

George Alexander Kelly: The Man and his Theory

Fay Fransella

University of Hertfordshire, UK

and

Robert A. Neimeyer

University of Memphis, USA

... thinking of the scientist and the thinking of the human subject should be considered to be governed by the same general laws. If the aim of science is usefully construed as prediction, why not try operating on the assumption that the aim of all human effort is prediction and see where this line of psychologizing leads us?

(Kelly, 1955/1991, p. 605/Vol. 2, p. 35)

In 1955, two heavy volumes containing 1218 pages of *The Psychology of Personal Constructs* landed on the desks of psychologists. Kelly's 'brief introduction' in the previous chapter is, in relation to the two volumes, indeed brief. The reception of this revolutionary work was mixed. Jerome Bruner, among the most prestigious of the many reviewers, said:

These excellent, original, and infuriatingly prolix two volumes easily nominate themselves for the distinction of being the single greatest contribution of the past decade to the theory of personality functioning. Professor Kelly has written a major work. (Bruner, 1956, p. 355)

We discuss some of the difficulties experienced by reviewers and subsequent readers later in this chapter. But, first, a word about the man who created this work.

GEORGE A. KELLY, THE MAN

His Education

George Kelly was born on 28 April 1905 on a farm near Perth, Kansas, to Theodore Vincent Kelly and Elfleda Merriam Kelly. He died on 6 March 1967, when he was Professor of Behavioral Science at Brandeis University, Boston, USA. His father was a Presbyterian Minister who gave up his ministry to take up 'hard scrabble' farming in a time and place that imposed both poverty and rural isolation on the hard-working family. Kelly says of his mother that she was the daughter of a Nova Scotian captain of a sailing ship who was driven off the North Atlantic Trade routes by the arrival of steamships. He had then gone into the Caribbean trade, making his headquarters in Barbados where his mother had been born. It is interesting that the 'spirit of adventure' symbolized by this maternal grandfather, seems to have seeped into the spirit of Kelly's later psychological theorizing.

Kelly tells how his father set off in 1909 in a covered wagon to take up a claim in eastern Colorado, becoming one of the last homesteaders on the American frontier. But there was little water there to grow crops or raise livestock, so the family returned to the Kansas farm in 1913 after four hard years of struggle. During that time Kelly did not attend any school and was educated by his parents. In fact, as far as one can tell, George Kelly's formal education was virtually nil during the first dozen years of his life. The first substantial period of formal education he had was from late 1918 to 1921 in Wichita. At 16 he then went to the Friends' University academy in Wichita where he took college and academy courses. He often told people that he had never graduated from high school—something that clearly pleased him. He then completed his baccalaureate studies in 1926, majoring in physics and mathematics. It is at Friends' University that we find the first evidence of George Kelly the thinker, the writer, a person with social concerns. He was awarded first place in the Peace Oratorical Contest held at the University in 1924 for *The Sincere Motive*—on the subject of war (Kelly, 1924).

Kelly gave up the idea of a career in engineering to study for a masters degree in educational sociology at the University of Kansas. In 1927, with his masters thesis not completed, he went to Minneapolis and supported himself by teaching various classes for labour organizers, the American Bankers Association, and prospective American citizens. He then enrolled at the University of Minnesota in sociology and biometrics, but soon had to leave because it was discovered that he could not pay the fees. In the winter of 1927, he found a job teaching psychology and speech at Sheldon Junior College in Iowa. There he also coached drama, laying the groundwork for his novel use of enactment in psychotherapy, and there met his future wife, Gladys Thompson.

Kelly's moves around academe were not yet finished. He received an exchange fellowship to go to Edinburgh University in Scotland to study for a Bachelor of Education Degree, which he completed in 1930. There was one last task—to get a doctorate degree—which he finally accomplished at the University of Iowa under Carl Seashore in the Department of Psychology. His PhD, on the common factors in reading and speech disabilities, was awarded in 1931. In that year he married Gladys Thompson and began seeking his first real position. America was in the midst

of the Great Depression, which was decimating the economy, making it hardly an auspicious moment to launch a promising career.

His Professional Years

After what can only be described as an unusual educational history, George Kelly's first employment was in 1931 at the Fort Hays Kansas State College, where he served for 12 years. Faced with a sea of human suffering aggravated by bank foreclosures and economic hardship, Kelly found little use for the physiological psychology that had initially fascinated him, and soon turned his attention to what he saw as being needed—the psychological evaluation of school-aged children and adults. It was here he started to make his distinctive contribution to psychology. He was instrumental in setting up a pioneering travelling clinic that toured western Kansas and offered a psychological diagnostic and remedial service to children of that area. It was staffed solely by George Kelly and his undergraduate and postgraduate students, eventually being funded directly by the financially strapped state legislature (Neimeyer & Jackson, 1997).

While at Fort Hays Kelly started to develop his thinking about psychological change, leading eventually to the psychology of personal constructs, his philosophy of constructive alternativism, and the basics of fixed role therapy (see Chapter 11, pp. 113–122). Informing all of these developments was the view that persons have created themselves and therefore can re-create themselves if they have the courage and imagination to do so. Finding himself largely alone in his efforts to help troubled students, he turned to Freud's ideas for inspiration. Although Kelly developed a respect for Freud's bold attempt to 'listen to the language of distress', he ultimately rejected the idea that offering correct therapist 'interpretations' of client experiences was the key to change. Instead, he began to realize that it was what the *clients* did with his interpretations that really mattered, and the only criterion for a useful therapist-offered conceptualization was that it should be relevant to the client's problem and carry novel implications for a possible solution (Kelly, 1969k).

It was early on in his time at Fort Hays that Kelly wrote his textbook *Understandable Psychology* (unpublished and dated 1932). There is also a draft manuscript of a book with W.G. Warnock entitled *Inductive Trigonometry* (1935). Both his interests in comprehensive theorizing and mathematics are to be found in the unique structure of *The Psychology of Personal Constructs*.

In the late 1930s Kelly was put in charge of a flight-training programme at Fort Hays College and in 1943 was commissioned in the US Naval Reserve, where he conducted research on instrument panel design and other problems of applied and clinical psychology. Shortly after the end of World War II, Kelly was appointed Professor and Director of Clinical Psychology at Ohio State University. During his nineteen years there he formalized his theory of personal constructs and its assessment tool, the repertory grid. Apart from his two massive volumes, he published little, but played a leading role in defining the emerging field of clinical psychology through leadership positions in the American Psychological Association. Kelly also extended his influence internationally, speaking at a number of universities around the world, and cultivating enduring contacts with such young European psychologists as Don

Bannister in the UK and Han Bonarius in the Netherlands. In 1965, the American Psychological Association bestowed on him its Award for Distinguished Contribution to the Science and Profession of Clinical Psychology.

Kelly left Ohio State University in 1965 to take up the Riklis Chair of Behavioral Science at Brandeis University, Boston, at the invitation of Abraham Maslow, the prominent humanistic psychologist.

He was a remarkable man. Not only did he become a distinguished academic in spite of a very unpromising education, but he also influenced the nature of psychology itself in ways we shall describe later. But first we offer a few words about the nature of this author of an unorthodox, grand vision of how each individual person gives personal meaning to life, others, and the world in general.

The Man Himself

To take a look at Kelly the man we can use an essential feature of his own theory—its reflexivity. Personal construct theory emphasizes that, in all our interactions, the same explanatory framework is equally applicable to both parties—to scientist and subject, therapist and client, husband and wife, and parent and child. Kelly did not emphasize this important feather in his theoretical cap, but many have done so since. For instance, see Bannister (2003, pp. 35–36) and Fransella (Chapter 4, pp. 43–44). To try to find out something about the author of personal construct theory, we can be reflexive and look at him through the eyes of his own theory.

It is clear that Kelly viewed his work with some ambivalence. On the one hand, Al Landfield, a student of Kelly, claimed, ‘I knew beyond a shadow of a doubt that Kelly’s hopes for the theory went way beyond ordinary ambition. His hopes went beyond himself, I believe’ (Fransella, 1995). On the other hand, Kelly (1966b) said that only one of the five books he had written had been published and that might have been a mistake. This radical shifting of views can be related to the theoretical bipolarity of all construing. All construing is bipolar—all personal constructs have opposites. It was as if Kelly felt the pull of those opposites in his own life, to the point of both boldly announcing and then questioning his own life’s work.

One major pull for Kelly was his great breadth of vision coupled with his equally great attention to detail. One can relate that also to the theory’s *Creativity Cycle*. To create new ideas and new ways of relating to the world one cultivates a *loose*, wide-ranging view of events until a thought or feeling emerges that enables one to *tighten*, focus down upon that thought or feeling to see whether it really is a good idea or not. See Chapter 11, pp. 118–120, for more details of ‘tight’ versus ‘loose’ construing. Kelly’s own tendency to shift from breadth of vision to attention to detail gave many problems to those who knew him—particularly his students. Al Landfield claimed:

Kelly was a revolutionary in the guise of a very formal man. No students would be called by their first name until they had been awarded their doctorate. He was bound by many such rules. Then the revolutionary would take over and he would become the warm, excited, involved, creator of ideas. (Fransella, 1995)

Could it be that this ability or tendency to shift from the tight to the loose construer in any way was related to his possibly conflicting religious experiences? He received his early life and education largely from his Presbyterian Minister father and lived for some time in the Bible-belt of America. He then was exposed to the much looser religious culture in his adolescence and early adult life at a Quaker College and then at a Quaker university. See Weihs (2004) for a discussion of the possible influence of Quaker beliefs on Kelly's theory of personal constructs.

GEORGE A. KELLY: INFLUENCES ON HIS THEORY AND PHILOSOPHY

Influences from Psychology

Many of the influences on Kelly's thinking are discussed in other chapters in this book. The obvious negative influences he saw at the time he developed his theory were behaviourism and the psychodynamic approaches, although the former seemed to be especially objectionable to him. He saw both of these as denying us any right to make decisions and be in charge of our own lives. The behaviourism of Kelly's day made the person a passive respondent to environmental events—in Bannister's (1966b) ironic words, 'a ping pong ball with a memory'. Bannister (2003) provides a comparison between behaviourism and personal construct theory. On the other hand, early psychodynamic theorists made the person a passive respondent to internal unconscious forces. For Kelly, we are forms of motion and we propel ourselves—no one person or no one thing does it 'to' us. Thus, Kelly can be seen as the 'loyal opposition' to the dominant psychologies of his day, challenging them while maintaining a commitment to developing a more humane alternative.

Influences from Philosophy

In contrast to Kelly's rejection of most of established psychology, he drew more eagerly on cutting edge developments in the philosophy of his day. He frequently cited the pragmatist and religious thinker John Dewey as one of the main philosophers to influence him, a connection analyzed by Bill Warren (2003). Trevor Butt considers how Kelly's thinking may also have been influenced to some degree by phenomenology (2003). Beyond these two sources of philosophic inspiration, it is clear that Kelly drew on the linguistic philosophy of Alfred Korzybski in his ideas that 'constructs' are interpretations that say at least as much about their human users as they do about the 'realities' they purport to describe. Likewise, Kelly acknowledged the influence of Hans Vaihinger's (1924) philosophy of '*as if*' in his formulation of constructive alternativism, and the psychodrama of Jakob Moreno in shaping the make-believe, role-playing strategies that occupies an important place in personal construct therapy. Thus, although he was highly original, Kelly was situated within a broader set of intellectual developments in the early twentieth century, importing and systematizing these themes in the construction of a unique approach to psychology (Neimeyer & Stewart, 2000).

Influences from Physics and Mathematics

It has been suggested that Kelly's degree in physics and mathematics may have played a major role in the development of his theory and his method of measurement—the repertory grid (Fransella, 1983, 2000). Most strikingly, Kelly asked us to look at individuals 'as if' each of us were a scientist, each having a theory about what is currently happening to us, each making a prediction based on that theory and then each testing out that prediction by behaving. That is the basis of construing and, in that model, behaviour becomes the experiment rather than an end result. Personal construct theory takes the quantum mechanics view that none of us has neutral access to reality. Einstein's relativity theory, among other things, sees the world as an undivided whole in which all parts merge into one another. Kelly says: 'The universe . . . is integral. By that we mean it functions as a single unit with all its imaginable parts having an exact relationship to each other' (1955/1991, p. 7/Vol. 1, p. 5). Al Landfield tells how a physicist commented at one of his personal construct seminars that 'Kelly's theory can be seen as a good theory of physics' (Fransella, 1995).

As to mathematics, there is a branch called *mathematical constructivism*. These minority party mathematicians stand against the majority who take the *Platonic* stance which says that mathematical statements are there to be discovered, having an independent reality apart from the human mind. Mathematical constructivists on the other hand argue, along with Kelly (1954), that such 'ideas are not discovered, they are invented'. In addition to this general philosophic compatibility with developments in mathematical theory, Kelly commonly drew on his love of mathematical concepts and methods to conjure and measure some of the complexity of psychological space. He is reported by Hinkle as saying: 'Johann Herbart's work on education and particularly mathematical psychology influenced me. I think mathematics is the pure instance of construct functioning—the model of human behaviour' (1970, p. 91).

Other Influences

Because of its great scope and richness, personal construct psychology can be viewed as situated in a vast web of reciprocal influences with other important developments in twentieth-century thought, and indeed, with broader traditions of human understanding that span millennia. For example, Mair (1985) has argued persuasively that Kelly's theory represents a counterpoint to the religious ideology of his conservative Christian parents, in which he emphasizes the human potential to live boldly and unconventionally, by audacious experimentation rather than blind faith in authority (see also Warren, 2003, on personal construct theory and religion, pp. 387–394). Could that counterpoint be related to his later exposure to the Quaker religion during the latter part of his education? Existential themes of choice and agency clearly pervade the theory, as well as an ethic of advocating construing the outlooks of others as a precondition for meaningful role relationships on personal or cultural levels (see also Scheer, 2003). Deeper currents in Euro-American thought no doubt also shaped Kelly's thinking, such as his evident belief

in human progress, and his fundamental individualism. But in a sense, Kelly's genius resided in the way he integrated these many streams of thought into a comprehensive, coherent, practical, and generative theory, one that is still being actively elaborated by psychologists and social theorists around the world. It is this final topic, the reception of Kelly's theory, to which we now turn.

DEVELOPMENT OF PERSONAL CONSTRUCT THEORY SINCE 1955

A consideration of the development of personal construct theory as a field since 1955 could yield a book in itself—indeed, it has done just that. Neimeyer (1985c) has drawn on models and methods devised in the sociology of science to depict the theory's social and intellectual emergence from the 'normal science' of its day. It first represented a radical departure in psychological theory, then moved through the evolution of small 'clusters' and larger 'networks' of like-minded researchers, to become the established and diversified 'specialty' that it is today. At each stage of its development, the theory encountered important challenges, such as the premature death of its founder, the need to develop international cohesiveness in the pre-internet era, the establishment of training centres inside and outside academia, and the creation of respected publication outlets for the work of group members. That such challenges were met successfully is evident in the range and vitality of chapters that make up this volume.

Here, however, we would like to focus on four particular issues: the abstract, 'value free', orientation of the theory; the ambivalent relationship between personal construct theory and cognitive perspectives; the difficulty in grasping the developmental implications of the theory; and the distinctive nature of its major methodologies.

FOUR ISSUES ARISING FROM PERSONAL CONSTRUCT THEORY

Its 'Value Free' Orientation

One of the remarkable features of personal construct theory—and one that no doubt contributes to the flexibility with which it has been applied to people and problems of all sorts—is its abstract, content-free orientation. Unlike many psychological theorists, Kelly did not propose a detailed list of human needs, motives, conflicts or ideals that presumably hold for all people, but instead focused on the general *processes* by which people made sense of, and navigated, the social world. This abstractness makes personal construct theory about as 'value free' as a theory of personality could aspire to be, and helps the clinician, psychological scientist and general observer of human events to 'step inside' the outlooks of those persons they seek to understand. Kelly enshrined a respect for individual and cultural differences in his basic theory, and advocated a *credulous*, rather than critical approach as the more enlightened way to either study human beings or attempt to promote their

development across a range of settings. As Kelly (1955/1991, p. 608/Vol. 2, p. 37) noted:

In the broadest sense we are restating here the philosophy of constructive alternativism. In a narrower sense we are describing the value system of the clinician [or psychologist more generally] as a kind of liberalism without paternalism. The clinician is not only tolerant of varying points of view . . . , but he is [also] willing to devote himself to the defence and facilitation of widely differing patterns of life. Diversity and multiple experimentation are to be encouraged.

Thus, decades before respect for diversity became the watchword in psychology and related disciplines, Kelly strove to draft a genuinely respectful psychology in which the active appreciation of alternative perspectives and ways of life was at the core.

Still, some have argued that personal construct theory is not truly value free; even celebrating and exploring diversity is, after all, a value. Clearly, Kelly did have his values, which he enshrined in his theory: risk-taking, adventure, creativity, and an unwillingness to settle for conventional answers to life's probing questions (Mair, 1985; Walker, 1992). In fact, it would not be too much to say that personal construct theory and like-minded constructivist perspectives even carry with them an ethical mandate, to 'try on for size' the initially alien or threatening perspectives of others, according them the same level of potential validity as one's own (Mair, 1989a; Neimeyer, 2002b). Ultimately, then, personal construct theory enjoins us to deal with the question of values by both recognizing the values implicit in our own core constructs, and attempting, insofar as possible, to accord equal legitimacy to the value perspectives of those persons we seek to comprehend.

Personal Construct Theory and Cognition

One prominent psychologist who hailed George Kelly as the creator of the theoretical model of cognitive or thought processes was one of his students, Walter Mischel. In a personal tribute to Kelly, Mischel (1980, p. 85) said:

That George Kelly was a very deep, original, refreshing voice was always evident to all who knew him well. What has surprised me was not the brilliance with which he first spoke but the accuracy with which he anticipated the directions into which psychology would move two decades later.

A little later, Mischel (1980, p. 86) continues: 'Long before "cognitive psychology" existed, Kelly created a truly cognitive theory of personality, a theory in which how people construe is at the core.'

Although Mischel's tribute appropriately acknowledges the role of Kelly's thinking in foreshadowing the enthusiasm for cognitive science and cognitive therapy that was so apparent in the second half of the twentieth century, many contemporary personal construct theorists take exception to their theory being closely aligned with cognitive perspectives. Certainly, Kelly took great pains to emphasize that his theory was at least as concerned with human passion and action as with thought, and at a fundamental level, he attempted to integrate all of these features of human

functioning in his definition of the construct. In Chapter 2 (pp. 15–28), entitled ‘The logic of passion’, Don Bannister discusses the thought–feeling dichotomy.

The common tendency to assimilate personal construct theory into a cognitive framework ignores much in the theory—such as its novel treatment of emotions as signals of a sometimes threatening transition in our construing. In turn that reflects the priority of an ingrained cultural construct that contrasts thinking with feeling, as well as the role of historical accidents, such as the publication of the first three chapters of Kelly’s basic theory as a convenient and widely read paperback, while the ‘emotional’ and ‘action-oriented’ parts of the theory were relegated to Kelly’s two-volume *magnum opus* encountered by relatively few readers. The resulting selective reading of the theory has given it more of a cognitive cast than it deserves, with many of its radical implications for understanding human behaviour remaining to be developed. Gabriele Chiari and Maria Laura Nuzzo discuss the many philosophical differences between cognitive and personal construct psychologies in Chiari and Nuzzo (2003).

Levels of Awareness

One aspect of Kelly’s theory that has not been emphasized so far, is the fact that his theory includes ‘fresh interpretations of “the unconscious”’. Freud argued that some psychological energy had to be present to explain why people did what they did. He called it ‘psychic energy’. Kelly said there is no need to create an energy system for human beings similar to that in physics. Human beings are not inert substances that need energy to move them. They are living matter and one crucial property of living matter is that it moves.

Having that as his starting point, Kelly then agreed with Freud that much of human construing takes place outside of consciousness. Instead of ‘the unconscious’ as the reservoir of psychic energy, he suggested the notion that there are *levels of awareness* with ‘conscious’ construing being at the highest level of awareness. At the lowest level is ‘preverbal’ construing. That consists of discriminations a baby and young child create to make sense of their experiences but they have no verbal labels attached to them. These preverbal constructs can account for much of our seemingly irrational reactions to events. As we develop over the years, we find verbal labels to attach to many of them and so are able to look at them in the cold light of day to see if they are still useful ways of looking at events. Much of counselling and psychotherapy is concerned with exactly that—finding verbal labels to attach to our preverbal construing. Thus, those who call personal construct theory a traditional ‘cognitive’ theory—meaning that it deals with only verbally or intellectually accessible thought processes—are taking no account of the majority of what Kelly calls construing. It is interesting to note that in this respect Kelly foreshadowed more contemporary cognitive theories, which now routinely recognize the limits of consciousness in grasping the ‘metacognitive’ basis of much of human functioning. Clearly, people ‘know’ much more than they can tell, in the sense that some of the bases on which we construe events in our lives can only be inferred, rather than directly reported. Much more will be said about the role of non-verbal

construing, particularly relating to core parts of our systems of meaning, in the chapters that follow.

Human Development

A recurrent complaint is that Kelly did not talk about development—that is, from birth to adulthood. It has been argued (Fransella, 1995) that the omission was deliberate, in the sense that the whole theory of personal constructs is about development—human beings are seen as forms of motion, no matter what our age. There is a second reason for the omission. The theory rejects all attempts to put people into categories or boxes. It follows that Kelly was sceptical of the prescriptive age-and-stage models that characterized the developmental theories of his day, even those of theorists like Piaget who shared some of his constructivist leanings.

A close inspection of Kelly's work shows that he was hardly lacking in experience with children. He spent several years at Fort Hays working extensively with children, and used frequent examples of children to illustrate theoretical issues in his two volumes. Instead, Kelly, like Werner and more recent developmental theorists, preferred to view human 'becoming' as a highly individualized process of psychological development, in which both children and adults constantly extend, revise and reorganize the system of meaning/emotion/action schemes that they construct (Mascolo et al., 1997). However, his rather abstract approach to developmental issues could have contributed to the relative neglect of this aspect of his theory, leaving its application to the world of childhood in need of further development. What we do know about the psychological development of children can be seen in the chapters in the *International Handbook of Personal Construct Psychology* (2003) of Jack Adams-Webber on research (Chapter 5, pp. 51–58), Jim Mancuso on how children develop psychologically and in particular their sense of self (Chapter 27, pp. 275–282) and Tom Ravenette (in this book) on working with children and teachers when children are seen as having problems (Chapter 13, pp. 133–143).

Scientific Research

Kelly's influence here is profound. Although it is not claimed that he, alone, started the change in research methods, it can certainly be claimed that his thinking has played a part. He suggested that his philosophy of *constructive alternativism* was an approach to science that was an alternative to the scientific method favoured by psychology, for which he coined the term *accumulative fragmentalism*. Details of the differences are given in Chiari and Nuzzo (2003, Chapter 4).

Qualitative as Well as Quantitative Methods

Kelly's repertory grid technique represented a creative and flexible set of methods—much expanded by subsequent construct theorists—that allow qualitative data to be quantified. As described specifically by Richard Bell in Chapter 6

(pp. 67–76), the grid technique addresses a central goal in personal construct theory, namely, bringing to light the distinctive ways that individual human beings or groups organize and interpret some aspect of their experience. Kelly's unique contribution was to show how these data can be given arithmetical equivalents by placing them within a repertory grid matrix consisting of rows of personal constructs and columns of items to be construed by those constructs. Although grid methods have proved useful in even rather informal paper and pencil forms, countless researchers and practitioners have made use of the burgeoning number of sophisticated computer programs for eliciting, analysing and interpreting grid data.

Less widely recognized, but equally novel, were Kelly's contributions to qualitative assessment of personal construct systems. Indeed, methods like self-characterization, in which a person is invited to write a free-form description of him- or herself from a sympathetic third-person perspective, anticipated the present surge of interest in narrative concepts and methods in psychology. Kelly's characteristically detailed recommendations for analysing and using such material in psychotherapy are congruent with the current expansion of hermeneutic, constructivist and interpretive methods in the social sciences, recognizing the contribution of both words and numbers to psychology as a human science (see Chapter 8 (pp. 87–94) and Butt (2003, Chapter 38)). Many different ways of eliciting and making sense of personal constructs have been created since 1955. Some of these are described in Chapters 4 (pp. 41–56) and 5 (pp. 57–66). Greg Neimeyer also gives a useful account of many such measures (1993).

CODA

We have tried to provide some historical context for the chapters that follow, both in terms of Kelly's distinctive biography, and in terms of the subsequent development of his theory. Doing so is in keeping with Kelly's emphasis on reflexivity, which places the theorist firmly within the purview of his theory, as well as his focus on anticipation, on how construct systems evolve as they stretch to embrace the future. Personal construct theory has clearly evolved since its origins in Kelly's work, while nonetheless retaining its distinctive core commitments. As such, the theory represents not only a reflexive distillation of the themes of Kelly's life, but also a highly original anticipation of its extensions over the half-century that followed.

