



Reparative Craft

EVE KOSOFSKY SEDGWICK
AS A TEXTILE ARTIST

Jason
Edwards

INTRODUCTION

Reparative Craft

Reading Reparatively, or Sedgwick's Textiles

Reparative Craft is the first monograph to explore Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick's work as a textile artist. An accomplished poet and paradigm-shifting literary critic primarily known for her work in queer and affect theory, Sedgwick also created textiles, which have proven to be of comparatively little interest, even to her admirers.¹ The book focuses on the period from roughly 1996 to 2003, in which she was working toward her most-cited monograph, *Touching Feeling: Affect, Pedagogy, Performativity* (2003). Following a discussion of her early patchwork experiments and brief, productive period as a weaver, the book examines in detail the four exhibitions Sedgwick took part in. These were an amateur group show featuring her earlier fabric collages, *Floating Columns* (1999–2000); and three solo shows, exhibited at North American campus galleries: *In the Bardo* (1999–2000); *Bodhisattva Fractal World* (2002); and *Works in Fiber, Paper, and Proust* (2005).²

In so doing, *Reparative Craft* represents a kind of retrospective catalog of Sedgwick's textiles. The book can be read in chronological order, or readers can dip into the individual entries in a sequence of their choosing, as a particular object or exhibition attracts their attention. From the start, then, *Reparative Craft* resists a developmental narrative, adopting, sympathetically, a *patchwork* aesthetic, a genre central to Sedgwick's textiles, as we shall see.³

The book also puts aside a more conventionally *argumentative* mode, in favor of something more *reparative*. Indeed, readers should note, from the outset, that *Reparative Craft* is not a work of literary/art *criticism*, bracketing throughout potential critiques of, for example, Sedgwick's Orientalism.⁴ Instead, the book

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS



Figure 1.1. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick at the Penland School of Craft, ca. 1996–99.
Photograph: H. A. Sedgwick. Collection of H. A. Sedgwick. © H. A. Sedgwick

engages with her textiles respectfully and compassionately, being more concerned with what we might learn from them, rather than imagining, *avant la lettre*, that we have something to teach them, from our arsenal of default critical positions.⁵ As a result, *Reparative Craft* looks across at Sedgwick's textiles with wonder, rather than looking down on them with condescension.

In so doing, the book employs a *reparative* methodology, in Sedgwick's now famous, still little considered, terms. The book's founding premise is that her textiles represent her most sustained, useful example of reparative reading, because her artworks make repeated use of quotations from two literary sources. The first is Yoel Hoffmann's translations of Japanese haiku written by early modern Zen monks and poets on the verge of death, with Sedgwick usually incorporating the entire poem. Sedgwick's second key source is Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* (1913–27), in a range of English translations, from which she selects a number of single sentences, or a small number of successive sentences; rarely, however, as much as a paragraph.⁶

Rather than engaging with such literary sources in the familiar form of a critical essay, however, a genre Sedgwick continued to employ as she developed her craft practice, in her textiles she deployed quotations more as mantras, often in complex fonts and against colored or textured backgrounds. As such, Proust and Hoffmann represented text(ile)s that the artist, as well as her readers and spectators, could contemplate, *realize* in their minds, digest, and make nourishing use of; as Sedgwick herself seems to have done after her diagnosis with metastatic breast cancer in 1996, the moment at which her textile art practice began. (Sedgwick had been first diagnosed with breast cancer in 1990, undergoing a mastectomy and chemotherapy that year, before the cancer metastasized in her spine six years later.)⁷

In spite of the sustained literary-theoretical influence over the past twenty years of Sedgwick's *Touching Feeling*, and the number of so-called postcritical positions it inspired, the precise *reparative* methodology that she introduces there, that she employs in her textiles, and that I work with to engage sympathetically with them in this book, remains "little explored," even as it represents, in Sedgwick's view, the "heart of many histories of gay, lesbian, and queer," as well as trans, "intertextuality."⁸ I add trans intertextuality here because, as we shall see, the iconography of many of her textiles centers on a bodhisattva, a Buddhist divinity who defers entering nirvana and returns to samsara, the endless cycle of karmic reincarnation, motivated by deep compassion, to help living beings achieve liberation from reincarnation. This idea of self-consciously selfless compassion, rather than egotistic criticism, is central to the reparative project, and to the affective motives of this book.

According to Sedgwick, the bodhisattva in question, Avalokiteshvara in the Indian Buddhist tradition, Kuanyin in the Chinese, was "usually portrayed as a man" up to "about the eighth century" in South Asia and then, "after about the twelfth," was "generally seen and known in female form" in East Asia, while the bodhisattva of the intervening centuries was "often much harder to classify

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

in terms of gender.” Discussing the bodhisattva, Sedgwick noted that her own “thought and hope” was that “even in the expression of a strong sensuality,” Avalokiteshvara/Kuanyin did not need to be “shaped or perceived through the eyes of gender at all—not male, not female, not both male and female, and not neither male nor female.”⁹

If Sedgwick’s description circa 2007 emphasizes Kuanyin’s freedom from the troubles of gendered embodiment, gender and its transformations remained central to a divinity who, iconographically and historically, began as an Indian man, Avalokiteshvara, before becoming a Chinese woman, Kuanyin, but who was able, throughout, to embody whichever gendered form was likely to prove most relationally skillful.

From as early as her 1977 narrative poem “Trace at 46,” Sedgwick had been interested in ontologies “plaiting / together . . . lines female and male / and divine,” divinities usually “referred to in the plural number.”¹⁰ In her 1985 essay “Up the Postern Stair: *Edwin Drood* and the Homophobia of Empire,” however, Sedgwick argued that, too often, constructing a “position of apparent ‘androgyny’ or halfway-ness,” while “pretending to share equally in the qualities of two symmetrically opposite groups, really manipulated the asymmetry of their status for personal advancement.”¹¹

But that 1985 argument was mostly unrepresentative of her wider thinking, which witnessed her frequent, controversial identification *as a gay man* rather than merely *with* gay men.¹² In 1997, meanwhile, as Sedgwick was beginning to engage deeply with textiles, she noted how honored she felt at being asked to “initiate a discussion of two papers” on trans issues at that year’s Berkshire Conference of Women Historians, by Jack Halberstam and C. Jacob Hale, talks that “place[d] the very definition of ‘woman’ under the greatest conceivable pressure,” and projects that collectively articulated subjectivities “that purposefully move[d] across the boundaries of gender.”¹³

Sedgwick first introduced the idea of reparative reading in her fall 1996 introduction to the “Queerer than Fiction” special issue of *Studies in the Novel*, where she described as *camp* the reparative reading practice of many of her contributors.¹⁴ Sedgwick then expanded on the idea in the introduction to her 1997 edited collection, *Novel Gazing: Queer Readings in Fiction*. The notion of reparative reading, however, received its best-known iteration in the conclusion to chapter 4 of *Touching Feeling*, “Paranoid and Reparative Reading, or, You’re So Paranoid You Probably Think This Essay Is About You.”¹⁵ There, Sedgwick suggested that paranoid and reparative reading practices were often intertwined, and in her textiles there are many moments when she continues to read “through paranoid lenses,” employing the “x-ray gaze of the paranoid impulse” to see

“through to [her own] unfleshed skeleton.” More frequently, though, Sedgwick’s reparative reading project in her patchworks is “additive and accretive.” Indeed, patchwork was a form made up of many parts in complex interrelation through which Sedgwick sought to “assemble and confer plenitude on an object that [would] then have resources to offer” her own increasingly “inchoate self” in the context of a cancer treatment that ultimately proved “inadequate” and an illness that, in rezoning her own body into parts, and attacking them simultaneously and in succession, was “inimical” to her need for “nurture.”¹⁶

Indeed, one might read Sedgwick’s theorizations of camp in the mid-1990s, and the reparative reading practices that best responded to it, as an account of her aesthetic ambitions as a textile artist, a patchwork practice whose emergence coincided with the publication of the “Queerer than Fiction” essay in 1996, the year of Sedgwick’s recurrence diagnosis. In addition, spectators might understand Sedgwick’s textile practice as a resource-full attempt to model for her surviving readers and viewers what a reparative reading practice might look like should they themselves need one.

I make this claim because Sedgwick’s patchworks, often employing literary quotations, as we have seen, alongside materials and visual iconography concerned with her embodied experience of metastatic breast cancer, articulate precisely her account of “classic camp performance” and of the reparative reading that did it justice. That is because her textiles, as well as my accounts of them, often represented “startling, juicy displays of excess erudition”; “passionate . . . antiquarianism”; a “prodigal production of alternative historiographies”; a “rich, highly interruptive affective variety”; a “disorienting juxtaposition of present with past, and popular with high culture”; an “irrepressible fascination with ventriloquistic experimentation,” when it came to both Proust and her selected Japanese death poets; and an “‘over’-attachment to fragmentary, marginal, waste or leftover products.” Sedgwick’s was a “sloppy craft,” in a number of senses, as we shall see.¹⁷ Sedgwick’s frequently tacky or sticky reparative patchworks, often employing adhesives rather than embroidery, also visually register a “glue of surplus beauty,” “surplus stylistic investment,” in the form of the elaborate fonts she employed for the quotations, and the “unexplained wellings up” of parts that are “cement[ed] together and animate” the “amalgam of powerful part-objects.”¹⁸

In this book I will “help . . . [my]self again and again” to Sedgwick’s delicious, nutritious craft, to demonstrate that it is, in her words, “not only important but *possible* to find ways of attending to such reparative motives and personalities,” to find ways of “develop[ing] and disseminat[ing] the richest reparative practices,” even if I risk seeming “sappy, aestheticizing, defensive, anti-intellectual, or

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

reactionary” in my often formalist, languorously ekphrastic, deeply interpretative, but never *critical*, reading and looking practices.¹⁹ Indeed, I want the various readings and viewings contained within the book, taken together, to demonstrate Sedgwick’s insistence that reparative readings are “no less acute than a paranoid position, no less realistic, no less attached to a project of survival,” Sedgwick’s and my own, modeling cumulatively, in the pages that follow, the “many ways selves and communities” can “succeed in extracting sustenance from the objects of a culture—even of a culture whose avowed desire has often been not to sustain them.”²⁰

To do so, *Reparative Craft* focuses on the range of textiles Sedgwick produced in the decade or so after her diagnosis with metastatic breast cancer in spring 1996. The book comprises six chapters in chronological order. The first half of the book examines her early textile experiments as well as a small amateur group show she took part in. The second part provides close readings of her three solo exhibitions: *In the Bardo* (1999–2000), *Bodhisattva Fractal World* (2002), and *Works in Fiber, Paper, and Proust* (2005). While my periodization acknowledges Sedgwick’s diagnosis as, in some ways, radically interruptive, demarcating an extended “late” period of her life, *Reparative Craft* presumes a continuity of intentional idiom across her life and the different genres of her work, ranging from her better-known queer theoretical interventions, through her less well-known poetry, to her almost entirely ignored textiles.

If the book is, mostly, chronological, however, it isn’t, as I have begun to suggest, meant to be teleological. We can certainly see Sedgwick getting more technically and conceptually accomplished as a craftsperson, but the book nonetheless honors her preference for a kaleidoscope of alternating Kleinian *positions* in any one reading, as well as across time, and her hostility to a Freudian maturational schema of *phases*.²¹ In a late essay, “Reality and Realization” (1998), Sedgwick also suggested that reality and materiality were not “propositional,” that they were “spatial as much as temporal.”²² The book is, therefore, ongoingly metamorphic, rather than axiomatic; restlessly performative, rather than argumentative; and unusually formalist and ekphrastic, rather than contextualizing, ideological, or cultural-historical. The book also fans out a wide range of readings *beside* one another, since, as Sedgwick noted, “the irreducible positionality of *beside*” offered “useful resistance” to binary, hierarchical, teleological thinking, comprising instead a “range of desiring, identifying, representing, repelling, paralleling, differentiating, rivaling, learning, twisting, mimicking, withdrawing, attracting, aggressing, warping, and other relation[s].”²³

If the book’s variety of chapter forms is generically unconventional, with later chapters resembling an exhibition catalog more than a literary theory



Figure 1.2. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick at the *In the Bardo* exhibition, 1999–2000.
 Photographer unknown. Collection of H. A. Sedgwick. © H. A. Sedgwick

monograph, I'm hoping that much else about it might productively unsettle readers' formal expectations: its maximalist *fat* bulk stretching minimalist attention spans; its repeated rhythm of returning to new objects akin to the spanking meters Sedgwick found so evocative, painful, and pleasurable. Indeed, the book presumes, throughout, a queer reader's paradigmatic interest in sexual language and perverse pornographic scenarios, particularly, in Sedgwick's case, the scenes of masturbation, anality, urethrality, and sadomasochism, with all their "plural possibilities" of "voyeurism, horror, *Schadenfreude*, disgust, or even compassion."²⁴

Sedgwick's characteristic interests in these topoi were root deep and lifelong, although often controversial in and beyond her lifetime, with her circa 1989–90

D

UNIVERSITY
 PRESS

essay “Jane Austen and the Masturbating Girl” notorious in Republican hack journalism “months before it was published” and singled out for ridicule, in one case, “before the essay was so much as *written*”; and with Sedgwick “considered more dangerous than Saddam Hussein,” by some, in the early 1990s.²⁵ Indeed, my own first, life-changing encounter with Sedgwick in the flesh occurred in this period, while she was giving her similarly controversial essay “Is the Rectum Straight? Identification and Identity in *The Wings of the Dove*,” which dilated on Henry James’s sustained anal.²⁶ In addition, the publication of Sedgwick’s 1996 edited collection of her friend Gary Fisher’s s/m writing, *Gary in Your Pocket*, was, if anything, even more provocative for the way his texts frequently, performatively, coupled sexual and racial degradation.²⁷

But as section II of Sedgwick’s 1994 collection of poems, *Fat Art, Thin Art*, made clear, there was nothing new about her queer interests. Indeed, when it came to her lyric poetry, sadomasochism was, in many ways, its beating heart, in early poems, from the mid-1970s, including “Everything Always Distracts,” “Sexual Hum,” and “Sestina Lente,” as well as in posthumously published poems, from the same period, including “Explicit” and “The Palimpsest”; interests that ran right up to the urethral and anal thematics of one of the last lyrics she published before her death, “Bathroom Song.”²⁸

If *Reparative Craft* is a queer book, it is also self-consciously interdisciplinary, straddling literary and craft theory, the product of my graduate training, as a literary close reader, and subsequent career, as a close looker, in art history. Taken as a whole, the book also articulates a queer phenomenology, suggesting that reading is a kind of looking, with a dense materiality of its own, and looking is as amenable to complex interpretation as the closest of readings.²⁹ That the book focuses on Sedgwick’s amateur craft practice represents a particularly counterintuitive, canon-stretching evidence base from which to make such arguments. All the better!

In sum, *Reparative Craft* is, also perhaps, unusually descriptive, staying loyally, lovingly with its objects while promiscuously moving across lots of them. Sedgwick was aware of the resistance some readers had to such patient readings, noting in *Tendencies* that the “single most controversial thing” in several queer theory classes she taught was “that they were literature courses, that the path to every issue we discussed simply had to take the arduous defile through textual interpretation.”³⁰ This was not, however, an ekphrastic approach Sedgwick herself resisted, quite the opposite. At one point in *Touching Feeling*, she acknowledged that “the pleasure of quoting Dickens threatens to take over my discussion.”³¹ I have a similarly endless pleasure in quoting Sedgwick.

D

UNIVERSITY

8 INTRODUCTION

PRESS

In addition, *Reparative Craft* prides itself on being a piece of what Sedgwick characterized, in a lesser-known 1998 article, as “Experimental Critical Writing.” The essay originated in a syllabus for a seminar Sedgwick was teaching, which sought to make the “ambitions of literary criticism become more expansive” at the “boundaries between genres, between ‘critical’ and ‘creative’ writing,” as well as between “argumentation and performance,” “individual and collaborative production,” and “literary and non-literary texts,” so as to “change the current profile of what is publishable in our profession,” to “interrupt” the academy’s “rather numbing” generic expectations, and to help further “overcome [readers’] inhibitions about experimentation.”³²

Following Sedgwick’s lead, indeed writing as a paid-up member of the “Church of Sedgwick,” I encourage spectators to “linger as long as they can” with the question of what the “ambition of this piece” of textile art is, focusing on novel answers that the “reader or even [artist] may not already know,” mindful that “verbal meaning isn’t the only or necessarily the most powerful form of meaning—even where words are involved.” The book also ponders, as Sedgwick’s students were encouraged to do, further questions: “What energies” does her work “tap into”? What happens when the “assignment of person changes” from “an ‘I’ . . . into a ‘he’ or ‘she’ or ‘they,’ and/or vice versa”? And how and why does Sedgwick employ so many quotations? Indeed, Sedgwick’s textiles center almost entirely on Proust, Japanese death haiku, and other assorted Buddhist texts, as we have begun to see, while parts of this book also wonder whether, as in “Walter Benjamin’s fantasy,” the “perfect book,” or at least an interesting one, might “consist *exclusively* of quotations,” “a fabric of quotations, a *catalogue raisonné* of quotations.”³³

As a self-conscious memorial, a hagiographic retrospective intellectual biography, *Reparative Craft* is also concerned, implicitly, throughout with “issues of representation and address that attach to the processes of loss and mourning,” experimenting with what Sedgwick characterized as “obituary issues and impulses” within “historical or textual scholarship.” In addition, just as Sedgwick’s textiles move “back and forth between poetry and prose,” between Proust and haiku, so the book shuttles freely across Sedgwick’s better-known critical works and her less-known poems, the “unexpected *conjunction* of the forms” allowing us to do things that we “might not have been able to do using just one or the other,” and exploring “the highly charged moments of switching back and forth” between different media. Again like the Sedgwick of “Teaching ‘Experimental Critical Writing,’” *Reparative Craft* is interested in what she calls “the ‘scrap-book’ form” with its multiple “short sections, with frequent new beginnings,”

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS



Figure 1.3. Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick at the Penland School of Craft, ca. 1996–99.
Photograph: H. A. Sedgwick. Collection of H. A. Sedgwick. © H. A. Sedgwick

and with the ongoing question of “how detachable” the parts are “from the overall structure”; a problematized relationship of parts and wholes evocative to an artist with metastatic breast cancer who is exploring the possibilities of patchwork, as we shall see.³⁴

In her “Experimental Writing” class, Sedgwick additionally encouraged her students to think in the first person, to think how a “biographical study,” like this one, might make “some interesting use of the fact that it is being written *by* somebody, as well as *about* somebody.”³⁵ My own ambitions, here, however, chime more with Sedgwick’s later, Buddhist interest in emptying out the first person, and in the desire she expressed, in an untitled poem from circa 1994, “to write” like her therapist “listen[ed],” hardly ever “offering back the face of my emotion, only, the face of [me] listening.”³⁶

Readers might also think about *Reparative Craft* as an example of *fat* criticism in celebration of what Sedgwick called *fat art* in the title of her first poetry

collection, *Fat Art, Thin Art* (1994). While the book you are currently reading focuses on her textiles rather than her glass or ceramics, which remain little known, the volume provides layer on overlapping layer of analysis, self-consciously recalling a form Sedgwick deeply admired: the fat lists employed by her favorite, mid-twentieth-century affect theorist Silvan Tomkins.

Comparing Tomkins's lists to the "long sentences in Proust" she frequently quoted in her textiles, Sedgwick described how the items on Tomkins's lists gestured toward the "possibility of random, virtually infinite permutation, some of it trivial, some of it highly significant: the suggestion of sheer, unlimited extent mark[ing] the impress of radical contingency on the possible outcomes." And yet, she continued, "the items on the lists, far from random, are always carefully chosen to open and indicate new vistas."³⁷ I hope that the unusually many open-ended interpretations of Sedgwick's textiles that follow function in a similar way, opening multiple new avenues of interpretation and experience. The nourishing number and generative richness of those overlapping interpretations, and the textiles that inspired them, are one of the things that makes this book *fat*, a word that will recur frequently.³⁸

As a self-assertive "fat woman," Sedgwick thought about fat art across her career. The unglossed phrase came from the end of her narrative poem "The Warm Decembers" (ca. 1980–86), which described "Two arts that feed as one. / Fat art, thin art."³⁹ She returned to the polyvalent, positive semiotics of fat in an essay coauthored with Michael Moon, "Divinity: A Dossier, a Performance Piece, a Little Understood Emotion" (ca. 1990), which thought about fat from several angles. As a whole, however, the essay challenged "offensive meanings" by celebrating the divinity of the "fat, beaming figure of the diva" as a fantasy alternate ideal body, which "never lost its representational magnetism," even as the essay differentiated the "gender specification, class complication, and racial bifurcation" of the semiotics of fat. Indeed, Sedgwick emphasized that in "*coming out as a fat woman*," within the context of a nascent "fat liberation movement," she wanted to make "clear to the people around [her] that their cultural meanings" would be "assaultive and diminishing to the degree that they are not fat-affirmative."⁴⁰

Sedgwick returned to "The Uses of Being Fat" in a circa 1994 poem of the same name, collected in *Fat Art, Thin Art*, in which she revealed that she

used to have a superstition that
there was this use to being fat:
no one I loved could come to harm
enfolded in my touch—

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

that lot of me would blot it up,
the rattling chill, night sweat or terror.⁴¹

In the poem, Sedgwick's earlier sense of herself as a woman whose fat blotted up trouble is curtailed by "the rattling chill, night sweat or terror" of many of her friends living with AIDS, the poem's "night sweat" recalling Thom Gunn's then-recent 1992 collection of poems relating to the AIDS crisis, *The Man with the Night Sweats*. As I complete this book, I see now that *Reparative Craft* may have unconsciously, melancholically, believed something similar. In the parts written while Sedgwick was alive, I hoped that her inexhaustible creative energy could somehow defeat her terminal cancer. After her passing, I think I tried to endlessly remake her in my mind, even as other parts of me knew that I could never bring her back.

As a result of this realization, I want to conclude this introduction with a second, untitled poem from *Fat Art*, *Thin Art*: the untitled one beginning "One of us falls asleep on the other's shoulder." This describes how

An hour later when we peel apart:
in the fat of the shoulder, artful, improbable
brand, the double outside curve,
an ear.

For hours (shower, clothes) it doesn't fade.

Returning to this improbable aural imprinting, I realized that the decades of work that went into this book might have assumed the related form of a somehow listening fat shoulder, one imprinted by Sedgwick's artistry, endlessly open to her words, without ever quite realizing "how much mourning there already [was]" between her and me.⁴²

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

Introduction. Reparative Craft

1. For the discussion so far, see Miller, “All about Eve” and “Reviewing Eve.” See also K. Hawkins, “Woven Spaces” and “Re-Creating Eve”; Nelson, “In the Bardo”; Cvetkovich, “Utopia of Ordinary Habit”; Edwards, “Introduction: *Bathroom Songs?*,” 68–74, and “For Beauty.” For a more recent assessment, see Goldberg, *Come as You Are*, 85–124.

2. Some of the later textiles were likely made for an “experimental seminar/studio workshop” Sedgwick taught at the CUNY Graduate Center, “How to Do Things with Words and Other Materials,” in 2004 and 2008. This invited students to conceptualize and practice different ways of combining written text and other visual media, making unconventional use of the materiality of the written word and its support, with students creating a portfolio “exploring different aspects of the complex relations among language, materiality, and visibility.” Quoted in Herring, “Sedgwick’s ‘Other Materials,’” 5.

3. For Sedgwick’s aversion to a developmental psychology of *stages*, in favor of a theorization of alternating affective *positions*, see *Touching Feeling*, 93–123; and *Weather*, 123–43. In the book I use, interchangeably, ideas of collage, assemblage, patchwork, and quilting, despite their different art historical genealogies and conceptions. For example, while collage has the highest art historical status, as a form of modernist, masculinist self-referentiality, quilting boasts a proud African American genealogy, and assemblage has been recently understood as a model for queer and trans self- and world-making. Sedgwick’s preferred term was *patchwork*, but, in mixing up the vocabularies, and their traditions, I want to insist on the Black/feminist craft origins and queer and trans implications of collage, and the high-modernist, complex semiotics of quilting. For more on trans assemblage, see Stryker, “My Words to Victor Frankenstein” and “More Words.”

4. In postponing a critique of Sedgwick’s “cross-cultural perspective,” I have been, to quote Sedgwick and Adam Frank on Silvan Tomkins, “conscious of wishing to defer a certain amount of accounting, not only out of protectiveness for [Sedgwick], but out of a sense that, if the deferral proved possible, the terms of that accounting might be richly

D

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

altered.” Sedgwick and Frank, “Shame in the Cybernetic Fold,” in Sedgwick *Touching Feeling*, 117.

5. For more *loving* reader relations to Sedgwick, see Kelleher, “If Love Were All”; and Allan, “Falling in Love.” Heather Love suggests that “to read Sedgwick *always* reparatively is to miss the energizing force of paranoia in her work” and “reduces the kinds of relations we might now cultivate with her.” In this book, I leave Love to her “hard work of deidealisation.” Love, “Truth and Consequences,” 240. For more on the need to deidealize queer theory, see Amin, *Disturbing Attachments*.

6. Hoffmann, *Japanese Death Poems*. In a recent discussion of Sedgwick, Cassie Westwood describes this as an “ardent reading” practice in which “even the most devoted of readers . . . tend to remember parts” of a text “rather than the whole thing,” “fragments” to be “turned round in our memories like the melody from a music box.” Westwood, “Queer Art,” 50. For more on Sedgwick’s encounters with Proust, see Goldstein, “Some Scenes in Proust”; Litvak, “*The Weather in Proust* (Review)”; and Butler, “Proust at the End.”

7. For more on Sedgwick’s emergence as a textile artist in the mid-1990s, see her “Making Things, Practicing Emptiness,” in *Weather*, 69–122; and my *Queer and Bookish*, 169–212, 213–58.

8. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 149. For other experiments with reparative reading, see Bradway, *Queer Experimental Literature*; Johnson, *Cultural Memory*; and K. Hawkins, *Thinking Feelingly*.

9. Sedgwick, *Weather*, 104–5. For more on Kuanyin, see Blofeld, *Bodhisattva of Compassion*; Karcher, *Kuan Yin Oracle*; Palmer and Ramsay, *Kuan Yin Chronicles*; and especially Yu, *Kuan-yin*.

10. Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 67–68.

11. Sedgwick, *Between Men*, 196–97.

12. For example, in her 1985 essay “A Poem Is Being Written,” Sedgwick noted that “in among the many ways” she identified “as a woman, the identification as a gay person is a firmly male one, identification ‘as’ a gay man.” *Tendencies*, 209.

13. Sedgwick, “Response to C. Jacob Hale”; and its draft (ca. 1997), “Comments on Judith Halberstam and Jacob Hale Papers,” in the Sedgwick archive. This is now located in the Sallie Bingham Center for Women’s History and Culture at Duke University.

14. Sedgwick, “Queerer than Fiction.”

15. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 123–52, 149–50. For a range of responses to the essay, see my “Reparative Reading at 21.”

16. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 149.

17. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 149–50. For more on “sloppy” and amateur craft, see Paterson and Surette, *Sloppy Craft*; and Holroyd, “Review of *Amateur Craft*.”

18. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 150.

19. For more on the so-called New Formalism and the return to decontextualized close reading, see Gallop, “Ethics of Reading”; Wolfson, “Reading for Form”; and Levinson, “What Is New Formalism?” For related musings on languorous reading, see Hanson, “Languorous Critic.”

20. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 150–51.

21. For more, see *Tendencies*, 52–72; and *Weather*, 123–43.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS

22. Sedgwick, *Weather*, 208.
23. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 8.
24. Sedgwick, *Tendencies*, 187. For the *locus classicus* of these interests, see Sedgwick's notorious 1985 essay "A Poem Is Being Written," with its account of *spanking* meter, enjambment as *stretching*, arousing scenes of sadomasochistic punishment, and female anal eroticism. *Tendencies*, 177–214. For a poignant recent account of the risks of Sedgwick-inspired queer pedagogy in the (in some ways) very different context of the post-#MeToo moment, see Doyle, *Shadow of My Shadow*, especially 123–35.
25. Sedgwick, *Tendencies*, 15–16.
26. For the essay, see *Tendencies*, 73–103. For a fuller account of my inaugural encounter with Sedgwick, see Edwards, *Eve Kosofsky Sedgwick*, 2–3.
27. Sedgwick, *Gary in Your Pocket*. For discussion, see Haye and Sedgwick, "All About Eve"; Arthur Frank, "Bodies, Sex, and Death"; Reid-Pharr, "Shock of Gary Fisher"; Hanson, "Future's Eve"; and Muñoz, "Race, Sex"; as well as Edwards, *Queer and Bookish*, 89–134.
28. The early poems are from Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 74–79, 83–85; the late poems are collected in Edwards, *Bathroom Songs*, 209–10, 234–36. (My *Bathroom Songs* is a collection of essays on Sedgwick's poetry along with previously unpublished poems. The poems will be cited via the book throughout.) For more on Sedgwick's urethral eroticism, see Edwards, *Bathroom Songs*, 31–37. For more on Sedgwick's interest in James's anality, see *Epistemology*, 182–212; and *Touching Feeling*, 27–35; and on Charles Dickens's anality, *Between Men*, 161–79.
29. For more on the phenomenology of reading, see Iser, "Reading Process." For a bravura account of queer phenomenology, see Ahmed, *Queer Phenomenology*.
30. Sedgwick, *Tendencies*, 5.
31. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 84. For a recent "descriptive turn" in literary studies, see Marcus et al., "Building a Better Description"; Best and Marcus, "Surface Reading"; and Love, "Close but Not Deep."
32. Sedgwick, "Teaching 'Experimental Critical Writing,'"
33. Sedgwick, "Teaching 'Experimental Critical Writing,'"
34. Sedgwick, "Teaching 'Experimental Critical Writing,'"
35. Sedgwick, "Teaching 'Experimental Critical Writing,'" 113.
36. Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 20. For more on close reading as "a way of listening," see Gallop, "Ethics of Reading," 12; and my "Reparative Reading at 21."
37. Sedgwick, *Touching Feeling*, 105–6. For more on Tomkins, see Sedgwick and Frank, "Shame" and *Shame*.
38. For more, see Butler, "Capacity."
39. Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 152.
40. Sedgwick and Moon, "Divinity: A Dossier, a Performance Piece, a Little Understood Emotion," in *Tendencies*, 215–51. For an alternate *thin* aesthetics, presuming that less is more, see Berlant, "Two Girls" and "Pedagogies"; and Crawford, "Slender Trouble."
41. Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 15.
42. Sedgwick, *Fat Art*, 35.

DUKE

UNIVERSITY
PRESS