psychological Research Society*, and wrote to his sister Olwyn:

I was surprised to find one theory stated & famously supported which I thought was my own — this was that in right-handed persons the left side of the brain has charge of all consciously-practised skills, capacities etc, but in the right lobe is the subconscious, or something deeper, a world of spirits. This is a half-baked sort of idea.⁴

It is hardly surprising that the idea was at this stage half-baked, since it was not until 1981 that Roger Sperry was awarded the Nobel Prize for his work on the split brain. Nevertheless, Hughes’ idea is remarkably prophetic.

In 1960 Hughes took his idea further in a letter to and Warren Plath. The following remarkable passage could be straight out of McGilchrist:

Discursive intelligence has become what it is, helped by the labours of the various thinkers and taught to each succeeding generation, only by ridding itself of everything unpredictable, obscure, mysterious, ambiguous and emotional. In other words, a division has been created in the Self, between a briskly busy discursive thought-process, logical, with an air of infallibility and precision, arrogant because it thinks it works according to eternal rational laws, and the whole emotional animal life of consciousness which is

on the whole impressionable, passive, and only positive in its intuitions – which cannot support themselves with argument – and when its emotions become positive, at which time they are of course anything but reasonable and predictable.⁵

Near the end of his book, McGilchrist writes:

The left hemisphere's assault on our embodied nature is not just an assault on *our* bodies, but on the embodied nature of the world around us. Matter is what is recalcitrant to the will. The idea that the 'material' world is not just a lump of resource, but reaches into every part of the realm of value, including the spiritual, that through our embodied nature we can commune with it, that there are responses and responsibilities that need to be respected, has largely been lost by the dominant culture. [440]

Hughes had said much the same forty years earlier:

The story of the mind exiled from Nature is the story of Western Man. It is the story of his progressively more desperate search for mechanical and rational and symbolic securities, which will substitute for the spirit-confidence of the Nature he has lost.⁶

McGilchrist's statement that 'It is the right hemisphere that is vigilant for whatever it is that exists "out there"' [40] echoes Hughes: 'I was all for opening negotiations with whatever happened to be out there'. McGilchrist's: 'The right hemisphere prioritizes whatever actually *is*, and what concerns us. It prefers existing things, real scenes and stimuli that can be made sense of in terms of the lived world, whatever it is that has meaning and value for us as human beings' [56] reminds us of Hughes' reference to 'the objective world where my talent really belongs'.⁷

In 1985, when the study of the divided brain was still in its infancy, Hughes wrote 'Baboons and Neanderthals: A Rereading of *The Inheritors*'.⁸ Here Hughes conceded that 'lifting the left side into dominance literally by suppressing the right, seems desirable in some situations'; but where it becomes habitual and automatic

it removes the individual from the 'inner life' of the right side, which produces the sensation of living removed from oneself ... In some enclaves (particularly familiar in Western Protestant society) where the cultural incentives promoting the rational tendencies of language are extreme, the

activity of the right side can be discredited and suppressed almost to extinction. [157-8]

He describes the New Men as 'a totally new kind of creature: born outside the laws, detached from them and with no direct means of learning them: the first animal to be out of phase with life on earth' [167].

Perhaps the first scientist to address this problem directly, was the South African zoologist Eugène Marais, who spent several years living with baboons in the second decade of this century. Out of this field research came his revolutionary book *The Soul of the Ape*.⁹ Marais demonstrated that sense degeneration had reached an extreme point in man, but that this was not an organic change, since it could to a large extent be reversed under hypnosis. He found that intelligence developed at the expense of instinct, so that the most intelligent baboons had the least idea of how to live as baboons. Hughes comments:

In Marais' definition, the 'subconscious' became the contained but for the most part inaccessible world not only of the 'brute' components of instinct but of instinct's positive attributes as well — those superior senses, superior intuitions, and that superior grasp of reality. ... He had really defined the subconscious as the lost, natural Paradise, where the lack of intellectual enquiry and adaptive ingenuity coincided with a perfect awareness of being alive in the moment, and in reality, (an awareness approaching, maybe, a state of blessedness), and an inborn understanding of 'how to live'. He had explained, in a sense, man's perplexed feeling of being everywhere an exile, everywhere separated from his true being. And without saying that his smarter baboons had suffered something like The Fall, he had brought zoological evidence to the argument that the free intelligence is man's original enemy. ... The Cro-Magnons begin to look less like demons of original depravity, more like helplessly processed and forlorn castaways, who are full of plans and plots and enterprise, but do not know 'how to live'. Figures who are, by their very nature, tragic. Subjects, maybe, for Golding's later books. [164, 168]

It was in *Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being* that Hughes was to publish his most extended account of the hemispheres:

We are told that, in general, the left side processes verbal language, abstract concepts, linear argument, while the right side is virtually wordless, and processes sensuous imagery, intuitive ideas, special patterns of wholeness and simultaneity. ... This tends to ally the deep subjective life of the animal

with the right side, and the objective self-control of the animal with the left side.¹⁰

Though the hemispheres were intended by nature to live in a happy marriage, history is the story of how the advance of rationality brought about a divorce. Rationality and language, with their innate tendencies to abstraction and logic, became ‘increasingly dominant in all human transactions’ to the point where ‘the right side can be discredited and suppressed almost to extinction’. This removes the individual from the ‘inner life’, removing oneself also from the real world – in Hughes’ words ‘living in a prison of sorts, since the left side screens out direct experience, establishing its verbal ‘system’ as a hard ego of repetitive, tested routines, defensive against the chaos of real things, resisting adaptation to them’. And here lies the importance of poetry: ‘Metaphor is a sudden flinging open of the door into the world of the right side, the world where the animal is not separated from either the spirit or the real world or itself.’ [159]

McGilchrist also puts a very high value on poetry as the language of the right-hemisphere:

Only the right hemisphere has the capacity to understand metaphor. ... Metaphoric thinking is fundamental to our understanding of the world, because it is the *only* way in which understanding can reach outside the system of signs to life itself. It is what links language to life. [115]

I must admit that when I first read *Shakespeare and the Goddess*, I attached little importance to Hughes’ talk of hemispheres: which, as far as I then knew, was just another of Hughes’ hobby-horses, like astrology. It is now clear that the section called ‘The verbal device and Tragic Equation as brain maps’ constitutes a remarkably full and accurate predictive summary of McGilchrist’s book.

Hughes suggests that this ‘brain map’ of the hemispheres ‘is like an image of the Equation itself’, the tragic equation (‘a gigantic map of the attempted cooperation of the brain’s two hemispheres’), which this whole book uses as a way of bringing into sharp focus a recurrent and central theme in Shakespeare: ‘The Goddess myth is in the right side, while the (ultimately rational and secularizing) myth of the Goddess-destroyer is in the left side’. [161]

However, while the Equation itself is too mythic, too complex, and too specific to Shakespeare and his time to have much general applicability, the translation of it into terms of our contemporary scientific understanding of the workings of our own brains obviously opens up many wider applications, one of which is to provide us with a new perspective on Hughes’ own poems.

What I have been saying, I suppose, is that as he continued to bake it consciously, Hughes' idea of the divided brain came to provide him, largely unconsciously, with a template for poems, functioning often just below the surface meanings, sometimes in conflict with them, as, he claims, the tragic equation functioned for Shakespeare.

In *Shakespeare and the Goddess* Hughes reiterates that the meanings revealed through the application of his 'tragic Equation' do not displace meanings arrived at by other means. It is one perspective among many, and may enter into an unresolved dialogue with other meanings. Thus a reading of Hughes poem in terms of the hemispheres is also only one way into the poem among many, but one which seems to me both apposite and revealing.

A high proportion of Hughes' poems are new incarnations of the same template of the battle of the hemispheres. As he puts it in 'Logos' that template is the ground of the battle between God (the Word) and his mother (Nature). It is the argument between Socrates and Buddha. It is the constant pattern in the turmoil of history.

The three poems which cropped up most frequently in my notes on the McGilchrist book were 'Hawk Roosting', 'Wodwo' and 'Go Fishing'. I shall therefore use these poems as examples of how this template can give us a new and valuable slant on the poems.

A Hughes poem is a 'crossroads' of all the energies and images evoked by its subject. In his comments on 'Hawk Roosting' in his 1970 interview with Egbert Faas, for example, Hughes gave a long (and incomplete) list of possible meanings which can be found in the poem, ranging from, at one extreme, 'Isis, mother of the gods' (whose presence in the poem I have never been able to detect) to, at the other extreme, 'Hitler's familiar spirit' [Faas 199].¹¹

According to McGilchrist, the left hemisphere is as solipsistic as Hughes' hawk. It sees the living as 'objects of use, prey, things'. References to 'actions of grasping' activate the left hemisphere' [55], which 'comes to believe its territory actually *is* the world' [219]. His account of the right hemisphere, on the other hand, with its 'open, receptive, widely diffused alertness to whatever exists' [25], its 'affinity with all that is "other", new, unknown, uncertain and unbounded' [83], sounds very like the wodwo's perception that 'there's all this', and its determination to 'go on looking'.

In passage after passage McGilchrist seems to be presenting us with what could easily be part of a critical commentary on these poems, a contrast, even a choice, between hawk and wodwo. Here are three of them:

Much of our capacity to ‘use’ the world depends, not on an attempt to open ourselves as much as possible to apprehending whatever it is that exists apart from ourselves, but instead on apprehending whatever I have brought into being for myself, my representation of it. This is the remit of the left hemisphere, and would appear to require a selective, highly focussed attention. The right hemisphere, as birds and animals show, is ‘on the look out’. It has to be open to whatever it is that exists apart from ourselves, as much as possible without preconceptions, not just focussing on what it already knows, or is interested in. This requires a mode of attention that is broader and more flexible than that of the left hemisphere. [38]

To know something is to encounter something other, and know it as separate from ourselves. If all I am certain of is my own existence, how does one ever cross the gap? For the solipsist, there is nothing to encounter, since all we know stems from our own mind alone. ... To use the term ‘I’ requires the possibility of there being something which is ‘not-I’ – otherwise, in place of ‘all that is, is mine’, we just get the vacuous ‘all that is mine, is mine’. [140-1]

There is ‘whatever it is that exists apart from ourselves’, but ‘whatever it is that exists’ only comes to be what it is as it finds out in the encounter with ourselves what it is, and we only find out and make ourselves what we are in our encounter with ‘whatever it is that exists’. [231]

McGilchrist finds corroboration in the work of many other thinkers, especially Heidegger. He quotes George Steiner:

Certainty is located in the *ego*. The self becomes the hub of reality and relates to the world outside itself in a ... necessarily exploitative way. As knower and user, the *ego* is predator. For Heidegger, on the contrary, the human person and self-consciousness are *not* the centre, the assessors of existence. Man is only a privileged listener and respondent to existence. The vital relation to otherness is not, as for Cartesian and positivist rationalism, one of ‘grasping’ and pragmatic use. It is a relation of audition. We are trying ‘to listen to the voice of Being’. [152]

As Hughes himself wrote in 1964: ‘The nearest we can come to rational thinking is to stand respectfully, hat in hand, before this Creation, exceedingly alert for a new word’.¹²

The hawk is a machine, like the terrifying thrushes and the suicidal sharks. Wodwo is a fully sentient being, open to experience, asking questions and making choices. Thus it seems to me that 'Hawk Roosting' is (among other things) a portrait of the madness of a disconnected left hemisphere, and that 'Wodwo' is a companion poem, a portrait of the sanity of the right hemisphere.

The other poem I found evoked most frequently in McGilchrist's book is 'Go Fishing'. He writes:

The existence of a system of thought dependent on language automatically devalues whatever cannot be expressed in language. [...] Yet it is only whatever can 'leap' beyond the world of language and reason that can break out of the imprisoning hall of mirrors and reconnect us with the lived world.
[229-30]

The right hemisphere's main concern, he says, is to enable us 'to be skilled participants in the life of the world as it flows'. The left hemisphere is at home with the fixed and rectilinear, but the right prefers curves and circles and the ever-changing flow of life. In McGilchrist's words:

Everything is understood within its penumbra of significances, in its context – all that encircles it. ... The images of movement within stasis, and of stasis within movement, are reflected in the circle, as they are in the movement of water, ever flowing, and ever the same.
[447]

Join water, wade in underbeing
Let brain mist into moist earth
Ghost loosen away downstream
Gulp river and gravity

Lose words

Joining water is a means of temporarily suspending the activity of the left hemisphere, busy as it is with 'urgency words', names, hospitals, the exclusively human world of 'books, thoughts and each other', of 'blotched newsprint' and 'monkey chatter'. This suspension allows the wounded right hemisphere to recover and heals the split between them. 'Go Fishing' is perhaps the most successful of the many later poems which seek to heal this split.

In an article on Hughes' admission to Poets' Corner in Westminster Abbey, Janet Winterson wrote:

He is a poet working to bring back into touch two continents of experience that have tectonically separated. The natural world and its rhythms, he believed, are as necessary to humankind as any amount of progress, and so Hughes uses his own body as a bridge, feeling everything that he writes through the shock of being there – he fished the rivers, crouched under the trees, had the adventure-spirit of a wild man. Then he translated nature's hermetic language into one we can read.¹³

In other words, Ted Hughes, in the tradition of Blake, Whitman, Yeats and Lawrence, gave the right hemisphere a voice.

© Keith Sagar, 1910, 1912. This essay may be quoted within the limits of fair use, and with due acknowledgement to this website.

¹ Iain McGillchrist, *The Master and his Emissary: The Divided Brain and the Making of the Western World* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2009).

² Carl Jung, *Collected Works*, vol. 9 part 2, ed. R. F. C. Hull (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978), 180.

³ D. H. Lawrence, *Apocalypse*, ed. Mara Kalnins, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 192.

⁴ *Letters of Ted Hughes*, ed. Christopher Reid (London: Faber and Faber, 2007), 123.

⁵ *Letters*, 174-5.

⁶ Ted Hughes, *Winter Pollen: Occasional Prose*, ed. William Scammell (London: Faber and Faber, 1994), 129.

⁷ *Letters*, 274.

⁸ *William Golding: The Man and his Books*, ed. John Carey, (London: Faber and Faber, 1986).

⁹ Eugene N. Marais, *The Soul of the Ape*, (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1973).

¹⁰ Ted Hughes, *Shakespeare and the Goddess of Complete Being*, (London: Faber and Faber, 1992), 157-8.

¹¹ Ekbert Faas, *Ted Hughes: The Unaccommodated Universe* (Santa Barbara: Black Sparrow Press, 1980), 199.

¹² Hughes, *Winter Pollen*, 52.

¹³ *The Guardian*, 16 March 2008.