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ABSTRACT

“perpetual movement, and a border of mystery”: The Transatlantic Imagined Community and Henry James’ The Golden Bowl, Nancy Cunard and Negro: An Anthology, and Jean Rhys’ Wide Sargasso Sea

by

Oliver Quimby Melton

Dr. Beth Rosenberg, Examination Committee Chair
Associate Professor of English
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Many modernist writers attempted to transcend nationality but are ultimately unable to do so because of an unyielding fact of post-eighteenth century existence; namely, that a person possesses a nationality is an unavoidable, requisite donnée of modern life. This dissertation argues that this paradox was effectively resolved in the Atlantic world, an especially active locus of modernist meta-nationality, where a dialogic, unfinalizable transatlantic “nation” or, using Benedict Anderson’s term, “imagined community” formed. This study examines three particular writers and works that frame and contribute to the development of this imagined community. First, I argue that the ideal “Anglo-Saxon total” Henry James identifies in an 1888 letter to his brother William is his vision of this transatlantic imagined community and that The Golden Bowl represents James’ most concentrated literary expression of this community. Second, I argue that Nancy Cunard finds her most appropriate national identity as a member of the transatlantic imagined community and that the text for which she is arguably most
remembered, *Negro: An Anthology*, is itself an intensively dialogic textual space that sets up an unfinalizable interaction of European, American, African, and West Indian national groups. *Negro’s* set of unfinalizable elements, therefore, collectively suggest that the text, like Nancy Cunard, is comprehensively unfinalizable in terms of Atlantic world national identity. For this reason, I argue it is a textual representation of the transatlantic nation. Finally, I argue that *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a paradoxical representation of transatlantic community and colonial opposition: an incongruity that lends *Wide Sargasso Sea* a precise sense of historical accuracy. Representing the transatlantic nation in the late 1830s and early 1840s, *Wide Sargasso Sea* focuses on the Atlantic world as it developed from Empire into community, from prescribed, hegemonic, and ideologically homogeneous imperialism into self-proclaimed, populist community made up of diverse, dialogic, and unfinalizable regional constituencies.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION: "NOT REAL BUT REALLY THERE"

After all everybody, that is, everybody who writes is interested in living inside themselves in order to tell what is inside themselves. That is why writers have to have two countries, the one where they belong and the one in which they live really. The second one is romantic, it is separate from themselves, it is not real but it is really there.

- Gertrude Stein, Paris France

Even a cursory glance at the cover of the still-current, 1991 edition of Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane’s classic modernism textbook reveals a peculiar incongruity. The subtitle of Modernism reads “A Guide to European Literature,” while surrounding it are nine photos of canonical modernist writers from both Europe and the United States. Five photos are indeed of native European writers whose participation in European literature is unquestionable: E.M. Forster, André Gide, Federico García Lorca, Bertolt Brecht, and G.B. Shaw. Four of the photos, though, are of United States natives: Ernest Hemingway and Gertrude Stein, who participated in the literary lives of both the US and Europe, and Marianne Moore and Wallace Stevens, who by and large participated in the life of modernism as it operated in the US. Extended into the realms of association, perhaps, the inclusion of Hemingway, Stein, and Moore makes some sense. All three traveled widely throughout Western Europe, and Hemingway and Stein are, of course, celebrated expatriates. By some measure of sense, they can be appropriately included in a study of European literature, even if Moore lived most of her life and did most of her publishing in the United States. Stevens’ presence on the cover, below and to the right
of the subtitle, is more overtly problematic and almost laughable. In spite of his Symbolist-influenced poetry and his celebrated love of French wine and French paintings, the lawyer-insurance executive-poet famously never traveled to Europe and wrote poems about jars in Tennessee, ideas of order at Key West, and ordinary evenings in New Haven rather than doleful views of war-wasted London, portraits of American expatriate life, or re-workings of obscure Languedoc troubadours. Since the subtitle doesn’t appear on the inside title page, it likely owes its existence to an earnest, albeit slightly daft, cover editor who sought an efficient way to reference the text’s original 1976 publication in the Pelican “Guides to European Literature” series. (The text’s inclusion in this series is, of course, problematic in the same way the 1991 subtitle is.) Rather than elucidating the text’s subject or argument, as subtitles customarily do, the conflict created by the subtitle and the photos of the four Americans effectively complicates the text. It leaves one puzzled, wondering why a guide to European literature displays pictures of Americans and includes a chapter titled “Chicago and New York: Two Versions of American Modernism” (151-61). Even if the ultimate origins of modernist stylistics and thematics allow the photos, the chapter, and every discussion of American writers and American cities in the book to fall under the heading “European,” and thereby problematically essentialize all things modern as just that, the subtitle is an incongruous addition to the text, especially when presented so self-evidently. Probably wisely removed in any subsequent editions, the curious subtitle nevertheless reminds modernist studies of two very important things. First, it illustrates just how difficult it can be to assign national identity to the texts and figures of modernism. Second, the subtitle suggests that thirty years after the
publication of Bradbury and McFarlaine’s original textbook and more than fifteen years since the release of the second edition, modernist studies is still wrestling with this same problem. Perhaps herein lies the subtitle’s only virtue.

Certainly modernism’s origins were in European culture; but by the 1920s, the movement had grown far beyond wherever or with whomever one wants to place those origins.¹ As Bradbury and McFarlane themselves allow,

No single nation ever owned Modernism even though many of the multiform movements of which it was made did have national dimensions and origins in specific regions of European culture. Many if not most of its chief creators crossed frontiers, cultures, languages and ideologies in order to achieve it. As George Steiner has put it [in Extraterritorial: Papers on Literature and the Language Revolution], it was an art of the ‘extra-territorial’, the art of an age of modern relativism and of a time when all frontiers were in vital and often dangerous flux. (13)

Indeed, the moderns’ sense and practices of extra-territoriality were probably necessitated by the vital and often dangerous national fluxes going on in the world around them. It’s not as if the moderns made a choice to move around while the political frontiers and national identities of the Western world remained constant, after all. Indeed, the growth of modernism and modernity during the twentieth century signaled the end of constant, if not fully “stable,” international orders that had persisted from at least the early nineteenth century. The Russian Revolution of 1917; the various incarnations of German leadership and state organization from 1871 to 1990; the end of the Austro-Hungarian Empire after WWI; the birth and death of the
League of Nations (1919-1945) and, in 1945, the emergence of its progeny the United Nations; the death (1939) and rebirth (1975) of the Spanish monarchy; the naissance of the British protectorate after WWI and, during the mid-twentieth century, the de facto dissolution of the sunset-less Empire—in a handful of generations, Europe was shaken multiple times into radically different systems of organization, interrelation, and political geography. The United States was also affected by modernity’s geopolitical restructurings. Between 1889 and 1912, eight states were admitted into the Union; and even if the immediate moment of this territorial flux was largely peaceful, it lived in the blood-soaked, nineteenth-century shadow of wars with Mexico and aboriginal tribes. Additionally, American involvement in Cuba, the Philippines, and even Hawai‘i during the early twentieth century approached the levels of violence and reformation seen in many contemporary European national experiences.

As a result of such political restructurings, national identity became, for modernist figures, simply another unstable variable inherited from preceding generations. The response to this state of affairs, at least in the days of European “high” modernism, was fairly standardized: intellectual detachment from the goings-on of politics and national affairs via conscientious objection and art that dealt with politics indirectly, if at all. Duncan Grant, David Garnett, and other members of the so-called “Bloomsbury Group” worked off their debts to the British war effort at Charleston farmhouse, narrowly escaping imprisonment for their consciences. Likewise, because of his pacifism, D.H. Lawrence spent the Great War years under various forms of nightmarish, DORA-inspired harassment. Yet, the most political writing he produced was *Women in Love* which, like its predecessor *The Rainbow*,
generated controversy not because of its oblique political content but because of its explorations of human sexuality. Septimus Smith’s madness, the scarred populace of 1920s London recorded in *The Waste Land*, the mysterious injury of Jake Barnes, Lord Chatterley’s broken, sexless, and wheelchair-bound body—we see national politics in 1920s modernism largely in terms of the human toll and oblique aftermath, rarely in direct glances. A scene from Virginia Woolf’s *The Years* capably represents the general modernist sentiment regarding the national reorganizations and violence of the early twentieth century. Waiting out a 1917 WWI German aerial offensive in a London cellar, sisters Sarah and Maggie Pargiter, their cousin Eleanor, Maggie’s French husband “Renny,” and the Polish-American Nicholas deal with the panic by drinking a bitterly ironic toast to “the New World” that sanctions and creates the mechanized extensions of national policy flying overhead (292). Sheltering themselves from the violence of national politics, they question leaving the relative safety of their cellar:

“Let’s go upstairs,” said Renny …

“And leave this cellar,” said Sara, stretching her arms out, “this cave of mud and dung …”

“Listen!” Maggie interrupted. She held up her hand. “I thought I heard the guns again …”

They listened. The guns were still firing, but far away in the distance. There was a sound like the breaking of waves on a shore far away.

“They’re only killing other people,” said Renny savagely. He kicked the wooden box.
“But you must let us think of something else,” Eleanor protested. The mask had come down over his face.

“And what nonsense, what nonsense Renny talks,” said Nicholas, turning to her privately. “Only children letting off fireworks in the back garden,” he muttered as he helped her out of her dressing-gown. (293)

Minimizing the war machines and the politicians that guide them as “children letting off fireworks” in as controlled a space as an English garden, Nicholas expresses the disdain the moderns felt for and the detachment they sought from national politics with emotion that matches “the very cold winter's night, so silent that the air seemed frozen” (297). Like her characters from The Years and many of her fellow moderns, Woolf herself seems to have taken on a similar meta-national mantle. Using gender as a means by which to transcend the national, in Three Guineas Woolf famously writes: “... [a]s a woman, I have no country. As a woman I want no country. As a woman my country is the whole world” (109).

Others follow suit. In 1914, Henry James seethed over US non-involvement in WWI and watched his beloved Europe crumble before his aging eyes as a direct result of naively intense national alliances. But the most political artistic act he could manage was adding an awkward section to a novel he’d abandoned in 1900 that’s left to us as the half-finished, time-travel fable known as The Sense of the Past. Even though critics hotly debate their role in the development of early 20th century modernism,2 writers of the 1930s, traditionally seen as more politically engaged than their 1920s counterparts, were certainly no less internationally mobile and nationally destabilized than their “high” modern predecessors. In the literature of the 1930s,
nationalism and nationality are ultimately still things aestheticized and thereby treated with a certain distance via representation. They were issues written into poems such as Auden’s “Spain 1937,” into novels such as Huxley’s Ape and Essence, and into allegories such as Orwell’s Animal Farm. Looking back on his time in Paris, the veritable Petri dish of modernism, Saul Bellow expresses the moderns’ sense of nonchalance vis-à-vis nationalism in the essay “My Paris.” He writes, “To be Modern, you see, meant to be detached from tradition and traditional sentiments, from national politics and, of course, from the family” (236). Again highlighting the detachment from national politics inherent to the modern mindset, Bellow elsewhere quotes Harold Rosenberg’s essay “On the Fall of Paris” where the art critic argues Paris of the early twentieth century was where one could be freed “from national folklore, national politics, national careers” (132).

Expatriates, wanderers, exiles, and émigrés, writers of the early twentieth century consistently attempted to achieve meta-nationalism by transcending the national identity question altogether. Whether trying to create an outside position from which to comment on their native culture, trying to create a lifestyle of alienation and alterity to drive their art, or simply trying to broaden their political and cultural perspectives across Europe, the Americas, and sometimes Africa (in the cases of modern primitivism and negrophilia, for example), the moderns were a restless, ever-moving lot. Certainly, regional distinctions have arisen within modernist studies and are vigorously defended; but as Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane argue, One of the more striking features of Modernism is its wide geographical spread, its multiple nationality. Scanning the pattern of its development east to
west, from Russia to the United States, one notes the emergence of artistic phenomena, explosions of consciousness, generational conflicts which—even if not always contemporaneous—show remarkable similarity. Yet each of the contributing countries has its own cultural inheritance, its own social and political tensions, which impose distinctively national emphases upon Modernism and leave any account which relies on a single national perspective misleadingly partial.¹ (95)

Fitting and appropriate for a movement that explored the subjective experience and sought to break down many forms of objectivity, the modernists’ attempts at transcending nationality effectively destabilized the national identities of many major modernist writers. T.S. Eliot of St. Louis and Harvard can be found listed in anthologies of both British and American poetry, The Waste Land taught in both “American” and “British” modernism seminars as a significant example of both canons even though, in terms of its subject matter, the poem has little connection with the US whatsoever. Continuing the pedagogical question, D.H. Lawrence would likely never be included in an American modernism class, though he might have a claim to be,² but rather would be down the hall in a “British” section and on the same syllabus with Joyce, Beckett, and W.B. Yeats all of whom, like most Irishmen, would probably bristle at being labeled “British” at all. What to do with Ezra Pound who dusted his hands of both the US and England, lived widely on the Continent, participated in troubling ways in Fascist Italian politics against the US, returned to the nation of his birth only to be spurned by Roosevelt and then, famously, under duress to be charged with the potentially capital offense of treason? He was then
imprisoned as a lunatic in the American capital and finally, upon his release from St. Elizabeth's, moved back to Italy where he was eventually buried in Venice's famous San Michele cemetery. Writers who have similarly destabilized national identities would include Ernest Hemingway, Gertrude Stein, and the three writers considered in this dissertation: Henry James, Nancy Cunard, and Jean Rhys. James was born not only an American but a Bostonian and yet lived abroad for the vast majority of his life, commented on the US as a foreign visitor in the The American Scene, and became a British subject as an act of opposition to his birth country's non-participation in the Great War. Cunard, born into a similarly prominent British family, spent her life roaming the Atlantic world in a hyper-destabilized state of exile-from-everywhere while vehemently rejecting her British heritage. Rhys was born on the fringes of the decaying British Empire to a Welsh father and Creole mother of Scots descent on the Caribbean island of Dominica, saw England for the first time in her late teens, and oscillated between Paris and London for the rest of her life as, in Shari Benstock' words, “an outsider among outsiders” (448).

In these examples, as in the many, many others, national identity is destabilized for the moderns in profound and unique ways that render most attempts at labeling those listed “American” or “British” unconvincing and misleading. As a point of comparison, Romanticism, a movement often cited as analogous to modernism, also saw its share of international movement, adoption, warfare, and commentary. Romantics such as the Shelleys and Byron traveled widely, adopted international causes (and in Byron’s case even foreign dress), and looked back on mother England with acutely critical eyes. However, are they not solidly “English”
writers? Likewise, few would ever argue that Mark Twain, a comparably well-traveled and urbane nineteenth-century figure, is anything but an iconic American writer and cultural figure. In modernism, these sorts of assurances are nowhere near as certain; claiming modern expatriate writers as national “ours” is nowhere near as easy a task. I would argue this disconnection between nineteenth-century writers and the moderns exists because the former writers sought a sort of internationality that maintained customary national unities and oppositions. Twain and Byron, for example, accepted their birth nationalities and maintained them as perspectives from which to comment on other nations and cultures and to compare their home nations to the international scene. Essentially, this is the sort of “‘international’ state of mind” (Henry James to William James 213) Henry James inherited and expresses his disdain for in the 1888 letter discussed in the second chapter of this study. Such a process of comparing-and-contrasting differs starkly from the sort of transcendent meta-nationality the moderns sought, what’s often referred to as either “transnationality” or “cosmopolitanism” in modernist studies. Put another way, it wasn’t enough for the moderns to internationalize themselves as Americans, Irishmen, or Britons. Rather, they attempted to become true citizens of the world, to give up their homelands by seeking a wholesale transcendence of nationality and the divisive identity and civic politics inherent to it.

However, as their legacies have come down to us, the internationally mobile moderns failed to achieve full separation from their birth nations. The residue of traditional national organization has always remained intact. For example, both James Joyce and Samuel Beckett exiled themselves from their native Ireland. After World
War II, Beckett was even writing exclusively in French, preferring, in his own words, "France at war to Ireland at peace" (Shenker 310). However, both have been continually repatriated, as it were, to service Irish national aims, creating a tension between national rejection and national bondage. Further illustrating the impossibility of fully separating oneself from his/her birth nation is the persistence with which we still consider certain writers and texts "British" or "American" even though their lives and thematic concerns present us with far more complicated state of affairs. Additionally, as I suggest, one can choose to exchange citizenships; but most of the moderns who floated about in the international cultural currents of their day didn't take formal steps to change their political, "passport" national identities even though they effectively destabilized our abilities to otherwise ascribe national affiliation to them. Though they exiled themselves from England and the United States respectively, neither Lawrence nor Pound, for example, actually became political citizens of any country other than their birth nations. Aldous Huxley, who lived in Southern California from 1937 until his death in 1963, applied for US citizenship after WWII but was denied because he wouldn't swear to take up arms and defend the nation if the necessity arose. Of the other writers mentioned, only James, Eliot, and Auden actually became citizens (in a sworn-allegiance, political sense of the word) of a nation different from that in which they were born. Ultimately, though, this question of whether or not a given modern changed his/her political citizenship seems to matter very little. Apparently, it is just one more unreliable system of ascribing national identity to modern writers since we arguably experience the same amount of anxiety whether we categorize James and Eliot (both British citizens at death) as
of his professional life) and Huxley (who tried to renounce his citizenship and lived in California for twenty-six years) as "British" writers.

Cultural affiliation, national residency, citizenship status—there simply seems to be no reliable standard by which to categorize Anglophonic moderns into satisfactory, national groups. Thus, we have inconsistent and taxonomically capricious methods of doing so that fail to account for the inherent (inter)national instability of the movement. Indeed, modernism quickly makes a mess of our ultimately flawed, yet incredibly persistent, tendency to divide the twentieth century English-language literary canon and the surrounding critical constellation into two Atlantic spheres, assigning constituent members to the former, and therefore works to the latter, apparently based only on a given author's nation of birth. Certainly a popular way to categorize writers in terms of nationality, this method nevertheless problematically favors a given writer's place of birth over the life s/he actually lived. As such, this study attempts to contribute to recent critical trends within modernist studies: trends that challenge traditional pedagogical and critical norms that section-off English-language literature of the 1890s-1930s into neat nationalities—what Wai Chee Dimock has labeled "deceptively sovereign units" (215) and offer alternative methods of organizing, teaching, and interpreting international literary modernism that, like Lawrence S. Rainey's recent anthology and a Fall 2006 special issue of *Modernism/modernity* titled *Modernism and Transnationalisms*, accommodate "the transnational reach of modernism" (Simon Gikandi, "Modernism in the World" 422) and its resulting national instability.
Toward this goal, this dissertation argues that the moderns successfully destabilized national identity as no movement before them had been able to. However, in trying to achieve extra-territoriality and in making the postures of (inter)national flux and attempts at meta-national transcendence I outline, these moderns attempt to circumvent an unyielding fact of post-eighteenth century existence, namely, that the possession of national identity is not something one can accept or reject. Rather, that a person possesses a nationality is an unavoidable, requisite donné of modern life. Certainly, one can choose to give up citizenship in the nation of his or her birth and to adopt the citizenship of another nation, but even this is a question of where one wants to be nationalized and not whether one wants to be nationalized. Similarly, one can choose national exile (or have it forced upon him/her), but the experience is always ultimately impure. An exile will usually be seen as just that: simply a member of nation x living elsewhere. Complicating and confusing his/her national identity, the exile’s birth nationality can often seem even more accentuated than usual because of the frustrated space placed between self and birth nation. Many nationalism theorists have noted the indispensability of nationality in the modern world. For example, drawing a parallel between the necessity of national identity and Adelbert von Chamisso’s novella Peter Schlemiehl—wherein the eponymous main character sells his shadow to the devil and thereby provokes revulsion from his fellow soldiers—Ernest Gellner argues that for Chamisso, an emigré Frenchman in Germany during the Napoleonic period ... the Man without a Shadow was the Man without a Nation. ... A man without a nation defies the recognized categories and provokes revulsion. ... A man must have
a nationality as he has a nose and two ears ... All this seems obvious, though, alas, it is not true. But that it should have come to seem so obviously true is indeed an aspect, or perhaps the very core, of the problem of nationalism. Having a nation is not an inherent attribute of humanity, but it has now come to appear as such. (6)

Benedict Anderson shares Gellner’s sense that modern men and women are inevitably bound to national identities. “Theorists of nationalism have often been perplexed ... by ... three paradoxes,” he writes, the second of which is

[t]he formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept—in the modern world everyone can, should, will ‘have’ a nationality, as he or she ‘has’ a gender—vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such that, by definition, ‘Greek’ nationality is sui generis. (5)

Anderson concludes the paragraph containing these paradoxes with a quotation from Tom Nairn’s polemical The Break-up of Britain. With none of Anderson’s objectivity, Nairn links nationalism with individual neurosis, describing both as “inescapable” and “largely incurable” (359). Confronting the inescapable limitations of nationality in the modern world, then, the modernist push towards extra-territoriality and meta-nationality creates a paradox since one cannot be both meta-national and inexorably bound by nationality at the same time.

This paradox certainly acts upon modernist writers and texts, but it outright harasses those who study modernism. After all, gratifying the precept that all must be nationalized, we continually use the set of traditional nationalities available to us to taxonomize modernism and modernist studies into neat, albeit falsely simplistic,
national units simply because this is the most convenient and efficacious course of action. Thus, no matter how we, as sympathetic and responsible readers, may want to accommodate the meta-nationality inherent to modernist studies, we aren’t always able to do so because of the persistent demands we face for clear and direct seminar titles (“Studies in Modern American Literature”), Library of Congress subject headings (“English Fiction – 20th Century”), and identity labels for ourselves as literature students, teachers, and critics (“I’m a British modernist”). Their limitations aside, teachers and students regularly perceive labels such as “American,” “British,” and “French” as immediately communicative and universally understood. The same cannot be said for more creative and particularized identity models. Thus, while our best intentions may lead us away from faulty nationality labels, the realities and demands of academic culture frequently trump our intellectual aspirations. Indulging such limitations, though, ultimately prevents us from conceptualizing and examining modernism in the creative national terms modernist figures established and leave modernist studies limited by and trapped in the paradox of our subject matter. Better options are available to us, options that recognize nationality as an inescapable part of modern life and yet accommodate the complex national identities the moderns formed.

Interested in establishing such a model, this dissertation argues that the paradox of modern national identity effectively resolved itself in the Atlantic world, an especially active locus of modern meta-nationality, where a textual “nation” or, using Benedict Anderson’s term, an “imagined community” developed among certain English-language writers and intellectuals. Composed of multiple traditional
nationalities and yet a form of national identification in its own right, this nation satisfies both the moderns’ desire for meta-nationality and their inescapable debt to national identity. Referencing the Stein epigraph, and envisioning “country” as a sort of thesauristic, cousin-word for “nation,” I argue certain nationally-destabilized, transatlantic moderns find their most comfortable national identity as part of this nation in which they “live really” (Stein 2). Wholly imagined, fundamentally textual as an Andersonian imagined community, possessing amorphous geographical borders, and built around an ever-shifting, unstable ocean that itself reflects the sheer dynamism and fluidity of the community—during the early twentieth century, certain moderns developed a transatlantic nation out of the (inter)national chaos of the day and their own destabilized national identities that is, again referencing Stein, “not real but ... really there” (2).

The concept of nations and nationalism was extremely important to the development of modernism as a whole, making the development of entities such as a transatlantic nation very nearly inevitable. In a recent special issue of Modernism/modernity titled “Modernism and Transnationalisms,” Sonia Sarker writes that in the turn-of-the-last-century’s battle of modernities, the nation-state was “the universal model under dispute” among various philosophies for various ends (561). Sarker suggests it was the nation-state that likewise acted as “the crucible for modernism and modernity emerging from the late-nineteenth into the twentieth century” (561) and that “nationalism is the vessel for modernism and modernity” (562). Echoing the paradox outlined above, Sarker also suggests modern “Trans/nationalism takes ... simultaneous and contradictory forms” (562). Trapped
by, and yet attempting to transcend, national identity, wary of nation-state politics, and with yet the national question so acutely present in their lives, it makes a great deal of sense, that an non-governmental nation, such as the one I examine in the Atlantic world, would grow out of the modern moment as a sort of mediating compromise between the incongruent and wildly combative national elements the early and middle twentieth century.

Furthermore, just as the development of the transatlantic nation allows these moderns not to satisfy their debt to modern nationality and paradoxical desire for national transcendence, it allows us as critics, teachers, and students to retire old and problematic terms such as "American" and "British" in favor of less exclusionary, more satisfactory terms. Accommodating other (not necessarily exclusionary) forms of modern categorization, similar terms ("transeuropean," "Anglo-American," "Afro-Caribbean," "Euromodernism," "geomodernism," "Atlantic modernism/modernity") will continue to arise and thereby allow us to classify modern writers in more complex ways appropriate to the composite orders of nationality they formed. In fact, not wanting to replace one set of unreliable category-limitations with an equally problematic and limited body of organizers, my concept of a transatlantic nation is permeable with regards to membership and comfortably overlaps with other forms of modern international taxonomies. In fact, I conceive of the transatlantic imagined community as one unit of a Venn diagram where it and certain other unities are placed in partnered, overlapping, non-exclusionary relationships. In this way, I, like Simon Gikandi (419-24), understand the question of modern nationality, of which my vision of a transatlantic nation is a part, as a series of liquid unities in relationships.
with other liquid unities, overlapping and engaging in complex interactions made up of clusters of traditional national groups. Though she quarrels more with the various temporalities and periodizations of modernism rather than the sorts of national category issues I focus on, in this sense I share Susan Stanford Friedman’s recent sense of urgency to facilitate

a move from singularities to pluralities of space and time, from exclusivist formulations of modernity and modernism to ones based in global linkages, and from nominal modes of definition to relational ones.

(“Periodizing Modernism” 426)

These entwining sorts of macro-organizational models reflect the diversity and complexity one finds at the micro-levels of their design. The transatlantic nation, for example, is itself no stable synthesis of elements. Rather, this imagined community is a volatile, dialogic space where the residues of European, American, African, and West Indian national groups interact with one another. While the transatlantic nation defines itself in opposition to older forms of national identity and national categorization, it is a collage of these same forms, in proper modern fashion, making something new out of old particulate. Composed of the multi-voiced, dialogic, and unsynthesizable mediation processes between the paradox of modern nationality and the residues of traditional Atlantic national organization, the transatlantic nation finds its most effective expression in dialogic and polyphonic texts such as *Negro: An Anthology* and the novel which as Mikhail Bakhtin argues is intrinsically dialogic and polyphonic and therefore capably accommodates the sort of intensive dialogue energizing the transatlantic nation. Sonita Sarker suggests such
The links between genre and the moderns’ desire to “expose the contingency of nation” is profound:

[T]he literary genre (the novel, the poem) is not just the container of this desire but its very shape. Genre becomes desire for the subject in and beyond the boundary of the nation, in and beyond the limits of historical period. (562)

Thus, extending Bakhtin’s theories of novelistic dialogism and unfinalizability into this particular cultural space helps explain how the polyphonic diversity and internationality of the transatlantic imagined community found its binding agent and developed into one of the major cross-cultural forces of twentieth-century, Anglophonic literature.

Conceived as units of an Andersonian “imagined community,” the three texts discussed in this study, *The Golden Bowl*, *Negro: An Anthology*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, are themselves representations and disseminators of the transatlantic nation. Considerably more focused on issues of historical development and gender/queer politics than I intend to be, Laura Doyle makes note of the relationship between the transatlantic imagined community and its literature as well as the distinctive identity of modern transatlantic writers and texts:

This long story of Atlantic history and English-language literature sheds a different light on English-language modernism. It suggests that there is something we can call Atlantic modernism, which would include writers identified with a range of literary race traditions. These writers craft metafictions of this Atlantic history, some more critically or consciously than others. (545)
The three texts discussed in this dissertation command a place in this a canon of Atlantic “metafictions” and are among the most reflexive, reflecting, and representational in this conceptual body of works, both of transatlanticism in general and of the various dialogisms of the transatlantic nation in particular. As for the creators of these three texts, not only are James, Cunard, and Rhys complimentarily cosmopolitan and nationally decentered in terms of their biographies, they all lived the experience of modern transatlanticism and created literary representations of the particular national anxieties of the Atlantic world. The works of these restless writers are intimately connected with, and reflect their own, transatlantic biographies and therefore make a satisfying triptych for investigating the animated textuality of the transatlantic imagined community.

In James’ *The Golden Bowl*, Cunard’s *Negro: An Anthology*, and Rhys’ *Wide Sargasso Sea*, the traditional national unities of the Atlantic world have broken down; and each text dramatizes various processes of hybridity and the formation of the transatlantic imagined community. Like this larger community, the texts are, therefore, wildly dialogic spaces where the old national residues of the Atlantic world (American, European, African, West Indian) interact to form a transatlantic whole. These texts are essentially portraits and imaginings of the transatlantic nation in action. Reflecting the personal experiences of each author, each chapter also deals with a particular face of the diverse, multi-racial and multi-cultural transatlantic nation: James the Anglo-Saxon/Continental Latin and Cunard and Rhys the African, West Indian, and European. Placing *The Golden Bowl*, *Negro*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea* in conjunction with one another, therefore, allows me to present several of the racial
experiences of the modern transatlantic nation. Finally, the chapters are organized so that they move chronologically across the modern moment as it developed in the Atlantic world: from *The Golden Bowl* (1904), to *Negro: An Anthology* (1934), to *Wide Sargasso Sea* (1966).

First, seeking an outright transcendence of both the customary nation and the discordant form of internationalism he describes in an 1888 letter to his brother William, I argue that the ideal “Anglo-Saxon total” (Henry James to William James 213) Henry James identifies in this letter is his vision of the transatlantic imagined community. However, even though James identifies literature, “fiction in particular,” as the “magnificent arm” of this Anglo-Saxon union (Henry James to William James 213), the Master found it persistently difficult to actually create fictions that manifested his ideal. Instead, the second chapter shows the majority of James’ international, transatlantic novels are, ironically, representations of the sort of internationalism he reviles in the 1888 letter to his brother, emphasizing the disconnect between the US and Europe, outlining the imbalance of their interactions, and suggesting a (re)union of the two is unlikely. Only *The Golden Bowl* suggests some fusion of the US and Europe, and therefore realization of the “big Anglo-Saxon total,” might indeed be possible. I argue, then, that this novel is James’ most concentrated literary expression, of the transatlantic unity he aspires to in the 1888 letter and his most profound representation of, and contribution to, the transatlantic imagined community.

Second, I argue that the biography of Nancy Cunard is particularly unfinalizable in terms of national identity. Cunard was a restless individual who spent
most of her life rejecting various aspects of her British birth nationality and wandering about the Atlantic world. In this way, she complements the many nationally-decentered modernist figures and literary characters discussed throughout this study and, as a result of her various rejections and peregrinations, cannot be comfortably categorized into any traditional Euro-American national unity. Yet, because of the inescapable fact that all must be nationalized in the modern world, she cannot transcend nationality all together. Resolving this paradox in the fashion described in the introduction, this chapter argues that Cunard finds her most comfortable national identity as a member of the transatlantic imagined community.

The text for which Cunard is arguably most remembered, *Negro: An Anthology*, is similarly unfinalizable. What ostensibly seems unified and finalized by its title—little more than a prominent and therefore understandably misleading description of one of the text’s many topics and possible genre identities—*Negro* is actually an intensively dialogic textual space, diverse and unfinalizable in terms of authorship and material textuality as well as in terms of genre, ethnic, cultural, and even linguistic identity. *Negro: An Anthology* is not, therefore, simply a cohesive collection of diasporic African culture. Rather, it is a veritable collage of the transatlantic nation that brings together texts and figures from around the Atlantic world into one textual space. In *Negro*, then, an unfinalizable dialogicity exists between the racial and cultural strains of the Atlantic world and, as a result, between European, American, African, and West Indian national groups. *Negro*’s set of unfinalizable elements, therefore, collectively suggest that, like Nancy Cunard, it is comprehensively unfinalizable in
terms of national identity and also that it can be understood as a textual representation of the transatlantic imagined community.

Third and finally, I argue that *Wide Sargasso Sea* presents a complex portrait of the transatlantic nation composed of various national parts—England, France, and certain West Indian nations such as Barbados, Jamaica, and Dominica—bound into a single community of commercial and social interaction. The characters of this transatlantic imagined community move, think, and live fluidly within it and are joined together in a self-contained, mutually-affective space. I argue, therefore, that *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the most substantial representation of the transatlantic nation in Rhys’ oeuvre and, in contrast to her other stories and novels, was received and circulated as such by various contemporary periodical reviews. The novel, though, is somewhat paradoxical. Alongside its representation of transatlantic community exists a robust portrait of regional identity, provincial difference, and colonial opposition: an incongruity that lends *Wide Sargasso Sea* a precise sense of historical accuracy.

Set in the late 1830s and early 1840s, *Wide Sargasso Sea* portrays an Atlantic world shifting from empire to community: a development precipitated in large part by the “creole” national developments Benedict Anderson suggests swept the Americas between the 1760s and 1830s. Such developments significantly altered, but did not erase, the notion of transatlantic unity established by first contact and developed over subsequent centuries. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the people of the Atlantic world began retiring prescribed, hegemonic, and ideologically homogeneous imperialism in favor of a self-proclaimed, populist community made up of diverse, dialogic, and unfinalizable regional constituencies. As the empire
recessed, this new community arose to organize the three-hundred-year-old transatlantic space: an imagined community in which provincial differences are neither erased nor synthesized as they are under empire but are rather set in dialogic, unfinalizable relationships. *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s paradoxical presentation of transatlantic unity and regionalism, then, represents the dramatic tensions that exist between transatlantic community, constituent regional identity, and empire. As such, the novel is an exceptionally complex, historically precise portrait of the development of the modern transatlantic nation.

Before developing this study as I have outlined, though, I need to examine certain topics and define certain terms heretofore presented as self-evident. Toward this end, the remainder of this introduction will proceed as follows. First, even though the best minds who’ve faced the task allow that defining “nationalism” is difficult to the point of absurdity,¹⁴ I first make a brief survey of the relevant criticism in an attempt to establish key points, even if not outright denotative definitions, regarding ways in which the concept of nationhood will be used in this study. I then discuss the topic as it has been appropriated in literary criticism and cosmopolitanism and then examine Bakhtinian dialogism, examining how the Russian critic’s theories of dialogism and unfinalizability provide the most appropriate models for understanding the cohesiveness of the diverse transatlantic nation, helping explain why and how this imagined community found its best expression and most vibrant life in the novel and texts such as *Negro*. Fourth and finally, I outline the ways in which this dissertation draws from and contributes to the larger academic discussion of “transatlanticism” current in the academy.
A relatively young exercise, the formal study of nations and nationalism has its earliest intellectual roots in social and political science. Likely because of Germany's fractured political history coupled with its strong Volk tradition, much of the early work on nationalism is German.\textsuperscript{15} The major early texts, however, date from just after WWI and WWII, as intellectuals attempted to come to terms with the brutality of world wars that had been fought largely as a result of fanatical nationalist ideologies.\textsuperscript{16} Over the course of the last quarter of the twentieth century, the topic has been widely appropriated by social scientists such as Anthony D. Smith and Ronald G. Suny;\textsuperscript{17} and while this dissertation is primarily a work of literary criticism, certain distinctions valuable to it have grown out of the considerations given the topic by such social and political scientists. First, for all his concerns about the political life of nations, Ernest Gellner, another significant contributor to social science's understanding of nationalism, puts forth two "cultural" and "voluntaristic" definitions of the nation that support the conclusion that nations and the nationalisms that drive them are essentially abstract belief systems that are self-imposed, self-maintained, and whose meaning, to whatever degree it exists, is self-ascribed by members:

1. Two men are of the same nation if and only if they share the same culture, where culture in turn means a system of ideas and signs and associations and ways of behaving and communicating.

2. Two men are of the same nation if and only if they recognize each other as belonging to the same nation. (7)

Writers such as James, Cunard, and Rhys might never have held a conference to establish the transatlantic nation; but as I discuss and outline, their writings and texts
stand in for such a conference and suggest the ways in which writers conceived of the Atlantic world as a unified community and themselves as part of a transatlantic nation. Additionally, contemporary reviews of such texts reveal the extent to which they were received and circulated by the reading public as expressions of transatlantic unity. Such reviews, then, bear even further evidence that during the early to mid-twentieth century, the Atlantic world had a widespread self-awareness of itself as an imagined community.

Gellner’s two definitions, like the arguments of most critics and theorists concerned with the nation, also imply an essential fact: nations are oppositional, to whatever degree of intensity, and separate the us from the them by categorizing humanity into categories defined by belief, language, culture, and experience. Indeed, social scientists frequently put forth the idea that nation is a sort of synonym for tribe, grouping together herds of humans in terms of language, religion, geography, and a host of other such factors. Certainly, though, the word nation can refer to political nation states as well: a fact loitering in the background of the preceding passages like a shadow. Making this division more explicit, Gellner opens his monograph Nations and Nationalism by arguing “nationalism” is “a political principle, which holds that the political and national unit should be congruent” (1). In other words, the political nation state and the belief-, ethnic-, religious-, or otherwise based nation group can be divided from one another. Likewise, Gellner’s larger vision of nationalism, that it is essentially the struggle between parties, often ethnic groups, vying for political supremacy within an established or developing nation and/or state, reveals this division even more overtly as does his suggestion that
“[N]ations and states are not the same contingency” (6) and his assertion that “the problem of nationalism does not arise when there is no state. It does not follow that the problem of nationalism arises for each and every state. On the contrary, it arises only for some states” (5; Gellner’s italics). Gellner makes certain valuable distinctions, then, which must be incorporated into any study of the nation. These distinctions follow:

1. The nation as an ethnic, linguistic, and/or other type of human unity (the nation group) is distinct from the nation as an entity of governmental and political action (the nation state).

2. The more conceptual nationalism that often drives these group formations and political actions is likewise an entity in its own right.

When studying nationalism, then, one faces an interactive but separable triptych of sorts: the nation group, nationalism(s), and the nation state. This key conclusion drives many studies of nationalism as critics and theorists try to define ways in which the three units interact. In fact, it’s quite safe to assert that the last quarter century has seen the greatest number of such studies about nationalism: detailed, engaging analyses on such specialized topics as gender and nationalism, narrative and nationalism, and the after-effects of empire on the development of mono- and multi-ethnic states. These studies often reflect the perspective of the developing, postcolonial world where post-WWII developments of nationalism have been particularly acute. Post-Cold War Europe, though, certainly receives its share of attention from critics as recovering Soviet states continue to come to terms with, as Gellner suggests, the realities of making, or attempting to make, their political and
culturo-ethnic identities congruent. In fact, the model of industrial-age nationalism espoused by Gellner in *Nations and Nationalism*, essentially the reclamation and politicization of folk culture by educated exiles, is unmistakably informed by such developments. This dissertation though, establishes a very different sort of national model. Thus, it is necessary to seek out other models of nationalism, less bound by the strictures of social science, in which to ground it.

The flexibility of the word “nation” can make Gellner and other like-minded theorists’ preoccupation with the political, that is “governmental,” life of nation groups seem unfairly limiting in the contemporary world. Widespread uses of “nation” by English speakers have given the term a certain elasticity, invariably altering and extending its meaning and lessening the exclusivity of its political connotations. Common conceptions of “nation” as a collective marker of like-minded enthusiasts, rather than an ethno-linguistic-political group caught in different processes of political opposition, emergence, and/or identification, has given rise to phrases that mark various different forms of non-governmental human unity. Googling any of the following phrases, using the quotation-mark, phrase-search operator, reveals that “nation” can be used to designate men and women grouped by vocation/avocation (“the blogger nation”), brand identity (“the Apple nation,” “BMW nation”), and sporting passion (“Manchester United nation,” “Yankee nation,” “NASCAR nation”). My own University of Georgia “Bulldog nation” illustrates a certain athletic-academic national identity hybrid common to university student bodies and alumni groups in the United States. Racially, culturally, and even geographically diverse, these groups have no serious Gellnerian political agenda that
I'm aware of. Perhaps the UGA fan-base is planning an uprising against Georgia Tech alumni to rid the state of Yellowjackets, and perhaps the geeky Mac OS/Windows war will turn politically violent and geographically territorial at some point, but the absurdity of these scenarios suggests just how apolitical these groups are and just how content members are to group themselves together as a “nation” and support certain occupations, products, and athletic franchises without trying to assert themselves in terms of Gellnerian nationalism. I would argue that developments such as these, though, do not push us to retire the nation as a model of human organization. Clearly, the word is current and meaningful. Rather, I would argue that the term “nation” is currently undergoing an evolution that asks us to understand the term and the model of nationhood more broadly, to paint our idea of nationhood with more creative strokes. Therefore, as the models of nations change but the need to be nationalized remains constant, we must open our minds to new forms of national belonging and new interpretations of it as an entity in the midst of significant augmentation and revision.

Benedict Anderson’s concept of nations as “imagined communities” offers a more comfortable and inclusive model of nationalism attuned to the complexities of both political and apolitical national groups. Labeling nations “imagined communities,” Anderson argues that nations are constructions disseminated by print capitalism, namely newspapers and the novel. Emphasizing the difference between the Medieval conception of time (“simultaneity-along-time”) and more modern forms of temporality (“transverse, cross-time, marked not by prefiguring and fulfillment, but by temporal coincidence, and measured by clock and calendar,” what Walter
Benjamin calls "homogeneous, empty time"), Anderson suggests the following about the relationship between the rise of nationalism and the novel:

Why this transformation should be so important for the birth of the imagined community of the nation can best be seen if we consider the basic structure of two forms of imagining which first flowered in Europe in the eighteenth century: the novel and the newspaper. For these forms provided the technical means for 're-presenting' the kind of imagined community that is the nation.

(24-25; Anderson's italics)²³

He suggests that after the death of religious-based communities, vertical chains of civic power (leading down through God into monarchs and finally the populace), and the conception of temporality outlined above ("simultaneity-along-time" vs. "empty time"), novels and newspapers provided modern man with "a new way of linking fraternity":

Nothing perhaps more precipitated this search, nor made it more fruitful, than print-capitalism, which made it possible for rapidly growing numbers of people to think about themselves, and to relate to others, in profoundly new ways. (36)²⁴

Explaining his famous phrase, Anderson then argues that the nation "is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion" (6; Anderson’s italics). Through novels and newspapers, men and women across wide geographical and cultural divides can read about each other, peer deeply into representations of each others’ lives and, as a result, gain an
imagined understanding of each other and therefore share a conceptual, abstract communion with each other: “These fellow-readers, to whom they were connected through print, formed, in their secular, particular, visible invisibility, the embryo of the nationally imagined community” (44). Such a community bears “none but the most fortuitous relationship to existing political boundaries (which were, on the whole, the highwater marks of dynastic expansionisms)” (46).

This dissertation argues certain modern writers of the Atlantic world can be understood as this sort of imagined community, one driven and defined by certain textual expressions and representations, and that such writers found unity through their textual output and can be classed together into a transatlantic nation created by, grounded in, and sustained by its own representations, for example, *The Golden Bowl*, *Negro: An Anthology*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea* and journals such as the two inceptions of *The Transatlantic Review*. These particular instances of print capitalism create, illustrate, and circulate the idea that the transatlantic region can be conceived of as an integrated community. Sharing meta-national struggles in their own lives and writing and distributing the very textual portrait of the transatlantic nation, these writers and texts and the many similar others can be linked together as an imagined community that helps resolve the modern nationality paradox and creates new, more appropriately complex modes of national classification modern writers. Anderson’s idea that the imagined community bears “none but the most fortuitous relationship to existing political boundaries” (46) suggests not only the appropriateness of his model with regards to this dissertation but also how substantially it differs from that of
Gellner and those of others who see the political and the national as a sort of double helix grounded in a given geographical area.\textsuperscript{26}

In this way, Anderson’s model approaches other contemporary models of human communal identity such as Jürgen Habermas’ vision of “postnational constellations” built around non-governmental, non-geographical social networks.\textsuperscript{27} In this model, as in Anderson’s, the nation as a collective human entity gradually moves away from its civic and geographical origins and into a new sense of social communion bound by neither. Wrestling with the “notoriously difficult to define” (3) concept of the nation, Anderson settles on terms that push the concept of nationalism away from geography, civics, anthropology, and social science and into the realms of literary studies that incorporate the theoretical, abstract, and “metaphorical sense” of nations and nationalism. As Anderson wittily puts it, his study into the “theoretically significant” (4) concept of nationalism seeks the sort of recentering I propose in this study: “both Marxist and liberal theory have become etiolated in a late Ptolemaic effort to ‘save the phenomena’; and … a reorientation of perspective in, as it were, a Copernican spirit is urgently required” (4). Revealing the monograph’s cross-over appeal to the literary community, Anderson describes nationalism as an “anomaly” driven by “significations” and suggests that “nationality,” “nation-ness,” and “nationalism” are all linked as “cultural artifacts” (4). Therefore, I believe Anderson’s model of nationhood, upon which this study’s concept of a transatlantic nation is based, serves as a sort of bridge between traditional concepts of nationalism and the more progressive concepts of postnationalism and cosmopolitanism. As Wai Chee Dimock suggests, contemporary critics are indeed pushing toward the so-called
“postnational” or “cosmopolitan” as they dispose of falsely simplistic literary
designations of national territory and chronology in favor of a more epically-centered,
genre-based, and diachronic sense of global temporality. Not bound by any sense of
time other than “modern,” a label whose sense of chronological periodization and
geography is most certainly under continual revision, or any sense of geography other
than the general—“Atlantic,” “American,” and “European”—I would argue that the
transatlantic imagined community I model on Andersonian nationalism follows the
sense of “loosened up” (Dimock 216) periodization and territoriality Dimock shares
with the other contemporary critics mentioned in this introduction. While it is framed
in the context of an inescapable nationalism and doesn’t quite embrace a
contemporary Habermassian constellation model, my model of the transatlantic
imagined community is appropriately of its time. After all, it would be rather
anachronistic to discuss the modernist transatlantic imagined community in terms of
twenty-first century Habermassian models of cosmopolitanism as the forces that form
the two entities are quite different. Arising not in the digitally-driven, multinational
corporate-dominated twenty-first century but rather in the early- and mid-twentieth
century when traditional nationalism was highly and even violently pronounced, the
transatlantic imagined community acts like the Andersonian model of imagined
communities upon which it is appropriately modeled, providing a sort of commerce
between traditional nationalism and contemporary theories of collective identity. The
transatlantic imagined community thereby incorporates elements of each, namely, the
inescapability of nationality and “loosened up” geographies, temporalities, and
memberships.
Taking up the theoretical/signification aspect of nationalism that Anderson mentions, literary critics are interested in the ways in which nations function as conceptual discourses. Such discussions further illustrate the ways in which nations and nationalism are conceived of in this dissertation. Homi K. Bhabha, for example, suggests nationalism is “a system of cultural signification” representing “social life rather than the discipline of social polity” (1-2). (Here, Bhabha once again emphasizes the basic division most critics maintain between nation state and nation group.) At their most basic, Bhabha argues, nationalisms are “narratives and discourses that signify a sense of ‘nationness’” (2) and, like narratives, they are a “symbolic force” (2). As Bhabha illustrates, nationalism is a slippery entity that is difficult to define in all but the most general terms. Often, critics have dealt with this problem by looking at the effects of nationalism on narrative or the uses of nationalism in narrative rather than trying to define the admittedly amorphous social force in its own right. Bhabha himself, in Nation and Narration, quickly shifts from trying to define nationalism itself to introducing the thesis of his essay collection, asserting that Nation and Narration considers how cultural manifestations and representations of nationalism in narrative form deal with the social ambivalence that arises from the dialogic, oppositional, and “Janus-faced” (3) nature of the nation, i.e., national progression and regression, political rationality and irrationality, and the other sorts of competing forces that seek dominance within a given nation (2).

Important for this study, though, is the sense that critics like Bhabha have that narratives, especially those grounded in the genre of the novel, are the lifeblood of nations. Katie Trumpener, in Bardic Nationalism: The Romantic Novel and the
British Empire, likewise illustrates the ways in which developments in the late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century British novel paralleled and influenced national developments within the British Empire, arguing that England's domestic challenges to Celtic cultures in Ireland, Scotland, and Wales led to a resurgence in Bardic oral traditions. The nationalist narratives that grew out of this experience were in turn exported to the early areas of the British Empire and there, ironically, both formed the basis of those colonies' fictions as well as the English narratives that justified imperialism. Jessica Berman's Modern Fiction, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Community is similar to Trumpener's study in that both monographs focus on the centrality of the novel in constructions of national communities. Berman's book, though, is more germane to this dissertation because of its modern, rather than Romantic, focus and its suggestion that, in a vacuum left by traditional social structures, modern writers created new sorts of communities with their texts.

Contemporary discussions of community and modernism have moved away from more traditional discussions of nationalism and toward discussions of "cosmopolitanism." As the subtitle of Rebecca Walkowitz' monograph suggests, this is a mode of criticism that examines "modernism beyond the nation" and, as a result, has clear appeal for studying the nationally decentered moderns and the meta-nationalism they sought. Invoking Habermas, theories of cosmopolitanism set down by critics such as Walkowitz, Berman, and others suggest "cosmopolitanism" is a sort of international social network of "planetary humanism" (Gilroy, Against Race 356) operating beyond the nation state and as a function of "the clearly expressed desire to continue a common life" rather than some more concrete combination of
language, race, and history” (Berman, Modern Fiction 9). As such, these critics study additional methods by which modern writers created communities that operate outside more traditional forms of national organization. It might seem, then, that nationalism and cosmopolitanism are at least somewhat mutually exclusive; and while not opposed exactly, the latter seems to have supplanted the former in the arena of modernist studies. However, no matter the clear contemporary preference for discussing modern writers in terms of cosmopolitanism, I would argue that the model I lay out of a transatlantic national imagined community capably accommodates a necessary sense of both nationalism and cosmopolitanism.

Cosmopolitan studies such as Berman’s try to examine the ways in which the moderns organized themselves, referencing Walter Benjamin’s essay “The Storyteller,” after “the demise of the knowable community” (2). Echoing this dissertation’s argument that the paradox of modern nationality led to the development of the transatlantic nation as a textual imagined community, Berman argues that the demise of knowable communities such as the nation generates imaginings of it in modern literature that fill the void. Berman goes on to argue that writers such as Henry James, Marcel Proust, Virginia Woolf, and Gertrude Stein use literature to engage with early transformations of community and cosmopolitanism in the twentieth century: changes such as those described by Benjamin and embodied by the rural-to-urban shift of modernism and modernity as a whole. Berman argues that all four writers develop different models of social organization to address the breakdown of experience-exchange and community in the face of modern cosmopolitanism and write about early twentieth century anxieties about race, ethnicity, gender, and
nationality (3). For Berman, modern narratives such as the ones created by James, Proust, Woolf, and Stein offer meaningful alternatives to previously solid models of community that have broken down in the modern world. Thus, modern conceptions of community can, like nations, be understood as narrative constructions expressed in the genre of the novel. Berman describes her study as

a dual project: first, to revise the theory of community in order to insist that it respond to the narrative construction of that term, and in particular to the ways that modernist fiction can provide meaningful alternative models of community. Homi Bhabha and others have claimed that nationality must be seen as a narrative process. So then, I argue, must community. (3)

Because of the inescapability of nationality in the modern world, I would argue that models of modern community, even cosmopolitan studies that position themselves "beyond the nation" must accept to some extent the presence of the nation in their discussions. Not going so far as to suggest the impossibility of this sort of cosmopolitanism because of the social dictum that all must be nationalized in the modern world, I would nevertheless suggest that models that discount or avoid the national question in modernism are ultimately as quixotic as the moderns' own meta-national quests. Berman especially seems to grant the moderns their right to transcend the national "knowable community" whereas I would argue this is an impossible illusion, especially in the twentieth century. Even Habermassian models of "postnational" human unity might still be a bit premature in the early twenty-first century and certainly don't reflect the social dynamic of the nationally acute early twentieth. Thus when Berman writes, "While community may be necessary to late
nineteenth- and twentieth-century European ideas of nationality, nationality is not necessary to ideas of community” (9), she is perilously close to suggesting one can somehow escape his/her nationality and the nation in the modern world and that forms of community can be conceptualized without considering the nation. Hearkening back to the paradox of modern nationality, such anxieties are why I choose to frame my discussion of the modern transatlantic community in terms of Andersonian nationalism rather than in terms of contemporary cosmopolitanism. I would argue that critics such as Berman, Walkowitz, Dimock, and even Habermas admirably push the study of modern communities beyond the traditional discourses of nationalism and into new realms of understanding that extend our understanding of national belonging but do not retire the concept of nationalism outright as they sometimes appear willing and even eager to do. At present, terms such as “American” and “English” remain very much alive; and as the various entente cordiales that pulled Western nations into WWI and drove the fascistic nationalisms that resulted in WWII, the national question certainly had a terrible liveliness in the modern moment. The modern transatlantic community accommodates the inescapability of nationality in the modern world as well as a sense of transnational cosmopolitanism. It is a sort of collective, cosmopolitan nation built around the very transnationality that would be impossible for traditional forms of Gellnerian national organization. Thus, while cosmopolitan studies frequently exude an almost heavy-handed desire to distance themselves from studies of nationalism, there exists a generative interactivity between narrative, the novel, nationalism, and cosmopolitanism that links the ideas of Berman, Bhabha, Anderson, and the several others discussed in this introduction.
Fundamentally, these studies envision the challenges faced by communities such as the nation in the modern world and the reconstruction of these models, of what Berman calls “being-in-common” (3), in literary form. Such common ground is at the center of the modern transatlantic nation which itself, like Berman’s form of cosmopolitanism, offers a meaningful alternative model of national belonging versus the nineteenth-century model from which the moderns sought escape.

Perhaps the strongest precedent to this dissertation’s concept of a transatlantic nation is Paul Gilroy’s *Black Atlantic*. Not a work of literary criticism *per se*, *Black Atlantic* has cross-disciplinary appeal. Relevant to literary critics because of its concerns with writers such as Richard Wright and the role literary texts play in unifying disparate cultural elements, Gilroy’s signature text is essentially a work of sociology that attempts to address the life of the “contemporary black English” who like the Anglo-Africans of earlier generations and perhaps, like all blacks in the West, stand between (at least) two great cultural assemblages, both of which have mutated through the course of the modern world that formed them and assumed new configurations. (1)

Gilroy argues that a nationally mixed community grew out of the twentieth-century Atlantic world as a result of such cultural hybridities and dualities. *Black Atlantic* addresses

one small area in the grand consequence of this historical conjunction—the stereophonic, bilingual, or bifocal cultural forms originated by, but no longer the exclusive property of, blacks dispersed within the structures of feeling,
producing, communicating, and remembering that I have heuristically called

the black Atlantic world. (3)

Nimbly investigating the ways in which this black Atlantic culture has infused the

entire West so that it cannot be considered solely possessed or affected by those of

African heritage, *Black Atlantic* is nevertheless a work almost exclusively focused on

Afrocentric issues and the intellectual life of Blacks in the Western, Atlantic world. A

magisterial study that helps frame this dissertation, Gilroy’s monograph is

nevertheless ultimately grounded in its concern with the dialogic, unfinalizable

cultural residues left by the struggle between black and white and the community of

negritude that grew out of the modern experience of blacks in the Atlantic world.

While “ideas of nation, nationality, national belonging, and nationalism are

paramount” (Gilroy 3) for both our studies, I attempt to investigate the ways in which

the twentieth-century transatlantic nation is larger than one ethnic group. Put another

way, this study is interested in the ways in which the Atlantic world is a diasporic

space composed of the fragmented identities and émigré personalities of Europeans,

Africans, and West Indians. After all, since the Atlantic world has produced so many

blended racial and cultural identities composed of the native, the African, the

European and still others, one frequently faces impossibility when s/he attempts to

section the Atlantic-world human experience into neat racial taxonomies. As with

nationality, I feel the best model is relational, porous, and overlapping. Like Gilroy,

though, I am acutely interested in a vision of transatlantic community that transcends

individual nations and cultures while being dialogically composed of them as well;

and if for no other reason, *Black Atlantic* lays important groundwork for this study
because, like other works of print capitalism such as *The Golden Bowl*, *Negro: An Anthology*, and *Wide Sargasso Sea*, it illustrates that the twentieth-century Atlantic world can be conceptualized as a distinctive community independent and yet composed of its constituent spheres: the West Indian, the American, the European, and the African.

At this point, two final tasks remain for this introduction. First, I explore and explain why Bakhtin’s concepts of dialogism and unfinalizability, as opposed to other theoretical models such as dialectical materialism, provide the most appropriate model for understanding the cohesiveness of the diverse transatlantic nation and, as it follows, why the transatlantic nation found its best expression and most vibrant life in the novel and anthology. Second and finally, I conclude with an analysis of the ways in which this dissertation draws from and participates in the larger academic conversation of “transatlanticism” in the contemporary academy.

First, one might find it easy to jump from the realization that nations and nationalisms are inherently oppositional to the conclusion that they are inherently dialectical in the Marx-modified, Hegelian sense of the term, that is, to the conclusion that they are organized around social displacement and opposing cultural forces. In fact, though, Marxists have persistently bobbled what they refer to as “the national question” from almost the time Marx and Engels neglected to outline a comprehensive theory of it themselves. The literature on the topic is fairly extensive and somewhat varied, especially in the early days of Marxist thought, and would include Joseph Stalin’s controversial “Marxism and the National Question” and his rival V.I. Lenin’s *Marxism and Nationalism* in the early twentieth century; Japanese
Marxists after WWII, and Tom Nairn’s controversial monograph *The Break-up of Britain* in 2003. However, making sense of the national question for Marxists doesn’t seem to require a particularly different tool-set from the one they use to understand any other feature of social and economic life. In other words, nationalism for Marxists is, like the movement of capital, the organization of labor, and the progression of history, a function of social and economic forces grating together and supplanting one another. In a phrase, Marxists see nationalism as another function of dialectical materialism rather than as a phenomenon in its own right. This conclusion—as well as the fundamental role nationalism played in Fascism: a passionately opposed political movement that ran concurrently with the major twentieth century developments of Marxist-fueled Communism—perhaps helps explain why a grand Marxist theory of nationalism has failed to emerge. Thus, when one reaches the unavoidable conclusion that nations and nationalisms are oppositional entities, it is most productive to consider alternative, non-dialectical theories such as *dialogism*.

Dialogism places opposing social forces in conversational relationships rather than in struggles for displacement and synthesis. This model of negotiating oppositional difference differs quite markedly from Marxist dialectics since asymmetrical agents are there placed into processes of elimination and synthesis rather than unfinalizable, dialogic negotiation. Mikhail Bakhtin’s concerns with the dialogism and the novel make texts such as *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* and essays such as those contained in *The Dialogic Imagination* and *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* comfortable, if largely overlooked, parts of the discussion.
concerned with the connections between literature and nationalism. In fact, Mikhail Bakhtin, arguably the most eminent proponent of dialogism in literary studies, saw his early critical ideas pushed into obscurity until the 1960s precisely because they conflicted with, and at times outright critiqued, the basic tenets of the Marxist dialectical model espoused by the Soviet state. Completed in 1929, Bakhtin’s 

*Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (originally titled *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Art*) introduces, at least in the published, English-translated texts available, his controversial concepts of the unfinalizable self, interpersonal communion, and *polyphony*, all three of which inform his grander concepts of *dialogism* and *heteroglossia* as outlined in works found in collections such as *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Arguing for the unfinalizability and communion of the self, Bakhtin shows traces of his earlier concerns with ontology as expressed in the fragmented text known today as *Toward a Philosophy of the Act* and argues, via the former, that human beings are caught in an endless process of dynamism and change. As a result, they can never be completely presented to the world. Arguing for the communion of the self, Bakhtin approaches even more closely the notion of *dialogism* and *heteroglossia*: all people and all language are inescapably linked to other people; and as a result, no one voice can be isolated from the many others.

*Heteroglossia*, primarily an expression of linguistics and an exploration of circulating speech forms in the indivisible soup of language relation and influence, reflects these concerns most acutely but is less useful to this study than *dialogism*: a theory which Bakhtin grounds in the genre of the novel, one of the genres expressing and embodying the transatlantic nation. However, *heteroglossia* bears mentioning because
it reflects Bakhtin's larger interest with aesthetic, social, and linguistic interactivity
("dialogism") rather than displacement and exclusivity.

In *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*, Bakhtin expresses perhaps the most
central tenets of his concept of dialogism when he argues for the polyphony of
Dostoevsky's work. Bakhtin argues that characters in the Russian novelist's texts are
used as representations of distinctive voices and individual selves. Put into the
collective space of a novel, these voices are unable to separate but maintain their
unfinalizability. Of the narrator of *Notes from the Underground*, Bakhtin writes:

The hero from the underground eavesdrops on every word someone else says
about him, he looks at himself, as it were, in all the mirrors of other people's
consciousnesses, he knows all the possible refractions of his character in those
mirrors. And he also knows his own objective definition, neutral to both the
other's consciousness and to his own self-consciousness, and he takes into
account the point of view of a "third person." But he also knows that all these
definitions, prejudiced as well as objective, rest in his hands and he cannot
finalize them precisely because he himself perceives them; he can go beyond
their limits and can thus make them inadequate. He knows that he has the final
word, and he seeks at whatever cost to retain for himself this final word about
himself this final word about himself, the word of his self-consciousness, in
order to become in that which he is not. His consciousness of self lives by its
unfinalizability, by its unclosednesss and its indeterminacy. (53)

The conflict between the communion of selves with other selves and the impossibility
that any self will ever fully know another self creates a fissure between
characters/speakers which is bridged, however tenuously and incompletely, by a polyphony of dialogism. Even the reader and writer are involved, caught up in the unavoidable dialogism and polyphony of the novel:

In Dostoevsky's polyphonic novel … we are dealing with an ultimate dialogicity, that is, a dialogicity of the ultimate whole. … Dostoevsky's novel is … constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes the object for the other; this interaction provides no support for the viewer who would objectify the entire event according to some ordinary, monologic category (thematically, lyrically, cognitively)—and this consequently makes the viewer also a participant. Not only does the [Dostoevskyan] novel give no firm support outside the rupture-prone world of dialogue for a third, monologically all-encompassing consciousness—but on the contrary, everything in the [Dostoevskyan] novel is structured to make dialogic opposition inescapable. Not a single element of the work is structured from the point of view of a nonparticipating "third person." In the novel itself, nonparticipating "third persons" are not represented in any way. There is no place for them, compositionally or in the larger meaning of the work. (18)

Bakhtin plays on the term "third person," using it to reference both the literary concept of an omniscient narrator as well as the space outside the text where an otherwise "nonparticipating" reader might exit. Rather, prefiguring Jacques Derrida's (in)famous phrase about the totality of literary space, Bakhtin too appears to suggest
“Il n'y a pas de hors-texte.”39 Questioning where the transatlantic nation might begin socially and end literarily (or vice versa) seems a bit meaningless, then. Via Bakhtinian dialogism and the genre of the novel, the literary space and the social space of the nation exist simultaneously. It would also, then, be wrong to suggest that modern transatlantic texts are “representations” of the transatlantic nation since the imagined community exists nowhere else but in those texts that expressed, embodied, and carried it. This portrait of novelistic polyphony and dialogism, where Bakhtin uses Dostoevsky’s novels as touchstones for the genre as a whole, also suggests that readers, writers, texts, narrators, and characters are all caught in webs of conversational exchange. Interacting to form an imagined community, the writers and texts of the transatlantic nation didn’t enter into oppositional flux via replacing usurpations and synthesizing fusions. Rather, they interact dialogically, placing texts, themes, biographies, and traditional national residues into constructive conversations that form an imagined community. The sort of dialogism Bakhtin outlines, therefore, helps explain how the diverse elements of the transatlantic nation avoid entropy and chaos and find their binding agent in this theoretical model of conversation. Interactive, mutually generative and supporting, refusing finalization, Bakhtin’s theory of dialogism provides the best model for understanding the development and essential verve of the transatlantic nation as a dialogic discussion space of residual Atlantic nationalities forming a new imagined community. As a result, I ground the suggestion that it found its greatest vibrancy and most appropriate vehicle in the novel as a result of the genre’s inherent accommodation to this sort of radical dialogism. Presaging Bakhtin’s own conclusions about the flexibility of the novel,
Henry James supports this conclusion when in the preface to *The Ambassadors* he argues “the Novel remains still, under the right persuasion, the most independent, most elastic, most prodigious of literary forms” (*The Art of the Novel* 326).

Unlike the novel, which enjoys many theoretical treatises, a comprehensive theory of anthology-as-genre has yet to arise. Nevertheless, it is easy to see that Bakhtin’s understanding of the novel as a collective conversational space capably accommodates anthologic or, since as I outline in the third chapter there is some debate about the text’s genre identity, otherwise multiphonous works such as *Negro: An Anthology*. Thus, while Bakhtin doesn’t deal with the genre of anthology as such, in many ways the anthology seems more or less a radical extension of the Bakhtinian understanding of the novel. Multi-authored and thus overtly multi-voiced, the multiple expressions of multiple authors “conversing” on given theses and topics gives the anthology an inherently rich chorus and makes it a comfortable partner to the novel in capturing and expressing so polyphonic and dialogic an entity as the transatlantic nation. Furthermore, the genre of the novel and, by extension, anthologic/multiphonous texts are uniquely able to thrive on the sort of cosmopolitan and textual diversity of the transatlantic nation. Rather than be threatened by it, Bakhtin suggests both novels (and certainly anthologies) “can include, digest, devour other genres” while maintaining their integrity (*The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays* xxxii). Reflecting the heteroglossia of language itself, the novel and the anthology are perhaps the only literary forms that could comfortably accommodate the polyphonic national and textual diversity of the literarily-expressed community of the twentieth-century transatlantic world. Using Bakhtin’s words, this
nation contains a plurality of “fully valid consciousnesses” (Rabelais and His World 9) expressed in the novel and anthology, all refusing finalization and bringing their own points of view to bear on the nation. Elsewhere, Bakhtin suggests the larger importance of dialogism: “Two voices is the minimum for life, the minimum for existence”; the end of dialogism means “everything ends” (Rabelais and His World 252). Thus not only is the novel abstractly and isolatedly dialogic; its inherent dialogism positions it to appropriately express and represent human lives and the communities they form. Explaining its unified diversity and the reason why it found so vivid an expression and so palpable a life in the novel, and by extension anthology-like texts, Bakhtin’s theories of polyphony, dialogism, and heteroglossia offers a portrait of entities such as the transatlantic nation interconnected not in spite of their diversity but precisely because of it.

Finally, over the past decade transatlantic discourse has gained a good deal of momentum across several fields including history, political science, music, and literary criticism. Likely, it will eventually be subsumed into transnational cosmopolitanism; but at present, transatlanticism maintains some autonomy, preserving the sense of communal and experiential uniqueness that has surrounded it since first contact between Europe and the Americas. In an excellent 2004 overview of the transatlantic academic shift, Laura M. Stevens suggests most studies are “concentrated in the years between 1500 and 1800, when cultures surrounding the Atlantic were most dramatically altered through their connections with each other” (93).41 Critics such as Stephen Greenblatt, Djelal Kadir, and Samuel Eliot Morrison would of course be part of this trend.42 However, concerns with transatlanticism are
not limited to Renaissance and Enlightenment studies, in literature or elsewhere. Stevens suggests this when she writes,

Few terms have spread across the academic landscape with the speed and thoroughness of transatlantic. In alternation with its cognate, circum-atlantic, and its root, Atlantic, it has become the descriptor of choice for recent scholarly projects of almost startling quantity and variety. Over the past decade, courses spanning the watery divide have become all but standard in college curricula, countless publications have sought to chart the flow of texts and people across the ocean, and many universities have established organizations dedicated to scholarship in a circum-atlantic framework. (93)

Another example of the inherently textual life of transatlanticism and the transatlantic nation, Stevens feels compelled to remind her audience that

There are at least two new journals—Symbiosis and the Journal of Transatlantic Studies—dedicated to this topic, while many conferences and journals purportedly focused on one region now include contributions with a far broader scope. Indeed, transatlantic conversations and projects have become so ubiquitous that even to comment on the prominence of the Atlantic Ocean as an organizing concept seems a cliché. (93)

Many studies of literary modernism use the term “transatlantic” quite loosely as a casual sort of shorthand or adjective for modernism at-large, that is, modernism taken whole and not broken into its traditional geographical distinctions such as American and British. As I suggest, the internationalization of modernism and the breaking down of archaic regional distinctions has already begun. However, using
“transatlantic” in this way, as a casual shorthand, seems more and more inadequate as the word takes on various nuanced meanings via many detailed considerations of it as a systematic dynamic within larger modernism.

Many discussions of the transatlantic aspects of literary modernism revolve around Paul Gilroy’s *Black Atlantic* and consider transatlantic literary modernism in terms of African heritage issues. Whether because of the influence of Gilroy’s work or because of the heritage of slavery and race relations in the Atlantic world (or likely the combination of both), many studies concerned with transatlantic modernism focus on that heritage and/or revolve around writers of African heritage and subjects concerned with the same (for example, African-European, African-American, &tc.). Others pursue a broader ethnic path or seek out other, more race-neutral sorts of cultural, gender, and biographical constructions within and correspondences between the parts of the transatlantic world. These studies understand transatlantic modernism as a dynamic, as a unique entity operating under certain rules of interaction that can be studied and conclusions drawn from them. This dissertation follows these sorts of macro views of transatlantic modernism, seeking out a pattern and ways in which to make sense of the dynamic at-large. Furthermore, this method is directly in line with the preponderance of transatlantic studies. As Stevens suggests, “scholars of cultures around the Atlantic are now more likely than ever to conceive their projects in terms of vast networks of thought and feeling, webs of influence, or circulations of people and objects” (95). In fact, it seems clear that the rise of various transatlanticisms in the academy correlates with the internationalization of scholarly conceptions of modernism as cosmopolitan and
transnational. Whatever the correlation-causation relationship between the two, the rise of transatlantic studies in the academy has certainly at the very least corresponded with the breakdown of historical regional divisions of all sorts. This dissertation's concern with the breakdown of national identification in the twentieth century would certainly complement Stevens' vision of internationalized academic and transatlantic inquiry:

[B]y showing that national identity can extend beyond natural geographical obstacles, by highlighting broader patterns of exchange, and by tracing the fraught ties of colony to metropole, transatlantic studies suggests that nations and nationalisms cannot really be considered in isolation. ... Mary Louise Pratt's application of the ethnographic term *transculturation* to comparative literary studies and Benedict Anderson's description of a nation as an "imagined community" are among the best known of these concepts with crossover influence. Such notions have enabled a shift from paradigms of isolated development to models of interrelatedness and multidirectional flow.

(94-95)

Especially pronounced has been the effect of transatlanticism on American studies wherein practitioners such as Djelal Kadir, Walter Benn Michaels, Julio Ortega, and John Carlos Rowe have attempted to create a "new Americanism" that seeks to break down the artificial, Cold War construction of American exceptionalism and (re)build paradigms focused on the United States' relationship to, commonalities with, and interactions with the Atlantic world and the world at-large. This movement has as one of its goals the extension of the term *America* as a
reference not only the United States (as it is often used in this study and by most other English-language writers and speakers) but the whole of North and South America and its transatlantic relationship with Europe. Essentially, then, new American studies is a revisionist movement that attempts to broaden the scope of American studies, interpret both North and South America's relationship to Europe, and reclaim the term America as inclusive of all of North and South America not just the United States. This dissertation enters into these sorts of dialogues, helping to make the web of transatlantic interaction seem exceptional in Western affairs without privileging any one of the elemental spheres as such. Indeed, moving away from such concepts as "American studies" is likely unavoidable as it becomes the transnational network rather than the constituent regions/nations that critics privilege, investigate, and use to frame their discussions of community in the current and previous centuries.

In conclusion, this dissertation attempts to engage with such intellectual shifts and develop an understanding of transatlantic modernism that accommodates and constructively augments them. Perhaps suggestive of the extent to which it at least positions itself to do so, Stevens uses language nearly identical to that used and cited throughout this introduction: "this recent upsurge of interest in transatlantic relations is rooted to some degree in the global preoccupations of the present. Our era is one in which people, commodities, wars, and plagues circulate among continents more rapidly than ever before" (93). Building on this conclusion, Stevens also makes it seem more than happenstance that the Atlantic ocean is at the center of such investigations:
It is understandable that scholars would be fascinated now by the ocean as source of both separation and connection. An ocean is a site of almost empty surfaces but richly populated depths, a place that must be passed through rather than settled on, and a vast territory whose edges change with the hours. For these reasons the ocean offers a pliable metaphor for a late modern world understood in terms of permeable boundaries, uncertainty, or flux. (93)

Such permeable boundaries and ongoing flux are core elements of the transatlantic imagined community, and therefore, the ocean is a pliable metaphor for it and a proper locus for it to develop around. Virginia Woolf's lyrical lines about the sublimity of the Atlantic ocean, from which the title of this dissertation comes, loiter in the background of such sentiments and in the background of this dissertation as well. In 1908, living and writing on the extreme west of the Welsh coast, Woolf writes, "Ah, it is the sea that does it! perpetual movement, and a border of mystery, solving the limits of the fields, and silencing their prose" (Woolf, *The Voyage Out* xii; Woolf to Clive Bell 356). To my thinking, this quotation neatly sums up the transatlantic dynamic of which the ocean is, along with the people and cultures that participate in it, an inexorable, inescapable, and fundamental part. Woolf links the "sea" with poetry, and thereby land with the prosaic, and thereby seems to emphasize the elegant centrality that the communal ocean holds within any discussion of transatlanticism that issues forth from any number of cultural perspectives. As a gesture of conversation with such sentiments and with studies interested in the historically-precedented imperative to envision the transatlantic space as a unified community, I offer the following investigation into the ways in which The Golden
Bowl, Negro: An Anthology, and Wide Sargasso Sea act as dialogic textual spaces where the old residues of Atlantic nationality interact to form the modern transatlantic imagined community.
Notes

1 Clement Greenberg argues that the roots of modernism can be found in nineteenth-century French Symbolism and Impressionism (see "Modern and PostModern" in Clement Greenberg Late Writings. Ed. Robert C. Morgan. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003). George Steiner writes: "[F]rom the eighteen-nineties until its enthusiastic swoon into Hitler's arms in 1938, Vienna was the foremost generator of our current sensibility" ("From the Vienna Woods," The New Yorker, 23 July 1973, 73-77). Virginia Woolf, of course, famously set the beginning date of modernism as December 1910: "On or about December 1910 human nature changed. ... All human relations shifted—those between masters and servants, husbands and wives, parents and children. And when human relations change there is at the same time a change in religion, conduct, politics, and literature" ("Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown" [In Collected Essays, 4 vols. [Ed. Leonard Woolf. London: Hogarth Press, 1966], 1:321]. Others place it with German intellectuals such as Nietzsche, Freud, and Marx or with nineteenth-century British intellectuals such as Darwin, Pater, Ruskin, and Wilde while most would allow it is a combination of all of these and still others. For excellent discussions regarding the complex origins of modernism, see Peter Childs, Modernism (London: Routledge: 2000) and "The Name and Nature of Modernism" (In Modernism: A Guide to European Literature. Ed. Malcolm Bradbury and James McFarlane. New York: Penguin, 1991)), especially pp30-35. See also the essays in section two of Modernism: A Guide to European Literature: "The Cultural and Intellectual Climate of Modernism" (57-190).

2 Some such as Kristen Bleumel have proposed calling the modernism of the 1930s "intermodernism" (see George Orwell and the Radical Eccentric [New York: Palgrave, 2004]) while others "resist the tendency to exclude the work of 'thirties writers' from the definition of modernism" (Jessica Berman, "Comparative Colonialisms: Joyce, Anand, and the Question of Engagement" [Modernism and Transnationalisms, spec. issue of Modernism/modernity 13:3 (September 2006)], 483n3). Indeed, Berman's article attempts to redefine "our understanding of engaged writing" (466) and both works, in their own ways, attempt "to avoid replicating the experimental/political split" (Berman, "Comparative Colonialisms: Joyce, Anand, and the Question of Engagement," 483n3) traditionally envisioned as inherent to the body of literature produced in the US and Europe between 1900 and 1940.


4 The section of Modernism that follows this quotation ("A Geography of Modernism") is useful for introducing the various regionalisms of modernism.

5 D.H. Lawrence lived an international life that undermines one's ability to identify him as an "English" writer. This fact has certainly not stopped the Brits from trying. Just as University College at Oxford did with their recalcitrant and cast-away student P.B. Shelley, the English have tried to (re)claim Lawrence with a gazebo sort of memorial in the writer's birth-town of Eastwood, Nottinghamshire. During his lifetime, though, the country of Lawrence's birth harassed and impoverished him because of his pacifist beliefs and aesthetic interests in human sexuality. Finally leaving the UK in 1919, Lawrence began his so-called "savage pilgrimage" and voluntary exile from England. Rounding the world, Lawrence and his wife Frieda took the long way from Europe to the US, stopping in Darlington, Western Australia where Lawrence started his book about Aussie politics.
called *Kangaroo*. Settling in Taos, New Mexico in September 1922 at the 160-acre Kiowa Ranch—the only home Lawrence ever owned—Lawrence was convinced by 1923, after a disastrous return trip to England, that the future of his literary career lay in the US rather than in England. As early as October 1921, Lawrence wrote “English publication no longer interests me much” and told Amy Lowell that “in direction” he thought of himself now as “more than half American. I always write really towards America: my listener is there” (The Letters of D. H. Lawrence. Ed. James T. Boulton, et al. [New York, Cambridge UP, 1987], 4:96, 97. Qtd. in Mark Kinkead-Weekes. *D. H. Lawrence: Triumph to Exile, 1912-1922* [New York: Cambridge UP, 1996], 675). Staying close to Lawrence’s letters and other texts of the period, Kinkead-Weekes makes many insightful points regarding possible reasons why Lawrence felt such an intense artistic camaraderie with the US (see esp. 351-55, 440-48, and 600-03). Begun in 1917, D.H. Lawrence’s experience in the US from 1922-25 also allowed him to finish Why Lawrence felt such an intense artistic camaraderie with the US (see esp. 351-55, 440-48, and 600-03). Begun in 1917, D.H. Lawrence’s experience in the US from 1922-25 also allowed him to finish why Lawrence felt such an intense artistic camaraderie with the US (see esp. 351-55, 440-48, and 600-03). Begun in 1917, D.H. Lawrence’s experience in the US from 1922-25 also allowed him to finish the subject in which Lawrence positions himself as an Old World codger commenting on American symbolism, Transcendentalism, and Puritanism. The quality and expertise of the text’s insight and the degree to which it captures its subject matter can perhaps be measured by Edmund Wilson’s estimation of it as “one of the few first-rate books that have ever been written on the subject” (*The Shock of Recognition* [New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1955], 906). A final testament to Lawrence’s destabilized national identity, the ultimate fate of his remains is uncertain. Buried in Vence, France when he died there of tuberculosis in 1930, he was exhumed and cremated in 1935 at the request of his widow Frieda. Intending to sail them from Marseilles to the US and have them interred at the ranch in Taos, there’s debate about whether or not Frieda ever actually received the ashes in New Mexico. Oddly enough, his family gravestone in Eastwood, Nottinghamshire also seems to claim he’s buried beneath it. Thus, his incinerated remains float in rumor, between the US, France, and England, all of whom appear to claim them as their own.

6 Ernest Hemingway is another stellar example of the destabilized nationality endemic to many modern writers. In terms of his realistic, “iceberg” literary stylings, “Boiling it down always, rather than spreading it out thin” (Hemingway to Mrs. Paul [Mary Downey] Pfeifer, Madrid, 17 October 1933, in *Ernest Hemingway Selected Letters 1917-1961*, ed. Carlos Baker [New York: Scribner, 1981], 397), one wonders whether Hemingway properly belongs to an American Realist line with Twain and Crane or a French Realist/Naturalist line with Balzac and Zola or whether, because of his proto-Existential themes, he is best understood as a father of the French Absurdist line with Camus and Sartre following? Supporters of the first line of thinking will usually cite Hemingway’s lengthy discussion, via his autobiographical persona, of American and world literature in the first chapter of *The Green Hills of Africa* (New York: Scribner, 1935), the most famous part of which reads: “The good writers are Henry James, Stephen Crane, and Mark Twain. That’s not the order they’re good in. There is no order for good writers … All modern American literature comes from one book by Mark Twain called *Huckleberry Finn*. If you read it you must stop where the Nigger Jim is stolen from the boys. That is the real end. The rest is just cheating. But it’s the best book we’ve had. All American writing comes from that. There was nothing before. There has been nothing as good since” (22). Example studies that link Hemingway with the French Realists/Naturalists include: Suzanne Bresard, *Empreintes: L’Analyse des ecritures de Colette, Hemingway, Balzac, Musset* (Paris: Delachaux et Niestle, 1968); Harry Levin, *Contexts of Criticism* (Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1957); and Alan H. Spiegel, “Fiction and the Camera Eye: A Study of Visual Form in the Modern Novel” (PhD diss., U of Virginia, 1974). Finally, in “Camus and Hemingway: The Solidarity of Rebellion” (*The International Fiction Review* 30:1-2 [2003]: 42-48), Ben Stoltzfus suggests, “Ernest Hemingway’s writing had a profound influence on the new generation of French writers in the 1930s, particularly Jean-Paul Sartre and Albert Camus, and, in a 1946 essay in the *Atlantic Monthly*, Sartre said that *L’Etranger* would not be what it is if Camus had not read *The Sun Also Rises*” (42). Stoltzfus’ other articles on the subject follow: “Camus and Hemingway: Suicide, Sisyphus, and the Leopard” (*International Fiction Review* 26:1-2 [1999]: 19-27) and “Political Commitment in Hemingway and Sartre” (*North Dakota Quarterly* 68:2-3 [2001]: 182-88). The article Stoltzfus’ references is Sartre’s “American Novelists in French Eyes” (*The Atlantic Monthly* [August 1946]: 114-118). Others who have investigated the connections between Hemingway
and Camus and Sartre as well as Hemingway and the larger French Existential/Absurdist tradition include: Hal Blythe and Charlie Sweet, “Hemingway’s ‘The Killers’” (Explicator 62:1 [2003]: 37-39); Dwight Eddins, “Of Rocks and Marlin: The Existentialist Agon in Camus’s The Myth of Sisyphus and Hemingway’s The Old Man and the Sea” (Hemingway Review 21:1 [2001]: 68-77); Richard Lehan, “Camus and Hemingway” (Wisconsin Studies in Contemporary Literature 1:2 [1960]: 37-48); and Erik Nakjavani, “The Prose of Life: Lived Experience in the Fiction of Hemingway, Sartre, and Beauvoir” (North Dakota Quarterly 70:4 [2003]: 140-65). Further complicating his national identity, Hemingway enjoys a statue and museum just outside the Plaza de Toros in Pamplona, set a good portion of his most important novel The Sun Also Rises in Spain, and produced the Spanish cultural study Death in the Afternoon. These contributions to and connections with Spanish culture suggest he is at least as much a part of Spanish culture as he is American. For its part, the US offers only two Hemingway showplaces: the major one in extremely out-of-the-way Key West, Florida and one, much more modest, where he was born in Oak Park, Illinois. Furthermore, only two of his twenty or so novels were set in the United States: the early The Torrents of Spring (1926) and the poorly regarded To Have and Have Not (1937) whose setting in Key West, the Southernmost point of the contiguous United States, just barely allows it to be counted as such. Cuba, it seems, has no less of a claim to their “Ernesto.” When building the collection that would become the Hemingway archive at the JFK Presidential library in Boston, his fourth wife and widow Mary was allowed to raid the Finca Vigía house in San Francisco de Paula only with the expressed agreement between herself and Fidel Castro that what remained would belong to the Cuban people in perpetuity (See “History of [Hemingway] Collection,” John F. Kennedy Library Foundation, January 2006, http://www.jfklibrary.org/JFK+Library+and+Museum/Join+and+Support/Friends+of+the+Hemingway+Collection/History+of+Collection.htm [accessed November 27, 2006]). Furthermore, Hemingway donated his Nobel Prize medal to the Cuban people, depositing it—humbly alongside the other pilgrims’ cheap copper coins and stones—it in their most important chapel: the Santuario El Cobre dedicated to the patron saint of Cuba, La Virgen de la Caridad del Cobre. Finally, the novel that most believe clinched him the prize itself—and that was in fact mentioned in his Nobel citation—is set in Cuba and was likely inspired by Cuban fisherman Gregorio Fuentes. All these points deeply undermine the United States’ ability to claim Hemingway as an “American” writer. Rather, it seems, he was born in the US, left at 18, and came “home” only intermittently between then and when he returned for good in 1960 to receive electroshock treatments at the Mayo Clinic and die by his own hand in rural Idaho.

7 The opening pages of the American Scene (In Collected Travel Writings: Great Britain and America. New York: Library of America, 1993) read: “The following pages duly explain themselves, I judge, as to the Author’s point of view and his relation to his subject; but I prefix this word on the chance of any suspected or perceived failure of such references. My visit to America had been the first possible to me for nearly a quarter of a century, and I had before my last previous one, brief and distant to memory, spend other years in continuous absence; so that I was to return with much of the freshness of eye, outward and inward, which, with the further contribution of a state of desire, is commonly held a precious agent of perception I felt no doubt, I confess, of my great advantage on that score; since if I had time to become almost ‘fresh’ as an inquiring stranger, I had not on the other hand had enough to cease to be, or at least to feel, as acute as an initiated native. I made no scruple of my conviction that I should understand and should care better and more than the most earnest of visitors, and yet that I should vibrate with more curiosity—on the extend of ground, that is, on which I might aspire to intimate intelligence at all—than the pilgrim with the longest list of questions, the sharpest appetite for explanations and the largest exposure to mistakes” (353). Following this preface, the opening pages of the first chapter “New England: An Autumn Impression” show James reminiscing in an act that seems more like refamiliarization and reintegration than simple remembering.

8 Brian A. Rowley suggests that “[i]n a general way, this parallelism [between Modernism and Romanticism] is a commonplace of literary history; and there are also many references, in studies both of Romanticism and of Modernism, especially on the German side” (“Anticipations of Modernism in the Age of Romanticism.” [In Facets of European Modernism. Ed. and foreword by Janet Garton.}]


James and Eliot, of course, became subjects of the UK in 1915 and 1927, respectively, and Auden became a US citizen in 1946. Considering these individuals, James is of the most consequence for the purpose of this study. Clearly considering himself at least partially American for the greater part of his life (from his birth in 1843 until just under one year before his death in February 1916), most argue James became a British subject as an act of opposition to the US policy of neutrality in the war (see, for example, Leon Edel, The Master, 1901–1916 [v.5 of Henry James. New York: Lippencott, 1972], 528-32). Thus, it can be inferred that it was only when James perceived a historical break between the Old World and the New that he formally renounced his US citizenship. Previous to 1915, then, it is safe to assert he was engaged in the modern transatlantic cultural cross-currents flowing between the US and Europe and felt at least somewhat conflicted as to his personal nationality.

10 In "Pre-national Time: Novel, Epic, Henry James," Dimock writes, "Literary studies ... largely a nation-based paradigm, has for too long been unilateral, carving up a global network into deceptively sovereign units: American literature, French literature, Italian literature, and so on" (215).

Lawrence S. Rainey’s Modernism: An Anthology is organized not around nationality but rather around the international, chronological development of English-language modernism. Not to be limited by language either, this admirable collection supplies a series of “Continental Interludes” within the anthology’s selections of British, Irish, and American writers. These interludes, translated into English, of course, are labeled with headings such as “Dada” and contain selections from intellectuals such as Walter Benjamin and Frederick Nietzsche.

11 The study of literary modernism being so textually-based a culture, illustrated visual representations of the entangled relationships of modernism are rare. And though it doesn’t deal specifically with national relationships, Bonnie Kime Scott’s “Tangled Mesh of Modernists” is nevertheless a rare visual illustration of the sorts of interactions I outline in the main text (see The Gender of Modernism: An Anthology. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990, 10). Both because of its rarity and its chaotic visual immediacy, I feel this “mesh” warrants mentioning and even seeking out as an illustration of the sorts of relationships and interactions I outline in the main text.

12 For example, after trying out two “provisional definitions” (one “cultural” and one “voluntaristic”), Gellner concludes that “neither is adequate. Definitions of culture, presupposed by the first definition, in the anthropological rather than the normative sense, are notoriously difficult and unsatisfactory. It is probably best to approach this problem by using this term without attempting too much in the way of formal definition, and looking at what culture does” (Nations and Nationalism. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1983, 7). In Imagined Communities (2nd ed. New York: Verso, 2006), Benedict Anderson writes “Theorists of nationalism have often been perplexed, not to say irritated, by these three paradoxes: (1) The objective modernity of nations to the historian’s eye vs. their subjective antiquity in the eyes of nationalists. (2) The formal universality of nationality as a socio-cultural concept—in the modern world everyone can, should, will ‘have’ a nationality, as he or she ‘has’ a gender—vs. the irremediable particularity of its concrete manifestations, such that, by definition, ‘Greek’ nationality is sui generis. (3) The ‘political’ power of nationalisms vs. their philosophical poverty and even incoherence. In other words, unlike most other isms, nationalism has never produced its own grand thinkers: no Hobbes,
Nationalism
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polylingual intellectuals, to a certain condensation" (5). Sentiments similar to these, more or less eloquently stating the difficulty of defining nationalism, are found copiously littered throughout the literature.


18 Stephen Grosby’s definition of nation suggests this as well: “The nation is a territorial community of nativity. One is born into a nation. The significance attributed to this biological fact of birth into the historically evolving, territorial structure of the cultural community of the nation is why the nation is one among a number of forms of kinship. It differs from other forms of kinship such as the family because of the centrality of territory. It differs from other territorial societies such as tribe, city-state, or various ‘ethnic groups’ not merely by the greater extent of its territory, but also because of its relatively uniform culture that provides stability, that is, continuation over time” (Nationalism: A Very Short Introduction 7; Grosby’s italics).

19 For Gellner’s extended discussion of the differences between nations and states, see Nations and Nationalism, 3-7 and 53-62.


24 For Anderson’s extended discussion of the link between print capitalism and the growth of nations, see “The Origins of National Consciousness,” chapter three of Imagined Communities (37-46).

25 There have been two major journals published entitled The Transatlantic Review. The first was published by Ford Madox Ford in 1924 and the second by Joseph F. McCrindle from 1959-77. For information on the former, see Bernard J. Poli, Ford Madox Ford and The Transatlantic Review (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1967). For information on the latter, see McCrindle’s introductions to Stories from the Transatlantic Review (London : Gollancz, 1970), i-xi and Behind the Scenes: Theater and Film Interviews from the Transatlantic Review (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), i-x.

26 Challenging the Gellnerian model of the nation, Anderson advances his concept of nations as imagined by tackling a major oversight of Gellner’s famous monograph head-on: “With a certain ferocity Gellner makes a comparable point when he rules that ‘Nationalism is not the awakening of nations to self-consciousness: it invents nations where they do not exist.’ The drawback to this formulation, however, is that Gellner is so anxious to show that nationalism masquerades under false pretenses that he assimilates ‘invention’ to ‘fabrication’ and ‘falsity’, rather than to ‘imagining’ and ‘creation’. In this way he implies that ‘true’ communities exist which can be advantageously
juxtaposed to nations. In fact, all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined. Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined. Javanese villagers have always known that they are connected to people they have never seen, but these ties were once imagined particularistically—as indefinitely stretchable nets of kinship and clientship. Until quite recently, the Javanese language had no word meaning the abstraction ‘society’” (6).


29 In this passage, Berman is quoting from Ernest Renan’s “What is a Nation?,” 19.

30 Though many schools of philosophy in many cultures use dialectics, Hegel’s concept of dialectics essentially put existence as pure Being, the Sein (thesis), into comparison with its indistinguishable opposite Nothingness, or Nicht (antithesis). This comparison brought Hegel to the conclusion that whatever comes into being is simultaneously returning to nothing: an interaction that results in the union of the two as Becoming (synthesis). See Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, Science and Logic [Trans. A.V. Miller. Intro. J.N. Findlay. New York: Humanities Press, 1969], 81-108. In the afterword to the second German edition of the first volume of Capital (Ed. David McLellan. New York: Oxford UP, 1999), Karl Marx famously appropriated Hegel’s “mystical” model by turning it “right side up” to make his own model of what’s become known as dialectical or historical materialism: “My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite. To Hegel, the life-process of the human brain, i.e., the process of thinking, which, under the name of ‘the Idea,’ he even transforms into an independent subject, is the demiurgos of the real world, and the real world is only the external, phenomenal form of ‘the Idea.’ With me, on the contrary, the ideal is nothing else than the material world reflected by the human mind, and translated into forms of thought. ... The mystification which dialectic suffers in Hegel's hands, by no means prevents him from being the first to present its general form of working in a comprehensive and conscious manner. With him it is standing on its head. It must be turned right side up again, if you would discover the rational kernel within the mystical shell” (11).


34 For example, even though Nimni’s earlier article (see n33) argues Marx and Engels’ own theory of nationalism is inconsistent and even anachronous, in *Marxism and Nationalism: The Theoretical Origins of the Political Crisis* (London: Pluto, 1991) Ephraim Nimni and Ernesto Laclau argue a general theory of nationalism can be extrapolated from the theory of evolution and Marx and Engels’ theory of the economic determination of the forces of production. Another study that seeks to establish a Marxist theory of nationalism in the absence of Marx and Engels’ own is Enzo Traverso and Michael Lowy’s retort to Nimni and Laclau’s text “The Marxist Approach to the National Question: A Critique of Nimni’s Interpretation” (*Science and Society* 54:2 [1990]: 132-46). Several of the works listed in previous notes concerned with the study of nationalism could be said to overlap this topic as well. An extended view of the ways in which socialist thinkers and labor leaders have adapted to, incorporated, and formulated their own theories of the national question is Michael Forman, *Nationalism and the International Labor Movement: The Idea of the Nation in Socialist and Anarchist Theory* (University Park: Penn State UP, 1998); and finally, in 2000 famed British Trotskyist politicians Alan Woods and Ted Grant put together an excellent, ambitiously comprehensive internet critical archive titled “Marxism and the National Question” (http://www.marxist.com/Theory/national_question.html [accessed November 14, 2006]; 15 February 2000, http://www.marxist.com/marxism-national-question250200.htm [accessed November 15, 2006]). Grant and Woods or whomever posted either of the websites either considered the archive to be a sort of hypertext book or posted it as an internet version of a book to be or that has been published because this is the way in which it is referred to on the larger WWW, as a “book” coauthored by Grant and Woods. It is unclear which situation is the case. The internet is a perfect vehicle for distributing free literature widely for little to no cost; and as is frequently the case with WWW “publications,” no one is really positioned to capitalistically profit from intellectual work. Marxist ideology being what it is, it very well may be, then, that Grant and Woods wrote the “book” intending it for dissemination on the WWW. The second URL, at least, presents a very handsome, well-edited version of the work that seems “finished” and “polished” especially by WWW standards but even by customary publication standards as well.

35 Furthermore, Marxism tends to transcend national identities anyway just as—in its idealized, philosophical form—it transcends distinctions of race, language, and religion. Workers and the struggle of the proletariat at the heart of any discussion of Marxism, national identity—like racial and religious identity—matters much less than class identity. In a Marxist vision of the world, the multinational, multi-ethnic, and multi-linguistic workers of the world are all bound by similar experiences of oppression, production, alienation, and control. Additionally, there is an identifiable and ever-generative body of literature associated with Marxism. Like modernism (and transatlantic modernism in particular), then, Marxism would be a particularly illustrative example of the text-based, conceptual, and trans-national communities of practitioners and recorded lives that this dissertation seeks to establish and investigate.


“There is nothing outside of the text. [there is no outside-text; il n’y a pas de hors-texte]. And that is neither because Jean-Jacques’ life, or the existence of Mamma or Therese themselves, is not of prime interest to us, nor because we have access to their so-called "real" existence only in the text and we have neither any means of altering this, nor any right to neglect this limitation. All reasons of this type would already be sufficient, to be sure, but there are more radical reasons. What we have tried to show by following the guiding line of the ‘dangerous supplement,’ is that in what one calls the real life of these existences ‘of flesh and bone,’ beyond and behind what one believes can be circumscribed as Rousseau’s text, there have never been anything but writing; there have never been anything but supplements, substitutive significations which could only come forth in a chain of differential references, the ‘real’ supervening, and being added only while taking on meaning from a trace and from an invocation of the supplement” (Of Grammatology [Trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1998]), 158-59. See also lxii and 602.

Bringing together writings by such theorists as Jonathan Culler, Northrop Frye, Georg Lukács, and Bakhtin, an excellent collection of different theories of the novel is Michael McKeon’s Theory of the Novel: A Historical Approach (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2000).

For comments similar to, but not as extensive or lyrical as, those found in Stevens’ article, see J. R. Oldfield, “Transatlanticism, Slavery, and Race” (American Literary History 14.1 [2002]: 131-140).


Another journal focused on the transatlantic dynamic is Atlantikos (http://www.msu.edu/~atlantik/, accessed October 31, 2006): a Michigan State publication whose submission invitation bears evidence of the broad time period, some 500 years, in which transatlantic studies are conducted: “We accept essays by graduate students in the field of Transatlantic Studies, broadly defined as the study of textual productions dating from the age of exploration to the present that originate in Europe, Africa, and the Americas.” Finally, yet another example of the broad temporality and primarily textual life of transatlantic studies is the following recent conference: “Transatlantic American Studies: Transcultural Visions of Identities in Images and Texts,” an international conference in honor of Günter H. Lenz held at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, February 17-19, 2005.


In his article “America and Its Studies” (America: The Idea, the Literature, spec. issue of PMLA 118, no.1 [January 2003]: 11), Kadir writes: “While America has come to be identified with a single country—The United States—America is a bicontinental hemisphere between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans that extends on a north-south axis from the Arctic to Antarctica. The identification of this territorial expanse with the name of a single country inside it is a historical curiosity, with all the national(ist) symptoms that obtain in that peculiar history. The study of America in a discipline referred to as American studies has been likewise marked by this singular national denotation through a curious set of historical and ideological reductions that are at once evidence of and conductive to a perennial nationalism.” This issue of the PMLA also gives an overview of the interests of the movement and presents several examples of New American, Transatlantic scholarship written by scholars such as Kadir, Ortega, and Marietta Messmer.
CHAPTER 2

HENRY JAMES’ “BIG ANGLO-SAXON TOTAL” AND THE GOLDEN BOWL

Henry James spent October 1888 in Geneva, Switzerland with his companion Constance Fenimore Woolson. The ambiguity surrounding this relationship has, of course, created considerable controversy within scholarly circles just as it did within the James family itself. For example, in a letter to William James, Alice James wrote somewhat condescendingly of their brother Henry’s situation: “Henry is somewhere on the continent flirting with Constance. He seems like the ‘buttony-boy’ to have broken out all over stories” (Yeazell 156). While Henry James was probably ignorant of this particular sentiment, he balanced Alice’s critique nevertheless in an October 1888 letter written at the Hotel de l’Ecu where he was staying, a full mile from Woolson’s room across Lake Geneva. In this, his own letter to William, James praises Robert Louis Stevenson’s novel Master of Ballantrae, muses about his boyhood stay at the Hotel de l’Ecu, and discusses his future travel plans. Having left Alice behind in London earlier that month, James also critiques his sister’s response to Europe, her homesickness, and ultimately what seems to be her exasperating provincialism. Outlining his impressions of her experience for their brother, James describes a certain conflict between his sister and the English in particular:

I don’t think she likes England or the English very much—the people, their mind, their tone, their “hypocrisy” &c. This is owing partly to the confined life she leads
& the partial, passive, fragmentary, and unreacting way in which she sees them.

... Also to her being such a tremendously convinced home ruler. ... It is always a
great misfortune, I think, when one has reached a certain age, that if one is living
in a country not ones own & one is of anything of an ironic or critical disposition,
one mistakes the inevitable reflections & criticisms that one makes, more & more
as one grows older, upon human life & human nature &c, for a judgment of that
particular country, its natives, peculiarities &c, to which, really, one has grown
exceedingly accustomed. (Henry James to William James 213; James’ italics)¹

Sandwiched between this rather biting assessment and the conclusion of the letter, James
asserts his opposition to such an outlook:

For myself, at any rate I am deadly weary of the whole “international” state of
mind—so that I ache, at times, with fatigue at the way it is constantly forced upon
one as a sort of virtue or obligation. I can’t look at the English and American
worlds, or feel about them, any more, save as a big Anglo-Saxon total, destined to
such an amount of melting together that an insistence on their differences
becomes more & more idle & pedantic & that that melting together will come the
faster the more one takes it for granted & treats the life of the 2 countries as
continuous & more or less convertible, or at any rate as simply different chapters
of the same general subject.

Elegantly transitioning into a discussion of the texts in which this “big Anglo-Saxon
total” finds effective expression and representation, James argues:

Literature, fiction in particular, affords a magnificent arm for such taking for
granted, & one may so do an excellent work with it. I have not the least hesitation
in saying that I aspire to write in such a way that it would be impossible to an outsider to say whether I am at a given moment an American writing about England or an Englishman writing about America (dealing as I do with both countries), and far from being ashamed of such an ambiguity I should be exceedingly proud of it, for it would be highly civilized.

Written a little over a year before the beginning of the influential fin-de-siècle decade, this passage bears evidence that the both the modernist aspiration for meta-nationality and its mistrust of conventional forms of (inter)nationalism were gaining momentum even in the late 1880s. Here, before Hemingway, Lawrence, Eliot, and many others made a mockery of our attempts to nationally categorize them, Henry James, himself nationally de-centered and an inspirational expatriate to these later others, was troubled by a similar state of mind, aspiring without "the lest hesitation … to write in such a way that it would be impossible to an outsider to say whether [he was] at a given moment an American writing about England or an Englishman writing about America (dealing as [he did] with both countries)." For James, this sort of meta-nationality is something to be sought after; "and far from being ashamed of such an ambiguity," he was "exceedingly proud of" the "highly civilized" objective.

Upon first glance, though, the opening lines of this passage seem to betray the cultural legacy that has grown like ivy around the living memory of Henry James. Romantic expatriate, textual architect of a bridge between Europe and the US, representative cosmopolite—his biography and body of works have made the name Henry James very nearly synonymous with the term international. As Ezra Pound wrote in an August 1918 issue of The Little Review dedicated to James’ life and works, Henry
James' “great labor” was one of “translation, of making America intelligible, of making it possible for individuals to meet across national borders” (“In Explanation” 7). Even the epitaph on James’ gravestone, situated just across the Charles River from Harvard University in the Cambridge Cemetery, reads “Novelist. Citizen of two countries. Interpreter of his generation on two sides of the sea.” How could it be, then, that in this passage James actually seems to revile the term critics have so closely aligned him with and, perhaps more strikingly, the term he took so many pains to align himself with? The solution to this conundrum lies in the relationship between the two passages I excerpt from the letter. When describing himself as “deadly weary of the whole ‘international’ state of mind,” James uses the term international in a somewhat specialized manner that differs starkly from the way in which we customarily apply it to him: not as a reference to bridging national divides but rather as a reference to his sister’s experience in England which, based on Henry’s description of Alice, seems to have been a grating, critical interaction of nations and nationalities whose particular traits are vigorously compared and contrasted ad nauseum toward an end of illustrating division, irreconcilability, and asymmetry. James’ negative portrayal of this particular “‘international’ state of mind” (“deadly weary,” “ache,” “fatigue,” “forced,” “obligation”) and clear aspirations toward the amorphous “Anglo-Saxon total” set the two concepts in clear opposition. Furthermore, the scare quotes suggest James sought to distance himself from the concept as it has presumably been applied to him and used by those like his sister Alice who participate in the (inter)national compare-contrast ritual James describes and unmistakably scorns. International in this passage implies an interaction of nations that is quite anti-cosmopolitan and even provincial, grouping nations in order to emphasize their
incongruity in an endless process of comparing and contrasting differences. Readily
distinguishable, easily split apart, and colliding against one another like marbles in the
same ring or ball-bearings in the same machine, James uses *international* in this passage
to describe a form of international relations wherein nations are set in divisive,
oppositional conflict rather than constructive communities. This sort of internationalism
exists only to justify division and establish difference rather than create new unities. The
term differs quite sharply, then, from James’ description of the Anglo-Saxon unity which
suggests something much more like a coin or a book: objects whose multiple elements
are distinguishable to a degree but which are also intimately merged into a single unit.
For example, James writes that the “Anglo-Saxon total” is “continuous & more or less
convertible, or at any rate … simply different chapters of the same general subject.” Not
synthesized exactly but certainly more unified than the specialized sense of *international*
he establishes in this letter would allow, James’ vision of a transatlantic union fuses the
nations of Europe and America into a constructive dialogic community that even the label
*international* doesn’t comfortably describe.

I would argue that the ideal, amorphous “Anglo-Saxon total” James identifies in
this letter is his vision the transatlantic nation. However, even though James identifies
literature, “fiction in particular,” as the “magnificent arm” of this Anglo-Saxon union, the
Master found it persistently difficult to actually create fictions that manifested his ideal.
Instead, the majority of James’ international, transatlantic novels are, ironically,
representations of the sort of internationalism he reviles in the 1888 letter to his brother,
texts that emphasize the disconnect between the US and Europe, outline the imbalance of
their interactions, and suggest a (re)union of the two is unlikely. The *Golden Bowl,*
though, diverges from these other national-opposition texts and suggests that some fusion of the US and Europe, and therefore realization of the “big Anglo-Saxon total,” might indeed be possible. I argue, then, that this novel is James’ most concentrated literary expression of the transatlantic unity he aspires to in the 1888 letter and his most profound representation of and contribution to the transatlantic imagined community.

Michael Anesko argues that early in his career, James began his European-American textual (re)unification project that would take him through the rest of his life, producing transatlantic fictions read and discussed on both sides of the Atlantic and understood as the embodiment of some sort of bridge between the two. By 1888, he’d published *Roderick Hudson* (1875), *The American* (1877), *The Europeans* (1878), *The Portrait of a Lady* (1881), and *The Reverberator* (1888). Outlining the transatlantic straddle of James’ literary career both in terms of aesthetics and the business of publishing, Anesko contents that in the late 1880s, James’ rising fame transformed him into a kind of literary ambassador from the new world to the old. … The particular success of ‘Daisy Miller’ stimulated a new appetite for fiction based on the ‘international situation.’ And James was immediately heralded as its creator. His books were widely discussed; he associated freely with the best literary circles in London; and in America he was welcomed home as a prominent man of letters. (79-80)

Michael Lund puts a similar emphasis on “Daisy Miller” as the originator of a new line of American literature steeped in the tradition of the European gaze toward the New World but revolutionary for its about-face as American literature began to “successfully export its forms and techniques to Europe” (126). Both Lund and Anesko also emphasize the
important role periodical serialization and reviews played in disseminating James’ transatlantic vision, as does Sara Blair who, in *Henry James on Race and Nation*, studies the role mass communication, namely press, photography, and visual culture, played on James’ literary output with regards to his experimental brand of transatlantic American realism and its role in shaping US national identity.

Though critics have largely glossed over the fact, European and American audiences received *The Golden Bowl* widely and in ways that mimicked their reception of other works such as “Daisy Miller,” namely, as a representation of transatlantic community. According to H.W. Boynton, it was marketed as “an international story” which was “sure to attract the wider audience as well as the elect” (413). And while the idea that a James novel would have mass-market appeal seems profoundly strange today, *The Golden Bowl* indeed seems to have been aimed at, and received by, a broad spectrum of the reading public. Though “negotiations with the Century” over James’ compensation caused the project to fall through (Anesko 169), the novel was invited for serialization by the popular New York magazine. Likely illuminating the appeal of serialization because of the effect it would have on magazine sales, retail sales of the novel seem to have been brisk. Leon Edel reports that “*The Golden Bowl* consorted in the bookshops with the current best-sellers” (*The Master* 276), and Roger Gard suggests “sales of *The Golden Bowl* even seemed to promise a real extension of interest in his work” (15). Further emphasizing the novel’s widespread appeal, *The Golden Bowl* was reviewed in no fewer than thirty-five papers, in the newspapers of record of such UK cities as London and Manchester and, across the pond, in New York, Boston, Chicago, New Orleans, Cleveland, and as far away as Oakland, California. Though these reviews are often
harsh, these reviews often present *The Golden Bowl* as a representation of the transatlantic nation.

For example, in a rather scalding review that challenges *The Golden Bowl*'s widespread appeal (naively, considering what seem to have been extensive sales), H.W. Boynton labels the novel a “cosmopolitan story” (413). Moreover, his choppy, fragmented summation of the plot suggests a preoccupation with the characters’ “cosmopolitan accomplishment” (414), their own mixed nationalities, and the transatlantic cross-currents and mixtures created by their marriages:

An Italian Prince, to be known as Amerigo ... betrothed and presently married to Maggie Verver, daughter of Adam Verver of American City, U.S. ... secondly married to Charlotte Stant of American blood, but of Italian birth and cosmopolitan accomplishment ... Mrs. Assingham, also acknowledged to be of American birth ... Colonel Assingham, a retired officer of the British Army ... (414)

Likewise, the anonymous *Independent* reviewer reads the novel as a sort of stage on which James’ typical conflict between “American uprightness and simplicity” and “European sordid sophistication” plays itself out (422). But the reviewer notes an important difference between *The Golden Bowl* and other novels such as *The Wings of the Dove*: the characters of the *The Golden Bowl* are more nationally complicated than their counterparts in other novels. For example, the reviewer suggests Maggie “has married into a title supplied by an Italian prince, tho [sic] one who is a resident of England ... Charlotte, by the way, is not a European by blood, tho she is by birth and instinct and education. Mrs Assingham, another English character, is also an American
made over” (422). As is the case with the Boynton review, such a preoccupation on the
reviewer’s parts reveals a sensitivity to the transatlantic community in which these
characters move about and the representation of it they form by virtue of their
interactions. Other reviewers, such as Annie R.M. Logan and the anonymous London
Morning Post writer, do similarly, describing the The Golden Bowl as a representation of
a transatlantic community unified by social and economic interaction unfettered by
traditional national distinctions, identities, and borders. For example, of the novel’s plot
and character interactions Logan writes,

Mr. Verver, a person so rich that his nationality may be taken for granted, buys
for his daughter Maggie a husband, a Roman Prince ... The Prince .. means to use
the Verver money as his own ... Just before the marriage, appears in London Miss
Charlotte Stant ... She has left her own vast and uninteresting continent and
crossed the Atlantic ostensibly to buy a wedding present for Maggie. (423-24)

Logan’s portrait of the novel, then, is of a single community and marketplace within
which money flows freely and social interactions bind traditional Atlantic-world
nationalities into a new transatlantic whole. Finally, in his review, Claude Bragdon
extends this sense of transatlantic community to include James himself. Comparing him
to a list of solidly British novelists, including George Meredith, Thomas Hardy, Rudyard
Kipling, and J.M. Barrie, Bragdon refuses to nationally finalize James with any more
precision than as “the only Ango-Saxon novelist of the first class remaining” (420). In
this way, Bragdon seems to gratify James’ 1888 desire to be classed as neither British nor
American but rather as the liminal articulator of a transatlantic, “Anglo-Saxon”
community. Bragdon also picks up on The Golden Bowl’s representation of such a
community, arguing the novel is in part a portrait of "the seduction exercised by Europe on the American imagination" (421) and closes with a rather purple extended metaphor meant to define James' late career mindset and situate him in the history of his family. This metaphor, though, also serves as a portrait of the transatlantic community: "... the Swedenborgianism of his father, like some pure, pale flower plucked from a cold Norwegian precipace, transplanted thence to a New England garden, blooms now in an English hothouse" (422).

A classic development of Andersonian nationalism, Lund, Anesko, Blair, and The Golden BowT's contemporary reviewers all suggest how these print media sources created a conceptual reality wherein newspapers and magazines, along with James' novels and short stories they helped publicize, carried the idea of transatlantic nationalism and disseminated it on both sides of the Atlantic. Anesko even suggests the extent to which James' late career was a part of an even larger trend of solidifying the European-American publishing industry into one community of copyright protection and publishing imprints: "When the United States and Great Britain signed the first Anglo-American copyright agreement in 1891, the transatlantic market for literary works instantly expanded" (142). It also instantly solidified into one literary market and a single literary community. In true Andersonian fashion, then, what was textually-based also became materially realized as James' transatlantic fiction, the reviews of these texts, and the larger publishing marketplace of the late-1800s/early-1900s created and disseminated the idea that the Atlantic peoples in Europe and America could be unified into one imagined community. It seems no accident, then, that James would use a textual simile to describe an Anglo-Saxon union that both lived and was disseminated in print. In the 1888 letter to
his brother, James describes the idealized transatlantic imagined community “as simply
different chapters of the same general subject.” Like the dialogic chapters interacting,
while not outright synthesizing, to form a single text or subject, James disparages the
dissonant “internationalism” his sister Alice participates in and instead aspires to a
transatlantic community built around the harmonious, dialogic union of national parts. In
the letter, James also articulates the relationship between the transatlantic nation and the
texts that both form and embody it and the ability literature has to create the Anglo-Saxon
union he aspires to: “Literature, fiction in particular, affords a magnificent arm for such
taking for granted, & one may so do an excellent work with it.”

Upon inspection, though, it seems rather strange that the dissemination of the
larger portion of James’ transatlantic texts and their reviews would hasten a sense of
transatlantic unity, engaging so persistently as they do in Alice James’ style of
international comparing and contrasting. And no matter how “deadly weary” James was
of this sort of internationalism and no matter how fervently he and others have thought
that literature could transcend it, most critics have never really allowed him to break free
of that “state of mind.” After all, discussions of the so-called “international situation”
(meaning Alice’s style of asymmetrical internationalism) in his fiction loom largely
within the voluminous body of Jamesean criticism. As Pound describes, perhaps
contradicting himself, in the same essay already mentioned, “the major conflicts which
[James] portrays” in his texts show

race against race, immutable; the essential Americanness, or Englishness or
Frenchness … the difference between one nation and another; not flag-waiving
and treaties, not the machinery of government, but ‘why’ there is always
misunderstanding, why men of different race are not the same. ... [I]n these novels, the essential qualities which make up the national qualities, are found and set working, the fundamental oppositions made clear. (9)

T.S. Eliot's contributions to the same issue of the *Little Review* possess similar reservations about James' ability to act as a bridge, either as a man or a writer, imposing upon the Master a constant stream of international oppositions, leaving the Atlantic split quite divided. Later in the twentieth century, Louis Auchincloss suggests,

It has always seemed curious to me that one of the most discussed aspects of James’s fiction should be the ‘international situation.’ I have never seen what there was to be said about his treatment of this theme after one has noted that his American characters are high-minded and naive and are taken advantage of by their more worldly European acquaintances. (56)

Auchincloss even goes so far as to suggest that James’ “comparison of American with European values brought out [his] most superficial side” (57) and finally refers to the “international situation” as an over-concern of James’ (61). Nearly sixty years ago, F.O. Matthiessen came to a similar conclusion, again emphasizing the importance of “Daisy Miller” in establishing James’ concern with the European/American divide: “... I am not primarily concerned with James’ international theme. From [James’] first success with *Daisy Miller* that aspect of his achievement has been the one most frequently dwelt upon” (xi-xii). Some of us, though, see the international situation as one of James’ greatest achievements rather than his most definable cliché. Critics such as Cristof Wegelin and Leon Edel, for example, peerlessly articulate ways to address the study of James’ obsession with the Atlantic split and precipitated the contemporary preoccupation
with James and cosmopolitanism by critics such as Jessica Berman and Adeline Tintner.⁸ Therefore, although even contemporary critics such as Tintner suggest “[p]erhaps the most overworked area in studies of Henry James has concerned his development of the international theme, especially in its earlier phases” (1), the trend simply will not abate. Critics continually find new ways to approach the subject, suggesting the Jamesean canon is a bountiful resource for discussing internationalism, transnationalism, cosmopolitanism, and related features such as this study’s concept of a transatlantic nation.

For my part in this debate, I argue that the international situations James wrote into his fictions seem thoroughly ironic in the context of the 1888 letter to his brother. With the critics split on the issue—sometimes arguing James acted as an international bridge, sometimes arguing he engaged in his sister’s style of asymmetrical internationalism—I turn to James’ transatlantic texts themselves to settle the issue. I argue that within this body of fiction, we find that the majority of his international, transatlantic texts save *The Golden Bowl* suggest James’ artistic vision was consistently bound by the sort of internationalism the 1888 letter suggests he despised. Along with the three “major phase” novels, that is, *The Ambassadors, The Wings of the Dove,* and *The Golden Bowl,* key representatives of James’ body of transatlantic fictions would include *Roderick Hudson,* *The American,* *The Portrait of a Lady,* and of course “Daisy Miller” and other assorted shorter works: texts that contain persistent European-American themes, major European-American characters engaged in relationships with one another, and amplified processes of exchange between the Europe and the US. These texts warrant the label “key” because of their inclusion in the New York Edition of 1909 (vs. other of
James’ transatlantic novels such as *The Europeans*) and their relative centrality within the Jamesean canon (vs. more obscure novels such as *The Reverberator*). As previously suggested, critics persistently refer to these sorts of texts as James’ “international situation” fictions. However, such texts are almost always concerned with the transatlantic relationship and are perhaps more properly labeled as such because the primarily international interactions found therein are between American and European characters. For example, Brits Kate Croy and Merton Densher scheme against American Milly Theale in *The Wings of the Dove*, the French Bellegardes expose American Christopher Newman to the ways of the world in *The American*, and French Marie de Vionnet helps open American Lambert Strether’s eyes to a world of aesthetics and moral relativism in *The Ambassadors*. Through such European-American international interactions, James’ transatlantic fictions consistently operate around the sort of internationalism he disparages in the 1888 letter, highlighting the differences and disconnection between Europe and America and suggesting there is an unbridgeable difference between the two. Sometimes, James’ transatlantic texts go as far as suggesting interactions between Americans and Europeans can lead to disagreeable, even tragic outcomes.

In “Daisy Miller,” for example, the titular heroine dies in Rome as a result of a fever she develops during a nighttime outing with Giovanelli, the “cavaliere avvocato” she and her family attach themselves to Rome (285). Highlighting the difference between Daisy’s American liberalism and European reserve, Winterbourne scolds Daisy’s constant flirting, warning her “they don’t understand that sort of thing here” (281). In *The Ambassadors*, Madame de Vionnet tells Strether “[o]ur arrangements are so different
from yours” (365); and of course model American girl Isabel Archer, who has “been encouraged to express herself,” seen “her remarks attended to,” and “been expected to have emotions and opinions” (78), stands in stark contrast to her demure European sisters, especially someone like family-dominated Claire de Cintré in The American.

When forms of European-American fusion do occur in these texts, James seems to further betray his ideal Anglo-Saxon total as the results of the fusion are commonly problematic and suggest Europe and the US are best left separate. For example, when adulterated Americans such as Winterbourne, who have “lived too long in foreign parts” (James, “Daisy Miller” 295), appear in James’ texts, they are frequently villainous. In Roderick Hudson, the eponymous American main character becomes catastrophically obsessed with the complex and sinister Christina Light, the European-raised half-American daughter of an American painter and an Englishwoman (James, Novels: 1871-1880 271). Gilbert Osmond, an American gentleman living in Florence, ultimately dooms Isabel Archer’s quest to live in happy freedom; and while he is not exactly villainous, Winterbourne’s views on Americans who have “lived too long in foreign parts” comes off more as a lament than a source of pride, the essential sense of it being that something (namely, his “Americanness”) has been irreparably and regretfully lost. A similar thing could be said of Maria Gostrey, an unmarried American woman living in Paris, who in the beginning of The Ambassadors makes her expatriatism and European assimilation seem more like a prison sentence than a Hemingwaysque adventure:

My own fate had been too many for me, and I’ve succumbed to it. I’m a general guide—to “Europe,” don’t you know? I wait for people—I put them through. I pick them up—I set them down. I’m a sort of superior
“courier maid.” I’m a companion at large. I take people, as I’ve told you, about. I never sought it—it has come to me. It has been my fate, and one’s fate one accepts. (65)

At the conclusion of the same novel, both Lambert Strether and Chad Newsome face a similarly uncomfortable reality. Neither European nor American, something like the Anglo-Saxon total might appear to have been reached; but as with James’ other transatlantic texts, the novel presents the fusion as something unappealing and cheerless, confused and restless even. In their final meeting, Madame de Vionnet lambastes Strether, though she might as well be speaking to her lover Chad: “Where is your ‘home’ moreover now—what has become of it? I’ve made a change in your life, I know I have; I’ve upset everything in your mind as well; in your sense of—what shall I call it?—all the decencies and possibilities” (480). Moreover, this scene comes at the end of a novel driven by a key international tension, namely, the US, embodied by the specter of Mrs. Newsome, trying again and again to regroup her brood and bring “home” Americans in danger of becoming Europeanized. Communal unity, especially of a constructive sort, between the US and Europe is largely absent from The Ambassadors; and instead, a sense of essential difference between “home” and “foreign” and the confusion and contamination that occurs when these two intermix drives the novel’s transatlantic exchanges. Doubtlessly, in this way, we feel Strether most piquantly at the end of the novel since he, like Winterbourne, seems somehow less American at the conclusion of the novel and sadder for the loss. He knows then that his relationship with Chad’s mother, Mrs. Newsome, to whatever extent it existed, is over because of the changes he’s undergone while immersed in European social life: “Too much has happened. I’m
different for her ... She's the same. She's more than ever the same. But I do what I didn't before—I see her” (510). Dialoguing with Miss Gostrey, herself a lost expatriate, Strether is then asked the looming, unanswered question, “What then do you go home to?” (510). Asked again several lines later, Strether finally answers, “I don’t know” (511); and we’re not even sure that he will return to the US. At the conclusion of The Ambassadors’ dark comedy, then, Lambert Strether finds himself in an uncomfortable liminality rather than an Anglo-Saxon totality. Therefore, while James allows that “Americans, rightly or wrongly, are commended for the ease with which they adapt themselves to foreign conditions” (Portrait of a Lady 40), the results of these adaptations are, as I previously suggested, frequently tragic at worst and unsavory and uncomfortable at best.

In these sorts of passages and through the experiences of these sorts of characters, James can even make the “Anglo-Saxon total” seem like something to be avoided rather than aspired to. Even fairly well-adjusted Americans living in Europe can seem vehemently resistant to any sort of fusion with European culture, instead choosing a persistent engagement with Alice James’ style of grinding “internationalism.” The Touchetts in The Portrait of a Lady, for example, may not be even one generation removed from their Rutland, Vermont origins; but even as paterfamilias Daniel, who “had been a very small boy” when his father came to England “as a subordinate banking partner in a banking-house where some ten years later he gained preponderant control,” sees “before him a life-long residence in his adopted country, of which, from the first, he took a simple, sane and accommodating view,” he has “no intention of disamericanising” and no “desire to teach his only son” Ralph, born in England, “any such subtle art” (38-
39). The narration continues, outlining Daniel’s stubborn resistance to forming any sort of Anglo-Saxon total between the US and England:

It had been for himself so very soluble a problem to live in England assimilated yet unconverted that it seemed to him equally simple his lawful heir should after his death carry on the grey old bank in the white American light. He was at pains to intensify this light, however, by sending the boy home for his education. Ralph spent several terms at an American school and took a degree at an American university, after which, as he struck his father on his return as even redundantly native, he was placed for some three years in residence at Oxford. Oxford swallowed up Harvard, and Ralph became at last English enough. (39)

The idea of being “redundantly native” (perhaps meaning artificially and/or too intensely American) and the macrophagic Oxfordian cure seem to highlight the constant back-and-forth Ralph experiences, being tossed between cultural and national identities at the mercy of his father’s attempts to craft him into an American who can live in British society. This sense of awkwardly adjusted, Anglo-American “internationalism” continues in James’ rich and sensitive portrait of the relationship between Touchett père and Touchett fils. Ralph’s “outward conformity to the manners that surrounded him was none the less the mast of a mind that greatly enjoyed its independence, on which nothing long imposed itself, and which, naturally inclined to adventure and irony, indulged in a boundless liberty of appreciation” (39). Like his cousin Isabel Archer, Ralph’s sense of freedom, intimated with certain buzz words such as “independence” and “liberty,” helps reveal his Americanness in opposition to the world of “manners” that surround him, namely, English society. Furthermore, while Ralph “distinguished himself, to his father’s
ineffable satisfaction” at Oxford (39), it seems he’s all but shut out from a career in England due to his father’s plan for him to carry on “the grey old bank in the white American light,” his invalidism, or simply because he is an American. Ralph might have a career by returning to his own country (though this point is shrouded in uncertainty) and even if Mr. [Daniel] Touchett had been willing to part with [Ralph] (which was not the case) it would have gone hard with him to put a watery waste permanently between himself and the old man whom he regarded as his best friend. (39)

Contrasting sharply with James’ sense of Anglo-Saxon totality, the image of the Atlantic as a “watery waste” that would divide father and son were one in America and one in England seems to emphasize just how disconnected the two spheres are and how great the national and geographical distance between the two is. This passage then ends by suggesting the complex divisions between Americans and Europeans. Reflecting on Daniel Touchett’s intention to live with stubborn resolve, as an American in English society, the narrator outlines how a workable solution, but never an outright Anglo-Saxon fusion, may be reached that allows even a hardened New Englander to live among the old English while preserving his American identity:

Americans, rightly or wrongly, are commended for the ease with which they adapt themselves to foreign conditions; but Mr. [Daniel] Touchett had made the very limits of his pliancy half the ground of his general success. He had retained in their freshness most of his marks of primary pressure; his tone, as his son always noted with pleasure, was that of the more luxuriant parts of New England. At the end of his life he had become, on his own ground, as mellow as he was rich; he
combined consummate shrewdness with the disposition superficially to fraternize, and his “social position,” on which he had never wasted a care, had the firm perfection of an unthumbed fruit. (39-40)

Worlds apart from the sort of civilized ambiguity James aspires to in his 1888 letter, namely, a blurring of the distinguishability between his fictions and even his own self as either American or British, characters such as Daniel Touchett seek no such Anglo-Saxon total. Rather, they construct ways by which Americans may remain Americans and yet fit in with English society. Though a bit muted for the sake of effective social progress, asymmetrical internationalism is vividly present in this passage and in the lives of these characters. And in a final statement of defiance to assimilation, it seems the Touchetts are bound to stubbornly maintain their differences in the face of an English milieu, no matter how seductive that social ether may appear:

It was perhaps his want of imagination and of what is called the historic consciousness; but to many of the impressions usually made by English life upon the cultivated stranger his sense was completely closed. There were certain differences he had never perceived, certain habits he had never formed, certain obscurities he had never sounded. As regards these latter, on the day he had sounded them his son would have thought less well of him. (40)

Thus it seems that even as they curse “the flatness of exile” in England, the Touchetts nevertheless, as James puts it, curse only to conform (41); but as Portrait of a Lady extends this picture of development, it sketches out an image of uncomfortable difference and asymmetry, namely, the sort of internationalism James identifies and derides in his 1888 letter.
Henry James also consistently betrays his vision of a unified transatlantic community by using certain amplified process of national commercial and cultural exchange that occur between Europe and the US. These processes form the macrostructure of several of James’ transatlantic texts, further suggesting the extent to which these fictions are ironically bound by asymmetrical internationalism. Driven by imbalances he sets up between the US and Europe, several of James’ transatlantic texts operate around patterns of exchange that attempt to mediate scarcity on one side of the Atlantic and superfluity on the other. In *Roderick Hudson*, *The American*, and *The Wings of the Dove*, for example, representatives of the two sides of the Atlantic world enter into exchange relationships that attempt to balance and resolve certain disproportionalities but that actually result in the amplification of the differences between the two sides of the Atlantic. I label these processes of European-American exchange a *cultural chiasmus*. Used to great effect by US president John Kennedy who encouraged Americans to “Ask not what your country can do for you; ask what you can do for your country” (Kennedy), these exchange relationships conceptually approximate the chiasmus, the rhetorical trope of inverted parallelism. As he presents them in several of his transatlantic fictions, James presents the US as a region of abundant capital resources but lacking certain aspects of historical heritage, culture, and aesthetic resources found in Europe, something akin to what James, in *The Portrait of a Lady*, refers to as “the historic consciousness” (40). Even to the point of their own undoing, Americans readily trade portions of their capital resources in order to gain possession of these European artifacts and/or internalize some form of the historic consciousness. On the other side of the chiasmus, James presents Europe as flush with in the sorts of historical, cultural, and aesthetic resources and
experiences craved by their American counterparts but lacking in the capital resources found on the other side of the Atlantic in abundance. In a manner opposite the Americans, Europe and its representatives readily give up their cultural resources (aristocratic titles, art, aesthetic experiences) and share their historic conscience in order to gain the capital resources found on the other side of the Atlantic. And while the cultural chiasmus might appear to create harmony and stability between the US and Europe, the effects of these interactions are usually anything but. Rather, as is the case with the bulk of James’ transatlantic fictions, the negotiated asymmetry outlined above actually further emphasizes the disconnect between Americans and Europeans and suggests a (re)union is unlikely.

For example, the eponymous hero of *Roderick Hudson* travels with the wealthy American Rowland Mallet to Rome where, thanks to Mallet’s millions, aesthetic resources abound for the young sculptor. Hudson squanders his chance, though; and after discovering Mallet is in love with his fiancée, Hudson dies in an Alpine storm. *Roderick Hudson*, then, ends with a stock Jamesean trope that suggests the continued division of the US and Europe: the corruption and even destruction of Americans set against a European milieu. In *The American*, wealthy American Civil War veteran Christopher Newman becomes engaged to the half-French, half-English noblewoman Claire de Cintré (*The American* 46-47) only to have his relationship with her thwarted by her mother and older brother who are drawn to Newman’s money but ultimately cannot “reconcile” themselves to his “antecedents … to a commercial person” (*The American* 218). As previously mentioned, rich but ailing American Milly Theale is set upon by Brits Kate Croy and Merton Densher in *The Wings of the Dove* who scheme to take her money.
Theale catches an aesthetic vision of her mortality in Florence at the Uffizi while looking at a Bronzino portrait (possibly that of Lucrezia Panciatichi) and ultimately does leave a sum of money to Densher before she dies. However, Densher refuses it, and all the money goes to Croy whose relationship with Densher abruptly ends. Finally, though it follows quite a different process of development, even in “Daisy Miller” a hint of the troubled cultural chiasmus lingers in the background like the Coliseum miasma that dooms Daisy. Referring to the attachment between Giovanelli and the Millers, Daisy in particular, Winterbourne muses at one point that the Italian...

has never found himself in personal contact with such splendor, such opulence, such expensiveness, as this young lady’s. … He has nothing but his handsome face to offer, and there is a substantial Mr. Miller in that mysterious land of dollars. Giovanelli knows that he hasn’t a title to offer. If he were only a count or a marchese! He must wonder at his luck at the way they have taken him up. (285)

In this way, Winterbourne sets up the relationship between the Millers and Giovanelli in terms of the cultural chiasmus. Thought they falsely believe he has one to offer, the Millers are drawn to Giovanelli’s title while he is drawn to their money issuing from the US which James almost heavy-handedly abstracts as “that mysterious land of dollars.” Ultimately, it is even this relationship that leads to Daisy’s death. Thus in the case of “Daisy Miller,” Roderick Hudson, The American, and The Wings of the Dove, the cultural chiasmus draws the characters, themselves representations of Europe and the US, together but, ultimately, fails to bind them in lasting unions.  

The cultural chiasmus, then, is one of several ways in which James’ body of “international situation,” transatlantic texts consistently suggest: a (re)union of the US
and Europe is unlikely and even undesirable; that the cultural drama between these two spheres of the Atlantic world often ends in tragedy and disorder; and that any sort of transatlantic total will always be thwarted by the myriad differences that exist between Europe and America. In this way, the majority of James’ transatlantic texts ironically suggest that Alice’s “international” critiques are more representative of the Atlantic split in her brother’s fictions than Henry’s own vision of an Anglo-Saxon total. In *The Golden Bowl*, though, the only major transatlantic text yet to be considered, James presents a thoroughly different portrait of the Atlantic relationship. Here, toward the end of his career, James was finally able to use the “magnificent arm” of literature to create his own textual articulation of the “big Anglo-Saxon total” he aspired to in 1888.

Just past the centenary of the novel’s publication, it remains quite unexceptional to make these sorts of assertions about the exceptionalism of *The Golden Bowl*. Nevertheless, the practice continues unabated. Whether to laude various forms of its pre-eminence, to suggest the text’s central role in the development of the modern novel, or to discuss certain thematic and stylistic peculiarities that make it an incongruous member of James’ larger oeuvre, critics consistently assert *The Golden Bowl*’s uniqueness. Playing on the infamous World War I epithet, Gabriel Pearson refers to the text as “The Novel to End all Novels”; and both James himself and Leon Edel believe it represents the “summit” of the former’s career (*The Master 219*). Of late, both James and *The Golden Bowl* have enjoyed a highly visible presence in the extensive discussions of cosmopolitanism current in modernist studies. Assertions of *The Golden Bowl*’s distinctiveness are acutely present in these commentaries as well. Adeline Tintner suggests the novel is “the chief representative of the cosmopolitan novel in James’
oeuvre" (224) and Jessica Berman argues "Adam Verver is James’s ultimate expression of the American commercial man" (66). Considering The Golden Bowl’s position in the development of the modern novel, especially the version produced in the United States, Mark McGurl concludes that The Golden Bowl helped elevate the genre to new levels of aesthetic prominence. Referencing its thematic and stylistic peculiarities, Denis Donoghue and James both claim the novel is composed of a certain indirect obliqueness that makes it a unique member of the Jamesean canon. Even when critics such as F.O. Matthiessen break James’ body of work into typical subsets such as the three completed novels of the “major phase,” they read The Golden Bowl as a largely incongruous other alongside the other two: The Wings of the Dove and The Ambassadors. Stephen Spender suggests the novel is a portrait of “two different sorts of marriage” rather than “the single isolated person in conflict with the intrigue of nature and marriage” as is the case in the other two late novels (35). Nicola Bradbury writes, “The Golden Bowl, though written shortly after The Wings of the Dove and The Ambassadors, differs from them not simply in degree but in kind” (123).

It seems merely a matter of course, then, that so exceptional a novel—on both a broad literary scale and within the context of James’ total oeuvre; for formal, thematic, and stylistic reasons—would also be a unique member of James’ more intimate canon of transatlantic fictions. However, the numerous ways in which The Golden Bowl differs from the rest of these texts notwithstanding, the novel actually possesses many of the same formulas as James’ other transatlantic novels. Comfortably a part of this group of Jamesean texts for this and other thematic reasons, the elements The Golden Bowl shares with James’ other transatlantic fictions nevertheless lead to different conclusions. Rather
than engaging in Alice James-style internationalism that leads to a sense of sustained
disconnection and asymmetry between Europe and the US, *The Golden Bowl* uses the
cultural chiasmus and other Jamesean transatlantic devices, such as the Europeanized
American, to illustrate the formation of the big Anglo-Saxon total James describes, what
I refer to as the transatlantic nation.

While several other situations and characters give the book its transatlantic flavor,
the centerpiece of this development is the marriage of Prince Amerigo and Maggie
verver. As Stephen Spender suggests in the previous quotation, *The Golden Bowl* is
essentially a book about marriage. Elsewhere in *The Destructive Element*, Spender
further argues this conclusion, suggesting *The Golden Bowl* examines a “conflict,
between the two kinds of marriage, the spiritual and the Platonie” (88). Likewise, Martha
C. Nussbaum reads the novel as a philosophical meta-love story that explores certain
modes of Aristotelian moral philosophy and the imperative therein of adequately
representing material life and its inherent value structures. In fact, had he not already
used it for an 1891 short story, James’ preferred title for the *donnée* that would became
*The Golden Bowl* was apparently *The Marriages*; and it is through the most central
marriage of the book, namely, Prince Amerigo and Maggie Verver’s, that *The Golden
Bowl* most perceptibly sustains itself as a fable of European-American totality and a
metaphorical portrait of the transatlantic imagined community. Others have come to
related conclusions. For example, hinting at the cultural chiasmus that drives several of
James’ transatlantic fictions including *The Golden Bowl*, Christof Wegelin eloquently
writes that the marriage of Amerigo and Maggie “itself is emblematic” (124). Wegelin
explains that the novel “begins as a marriage of American wealth to European nobility,
motivated on the European side by the need to make nobility solvent, on the American side by the desire to appropriate the tangible signs of tradition and age” (124). Suggestive of the extent to which James was able to communicate his vision of an Anglo-Saxon total via *The Golden Bowl*, Weglin very nearly paraphrases the Master’s 1888 vision: “On one level, then, *The Golden Bowl* is a fable emblematic of the achievement of the international ‘social fusion’ which James envisions as the ultimate result of the increasingly intimate social relations between Europe and America” (125). Intoning James’ Anglo-Saxon total and the transatlantic nation in this way and using the phrase “social fusion” from James’ preface to the fourteenth volume of the New York Edition (vi), Wegelin reads the marriage of Amerigo and Maggie as essentially the vehicle by which James achieves what he calls, in the same preface, “a new scale of relations” (v) between Europe and America. Finally, echoing my own analysis of James’ transatlantic canon, Leon Edel suggests that *The Golden Bowl* is unique because among all of James’ novels, even the transatlantic ones, it alone symbolically marries the US and Europe. Like Weglin, Edel reads the marriage of the Prince and Maggie as the vehicle through which James achieves this metaphor, suggesting that by the time *The Golden Bowl* was published,

> [James] had written nineteen novels and in many of them he had affirmed that no marriage as possible between the Old World and the New—that America and Europe were irreconcilable. Now in his twentieth he brings the marriage off.

Prince Amerigo, descendant of explorers, can as it were “marry” the continent of their journeyings; and Maggie—and America—can with the proper will respond not in ignorance but in awareness. (*The Master* 216)
As I suggest, in his other transatlantic fictions James puts American and European elements in conflict with one another to examine their differences and the ultimate division created by the Atlantic split. Setting this marriage as the dominant symbol of transatlantic unity in *The Golden Bowl*, though, helps reveal a host of threads James uses to tie traditional forms of Atlantic nationality into a successful dialogic relationship that creates the transatlantic community.

In a larger sense, though, *The Golden Bowl* is a representation of chaotic national identity from which the marriage of Amerigo and Charlotte and the other markers of transatlantic unity develop. As I suggested in the introduction, the larger social and aesthetic context of modernism, of which *The Golden Bowl* and Henry James were a part, was one that included radical shifts in national identity from clean divisions to more complex and decentered forms of (inter)national organization and personal national identity constructions. This was especially pronounced in the lives of writers in the Atlantic world, such as James himself, and is likewise hyper-present in the lives of the characters in *The Golden Bowl*. Critics focus on the topic of nationalism and *The Golden Bowl* in a variety of ways, most rather different from the position I take. Using *The Golden Bowl* as an important touchstone and initially seeming to come close to my own argument about the novel, Wai Chee Dimock’s article “Pre-national time: Novel, Epic, Henry James” moves beyond Alice James’ practice of comparing and contrasting defined national units and supports the decentered geography and temporality of the Anglo-Saxon total/transatlantic imagined community. In an excellent article that suggests James scholarship has traditionally been a rare exception to the prevailing academic modes of literary nationality paradigms carving up “a global network into deceptively sovereign
units: American literature, French literature, Italian literature, and so on" (215), Dimock looks beyond the traditional academic forms of periodization and geography and toward more “loosened up” models of categorization (216). Appropriate to her goals, though, Dimock ultimately does not use *The Golden Bowl*’s national issues to discuss the way it and other Jamesan texts negotiate nationalism in its own right. Rather, she provides a model for discussion beyond the national, investigating how the novel and epic genres dramatize questions “of size, of scale, of scope” and carry out negotiations with “space and time commingling with other genres in the process” (216). Dimock and I share a concern, then, for appropriately complex considerations of modern temporalities and geographies but differ in our methods of exploring this complexity. Though framed within a well-articulated concern for national issues that raises many important and contemporary concerns about canonical periodization and geographies, the Dimock article is more or less an elegant and challenging postnational discussion of genre that collapses the boundaries between epic, novel, and the larger geographical and temporal concerns of critical modernism. More traditionally focused on nationalism, but no more akin to this chapter’s understanding of *The Golden Bowl*, Cristof Wegelin’s “The ‘Internationalism’ of ‘The Golden Bowl’” [sic] follows the spirit of international relations James ascribes to his sister in 1888. In fact, Wegelin argues that James develops this same theme across his last three novels, making them a “trilogy” of sorts (161). In particular, though, Wegelin frames his discussion of the *The Golden Bowl*’s internationalism in terms of a conflict he sees between competing moral sensibilities, namely American idealism and European empiricism.
Beyond these two articles, which are separated by almost fifty years, the sorts of discussions of cosmopolitanism by Berman and Tintner already mentioned are about as close as critics get to discussing *The Golden Bowl* in terms of nationalism. As Ezra Pound wrote in 1918, though the criticism surrounding James’ career is acutely focused on it “No one seems to talk of these things” with regards to *The Golden Bowl*, namely, “The whole great assaying and weighing, the research for the significance of nationality, French, English, American” (“In Explanation” 7). Thus, for all the ways in which the novel destabilizes national identity, *The Golden Bowl* remains largely untapped with regards to discussions of nationalism, critics instead preferring to focus on some aspect of the marriage plot, the relationships of the characters, or the dominant symbolism of the bowl. The novel then is most often seen as an elegant aesthetic artifact, a grand metaphor, a masterpiece of the novel genre but a limited work in terms of larger social issues such as nationalism. Even Sara Blair’s *Henry James and the Writing of Race and Nation* contains but one reference to the novel, preferring instead to concentrate on *Tragic Muse* and, of course, James’ overtly and singularly political and nationalistic *The Princess Casamassima*. Also hinting at the presence of the cultural chiasmus in the novel, Blair writes,

... *The Golden Bowl* can be taken as James’s meditation on the twentieth-century project of cultural assimilation, conducted within the conventions of the marriage plot; there, the very condition of possibility for cosmopolitan assimilation itself is none other than New World capital, crucially backed by the cultural capital of the pawnbroking, racially transgressive, problematically assimilated Jew. (8-9)
Like Jonathan Freedman’s article “The Poetics of Cultural Decline: Degeneracy, Assimilation, and the Jew in James’s *The Golden Bowl*,” I feel the Blair passage overemphasizes the role of Jewishness in *The Golden Bowl*. However, the overarching message of Blair’s concern with the novel reinforces Benedict Anderson’s belief in the power of texts to create imagined communities and even seems to restate the passage quoted from James’ 1888 letter where James looks out beyond the nation and even the grindingly “international” to a radical form of transatlantic community he refers to as the “big Anglo-Saxon total.” For example, in the second half of her brief mention of *The Golden Bowl*, Blair argues that

> in the prefaces to the New York Edition, James works to invent another “state of things”—that is, both a state of mind and a version of the civic nation-state—in which fiction does the hard labor of transfiguring race and nation as categorical imperatives, mapping a psychic geography of continuously social, universally human “relations.” For *this* James, the “very condition” of both literary modernism and American liberal modernity is the supercession of any racialized national identity “whatever” (9).

In another one of the rare direct considerations of *The Golden Bowl* and nationalism, Margery Sabin reads the novel as a socially and historically aware postcolonial allegory that “dramatize[s] America’s embattled postcolonial position at the end of the nineteenth century” (206). Throughout this reading, Sabin engages in the sort of international compare-contrast ritual James rejects in 1888 but that he participates in over the course of his literary career. Drawing out the conflict between American and European civilizations, Sabin organizes her reading around the idea that the
question that haunts the psychological, moral, and cultural situation depicted in *The Golden Bowl* is whether America's new wealth would sponsor a new and superior civilization or whether America was doomed merely to replicate the worst patterns of its earlier masters and rivals. Was the American dream of novelty in the arts of wealth and power an inspired vision of merely a self-deceiving hallucination? A higher and holier Idea, or a new version of earlier imperial depredation and decadence?” (206-07)

As suggested by the passage from the 1888 letter, James fancied himself reluctant to engage in these sorts questions and the endless, grating comparisons that drove them. And while his larger body of fictions do seem preoccupied with this sort of “internationalism” as an end in itself, I disagree with the ways critics such as Sabin and Wegelin understand *The Golden Bowl* as such. Instead, I argue that *The Golden Bowl* is a destabilized national stew from which transatlantic national identity emerges.

Almost all the major characters in *The Golden Bowl* experience some form of national instability. For example, while there is never any doubt that he most certainly intends to return to American City, “his adoptive city and native State,” to finalize his “museum of museums” (110), James complicates Adam Verver beyond the standard sorts of commercial men, such as Christopher Newman, found elsewhere in his fiction.18 Drawing a sense of self from American City, Adam is steeped in the “American way” (8); and it is when Mr. Verver “talks American … he is the most alive” (9). American City gives him a reputation and “a pretty personal side” (498). Amerigo remarks Adam is “the man in the world least equipped with different appearance for different times” and sees him as “simple … a revelation of simplicity, and that was the end of him” (240). But
even Adam feels a bit distanced from his fellow citizens because of his exposure to Europe and, to be fair, his acutely egomaniacal sense of purpose. James suggests that

It was the hushed daybreak of the Roman revelation in particular that [Verver] could usually best recover—the way that there above all, where the princes and popes had been before him, his divination of his faculty had gone to his head. He was a plain American citizen staying at an hotel where sometimes for days together there were twenty others like him; but no pope, no prince of them all had read a richer meaning, he believed, into the character of the Patron of Art. He was ashamed of them really, if he wasn’t afraid, and he had on the whole never so climbed to the tip-top as in judging, over a perusal of Hermann Grimm, where Julius II and Leo X were ‘placed’ by their treatment of Michael Angelo. Far below the plain American citizen—in the case at least in which this personage happened not to be too plain to be Adam Verver. (113-14)

Unlike *The Ambassadors* whose entirety is a process of examining Lambert Strether’s national complication and “Europeanization,” here it is clear that Verver already possesses a sense of national complexity when *The Golden Bowl* opens. Verver even seems aware that Europe gives him a specific sort of inspiration and that he needs it as a market for his American capital. For example, James suggests that Verver’s

... return to England hadn’t been unconnected with the appreciation so determined. It marked what he liked to mark, that he needed, on the matter in question, instruction from no one on earth. A couple of years in Europe again, of renewed nearness to changes and chances, refreshed sensibility to the currents of
the market, would fall in with the consistency of wisdom, the particular shade of enlightened conviction, that he wished to observe. (111)

Finally, a classic development of the cultural chiasmus, albeit one positively rather than destructively resolved, Verver plans to build his “Greek temple” of art (“a receptacle of treasures sifted to positive sanctity”) in American City and seeks to transmit a deep sense of European aestheticism to the US by stuffing the American museum with European treasures, delivering his fellow Americans from “the bondage of ugliness” by buying a good many European aesthetic objects (110). This plan helps undermine the neat distinctions that can be made between the US and Europe and lends the transatlantic community a sense of unity bound by the trade of capital for aesthetic objects and the experience of these aesthetic objects themselves. Existing beyond any single national space and suggesting how freely she and her father and the goods move within the imagined community, Maggie tells Amerigo that the museum will be filled with objects bought and stored all over Europe.

There are things ... that father puts away—the bigger and more cumbrous of course, which he stores, has already stored in masses, here [in London] and in Paris, in Italy, in Spain, in warehouses, vaults, banks, safes, wonderful secret places. We’ve been like a pair of pirates—positively stage pirates, the sort who wink at each other and say “Ha-ha!” when they come to where their treasure is buried. (13)

As for Maggie’s own national identity, she does fit the Jamesean model of the “innocent American girl” (Wegelin 123) made up of “extraordinary American good faith” (James, *The Golden Bowl* 10) whom the Assinghams feel “wasn’t born to know
evil” and “must never know it” (James, The Golden Bowl 60). But the sense of complexity, maturity, and even European-style awareness Maggie possesses at the end of the novel, as well as her choice to remain in Europe rather than returning to the US, makes her seem, like her father, something other than a neatly defined American. Proposing places they could live, by the end of the novel Maggie’s entire focus is on Europe. Not including the US on in a list of suggestions, Maggie suggests she and Amerigo go “abroad … to Switzerland, the Tyrol, the Italian Alps, to whichever of [Amerigo’s] old high places [he] would like most to see again—those beautiful ones that used to do [him] good after Rome and that [he] so often told [Maggie] about” (539). Describing Americans as “awful people” who make “horrible vulgar jokes” (498) and take advantage of her father’s generosity, she seems, at the end of the novel, complicated and mature in a constructive way, beyond the other flatly American-girls-in-Europe James writes about, the Daisy Millers and even the Isabel Archers.

While Maggie and her father exhibit some of the decentered nationality identities common to modern figures, though, they are rather conservatively national compared to other characters in The Golden Bowl who are much more intensely destabilized, perhaps no one more so than Charlotte Stant. Upon seeing Charlotte, Amerigo finds it “difficult indeed … to disembroil her race-quality. Nothing in her definitely placed her; she was a rare, a special product” (42). She has an “odd precious neutrality” (42-43). The Prince is captivated by “her strange sense for tongues, with which she juggled as a conjuror at a show juggled with balls or hoops or lighted braids” (43). Furthermore, James describes both Charlotte and Amerigo as “polyglot” (43). The Prince describes himself as similarly composed and allows such is “the case too with so many of his friends and
relations; for none of whom more than for himself was it anything but a common convenience” (43). Here, the Prince suggests that his own linguistic proficiency, as well of that of his “friends and relations,” exists as a “convenience” for navigating a decentered and confused linguistic community. He then takes to linking linguistic identity and national identity by highlighting Charlotte’s peculiar polyglotism. Of Charlotte, Amerigo thinks:

The point was that in this young woman [her linguistic proficiency] was a beauty in itself, and almost a mystery: so certainly, he had more than once felt in noting on her lips that rarest, among the Barbarians, of all civil graces, a perfect felicity in the use of Italian. He had known strangers—a few, and mostly men—who spoke his own language agreeably; but he had known neither man nor woman who showed for it Charlotte’s almost mystifying instinct. He remembered how, from the first of their acquaintance, she had made no display of it, quite as if English, between them, his English so matching hers, were their inevitable medium. He had perceived all by accident—by hearing her talk before him to somebody else—that they had an alternative as good; an alternative in fact as much better as the amusement for him was greater in watching her for the slips that never came. (43)

Perhaps referencing the decline of the once solid nationality offered by the Roman Empire at the hands of the ancestors of those he now lives among, Amerigo describes non-Italians as “Barbarians.” Certainly, the pejorativity of this word would make it seem strange that someone possessing so destabilized a national identity as himself would look down on non-Italians, but the root of “barbarian” is actually linguistic in nature. Both the
Latin and Greek roots of the word were appellations given to non-Greco-Roman
European tribes by the Greeks and Romans because of the way these tribes spoke. To the
Greeks and later Romans, this speech sounded like stammering nonsense or “ba ba” and
immediately defined them as national others. In a larger sense, then, language defined
nationality for these ancient groups (as it continues to do today). Using the word
“Barbarian,” in this passage, then, James uses Charlotte’s linguistic proficiency to
highlight her confused national identity. She is a non-Italian, a “Barbarian” who speaks
multiple other tongues, but her aptitude for Italian makes her seem just that as well.
Unable to be classified as either Italian or other in terms of her language, Charlotte exists
as liminal polyglot in some form of linguistic, national, and cultural limbo: seemingly
Italian through proficiency but also fluent in English.

James further compounds this confusion. Charlotte seems to live in England,
wanders about the Continent incessantly, but enters the story from the US (30). We are
further confused and convinced Charlotte is a decentered, liminal national and polyglot
after reading the continuance of the passage above which might reflect a lie Charlotte has
told Amerigo about her origins. Her parents seem to have been American or perhaps
English or even Italian. The novel’s ambiguity on this point and outright thwarting of our
ability to draw a neat conclusion emphasizes Charlotte’s destabilized national identity. At
first glance, she seems to resemble the type of corrupted American represented by Gilbert
Osmond. As Wegelin argues, Charlotte Stant

is pointedly reminiscent of Gilbert Osmond of The Portrait of a Lady, in fact,
might almost be his daughter: born in Florence, her parents American but
"already of a corrupt generation, demoralized falsified polyglot well before her,"
herself—like Pansy Osmond—schooled in a Tuscan convent. (123)

A careful reading of the passage to which Wegelin refers in *The Golden Bowl*, though, suggests he likely jumped to a conclusion about the nativity of Charlotte’s parents when he suggests they are American. The passage in *The Golden Bowl* to which he refers doesn’t make so clear a case. Rather than summing up her core nationality, it instead leads to further instability. Referring to her linguistic ability as a “mystery,” the narrator suggests Charlotte’s “account of the mystery didn’t suffice: her recall of her birth in Florence and Florentine childhood; her parents from the great country, but themselves already of a corrupt generation, demoralized falsified polyglot well before her …” (43).

“The great country” could refer to the US. In *The Golden Bowl*, America is almost completely represented by the looming metropolis “American City”: an entire nation and its culture conflated into one urban idea at once abstractly general and concretely metaphorical, opaquely representing some New York or perhaps Chicago or even all American metropolises at once, summing up the bustling commercial lifestyle so central to James’ vision of the US. Fanny Assingham epically invokes the bustling US, thinking of Adam and Charlotte returning and planting themselves there, “I see the long miles of ocean and the dreadful great country, State after State—which have never seemed to me so big or so terrible. I see them at last day by day and step by step, at the far end—and I see them never come back” (526). *Great*, meaning “powerful” and “imposing” and generally “large,” certainly would describe such a place; and in this way, “the great country” would act as an artful noun phrase standing in for “US” or “America.” Certainly, the “corrupt generation” would fit with the sorts of Americans James presents
elsewhere in his fictions: the Osmonds and the Winterbournes and the Maria Gostreys. It seems likely, though, that James would have capitalized the phrase were he using it to stand in for the US. Doing so would have given it the feeling of being a proper noun or, at least, standing in as or for one. As it is, the phrase seems to read more like a general descriptor. Furthermore, the phrase actually seems to refer to Italy. Using the definite article “the”—rather than “that,” in its pronoun sense, as the object of the preposition “from” which would make it refer back to Italy more explicitly—certainly leaves the phrase open to interpretation. But in the context of the passage, it would be a radical leap to have the phrase reference the US, especially since it is not capitalized. Finally, James suggests Charlotte is from a line of national mongrels, that her parents were not American but rather corrupt, falsified, and “polyglot well before her” (43). This is all the information we have. Italians or Americans or some hybrid of both, Wegelin’s desire to nationally place Charlotte, an impulse grounded in the inescapability of nationality in the modern world, overrides a clearer-minded reading of the passage from which he draws the conclusion of Charlotte’s nationality. Rather than being clearly American or any other nationality for that matter, Ms. Stant is a decentered national polyglot born of the same. She is a true transatlantic national.

A few lines farther into the book, Amerigo makes a similarly opaque reference to Charlotte’s homeland, suggesting it could be either the US or Italy. Again highlighting the use of “their English,” Amerigo asks about her country:

“You haven’t, I rather gather, particularly liked your country?” They would stick for the time to their English.
“It doesn’t, I fear, seem particularly mine. And it doesn’t in the least matter over there whether one likes it or not—that is to any one but one’s self. But I didn’t like it,” said Charlotte Stant. (44)

“Your country” would make sense as a reference to the US, from whence Charlotte’s just arrived; but considering the passage that follows, in which Amerigo expresses concerns for what could either be his own visit to the US with Maggie or perhaps the affianced couple’s trip to see his family estate in Italy, we are cast back into a state of confusion with regards to Charlotte’s nationality:

“That’s not encouraging then to me, is it?” the Prince went on.

“Do you mean because you’re going?”

“Oh yes, of course we’re going, I’ve wanted immensely to go.” (44)

But go where? To the US, to Italy? Both are possible and both happen in the novel.

Later, considering the London weather during a meeting with Amerigo not long after her arrival in London, Charlotte further confuses the issue. As she looks about her, she sees a day “in the heart of London, of a rich low-browed, weather-washed English type” (69) and reflects, “It was as if it had been waiting for her, as if she knew it, placed it, loved it, as if it were in fact a part of what she had come back for. So far as this was the case the impression of course could only be lost on a mere vague Italian … ” (69).

Does she mean herself of Amerigo? As the passage continues, this question comes no closer to being answered: “ … it was one of those for which you had to be blessedly an American—as indeed you had to be blessedly an American for all sorts of things: so long as you hadn’t, blessedly or not, to remain in America” (69). Again, while we know she is not referring to Amerigo, is she speaking of herself or merely reflecting generally on
Americans, the people from whom she has just departed? Certainly, she could be claiming to be an American, but that seems strange since she was born, raised, and educated in Italy. Then, as if the matter couldn’t be muddled any further, a few paragraphs later Amerigo even asserts, to Charlotte, that he’s never “understood your English buying” (71; my italics). He could of course mean “the buying she does in England” but also “the buying the English do.” Does this passage, then, imply Charlotte is actually English or maybe that Amerigo, like James in 1888, thinks of America and the US as a big Anglo-Saxon total, using “English” to refer to Anglophones on both sides of the Atlantic? This conclusion doesn’t really satisfactorily explain Charlotte’s Italianness, though; and while she found the US, as it’s so frequently presented in James’ fictions, to be the center of ready capital where she was able to save up money (James, The Golden Bowl 71), Charlotte admits she ultimately returned to Europe because “it was impossible to get in America” what she wanted (48). All these passages, especially when taken together, therefore leave one scratching his/her head, wondering how to ascribe nationality to Charlotte. American or Italian or English or, of course as I argue, a transatlantic permutation of all three, the novel exudes what seems like almost intentionally misleading ambiguity and even contradictory information on the matter of Charlotte’s nationality. As a result, the sorts of conclusions drawn by Wegelin and others such as Jessica Berman as to Charlotte’s American “homeland” (Berman, Modernist Fiction 67) must be seen as purely speculative. When the novel is taken as a whole, readers can’t really draw definitive conclusions about what Charlotte’s nationality might be. Every time the matter is discussed, it fragments the issue in different directions like a broken piece of glass. Split between the US and Europe, she is a representation, albeit a
chaotic one, of a true transatlantic national, one whose national identity cannot be placed in one nation of the Atlantic world but rather is spread throughout it.

While Charlotte is easily the most nationally decentered character in the novel, *The Golden Bowl* presents many ways in which the Prince’s national identity is also complicated, making him more than simply an Italian who marries an American girl. He certainly comes from a long line of Italians including an “infamous” Pope (10), a Cardinal (17), “three or four” other (doubtlessly Catholic) “ecclesiastics” (17), and perhaps even the explorer and cartographer Amerigo Vespucci (61-62). But as suggested, the Prince also refers to himself as a polyglot: “He was polyglot himself, for that matter—as was the case too with so many of his friends and relations; for none of whom more than for himself was it anything but a common convenience” (43).

Later, in the curio shop, Amerigo flirts with Charlotte in Italian so that the shopkeeper asks “You’re Italian then, are you?” Amerigo replies jokingly: “in English. ‘Oh dear no.’” The shopkeeper then asks, “‘You’re English?’ To which the answer this time, with a smile, in briefest Italian. ‘Che!’” (85). While certainly a joke, in the larger context of the novel, this phrase of discussion is a part of a larger pattern of breaking down and juxtaposing national identity barriers and leaving behind a confused mess. Even as the book opens, it is immediately clear just how deeply traditional lines of national division, at this moment even lines of temporal division, have broken down. Coming from a family that includes “the most anglicized of Milanesi” (16), the Prince (an Italian nobleman seemingly from Rome) possesses *his* London, along with a swarm of fellow Latins, in a vision of unity between the old Roman empire and the modern British one:
The Prince had always liked his London, when it had come to him; he was one of the Modern Romans who find by the Thames a more convincing image of the truth of the ancient state than any they have left by the Tiber. Brought up on the legend of the City to which the world paid tribute, he recognized in the present London much more than in contemporary Rome the real dimensions of such a case. If it was a question of an Imperium, he said to himself, and if one wished, as a Roman, to recover a little the sense of that, the place to do so was on London Bridge, or even, on a fine afternoon in May, at Hyde Park Corner. (5)

An odd national juxtaposition, here Amerigo admits to forsaking Rome for London in order to find “a more convincing image” of la Città Eterna itself. This passage destabilizes and mixes up what it means to be Italian and English, to be a Roman and a Londoner. It suggests a new national whole has been born, composed up of a dialogic interaction between formerly exclusive national groups. The passage also makes it seem like playful shame that makes Amerigo answer as he does in the antiques shop, wishing not to be associated with the fallen empire of Rome but rather with England, the seat of present imperial power. This would also explain the pride he takes in his English language abilities. It is not assured, though, that the English return the fraternal gaze of the Prince who is “insatiable for English customs” (374). Further complicating Amerigo’s national identity, the third-person limited narrator suggests at one point “as we join” Amerigo that his “dark blue eyes” and “dark brown moustache” are more “sharply ‘foreign’ to an English view than to have caused it sometimes to be observed of him with a shallow felicity that he looked like a ‘refined’ Irishman” (6). At the very least, both he and Charlotte, with their linguistic games, blur the distinctions between Italian and
English and thereby confuse their national origins and identities. In addition to the previous examples, just as Charlotte speaks flawless Italian, James highlights the Prince’s comfort with English. Comparing himself to other sons-in-laws he knows, the Prince thinks

of these fellows, from whom he was so to differ, in English; he used, mentally, the English term to describe his difference, for, familiar with the tongue from his earliest years, so that no note of strangeness remained with him either for lip or for ear, he found it convenient, in life, for the greatest number of relations. (7)

In fact, his bride-to-be playfully suggests he speaks “English too well—it was his only fault, and he hadn’t been able to speak worse even to oblige her” (7). Adding another tongue to the mix, Amerigo tells Maggie, “When I speak worse, you see, I speak French” (7). In Maggie’s view, Amerigo’s sheer ability to speak English threatens his authentic Italianness. Drawing a line between English and another major Anglophone nation and thereby further contributing to the sheer amount of traditional Atlantic national identities floating about in the novel, Amerigo is even “practicing his American in order to converse properly, on equal terms as it were, with Mr. Verver. His prospective father-in-law had a command of it, he said, that put him at a disadvantage in any discussion …” (7). Asserting Adam’s Americanness and thereby confirming the US as a distinctive national entity within the confused nationalities of the novel, Amerigo argues that he must cultivate his “American” and that Adam Verver could not exist so well, unlike himself who exists well in at least two nationalities and languages, in any other language but “American” (9). In the end, though, James throws another language and nationality
into the already cacophonous stew and perhaps blurs Adam's American identity a bit when Maggie assures Amerigo: “I think he could make you like him in Chinese” (9).

As these passages illustrate, language is arguably the most prominent vehicle by which the characters of The Golden Bowl discuss nationality and reveal their confused national identities. As I suggest, the very term polyglot even refers to a linguistic sort of cosmopolitanism, referencing one who is proficient in many languages. Both Charlotte and Amerigo fit this definition. However, the term can also refer to a cacophonous confusion of language; and as the wild disorder and admixture of nationalities presented in the Golden Bowl develops (presented largely through discussion and possession of language), the Biblical story of Babel, whose attempted engineering feat resulted in the division of humanity into chaotic and linguistically-diverse nations, seems to assert itself most prominently. In The Golden Bowl, just as in the aftermath of mythological Babel, there exist a multitude of languages and nationalities: Italian, French, English, American, and even, briefly, Irish and Chinese. Not quite reaching the level of effortless, ordered, and transnational/polyglot fluency that balances the Babel story in the Christian tradition, namely the New Testament story of Pentecost, in The Golden Bowl the memory of Babel is nevertheless turned on its head. The Golden Bowl presents a cast of characters caught in the post-Babel chaos of national/linguistic disunity they inherited but who, especially in Amerigo and Charlotte's cases, frequently attempt to transcend such national/linguistic divisions by becoming cosmopolitan, pan-European and even transatlantic polyglots. Like the moderns outlined in the introduction, the national/linguistic confusion of the characters in The Golden Bowl arises not as a result of unity divided as happened at Babel but rather as a result of their attempts to transcend the
national divisions they inherited. In so doing, though, they face the same sort of paradox as the moderns. Transcending the national is ultimately impossible. Thus, I read The Golden Bowl’s national/linguistic confusion as an early stage of the post-Babel, multinational/multilingual pendulum swinging back from division toward unity. Unsynthesized, unfinalized, complex, and in the process of creating new forms of dialogic national unity from national/linguistic chaos and division, The Golden Bowl offers a glimpse of the chaotic transformation of the transatlantic community from multinational/multilingual divisions to multinational/multilingual dialogic unions.

Therefore even though the characters of The Golden Bowl, like the nationally transient figures of modernism, may appear to have destabilized nationalities for a time, they must ultimately conform to some national identity. And so, in various ways, the characters of James’ late novel do. Some like Bob Assingham—never all that nationally destabilized, remaining as ever the staunch British gentleman and “English husband” (29)—and Adam Verver merely resolve into a traditional national unit of the Atlantic world. Many others, though, are best labeled transatlantic nationals. For example, Charlotte, at the end of the novel, may appear to have Americanness forced upon her. However, I would argue that at that point she is still an unfinalized transatlantic polyglot even if she’s forced into the mold of an American. Her transatlantic national identity, then, isn’t really threatened but rather persists even if it is somewhat gilded with a thin glaze of Americana. Like Charlotte, Fanny, Amerigo, and Maggie are all transatlantic national figures who resolve their own destabilized national identities as members of this community. For example, a passage primarily intent on painting Fanny Assingham as decadent and gilded, the novel’s early description of her nevertheless confuses her
national identity, scattering it about the Atlantic world, between Europe and “her early American time” (29) and even beyond into the larger world:

a daughter of the South, or still more of the East, a creature formed by hammocks and divans, fed upon sherbets and waited upon by slaves. ... She was in fact however neither a pampered Jewess nor a lazy Creole; New York had been recordedly her birthplace and ‘Europe’ punctually her discipline. ... She enjoyed, she needed the warm air of friendship, but the eyes of the American city looked out somehow, for the opportunity of it, from under the lids of Jerusalem. (28)

But through her marriage, a transatlantic entity similar to, but much less prominent than, Amerigo and Maggie’s, somewhat nationally confused Fanny finds what “American girls” like herself accept as “good enough” (29). A clear symbol of the transatlantic community, Mr. and Mrs. Assingham’s union plays a sort of supporting, precedent-setting role to Maggie and Amerigo’s and is described as “a kind of hymeneal Northwest Passage,” referring to the reason so many explorers set out from Europe to the Americas in the first place: to find a hypothetical sea route connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans through the Arctic Archipelago of Canada. According to “the younger friends of this couple,” a legend grew up about them “almost too venerable for historical criticism” but receiving a puissant historical parallel nevertheless:

... the marriage itself, the happiest of its class, dated from the far twilight of the age, a primitive period when such things ... hadn’t begun to be; so that the pleasant pair had been, as to the risk taken on either side, bold and original, honorably marked, for the evening of life, as discoverers of a kind of hymeneal Northwest Passage. Mrs. Assingham knew better, knew there had been no historic
hour, from that of Pocahontas down, when some young Englishman hadn't precipitately believed and some American girl hadn't, with a few more gradations, availed herself to the full of her incapacity to doubt; but she accepted resignedly the laurel of the founder, since she was in fact pretty well the doyen, above ground, of her transplanted tribe, and since, above all, she had invented combinations, though she hadn't invented Bob's own. (29; James' italics)

Casting the history of transatlantic European-American relations in terms of a love story by alluding to the (slightly romanticized) history of John Rolfe and Pocahontas, Fanny finds her sense of national identity in a happy marriage that symbolizes the transatlantic community and the bridgeable difference between Europe and the US. Fanny seems resigned and satisfied among the English and other American expatriates, her "transplanted tribe" (29), while also aware of "her American blood" and "New England grandmothers" (414). In this way, Fanny is a rare example of the idea that compounding one's Americanness with Europeanness in the interest of assimilation does not always have a corrupting effect. Certainly, Mrs. Assingham, represented by one of the more humorous and even heavy-handed names in the James canon, is a busy-body, a gossip, and a trickster ficelle who continually butts her way into the lives of others. She is worlds away, though, from the other sorts of Europeanized Americans we see in James' transatlantic fictions such as Gilbert Osmond. She even differs rather profoundly from fairly benign examples of Europeanized Americans such as Winterbourne and Maria Gostrey in that Fanny finds happiness in her transplantation and national identity complication. Ultimately, Fanny is a mother figure who furthers Amerigo and Maggie's best interests, serving as an advisor and a caretaker. Certainly a figure opposed to the
grinding sort of internationalism James accuses his sister of practicing, Fanny Assingham and the marriage of which she is a part stand as rare examples of positive cultural assimilation that can occur between the US and Europe and, in turn, a representation of the transatlantic national community.

Other characters eventually find their own senses of transatlantic national identity resolution as well. At the end of the novel, Adam Verver, complicated beyond the simple Americanness of a character like Christopher Newman but never really in doubt as to his true national identity, returns to American City to finalize his museum and oversee his business empire. The tension on their relationship and marriages profound by this point, Maggie wonders near the end of the novel, “You don’t claim, I suppose, that my natural course, once you had set up for yourself, would have been to ship you back to American City?” (501). Her father replies, coming to terms with the painful realization that he must distance himself from his daughter for her own happiness’ sake,

"Do you know, Mag, what you make me wish when you talk that way? ... You regularly make me wish I had shipped back to American City. When you go on as you do—" But he really had to hold himself to say it.

"Well, when I go on—?"

"Why you make me quite want to ship back myself. You make me quite feel as if American City could be the best place for us."

It made her all too finely vibrate. "For ‘us’—?"

"For me and Charlotte. Do you know that if we should ship it would serve you quite right?" ... "And if you say much more we will ship."

(502; James’ italics)
Thus, the “end’ that the Prince was at all events holding out for” is the end of the novel, “represented to expectation by his father-in-law’s announced departure for America with Mrs. Verver” (541), the pair leaving for “the dreadful great” (526) US never to return. Ever the transatlantic, in the end Charlotte, by virtue of traveling with her husband, might seem to be forced into the mold of an American as she and Adam withdraw from Europe and their in-laws into the big and terrible New World. However, we can read her resistance to this Americanization. Asserting herself merely to gain power over Maggie and to be unpleasantly malicious, Charlotte tells her step-daughter-in-law she’s “dreamed another dream” of how she and Adam should live (533) and betrays her true feelings on the matter. Charlotte suggests their “real life isn’t here” and that she means to take Adam “home to his real position ... immediately” (534). Maggie’s intensely negative reactions to these assertions suggest just how disingenuous they are and just how much Charlotte’s transatlantic spirit resists being finalized into the “American” wife of a very public American Croesus.

There are other ways in which The Golden Bowl creates a sense of transatlantic national identity as well. For example, helping draw his own national identity into some sort of focus, the Prince’s given name suggests the development of a transatlantic nation. As Jessica Berman writes, the Italian prince’s name “can only imply the interconnection of Europe and America” (67); and while they do share this name, whether or not the Prince is actually related to the explorer and cartographer Amerigo Vespucci is debatable. We have to choose or refuse to take Fanny Assingham’s word on it. In a playful discussion between Fanny and Col. Bob Assingham, The Golden Bowl suggests that the
name “Amerigo” was “one of the Prince’s baptismal names” (61); and this, as Col. Assingham tells his wife,

was the name, four hundred years ago, or whenever, of the pushing man who followed, across the sea, in the wake of Columbus and succeeded, where Columbus had failed, in becoming god-father, or name-father, to the new Continent; so that the thought of any connection with him can even now thrill our artless breasts. (61)

Slightly undermining Fanny’s Americanness, James lets us know that the Colonel takes pleasure in pointing out “his wife’s not infrequent imputation of ignorances, on the score of the land of her birth” (61). Fanny is ready for this particular charge, though; and in response to her husband, she puts forth a wildly speculative hypothesis, not exactly proven, of the Prince’s link to Vespucci. Col. Assingham asks, “But where does the connection come in?” Fanny responds,

By the women—that is by some obliging woman, of old, who was a descendent of the pushing man, the make-believe discoverer, and whom the Prince is therefore luckily able to refer to as an ancestress. A branch of the other family had become great—great enough, at least, to marry into his; and the name of the navigator, crowed with glory, was, very naturally, to become so the fashion among them that some son, of every generation, was appointed to wear it. (61)

Whatever the familial relationship, or lack thereof, between the Prince and Vespucci, the name “Amerigo” is a marker of transatlantic unity. Named after a traveling, pan-Atlantic figure who lent his name to the “new Continent,” carrying the name “Amerigo” makes the Prince himself seem Atlantically liminal, planted somewhere in between Europe and
the US, having a claim to both worlds. His name has taken on a sense of Atlantic hybridity, at once hearkening both to Italy and the Americas, the New World and the Old, and it seems impossible not to read the name without simultaneously thinking of both Europe, the US, and even the larger Western Hemisphere. In this way and in a larger sense beyond the prince personally, the name looms in *The Golden Bowl* as a historically preceded marker of transatlantic unity, an Italian name given to designate the continents of the Western Hemisphere.

Building up the marriage of Amerigo and Maggie and recounting the history of their relationship, James makes it a point to tell the story of the Prince and Maggie’s process of falling in love using the name Amerigo, the history of Atlantic exploration, and the larger context of transatlantic unity. Thinking back to a moment when the Ververs, Assinghams, and the Prince were all riding in a carriage in Rome, Fanny tells her husband the following anecdote after recounting the speculative history of the Prince’s connection to Vespucci:

My point is at any rate that I recall noticing at the time how the Prince was from the start helped with the dear Ververs by his wearing [the name Amerigo]. The connection became romantic for Maggie the moment she took it in; she filled out, in a flash, every link that might be vague. “By that sign,” I quite said to myself, “he’ll conquer”—with his good fortune, of course, of having the other necessary signs too. It really ... was, practically, the fine side of the wedge. Which struck me as also ... a lovely note for the candor of the Ververs. (61)

Maggie and her father are drawn to the Prince because of his name. As a marker of the union between the US and Europe, “Amerigo” seems to be a “romantic” indicator that the
marriage of Maggie and the Prince is somehow meant to be. And as if establishing the veracity of this belief, Mrs. Assingham notes that as the relationship between the Prince and Maggie begins to take form, “Not only were there no objections” to it, “there were reasons, positive ones … all excellent, all charming” to encourage the match (63). By forming a bridge between Europe and the US, this match essentially harmonizes their individually chaotic national identities into one transatlantic whole. Yet even in their chaos, both Maggie and Amerigo are more regional in their decenteredness than someone like Charlotte whose various national identities scatter her across the entire Atlantic world. This lends the marriage a sense of unifying two halves of the same whole. For example, while Amerigo approaches a distinctive level of national instability, it would be difficult to argue he ever achieves full departure from Europe or Charlotte’s level of transatlantic national decenteredness. For all his linguistic abilities and cosmopolitanism, Amerigo persistently affirms his Italianness, after all, claiming an understanding of his “poor dear Romans” (71), facing gentle accusations by Mrs. Assingham of being a “deep old Italian” (25), claiming to be “a galantuomo” (8), and participating in the collective possession of “our poor dear backward old Rome” (26). In fact, I would argue that Amerigo’s polyglotism and cosmopolitanism reveal Amerigo to be an old-line European prince who embodies the entire Old World. Amerigo’s national identity crisis and polyglot command of English and Italian lend him an air of pan-Europeanism. He aspires, but feels he is unable as of yet, to speak “American”; and I cannot accept it as anything other than false humility when a late-Victorian noble of his stature claims to speak French, the language of courts and international commerce well into the twentieth century, as badly as the Prince does (5). Not fully transatlantic, his identity scattered
around the Continent rather than, as is the case with Charlotte, the Atlantic world,
Amerigo taken by himself seems more pan-European than Transatlantic. He needs his
wife to complete the transatlantic national transformation. In fact, Maggie is very much
in the same situation as Amerigo. As essentially the American version of himself, Maggie
speaks “American” but aspires to speak “her own French, which she had always so
dreamed of making good, of making better” (7); and having gained a European sense of
social decorum and committed to remaining in Europe, she seems like a transatlantic-
leaning American. The two, then, are transatlantic-leaning mirror images of one another,
the marriage of Amerigo and Maggie representing a union of the US and Europe. In this
way, it stands as perhaps the most powerful representation of the transatlantic imagined
community.

Beyond helping them resolve their own national identities, though, Maggie and
Amerigo’s marriage also serves a number of additional roles related to The Golden
Bow’s representation of the transatlantic imagined community. First, the marriage
produces uniquely transatlantic offspring which represents an even deeper level of
dialogic fusion between Europe and the US. As Edel writes of the family, emphasizing
the importance and uniqueness of the Principino, Amerigo and Maggie “have a child, a
boy, and for the first and only time in all of James’s fiction, this novel ends with a family
in which the offspring is allowed to live” (The Master 214). As part of her discussion of
gender roles in The Golden Bowl as related to its contemporary, Teddy Roosevelt-
inspired ideals of American manhood into which it was published, Martha Banta, also
notes the Principino’s split national identity: “the Principesso [sic]” is “hardly likely to
grow up as the solid American citizen, however much American money and American
blood the child will inherit" (36). But where Banta sees irreconcilable division, I see national dialogism. Placing special emphasis on the child as that which fully cements his daughter’s union with Amerigo, Mr. Verver wonders if their marriage had deserved the name, or their union worn the beauty, in the degree to which the couple now before him carried the matter. In especial since the birth of their boy in New York—the grand climax of their recent American period, brought to so right an issue—the happy pair struck him as having carried it higher, deeper, further; to where it ceased to concern his imagination at any rate to follow them.

Like his parents, the Principino has an unfinalizable national identity, being a dialogic product of a transatlantic union of the US and Europe, an American born into European nobility and exclusively referred to by his diminutive title until such time as “Prince” should better fit him. Although born in New York, the Principino is a true “Amerigo,” a European-American hybrid possessing a complex national heritage that straddles the Atlantic world. As Adam Verver considers his European treasures and his family, he thinks of his grandson:

In the way of precious small pieces he had handled nothing so precious as the Principino, his daughter’s first-born, whose Italian designation endlessly amused him and whom he could manipulate and dandle, already almost toss and catch again, as he couldn’t a correspondingly rare morsel of an earlier pâte tendre.

In this scene, then, we see a grandfather of the old Atlantic divisions looking upon two generations ahead of himself. Verver sees a fused generation of European-American
totality even beyond and to a deeper level than the marriage that brought the generation into being. It’s the child, then, that cements the union and represents the full success of transatlantic fusion. The end of the novel suggests the profundity of this particular representation. Within a hairsbreadth of *The Golden Bowl*’s final moment, Maggie and her father meet just before Mr. and Mrs. Verver set sail for the US. Maggie’s “joy went straight” as she looks into her father’s eyes, “It’s success, father” (572). Talking beyond their lives, both Maggie and Adam seem to be affirming the successful creation and perseverance of Maggie’s marriage which is the productive embodiment of James’ Anglo-Saxon total. This moment of discussion precipitates the entrance of the Principino: the most profound extension of that union. Adam agrees with his daughter, “It’s success. And even *this,*’ he added as the Principino, appearing alone, deep within, piped across an instant greeting—‘even this isn’t altogether failure’” (572; James’ italics). *This* being Adam and Charlotte’s return to the US for the greater good of Maggie and Amerigo’s union, the Principino’s presence calms the tensions of the room and commands a unique reverence. Maggie and Adam enter the room where the Principino, Amerigo, Charlotte, and Miss Bogle, the nanny, are waiting:

They went in to receive the boy, upon whose introduction to the room by Miss Bogle Charlotte and the Prince got up—seemingly with an impressiveness that had caused Miss Bogle not to give further effect to her own entrance. She had retired, but the Principino’s presence by itself sufficiently broke the tension—the subsidence of which, in the great room, ten minutes later, gave to the air something of the quality produced by the cessation of a sustained rattle. (572)
Reading this “sustained rattle” as a reference to the chaotic mess of nationalities found in the novel, the Principino’s presence and the fully-formed dialogic national unity he represents is enough to quiet the international “noise” and allow the novel to conclude in transatlantic harmony.

The book doesn’t ultimately close with a focus on the Principino, though. He is absent from the final scene. In fact, it means “something for [Maggie] the Princess that her husband had thus got their son out of the way, not bringing him back to his mother” so the husband and wife can be alone and enjoy a moment of “their freedom to be together there always” (572). Thus, though the Principino is the ultimate realization of transatlantic unity in the novel, I would nevertheless argue that *The Golden Bowl*’s central focus is the marriage of Amerigo and Maggie. Far from minimizing the importance of the Principino, it is nevertheless this union that creates the child and thus lends the marriage its sense of primary importance. Furthermore, the perseverance of this marriage is critical to the novel’s representation of the transatlantic community. Partnered with the eponymous, and what others argue is the dominant, symbol of *The Golden Bowl*, one can even read the entire novel as a process of creating, sustaining, and affirming this nation. The antique golden bowl is the symbolic correlative of this progress. Often geometrically, critics usually read the bowl as a symbol of familial and marital unity, its crack representing the imperfection of the perceived social order.^^ My reading certainly does not contradict or even conflict with these dominant and representative others. The symbol of the bowl represents the progress of Amerigo and Maggie’s marriage and the transatlantic unity it represents. The bowl embodies the progress of the novel from marital union to the challenge of this union by Charlotte. It even represents the recreation
and empowerment of this union released from its objective correlative. In this way, Fanny’s smashing of the bowl can be read as the moment of liberation of transatlantic union, represented by Maggie and Amerigo’s marriage, from trials and challenges and its transformation into an empowered entity. As Fanny says, the bowl’s “having come apart makes an unfortunate difference for its beauty, its artistic value, but none for anything else. It’s other value is just the same” (440). Likewise, by the end of the novel, the constructive transatlantic unity has changed forms, sloughing off its symbolic correlative and existing only as an empowered entity. The bowl and the novel, then, can be read as dramatizations of the creation, perseverance, and empowerment of the proactive, constructive transatlantic union.

Finally, Maggie and Amerigo’s marriage is, in addition to the Verver museum, an important vehicle through which James resolves the cultural chiasmus common to his transatlantic fictions. In her afore mentioned article, “Men, Women, and the American Way,” Martha Banta also catches a glimpse of this idea, noting that Adam Verver collects “art objects for the purpose of importing ‘culture’ to American City” (35) and that Prince Amerigo

is a titled but impoverished Italian named for a has-been explorer of the New World, who lives neither in the United States not in his native land. ‘Bought’ as a suitable mate for Maggie, the Prince bring as his dowry a deep, dark, dense Old World record of violence and magnificence … But what function is left for the Prince to take? Is it his fate to be that perpetually useful commodity, the Married Man? (36)
Even Maggie tells Amerigo, as the couple makes extended exchanges reminiscent of the Song of Solomon, that he is "part of" her father's museum collection,

one of those the things that can only be got over here. You're a rarity, an object of beauty, an object of price. You're not perhaps absolutely unique, but you're so curious and eminent that there are very few others like you—you belong to a class about which everything is known. You're what they call a morceau de musée.

(12)

Amerigo, the "museum piece," replies, "I see. I have the great sign of it ... that I cost a lot of money" (12). And so the exchange, foreshadowing the challenges ahead, continues:

"I haven't the least idea," she gravely answered, "what you cost"—and he had quite adored for the moment her way of saying it ...

"Wouldn't you find out if it were a question of parting with me? My value would in that case be estimated."

She had covered him with her charming eyes, as if his value were well before her. "Yes, if you mean that I'd pay rather than lose you." (12)

Each offering the other a unit of the chiasmus (Maggie, money; Amerigo, European historical and aesthetic conscience), the marriage of Maggie and the Prince, along with the construction of Mr. Verver's museum, represents virtually the only successful resolution of the cultural chiasmus in James' transatlantic fictions. Whereas elsewhere it ultimately creates problematic divisions and confusions, in The Golden Bowl the cultural chiasmus actually binds Europe and America. Through the successful transatlantic union of Maggie and Amerigo, Adam Verver is able to buy his way into European civilization, inserting his line into it via the Principino, and populate an
American museum with aesthetic artifacts. Likewise, Amerigo remains fiscally solvent, and is even able to rebuild his ancestral Italian home “within sight and sense of his profit” (121), thanks to the influx of American capital; and this mutually beneficial, singularly balanced and constructive resolution of the cultural chiasmus is one more way in which *The Golden Bowl* persistently outlines a portrait of James’ vision of the big Anglo-Saxon total and my vision of the transatlantic nation. The marriage of Amerigo and Maggie, then, lends *The Golden Bowl* its sense of dialogic transatlantic unity made up of the old nationalities of the Atlantic world wherein these multiple national parts, the units of the “big Anglo-Saxon total,” are placed in euphonic harmony rather than, as is the case with his other transatlantic novels, cacophonous antagonism. This interaction of lovers, then, leads to James’ most sustained and concentrated textual expression of his own literary aspirations for the transatlantic community.

Finally, it seems worth noting that in the preface to the fourteenth volume of the New York Edition of his novels, James seems to catch an indirect glimpse of this unique internationalism that pervades *The Golden Bowl*. In my opinion missing the mark about the sort of internationalism that pervades the larger body of his international/transatlantic novels, late in life James nevertheless saw *The Golden Bowl* as a unique portrait of the sort of transatlantic entity he aspired to in 1888. In this particular preface to a volume of what James refers to as “international” short fictions, repeating the sort of scare quotes he uses in 1888, James once more sets himself against his sister’s form of internationalism, proposing that he wrote *The Golden Bowl* and *The Wings of the Dove*, the latter text a bit harder to accept as such, “by no means” merely to address “the opposition of aspects from country to country,” the “back and forth between the distinctively American and the
distinctively European outlook,” or the portrayal of “certain Americans as Americans, of certain English persons as English, of certain Romans as Romans” (v). Displaying the same uncharacteristic imperceptivity we see in the 1888 letter, James instead suggests these novels could have been “perfectly expressed had all the persons concerned been only American or only English or only Roman or whatever” (vi). It is, of course, possible that here James is engaging in a sort of litotes, radically understating the purpose of internationalism in his fictions for the purposes of either further distancing himself from a label we know he despised or to set up the stories contained in the fourteenth volume of the New York Edition (“Lady Barbarina,” “The Siege of London,” “An International Episode,” “The Pension Beaurepas,” “A Bundle of Letters,” “The Point of View”) as much more intensely international. After all, listing four of his transatlantic fictions (Wings, Golden, Portrait, and Ambassadors), James allows that these texts “would not have been written” without the “sense and experience” of “achieved social fusion” (vi). Fitting with respect to the larger thesis of this dissertation and this chapter in particular, instead of reading James’ list of nationalities as distinct taxonomies, I instead interpret James’ statement to be yet another challenge to his sister’s style of discordant internationalism. Reading the passage in this way, the statement would mean all three nationalities are one anyway, that making distinctions between Romans and the English and the Americans is pointless because of the “achieved social fusion.” In this sense, James is not imagining recasting any of his international situation novels with an all Roman, American, or English cast. Rather, he’s imagining the cast of these novels as all one transatlantic nationality.
Quoting the passage to which James' idea of “achieved social fusion” refers, looking back on his career James believes his international cast of characters Americans, Englishmen, Romans are, in the whole matter, agents or victims; but this is in virtue of an association nowadays so developed, so easily taken for granted, as to have created a new scale of relations altogether, a state of things from which emphasized internationalism has either quite dropped or is well on its way to drop. (v-vi)

It is this sense of internationally, transatlantic “achieved social fusion” (vi) that permeates *The Golden Bowl*, and James' use of Roman, English, and American perfectly matches the dialogic national units of the transatlantic community he creates in the novel. Using this reading and seating James' textual achievement of the Anglo-Saxon total in *The Golden Bowl*, it would ultimately be too literal to take “Anglo-Saxon” to mean Caucasian Anglo-Americans of Scandinavian descent or even as a reference to the larger cultures of the two nations. In the context of the 1888 letter, James is discussing his concerns with internationalism in the context of his sister's experience of the US and England. It is understandable that “Anglo-Saxon” would therefore spring to mind. In *The Golden Bowl*, though, taken in the context of both the 1888 letter and the 1908 preface, James writes about the American and the Continental Latin characters set against an English milieu with British *ficelles*. This gives the novel a true US-pan-European feel that presents the transatlantic nation in a much more diverse, and daresay complete, light than a literal “Anglo-Saxon” union would allow.

Finally, though *The Golden Bowl* differs so radically from the other members of James’ transatlantic canon, like them it possesses a certain irony within the context of
James’ larger career. While it presents James’ most palpable assertion of transatlantic communion, it was published at a time when that unity was at a historical ebb. Just before the Great War, the US was engaged in a policy of isolationism towards the goings on of Europe. While by the end of the war, American involvement in European affairs increased drastically with the League of Nations and the Treaty of Versailles, the looming war and the sense of frustration James felt with the US as a result of its non-involvement in European affairs caused him to renounce his citizenship and, as both Pound and Eliot recognize in their *Little Review* essays, both renounce his ties to the US and thereby symbolically suggest no bridge was possible between the two. In light of these events, *The Golden Bowl* seems to represent James’ final fully formed textual attempt at the international/transatlantic situation; and upon finding this unity and articulating it in text (as he wanted to do as long ago as 1888), he drew away from it in his own life. Late in life, as his own mortality and a world war loomed, James seems to have accepted the division of Europe and the US in a desperate personal move that reflected a perceived social reality. James’s life and his texts, then, never were synchronized with one another. Presumably attempting to acting as a bridge most of his life, engaged in what Pound describes as “the great labor, this labor of translation, of making America intelligible, of making it possible for individuals to meet across national borders” (7), the larger set of James’ transatlantic fictions suggest no bridge is possible. Then just when the textual articulation of the unity he sought in the 1888 letter and described again in the 1908 preface had been distilled in *The Golden Bowl*, James personally began to move away from a belief in that unity, renouncing the US for his adopted Europe. The continued existence and development of the transatlantic nation in spite of the actions of one man is
a testament to it being larger than one biographical entity. Even when that person is perhaps the greatest and most celebrated figure of transatlanticism, the imagined community nevertheless lives on. A reflection of its textual and imaginary rather than political, geographical, or biographical, essence the transatlantic imagined community persisted long after James’ abandonment of his seminal and peerless role as Euro-American translator and completion of his complex body of textual contributions to the transatlantic nation. In 1934, the community was still alive in the textual imagination of the Atlantic world so that Nancy Cunard could pick up where *The Golden Bowl*’s portrait of European-American union leaves off and compile her own unique contribution to the transatlantic imagined community.
Notes

1 The first several pages of this chapter contain quite a few quotations from this letter. Rather than exhaust the reader with the same parenthetical and/or endnote citation over and over, I make note here that all the direct quotations from this letter can be found on p213 of Henry James: A Life in Letters (Ed. Philip Horne. New York: Viking, 1999).

2 One of four articles Pound contributed, this essay is part of a larger Little Review (5:4 [August 1918]) issue from August 1918 that considers James’ life and canon of works.

3 Years and generations later, Edmund Wilson would make a similar claim about D.H. Lawrence’s Studies in Classic American Literature (The Shock of Recognition. New York: Farrar, Straus and Cudahy, 1955) which seems to suggest this trend continued: “Studies marks the moment when Europe first begins to look forward to America, not merely for freedom, not merely for money, not merely from curiosity, but with a desperate need for new ideals to sustain European civilization” (906).


5 Kevin J. Hayes’ Henry James: The Contemporary Reviews (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1996) is, of course, the standard critical archive of the contemporary reviews of many of James’ works. In addition to the ten reviews of The Golden Bowl Hayes reprints, he lists some twenty-eight others in his “Checklist of Additional Reviews” (432), making it an excellent resource for familiarizing oneself with The Golden Bowl’s contemporary reviews. Dating from 1996, though, the research that built this text was necessarily limited when compared to the research options available at present. For example, using the “Google News Archive Search” (http://news.google.com/ archivesearch), I was able to discover twenty-five additional reviews from 1904-05 printed in newspapers such as The New York Times, the Hartford Courant, and The Oakland Tribune. All in all, then, there were likely between 50-100 reviews of The Golden Bowl produced in the year of and the year following its publication. So large a list would make any comprehensive evaluation of the reviews either hopelessly quixotic or, if achieved, taxing and dull if included in a study such as this. Sensitive to both these possibilities, I’ve selected merely a representative handful of the many reviews for discussion and quotation in the main text. Many of the other reviews left unquoted, though, bear out the same sorts of sentiments and patterns of evaluation as those discussed, that is, they frequently read The Golden Bowl as a representation of the Transatlantic community.

6 T.S. Eliot’s “In Memory” and “The Hawthorne Aspect” appear in the same Little Review issue as Pound’s “In Explanation.” Eliot never really allows James any sustained European stature, instead suggesting—both explicitly and implicitly by putting him in the tradition of Hawthorne rather than Balzac, Turgenev, or Flaubert—he is an American writer who writes only marginally satisfactory representations of Europeans and European life. As complex and contradictory as Pound’s evaluation, though, at one point Eliot does come down fairly hard on both the Americans and the English for not appreciating James enough, and
gives James credit for cementing “the Anglo-American Entente” (“In Memory,” 47). Eliot’s larger argument and examples, though, quite contradict this sentiment, making it seem like a softly-pitched, pity-praise for a dead literary titan whose star, in 1918, shone much more brightly than Eliot’s own. Like the larger body of James critics, then, Eliot too seems somewhat conflicted with regards to James’ heritage.

7 In The Image of Europe in Henry James (Dallas: SMU Press, 1958), Cristof Wegelin suggests his purpose is “to trace James’s relation to traditional American attitudes toward Europe and the development of his treatment of the ‘international situation’ from more or less conventional beginnings to the conceptual and formal complexity of his latest fiction” (7). Edel’s contribution to Jamesean criticism is, of course, peerless and rather vast. Examples of his concern with the Old World/New World dynamic in James’ work are numerous. One particularly concentrated distilment, though, of his concern with James’ “vision of the golden threads binding America to Europe and Europe to America” (322) is “Henry James: The Americano-European Legend” (University of Toronto Quarterly 36:4 [July 1967]: 321-34).

8 See Jessica Berman, Modern Fiction, Cosmopolitanism, and the Politics of Community (New York: Cambridge UP, 2001) and Adeline R. Tintner, The Cosmopolitan World of Henry James (Baton Rouge: LSU Press, 1991). Tintner suggests the international theme traced by critics in the mid-twentieth century transformed into the current study of “cosmopolitanism” (2) and further suggests the debt critics interested in James’ “cosmopolitan imagination” (xiv) such as Berman and herself owe to both Wegelin and Leon Eden in particular (xii-xiv).


11 A passage from Tennessee Williams’ play Cat on a Hot Tin Roof (New York: Signet, 1958) neatly and profoundly expresses the sense of commercial-cultural exchange that exists between the US and Europe in James’ fiction and elsewhere. Looking over a basement filled with surplus historical and aesthetic goods and raling to his son Brick about his salad days, “Big Daddy” Pollitt recounts the following memory of his and Brick’s mother’s trip to Spain: “We got that clock the summer we went to Europe, me an’ Big M ama ... And Big M ama bought more stuff than you could haul in a couple of boxcars ... Everywhere she went on this whirlwind tour she bought, bought, bought. ... That Europe is nothin’ on earth but a great big auction, that’s all it is, that bunch of old worn-out places, it’s just a big fire-sale, the whole rotten thing, an Big Mama wint wild in it, why you couldn’t hold that woman with a mule’s harness! Bought, bought, bought! ... It’s lucky I’m a rich man ... Y’know how much I’m worth? ... Close on ten millions in cash an’ blue chip stocks, outside, mind you, of twenty-eight thousand acres of the richest land this side of the valley Nile! ... They’s one thing else that I remember in Europe. ... The hills around Barcelona in the country of Spain and the children running over those bare hills in their bare skins beggin’ like starvin’ dogs with howls and screeches ... I got money enough to feed that goddam country ... I don’t reckon the money I passed out there to those howling children in the hills around Barcelona would more than upholster one of the chairs in this room, I mean pay to put a new cover on this chair! Hell, I threw them money like you’d scatter feed corn for chickens. I threw money at them just to get rid of them long enough to climb back into th’ car and—drive away ... ” (64-65; Williams’ dialect spellings). At the end of this passage, the American penchant for distributing capital to Europeans takes a much more direct path than the cultural chiasmus provides, then. Having bought some artifacts, Big Daddy simply takes to simply tossin his currency out onto Europe like farm seed. A powerful agricultural metaphor that suggests both the casual treatment of
abundant capital by Americans and perhaps reflects Marshall Plan-styles of European rebirth at the hands of American expenditure, this passage highlights the sheer ease by which literary Americans (such as those James explores) distribute capital to their European counterparts. Envisioning Europe as a great “fire-sale” also shows the degree to which these same Americans and Europeans are all ready to barter commercially in an attempt to mediate their disproportionalities. Finally, it is interesting to note that Big Daddy’s relationship to the Old World—namely, his vision of Europe as a great marketplace—mirrors Adam Verver’s almost exactly (see *The Golden Bowl*, 109-117). The men differ only in their plans for the goods (Big Daddy: personal accumulation; Verver: to build a museum) and the source of their wealth (Big Daddy: agriculture; Verver: unclear).

12 Though the novel is ambiguous as to exactly which painting Milly looks at when she has her mortal epiphany, Miriam Allott has argued rather convincingly that it is indeed Bronzino’s portrait of Lucrezia Panciatichi (see “The Bronzino Portrait in Henry James’s *The Wings of the Dove*” [Modern Language Notes 68:1 (1953): 23-35]). The success of Allott’s argument and research may be gauged by the use of this portrait to grace the cover of both the 2002 Norton Critical Edition and the 1998 Oxford World’s Classics edition of *Wings of the Dove*.

13 Very rarely, the chiasmus may seem to flow in reverse, James setting Europeans as the source of capital abundance and the Americans the beneficiaries of this largesse. Two examples of this sort of interaction would be Prince Casamassima’s thwarted, but eventually consummated (see *The Princess Casamassima*), relationship with the half-American Christina Light in *Roderick Hudson* and Daniel Touchett’s gift of somewhere between five (202, 204), sixty (205), and “something like seventy thousand pounds” (231), and also 270, 303, and 476) to Isabel Archer in *The Portrait of a Lady*. (For an engaging read that investigates the deliciously gossipy question “How Rich Was Isabel Archer?,” see Elliot M. Schrero’s article in The Henry James Review (20.1 [1999]: 81-88). The end result of these interactions is no less divisive, though, as in both cases Europeans and the US still find themselves divided as a result of the interaction. Light/Princess Casamassima even goes as far as becoming a revolutionary against the European aristocratic establishment. Also, these examples are semi-impure as one could argue that the European-raised Light is American in paternity only and that as an American so fiercely resistant to assimilation, Touchett remains at least self-consciously American when he passes the money on to Isabel.

14 On the same page, Edel quotes letters James wrote to his agent and publisher that suggest the esteem in which James himself held *The Golden Bowl*. James felt he was “producing the best book [he’d] ever done” and held “the thing the soldest, as yet, of all [his] fictions.” And though, as Edel suggests, critics were rather hard on the novel when it was published, “few denied its greatness in 1904” (219) and truly, few have denied its greatness since. Of course, in looking back on his career as he compiled the New York Edition of 1909, James seems to have thought *The Ambassadors* was “the best, ‘all round’, of all [his] productions” (*The Ambassadors* 35) raving about this novel and not *The Golden Bowl*. The question of James’ true favorite and true opinion of superiority concerning his texts, then, is a bit unclear. At the very least, though, as *The Golden Bowl* emerged, James recognized its unique qualities just as many critics have done since that time. In *The Destructive Element: A Study of Modern Writers and Beliefs*, Stephen Spender suggests that “*The Ambassadors* is, in a popular sense, James’s masterpiece. It is not as great a book as *The Golden Bowl*, yet it has the merit of being more readable” (75). Perhaps these are the terms James used to label *The Ambassadors* “the best”: as unified commercial, critical success.

15 Denis Donoghue writes, “I propose to come to *The Golden Bowl* somewhat indirectly and to justify my procedure by claiming that this is how the book comes to itself. In my sense of it, there is no moment, no scene, in which the book delivers itself over to us. We never feel, before the end and perhaps not even then, that James has given it to us without reserve and indicated how we are to receive it. We immerse ourselves happily in it, page after page, but we are never allowed to feel sure that we have it right” (Introduction, *The Golden Bowl*, xi). Revisiting the novel in 1909 as part of the New York Edition project, in the preface to *The Golden Bowl* James writes, “Among many matters thrown into relief by a refreshed acquaintance with ‘The Golden Bowl’ [sic] what perhaps most stands out for me is the still marked inveteracy of a certain
indirect and oblique view of my presented action; unless indeed I make up my mind to call this mode of
treatment, on the contrary, any superficial appearance notwithstanding, he very straightest and closest
possible" (577).

Part of a list of some dozen “sujets de roman” he has “en tête” for novels, James records the following
germ of The Golden Bowl in an 1895 journal entry: “2° The Marriages (what a pity I’ve used that name!):
the Father and Daughter, with the husband of the one and the wife of the other entangled in a mutual
passion, an intrigue” (34 De Vere Gardens, London, 21 December 1895. In The Complete Notebooks of

This issue of The Little Review also bears further evidence of how James’ work and the reviews of it
carried the spirit of Transatlantic nationalism in print capitalism even if, as Pound vehemently argues, the
Americans understand “nothing about it. … They have not stopped for eight minutes to consider the
meaning of his last public act” (6), Pound reading James’ rejection of his American citizenship and
becoming a British subject as an admitted failure—“after a year of ceaseless labor, of letter writing, of
argument, of striving in every way”—to unite the US and Europe and “to bring in America on the side of
civilization. … America has not realized that never in history has one of her great men abandoned his
citizenship out of shame. It was the last act—the last thing left. He had worked all his life for the nation and
for a year he had labored for the national honor. No other American was of sufficient importance for his
change of allegiance to have constituted an international act; no other American would have been welcome
in the same public manner. America passed over these things, but the thoughtful cannot pass over them” (6-7, 8).

Though his origins are all but assured to be American, we are not really sure what town Adam Verver
comes from. He’s so linked with American City in the novel that I suppose it matters little; but the idea that
American City is his adoptive home arises elsewhere in the novel too, giving it at least a marginal sense of
emphasis. Maggie elsewhere suggests her father comes from outside the gotham he now calls home,
preumably rural America or some less hyper-urban burb than American City: “American City isn’t, by
the way, his native town, for, though he’s not old, it’s a young thing compared with him—a younger one. He
started there, he has a feeling about it, and the place has grown, as he says, like the program of a charity
performance” (12). It’s likely that by making Verver a domestic immigrant, of sorts, to American City, James
merely wants to emphasize his self-made status. Linking the way his wealth and the wealth of
America (symbolized by “American City”) grew together, James further emphasizes Adam’s Americanness
and the distinctly American way he made his become financially flush. James’ use of “native State”
(110)—quoted in the main text—seems itself to be a play on words, using “State” to reference both
whatever US state in which one would find American City and the state Verver comes from as well as the
larger governmental “State” of which he is a part, namely, the US. Perhaps this phrase even leads us to
believe that Verver comes from the same state in which American City is found. Whatever the case amid
this wild speculation, the idea that he’s non a native of American City, then, doesn’t really challenge his
Americaness. Rather, it seems to be a deft, indirect way of actually emphasizing it.

See the OED (2nd ed.) s.v., “barbarous” for more information on the etymology of words with the same
Latin “barbar-us” and Greek “βάρβαρος” roots as “barbarian.”

See Genesis 11:1-9 (New International Version): “Now the whole world had one language and a
common speech. As men moved eastward, they found a plain in Shinar and settled there. They said to each
other, ‘Come, let’s make bricks and bake them thoroughly.’ They used brick instead of stone, and tar for
mortar. Then they said, ‘Come, let us build ourselves a city, with a tower that reaches to the heavens, so
that we may make a name for ourselves and not be scattered over the face of the whole earth.’ But the Lord
came down to see the city and the tower that the men were building. The Lord said, ‘If as one people
speaking the same language they have begun to do this, then nothing they plan to do will be impossible for
them. Come, let us go down and confuse their language so they will not understand each other.’ So the
Lord scattered them from there over all the earth, and they stopped building the city. That is why it was
called Babel—because there the Lord confused the language of the whole world. From there the Lord scattered them over the face of the whole earth.”

21 See Acts 2:1-40 (NIV). Traditionally seen as a reversal of the divisions of Babel and a linguistic and national reunification through Christ, this story recounts the following event wherein the holy spirit descended to abide mankind until Jesus’ return: “When the day of Pentecost came, they were all together in one place. Suddenly a sound like the blowing of a violent wind came from heaven and filled the whole house where they were sitting. They saw what seemed to be tongues of fire that separated and came to rest on each of them. All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other tongues as the Spirit enabled them. Now there were staying in Jerusalem God-fearing Jews from every nation under heaven. When they heard this sound, a crowd came together in bewilderment, because each one heard them speaking in his own language. Utterly amazed, they asked: ‘Are not all these men who are speaking Galileans? Then how is it that each of us hears them in his own native language? Parthians, Medes and Elamites; residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya near Cyrene; visitors from Rome (both Jews and converts to Judaism); Cretans and Arabs—we hear them declaring the wonders of God in our own tongues!’” (1-11).

From the first eras of exploration in the sixteenth centuries until the mid-nineteenth century, this passage remained hypothetical, at least from a European perspective. Perhaps known by native peoples much earlier, the route remained just that to Europeans, Americans, and Canadian until it was established by various expeditions from 1845-1944 made by such explorers as John Franklin, Robert McClure, John Rae, Roald Amundsen, and (in a single season in 1944) Royal Canadian Mounted Police officer Henry Larsen aboard the St. Roch. For more information, see Glyndwr Williams, Voyages of Delusion: The Quest for the Northwest Passage (New Haven: Yale UP, 2003).

22 As Nicola Bradbury suggests, “in The Golden Bowl there are two basic figures: the square of the relationship between four main characters, and the rounded bowl which is to symbolize their perfect happiness” (123). Likewise, Stephen Spender creates a detailed visual representation of what F.O. Matthiessen refers to as “the symmetrical structure” (55) of the novel. The hash-shaped (#) pattern Spender outlines in The Destructive Element represents a symmetry “that symbolizes the social order ... The golden bowl with its flaw represents, of course, the flaw in the order of their lives” (88).
CHAPTER 3

"CUNARD ... UNFINISHED ... ": THE TRANSATLANTIC UNFINALIZABILITY
OF NANCY CUNARD AND NEGRO: AN ANTHOLOGY

Anne Chisholm begins her biography of Nancy Cunard with the astute suggestion that “Nancy Cunard’s childhood could be a story by Henry James” (3). Indeed, Chisholm gracefully outlines her case for this opinion, listing as examples the transatlantic marriage that brought Cunard into being, the financial means and aristocratic gravitas at her family’s disposal, and the various adulterous liaisons that permeated the family early in Cunard’s life. As Chisholm reads it, Cunard’s childhood, the relationship of her parents Sir Bache and Lady Maud, and the latter’s relationship with G.E. Moore is a sort of What Masie Knew meets “A London Life” meets “The Pupil.” By way of the gothic Nevill Holt house where Cunard grew up, there is even a bit of The American lurking in the background of Cunard’s early years. But while Chisholm makes a convincing case for the link between James’ fiction and the narrative of Cunard’s childhood, the parallels between the two as literary figures do not extend much farther. Thus, while both writers and texts are participants, in and expressions of, the transatlantic imagined community, shifting focus from Henry James and The Golden Bowl to Nancy Cunard and Negro: An Anthology involves a rather significant alteration in critical perspective.

The relative unity of James’ work codified in the voluminous, editorially engineered New York Edition; his entrenched canonicity; the sheer tonnage of scholarship concerned with him—these contrast point for point with Nancy Cunard’s
own literary gestures and the ways in which her biography lives both in the critical imagination and in pedagogical praxis. Primarily associated with a particular genre of which he was acknowledged “the Master” by the succeeding generation, James created single-authored, baroque novels and stories as well as reams of ornate criticism. Cunard, conversely, wrote a diverse set of comparatively overlooked and often difficult-to-find poems and miscellaneous prose and is largely remembered, as a writer, for having edited a multi-authored text entitled *Negro: An Anthology*. While I would argue *Negro* is not exactly forgotten, as Laura Winkiel suggests (508), it does lie on the fringe of modernist studies, especially compared to such texts as *The Golden Bowl, Mrs. Dalloway,* and *Ulysses*. But while statements about the obscurity of *Negro* and Cunard often appear to be the requisite way to begin critical treatments of Cunard and/or *Negro*, the winds of academic fashion have actually begun to blow in favor of both editor and text. Thus, once incontrovertible statements about the disappearance of *Negro*, assertions that “the anthology has been reduced to a peripheral footnote in modernist studies” (Sweeney, “‘One of them, but white’” 94) and suggestions that “Cunard’s complex role as writer and activist in the unfolding of Modernism has yet to be assessed” (Friedman, “Nancy Cunard” 64) have begun to seem misleading and outdated, especially within modernist circles where, ironically, these statements most often arise.

Admittedly, the Cunardian critical paper trail amounts to nothing like the gargantuan mass of articles and monographs associated with “superstar” moderns like James, Eliot, Joyce, and Woolf. But Cunard and *Negro* have become critically voguish in the past fifteen to twenty years. Suggesting interest in both is accelerating, the lion’s share of the two dozen or so critical works concerned with Cunard and *Negro* have been
published since the turn of the millennium; and several of Cunard’s poems and three of her essays appear in Lawrence S. Rainey’s recent, progressively minded Modernism: An Anthology (782-776). This state of affairs does not mean those interested in Cunard’s works and legacy have fully satisfied the charge made by Susan Stanford Friedman, Holly McSpadden, Laura Winkiel, Jane Marcus and others who, echoing Ezra Pound’s question from The Pisan Cantos, wonder “Where is Nancy Cunard?” (Marcus, Hearts of Darkness 126) in the history of modernism. Indeed, this question still invites answers as, at present, it would likely be difficult to dissuade most critics from classifying Cunard with the “forgotten and silenced makers of modernism” (Scott v) such as Mary Butts, Mina Loy, Aleister Crowley, Laura Riding Jackson, Donald Douglas, and other “alternative” modernists or from essentializing her, in Renata Morresi’s words, as “the ‘Other’ who studied the ‘Others’” (149). Nevertheless, it is apparent that Cunard and Negro are currently emerging from this particular group of shadows and moving into a different stratum of appreciation, not the radiant stratosphere of James, Woolf, Eliot, and Joyce certainly but likely that liminal place between celebrity and translucent presence occupied by figures and texts such as Djuna Barnes and Nightwood and Rebecca West and The Return of the Soldier. The time has come, then, for critics to put away heretofore common assertions of anonymity that surround Nancy Cunard and Negro: An Anthology and transition from the early recovery phase into active analysis and textual reconstruction of Cunard’s literary output. It now seems proper that we embrace the emerging notoriety of Cunard and Negro and begin emulating the dock chatter that would have welcomed one of her family’s ships into port. In a phrase, “Ladies and gentlemen,” we need to begin operating under the emerging reality that “Nancy Cunard has arrived.”
Or re-arrived, rather. Indeed, even though the better part of Cunard's textual output has been historically overlooked, as an individual Cunard enjoyed considerable fame during the first part of the twentieth century. With a new biography published in 2007, even at present Cunard's life, letters, and relationship with The Hours Press initiate considerably more printer traffic than her poetry and non-Negro prose. Professional critics and daresay laypeople are understandably fascinated by Cunard's charisma and dramatic life which involved: the rejection of her petit-aristocratic, though fabulously wealthy, family; leftist political gestures; bisexual and biracial affairs; an uncanny ability to place herself at the white-hot center of modern aesthetics; and especially her obsession with diasporic African culture and social issues. Such gossipy biographical tidbits make any rendering of Cunard's life read like a readymade film-script filled with adventure, controversy, experimentation, political progressivism, and sustained drama. Likely both a gesture of introduction and the result of human weakness for gossip and scandal, virtually all criticism concerned with Cunard's literary output (even this chapter it would seem) includes at least a cursory outline of the more decadent mythology surrounding her life. A sort of New Critical nightmare surrounds the Cunardian critical constellation, then, as it appears nearly anathema to separate the writer from her works. And no matter how intentionally or biographically fallacious this practice might seem, critics tenaciously and overwhelmingly resist writing about Cunard's texts without giving her biography at least a perfunctory nod. In fact, when critics wish to (re)affirm Cunard's place as a modernist writer, they frequently make protests of a biographical, rather than textual, nature. They suggest that as a radical, exiled, experimental, and aesthetically
minded intellectual, Cunard was in many ways modernism incarnate. Anne Chisholm suggests,

In every generation, a few people appear to be especially characteristic of their times. They stand for the age even during their lifetimes, and still more after they are dead. Something in their style or behavior catches the attention of the image makers, the commentators, novelists or diarists, and they are singled out and fixed forever as the embodiment of a certain period or mood. Nancy Cunard was one of these … (xi)

Others argue that Cunard embodies “much of what one typically associates with the Parisian avant-garde and with left political commitments of the 1930s,” (Moynagh, Essays on Race and Empire 9) and yet, paradoxically, has historically found herself marginalized in modernist studies. A peculiar juxtaposition of the roles usually played by oeuvre and biography, Cunard’s 1920s/30s fame has even granted what her texts have traditionally failed to provide: a slyly indirect way into the modern canon.

After all, Nancy Cunard enjoys an unusual ubiquity and perhaps even peerless presence in the works of other modern writers, finding distinctively conspicuous canonicity as a character even if not as a writer. Thinly disguised, Cunard appears in Michael Arlen’s The Green Hat as Iris March (Chisholm 68-73); in Aldous Huxley’s novels Antic Hay as Myra Viveash, Those Barren Leaves as Francis Chelifer, and Point Counter Point as Lucy Tantamount (Chisholm 74-82); and in Richard Aldington’s story “Now Lies She There: An Elegy” as Constance (Gordon 126, 188-90). Many have even seen her lurking about in the most eminent modern poem of all, as Fresca in “The Fire Sermon” section of Eliot’s The Waste Land (Chisholm 339), and theatre goers since July
5, 1953 have heard her name repeated several times in Lucky's sudden, mock-intellectual logorrhea late in the first act of *Waiting for Godot* (Beckett 45-47). Even Ernest Hemingway felt pressed to argue against the idea that Lady Brett Ashley in *The Sun Also Rises* is a treatment of Cunard by way of Arlen's Iris March (Hemingway to Maxwell Perkins 224). The list of Nancy Cunard's literary appearances goes on and on and would include a diverse set of texts by Wyndham Lewis, Louis Aragon, Mina Loy, Evelyn Waugh, Tristan Tzara, Pablo Neruda, Kay Boyle, and William Carlos Williams. And Cunard was just as present in modern visual arts. Brancusi created a curvaceous and typically abstract sculpture of her, and she was photographed and painted by such modern artists as Cecil Beaton, Wyndham Lewis, John Banting, Man Ray, and many others far too numerous to list without belaboring the point.\(^9\)

Adopting the accepted feminist position, Alan Warren Friedman suggests Cunard's fame has been rather poisonous for her legacy: "she has been virtually written out of cultural history, marginalized by being transmuted into an iconic figure" (xii). Patricia Clements, Holly Ann McSpadden, and Monique Wittig all come to similar conclusions, suggesting aesthetic representations of Cunard have violently shaped and even distorted the actualities of her life.\(^{11}\) Maintaining this uncomfortable relationship between represented self and biographical self, Lois Gordon personalizes Cunard's relationship to her own complex iconicity by labeling Cunard a "Reluctant Icon": the title of the sixth chapter of her recently published biography. Since so much of the criticism surrounding Cunard includes at least a brief overview of the circumstances of her life, critics are often guilty of the same crimes of iconization and transmutation we accuse modernist writers and artists of committing. But a simple fact nevertheless remains:
whatever distortions the objective record of Cunard's life has suffered as a result of her
celebrity, the relationship between her chronological biography and iconic fame has
proven to be a devil’s bargain. After all, were it not for the fame that has continued to
fascinate critics and biographers years after her death and the myriad ways in which
Cunard was appropriated and perhaps even “distorted” in modernist literature and art,
serving as a sort of “Gioconda of the Age” and an inspiration to “half the poets of and
novelists of the ‘twenties” (Acton 73), Cunard would almost certainly be emerging from
an even deeper level of obscurity.

Whatever controversy surrounds her fame, though, it has had one undeniable
effect: as she lives in cultural memory, literary expression, biographical history, and
critical treatment, Nancy Cunard has an acutely unfinalizable self. Having been
transmuted by writers and visual artists and iconicized by critics and biographers,
Cunard’s chronological biography is merely the kernel of fact to which creative and
critical renderings, adaptations, and idealizations have been and continue to be appended.
Therefore, the living biography of the dynamic muse of modernism has a complex
multidimensionality, Cunard’s many selves set in dialogic relationships with one another
across the many literary and critical expressions concerned with her. Among the critics
who have recognized this, Renata Morresi suggests that while she has no trouble turning
up “descriptions, reports, images, memoirs, photographs, portraits, [and] stories” of
Cunard (147), the sheer diversity of this body of representations makes finalizing a
comprehensive idea of Cunard’s true self impossibly difficult: “I tried to wade through
the mass of images, descriptions, definitions, in search of the true Cunard. I tried to put
all the pieces together, to build a final intelligible image. But I soon found myself playing
As Morresi describes it, the biography of Nancy Cunard is a sort of unsolvable geometry puzzle, a set of shifting shapes critics and artists move around and further distort when creating their representations and treatments of her. Expressing an even more intensive sense of the fragmentation and unfinalizability that defines her biography, Cunard’s contemporary Langston Hughes remembers her as a “kind and good and catholic and cosmopolitan .... [S]he had ... a face made of a million mosaics in a gauze-web of cubes lighter than air and a piñata of a heart in the center of a mobile at fiesta time with bits of her soul swirling in the breeze ... ” (xxi). In this passage, Hughes uses systems of intricate fragmentation to describe Cunard and also suggests that such mosaics and cubes are held together by nothing more than the tenuous strength of “a gauze-web” and the delicate papier-mâché body of a trinket-filled piñata about to be beaten, fragmented, and scattered “at fiesta time.” Hughes even sets this piñata in “the center of a mobile” decorated with “bits of her soul” and thereby lends Cunard an even more thorough sense of fragmented unfinalizability as her soul sits apart from the rest of her. In Hughes’ portrait of her, then, Cunard seems to be continually on the verge of fragmenting but ultimately does cohere into a diversified whole thanks to the most delicate arrangements and connections. Such connections perhaps suggest the social networks in which Cunard moved, the various professional and personal relationships she cultivated, and the international connections she achieved as a result of her work and lifestyle. Indeed, Hughes’ description of Cunard as “catholic and cosmopolitan” suggests the extent to which she universalized herself and even the way she tried, like so many of her contemporaries, to live internationally, outside the boundaries of any single nation.
The biography of Nancy Cunard is, therefore, particularly unfinalizable in terms of national identity. Cunard was a restless individual who spent most of her life rejecting various aspects of her British birth nationality and wandering about the Atlantic world. In this way, she complements the many nationally decentered modernist figures and literary characters discussed throughout this study and, as a result of her various rejections and peregrinations, cannot be comfortably categorized into any traditional Euro-American national unity. Yet, because of the inescapable fact that all must be nationalized in the modern world, she cannot transcend nationality all together. Resolving this paradox in the fashion described in the introduction, this chapter argues that Cunard finds her most comfortable national identity as a member of the transatlantic imagined community. The text for which Cunard is arguably most remembered, *Negro: An Anthology*, is similarly unfinalizable. What ostensibly seems unified and finalized by its title—little more than a prominent and therefore understandably misleading description of one of the text’s many topics and possible genre identities— *Negro* is actually an intensively dialogic textual space, diverse and unfinalizable in terms of authorship and material textuality as well as in terms of genre, ethnic, cultural, and even linguistic identity. *Negro: An Anthology* is not, therefore, simply a cohesive collection of diasporic African culture. Rather, it is a veritable collage of the transatlantic nation that brings together texts and figures from around the Atlantic world into one textual space. In *Negro*, then, an unfinalizable dialogicity exists between the racial and cultural strains of the Atlantic world and, as a result, between European, American, African, and West Indian national groups. *Negro*’s set of unfinalizable elements, therefore, collectively suggest that, like Nancy Cunard, it is
comprehensively unfinalizable in terms of national identity and also that it can be understood as a textual representation of the transatlantic imagined community.

Having already suggested I would avoid belaboring Cunard’s celebrity in modern aesthetics, two other of Cunard’s literary treatments nevertheless warrant closer attention because of the way they frame her fragmented national identity. Also, because her biography has been transmuted, iconicized, and augmented by her various literary and critical avatars, it seems uniquely appropriate in Cunard’s case to work creatively against the customary analytical flow. Assuming of course that some distinction can still be made between the two after nearly a century of conflation and interaction, rather than using Cunard’s chronological biography to inform an understanding of her literary manifestations I instead use two of Cunard’s literary manifestations as means by which to understand a particular aspect of her biography, namely, her decentered national identity.

Cunard’s 1920s/1930s-era fame and aesthetic iconization arguably unrivaled among her contemporaries, she certainly did not escape the attention of Ezra Pound, the great midwife of modernism who had his fingers in at least as many cultural pies as Cunard. One of her lovers in the 1920s, Pound shared a fairly significant and dynamic professional relationship with Cunard that persisted well into the late 1940s. Though Lois Gordon suggests Cunard was “disappointed” by the two “inferior pieces that she was too loyal to omit” (165), Pound nevertheless did contribute to *Negro*: a letter sent to him by a presumably black American student that muses on the state of college-level “Negro schools” in the US (Cunard, *Negro* 97) and a typically crotchety, “rambling two-paragraph essay” (Gordon 165) about the German ethnologist Leo Frobenius (Cunard, *Negro* 393-94). Furthermore, Cunard’s The Hours Press published Ezra Pound’s *A Draft*
of XXX Cantos in 1930, and Cunard appears twice in the eightieth: one of the “Pisan” Cantos published by New Directions in 1948, two years after Cunard wrote Pound a scathing letter that holds the institutionalized Pound to account for his vitriolic socio-political positions. Pound mentions Cunard twice in Canto LXXX, notable for its length and as a “point of transition” in the Pisan cycle “from the public to the private,” beginning Pound’s “shift back to personal memory ... a more personal past” (Sicari 140). Critics argue that in this Canto, Pound reflects on “the friendships of his years in London and Paris during that happier time” (Flory 210). But there is a very sinister sense of bleakness and chaos pervading the poem as well as all ten of The Pisan Cantos. Hugh Kenner and others have labeled this shift in timbre from the earlier Cantos elegiac, reading the Pisan series as a reflection on the friendships that once existed and on a Europe fragmented and ravaged by war. Thus, while Wendy Stallard Flory argues Pound, in this Canto, is not concentrating on “the woman he loves” (210), it would be difficult to argue against reading the “Nancy where are thou?” line (80/88) as a cry for help to a muse-like darling Pound remembers from happier times and, as Lois Gordon reads it, as Pound’s direct reflection on the pair’s 1920s-era romance (33).

In addition to serving as a sort of muse figure or romantic memory, though, Cunard’s presence at this point in the Cantos also heightens the poem’s concerns with all manner of social fragmentation and, especially, the breakdown of traditional national identities. The Pisan Cantos, and the eightieth Canto in particular, persistently dramatize national negotiations and breakdowns, considerations of the aftermath of war, and different sorts of “economic and political decay” (Flory 212). For example, toward the beginning of Canto LXXX, Pound suggests that
... when bad government prevailed, like an arrow,

fog rose from the marshland

  bringing claustrophobia of the mist

beyond the stockade there is chaos and nothingness (80/79)

England in particular features rather prominently in this Canto. At the end of the poem—after a long, wistful section considering the British present and recounting the British past (80/92-94)—the poetic voice muses, “and God knows what else is left of our London / my London, your London” (80/94). Mixing the languages and cultures of Europe into a poetic pile representative of the multinational rubble of post-World War II Europe, Pound quotes Shakespeare—“There is no darkness but ignorance” (80/79) from Twelfth Night and “… The evil that men does lives after them” (80/79) from Julius Caesar—and mixes language and national heritage when he writes, in an “Engdeutch” patois: “Jah, the Bard’s pedestal is am Lesterplatz / in the city of London” (80/79). This is, of course, to say nothing of the Greek phrases and references and the Chinese characters littered throughout the poem or the various other national juxtapositions, conflations, and mixtures: “Don Juan of Austria” (80/71), “Las Américas” (80/72) plaza in Madrid, Turgenev conflated with Tiresias (80/72), and the suggestion that one might find “buried in the Red Square in Mosqu … Andy Jackson, Napoleon and others” (80/75). Mixing the elements of the British Empire, Africa, and Continental culture together and referring to a famous act of international impersonation, Pound suggests British prankster Horace de Vere Cole (famous for literally impersonating another national identity)¹⁶

... impersonated a sultan

of was it Zanzibar and took up the paving in Bond St.
to compensate for a partial deafness
which, he felt, lost him part of life's fun
and persuaded an Aussie or Zealander or S. African
to keel with him in prayer
outside Kardomah tea rooms
and also roused a street demonstration
in Soho for Italy's entry into combat in
19 was it 15? (80/80)

Elsewhere, Pound imagines an eighty-year old "Colonel Jackson"—perhaps an ignobly
demoted Confederate Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson—training and cooking for French
and Irish soldiers, preparing them for the WWI front and struggle for Irish independence,
respectively (80/82). These examples are just at the micro-level of the poem. Taken on a
larger scale, both the eightieth Canto as part of The Pisan Cantos and this particular
series as part of the body of one-hundred and nine Cantos can be understood as
extraordinarily diverse tapestries of cultures, histories, and national identities from
around the globe wherein pre-war wholes have broken down and become part of a
fragmented rubble pile. Expressing the moderns' quixotic push toward the destruction
and transcendence of nationality I explore in the introduction, this poetic pile represents
the breakdown of the old forms of national identification. The Cantos and more
specifically The Pisan Cantos and more specifically still Canto LXXX can be read,
therefore, as unfinalizable masses of once whole cultural and national identity markers,
broken down, mixed together, and pulverized into dialogic scrap.
Including Cunard in *Canto* LXXX adds to this persistent theme of national instability, destruction, and amalgamation. Unable to effectively ascribe traditional national identity markers to the world around him anymore, Pound invokes Nancy Cunard as a lover, muse, and also as a uniquely nationally decentered character in his poem. Like Charlotte Stant and the Principino of *The Golden Bowl*, Cunard is a transatlantic national, a person who possesses an unfinalizable Atlantic-world nationality and belongs more comfortably and convincingly nationally classed in the transatlantic imagined community. Skillfully capturing and emphasizing its intricate, unfinalizable transatlanticity, Ann Douglas describes Cunard’s national identity as an unfinalizable amalgam of American and British:

Cunard was British by birth but not by descent; she could best be described as someone paradoxically born an expatriate American. Her mother, lady Emerald Cunard, née Maud Burke, was American; her father, Sir Bache Cunard, though born in England, was from American stock. His grandfather was a Philadelphia engineer, Samuel Cunard, who founded the shipping line that made the family’s fortune and settled, in his old age, in England, where Queen Victoria made him a baronet. Sir Bache’s mother, Mary McEvers, was a New Yorker. (273)

In fact, considerations of Cunard frequently lead to discussions of maps, geographies, and destabilized nationality. In his first reference to her in *Canto* LXXX, for example, Pound can do little more than label Cunard with a general, geographical cardinal as “a southern Nancy” (80/73). Susan Stanford Friedman suggests Cunard’s “name criss-crosses the map of modernism—not so much as a poet but more as a tireless advocate, a progressive spirit, a charismatic dynamo, a woman who fascinated and frightened people with her
passions" ("Nancy Cunard" 63). Intimating Ann Douglas’ estimation of her nationality, Mae Henderson suggests Cunard’s “exile as a British subject in Paris in the 1930s can be described as a kind of permanent liminality defined by her transgression of family, class, national, and racial boundaries” (6). Jane Marcus suggests Cunard “not only publicly repudiated her mother, her class and her country ... she never settled down, never made a home. Exile was her element, and she exulted in it” (*Hearts of Darkness* 144).

Pound’s second reference to Cunard in his eightieth *Canto*, then, can be read as an affirmation of Cunard’s legendary Atlantic-world peregrinations and national instability, both affirming the roving spirit and exiled national he knew and wondering, perhaps exasperatedly and/or a bit whimsically, where she’s wound up after all those years of moving about:

Nancy where art thou?

Whither go all the vair and the cisclations

and the wave pattern runs in the stone

on the high parapet (Excideuil)

Mt. Segur and the city of Dioce ... (80/88)

Understanding *The Cantos*, and specifically *Canto LXXX*, as a tableau of pulverized national and cultural identities, Pound’s inquiries about the departure of “vair” and “cisclations” seem to reference the breakdown of heraldic, proto-national identity: *vair* a type of heraldic fur or tincture and *cisclations* a Provençal word for “a kind of gown,” particularly a royal robe (Edwards and Vasse 40). Taken in tandem, the two terms seem to invoke the departure of courtly social organization that was the forerunner of modern national communities. Here, then, Pound is looking back pensively to Medieval forms of
social organization, commenting on their departure alongside the departure of modern
nationality. The references to “Excideuil / Mt. Segur and the city of Dioce” not only
reference Pound and Cunard’s mutual passion for the Dordogne and Languedoc regions
of France but also bring city-state organization, an even more direct ancestor of the
modern nation, into the mix of dead human social and political unities, thereby creating a
wide-ranging, diachronic sense of social and political fragmentation. Though he cites it in
reference to Canto XXIX, Hugh Kenner’s identification of “the wave pattern cut in the
stone” (29/150) as a fragmented part of Excideuil castle (336-37), which lies about one
hundred miles northeast of Bordeaux, very likely identifies the reference in Canto LXXX
as well. Thus, the poem suggests even the stone in which “the wave pattern runs”
cannot resist decay and thereby positions it as an arresting image of the decline and fall of
once powerful systems of national and proto-national organization whose structures have
fallen into disrepair and whose symbols have even been obscured. Nevertheless, even
among all this fallout, Pound seems to have the same typically modern sensibility that
national chaos can be transcended and that nationality and its proto-forms can be done
away with. “Whither go,” after all, seems unavoidably reminiscent of the ultimate act of
transcendence in the Western, Christian tradition: the question “Quo vadis?” that Jesus
asks reflexively about his own ascension into heaven (John 16:5). The phrase now, of
course, has been extended to inquire after someone gone or going on a metaphorical or
literal journey, one who will travel a great distance and/or who will be gone a long time.
This makes it a uniquely appropriate question for Nancy Cunad who moved throughout
the Atlantic world most of her life, generating a dynamic sense of transatlantic identity as
she mapped herself as an exile, resisting finalization into a traditional national category.
More oblique than Cunard’s appearance in *Canto* LXXX as an embodiment and representative of decentered national identity, Beckett’s reference to Nancy Cunard in *Waiting for Godot*—what Jane Marcus has referred to as “a faintly obscene echo of her name” (*Hearts of Darkness* 142)—nevertheless expresses a comparable sense of the national unfinalizability surrounding her biography. Samuel Beckett and Cunard’s relationship was warm and, unlike her affiliation with Pound, largely if not exclusively platonic and professional. Beckett, though, likely knew Cunard at least as well as Pound did. As I discuss later in this chapter, Beckett enjoyed some of his earliest literary successes because of Cunard and worked closely with her to bring *Negro* into being. And because the *Negro* phase of Cunard’s career was so especially travel-oriented and nationally chaotic, Beckett was likely in a position to have been even more aware of Cunard’s restlessness, wandering, and her frenetic national unfinalizability than Pound. Beckett’s placement of the name *Cunard* next to the word *unfinished* at the end of Lucky’s *Godot* monologue (47), therefore, seems more than arbitrary or accidental. It seems an almost deliberately constructed representation of the sense of unfinalizability, national and otherwise, that surrounds Cunard. In the larger monologue that precedes it, “stones,” “calm,” “Cunard,” and “unfinished” indeed seem like four random elements of an equally random albeit repetitive array. At the end of the monologue, though, just before Vladimir seizes Lucky’s hat, silencing him and causing him to fall to the floor, these four words coalesce into a unified phrase of meaningful insight. Like four cacophonous notes, previously repeated at arbitrary intervals, the four words harmonize into two chords that contrast the staidness of “… the stones … so calm …” and the dynamism of “Cunard … unfinished …” (47). Certainly, Cunard remains “unfinished”
in any number of ways; but reading this passage as a comment on her national
unfinalizability, “stones” hearkens to the territory, the literal ground upon which
traditional nations are built as well as their restrictively finalized and “calm” unities. In
comparison, Cunard is unencumbered by such stagnancy and remains “unfinished” as a
member of any national group.

Employing her in their texts, then, both Beckett and Pound capture a sense of
Cunard’s acute unfinalizability and the ways in which she lives iconicized and
transmuted in cultural memory, literary expression, biographical history, and critical
treatment. However, while Pound and Beckett effectively suggest the sense of national
unfinalizability that defines the biography of Nancy Cunard, they fall into the typically
modernist trap of implying Cunard has transcended national belonging. Leaving her in a
state of limbo, they don’t offer Cunard an alternative national identity: a requisite feature
of post-eighteenth century life. Cunard, though, establishes her transatlantic national
identity and furthers the idea of such a community in her own texts and chronological,
versus represented, biography. Most critics have never let Cunard rest as a member of
any national group and instead frame their discussions of her in terms of transatlantic
travel and dialogic national identity, geography, and exile. This indicates that a certain
level of persistent transatlanticity exists in her work and in the record of her life. Thus,
even though it would be difficult to find a passage in Cunard’s writings comparable to the
overt directness of the passage from James’ 1880 letter, Cunard’s writings and complex
biography nevertheless convey a comparable awareness of the transatlantic imagined
community and her place in it. In several instances, Cunard reveals the level to which she
refuses national finalization and her propensity to think and act in a transatlantic manner.
For example, Cunard’s most persistent professional theme, namely her preoccupation with Atlantic négritude, may be read as a convenient, problematically-finalized label for what is actually a multitude of interests. Studying the topic of black Atlantic culture and participating in the discourse at-large allows Cunard to investigate several nuanced subtexts: leftist politics, the question of empire, human rights, and the transatlantic nation. Concerning the last of these four, Cunard consistently frames and participates in the idea of négritude in broadly Atlantic terms and in so doing implies a certain community exists there composed of both whites and blacks. Refusing to finalize the problems facing blacks in the Atlantic world as any one nation’s or race’s concern, Cunard also refuses to limit her understanding of or participation in the socio-geographical space to any one nation. Instead, she consistently reinforces the idea that the region should be understood as a dialogic, collective entity bound by the problem of race relations; and using various examples of racial struggles, Cunard works toward ridding the transatlantic nation of what she sees as the greatest fracture point threatening its cohesiveness. For Cunard, then, the struggle to stamp out Atlantic racism is a struggle to further unify and integrate the multi-racial and multi-national transatlantic imagined community.

This mission seems to date from the earliest phases of Cunard’s career. In her 1915, pre-Negro essay “Black Man and White Ladyship” for example, Cunard persistently negotiates between black culture and social conditions in the US, on the Continent, and in the UK. Doing so, she avoids localizing the problem and figures the racial struggle as a transatlantic concern. Attacking her mother, she writes
... you cannot kill or deport a person from England for being a Negro and mixing
with white people. You may take a ticket to the cracker southern states of U.S.A.
and assist at some of the choicer lynchings which are often announced in advance.
You may add your purified-of-that-horrible-American-twang voice to the Yankee
outbursts: America for white folks—segregations for the 12 million blacks we
can’t put up with—or do without ....

No, with you it is the other old trouble—class.

Negroes, besides being black ... have not yet ‘penetrated into London
Society’s consciousness.’ You exclaim: they are not “received!” (183)

In addition to situating the Atlantic race-struggle broadly on both sides of the Atlantic
and thereby suggesting it is a problem that defines and unifies both the US and Europe,
Cunard urges London society to receive blacks into society and castigates the southern
US states for their own bigotry. In doing so, Cunard invites the US and Britain to
confront the major challenge facing the unity of the Atlantic world. Additionally, Cunard
insults her American-born mother’s accent, describing it as semi-purged of its American
roots but likely not convincingly British either. Rather, it seems Cunard wants to expose
her mother as some awkward hybrid of the two, capably finalized as neither. Ironically
because of the extent it would almost certainly irritate Cunard, this critique actually puts
forth the idea that Lady Cunard—a Charlotte Stant sort of polyglot, a “Californian heiress
who” like Maggie Verver “sought a titled husband to enhance her social standing” and
exchanged “an American for an English identity” (Moynagh, Essays on Race and Empire
21)—would likely be properly situated in the same sort of imagined community as
Cunard herself. In this passage, then, Cunard uses her mother as a touchstone for the
cultural interactions that destabilize traditional nationalities and lead to the creation of the transatlantic nation. Cunard also invites her mother to travel within the transatlantic space, emphasizing the idea that the Atlantically liminal Lady Cunard would be comfortable in either England or the US because of the atmosphere of racial bigotry that unifies the Atlantic world.

Later in the same essay, Cunard suggests that "Her Ladyship’s” hysterical response to Cunard’s association with Henry Crowder and other blacks “produced the following remarks”:

*that* — no hotel would accommodate my black friend.

*that* — he was put out of England (exquisitely untrue, for we came, stayed and left together after a month.)

*that* — she would not feel chic in Paris any longer as she had heard that all the chic Parisians nowadays consorted with Negroes.

*that* — I now wrote for the Negro Press. (One poem and one article have appeared in *The Crisis*, New York.)

*that* — where I will be in a few years’ time.

*that* — she does not mind the Negroes now artistically or in an abstract sense but … oh, that terrible color! (I invite Her Ladyship to send in writing a short definition of a Negro in the abstract sense.)

*that* — she knew nothing at all of the whole thing til Mr. Moore read her my letter. (184; Cunard’s italics)

Admittedly, this list is, like many parts of “Black Man and White Ladyship,” fairly awkward, ranting, and clearly written in the illogical fog of anger. Whatever its literary
and rhetorical failings, though, the list nevertheless suggests Cunard conceived of the transatlantic world as a cohesive space with mutually interactive and affective elements. A closed system of sorts, Lady Cunard's actions in England aren't limited to that nation. Rather, they have a transatlantic effect on the larger whole, affecting the state of affairs there as well as in Paris and New York. Thus, this passage shows Cunard's mind moving freely within the community she imagines exists among the Atlantic nations, suggesting the extent to which this national space is defined and affected by the interactions of its member nations.

Cunard augments the inclusiveness of this transatlantic space by adding the African and West Indian experience to it. In the second section of "Black Man and White Ladyship," Cunard gives a rather impassioned overview of the Atlantic world's collective treatment of Africans during days of the slave trade while the US bears the brunt of her anger over the treatment of their descendents in the early twentieth century. In a doubtlessly idealized portrait that more or less contradicts her description of European slave ships early in the section, Europe as Cunard describes it has historically integrated Africans into society without incident and formed an inclusive transatlantic society:

For Louis XIV ... it was an honor to entertain and make presents to a royal black man. Negroes were invited, feted, sought after in the salons of 17th and 18th century France. In the realm of war black Haitian Christopher was Napoleon's successful and unsubdued antagonist. ... Many people of different classes have no race or color prejudice whatsoever. In France, it is non-existent. It is not a problem but a glory to have so many black subjects. When in Montmartre some Negroes shot in self-defense a bunch of drunken Yankee sailors who had attacked
them the French took the Negroes’ side. A French person experiences no difficulty in shaking hands with a black man; the Negro is not excluded from commercial enterprise and competition, from social contracts, from social functions. Segregation as a word would have to be explained. The same with Germany to an even greater extent. (127)

The vilification of the US in this passage and later in the section, as well as the opposition she sets up between European and American treatment of blacks, could lead one to conclude that Cunard seeks to divide the Atlantic world. In her black-oriented writings, it is clear, though, that Cunard’s goal is helping blacks integrate fully into white transatlantic society and breaking down the oppressive racial lines driving imperialism that threaten this community. Presenting a unified portrait of Europe, Africa, and the West Indies in the passage above, Cunard critiques the US in order to expose injustice, retire it, and grant blacks full social rights relieved of prejudice. Cunard writes in the service of integration, in the service of a transatlantic community purged of the stigma and inherent flaws created by racial injustice. Thus, when Cunard attacks the US and violently contrasts its racial “inconsistencies” (192), comparing it unfavorably to Europe, we can read this as Cunard’s desire to bring the US more successfully into the transatlantic national fold by exposing and solving its problematic race relations. Near the end of the essay, after all, Cunard argues that there are some successful instances of black integration in the US: “the 12 million blacks are the loyalest, best Americans; a Negro in the States has written a good book, therefore he is a good American writer; the same of the colored musician, the colored artist, etc.” (195). In “Black Man and White Ladyship,” then, Cunard outlines her ideal vision of Atlantic unity forged between Africa, the West
Indies, and Europe; and in the hopes of forming a fully integrated transatlantic community, she vilifies the US only to reveal and hopefully heal the rift its racial intolerance creates in the larger transatlantic community.

In other non-Negro writings, Cunard negotiates and establishes the idea of a transatlantic imagined community in a similar fashion. Considerably less harsh on the constituent nations, Cunard’s 1942, post-Negro essay “The White Man’s Duty: An Analysis of the Colonial Question in Light of the Atlantic Charter” discusses the ways in which the Atlantic world has unified itself militarily and socially “without distinction of race, color or religion” to defeat Fascism (127). After completing this task, Cunard argues that the new community unified under the Atlantic Charter—itself a document that bears further evidence that the Atlantic world saw itself as a unified, dialogic national space in the first part of the twentieth century—should work on integrating colonials into the larger transatlantic nation. Cunard is not only concerned with Great Britain’s responsibility for doing so; she charges all the constituent spheres of the transatlantic nation to come together into one community, forming the sort of unit textually represented and imagined by the Atlantic Charter and purging oppressive colonialism and racial injustice from the US, Africa, Continental Europe, and the West Indies.

Furthermore, “A Journey to Africa,” her essay from the 1920s, uses a proposed trip to Africa as an excuse to discuss the colonization of the continent by white Atlantic nations. The racial politics of Europe have been imposed on Africa so that both exist in a confused state of social propriety, the grand irony being that it might not be acceptable for Cunard, Norman Douglas, and other white Europeans and Americans to travel to or within Africa with Henry Crowder: an African American for whom Africa is the land of
his ancestors. Sardonically illustrating how its racial politics unify the Atlantic world in one community of confused bigotry and reflecting Cunard’s goal of curing the transatlantic community of this social flaw so that all constituent races may move freely about in it, “A Journey to Africa” further illustrates Cunard’s understanding of the area as a single community.

Other Cunard writings express similar portraits of transatlantic community, but the connection between Nancy Cunard’s transatlantic national identity and Negro is especially profound. Cunard’s vision for Negro and her contributions to it further illustrate the way she conceived of the Atlantic world as a dialogic community and suggest the extent to which Negro is not just a representation of Atlantic negritude but rather a textual expression of the much larger transatlantic nation. As early as 1931 when she sent around a circular soliciting contributions to a compilation she then called Color, Cunard’s scope was never anything short of transatlantic and multi-racial.\(^2^4\) In the flier, Cunard proposes the text be organized around discussions of the “contemporary Negro in America, S. America, West Indies, [and] Europe” and that her goal was for “[m]any English and American authors” to “write articles, essays, and give new documentary facts on Africa and the question of COLOR in U.S.A. and Europe” (Cunard, Negro xvii). Illustrating the idea that the transatlantic world is a single community bound by problematic race relations, Cunard requests “outspoken criticism, comment and comparison” on the subject of Atlantic negritude as handled by “the present-day civilizations of Europe, America, South America, the West Indies, African Colonies, etc.” (Cunard, Negro xvii). Furthermore, while it may be a text organized around the subject of Atlantic blacks, she wants the collection to represent “the attitude of diverse
countries and races” and wishes “to make it as inclusive as possible” (Cunard, *Negro* xvii). When it came time to write the preface for *Negro*, it seems Cunard was able to preserve her intent of inclusiveness and diversity. She suggests *Negro* is a dialogic “Anthology of some 150 voices of both races” (Cunard, *Negro* xxxi) and moves through a discussion of the national regions represented in the text: the US, the West Indies, South America, Europe, and Africa. Here, then, Cunard is not only focused on *Negro*’s subject but also on collecting the diverse national regions of the Atlantic world into one textual space.

Several of Cunard’s contributions to *Negro* are, like her other writings on Atlantic negritude, concerned with the idea of a transatlantic community. Cunard made seven contributions to *Negro*; and collectively, they represent a nearly comprehensive concern with the transatlantic nation at-large: the US (“Harlem Revisited,” “A Reactionary Negro Organization,” “The American Moron and the American of Sense,” “Scottsboro—and other Scottsboros,” and “Southern Sheriff”), the West Indies (“Jamaica, the Negro Island”), and Europe (“Color Bar”). Only Africa lacks a piece in its own right but is discussed intensively in several of these pieces, especially “Jamaica, the Negro Island.” Individually, the pieces reveal a preoccupation with the dialogic unity of the transatlantic nation similar to “Black Man and White Ladyship” and Cunard’s other writings on Atlantic negritude. In “Harlem Reviewed,” Cunard links “the so-called capital of the Negro world” with its Dutch ancestry (*Negro* 47) and outlines the national diversity of the “350,000 Negroes and colored” collected in Harlem and Brooklyn:

American Negroes, West Indians, Africans, Latin Americans ... Spanish-speaking

... Puerto Ricans, the Central Americans and the Cubans. Nationalisms exist,
more or less fiercely, between [the Spanish-speakers] and the American Negro—as indeed does a jealous national spirit between American Negro and black Jamaican. (Negro 48)

Cunard does make some gross exaggerations and perpetuates certain stereotypes in this essay; but even as she hints at the rivalries among groups living in Harlem, Cunard reveals a deep interest in the cross-cultural currents unifying these groups with Europe and the larger Americas. For example, in addition to linking the black enclave with its Dutch heritage, she suggests the Jamaicans believe that “they are better at business, that the colored Americans have no enterprise” and wonders, “Are we to see here the mantle of the British as a nation of shopkeepers on West Indian shoulders?” (Negro 48). In this way, Cunard sets Harlem up as a transnational community in its own right, formed of dialogic nationalisms, both part of and a microcosmic representation of the larger transatlantic community.

In “Scottsboro—and other Scottsboros,” Cunard discusses the widespread transatlantic community that rose up to protest the Scottsboro boys case: a famous, racially motivated kangaroo trial in Alabama that motivated Nancy to complete Negro and that occupies a fairly significant amount of discussion in the text.26 This protest came across the Atlantic to the US from the Berlin Transport Workers Union and caused “meetings and manifestations not only all over America but in European countries outside the American Embassies and legations”:

In Cuba a militant meeting took place outside the American-owned Havana Post. Several deaths, smashed windows in the American Embassy and police fights marked the breaking up of a huge manifestation in Berlin. Protests poured in from
the workers of the Soviet Union, of China, of Mexico. *L'Humanité*, in Paris, lists in one day, just before the execution [of the Scottsboro boys] was postponed by the appeal, the following protests:

- 40,000 Parisian workers. The Fédération Unitaire des Métaux Jeunesses Communistes. Italian Section of the Red Aid.
- 15,000 members of the Paris Municipal Workers
- The Ligue de la Défense de la Race Nègre. (*Negro* 164)

Cunard suggests there were further forms of Atlantic world diplomatic and intellectual protest from the Soviet Academy of Science, the London School of Economics and the University of London, and various religious bishops and rabbis in the US and Europe, and intellectual and artistic figures on both sides of the Atlantic (*Negro* 164). “Acclaimed by huge crowds,” Cunard also writes about the experiences of Ada Wright and American International Labor Defense representative J. Louis Engdahl had when they made their “tour of protestation in 13 European countires” (*Negro* 165). “Scottsboro—and other Scottsboros,” therefore, emphasizes the extent to which the Scottsboro case unified the transatlantic world in a community of protest and suggests again that the region can be conceived of as a unique system unified by the problem of race relations.

In “Jamaica—The Negro Island,” her lengthiest contribution to *Negro*, Cunard repeatedly discusses Jamaica’s relationship with Europe, Africa, South America, and the larger West Indies. Expressing the idea that the entire region can be conceptualized as a single community of mutually interacting units, she situates the history of the island broadly, including a generous overview of European colonization of Jamaica and the diffusion of runaway slaves that eventually formed the island’s dominant population. She
also links Jamaica's experience with that of Dutch Guiana, now Suriname, and other West Indian islands such as Martinique and Haiti. In writing the history of Jamaica, then, Cunard cannot help but write the history of the transatlantic nation. Reluctant to isolate constituent national spheres, she outlines a history of the community, including participants from Europe, Africa, and South America; and in nearly every paragraph, she portrays a unified system of cultural and political causes and effects. In the same way she suggests her mother's comments affected a broad transatlantic space in "Black Man and White Ladyship," Cunard outlines how political changes and developments in one part of the transatlantic community invariably affect the other areas. She even outlines the further blurring of these individual national distinctions into one transatlantic whole by reporting the story of "free persons of color and of pure blacks" who "were sent to England to be educated" (Negro 276) and then returned to open Jamaican schools. She suggests many of these were "the illegitimate children of planters" (Negro 276) and thus hints at the racial blurring of the Atlantic nations into a single community made up of mixed-race Europeans, native West Indians, and Africans. Cunard's portrait of Jamaica is one of constant population shuffling between the constituent spheres of the transatlantic nation, repeated political and social cause-and-effect in the closed space, and eventual cultural blending on the island to form a representative sampling of the transatlantic nation. Expressing the sense of fusion that has arisen between Africa and the West Indies, Cunard asks rhetorically, "And the Jamaica of today? ... It is ridiculous and bound to strike any traveler there overpoweringly that this island should be anything but a black man's territory. Africa is populated by Negroes. So is Jamaica" (Negro 280). Jabbing at the English, Cunard's descriptions of Kingston and Spanish Town further enriches the
cultural, national, and racial patois formed by Africa, the West Indians, and Europeans
representative of Jamaica and, by extension, the transatlantic imagined community:

Of Kingston, the capital, I cannot say otherwise than that I found it a very ugly
town, contrived by that singular British spirit which is quite desperately without
any concept of even the existence of plan, architecture or form. ... Spanish Town
is different; the Latins made it, and though frequent earthquakes have shaken half
of it down the sort of warm yellow sunset coloring on the lovely 18th century
buildings gives an idea of what the white man’s past must have looked like.

(NEGRO 280)

Of Montego Bay, “a white man’s resort,” and of larger Jamaica, Cunard describes a
similar state of affairs:

... [t]hat night [in Montego Bay], there was the dense, moving, vivacious black
crowd, round a preacher in the open square. The white have planted Christianity
in Jamaica ... In Kingston the raucous crashing of the Salvation Army is as
inescapable as it is insufferable. (NEGRO 280)

Cunard also links Jamaica, the United States, and Africa by discussing Marcus Garvey.
As she presents it, the Universal Negro Improvement Association is a broadly
transatlantic organization, urging New World blacks back to Africa, collecting “between
2 and 3 million dollars” from “American colored people” (NEGRO 282), and affecting the
state of affairs in the Americas as well as in Europe. Cunard uses this topic as an excuse
to discuss American economic interests in Africa, namely, “the Firestone rubber interests
that control” Liberia (NEGRO 282), and she lists several other examples of interactions
binding the constituent Atlantic nations into one imagined community. Cunard discusses
Garvey’s trial in New York, his speech at the League of Nations in Geneva, and his wife’s experience in London. Cunard then concludes the essay with a portrait of economically necessitated black movement around the West Indies and the US and even describes how the Jamaican women she met asked her to take them to England with her, “To England, ‘mother country’” (*Negro* 284). Cunard calls them “the loyalest subjects of Great Britain” (*Negro* 284). In this essay, therefore, Cunard presents Jamaica as she does Harlem: as a sort of microcosmic representation of the transatlantic nation as a whole, the island’s post-1600s history being a series of Atlantic interactions and fusions between Africa, Europe, and the West Indies.

“Color Bar,” Cunard’s seventh and final contribution to *Negro*, radiates the idea that racial bigotry is a significant unifying factor of the transatlantic imagined community. She suggests that British Common Law provides for equal treatment of blacks at public houses and inns but that in practice widespread discrimination against “people of color” (*Negro* 343) occurs quite regularly. Cunard links this English practice with that in the “the Southern States of America” where signs reading “‘For colored,’ or ‘Dogs and niggers not allowed’” (*Negro* 343) are common. Cunard in fact argues that this “infamous and insane working of the so-called ‘British Public Opinion’” causes “American colored people” and “many West Indians and Africans” to travel to, and spend their money on, the Continent. As she does with the United States in her other writings, Cunard identifies a social flaw in the transatlantic nation that prevents the free movement of people and, here, even capital within the community. Using an example of Franco-American relations against the British Color Bar and holding the French up yet
again as a properly integrated and functional unit of the transatlantic community, Cunard reports that

when some Americans tried to foist their prejudice on to some restaurant and cabaret directors in France ... the French government immediately acted *and closed* these places ... The French know that the economic lever is the only one that counts. We should see the difference if it were made to function in England. (*Negro* 345)

Beyond Cunard’s textual contributions to *Negro*, the sheer editorial leg-work needed to compile the text necessitated one of Cunard’s greatest traveling feats within the Atlantic world and initiated an odyssey that profoundly contributes to the sense of national unfinalizability and transatlanticity that surround her and *Negro*. An act of what Maureen Moynagh refers to as “political tourism” (“Cunard’s Lines” 70), Cunard’s “life was dominated” from late 1930 to the spring of 1934 “by her determination to produce an anthology on black politics and culture” (Chisholm 191). And for all of these four years, she was almost constantly on the move, making a series of frenetic imaginary and physical transatlantic peregrinations. The particular transatlanticity of the *Negro* phase of Cunard’s career and the way these movements contributed to her own transatlantic national identity and that of *Negro* are outlined in the following narrative map.27

Though her companion Henry Crowder suggests she had mentioned doing so before, Cunard “decided to embark on an anthology of Negro history, politics, and art” (Chisholm 153) in southern France in the early autumn of 1930. Ignoring his own reservations about her qualifications for engaging in such a project, Crowder gave Cunard “the names of serious black leaders in America” he thought she should contact
By April of 1931, Cunard was back in the south of France—in Cagnes-sur-Mer—after spending a few months in Paris; and it “must have been around this time that Nancy first heard of the Scottsboro boys case” (Chisholm 175). Here, Cunard wrote the aforementioned circular stating the mission of *Negro* that she sent out with letters requesting contributions. After visiting his wife in the US for a few months in early 1931, Crowder returned to France in May and found Nancy engaged in a relationship with Raymond Michelet, *Negro*-contributor and, some argue, “chief collaborator” (Rabaté 162). After a series of quarrels with Crowder about this situation, Cunard thwarted his plans to end their relationship and return to the US alone, more or less imposing herself on his return trip to the US ostensibly “to follow up her plans for the anthology” (Chisholm 177). Unable to work out a trip to Africa, Cunard and Crowder sailed for the US in July 1931. The pair spent a month in the summer of 1931 in Harlem, experiencing American racism and black culture, meeting with several *Negro* contributors, including “the staff of the NAACP magazine *Crisis*” (Chisholm 180-81) and its editor W.E.B. DuBois as well as Walter White, William Pickens, Langston Hughes, Countee Cullen, and William Carlos Williams. In New Jersey with Williams, Nancy and Henry traveled to Suffern, NY “to see the remains of the Jackson White settlement” (Cunard, *Negro* xviii), presumably a site related to the controversial, likely mixed-race Ramapough Mountain People. Returning to Paris in mid-August of 1931, the troubled relationship between Cunard and Crowder continued; and the pair traveled to Germany to visit the ethnological museums in search of African art and cultural artifacts. After taking a break from compiling *Negro* in late 1931, Cunard traveled from Paris back to the US in April 1932. Crowder having already returned to the US in early fall 1931, Cunard and
Raymond Michelet traveled from Paris to London, joined up with surrealist painter John Banting, and sailed for New York. Once there, the coterie settled in Harlem. Cunard unsuccessfully tried to track down Crowder by making one or two trips to Washington, D.C. Cunard also had to move to a friend’s Dutchess County farm in upstate New York to avoid death threats and the overwhelming amount of negative press surrounding her second visit to the US. In May 1932, after about a month’s residence at the farm, Cunard traveled to Boston to meet with Negro contributors Taylor and Eugene Gordon and Sterling Brown. While there, she gained the attention of black Communist party/International Labor Defense leaders William Patterson and his wife Louise Thompson. In July 1932, Cunard left the US for the West Indies with Negro contributor A.A. Colebrooke with whom she’d had a media-sensationalized, and perhaps entirely fictional, relationship in Boston. Cunard spent about three weeks in the West Indies, first in Cuba and then in Jamaica. In Cuba, Cunard met with poet and Negro contributor Nicolás Guillen. In Jamaica, she met with Marcus Garvey and “was the guest of honor at a reception given by the Universal Negro Improvement Association” (Chisholm 203). In August 1932, Cunard returned to France and traveled to the Ile Calypso in the Dordogne River where she and Michelet worked steadily, “writing, translating and adapting the material that by this time was pouring in” (Chisholm 204). In the fall, they returned to Paris and spent the winter of 1932 in Réanville and Brussels. During the two weeks they spent in Brussels, Cunard and Michelet met with photographer Raoul Ubac at the Tervueren Musem where Ubac took pictures and Michelet sketched African sculptures and carvings. In spring 1933, Cunard moved to London without Michelet. She brought with her “the huge bulk of manuscript and pictures she had amassed over the previous
two years” (Chisholm 206). She briefly visited Michelet in France for a few days in the spring of 1933, confirming the end of their romantic relationship, and took a trip to the country, “an hour or so away” where she “isolated herself at a small village inn” (Cunard, *Negro* xxii) “for a while to work on Negro” (Chisholm 212). Then, after “a year of more than usual confusion and upheaval for Nancy and those involved with her” (Chisholm 206), *Negro* was finally published in London on February 15, 1934.

This grand tour that Cunard made of Europe, the US, and the West Indies in the service of *Negro*, as well as later visits she made to Russia, Spain, Algeria, South America, the Caribbean, Mexico, the UK, and the US, helps establish her own transnational liminality and, more specifically, outlines her participation and membership in the transatlantic imagined community. This particular phrase of movement in the early 1930s, though, has a unique importance as it resulted in the collection of the transatlantic nation into a single textual space which was then given back to the literate people of Europe, the US, and the West Indies as a representation of their transatlantic nationhood. Some would argue that this is an overstatement of the importance and/or the reception of *Negro*; but even though *Negro*’s initial press run was limited to 1,000 copies, several of which Cunard sent “to the press and to numerous American and English libraries,” it would be incorrect to accept the idea that the text suffered from a “lack of reviews” (Gordon 173, 174) or that upon publication “it did not receive significant attention” (Sweeney, “‘One of them, but white’” 96). Such indiscriminate conclusions irresponsibly service the increasingly flawed but stubbornly persistent idea perpetuated by critics that *Negro* is extraordinarily obscure.30 Similarly, it would be incorrect to suggest that the “black presses in the United States ignored [Negro’s] publication” or that the black
This unfounded conclusion services an entirely different, but equally problematic, set of arguments that impugn the continuing relevance of *Negro* because it doesn’t meet with contemporary standards of racial politics.  

Concerning the first fallacy surrounding the contemporary reception of *Negro*, critics all too often focus on where *Negro* wasn’t reviewed, most starkly in *The Times* of London, rather than on where it was reviewed, and on who didn’t respond to its publication rather than who did. For example, in his introduction to *Negro* Hugh Ford points out that leftist luminaries such as *New Masses* editor Mike Gold and reporter John Spivak, a sort of radical Bob Woodward figure who contributed to *Negro*, neglected to review the text (Cunard, *Negro* xxix) while Carole Sweeney is peculiarly anxious that the text wasn’t more heavily reviewed in the hyper-specific field of ethnography (Sweeney, “‘One of them, but white’” 96). Concerning the second fallacy perpetuated about the reception of *Negro*, significant modernist figures, both black and white, responded favorably to the text’s publication. Langston Hughes, Theodore Dreiser, Alain Locke, and William Carlos Williams were among the many figures who wrote to Cunard, congratulating her on the text’s publication, and *Negro* was reviewed in a multinational, multi-cultural, multi-ethnic set of Atlantic world periodicals including *The New York Times*, the Jamaican *Daily Gleaner*, *The New Republic*, and other specialty publications such as the black-focused *Amsterdam News*, the NAACP’s *The Crisis*, and the leftist English papers the *Daily Worker* and *New Statesman*. Laura Winkiel’s recent article, based on groundbreaking research performed at the Beinecke Library, illustrates just how wide-spread and diverse the reaction to *Negro* was; and rather than implying *Negro*’s
unimportance, *The Times* of London’s failure to review the text can likely be explained by social pressure. As Anne Gordon implies, *The Times* of London likely deliberately ignored the publication of *Negro* even as, or precisely because, it gave Cunard’s mother’s social functions “regular coverage” (174). Thus, while the initial press run was relatively small and the reviews were not overwhelming in number, the publication of *Negro* did initiate a geographically and racially diverse discussion about the text in the American, West Indian, and British press. Moreover, a close look at these reviews and responses reveals that many read *Negro* as a vehicle for imagining a transatlantic community and thereby helped disseminate the idea more widely.

As expected, *Negro*’s treatment of Atlantic négritude is the dominant concern of these articles; but as is the case with many of Cunard’s texts, this discussion is simultaneously one of a transatlantic community bound by its concern with black-white race relations. Running the same wire review, *The Daily Gleaner* and *The New York Times* emphasize that “the book is concerned with the Negro in the United States, Africa, the West Indies and Europe” (“Cunard Anthology on Negro is Issued”). Reflecting the sense of Atlantic camaraderie *Negro* tries to instill in its audience, another article printed in *The Daily Gleaner* quotes a lengthy passage from Cunard’s *Negro* essay “Jamaica—The Negro Island” that emphasizes the cultural connections between Jamaica, Africa, and the US (“Miss Cunard’s Anthology of the Negro Race”). The same paper also carries a story reporting that *Negro* was banned in Trinidad as “a seditious publication” (“Trinidad Order Banning the Book By Nancy Cunard”); and while there are likely a number of reasons for this—the text’s leftist leanings, for example—I would argue *Negro* helps Atlantic blacks see themselves as part of a larger, racially diverse transatlantic nation.
Not unrelated to the text’s Marxist elements, this breaking down of oppressive color lines in the interest of a single, pluralistic community would make colonial control of the island as it existed in the first part of the twentieth century, namely white power over blacks, much more difficult to maintain and justify. Substantiating this, Jane Marcus suggests that *Negro* helped destroy “any excuse for empire” because it presented Atlantic blacks as equal artistic and intellectual participants in the transatlantic community and bore evidence that black people were not racially inferior. Africans and their descendents, and by extension, other peoples of color, must now be accepted as sharing that quality Woolf called “human character.” In addition Nancy Cunard, George Padmore, and the other black intellectuals who made the *Negro* anthology must be recognized as public intellectuals and no longer dismissed as outside agitators. (Marcus, *Hearts of Darkness* 179)

The fact that many Trinidadians were likely illiterate in the early twentieth century further testifies to the perceived power of the text and the political ripples, and even overreactions its publication created. Trinidadian authority figures, after all, seemed loathe release the text even to those who couldn’t read it. Given the reception of *Ulysses*, *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*, *Lady Chatterly’s Lover*, and *Tropic of Cancer*, one also cannot convincingly claim that banned books are ignored books. Rather, the political opposition *Negro* experienced when published, even in the US and the UK by means of the FBI and British intelligence agents, suggests the gravity with which it was received; and whether it was actively repressed as in Trinidad, “the British West Indies and several West African colonies” (Winkiel 507) or passively repressed by being ignored in *The Times*
and doubtlessly other mainstream newspapers, the publication of *Negro* elicited a fairly profound and diverse response from the press of the Atlantic world.

Other reviews are more overt in their understanding of *Negro* as a textual representation of the transatlantic imagined community. Writing for *The Nation*, Anita Brenner references George Antheil's "The Negro on the Spiral or A Method of Negro Music" (Cunard, *Negro* 214-19) as a sort of Baedeker for New Yorkers wishing to experience Asadata Dafora's dance opera *Kykunkor*.\(^3^9\) Appropriate to the goals of Antheil's essay, which outlines the cultural correspondence between African music and the Western tradition, Brenner's reference to the essay helps create the impression that there is an aesthetically based transnational relationship emerging between African dance and the New York art world. Perhaps most overt in its appreciation of *Negro* as a textual representation of the transatlantic imagined community, though, are Henry Lee Moon's reviews of the text. The first, a full-page, five-column treatment titled "'Negro' Arrives at Last: Nancy Cunard's Anthology Found Invaluable Document," complements the more general sense critics have of *Negro*’s encyclopedic treatment of pan-Atlantic "Negro life in the Americas in Africa and in Europe." Moon is more direct in his assessment of the text’s multinational and multiethnic diversity, though: "*Negro* is the compilation of some 150 contributors, Negro and white, American, Latin American, European and African." Moon similarly picks up on the sweeping transatlanticism of Cunard’s contributions to *Negro*, giving her credit for "articles on Harlem, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People ..., the American mind and color, Scottsboro, Jamaica, and the color bar in Europe," and hints at an understanding of the tragic binding agent of Cunard’s vision of the transatlantic nation when he gives her credit for, "unlike most
Europeans,” understanding “Scottsboro not as an isolated instance of race terrorization, but as it is, merely one link in a whole system of oppression.” Assigned the sweeping title “Negro in the Western World,” Moon’s second review was published in The New Republic. Not only does the title seem to sum up the gargantuan, transatlantic scope of the text, but Moon also argues the “comprehensive and illuminating” text sets forth in a completeness unequaled by any other single book the varied activities of that race. Some 150 writers, Negro and white, American, Latin American, African and European, have contributed historical surveys of the Negro’s African background and of his introduction to and development in the Western World; as well as accounts of the obstacles facing him both as a Negro and as a worker; of his achievements in education, literature, music, the arts.

Moon clearly picks up on the essential dialogism of Negro and describes it as a diverse textual community of Atlantic-world voices bound in one textual space and organized around, but not limited to, the particular subject of Atlantic negritude. Further suggesting the extent to which Negro textually embodies the idea of a transatlantic nation, Moon argues that Cunard brings to the English reading public a number of highly articulate Latin Americans and Africans little known in this country. These she ranges side by side with some of the leading American and European writers and critics … “Negro” is at once a slap in the face of the British dowagers who disavowed her for her association with Negroes, and a justification for her defiance of the restrictive code of Anglo-Saxon society. (317)
Moon, then, reads *Negro* as a forceful coming-out for blacks and, as Cunard often saw her political struggle, as a statement of their aggressive union with the larger Atlantic world. But *Negro* is not just a text for or about Atlantic blacks. Rather, the text strengthens the Atlantic world’s sense of community by introducing obscure Latin American and African writers and cultural figures to Anglophonic readers. As Moon received it, then, *Negro* is not simply a collection of, for, or by Atlantic blacks. Rather, *Negro* represents the creation of a larger community of multicultural, multinational, and multiethnic Atlantic nations and cultures. It brings together this diverse set of voices and texts from around the Atlantic world and stands as a textual vehicle through which the Atlantic world can see and understand itself as a collective space, as a transatlantic imagined community.

The title *Negro: An Anthology*, though, has historically proven problematic with respect to the academic scholarship concerned with it. Critics have consistently allowed the deceptively finalized title fool them into misrepresenting and even marginalizing the racial diversity of the text. Essentializing *Negro* as an extension of black modernity and as a representation of the black diaspora, such critics limit *Negro* to being a “manifesto of black socialist-realism ... infused with several facets of black primitivism” and consider little about the text beyond its topical concerns with Atlantic negritude and the various discourses concerned with it in the early twentieth century (Lemke 133). Others ascribe more derogatory qualities to *Negro* but still essentialize it as a “black book.” For example, as I suggest, some condemn *Negro* as a pejorative relic of the past and, overlooking its generally positive reception in the 1930s Atlantic black community, force modern standards of political correctness upon it and its author. Related arguments
present *Negro* as an act of textual oppression, as an embodiment and expression of colonialism and the problematic black/white binary\(^43\) while still others approach this chapter’s understanding of the text as a dialogic, multinational/cultural/ethnic space without fully executing arguments that avoid the sort of finalization implied by *Negro*’s title and subject.\(^44\) Three critics, though, have recognized the diversity of the text and echo *Negro*’s contemporary reviewers by pushing *Negro* into a wider sphere of understanding. Such progressive inquiries have attempted to recontextualize *Negro* as a unifying agent of the Atlantic world, as a text that sutures rather than exacerbates divisions between blacks and whites. These critics also frame their discussions of *Negro* in ways that incorporate rather than ignore or marginalize its various diversities.

Referencing Paul Gilroy’s *Black Atlantic*, Maureen Moynagh suggests that negritude in and of itself acts as a binding agent of the Atlantic world: “The image of the Negro and the idea of ‘race’ which it helps to found are living components of a western sensibility that extends beyond national boundaries, linking America to Europe and its empires” (Gilroy, *The Black Atlantic* 159). From this conclusion, Moynagh suggests this “transatlantic … linkage and this western sensibility are exemplified and anatomized in Cunard’s anthology” (*Essays on Race and Empire* 11). Arguing for its continued relevance, Moynagh proposes that *Negro* “lays a modernist transatlantic matrix alongside a black transatlantic matrix” (*Essays on Race and Empire* 11) and creates a sense of interactivity and connectedness between the two. Often critiquing the limitations placed on the text by the same studies referenced in the previous paragraph, Laura Winkiel takes a position similar to Moynagh’s, arguing that “*Negro*’s transnational effort … obscured by critical attention to Cunard’s racial romanticism … can be understood as
recontextualizing white avant-gardist and socialist rupture within an African and African-diasporic modernity” (508). As I do in this chapter, Winkiel reads “Negro as a transnational modernist text” created not by naïve, well-meaning but ultimately oppressive whites but rather “articulated (at least in part) from the perspective of colonized and subject peoples of color” (508). Further establishing the diverse yet cohesive bi-racial and multinational dialogism of Negro, Winkiel proposes “we read Negro as a collectivist documentary project” that investigates “the occulted history of African and African-diasporic modernity and how it intervenes in the racialized ground of Anglo-European modernism by making visible the constitutive function of racial difference” (508). Winkiel sees “Negro as a fringe document, a border crossing hybrid” organized around “the uneven race relations of the 1930s: situated as it is between the anti-imperialist—yet often racially hierarchical—initiatives of white cosmopolitanism and an increasingly powerful and organized black transnationalism” (508-9). Finally, in her unique monograph-cum-memoir, Jane Marcus, often acknowledged as the vanguard of such thinking by critics such as Laura Winkiel (527-28n5), argues that Negro occupies a “unique place as a biracial text” where “even more groups are represented in the making of the anthology and its reception than emerging African intellectuals and European and American anthropologists” (Hearts of Darkness 17). Marcus suggests that

If we read Negro as creating a cross-cultural and cross-racial contact zone that connects Harlem and Paris with Zimbabwe and Haiti, Alabama and Brazil with lynching in America, and the history of African art with hundreds of drawings and photographs—it will perhaps emerge with all its contradiction intact as a way of
understanding race relations in Europe and the black Atlantic between the wars.

(*Hearts of Darkness* 17)

In this way, Marcus establishes *Negro* as a “collective effort” of “international networks of scholars, historians, anthropologists, photographers, and poets” (*Hearts of Darkness* 141) that unifies the nations and races of the Atlantic world. *Negro*, she argues, is outstanding because it refuses to remain in the domain of art and ventures bravely into politics, anthropology, and history … Cunard’s work and the cultural work of the book are part of a lost legacy of active public intellectuals, Africans, West Indians … who worked with London leftists as a new breed of public intellectuals with an international perspective. (*Hearts of Darkness* 142, 179)

Extending its value beyond black studies, Marcus concludes her monograph with the assertion that “[i]n the classroom the *Negro* anthology gives us back the words and images of a whole generation of public intellectuals” (*Hearts of Darkness* 182).

But for all these critics do to push our understanding of *Negro* beyond the traditional, largely racial limitations imposed on it, I believe many of the specific ways in which *Negro* reveals its racial and national unfinalizability remain under-articulated. Thus, I want to outline and briefly discuss some of the major factors contributing to *Negro*’s status as such. Doing so will further the growing sense critics have that the text is a collection of bi-racial, Atlantic-world culture and, as is my specific contention, that it is a veritable collage of the transatlantic nation that brings together texts and figures from around the Atlantic world into one dialogic textual space. Unfinalizable in almost every facet of its being—in terms of authorship and material textuality as well as in terms of genre, ethnic, cultural, and even linguistic identity—*Negro* brings together not only the
racial and cultural strains of the Atlantic world but also, as a result, European, American, African, and West Indian national groups. *Negro*’s set of unfinalizable elements, therefore, collectively suggest that the text, like Nancy Cunard herself, is most comprehensively unfinalizable in terms of national identity and that the text can for that reason be defined as a representation of the transatlantic nation filled with a diverse, multinational set of writings by a bi-racial cast of writers.

Perhaps the most widely-received way in which *Negro* asserts its unfinalizability is in terms of genre identity. While as I suggest the first part of *Negro*’s title has historically proven tyrannical, critics have shown a contradictory level of resistance toward the subtitle “An Anthology.” Almost as ubiquitous as proclamations of its obscurity, comments on the text’s genre-defiance exist in nearly every critical work concerned with the text. Because it contains “fiction, musical scores, historical material, folk knowledge, scientific accounts, and political pamphlets[,] *Negro* is a treasure trove of documentary material” and “valuable historical information” (Lemke 130-31) and as such resists finalization into any specific genre. Critics consistently even resist the most obvious label “anthology.” Michael North, for example, goes as far as suggesting because “it includes poems, music, pictures, maps, tables, arguments, essays, letters, and bibliographies[,] in a very practical sense it is a direct heir of such other omnivorous and generically indiscriminate works as The Waste Land and The Cantos” (189). In this way, North seems to read the text as a sort of modernist long poem. Doubtlessly, the diversity of its content inspires critics to define *Negro*’s genre identity in such extraordinary ways: as a “publishing project” (Moynagh, Essays on Race and Empire 9); a “booklike creation from a fringe area” (Winkiel 507); 45 as “border paraphernalia” (Winkiel 507);
as a "remarkable tome" (Friedman xix); as "a generically eclectic document" (Sweeney, "One of them, but white" 93); as an ethnographic, fantastical "travel journal" (Archer-Straw 168); and even as a "large ungainly album" (McCormack, "Samuel Beckett and the Negro Anthology" 75). Even this generous list of descriptions is in no way exhaustive; and because of this commotion, perhaps it is best to simply use the generic descriptions put forward by novelist Mulk Raj Anand and critic Jane Marcus who respectively describe the text as "a big book called Negro" (38) and a "huge collaborative book" (Hearts of Darkness 179). I would agree with Sieglinde Lemke, though, that Negro's ungainliness gives it a certain "symbolic enormity" (130) and with Jane Marcus who reads Negro's materiality as "a semiotic signifier" (Hearts of Darkness 141). In this way, I read the bloatedness and ambiguous genre identity of Negro as a metaphor for and adequate representation of the size, fluidity, and diversity of the transatlantic nation. Pushing at its textual limits, its elements refusing finalization and set in dialogic, unfinalizable relationships, Negro is ultimately an unruly text acting as a collective space and representation of the equally expansive and dynamic transatlantic imagined community.

In fact, a sort of radical apotheosis of the Bakhtinian novel, Negro is an overtly polyphonic "big book" composed of unfinalizable elements and voices from around the Atlantic world. And the various ways in which Negro reveals its unfinalizability and transatlanticity are in no way mutually exclusive. In most cases, one trait helps reveal the others and the sum of them all reveals the point most profoundly. For example, the "150 voices of both races" (Cunard, Negro xxxi) who composed Negro represent nearly every constituent nation that could conceivably be included in the transatlantic imagined
community: the US, Nigeria, France, Haiti, Jamaica, Brazil, Kenya, the UK—any complete list would descend into tedium. As Sieglinde Lemke describes it, “The cultural backgrounds of the contributors as well as the issues addressed in the anthology range from Europe to America, from Africa and the West Indies to South America” (130). Furthermore, not only do these multiple authors reveal the composition of Negro cannot be ascribed to one person or one race, they suggest the extent to which it collects and represents the multilingual transatlantic nation. True, Negro is published in English; but as Alan Warren Friedman’s Beckett in Black and Red illustrates, many of the pieces were originally composed in French. They, along with submissions in still other languages such as German and Spanish, had to be translated by Beckett and others. Thus while Negro presents itself as an English-language text, some of the major languages of the transatlantic imagined community exist in the background of the text’s history like ghosts. As Hugh Ford describes the circumstances surrounding its composition,

Nancy looked after the articles written in English, [Raymond] Michelet handled those in French and German, and arranged for translations. At least a dozen articles submitted by French contributors, some of considerable length and complexity, when to Samuel Beckett, who quickly returned them translated into impeccable English. Victor Cunard, Nancy’s cousin, translated others, and Nancy herself found time to do one. (Cunard, Negro xxi)

Negro’s linguistic diversity, then, also allows us a glimpse at its authorial diversity. Even allowing just Raymond Michelet and Samuel Beckett their significant roles in the text’s development, claiming Cunard was the central editor of Negro begins to seem more and more absurd, more like a convenient and even narcissistic label than an adequate
reflection of the profound contributions made by a dynamic and diverse editorial team.

As Michael North describes the contributors and editors,

*Negro* brought together ... the French surrealists, like [Louis] Aragon ...
collectors of African art such as Paul Guillaume; transatlantic modernists like
[Ezra] Pound; members of the Americanist avant-garde such as [William Carlos]
Williams and [Alfred] Kreymborg; Harlem Renaissance writers and older
African-American authorities like Du Bois; Afro-Caribbean and African scholars
and revolutionaries like George Padmore, who actually collaborated on the
volume, and Jomo Kenyatta, who was studying with [Bronisław] Malinowski at
the time. (190)

And in truth, Beckett’s textual contributions to *Negro* eclipse everyone else’s, even
Cunard’s. Alan Warren Friedman labels Beckett’s “nineteen translations” for *Negro* his
“most extensive publication (more than 63,000 words)” (xi). And though he places the
total word count nearly a third higher than Friedman’s, W.J. McCormack makes a similar
claim about Beckett’s contribution to *Negro*:

Nobody contributed more to [Negro] than Beckett who translated nineteen pieces
in all, a body of prose amounting to well over one hundred thousand words ... No
other translator contributed more than five pieces (these from Spanish), and the
only other translators from French were Nancy Cunard herself and her cousin
Edward, who contributed two each. In effect, Beckett was responsible for
virtually all the originally Francophone material. *The Negro Anthology* [sic]
constitutes his largest prose work, and hence his largest single publication of any
kind. ... Beckett in the anthology becomes nineteen voices, a dissembled dramatic
text. (From Burke to Beckett 386, 388)

McCormack reads Beckett’s translations for Negro as part of the “chronology of
decreasing authority in Beckett’s work” (398) and thereby makes it as much a part of the
Beckett canon as the Cunard or any other editor or contributor. Thus, while it is certainly
convenient to ascribe possession and primary editorship of Negro, it appears likely
improper and even illogical to do so. Rather, it seems that Negro’s authorship is as
diverse and as transatlantically unfinalizable as its other aspects.

Collectively, then, Negro brings together not only the racial and cultural strains of
the Atlantic world but also, as a result, European, American, African, and West Indian
national groups. As such, it represents the dialogic fusion of these national groups into a
textual representation of their collective unity. This is perhaps nowhere better illustrated
than by Negro’s organizational schema. In his introduction to Negro, Ford describes the
trouble the team of editors had when trying to organize the text: “Despite efforts to bring
some order to Negro, it continued to push out in all directions. Contributions often defied
classification. No clear thesis emerged from the articles that had arrived” (Cunard, Negro
xxi). Ford bobbles the issue a bit, suggesting Cunard, Michelet, and the others were
happy to discover the “righteous thesis” of racial injustice guided and unified their work.
And while this abstract thesis might have guided the work and provided it with some sort
of thematic structure and compositional impetus, the question of nationality organizes the
work in a much more overt and profound way. Fusing multiple Atlantic-world national
groups into one textual community is the clear anxiety driving and organizing principle
of Negro. The table of contents, the most direct and immediate representation of any
text's organization, is not dictated by genres, subjects, or even the alphabet but rather by Atlantic national regions: America, West Indies, Europe, and Africa. 49 Certainly there are the three non-national headings “Negro Stars,” “Music,” and “Poetry,” but the subheadings of the latter two categorize that section’s contents into national units. In the case of “Music,” Cunard broke the section into “America,” “Creole,” “West Indies,” and “Africa”; and in the case of “Poetry,” she used “West Indian,” “Jamaica,” “Haiti,” “Cuba,” “Barbados,” “Trinidad,” “Grenada,” “Virgin Islands,” “Guadeloupe,” “British Guiana,” “Brazil,” and “Uruguay.” Only two of the “Poetry” subsections aren’t nationally based, “By Negro Poets” and “Poetry by White Poets on Negro Themes,” and the “Negro Stars” section contains no subheadings. But the “By Negro Poets” subsection of “Poetry” could be alternatively labeled “America” as all the poets there are Americans. Why Cunard used “Negro Poets” instead is a mystery. What’s clear, though, is that the dominant organizational schema for *Negro* centers on a structure of unfinalizable Atlantic nationalities representing the editorial compulsion to unify the multinational transatlantic nation in one textual space. *Negro*’s table of contents, then, creates a visual representation of the dialogism inherent to this imagined community and the multinational body of nations forming it. Furthermore, this principle of organizing the text nationally reveals the text’s true geographical focus. Though critics such as Sieglinde Lemke, Jane Marcus, Michael North, and Laura Winkiel assert the “global” and “worldwide” concerns of *Negro*, this isn’t really the case. 50 The text is in fact, precisely Atlantic in its organization and in its various unfinalizable elements. The text is not global in reach nor does it present a face of world-wide national communion or a concern with any global subject.
Rather, it compiles the nations of the Atlantic world into one textual space that represents its unique sense of community.

Overlooking the multinational and multiracial diversity of *Negro* are functions of a similar problem. In the same way one must possess a national identity in the modern world, s/he must also have a racial designation. Transcending either doesn’t seem feasible at present nor was it possible in the early twentieth century; and as I discuss in the introduction, these sorts of categorical imperatives lead us to strange paradoxes and engender uncomfortably simplistic and falsely finalized labels. Thus, just as the impossibility of transcending nationality leads us to ascribe problematically simple nationalities to complex nationals, the impossibility of transcending race leads us to essentialize a diversely national and racial text like *Negro* as “black” and thereby push it from the predominantly white canon of Anglo-American literature. Ironically, as the academy and canon became more and more pluralistic late in the twentieth century, *Negro* has been invited back in, either to praise or decry it, for precisely the same reason it was excluded: because it has been perceived as a “black” text. At present, though, it seems academic critics are beginning to understand *Negro* in the way it was received by contemporary reviewers: as a diversely racial and national textual space. After three-quarters of a century, then, *Negro* is finally beginning to settle into its proper place, neither marginalized as nor limited to being a black text but rather seen as the polyphonic, unfinalizable textual space it is.

If this constructive shift is going to continue and if the growth of interest in *Negro* and Cunard is to be perpetually fruitful, though, reliable and widely available editions of *Negro* and Cunard’s other writings must be produced. As I suggest at the beginning of
this chapter, textual reconstruction is the necessary counterpoint to furthering the active
analysis Nancy Cunard’s literary oeuvre. As Renata Morresi suggests (147) and really
anyone who has approached the woman and her texts can attest, Cunard’s writings are
frequently difficult to find, even in the twenty-first century internet age; and the obscurity
of both *Negro: An Anthology* and Cunard’s poems and miscellaneous prose is likely the
single-most significant factor contributing to Cunard’s relative marginalization in modern
studies. No writer could invite criticism or find him/herself ushered into the canonical
circle without reliable, moderately priced, and readily available versions of his/her texts.
The only widely available version of *Negro* in print is the Ford abridged, somewhat hard-
to-find, version of the original. To see a 1934 *Negro*, one would have to either gain
passage from the protective guardians of material literary history as some critics and
biographers have done and browse an elite research archive such as the University of
Texas’ Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center or luck out at an antiquarian
bookshop which would offer interested parties one of the 1000 originals, many of which
were destroyed in a warehouse fire during the WWII “bombings of London” (Cunard,
*Negro* xii), at the cost of many thousands of dollars. A comparison of the original
*Negro* with the latter edition illustrates the extremity of Ford’s editorial licenses. Simply
reading over the original table of contents, helpfully provided in the first appendix of
Alan Warren Friedman’s *Beckett in Black and Red* (162-68), and that of Ford’s edition
illustrates a radical shift in organizational prospective. Ignoring the fact that the Ford text
includes just over half the original contents, Ford has privileged and even outright created
racially dominated sub-headings and organizational schema at the expense of the original
*Negro*’s preoccupation with national organization. And having exchanged the plain
original cover—which merely credits the editor and titles the volume in large, sans-serif letters running diagonally from top left to bottom right across a dark cover— for one that includes a picture of a Negroid silhouette, it seems Ford’s edition might have contributed greatly to the continued finalization and marginalization of the text as nothing more than a black book. I would argue, then, that this is the final way in which Negro is unfinalizable: in terms of material textuality. There seem to be two versions of it now: an antique, hard-to-find original and a corrupt, easier-to-find and more-affordable later edition. Unfinalizably racial and national, reflecting our own concerns with transnationalism and pluralism, Negro reflects important preoccupations of the 21st century academy. But if Cunard and Negro are going to continue to assert themselves in modern studies, new, authoritative, and readily-available editions of the original Negro and Cunard’s other works will have to be published by a major press and made readily available to libraries, teachers, and students. Simply reprinting a complete edition of the original Negro with either the initial cover or one that even more fairly represents its diversity and unfinalizability would be a giant leap forward for modernist studies and help the dynamic muse of modernism and the diverse and unfinalizable “big book” that bears her name continue their (re)emergence. One need look no farther than Jean Rhys and Wide Sargasso Sea for an example of the popularity often available to marginalized women writers when reliable, widely available editions of their texts exist.
peculiarities such as using a miniscule initial letter for customarily capitalized proper nouns. When quoted

\textit{Empire British and Irish Poetry.}

also reprints two of Cunard's contributions to \textit{Modernism and Transnationalism}. In this chapter references and quotes the 1996 Continuum edition. In this edition, Ford has, admirably for authenticity's sake, thought, maintained antiquated and/or Anglicized spellings of certain words and several of Cunard's other textual peculiarities such as using a miniscule initial letter for customarily capitalized proper nouns. When quoted in this chapter, though, I have silently emended such words and letters to match preferred, contemporary American usage. I have done the same with the spelling of several words quoted from Maureen Moynagh's edition of Cunard's collected \textit{Essays on Race and Empire} (Orchard Park, NY: Broadview, 2002) and her article “Cunard’s Lines: Political Tourism and Its Texts” (\textit{New Formations} 34 [Summer 1998]: 70-90).

\textsuperscript{1} In addition to an excellent introduction that gives an overview of Cunard’s life and works and situates her within the larger context of modernism, Moynagh’s edition of Cunard’s collected \textit{Essays on Race and Empire} provides a more-or-less complete bibliography of Cunard’s published works (303), except \textit{Men-Ship-Tank-Plane} (London: New Books, 1944), and a similarly satisfactory listing of the handful of critical sources concerned with Cunard’s literary output and biography (303-04). The Moynagh text is also important, though, for reprinting three of Cunard’s difficult-to-find essays: “A Reactionary Negro Organization,” which appears in the original 1934 \textit{Negro} but not in the Ford abridged version, and “The White Man’s Duty: An Analysis of the Colonial Question in Light of the Atlantic Charter” and “Black Man and White Ladyship.” The other four selections in the Moynagh text are in the Ford edition of \textit{Negro}. Cunard’s 592-line poem “Parallax” (London: Hogarth, 1925. Rpt. in \textit{Anthology of Twentieth-Century British and Irish Poetry}. Ed. Keith Tuma. New York: Oxford UP, 2001), more or less a pastiche of Eliot’s \textit{The Waste Land}, has received an extremely limited amount of reprinting and critical consideration: see David Ayers, “‘The Waste Land,’ Nancy Cunard and Mina Loy” (In \textit{Modernism: A Short Introduction}. London: Blackwell, 2004). Her pamphlet “Black Man and White Ladyship” (Toulon: Imp. A. Bordato, 1931. Rpt. in \textit{Essays on Race and Empire}) remains a bit less obscure, having been reprinted at least four times (in Hugh Ford’s collection \textit{Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel}, 1896-1965 [Philadelphia: Chilton, 1968]; \textit{The Gender of Modernism} [Ed. Bonnie Kime Scott. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1990]; Moynagh, \textit{Essays on Race and Empire}; and Lawrence S. Rainey, ed., \textit{Modernism: An Anthology} [Oxford: Blackwell, 2005]) and has received slightly more critical attention: Renata Morresi, “Negotiating Identity: Nancy Cunard’s Otherness” (In \textit{Resisting Alterities: Wilson Harris and Other Avatars of Otherness}. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2004) and Jacqueline Hurtley and Elizabeth Russell “Women against Fascism: Nancy Cunard and Charlotte Haldane” (BELLS: \textit{Barcelona English Language and Literature Studies} 7 [1996]: 43-52). The latter article considers Cunard’s treatment of Fascism in both “Black Man and White Ladyship” and her 1921 poetry collection \textit{Oulalaws} (London: Elkin, Mathews and Murrut, 1921) while \textit{The Gender of Modernism} also reprints two of Cunard’s contributions to \textit{Negro}, “Harlem Reviewed” (73-78) and “The American Moron and the American Sense—Letters on the Negro” (78-80), and one of her particularly vitriolic letters to Ezra Pound. Rainey’s \textit{Modernism: An Anthology} also reprints “Harlem Reviewed” (770-75) from \textit{Negro} as well as six of Cunard’s poems (provocatively excluding “Parallax”) and her otherwise unprinted 1939 essay “The Exodus from Spain” (775-76). Ford’s \textit{Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel}, 1896-1965 is a similarly rich, anthologistic text that reprints a diverse and copious number of Cunard’s poems and essays as well as many writings about Cunard by her contemporaries. With the exception of the letter to Pound reprinted in \textit{The Gender of Modernism} (80-84) and \textit{Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel}, 1896-1965 (358-61), the bulk of Cunard’s letters remain largely uncatalogued and unpublished, scattered between the Lilly Library at Indiana University, the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University, and the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas. One critical treatment, not part of a larger biography, has been given Cunard’s letters:
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James J. Wilhelm, “Nancy Cunard: A Sometime Flame, a Stalwart Friend” (Paideuma: A Journal Devoted to Ezra Pound Scholarship 19:1-2 [Spring-Fall 1990]: 201-21). Even this, though, is more a sketch of her sustained relationship with Ezra Pound, printed in a journal that focuses on critical treatments of Pound, and written as a response to the question of whether there were “any ‘really exciting’ letters in the Pound collections” (201).

2 Carole Sweeney makes similar claims about the obscurity of Negro in her article “‘Go to Harlem, it’s sharper there’: Negro: An Anthology (1934)” (In From Fetish to Subject: Race, Modernism, and Primitivism, 1919-1935. London: Praeger, 2004).


5 The first section of Maureen Moynagh’s introduction to Essays on Race and Empire is “Alternative Modernisms” (9).

6 Enjoying a major new biographical treatment in 2007 (as well as a review of that treatment in the New York Times, The Nation, and The Washington Times), Cunard’s life and letters and the roles she played in modern aesthetics, sexuality, and racial/gender identity seem to persistently fascinate even if her specific works are largely overlooked. And while it is not always easy to discriminate between biographical treatments of Cunard and critical treatments of her work, some that lean toward the former follow: Miriam J. Benkovitz, “‘The Back Like a Weasel’s’” (Columbia Library Columns 28:1 [1978]: 21-28; Shari Benstock, Women of the Left Bank: Paris, 1900-1940 (Austin: U of Texas P, 1986); Anne Chisholm, Nancy Cunard: A Biography; Patricia Clements, “‘Transmuting’ Nancy Cunard” (Dalhousie Review 66:1-2 [Spring-Summer 1986: 188-214]; Henry Crowder, As Wonderful as All That? Henry Crowder’s Memoir of

While treatments of Cunard’s life are plentiful (as evidenced by the preceding note), those wanting a succinct and engaging overview of her life can do no better than Susan Stanford Friedman’s introduction to the Cunard selections that appear in The Gender of Modernism (63-68) or Maureen Moynagh’s introduction to Essays on Race and Empire (19-30). For an even briefer chronology, see Essays on Race and Empire, 64-68.

8 Perhaps the most sustained expression of this irony can be found in Jane Marcus’ Hearts of Darkness: White Women Write Race (121-29).

9 In Nancy Cunard: Heiress, Muse, Political Idealist, Lois Gordon provides extensive examples and persistent discussion of the many, many literary works in which Cunard appears. See, for example, xii and 126. Hugh Ford, in Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel, 1896-1965, does likewise, reprinting dozens of contemporary treatments and discussions of Cunard.

10 Lois Gordon’s Nancy Cunard: Heiress, Muse, Political Idealist reprints several of the visual representations of Cunard created by the artists listed in the main text as well as many others. For a list of the illustrations contained in the book, see ix and x. For a discussion and listing of both visual and literary artists who incorporated Cunard into their works, see 126. Hugh Ford’s Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel, 1896-1965 reprints several of the visual treatments of Cunard as well. See his “List of Illustrations,” xix.

11 Clements investigates “the ‘transmutation’ of a woman seeking to enter history into the represented feminine. The woman is Nancy Cunard (1896-1965); the transmuting artists include John Banting, Cecil Beaton, Man Ray, Aldous Huxley, Michael Arlen, and Richard Aldington; and the ‘transmutations’ are both the widely circulated photographs and paintings of the ‘twenties and early ‘thirties and some ‘keyed’ fictions” (“‘Transmuting’ Nancy Cunard,” 188). Wittig suggests her essay examines “a series of meetings of the aesthetic with the real, political, and personal. It is about some of the ways in which ‘language casts sheaves of reality upon the social body, stamping it and violently shaping it’” (“The Mark of Gender” [In The Poetics of Gender, ed. Nancy K. Miller. New York: Columbia UP, 1986], 64). Finally, McSpadden studies the ways cultural narratives shape the “literal body or person of Nancy Cunard and the body of Cunard’s work as a cultural theorist and historian of black culture” (“Crossing Racial Borders: Nancy Cunard’s Political Modernisms,” 6).

12 This letter can be found reprinted in Bonnie Kime Scott, ed., The Gender of Modernism (80-84) and Hugh Ford, ed., Nancy Cunard: Brave Poet, Indomitable Rebel, 1896-1965 (358-61).
I cite Pound’s *Cantos* by Arabic number and (/) page on which the specific quotation appears in the 1948 New Directions edition of *The Cantos of Ezra Pound*. Nancy Cunard is mentioned in *The Cantos* as follows: “This affair of a southern Nancy” (80/73) and “Nancy where are thou?” (80/88). Cunard’s lover Henry Crowder appears in *The Pisan Cantos* as well, mentioned fantastically as part of a list of largely African-American soldiers Pound encountered at the American Disciplinary Training Center in Pisa, Italy (84/115).

13 See Hugh Kenner, *The Pound Era* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1973), 71: “Then suddenly after a quarter-century circumstances changed the tone of the *Cantos* once more to elegy ...” and Richard Sieburth’s introduction to *The Pisan Cantos* (New York: New Directions, 2003), xv: “By late June or early July [of 1945], Pound had sufficiently recovered to resume work on the *Cantos*—his as-of-yet unfinished Odyssean epic ‘including history,’ nearly thirty years in the making but which, given his current plight at the DTC, would now take an unexpectedly elegiac and autobiographical turn in Cantos 74 through 84, later published in 1948 under the title *The Pisan Cantos* and considered by most critics as the finest section of Pound’s magnum opus.”

14 *The Pisan Cantos* were written, of course, while Pound was a prisoner at the American Disciplinary Training Center in Pisa, Italy from April until November 1945, and *Canto LXXX*, for example, “cannot do more than temporarily keep at bay the horror of his present situation” (Flory 210), Pound living both imprisoned as a political prisoner and in a war-ravaged Europe. Alone, caged among dead men and women and the ruins of civic life, Pound has little option but “to write dialog because there is / no one to converse with” (80/77): a sentiment seconded by the soldiers who guarded him and later remember Pound’s lengthy, monologic ramblings about all manner of subjects. See, for example, Hugh Kenner, *The Pound Era* (Berkeley: U of California P, 1973) where Kenner relates the engaging story of “a leathery Texan” who had been one of Pound’s guards at the ADC. This “sentry” claimed that because of his access to Pound, he knew more than the law students surrounding him at a Los Angeles bar even though he had “never been to college” (462).

15 Horace de Vere Cole (1881-1936) was English prankster and self-proclaimed descendent of Celtic Britain’s legendary Old King Cole. Famous for many high-profile pranks, while an undergraduate at Cambridge, Cole dressed himself as the sultan of Zanzibar who was visiting London at the time. He made a mock but convincing visit to his own college as the sultan. See Kathryn Lindskoog, *Fakes, Frauds & Other Malarkey* (Illustrated by Patrick Wynne. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1993), 32-34.

16 Had General Stonewall Jackson (b. 1824)—Confederate Civil War veteran and great-grandson of Ulster-Scots—not died as a result of complications from a friendly-fire incident in May of 1863, he would have indeed been in his eighth decade of life between 1904-1914.

17 Clearly an accidental editing oversight in the original text, I have silently emended this quotation by adding the “of” between “kind” and “permanent.”

18 *Further suggesting the term describes a royal robe, consider the use of cisclations in Marion Lee Reynolds’ poem “Geraint of Devon” (1916): “...I will clothe thee in the finest vair / The furriers have for queenhood; cisclations, / Scarlets and Alexandrian brocades— / All these shall be for thee when thou art mine” (The Camelot Project at the University of Rochester, “Geraint of Devon by Marion Lee Reynolds,” http://www.lib.rochester.edu/camelot/reynolds.htm [accessed May 29, 2007]).

19 Excideuil in the Dordogne department of modern France is the site of a castle that repelled Richard the Lionheart on three occasions. As part of his “Sacred Places” chapter, Hugh Kenner reproduces a photograph of the wave pattern Pound seems to be referring to (337). It can be found carved in the stone of the castle’s entrance archway. Mt. Segur, or Montségur, was an Occitanian stronghold destroyed in what was effectively the last battle of the Albigensian Crusade in the thirteenth century. The castle ruin that exists now is one rebuilt after this event, the Cathar fortress having been totally destroyed. Finally,
Dioce/Deïoece was the legendary first king of the Medes. According to Annotated Index to the Cantos of Ezra Pound (Ed. John Hamilton Edwards and William W. Vasse. With the assistance of John J. Espey and Frederic Peachy. Berkely: U of California P, 1971, 56), the city of Dioce would be Eebatan/Eebatana: the ancient capital of the Medes in Media Magna, an area that would include parts of modern Iran.

21 In A Walking Tour in Southern France: Ezra Pound Among the Troubadours (New York: New Directions, 1992), Richard Sieburth also suggests that Pound’s allusions to “the wave pattern” in both Cantos XXIX and LXXX refer to the same part of Excideuil castle (24).


23 For an overview of these points in the careers of Cunard and Beckett, see Anne Chisholm, Nancy Cunard, 151-52 and Lois Gordon, Nancy Cunard: Heiress, Muse, Political Idealist, xi-xii.

24 This circular is reprinted in both Cunard biographies (Chisholm 191-92, Gordon 400n17) as well as in the Ford introduction to Negro (xvii).

25 With the curious exception of “A Reactionary Negro Organization,” all seven of Cunard’s contributions to Negro are reprinted in the Ford edition of the text. The excluded essay can be found listed in Negro’s original 1934 table of contents (reprinted in the first appendix of Alan Warren Friedman’s Beckett in Black and Red [162-68]) and has been included in Maureen Moynagh’s edition of Cunard’s various Essays on Race and Empire (266-78).

26 For more information on this case additional to Cunard’s essay, see Cunard, Negro 18, 51-52, 97, 122, 123, 137-38.

27 I compiled this chronology using Hugh Ford’s introduction to the 1996 edition of Negro and the two currently available biographies of Nancy Cunard: Anne Chisholm, Nancy Cunard and Lois Gordon, Nancy Cunard: Heiress, Muse, Political Idealist. Quotations and references to these texts are cited by author’s last name and page number.

28 For an account of the eventually prohibitive difficulties that faced Cunard’s planned trip to Africa in 1931, see “A Journey to Africa,” 109-13.

29 Referred to by various sobriquets including “Jackson Whites”—an elision of “Jacks and Whites,” per the OED (2nd ed.) “jack” being a nineteenth-century slang term for a slave or servant (s.v., “jack” n 1.4.a)—the “Rapam Mount Indians,” and the “Rampough Lenape Nation,” this variously defined group of people lives in the Rapam Mountains along the state line separating New Jersey from New York. Generally considered to be of mixed African, European, and Native American descent, having been formed by runaway slaves and/or freed blacks, rustic whites, and native peoples, their attempts to be recognized as an Indian tribe have been rebuffed by New York and the U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs but have succeeded in New Jersey. For more information on the Ramapough Mountain Indians, see David Steven Cohen, The Ramapo Mountain People (New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1974).

30 See, for example, Holly Ann McSpadden, “Transgressive Reading: Nancy Cunard and Negro”: Negro “has not received the critical attention it deserves” and has experienced “continuing dismissal” (60); M.G. Shanahan, “Visualizing Africa in Nancy Cunard’s Negro Anthology”: “Despite its size and scope and even its status as an end marker of the Harlem Renaissance, the Negro Anthology has received little mention in the histories of the major literary and artistic movements of the time” (paragraph 5); Carole Sweeney, “One of them, but white’: The Disappearance of Negro: An Anthology”: “the anthology has been reduced to a peripheral footnote in modernist studies and studies of early twentieth-century anti-colonialism (94) and
“Go to Harlem, it’s sharper there”: *Negro: An Anthology* (1934); *Negro* has been “all but excised from studies of literary modernism” and “[e]ffectively written out of all but the marginalia of black cultural histories” (71); and Laura Winkiel, “Nancy Cunard’s Negro and the Transnational Politics of Race”: “Negro is now a nearly forgotten anthology” (508).

31 See Petrine Archer-Straw, *Negrophilia: Avant-Garde Paris and Black Culture in the 1920s*: “Most [European négrophiles] promoted a romanticized exoticizing and stereotyping of the black image linked with notions of rejuvenation of the white race through devolution and atavism” (162), and “Cunard’s sentiments” in particular with respect to *Negro* “evoke ideas of latent ‘primitivism’ popular in artistic circles at the time” (167); Sieglinde Lemke, *Primitivist Modernism: Black Culture and the Origins of Transatlantic Modernism: Negro* “is a prominent example of the interrelation between black and white culture. Enormous (almost nine hundred pages), it discusses issues concerning people of African descent in America, Africa, and Europe. The articles, written by prominent black and white intellectuals, often idealize African or African American lifestyles as socioeconomically repressed but physically unfettered, infused with ‘spontaneous’ art, and inherently ‘collective.’ Cunard’s anthology uses accounts of the ‘essence of African civilizations as models for an aesthetics of communist life in which black primitivism is a counterforce to the capitalist ethos. In her attempt to defeat everything she associated with the bourgeoisie (e.g. positivistic rationalism, Puritanism, capitalism), Cunard embraced black people and black cultures as a model for an organic Ur-Communism” (9); Maureen Moynagh, “Cunard’s Lines: Political Tourism and Its Texts”: “Cunard’s relationship to her [Negro] subject matter” and the relationship she set up between herself and the black Other “present ample scope for demonstrating the necessity of undoing the racial insider/outsider binary” (70); and Michael North, *The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature: Negro* “might have served as solid evidence of the rapprochement between African-American writing and Anglo-American modernism if the contributions from the modernists had not been either diffident or condescending. ... There was very little in [certain *Negro* essays] to show that white emulation of African-American language and culture had advanced beyond the stage of exaggerating a few verbal clichés” (190); and “[f]or all the space it gave to responsible black commentary, the anthology still tended to present African Americans as objects of pity or comedy” (191). See also North 192-94.

32 Writing primarily for the *New Masses* and bent on furthering that magazine’s prevailing Marxist ideology, John Spivak was nevertheless instrumental in exposing the flaws in the Congressional hearings that followed the so-called “Business Plot” of 1933 to overthrow FDR in a military coup. See Jules Archer, *The Plot to Seize the White House* (New York: Hawthorne, 1973), 194-220. He contributed a piece to *Negro* titled “Flashes from Georgia Chain Gangs” (124-30).


35 For overviews of the reviews from the *Amsterdam News, The Crisis*, and the *Daily Worker*, see Sweeney, “‘One of them, but white’: The Disappearance of *Negro: An Anthology* (1934),” 96. For an overview of the review printed in the *New Statesman*, see Gordon, 173. In his introduction to *Negro*, Hugh Ford also discusses the text’s critical reception in the *Amsterdam News, The New Republic*, and the *Daily Worker* (Cunard, *Negro* xxiii-iv).
36 In “Nancy Cunard’s Negro and the Transnational Politics of Race,” Laura Winkiel provides arguably the most comprehensive listing of contemporary responses, both personal and periodical, that exists with respect to Negro’s critical constellation. See 526-27n3.


38 See Jane Marcus, Hearts of Darkness: White Women Write Race: “It is clear from [Cunard’s] FBI file that spies in London reported to the United States on the preparation and publication of the Negro anthology. The local censors intervened, insisting that Rene Crevel’s ‘The Negress in the Brothel,’ translated by Samuel Beckett, be removed from Negro. Undaunted, Cunard had the three pages set secretly by the radical Utopia Press and tipped them in while binding the volume herself. The essay, though not listed in the table of contents, is actually printed in the book . . . " (139). Marcus even suggests the US State Department, until recently, kept classified files on Cunard (139-40).

39 For more information on Kykunkor, see Anita Brenner, “The Dance; ‘Kykunkor’; Native African Opera,” The Nation, June 13, 1934, 684-86.


41 Concerned with Alain Locke’s The New Negro and Cunard’s Negro: Anthology, the fifth chapter of Sieglinde Lemke’s Primitivist Modernism: Black Culture and the Origins of Transatlantic Modernism is titled “The Black Book” (117).

42 See Petrine Archer-Straw, Negrophilia: Avant-Garde Paris and Black Culture in the 1920s, 159-70, 176-77 and Michael North, The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature, 177, 190-94.

43 See Jeremy Braddock, “The Modernist Collector and Black Modernity, 1914-1934”; Holly Ann McSpadden, “Transgressive Reading: Nancy Cunard and Negro”; and Maureen Moynagh, “Cunard’s Lines: Political Tourism and Its Texts.” More or less an act of exposition aimed at introducing readers to Negro and outlining its historical context, Carole Sweneey’s “‘One of them, but white’: The Disappearance of Negro: An Anthology (1934)” essentially blames the “disappearance” of Negro on the development of these sorts of postcolonial/poststructuralist positions which are “irreconcilable with the racial essentialism of Cunard’s anti-colonial and anti-racist manifesto in which she resorts to the same kinds of primitivist ideologies that she ostensibly sets out to critique” (99).

44 For example, Maureen Moynagh argues “The making of the Negro anthology ... entails most substantively and spectacularly the negotiation of multiple social and geopolitical boundaries” (“Cunard’s Lines: Political Tourism and Its Texts,” 71) but ultimately fails to expand this idea in a manner that reflects the diversity of the social and geopolitical boundaries. Moynagh instead argues that Negro is a record of “political tourism” (70); and using the “social and geopolitical” diversity of Negro to service her argument, Moynagh critiques the text in the same sorts of postcolonial/poststructuralist ways that concern the critics mentioned in the preceding note: “Organized into regional categories, the contributions to the anthology place specific histories of the black diaspora in tension with a European tendency to construct a monolithic notion of blackness as the principle of racial difference” (71). In “‘Go to Harlem, it’s sharper there’: Negro: An Anthology (1934),” Carole Sweeney does likewise. She allows that Negro is a “massively proportioned work, with contributions from renowned figures in literature, politics, art history, and anthropology from
France, Britain, and America” but doesn’t investigate how this diversity affects our understanding of the text (72). Rather, she stages a challenge to the reasons she believes Negro has become “almost untouchable” in the contemporary “postcolonial era” and attempts to (re)establish it as “a serious multidisciplinary intervention in internationalist anticolonial activism and an important model of transnational black Atlanticism of the 1930s” (72).

45 Winkiel’s description of Negro as a “booklike creation from a fringe area” is inspired by a line from Walter Benjamin’s 1931 essay “Unpacking My Library” (Illuminations. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1968), 66.

46 Other examples would include descriptions of the text as a “weighty and dignified tome” (Jane Marcus, Hearts of Darkness: White Woman Write Race, 142) and Michael North’s pointed evaluation of Negro as a “miscellaneous, collective, disorganized, supergeneric sprawl of a book” (177) and as “capacious and miscellaneous,” and as “generically indiscriminate in the extreme” (189).

47 Friedman also suggests Beckett contributed less to the anthology than Cunard and her lover-assistant Raymond Michelet (xi); and while this may be true in terms of leg-work and editing, the astounding word count of Beckett’s contributions places his textual contribution to the anthology well above these other two, even considering Michelet’s essays and drawings. Such ranking and quantifying, though, is probably best avoided. That Beckett contributed profoundly to Negro in a capacity approaching Cunard’s and quite a bit more than any of the black contributors is the important point in establishing the anthology as a profoundly multicultural and multinational text.

48 See also 386-91, 398. In his article “Samuel Beckett and the Negro Anthology” (Hermathena: A Trinity College Dublin Review [1992]: 73-92)—text exceedingly similar to the sections of From Burke to Beckett (2nd ed. Cork: Cork UP, 1994) listed—McCormack suggests Beckett’s contributions to Negro totaled more like “eighty thousand words” (75).

49 Analyzing Negro’s organizational schema, I use the text’s original 1934 table of contents helpfully provided in the first appendix of Alan Warren Friedman’s Beckett in Black and Red (162-68).

50 See Sieglinde Lemke, Primitivist Modernism: Black Culture and the Origins of Transatlantic Modernism: “Given its pivotal role for the black intelligensia worldwide it might seem strange that Negro was edited by an aristocratic British woman” (131); Jane Marcus, Hearts of Darkness: White Women Write Race: Negro “was one of the first works to attempt the production of knowledge about African cultures on a global scale” (128); Michael North, The Dialect of Modernism: Race, Language, and Twentieth-Century Literature: “the anthology is global in reach” (189); and Laura Winkiel, “Nancy Cunard’s Negro and the Transnational Politics of Race”: “Negro’s achievement” was its “articulation of a transnational African and African-diasporic world” (508).

51 See also Gordon, 174: “The several hundred copies of Negro that languished at Wishart’s publishing warehouses were destroyed during the Blitz.”

52 For example, as of February 2008 a San Francisco antiquarian bookshop has an original 1934 copy of Negro on sale for $5,500.00 (see Thomas A. Goldwasser Rare Books, Inc., “Negro. Anthology made by Nancy Cunard 1931-1933. by Nancy [ed.] Cunard,” http://www.goldwasserbooks.com/cgi-bin/gwb455.cgi/19791.html [accessed May 3, 2007]). Jane Marcus substantiates this price, suggesting that in 2002, an original Negro “brings several thousand dollars at Southeby’s or in the book trade if one can find a copy (Hearts of Darkness: White Women Write Race, 141; Marcus’ italics).

53 See Jane Marcus, Hearts of Darkness: White Women Write Race, fig. 12 following page 114.
CHAPTER 4

"WHERE IS MY COUNTRY AND WHERE DO I BELONG": JEAN RHYS’

Wide Sargasso Sea AND THE EMERGENCE OF

TRANSATLANTIC COMMUNITY

Since the publication of Wide Sargasso Sea in 1966 and thanks to its wide availability ever since, Jean Rhys has traditionally enjoyed a more prominent place in modernist studies than Nancy Cunard. But during the early twentieth century, when the fame of Negro and Cunard were at their respective apexes, Rhys faced her own share of marginalization. Highlighting her separation from the life of greater high modernism, Shari Benstock describes Rhys as “an outsider among outsiders” who could not find a place even among fellow “margineaux”: those writers on the Left Bank in the 1920s who fancied themselves “on the margin of culture,” “dislocated,” and even “dispossessed” (448). Benstock argues that Rhys “lived ... outside even the bounds of so loosely constructed and open a society as that of the Left Bank,” and that in Paris

[s]he discovered ... no island havens, no communities of writers, no women friends who might support her talent ... She moved like a ghost among the expatriates. Whether by choice or by chance, she remained at the furthest fringes of intellectual and literary activity during her Paris residence. (448-50)

Alienated as Rhys and the larger body of her works were in the first part of the twentieth century,1 it seems especially fortuitous that Wide Sargasso Sea was published decades after “high” modernism in the latter half of the twentieth century when certain discourses
more sensitive to the voice of the Other began empowering readers, giving them the ability to appreciate a work like Rhys’ final, and at present most famous, novel.\(^2\)

Yet, however incongruous *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s publication date and the traditional models of modernist periodization are, it seems modernism has stubbornly claimed *Wide Sargasso Sea* as part of its textual brood. Rhys’ other works, save the three story collections and unfinished autobiography published after *Wide Sargasso Sea*, were all published during the 1920s and 30s and therefore, along with their author, have an obvious modernist identity.\(^3\) Separated from these texts by at least a twenty-seven year publishing hiatus and produced outside even the most extreme frontiers of traditional modernist periodization, critics have nevertheless claimed and discussed *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a modernist text for both stylistic and thematic reasons.\(^4\) Begun more or less in 1945 and published in 1966,\(^5\) the publication gap between *Wide Sargasso Sea* and Rhys’ earlier works, therefore, seems less like a marker of displacement and more like the space between bodies in gravitational orbit. Holding the text in an inexorable relationship with Rhys’ larger oeuvre and, by extension, the traditional boundaries of modernism, the novel’s two-decade-long development period draws out the novel’s temporal sensibility and gives it a sense of being pan-twentieth century, both outside the traditional temporal boundaries of modernism and inescapably attracted back to them. Of course, critical acceptance of *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a modernist text also seems to justify the arguments of Susan Stanford Friedman, Simon Gikandi, Wai Chee Dimock, and other critics discussed in this study who argue the traditional models of modernist periodization should be loosened to include a much broader temporal span.\(^6\) Certainly both Rhys and *Wide Sargasso Sea* present critics with excellent touchstones for justifying such a
position, profoundly illustrating as they do the need for conceptual change. But even as critics work toward such widespread adjustments in understanding and revisions of temporal modeling, *Wide Sargasso Sea* and its author have an accepted place in the discussion of modernism and, the novel's publication date notwithstanding, are therefore apposite companions to Henry James, *The Golden Bowl*, Nancy Cunard, and *Negro*.

*Wide Sargasso Sea*’s murky temporal identity bears evidence of other ambiguities that lend the novel and its author an even deeper sense of camaraderie with these two texts and writers. For example, in her memoir Stella Bowen describes Rhys, her rival for the affections of Ford Madox Ford, as “a really tragic person” who suffered, among other ills, a “lack of nationality” (166). Indeed, like so many twentieth-century figures, including James and Cunard, Rhys undermines our ability to include her in a neat national taxonomy. Echoing Ford’s preface to *The Left Bank and Other Stories*, V.S. Naipaul argues Rhys “never pretended she had a society to write about. Even in her early stories, of Left Bank life in Paris, she avoided geographical explicitness. She never 'set' her scene, English, European, or West Indian.” And indeed, at different points in her life, Rhys was all of these. She was born on the Caribbean island of Dominica to a Welsh father and white Dominican mother of Scots descent; saw England for the first time in her late teens; lived in London, Paris, and the wider Continent in the 1920s and 30s; returned to the Caribbean only once (in 1936); and spent her final years in rural England. Judith L. Raiskin illuminates the uncomfortable disconnection between Rhys’ national unfinalizability and the accolades she and *Wide Sargasso Sea* received after the novel’s publication, accolades such as the W.H. Smith Award for Writers and traditionally English awards such as the Heinemann Award of the Royal Society of Literature and an
investiture into the Order of the British Empire. In these ways and in spite of her clearly chaotic national identity, Dame Jean was heralded as “The Best Living English Novelist,” using the title of A. Alvarez’ review, even though, as Judith L. Raiskin argues, she never considered herself to be English and remained throughout her life an incisive and bitter critic of what she perceived to be English values ... [I]t is an irony that Rhys, who always hated England and English culture and who perceived herself to be, as a displaced colonial, the object of English disdain and hatred should be declared a light of English culture ... (Rhys, Wide Sargasso Sea ix)

Further confusing the issue of her national identity, Rhys held this view even as she spent the greatest portion of her life, as Raskin notes, “in small, remote English villages” (ix). On the other side of the Atlantic, both Rhys and Wide Sargasso Sea’s Dominican identities are similarly contentious. Just as she resisted being labeled “English,” of Dominica Rhys wrote that she “wanted to identify” with the island, “to lose [herself] in it,” but felt “it turned its head away, indifferent, and that broke [her] heart” (Rhys, Smile Please 66). Critics such as Kenneth Ramchand, John Hearn, and Wally Look Lai debate Rhys’ Dominican identity, arguing the degree to which Rhys and Wide Sargasso Sea are “Caribbean” and whether or not the text should be included in the West Indian literary canon. In the case of Rhys’ particularly fragmented national identity, then, neither birthplace nor preponderant time of residence seem to settle the issue of what Mary Lou Emery has labeled her “plural and often conflicting outsider identities as a West Indian writer [and] European modernist,” occupying as she does “the space in between” such national identities (Jean Rhys at “World’s End” 7). As Derek Walcott writes in the poem
named after her, Jean Rhys seems particularly meta-national, even by modernist
standards. She is both indigenous and foreign, both West Indian and English born as she
was “in the bush of Dominica” with “her right hand married to Jane Eyre” (159-60). She
is, as Walcott writes,

a sepia souvenir of Cornwall …

for whom the arches of the Thames,

Parliament’s needles,

and the petit-point reflections of London Bridge

fade on the hammock cushions from the [Dominican] sun … (159-60)
Pulled back and forth, rejected and claimed as both an Englishwoman and a Dominican,
awkwardly labeled with unsatisfactory national taxonomies—Rhys seems as nationally
decentered as James and as exiled-from-everywhere as Cunard, and one can imagine her
writing self-reflexively in Wide Sargasso Sea when Antoinette laments, “I often wonder
who I am and where is my country and where do I belong” (61).

But to whatever degree Rhys appears meta-national, she like the other modernists
discussed in this dissertation cannot escape the necessity of being nationalized. Like
James and Cunard, then, I argue she finds her most comfortable national identity as a
member of the transatlantic nation and contributes to the textual articulation and
circulation of this imagined community in her works. Indeed, virtually all of Rhys’
novels and many of her short stories are, like the major portion of Henry James’ fiction,
portraits of interaction between various Atlantic-world nationalities. Wide Sargasso Sea,
though, is unique in that it offers the broadest geographical span and the most diverse
array of transatlantic characters, settings, and nationalities in all of her texts. The novel
presents a complex portrait of the transatlantic nation composed of various national parts—England, France, and certain West Indian nations such as Barbados, Jamaica, and Dominica—bound into a single community of commercial and social interaction. The characters of this transatlantic imagined community move, think, and live fluidly within it and are joined together in a self-contained, mutually-affective space. I argue, therefore, that *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the most substantial representation of the transatlantic nation in Rhys’ oeuvre and, in contrast to her other stories and novels, was received and circulated as such by various contemporary periodical reviews. The novel, though, is somewhat paradoxical. Alongside its representation of transatlantic community exists a robust portrait of regional identity, provincial difference, and colonial opposition: an incongruity that lends *Wide Sargasso* a precise sense of historical accuracy. Set in the late 1830s and early 1840s, *Wide Sargasso Sea* portrays an Atlantic world shifting from empire to community: a development precipitated in large part by the “creole” national developments Benedict Anderson suggests swept the Americas between the 1760s and 1830s. Such developments significantly altered, but did not erase, the notion of transatlantic unity established by first contact and developed over subsequent centuries. During the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century, the people of the Atlantic world began retiring prescribed, hegemonic, and ideologically homogeneous imperialism in favor of a self-proclaimed, populist community made up of diverse, dialogic, and unfinalizable regional constituencies. As the empire recessed, this new community arose to organize the three-hundred-year-old transatlantic space: an imagined community in which provincial differences are neither erased nor synthesized as they are under empire but are rather set in dialogic, unfinalizable relationships. *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s
paradoxical presentation of transatlantic unity and regionalism, then, represents the
dramatic tensions that exist between transatlantic community, constituent regional
identity, and empire. As such, the novel is an exceptionally complex, historically precise
portrait of the development of the modern transatlantic nation.

As I suggest, even exclusive of *Wide Sargasso Sea* Rhys’ body of fiction is
preoccupied with the interactions of various Atlantic-world nationalities. However, most
of these novels and stories are significantly less comprehensive with respect to their
geographical spans, topographical milieux, and cast of nationalities than the 1966 novel.
Critics have generally agreed that the characters of *Quartet, After Leaving Mr.
Mackenzie, Voyage in the Dark,* and *Good Morning, Midnight* suffer from a sense of
national displacement and find themselves in foreign lands cut off from a home that
begins to seem less and less familiar. For example, while I would suggest the national
origins of Anna Morgan in *Voyage in the Dark* are a bit more complex than her argument
allows, Andrea Lewis nevertheless capably describes the central national conflict of
Rhys’ four early novels:

Rhys’ early novels are concerned almost exclusively with English women who,
for various reasons, find themselves in a country other than that of their birth. ... Yet, in their movement between countries, they lose these origins ... For these
women, it is the specific act of crossing national borders that brings about their
alienation ... (82)

Certainly, this interpretation describes the semi-autobiographical, roman à clef *Quartet* in
which Englishwoman Marya Hughes Zelli (Rhys) lives with her Polish husband in Paris
until a series of events involving his imprisonment and her affair with the Englishman
Hugh Heidler (Ford MadoxFord) ultimately banishes her to the French countryside where she sinks into a drug and alcohol-fueled depression. While it fits the model critics have established for the four early novels, *Quartet* presents a rather limited set of national interactions between various European and a few American characters and is set exclusively in Paris and rural France. *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* is even more limited in its national concerns. Its heroine, Julia Martin, is a displaced Englishwoman living in Paris whose English ex-lover, the titular Mr. Mackenzie, tires of paying her stipend. Shifting narrative perspective between the two main characters, the novel traces Martin’s gradual emotional breakdown alongside the interactions of French, English, and other minor Continental national figures. *Good Morning, Midnight* is also set in Paris and dramatizes a similarly limited cast of nationalities: French, English, and some minor Russians and Americans. And while the highly sensual, often tragic story of Sasha Jansen develops widely around Europe, like *Quartet* and *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie*, *Good Morning, Midnight* is limited to that space. Indeed, the limited presentation of mostly European nationalities set against a European backdrop makes these novels less comprehensive portraits of the transatlantic imagined community than *Wide Sargasso Sea*. The West Indies absent from them, *Quartet, After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie*, and *Good Morning, Midnight* are not nearly as diverse as the set of nationalities present in Rhys’ 1966 magnum opus and even fall short of Rhys’ other early novel *Voyage in the Dark*.

Like the characters of Rhys’ other three early novels, Anna Morgan, the heroine of *Voyage in the Dark*, suffers from a sense of national displacement and finds herself in a foreign land cut off from a home that begins to seem less and less familiar. However, unlike Marya, Julia, and Sasha, who find themselves in Paris by way of Britain, Anna
finds herself in England by way of an unnamed island in the West Indies.\textsuperscript{10} Anna’s national origin and the various conflicts it creates when held up against the England of \textit{Voyage in the Dark} have led critics to analyze the novel in “postcolonial” terms, arguing that it dramatizes certain relationships between colonizer and colonized, the enduring legacy and effects of colonialism, the materialist dialectic between imperial hegemony and colonial revolution, and the uncomfortable synthesis of colonist and colonizer vis-à-vis identity politics.\textsuperscript{11} As Urmila Seshagiri argues, \textit{Voyage in the Dark} “illuminates a complex but overlooked genealogical moment in twentieth-century literature: the point when the exhausted limits of modernist form revealed the lineaments of postcolonial fiction” (487). As a result, Seshagiri suggests the novel “maps two overlapping arcs: Western imperialism’s rise and decline over four centuries, and British modernism’s rise and decline over four decades” and “lays the groundwork for a developing literature of postcoloniality through the many-shaded voice of a Creole protagonist-narrator” (488). Indeed, \textit{Voyage in the Dark} is driven by national and colonial concerns similar to those of \textit{Wide Sargasso Sea}; but where the latter text is a diverse, sprawling opera of Atlantic-world movement and national interaction, \textit{Voyage in the Dark} is more like an intimate chamber solo. Focusing intensely on the development and consciousness of a single character in a single country, Anna’s mind does move back and forth between her West Indian past and her English present as it develops from 1912 to 1914; but as such, the whole milieu of the book is limited to England, and the only international movements are Anna’s imaginary forays into the past. Even the novel’s opening comparison of England and the West Indies takes place in an English present while the West Indian past is relegated to a less immediate memoryscape. Furthermore, the central characters of the
novel are, with the exception of Anna, comfortably English, and all the non-imaginary travel in the narrative takes place in England. Certainly, a few minor characters bring some national diversity into the text—the French-Irish Germaine Sullivan, the two American businessmen Carl Redman and Joe Adler, and the Swiss-French abortionist Mrs. Robinson—and Anna’s lover Walter Jeffries and his cousin Vincent make an “off-scene” trip to New York (87). But even the most prominent assertion of the West Indies and transatlantic community in the novel occurs indirectly: when Anna and her stepmother Hester discuss Anna’s Caribbean childhood, family politics, and the probate controversy over Hester’s sale of “Morgan’s Rest,” Anna’s ancestral home (57-74) they do so in England via letter and discussed memories. Therefore, even though critics such as Urmila Seshagiri rightly argue that *Voyage in the Dark* possesses a “complex transnationality” and a “contrapuntal geography that oscillates between England and the West Indies” (487), such movements are limited to the characters’ imaginations and certain off-scene instances of travel. They are therefore much less immediate when compared to *Wide Sargasso Sea* whose present milieu continually shifts around the Atlantic world. Thus while it is certainly Rhys’ most diversely national and acutely transatlantic text other than *Wide Sargasso Sea*, *Voyage in the Dark* has substantial limitations when compared to the myriad national characters, transnational movements, and geographical settings one finds in *Wide Sargasso Sea*.

Critics have drawn conclusions about Rhys’ short fiction similar to those surrounding the early novels. A.C. Morrell has gone as far as suggesting Rhys “told the same story forty-six times, only finding different characters, settings, and symbols to convey her meaning” (243). Echoing the critical consensus about Rhys’ early novels,
Morrell defines Rhys’ stories as insistent exposes on “the position of the lone woman in any society, whether West Indian, French, or English” (243). In what is arguably the most comprehensive study of Rhys’ short fiction, Cheryl and David Malcolm trace a similar “continuity of concern” (xiii) with the outsider, organizing Rhys’ short fiction into three groups: (a) those from The Left Bank and Other Stories that focus on the outsider’s “possibilities for escaping a crushing social and sexual alienation”; (b) those from Tigers are Better Looking that focus on “specifically English forms of exclusion and marginalization, especially in terms of social class and national-racial identity”; and (c) those remaining stories that focus on “colonial issues” (xiii). Clearly, as with the early novels, national identity plays a role in such critical assessments of Rhys’ short fiction. The Malcolms’ second category, for example, reads almost identically to the prevailing interpretations of Quartet, After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie, and Good Morning, Midnight. However, while the stories are indeed wildly multinational and mix a diverse set of characters from around the world, like her four early novels, Rhys’ short fiction lacks the sense of transatlanticism that saturates Wide Sargasso Sea.

For example, after giving three quarters of its length over to a sort of flâneur reverie on Parisian life, Ford Madox Ford’s rambling, albeit engaging, preface to Rhys’ The Left Bank and Other Stories argues that the collection lacks “topography” and that this allows Rhys to “hand you the Antilles with its sea and sky” as much as it presents and captures Paris (Rhys, The Left Bank and Other Stories 25-26). He suggests the collection represents “[s]omething human … dearer to one than all the topographies of the world,” something “penetrative” beyond Montparnasse, London, and Vienna (26) but worries that the story collection might leave readers wondering “‘Where did all these take
place? What sort of places are these?" (26). However, there is every reason to suspect the excesses of the first fifteen pages of the text carry over into the final five (the only ones concerned with The Left Bank and Other Stories) and that Ford makes so obvious an interpretive gaffe simply to justify his desire to include a reminiscent and interpretive essay on Paris at the beginning of the text. Explicitly targeting its presumption and heavy-handedness, Deborah L. Parsons critiques the Ford preface as a patriarchal parasite; and argues that in it, Ford unfairly dictates the terms of artistic authority and cosmopolitan authenticity (137-39, 149). Parsons also points out a major fallacy of the preface, namely, Ford’s reluctance to accept Rhys’ representation of a Paris as authentic and as topographically precise as his Paris, namely “the ‘Latin Quarter’ … the social hubs of the Dôme and the boulevard Saint-Germain” defined by “the hegemony that literally, textually, and culturally associates 1920s and 1930s Paris with the Anglo-American expatriate community” (139). Therefore while Ford suggests the short fiction found in The Left Bank and Other Stories transcends or even ignores place, it seems undeniable that the bulk of the text takes place in Paris and, like Quartet, After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie, and Good Morning, Midnight, that it uses the French capital as a backdrop for exploring the interactions of various nationals.

“Mixing Cocktails” and “Again the Antillies,” which take place on islands in the West Indies, and “Vienne,” which seems to be a memory of the narrator’s time in Vienna, are notable exceptions. As such, they seem at odds with the title and spirit of the collection, divorced as they are from Paris life and diminutive as they are in number versus the eighteen set in Paris. However, even in these stories, Rhys clearly asserts Paris as the central place and present of the collection in the same way she makes London the
central geography of *Voyage in the Dark*, returning to the West Indies only in memory. Perhaps sensitive to how incongruous the two stories might seem without such a set-up, Rhys transitions from “Trio,” a story about a “very black—coal black” (83) family from Martinique sitting in a Montparnasse restaurant, to “Mixing Cocktails” and “Again the Antillies” with the following line: “It was because these were my compatriots that in that Montparnasse restaurant I remembered the Antillies” (85). Then, after relating the story of “Papa Dom” in “Again the Antilles,” Rhys resituates the story collection in Paris, ending the pair of West Indian tales with the narrator wondering: “I wonder if I shall ever again read the *Dominica Herald and Leeward Island Gazette*” (97). In this way, Rhys seems intent on suggesting that the preceding stories were nothing more than forays into memory from the present of 1920s Paris. As in *Voyage in the Dark*, then, Rhys relegates the West Indies to memory while maintaining 1920s Paris as the present of *The Left Bank and Other Stories*, setting the French capital as the text’s primary present and milieu.

Something similar could be said of the story “Vienne” which almost certainly presents a narrator in Paris remembering Vienna. Possessing a crafty double meaning, the title of the story is both the French word for “Vienna” and the first-person present subjunctive form of the French verb *venir*. The story’s title, then, would translate into English as “I come.” Indicating some distance between the narrator and Vienna, the story’s title suggests the narrator comes to Vienna in the present through memory, beginning as she does with the retrospective line: “Funny how it’s slipped away, Vienna. Nothing left but a few snapshots. Not a friend, not a pretty frock—nothing left of Vienna” (193). Moreover, presenting the name of the Austrian capital in French seems to distance Vienna and
affirm that the memory of time spent there is occurring in and is colored by a French, or more specifically Parisian, present.

While the collection shares many traits with Rhys’ other four texts from the 1920s and 30s, the nationalities represented in *The Left Bank and Other Stories* is undeniably more comprehensive than the four novels. As I suggest, “Trio” deals with a “very black—coal black” Martiniquais family sitting in a Montparnasse restaurant. “The Sidi” focuses on an Arab Francophone in Paris, and “Mixing Cocktails” is a portrait of transatlantic community and national interaction. In addition to the “English Aunt” who “gazes and exclaims at intervals” (89), the narrator mentions that “On the veranda, upon a wooden table with four stout legs, stood an enormous brass telescope. With it you spied out the steamers passing: the French mail on its way to Guadeloupe, the Canadian, the Royal Mail” (87). Likewise, Papa Dom in “Again the Antilles” reveals the multitude of nationalities present in the West Indies when the narrator suggests he is “against the English … against the existence of the Anglican bishop and the Catholic bishop’s new place” (93-94). “Vienne” is even more diversely international, including as it does Japanese, French, Hungarian, and German characters set in a milieu that shifts from Vienna, Budapest, and Prague and ends with an argument as to whether the band of travelers moving across a war-torn Europe should go to London or Warsaw. The Parisian stories are no less nationally diverse: Americans, English, Russians, South Americans, French, Arabs, and assorted Continentals populate these stories but always against the backdrop of Paris. Furthermore, the stories seem more isolated than unified, and the scattered nationalities seem more chaotic than harmonized into a single community. The same is true of Rhys’ larger body of stories. While as a collection they exude a sense of
internationalism, taken individually there are virtually no transatlantic movements to match those of *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Rather, the individual stories are local rather than geographically diverse. Rhys' short fiction is Parisian in the case of “Night Out 1925,” West Indian in the case of “The Day they Burned the Books” and “Pioneers, Oh, Pioneers,” and English in the case of “Let Them Call It Jazz” and “Tigers are Better Looking.” Stories such as “Outside the Machine” follow a patterns similar to the early novels by situating English characters in a Parisian milieu or, in the case of “Til September Petronella,” the French in London. Like *Voyage in the Dark*, still others such as “Temps Perdi” portray exiles projecting the West Indies onto an English present using memory. Finally, as if vindicating Ford’s comments about her short fiction, stories such a “The Lotus” and “The Sound of the River” seem almost intentionally devoid of topography. Thus while stories such as “Trio,” “Mixing Cocktails,” and “Again the Antilles” hint at transatlantic community and while the stories as a body of work present a diverse cast of nationals and move around Europe and the West Indies, taken individually they are not as transatlantically-focused as *Wide Sargasso Sea*. Even taken as a cohesive sub-cannon, the diverse nationality mix of Rhys’ short fiction is ultimately more chaotic and cacophonous than dialogically integrated; and in this way, it contrasts sharply with the diverse set of nationalities found in *Wide Sargasso Sea* whose interactions form a concentrated representation of transatlantic community.

Suggesting the degree to which this is true and the degree to which *Wide Sargasso Sea* contrasts with Rhys’ other works in this regard, the 1966 novel was received as a textual representation of the transatlantic nation in the contemporary press.¹⁴ Such is not the case with the rest of her fiction.¹⁵ Of *The Left Bank and Other Stories*, an anonymous
reviewer in the November 20, 1927 issue of The Charleston [West Virginia] Daily Mail reads the collection as a representation of expatriate life on the Left Bank even though it contains stories set elsewhere. Precisely identifying the text as Parisian, the reviewer helps challenge the necessity of Ford’s preface and his concerns with the text’s topographical sensibility:

Not all of these stories, it is true, are stories of the Left Bank. Yet the title is no falsification, for they could only have been written from Montparnasse, out of the kind of anguish in which Montparnasse lives, and with the aid of the technique that Paris teaches. (Review of The Left Bank and Other Stories)

Furthermore, while the reviewer suggests the collection captures the “life of the Anglo-American flotsam and jetsam that rose toward 1917,” s/he doesn’t elaborate on this suggestion that the collection might be understood as a representation of transatlantic community. Rather, the review seems intent on conveying the idea that The Left Bank and Other Stories is primarily a Parisian book about Parisian life in the early 1900s. Reviews in the New Republic and The New York Times read similarly. Completely glossing over its West Indian elements, the former review by L.S.M. suggests the collection represents “the precarious fringes of life in Europe”; and the latter echoes the Daily Mail review. Reading The Left Bank and Other Stories as primarily a Parisian text that defines life in “Montmartre and Montparnasse,” the anonymous New York Times reviewer suggests,

One of these stories takes place in a jail, another along the Riviera, and the longest and best in Vienna. But the spirit these stories show of undisciplined and
unconventional youth, of hardship, of disillusion, of loose and nervous and artificial existences, is expressly brought out by the term “left bank.”

(Miss Rhys’s Short Stories,” December 11, 1927)

Continuing chronologically through Rhys’ early oeuvre, the often scathing reviews of Quartet critique it as an immoral story of Parisian life. For example, in the June 16, 1929 issue of The Charleston [West Virginia] Daily Mail, an anonymous reviewer describes the novel as a representation of “Parisian nondescripts.” Taking issue only with the adjective brilliant, The Hartford Courant reviewer agrees with the publisher’s description of the novel as a “brilliant novel of the game of adultery in the Latin Quarter of Paris.” T.S. Matthews, reviewing Quartet for The New Republic, resists the novel’s adulterous label and generally praises its style, but he makes no mention of it as anything but a book about life in the Left Bank. Suggesting the novel had a relatively minor impact in the Atlantic world, The New Republic only mentions After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie briefly as one of its list of “neglected books.” Moreover, The [London] Times seems to have declined reviewing the novel but did run a publisher’s overview of it. Like the only other readily-available review of After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie, this advertisement contains sentiments similar to the Quartet reviews, reading the novel as an intriguing, well-crafted portrait of libertines in Paris without any mention of it as a specifically transatlantic text or even as one concerned with national identity more generally. Voyage in the Dark has a similarly limited presence in its contemporary press. In the December 28, 1934 edition of The New York Times, the “Book Notes” section reports that the president of Morrow and Company has returned from London with the rights to publish Voyage in the Dark in the US; and by the spring of the next
year, two reviews of the novel appear in the US press. The first, "A Girl's Ordeal," was published anonymously in *The New York Times* and serves as a career retrospective for Rhys up to 1935. The reviewer describes *The Left Bank and Other Stories* as a "collection of tales and sketches dealing for the most part with the Parisian underworld," and sets up *Quartet* and *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* in the typical way: as representations of tragic Englishwomen in Paris. Turning his/her attention to *Voyage in the Dark*, the reviewer shows some interest in Anna Morgan’s West Indian past but more as a function of modernist style:

Miss Rhys has made use of modern methods where it suited her. Anna’s early life and upbringing in the West Indies … are brought before us in a series of back-flashes. Some of these are written without punctuation, but with spaces to represent quick changes of thought.

In this way, the reviewer argues, as do I, that *Voyage in the Dark* relegates the West Indies to memory and off-scene reminiscence. Again, showing s/he is less interested in the national issues highlighted by the novel’s West Indian subtext, the reviewer seems more interested in the sensuousness of the West Indies versus the “grayness” of London and closes the review with a plot summary focused on the chronology of Anna’s London life. *Voyage in the Dark*’s transatlanticity is even more profoundly lost on the novel’s *New Republic* reviewer. Highly complimentary in its assessment of Rhys as “one of the finest writers of this time,” the anonymous review titled “Some Spring Novels” focuses on *Voyage in the Dark* as a triumph of style. Giving it little identity beyond Rhys’ other published works, though, the reviewer argues the novel is “a variation on a theme, for it is the story [Rhys] has always told, with only minor differences of circumstance, about a
helpless tired creature, the girl ‘with a spring broken in her somewhere.’” The short review does allow that “Anna has been sent to England, where she is on the stage,” only later revealing she arrived in England from “the West Indies of her childhood.” Again supporting my argument that these origins are relegated to memory in a relatively more immediate present of London, the reviewer adds that Rhys represents the West Indies only in “the undercurrents of memory” that “run through” her “dreary” London life. Finally, suggesting Rhys’ presence in the world of Atlantic letters had entered its decline well before the novel was published in 1939, I could find no reviews of Good Morning, Midnight even when using the same resources that yielded the myriad other reviews discussed in this chapter and the other two chapters of this dissertation.\(^{18}\)

It would be difficult to overstate the level of difference that exists between the reviews surrounding Rhys’ 1920s/30s texts and Wide Sargasso Sea’s constellation of contemporary reviews. In terms of sheer numbers, reviews of Wide Sargasso Sea outnumber those of the entire earlier canon by a ratio of at least two to one. When the texts are considered individually against Wide Sargasso Sea, the numbers are even more remarkable. Rhys’ 1920s/30s texts received, on average, about one review for every seven that Wide Sargasso Sea garnered. Wide Sargasso Sea’s contemporary and enduring popularity, though, is well established; and while these totals do help us conceptualize the general fact of just how much more popular the 1966 novel was versus the texts of Rhys’ early career, they also help introduce the more specific point of Wide Sargasso Sea’s transatlantic reception and appeal for just as Wide Sargasso Sea’s reviews differ in number from those of the earlier canon, they differ just as radically in kind. While the 1920s and 1930s reviews come mostly from the US and the UK, Wide Sargasso Sea was
reviewed in the West Indies as well. The Jamaican *Daily Gleaner* ran four reviews of *Wide Sargasso Sea* from 1966-68 all of which bear evidence of its transatlantic reception and even, more broadly, the existence of a transatlantic publishing community. For example, *The Daily Gleaner* first discusses the novel as part of its coverage of a trip English publisher Andre Deutsch took to the island, a trip that began as “a holiday” but became a “business visit” to further what appears to be a transatlantic community of literary authorship, readership, and marketing (“English publisher on visit,” July 21, 1966). A profound example of Andersonian nationalism, this article outlines the sense of community that exists in the Atlantic world thanks to sources of print capitalism. In this article, Deutsch expresses his desire to market texts such as Ian Flemming’s *Jamaica; “a new book on the botanical gardens” of Jamaica “by Alan Eyre of the University of the West Indies at Mona”; and “a travel guide” on Jamaica “written by an American Paul White and an Englishman Paul White, both residents of Montego Bay,” to islanders and tourists, most likely English-speaking ones from the US and UK. The first and third texts exude an especially acute sense of transatlanticity. Flemming’s now out-of-print *Jamaica* is an introduction to the island cum memoir about the extensive amount of time the British James Bond novelist spent there, and the White and White travel guide conflates American and British perspectives on a West Indian subject. The article clearly asserts *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s logical presence within this group of transatlantic texts and emphasizes the idea that the novel has a logical place within so transatlantically-focused a publishing house. Asserting that “[m]any noted West Indian writers are published by Andre Deutsch,” the article affirms *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s transatlantic appeal and Deutsch’s desire to market this novel and other texts broadly in the Atlantic world.
Mentioning Rhys’ 1966 novel among a matrix of forthcoming books written and marketed from a transatlantic perspective, the anonymous article author writes, “Among forthcoming Deutsch publications is Wide Sargasso Sea by Dominican-born Jean Rhys. It is a historical novel and part of the setting is in Jamaica.” Thus, even while the reporter suggests Deutsch “admitted that West Indian writing has a limited sales appeal on a world-wide level,” the article implies something else entirely. As a publisher, Deutsch has clearly produced and is clearly planning to produce more texts reflective of, crafted by, and marketed toward a transatlantic community that includes the US, the West Indies, and the UK. In fact, according to the article author, Deutsch qualified his statement about West Indian writing abroad, suggesting that no matter its limited sales appeal world-wide, “with proper promotion, adequate sales can always be made.” And based on the half-dozen texts mentioned in the article, Deutsch seems intent on commissioning books that capture and reflect a transatlantic perspective and on marketing texts within a transatlantic community. Indeed, no matter what the publisher’s sentiments about the “world-wide” appeal of West Indian letters, Deutsch clearly believes in the more local distribution of transatlantic texts within the Atlantic world. Moreover, he is not really marketing West Indian texts by West Indian authors to the world anyway. Rather, based on the works mentioned in this article, the Deutsch publishing house produces and sells transatlantic works by and for a transatlantic community.

Other reviews of Wide Sargasso Sea confirm the novel’s transatlantic popularity as well. The September 3, 1967 edition of the Kingston, Jamaica Sunday Gleaner suggests Wide Sargasso Sea was the fourth most requested library book over the past week (“Selectively Yours: Books”). Whether this statistic refers to local Kingston
libraries, those in Jamaica as a whole, or an even wider sampling of libraries is unclear; but in either case, the rank attests to the novel’s popularity within Kingston at least. The next year, The Daily Gleaner published two reviews of the novel. The first, from the March third Sunday edition, is rather short but nevertheless picks up on the novel’s representation of transatlantic community. Focusing on Wide Sargasso Sea’s pastiche elements, the anonymous reviewer summarizes the novel as a study of the “origins and relationships” of Mrs. Rochester “with the Jane Eyre hero” (The Sunday Gleaner [Kingston, Jamaica], “Books: Interesting Reading,” March 3, 1968.). This summary is, of course, a bit problematic, privileging as it does Antoinette’s minor, almost incidental relationship with Jane Eyre over her relationship with the Mr. Rochester figure. Nevertheless, framing Wide Sargasso Sea as a study of Antoinette’s origins and her relationship with Mr. Rochester, the reviewer asserts the novel’s Atlantic straddle and defines it as a representation of community that is part British and part West Indian. The reviewer’s suggestion that Antoinette’s “tragedy becomes in part at least the tragedy of the society to which she belongs” namely, “a world of warmth and exotic beauty which her husband hates and wars against” reflects the paradoxical nature of the text as the Atlantic world shifted from empire to community. The final Daily Gleaner review concerned with Wide Sargasso Sea focuses on both the 1966 novel and 1968 Tigers are Better Looking story collection. Like the March 1968 Daily Gleaner review, this review focuses on the transatlantic nature of the novel plot. The reviewer suggests Rhys “took as the heroine the first wife of Mr. Rochester of Charlotte Bronte’s ‘JANE EYRE’ and wove a story of her childhood in Jamaica and her early married life on the Windward Islands” (The Sunday Gleaner [Kingston, Jamaica], “Excellent Writer from Dominica,” November
17, 1968). Since the title of the article reads “Excellent Writer from Dominica,” this reviewer also (re)claims Rhys, who had been living in England for well over twenty-five years by 1968, as a West Indian writer. In the article, though, the reviewer asserts Rhys’ complex nationality and transatlantic sensibility. Contrasting profoundly with earlier reviews of Rhys’ oeuvre, it seems the publication of Wide Sargasso Sea allows this reviewer, at least, to look back on Rhys’ career in more transatlantic terms and understand Rhys as the creator of representations of transatlantic community not limited to Wide Sargasso Sea. The reviewer writes,

The vividness with which Jean Rhys can evoke a scene is remarkable, whether the story is of little children in the West Indies or of a Barbadian woman in London, a hospital in Paris, a male journalist nigh-clubbing in London or the varied pleasures of France (and one of Vienna).

In this way, it seems Wide Sargasso Sea not only calls attention to itself as a representation of transatlantic community, but also initiated an unprecedented understanding of Jean Rhys, at least in the case of this review, as a transatlantic figure who created representations of transatlantic community in several of her works.

Further establishing Wide Sargasso Sea’s transatlantic popularity and reception, the novel was widely read across the United States. Several American newspapers printed notices that the novel had been added to local libraries in cities as regionally diverse as Canandaluga, New York; Florence, South Carolina; Newark, Ohio; and Kokomo, Indiana. Additionally, in stark contrast to the limited response Rhys’ earlier texts received, a generous portion of the transatlantic world seems to have celebrated her winning the W.H. Smith Literary Award in 1967. Often printing different cuts of the
same London wire report, newspapers such as The [London] Times, The Danville [Virginia] Daily Register, and the Syracuse, New York Post-Standard all reported news of the award to a geographically diverse, transatlantic audience, the members of which are clearly familiar with, and interested in, Wide Sargasso Sea. More extensive reviews of the novel arose in the US and UK as well. The [London] Times printed a review remarkably similar to the “English publisher on visit” article in The Daily Gleaner. Though its title might seem more regionally adversarial than community focused, “Less American domination in fiction of 1966” nevertheless discusses the Atlantic publishing world as a single literary community. Reviewing works from the US, the UK, and “the Commonwealth” including Africa, the article deals with a single transatlantic literary community made up of literary publishing and reader interest. Also like many of the reviews discussed, the anonymous article author focuses on the transatlantic aspect of Wide Sargasso Sea’s plot, namely, the West Indian back-story of “the wife of Rochester in Jane Eyre.” Likewise establishing the representation of transatlantic community in and scope of the novel, another anonymous review printed in The [London] Times earlier in 1966 suggests Wide Sargasso Sea is the “prehistory” of “Mr. Rochester’s mad first wife”: “It takes her from childhood in the West Indies, through marriage, to her last hideaway in the attics of Thornfield Hall” (“New fiction,” November 17, 1966). Likewise, The [London] Times Literary Supplement reviewer focuses on Wide Sargasso Sea’s movements within the transatlantic community among the West Indies, the greater Windward Islands, and England (“A Fairy-Tale Neurotic,” November 17, 1966). Comparing Wide Sargasso Sea to Rhys’ earlier novels, the reviewer argues that in the 1966 novel, “the heroine’s difficulties are placed in a larger perspective than in the other
novels.” S/he continues, adding that while “the earlier heroines existed in a social vacuum,” Antoinette’s world is much larger, encompassing as it does both sides of the Atlantic. Walter Allen’s New York Times review “Bertha the Doomed” suggests Jane Eyre is mum on the subject of Bertha/Antoinette’s West Indian past precisely because of Charlotte Brontë’s national limitations. Rhys, though, is able to unlock the transatlantic scope of Antoinette’s back-story, from her West Indian “childhood to her incarceration at Thornfield,” because in addition to spending so much time in England, she “comes from the Caribbean” and as a result vividly renders a representation of “life in Jamaica in the early 19th century.” Allen, then, emphasizes both Rhys’s transatlantic identity as well as the transatlantic movements one finds in Wide Sargasso Sea. Writing for The Washington Post, Times Herald, Robert Granat similarly conflates Jean Rhys’s transatlantic life and the life of her Wide Sargasso Sea heroine. In creating Antoinette, “the insane Creole first wife Mr. Rochester kept hidden away in the attics of Thornfield Hall,” Granat notes that “Rhys has taken places and events from her own childhood in the British West Indies.” Granat also recognizes the transatlantic scope of the novel and the community it represents, the social and economic movements that brought “Mr. Rochester … from England to marry [Antoinette] for her dowry.” The anonymous Nation reviewer does likewise, suggesting that Antoinette is “the Creole heiress who was the first Mrs. Rochester in Jane Eyre—the terrifying wraith in the attic of Thornfield Hall” (“Nation Book Marks,” October 2, 1967). S/he suggests the novel moves between “that attic room” in England and Antoinette’s “descent into madness during Antoinette’s adolescence and early married life in the West Indies.”
As the contemporary reviews suggest, *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s relationship to *Jane Eyre* contributes to its representation of transatlantic community. Rhys’ novel defines an important, transatlantically situated ambiguity missing from the Brontë text, namely, Edward Rochester and Antoinette/Bertha’s history and their progress from the West Indies to England. Some contemporary critics even suggest the bond between *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Jane Eyre* is so strong that the 1966 text does not exist independently of the Brontë novel. One London review argues *Wide Sargasso Sea* “remains whatever the opposite of a sequel is, and doesn’t snatch a life of its own” (*The [London] Times*, “New fiction,” November 17, 1966) while Walter Allen’s previously mentioned review in New York suggests *Wide Sargasso Sea* does not “exist in its own right” since it “needs ‘Jane Eyre’ to complement it, to supply its full meaning.” In his introduction to the novel, Francis Wyndham articulates the opposing view that *Wide Sargasso Sea* “is in no sense a pastiche of Charlotte Brontë and exists in its own right, quite independently of *Jane Eyre*” (Rhys, *Wide Sargasso Sea* 6). But to whatever degree Rhys’ novel does or does not stand apart from Brontë’s, it is undeniable that *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Jane Eyre* have an unusually close connection. Forming a sort of double helix concerned with two aspects of the same story, in national terms the two novels partner to form a single representation of transatlantic community: the human movement among and social space common to both England and the West Indies. In an essential way, then, *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s connection to *Jane Eyre* reveals its most fundamental transatlanticity. But even apart from *Jane Eyre*, this chapter argues Rhys’ final novel stands as a representation of transatlantic community in its own right by presenting the Atlantic world as a fluid social space.
unbound by constituent regions and unhindered by the ocean that lies between the West Indies and England.

*Wide Sargasso Sea* persistently affirms the fluidity of the transatlantic community’s social space. For example, education happens on a transatlantic rather than regional scale. Early in the novel, Antoinette suggests her step-brother Richard has left their home in Jamaica and gone to “school in Barbados” before “going to England” for what is presumably his final social finishing (19). Such an educational, coming-of-age process prepares him for a broadly transatlantic life, casting him in both English and West Indian moulds. It also seems Antoinette’s bi-racial half-brother Daniel Cosway also “left Jamaica” and received a proper English education in Barbados. He notes, “I can read and cipher a little. The good man in Barbados [William Hart Coleridge] teach me more, he give me books, he tell me read the Bible every day and I pick up knowledge without effort” (58; Rhys’ italics). Though the pledge is unfulfilled because of Pierre’s untimely death, Antoinette also remembers her step-father’s promise to send her developmentally challenged brother “to England later on” where he can be “cured” and “made like other people” presumably via some proto-special education program (22). The convent where Antoinette attends school also bears evidence of a transatlantic educational community, employing as it does nuns from Europe, in particular a “young nun from Ireland” (33) and Miss Louise who was “born in France fifteen years ago” (33), as well as “colored” West Indians (30).

Related to the convent, religion acts as a marker of transatlantic community in the novel as well. While it would be rather easy to read the novel’s presentation of religion as a tension between European, Christian orthodoxy and West Indian religions, the book
frequently presents the two as fused into one syncretic transatlantic religion. The sheer presence of voodoo in the novel, a “syncretistic religion, a combination of several West African religions ... and overlaid with Christian symbols” (Rhys, Wide Sargasso Sea, 64n5), attests to this. More specifically, Godfrey, one of the Cosway’s native West Indian servants at Coulibri house, has clearly been influenced by a fundamentalist strain of European Calvinism. Antoinette remembers him telling her people are “not righteous” and that they are “all damned and no use praying” (20). The servant Myra has a similar sense of humanity’s relationship to the divine. “Everyone [goes] to hell,” she tells Antoinette. “You had to belong to her sect to be saved and even then—just as well not to be too sure” (21). Also, Christophine’s obeah religious practices don’t prevent her from having “pictures of the Holy Family” and the Catholic “prayer for a happy death” (18) in her room; and even as she practices obeah rituals, as evidenced by “a heap of chicken feathers in one corner” of her room, “the palm leaf from Palm Sunday and the prayer for a happy death” look on (70). In one case, the Christian belief in the soul’s resurrection and the voodoo zombie myth even seem fused into one haunting image of post-mortem animation that is at once corporeal and spiritual. At the convent—thinking of her mother, saying her Hail Mary, and praying the Prayer for the Dead—Antoinette muses, “This is for my mother ... wherever her soul is wandering, for it has left her body” (34).

Wide Sargasso Sea affirms the fluidity and unity of the transatlantic social space in other ways as well. For example, Rhys presents property ownership in such a way that diverse geographical areas seem contracted into more intimate, conjoined arrangements. The Rochester figure enjoys rights to properties in both the West Indies and England; and in an argument, Antoinette’s mother describes Mr. Mason’s dispersed homes as if they
are situated next door to one another: “Do you suppose that they don’t know all about your estate in Trinidad? And the Antigua property?” (19). Since it occurs in Coulibri house, this argument also suggests the Masons’ Jamaican property is a part of the contracted community. Often as a result of these scattered but conjoined property rights, the characters of *Wide Sargasso Sea* think and live in transatlantic rather than regional ways, unbound by any of the community’s constituent regions. Furthermore, neither class, race, nor wealth seem to hinder the movement of the characters: rich, poor, and working-class whites and blacks all seem to move about the community with relative ease. In contrast to the tyrannical oppression and vertical authority models inherent to empire, such integrated democracy seems indicative of a populist community.

Antoinette’s mother and step-father honeymoon in Trinidad (17) but live in Jamaica. Friends of Mr. Mason’s come from England to the West Indies for the winter (35), the young Antoinette imagines traveling in the other direction (35), and Antoinette’s Aunt Cora moves freely between England and the West Indies (35). Rochester affirms that Mr. Fraisier, “an Englishman” is “a retired magistrate” (45) who’s likely relocated to the West Indies to live out his remaining years, and Christophine tells the story of Baptiste, a butler living in St. Kitts but born in Jamaica “and willing to come back” (53). Améle tells Rochester that Daniel Cosway was “one time ... a preacher in Barbados ... and he have a brother in Jamaica in Spanish Town” (72). Then after he seduces her, Améle tells Rochester of her desire “to join her sister who was a dressmaker in Demerara” (now Guyana) and that she would ultimately like to go to Rio de Janeiro in Brazil (84). Affirming her step-father’s Atlantic peregrinations, Antoinette remembers “he often left Jamaica and spent a lot of time in Trinidad” (80). Finally, digging into Christophine’s
past, Rochester has trouble establishing the facts of her biography precisely because of
the transatlantic community’s fluid social movement. He and a Mr. Fraser discuss
whether she is in Jamaica or whether she has “gone back to Martinique her native island”
(86).

Furthermore, Rochester exhibits a certain ability to think in terms of transatlantic
community as well. As they ride together early in their courtship, Rochester affirms the
similarities between the West Indies and England: “Next time she spoke she said, ‘The
earth is red here, do you notice?’” He replies, “It’s red in parts of England too” (42).
Soon after, Rochester notices a building he thinks looks “like an imitation of an English
summer house” (42). He does similarly later in the novel, comparing a day on Jamaica to
an English summer day: “It’s cool today; cool, calm, and cloudy as an English summer
... It’s an English summer now, so cool, so grey” (98-99). The novel, then, while mostly
set in Jamaica, England, and Dominica consistently intones a sense of transatlantic
movement and exudes a sense that this area is a single community composed of
interacting national elements and people who move freely within the common social
space. Mail in *Wide Sargasso Sea* also moves fluidly and easily among the Atlantic world
(39, 41, 45, 85-86), and certain types of agriculture help indicate just how integrated the
transatlantic community is. Mr. Mason affirms the importance of the tamarind tree, a
West African import, in West Indian culture (23), and Rochester notes that a “Seville
orange tree” (44) from Spain grows by the steps of Coulibri house. Styles also exist
transatlantically and in populist terms since the common women of Jamaica wear their
clothes “à la Joséphine,” (47; Rhys’ italics) that is, in the style of Joséphine Bonaparte:
the empress of France who was born in Martinique. Such an observation causes
Rochester to suggest Antoinette talks “of St. Pierre [Martinique] as though it were Paris,” one of the world’s great fashion capitals, to which Antoinette responds, “But it is the Paris of the West Indies” (47). Rochester later remembers this conversation, re-affirming St. Pierre as “the Paris of the West Indies” (87) and thereby reemphasizes the fused social space that exists between Europe and the West Indies. In addition to Joséphine Bonaparte, there are a multitude of references to other famous transatlantic liminal figures such as the bi-racial cultural liaison Thomas “Indian” Warner (38), the aforementioned educator William Hart Coleridge (58), and the cruel Père Labat (63). Examples of how fluidly people move in the transatlantic community, the ways in which common folk gain stature in the community, and the liminal identity compounds such people form, these individuals, like Joséphine Bonaparte, helped instigate the cultural and national integrations that formed the transatlantic imagined community. Incorporating these figures into the text, then, no matter how obliquely, is a way of affirming their presence in the transatlantic community and giving a nod, however (un)intentionally, to the effect they had on the formation of this community.

Throughout the novel, Rhys also conflates multiple races and languages into compounds that defy customary racial taxonomies and help blur the lines of regional identification. Thus, as the lines between black, white, and native and those between Anglophone, Francophone, and speakers of West Indian languages break down so do the lines dividing geographical designations such as European, African, and West Indian. This state of affairs has the general effect of presenting a racially, linguistically, and transatlantically mixed cast of characters who all seem best identified as “transatlantic” rather than in terms of traditional linguistic, racial, and territorial groups. For example,
*Wide Sargasso Sea* frequently merges the two dominant racial groups of the novel into one often grotesque, classless compound. In doing so, it undermines any national identity the black characters might have as West Indian/African and the white characters might have as English/British and, often, any sorts of class hierarchies that are the lifeblood of empire. For example, as they escape the conflagration of Coulibri house, West Indians taunt Antoinette, her family, and their black servants. They call Mannie and/or Sass (it’s unclear which) “the black Englishman” and Annette and the rest of the Masons “white niggers”: “Look at the white niggers! Look at the damn white niggers” (25). Standing in the glow of the burning mansion, one of the mob even makes the observation “black and white, they burn the same” (26). This is no isolated incident either. Earlier in the novel, Antoinette’s black West Indian playmate Tia tells her “old time white people” (feudal plantation owners of British descent like the Cosways) are “nothing but white nigger now” (14). When the same Tia stands as part of the angry crowd cheering on the destruction of Coulibri, she throws a rock that hits Antoinette in the head. In the aftermath of this betrayal, Antoinette remarks: “I looked at her … We stared at each other … It was as if I saw myself. Like in a looking-glass” (27). In this scene, any racial difference, and by extension national and class difference, between the black, West Indian/African Tia and the white, British Antoinette seems negated. Soon after Antoinette’s recovery from her injuries, a monstrous presentation of racial conflation occurs. As she walks to her first day at the convent school, Antoinette encounters a bully whom she notes has

white skin, a dull ugly white covered with freckles, his mouth was a negro’s mouth and he had small eyes, like bits of green glass. He had the eyes of a dead
fish. Worst, most horrible of all, his hair was crinkled, a negro’s hair, but bright red, and his eyebrows and eyelashes were red. (29)

Clearly either a bi-racial or black albino child, the boy refuses to resolve into any one racial or national category. Either the result of West Indian, African, and European racial inbreeding or a genetic mutation that gives him, as a black person, Caucasian/European racial features, the bully serves as an example of the transatlantic racial ambiguity and admixture that pervades Wide Sargasso Sea and the way in which this thwarts our ability to neatly categorize characters into customary racial and national groups.

Examples of this sort are legion in the novel. Anticipating her entrance, Rochester suggests he knows Amélie will be “wearing a white dress. Brown and white she would be, her curls, her white girl’s hair she called it, half covered with a red handkerchief, her feet bare” (72). Likewise, Rochester’s discussion with the bi-racial Daniel Cosway is loaded with the imagery of racial integration. As if the old man’s color reveals his culpability, Daniel remembers his father, Mr. Cosway, turning “a kind of gray color” (gray being the color formed by the mixture of black and white) when Daniel confronts him about his paternity (74). Further blurring any sense of class superiority the landed, English-descended whites might be able to hold over the West Indian blacks, Daniel references his half-brother Alexander, “colored like me but not unlucky like me,” who married “a very fair-colored girl, very respectable family. His son Sandi is like a white man, but more handsome than any white man, and received by many white people they say” (75). And earlier in the novel, when Antoinette discusses the same situation, she admits that there was a time when she “would have said ‘my cousin Sandi’” but that “Mr. Mason’s lectures had made [her] shy about [her] colored relatives” (30). Therefore, even
in circles of kinship, the racial barrier, where it so often is strongest, has broken down. Finally, in a moment reminiscent of Kafka-esque transformation that mixes white and black, Amélie calls Antoinette a “white cockroach” (60) and sings a song featuring the epithet:

\[\text{The white cockroach she marry}\]
\[\text{The white cockroach she marry}\]
\[\text{The white cockroach she buy young man}\]
\[\text{The white cockroach she marry.} \ (60; \text{Rhys’ italics})\]

Returning to the ubiquitous “white nigger” phrase, Antoinette affirms that this “song about a white cockroach” is about her:

That’s me. That’s what they call all of us who were here before their own people in Africa sold them to the slave traders. And I’ve heard English women call us white niggers. So between you I often wonder who I am and where is my country and where do I belong and why I was ever born at all. (61)

This passage suggests that the instances of racial mixture and ambiguity, as well as the breakdown of vertical class structures, causes Antoinette to question her national identity and helps suggest the extent to which the breakdown of racial categories indicates the breakdown of national and class categories and that the mixture of one indicates the mixture of the others. Black and white; European, African, and West Indian; rich and poor—Wide Sargasso Sea persistently mixes these traditionally divided entities into a single transatlantic mélange.

Rhys presents language in a similar way. Unlike Charlotte Stant’s polyglotism which is defined by a mastery of many distinctive languages, the boundaries that
delineate the languages of Wide Sargasso Sea are often hazy at best. Certainly, English is the dominant language in which the novel is written, but littered throughout are words, phrases, and situations that affirm the linguistic soup in which the characters find themselves, one formed by all sorts of Atlantic-world languages. This has the effect of blurring lines of national and racial identification since traditionally, differences in language have often been used, like differences in race, to define nation groups and racial tribes from one another. Commercial globalization and political imperialism in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries did much to blur the divisions between such categories; but before the early nineteenth century (the moment of Wide Sargasso Sea), certain languages would have held more iron-clad associations with certain races and nations. Thus, I would argue that the breakdown in language distinctions that the novel dramatizes helps further a key theme of Wide Sargasso Sea, namely, that Atlantic world races, nations, and languages have all sloughed off their individual identities and been mixed to form a single community. For example, Antoinette tells us early in the novel that Christophene sings “patois songs” (11) and that she can speak “good English if she [wants] to, and French as well as patois” (12). As a language or dialect “that develops out of contact between the language of a colonizing people (i.e., the English, French, Spanish, Portugese, or Dutch) and that of a colonized people (i.e., West Africans or Native Americans)” (Rhys, Wide Sargasso Sea, 12n1), patois languages owe their very existences to the interactions of national language groups and the interrelationships and new compounds they form. Had Rhys wanted to make Wide Sargasso Sea an entirely different sort of novel, she could have written it entirely in a form of patois. This would certainly have realistically represented her setting and the language of many of her
characters. However, such a style would also have given the novel a Faulknerian sense of linguistic opacity such as one finds in *Absalom, Absalom!* As it is, one gets the sense Rhys wanted *Wide Sargasso Sea* to be more widely transparent than such a style would allow and therefore uses the more muted technique of dialect (as evidenced by the Tia and Daniel Cosway quotations already cited) and scattered instances of linguistic diversity to communicate an atmosphere of linguistic patois. *Wide Sargasso Sea*, therefore, achieves two goals that might otherwise be mutually exclusive: literary transparency and representation of transatlantic community using linguistic patois.

As I suggest, this linguistic complexity has the effect of blurring racial and national distinctions. Antoinette, for example, seems to be proficient in English, of course, but also has some knowledge of French and patois. She admits she can’t “always understand [Christophine’s] patois songs” but knows “the one that meant ‘The little ones grow old, the children leave us, will they come back?’ and the one about the cedar tree flowers which only last for a day” (11). Bearing evidence of the linguistic diversity that drives the song, Antoinette is also able to recognize the difference between *adieu* as Christophine sings it and the way the word is used in standard French and English:

The music was gay but the words were sad and her voice often quavered and broke on the high note. ‘Adieu.’ Not adieu as we said it, but *à dieu*, which made more sense after all. The loving man was lonely, the girl was deserted, the children never came back. Adieu. (11)

Claiming at least some identity with the French tongue (“Not adieu as we said it”) makes Antoinette seem rather linguistically, and therefore nationally, diverse. Also, this passage indicates the permutations a word may undergo as it is used and bent by a patois such as
that spoken in the West Indies. In the way Christophine uses it, the term is complicated and extended, making it seem both French and other-than-French. It therefore loses its national and linguistic exclusivity and serves as a sort of synecdoche for what happens to languages as they lose their national exclusivity and develop into diverse patois.

Anotinette further reveals her fluency in West Indian patois when she refers to Christophine’s use of the difficult-to-identify word “da” which she defines as “my nurse” (42). Likewise, she has no trouble understanding an “elderly woman” who refers to her in patois French as “Doudou, ché cocotte” (43), that is, “darling little ducky” (43n4). Christophine herself brings a great deal of linguistic patios into the novel. For example, she calms Antoinette’s concerns over her marital troubles with the abbreviated “doudou” and “doudou ché” (68) and later, as Antoinette languishes in a mad fit, uses the patois French terms of endearment “Ti moun” (“young one”), “Doudou ché,” “Do do l’enfant do” (“sleep, sleep, child, sleep”) (90) and again “doudou” (91).

In its own right, the French language also helps establish the Atlantic world’s sense of literary community. Referencing a sixteenth-century Malherbe poem titled “Consolation à M. du Périer” (51n4), Rochester quotes the poem in an off-handed way, “Rose elle a vécu” (51). But when asked, Antoinette has no trouble recognizing the poem and offering her assessment of it and therefore exhibits familiarity with it. Foreshadowing their tragic future, Rochester asks, “Is that poem true? Have all beautiful things sad destines?” to which Antoinette replies, “No, of course not” (51). Later, that same afternoon, Antoinette refers to Bothrops lanceolatus, or Martinique lancehead, by its French name, the “fer de lance” (52; Rhys’ italics); and again, Rochester gives no sign of not understanding. Discussing other wildlife, Antoinette even asserts the periodic
primacy of other tongues over her English which makes her seem truly patois rather than Anglophonic/English. Throwing rocks into a body of water, Rochester and Antoinette notice some crabs. Of one, Antoinette admits, “I don’t know the name in English. Very big, very old” (52). Furthermore, Antoinette uses the Carib word “ajoupa” to reference the gazebo on the grounds of Granbois (52) and sings in patois: “Adieu foulard, adieu madras” and “Ma belle ka de maman li” (54). Rochester notes too that when she is angry, Antoinette “chatter[s] to Christophine in patois” (54). There are several such instances of patois being spoken, such as when Amélie mutters to Christophine after being scolded (61). Some reveal even Rochester understands patois. For example, when Antoinette and her friend Caroline visit early in the second part of the novel, Rochester identifies the language they’re using as patois (39); and when Jo-jo asks him “politely in patois” if he is well (70), Rochester has no problem understanding him. Later, Rochester confirms his command of the hybrid tongue, affirming “I knew the sound of patois now” (97), and even exhibits some command of French. In a letter to his father, he approximates the English meaning of Grandbois “the High Woods I suppose” (45) and shouts “Asleep, dormi, dormi” at Baptiste (98). Later, thinking of their trip across the Atlantic to England, Rochester thinks bitter thoughts: “If she says good bye perhaps adieu. Adieu—like those old time songs she sang. Always adieu … ” (99). Later, he resolves his opinion: “Do not be sad,” he instructs Antoinette in his mind, “Or think Adieu. Never Adieu” (101). Exhibiting the linguistic transformation that has taken place with respect to himself, where he once called the gazebo “the summer house” (52), later in the novel Rochester refers to it only using the Carib word “ajoupa” (100). Other examples of the characters’ linguistic versatility abound such as when Rochester refers to presumably
finished roads as “pavé” roads (63) and when Christophe refers to fantastical stories using the West Indian storyteller’s cry “tim-tim” (67), calls white people “bébé” (68, 70, 96), and mentions the legendary “soucriant,” a sort of West Indian vampire, to Rochester without any explanation requested or confusion expressed by him (70). Responding to Antoinette’s apparent madness, the servant Baptiste exclaims, in patois French, “Que komesse” (87) and later suggests, “A hundred years, a thousand all the same to le bon Dieu and Baptiste too” (98). Done sparingly for the sake of the reader, the characters of Wide Sargasso Sea nevertheless seem conversant in a rich linguistic patois made up of English, French, and West Indian languages. As a result, their linguistic and, by extension, national identities appear liberated from traditional categories and integrated into a single transatlantic community.

Yet, for all the ways such linguistic, racial, and cultural issues suggest Wide Sargasso Sea presents an integrated, dialogic transatlantic community made up of constituent national parts, there are palpable, unavoidable ways in which the novel asserts regionalism, national difference, and even hostile division. Indeed, these are much more in-line with preponderant readings of the novel as a postcolonial fable. As I suggest previously in the chapter, such readings examine the opposition between colonizer and colonized, the enduring legacy and effects of colonialism, the materialist dialectic between imperial hegemony and colonial revolution, the uncomfortable synthesis of colonist and colonizer vis-à-vis identity politics, and, specific to Wide Sargasso Sea, the ways in which a tyrannical Europe exerts itself over a victimized West Indies. The ways in which the novel dramatizes Atlantic division and colonial oppression have been well documented by these postcolonial critics, but a few examples follow. Certainly, there is
some racial tension in the novel when a black West Indian girl chases the young Antoinette and chants, “Go away white cockroach, go away, go away ... Nobody want you. Go away” (13). The other instances of the “white cockroach” sobriquet already discussed would suggest the same, namely, that the native/black West Indians reject any sense of community with the English-descended whites. Other rivalries, tensions, and divisions exist as well. Antoinette notes, for example, that as a Martiniquaise Christophine’s “songs were not like Jamaican songs, and she was not like the other women” on Jamaica:

She was much blacker ... She wore a black dress, heavy gold ear-rings, and a yellow handkerchief—carefully tied with the two high points in front. No other negro woman [on Jamaica] wore black, or ties her handkerchief Martinique fashion. ... she took good care to talk as they talked. But they would have nothing to do with her and she never saw her son who worked in Spanish Town. She had only one friend—a woman called Maillotte, and Maillotte was not a Jamaican.

(12)

Such a passage illustrates subtle racial distinctions and national/linguistic identity issues that lead to division within the transatlantic space and stand in paradoxical contrast to the multitude of examples already listed. Other such examples are plentiful. As a child, Antoinette notes a difference in her diet after her mother marries Mr. Mason. Suggesting the foreignness of this food, Antoinette reports, “We ate English food now, beef and mutton, pies and pudding” (21). In the same scene, she looks at her mother and step-father “across the white tablecloth” and notes that Mr. Mason is “so sure of himself, so without a doubt English” and that her mother is “so without a doubt not English, but no
white nigger either” (21). Earlier, Antoinette addresses the misconceptions the English have about the West Indies. She wishes she could tell Mr. Mason “that out here is not at all like English people think it is” (20). Grown up and married to Rochester, Antoinette reflects on England with similar ignorance: “England must be quite unreal and like a dream” (61). This sense she has of England as an alien land continues. Considering with Christophine whether or not to leave Rochester, Antoinette tragically presages her trip to England and the transformative power such a trip to a foreign land would have:

I will be a different person when I live in England and different things will happen to me ... England, rosy pink in the geography book map, but on the page opposite the word are closely crowded, heavy looking. Exports, coal, iron, wool. Then Imports and Character of Inhabitants. Names, Essex, Chelmsford on the Chelmer. The Yorkshire and Linconshire wolds. Wolds? Does that mean hills? How high? Half the height of ours, or not even that? ... There are fields of corn like sugarcane fields, but gold color and not so tall. (66-67)

Here, then, Antoinette highlights the cultural and linguistic divisions between England and the West Indies and indicates just how foreign a place it is in comparison to her native West Indies. Starkly contrasting with the ways in which the novel integrates the West Indies and Europe into a single community, Christophine even expresses doubts such a place exists: “‘England,’ said Christophine ... ‘You think there is such a place?’” (67). Antoinette replies, “How can you ask that? You know there is” to which Christophine replies, “I never seen the damn place, how I know” (67). Their dialogue continues:

‘You do not believe that there is a country called England?’
She blinked and answered quickly, 'I don't say I don't believe, I say I don't know, I know what I see with my eyes and I never see it. ... I hear it cold to freeze your bones and they thief your money, clever like the devil. ... Why you want to go to this cold thief place? If there is this place at all, I never see it, that is one thing sure.' (67)

Radically different from the sorts of fluid movement described elsewhere in the novel, this passage suggests the West Indies and England are profoundly different and irreconcilably divided. A passage soon after it additionally undermines any sense that the transatlantic world is a place of fluid movement. In desperation, Antoinette realizes,

Going away to Martinique or England or anywhere else, that is the lie. He would never give me any money to go away and he would be furious if I asked him. There would be a scandal if I left him and he hates scandal. Even if I got away (and how?) he would force me back. So would Richard [Mason]. So would everybody else. Running away from him, from this island, is the lie. (68)

Referring to any notion of freedom as a "lie," Anotinette clearly feels limited to a certain regional sphere and expresses a sense of entrapment antithetical to the fluidity of transatlantic movement that exists elsewhere in the novel.

These are just a few instances of national difference and regional division that exist in the novel. Others could be and have been examined. After all, as I suggest, the major portion of Wide Sargasso Sea's traditionally postcolonial-dominated body of criticism operates on the assumption that the novel sets Europe and the West Indies in opposition via a colonizer-colonized relationship. As Judith L. Raiskin argues, Wide Sargasso Sea "deals directly with colonialism, European dominance in the Caribbean,
and the hypocrisies of English culture” (Rhys, Wide Sargasso Sea ix). Starting with such assumptions and indeed persistently labeling Wide Sargasso Sea a postcolonial text leaves little room for critics and classrooms to generate discussions concerned with the novel’s presentation of transatlantic community. However, even though the latter has been persistently ignored in favor of the former and one might feel the need to assert it at the expense of the traditional reading, there is no reason to swing the critical pendulum toward another extreme and attempt to argue that Wide Sargasso Sea is more community-focused than (post)colonial. In truth, pursuing either reading exclusive of the other seems to be the most short-sighted extreme since it forces readers to ignore evident and incontrovertible aspects of the text supportive of opposing viewpoints. The truth of the matter, then, seems to be that Wide Sargasso Sea stands as a contradictory presentation of both colonial opposition and transatlantic community. As a result, it seems the most balanced arguments would accept and accommodate this inconsistency, no matter how unwieldy it may seem, as an unavoidable part of the novel’s DNA.

I would argue that Wide Sargasso Sea’s paradoxical presentation of transatlantic community and colonial opposition gives the novel a rather profound sense of historical accuracy. Set in the late 1830s and early 1840s, Wide Sargasso Sea portrays an Atlantic world shifting from empire to community: a development precipitated in large part by the “creole” national developments Benedict Anderson suggests swept the Americas between the 1760s and 1830s. As Anderson reads this development, the growth of creole communities ran concurrently with, and at times even hastened, the ebb of empire in the Americas. Furthermore, it was these “creole communities that developed so early conceptions of their nation-ness—well before most of Europe” (50; Anderson’s italics).
They were, in other words, the first nations, or imagined communities, “to emerge on the world stage, and therefore inevitably provided the first real models” of the modern nation (46). As Anderson outlines the region, then, a major historical tension of the late eighteenth/early nineteenth Atlantic world was that between receding empire and emerging national community. I would argue, then, that as a representation of this region at this particular point in time, it is inevitable that Wide Sargasso Sea would present both the unities of transatlantic community and the oppositions of imperialism in the same textual space. Of course, in some ways, both community and empire act as agents of confederation. In the Atlantic world especially, empire was the original transatlantic unifier from the days of first-contact. However, empire operates via vertical, prescribed chains of authority; class hegemony built around a colonizer-colonized opposition; and assigned modes of homogeneity as colonizers impose on the subaltern colonized (often at the edge of a sword) the notion that foreign conqueror and native conquered are now a single “people” under an imperial banner. In this third way especially, empire and nation differ not just in function but in essence. Using the language of materialist dialectics, one could say empire demands the synthesis of its set of elements into one whole, that is, the Empire. Nations, on the other hand, are dialogic and unfinalizable. As Homi K. Bhabha describes it, the nation is an “ambivalent figure” because of “its transitional history, its conceptual indeterminacy, its wavering between vocabularies” (2). The nation is, in this way, an unsynthesizable anti-empire. American national communities such as those described by Anderson are no exception. In fact, they are acutely hybridized and diverse, especially when one compares them to their European cousins.
Nations such as the modern Slavic republics were built around common languages and ethnicities, two of the traits that mark what Anderson labels “provincial European thinking about the rise of nationalism” (47). American imagined communities are, on the other hand, diverse, self-proclaimed, populist movements composed of dialogic and unfinalizable constituencies. For example, while Anderson suggests he focuses on a rather traditional, and even archaic, definition of creole meaning “a person of (at least theoretically) pure European descent but born in the Americas” (47n1), he actually describes a much more linguistically and racially diverse form of community that matches more contemporary meanings of the term creole: definitions that employ the term as a descriptor of various sorts of racial and cultural integrations. Anderson wonders “Why did such colonial provinces” such as those in Latin America and the West Indies “usually containing large, oppressed, non-Spanish-speaking populations” of indigenous peoples “produce creoles who consciously redefined these populations as fellow-nationals?” (50). These communities are not, therefore, creolized in the sense that they are composed of European-descended whites born outside Europe but rather in the sense that they are patois communities built out of various races and languages, hybrids that contain elements of European, African, and Native American cultures. Thus, Anderson’s historical model implies that the push of the late 1700s and early 1800s in the West Indies and larger Americas was away from empire toward national community, from hegemonic prescriptions and homogeneity to creole diversity and self-proclaimed populism. *Wide Sargasso Sea* is a representation of this Atlantic world as it evolves from empire into the modern form of community this dissertation analyzes and therefore contains both residual and emerging forms of social order. In fact, clearly influenced by Andersonian models of
nationalism and early twenty-first century cosmopolitanism, recent studies such as Delia Caparoso Konzett’s *Ethnic Modernisms: Anzia Yezierska, Zora Neale Hurston, Jean Rhys, and the Aesthetics of Dislocation* and Carolyn Vellenga Berman’s *Creole Crossings: Domestic Fiction and the Reform of Colonial Slavery* have examined *Wide Sargasso Sea* in similar terms, as a representation of what they have labeled “creole community.” It seems, therefore, that *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s critical constellation is evolving coincident with the historical moment the novel captures, moving from a preoccupation with empire and its aftereffects and toward an interpretation of *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s social space as a hybridized community. Recent studies concerned with *Wide Sargasso Sea* and more traditional concepts of national identity also reflect this trend; and while it doesn’t concern itself with *Wide Sargasso Sea* directly, monographs such as Shalini Puri’s *The Caribbean Postcolonial: Social Equality, Post-Nationalism, and Cultural Hybridity* indicate how common it has become for critics at-large to conceptualize the West Indies as a diverse, hybridized, creole community in persistent dialogue with, but not limited to the legacy of, its colonial past.

As it must be by this point all too evident, the term *creole* has so many meanings that it nearly threatens to collapse entirely. Indeed, Jean Rhys herself decided against using the title *Creole* for what became *Wide Sargasso Sea* because of the term’s various, unstable meanings. Attempting to establish a workable standard, Berman defines *creoles* in a way that matches the diversity of the communities Anderson outlines as well as the term’s modern sensibilities. She argues they are liminal figures in terms of race, language, and nationality whose various identities are in constant states of flux and interaction. They have, Berman argues, both “overlapping but distinct geographical
parameters” (3). Berman establishes creoles as figures who transcend the traditionally neat racial, linguistic, and national categories that define the people of the Atlantic world. The term creole, she writes, crosses “what we now consider intractable racial lines” (38) and national distinctions (40). In this way, I would argue, she like Anderson helps assert their inherent transatlantic unfinalizability and the dialogicity of their identities. By extension, such a definition of the term creole captures the characters and community represented in Wide Sargasso Sea, namely, individuals who defy traditional Atlantic language, racial, and national categories but who form, nevertheless, an emerging, socially fluid “creole” community composed of the various racial and linguistic patois I outline.

In addition to the various processes of creolization already discussed, there are three main passages that neatly express the idea that Wide Sargasso Sea represents a tension between empire and emerging creole community and that the thrust of the novel is toward the latter. The first passage illustrates that even Rochester, the inheritor of British imperialism who has traveled to the West Indies largely to further its cause (as well as to fatten his purse), seems to resist empire. Noticing “two wreaths of frangipani … on the bed,” Rochester asks Antoinette, “Am I expected to wear one of these?” (43). Not receiving a reply immediately, Rochester “crown[s] [him]self with one of the wreaths and [makes] a face in the glass” (43). “I hardly think it suits my handsome face, do you?,” he asks Antoinette who replies, “You look like a king, an emperor” (43). To this, Rochester asserts, “God forbid” and treats his impromptu crown with disdain: “I … took the wreath off. It fell on the floor and as I went forwards the window I stepped on it” (43). Completely uninterested in maintaining Atlantic imperialism, Rochester resists
accepting the mantle of monarchy and empire and even defiles one of its metonyms when he steps on the crown. While such an attitude might seem rather surprising based on Rochester’s general deportment and tyrannical treatment of those around him, this scene combined with his various other participations in the transatlantic community illustrate his complicity in shifting the Atlantic world from empire to community. In a second passage, Rochester seems to affirm the transatlantic liminality of his wife. Watching her “critically,” Rochester notes she has “eyes which are too large and can be disconcerting. She never blinks at all it seems to me. Long, sad, dark alien eyes. Creole of pure English descent she may be, but they are not English or European either” (39). Drawing on the traditional meaning of creole as a European-descended white born in the Americas, Rochester can’t find her proper national or racial identity using the categories available to him. Whatever genetic European-ness he might have expected her to possess is absent. Likely influenced by the ease with which she mixes with blacks and the fact that she has bi-racial siblings as well as the general sense of racial, linguistic, and national integration pervading the West Indies of Wide Sargasso Sea, Rochester even seems less than convinced that Antoinette is a “pure English” creole. She may be this, he notes, but Rochester’s reflection has a certain hesitancy about it. Rochester’ opinion, therefore, seems to indicate that Antoinette belongs in another category entirely. Not European, not English, and not even definitively creole in its traditional sense, this passage seems to indicate Antoinette in fact embodies a new identity as a member of the transatlantic imagined community, that she is a creole in the more modern sense of the word: a hybrid figure composed of but also transcending the limitations of traditional Atlantic-world racial, linguistic, and national elements.
Third and finally, I would likely be remiss if I did not make the all-too-obvious point that both *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *The Golden Bowl* are novels about marriage. More specifically, each novel represents the transatlantic union of two people which in turn clearly symbolizes something essential about the transatlantic imagined community. However, it would be difficult to make the sort of argument about Rochester and Antoinette that I make about Amerigo and Maggie in the second chapter of this dissertation. Namely, one would find it almost impossible to suggest Rochester and Antoinette’s marriage represents a harmonious, productive union of Europe and the New World. In fact, theirs is quite the opposite. Antoinette and Rochester’s is a difficult, unhappy marriage that ends in disaster. Indeed, it seems more likely that the marriage of Rochester and Antoinette represents the problematic imperial unions of the Atlantic world. Its destruction, therefore, would represent the recession of this form of union so that something new could develop in its place, namely, the transatlantic imagined community. The novel’s final passages seem to indicate this idea most piquantly; and as the mad Antoinette dreams about burning Thornfield Hall, an act that will lead to her death and therefore the end of her union with Rochester, she has an extended fantasy that imagines, in various ways, transatlantic community. First, while dreaming about stumbling around in the dark of Thornfield, in the cold English night, Antoinette’s mind merges her memories of the West Indies and her European present. Escaping her imprisonment, she takes a candle and notes, “Suddenly, I was in Aunt Cora’s room. I saw the sunlight coming through the window, the tree outside and the shadows of the leaves on the floor” (111). Likewise, as she runs down the burning halls of the manor house, she calls, “help me Christophine help me” and discovers, “looking behind [her,] ... that [she]
had been helped” (112). These passages seem to merge the West Indies and England into one imagined space where a room at Thornfield exists simultaneously with Aunt Cora’s on Jamaica and where Christophine moves fluidly between the Americas and Europe like a ubiquitous, benevolent spirit. Dreaming that she’s escaped the burning house and alighted Thornfield’s battlements, Antoinette turns around and looks at the sky:

It was red and all my life was in it. I saw the grandfather clock and Aunt Cora’s patchwork, all colors, I saw the orchids and the stephanotis and the jasmine and the tree of life in flames. I saw the chandelier and the red carpet downstairs and the bamboos and the tree ferns, the gold ferns and the silver, and the soft green velvet of the moss on the garden wall. I saw my doll’s house and the books and the picture of the Miller’s Daughter. I heard the parrot call as he did when he saw a stranger, *Qui est là? Qui est là?* … when I looked over the edge I saw the pool at Coulibri. Tia was there. (112)

Projecting her West Indian past onto the red sky, the grounds of Thornfield, and even into the flames consuming the English manor house, Antoinette brings two spheres of the Atlantic world into immediate relationship with one another. Time too, it seems, has contracted into a single moment where the West Indian past and the English present merge into a state of simultaneity. In this way, the fire seems as eminently productive as it does destructive. It is a cleansing, phoenix flame that both destroys and creates, eradicates and gives birth. Appropriate to the paradoxical nature in which Rhys presents the two in the novel, the fire essentially burns away Antoinette and Rochester’s marriage and the Atlantic imperial union it represents. At the same time, though, it serves as the screen upon which Antoinette projects her West Indian past merging with the present to
form a single vision of transatlantic community. Causing the fire, then, is a way for
Antoinette to liberate the transatlantic community from its imperial past just as she, to
whatever degree of intentionality, liberates herself from her own destructive marriage.
Therefore, Antoinette’s declaration just before the novel closes, “Now at last I know why
I was brought here and what I have to do” (112), takes on an especially concrete meaning
and strips away any sense of madness that might surround the act. Antoinette sets out
with her candle “along the dark passage” (112) leading from her room to the larger
recesses of Thornfield Manor not only to burn away the problematic unities that
dominated her life but also the Atlantic world’s imperial past: an act that shores-up the
emerging community connections that will dominate its future.

This future is profoundly well represented by texts like Wide Sargasso Sea and
Negro: An Anthology. Certainly, The Golden Bowl does its part to develop the
transatlantic nation in the twentieth century; but on a long enough timeline, James’ novel
can appear racially and geographically limited compared to the other two texts explored
in this dissertation. The manifestations of the transatlantic community beyond the early-
to-mid twentieth century are much more diverse than Anglo-American or even European-
American interactions; and while this fact may make The Golden Bowl seem rather
conservative and traditional in the twenty-first century, Cunard and Rhys’ texts appear to
have been vanguards for the literature and social realities that followed them. As they
capably presage, the future of the transatlantic imagined community belongs to diverse
constituencies from around the Atlantic world rather than bipolar explorations of the
interactions of the US and Europe. As I explore in the conclusion, the textual
representations of transatlantic community that follow Negro and Wide Sargasso Sea do
their parts to ensure this progress; but if the diversity of transatlantic imagined community is to be fully appreciated and appropriate interpretations of it are to be further developed, critical sensitivity to these representations must be augmented lest we find ourselves trapped by Anglo-Saxon totals and international states of mind.
Years before, in his introduction to *Morning, Midnight*, Rhys disappeared from the literary scene, and her books went out of print" (*Jean Lady^*). In her preface to *US* in 1929, the title by which I refer to it in the main text).

Notes


2 In her preface to *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Judith L. Raiskin suggests something similar: “It took Rhys twenty-one years to write [*Wide Sargasso Sea*], years that we can see with hindsight were crucial to the development of feminist, anticolonial, postmodern perspectives that would permit critics to recognize Rhys as one of the foremost novelists, English or not, of her time” (ix). See also Francis Wyndham’s introduction to *Wide Sargasso Sea* where Wyndham suggests even Rhys’ novels of the 1920s and 30s were “ahead of their age, both in spirit and style” and match more closely with the prevailing literary tastes of the 1960s (6).

3 Capitalizing on the success of *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Rhys was able to publish the following short fiction collections after 1966: *Tigers Are Better-Looking* (1968), *My Day: Three Pieces* (1975), and *Sleep It Off Lady* (1976). Her unfinished autobiography *Smile Please* was published posthumously in 1979.

4 For example, Mary Lou Emery’s “The Politics of Form: Jean Rhys’s Social Vision in *Voyage in the Dark* and *Wide Sargasso Sea*” (*Twentieth Century Literature* 28:4 [Winter 1982]: 418-30) examines certain “similarities” between Rhys’ texts and the modernism of Joyce, Woolf, and Stein, particularly “the violence that informs them,” namely “the dimensions of a social world in often brutal transformation” (418-19; Emery’s italics). Emery argues that Rhys’ “novels expose the specific crisis—felt from the period of the First World War through the present—of the dissolution of moral values and traditions delininating the foreign from the ‘civilized’ and those separating private from public lives” (419). In a later article, Emery likewise suggests Rhys and *Wide Sargasso Sea* are part of a tradition of “Colonial Modernism” (see “Misfit: Jean Rhys and the Visual Cultures of Colonial Modernism,” *Jean Rhys*, spec. issue of *Journal of Caribbean Literatures* 3:3 [Summer 2003]: i-xxii). In *Ethnic Modernisms: Anzia Yezierska, Zora Neale Hurston, Jean Rhys, and the Aesthetics of Dislocation* (London: Palgrave, 2002), Defia Caparoso Konzett argues that “Jean Rhys offers a singular case of a modernist writer exploiting the myth of race from within its white supremacist definition” (127) and that *Wide Sargasso Sea* is the vehicle through which she achieves her critique of “imperialist Anglo-European modernism from within its own parameters” (132). Intent on establishing Rhys as a modernist writer and *Wide Sargasso Sea* as a modernist text, Konzett argues that claiming “Rhys mainly as a postcolonial writer potentially leads to a distortion of Rhys’s work in its tendency to disregard or subordinate her modernist style and aesthetic sensibility concerned particularly with the complex linking of displacement, commodity, and mass culture. These modernist concerns underlie Rhys’s entire oeuvre, including her Caribbean writings. Indeed, Rhys’s work reveals that the entire crisis of modernism is intimately linked to the colonial tradition … Rhys is to be read … as an avant-garde theorist commenting on modernity …” (132). See also 133-143. John Marx includes *Wide Sargasso Sea* in his study of *The Modernist Novel and the Decline of Empire* (New York: Cambridge UP, 2006. 122-24; 163-66), arguing the novel “takes both early twentieth-century writing and its Victorian precursor as explicit objects of study” (163). In her preface to *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Judith L. Raiskin suggests that all of Rhys’ works challenge “easy definition and [invite] intense debate” and that *Wide Sargasso Sea* “has generated an enormous amount of critical discussion, in large part because it is not easily categorized” (xi). She allows, though, that the novel has served mainly “as a touchstone text for critics interested in modernism, feminism, and postcolonial theory. … *Wide Sargasso Sea* … retains the
modernist sparseness of Rhys's pre-war work ... " (xi). In the introduction to her study of Jean Rhys' fiction *Territories of the Psyche: The Fiction of Jean Rhys* (London: Palgrave, 2005), Anne B. Simpson persistently discusses Rhys and her work, including *Wide Sargasso Sea*, in terms of modernism and modernist aesthetics (1-20). Finally, in her introduction to the Jean Rhys section of *The Gender of Modernism* Coral Ann Howells sums the relationship between modernism, Rhys, and *Wide Sargasso Sea* this way: "Jean Rhys would seem to challenge the date limits of this anthology for several reasons: her most celebrated novel, *The Wide Sargasso Sea [sic]*, was not published until 1966; the interviews with her and her own writing about her work appeared in the 1960s and 1970s; her unfinished autobiography, *Smile Please*, was published in 1979. Nevertheless, Rhys began writing in the 1920s and was seventy-six when *The Wide Sargasso Sea [sic]* was published" (372). Thus, no matter how fallacious it might seem in terms of traditional modernist periodization, some critics apparently consider *Wide Sargasso Sea* part of the modernist cannon simply by virtue of its author’s participation in early twentieth century literary aesthetics.

5 In her preface to *Wide Sargasso Sea*, Judith L. Raiskin proposes that "Jean Rhys first mentions working on what was to become *Wide Sargasso Sea* in October 1945" (ix). Thus, the text’s production dates fall somewhere between October 1945 and 1966 when it was published.


9 Predictably, *Wide Sargasso Sea*’s critical constellation is more extensive than the one surrounding Rhys’ 1920s and 30s texts. To put this suggestion in perspective, the 1966 novel has enjoyed the attention of around two hundred critical articles, chapters, and dissertations while the earlier canon has collectively received about half that many. Of these one hundred or so texts, roughly ten percent concern themselves with the topic of national identity in the early novels of Jean Rhys. For the most part, these inquiries follow similar lines of thinking, namely, that the characters of *Quartet, After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie, Voyage in the Dark*, and *Good Morning, Midnight* all suffer from a sense of national displacement and find themselves in foreign lands cut off from a home that begins to seem less and less familiar. Furthermore, the topics readily intersecting and overlapping as they do, it is not always possible, necessary, or constructive to artificially designate these sorts of critical inquiries into exclusive categories such as "(post)colonial" and "national." Often, a critical work would fit into both categories and perhaps even others. Allowing, then, that the following articles are, in some cases, concerned with multiple subjects and therefore may require multiple categorizations, they may be, nevertheless, considered examples of critical inquiry into national identity in the early works of Jean Rhys: Nancy Hemond Brown, "England and the English in the Works of Jean Rhys" (*Jean Rhys Review* 1:2 [Spring 1987]: 8-20); Bénédicte Corhay-Ledent, "Between Conflicting Worlds: Female Exiles in Jean Rhys’s Voyage in the Dark and Joan Riley’s The Unbelonging" (In *Crisis and Creativity in the New Literatures in English: Cross/Cultures*. Ed. Geoffrey V. Davis and Hena Maes-Jelinek. New York: Rodopi, 1990); Mary Lou Emery, "Refiguring the Postcolonial Imagination: Tropes of Visuality in Writing by Rhys, Kincaid, and Cliff" (*Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* Fall 1997 [16:2]: 259-80); Erica L. Johnson, *Home, Maison, Casa: The Politics of Location in Works by Jean Rhys, Marguerite Duras, and Erminia Dell'Oro* (Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 1997).

While Anna Morgan’s home island indeed remains unnamed in the novel, the set of hyper-specific longitude and latitude coordinates Rhys provides—“15° 10’ and 15° 40’ N. and 61° 14’ and 61° 30’ W.” (Voyage in the Dark [New York: Norton, 1982], 17)—reveals she was almost certainly thinking of Dominica.


Echoing my own critique that only a mere quarter of the Ford preface actually focuses on The Left Bank and Other Stories, an anonymous review of the collection in The New York Times suggests “Mr. Ford has written, a little needlessly but none the less interestingly, of the Rive Gauche of Paris, and ... he has told all about the Rive Gauche of his youth, only in the last few paragraphs bethinking himself of Miss Rhys” (The New York Times, “Miss Rhys’s Short Stories,” December 11, 1927).

The success of Wide Sargasso Sea ignited a resurgence of popular interest in Rhys’ total oeuvre. As I suggest in n3, this interest likely contributed to the publication of Rhys’ unfinished autobiography and her post-1966 story collections. Furthermore, the popularity of Wide Sargasso Sea also initiated several re-printings of her texts from the 1920s/30s. When these new editions were released in the late 1960s and 1970s, they, of course, received their own “contemporary” reviews as individual texts and/or as part of career retrospectives. In keeping with the general temporal concerns of this dissertation, namely the transatlantic nation as it existed during the modernism of the early-to-mid twentieth century, this chapter does not analyze such later reviews of the later editions of Rhys’ early texts, the many career retrospectives...
Concerning the contemporary reviews of Rhys’ texts, no published collection of them exists such as those available for Henry James, William Faulkner, Virginia Woolf and other “major” modernist writers. Even the Norton critical edition of *Wide Sargasso Sea* used in this dissertation contains only a few passing mentions of a few reviews of that text. It can be difficult, then, to track down reviews of Rhys’ work, even in the internet age. Because of this, facts about the publication, reception, and transatlantic identity of Rhys’ early texts vis-à-vis *Wide Sargasso Sea* must be extrapolated from the scattered and limited information available. For example, since we know *Quartet* had different American and European titles, we know that novel was published on both sides of the Atlantic even though I could find no British review of the text. Also, because many of the islands were British territories in the early 1900s, *Quartet* and Rhys’ other early texts were likely available in the West Indies as well. However, I could not find any reviews to substantiate this theory. Indeed, as the preceding discussion establishes, I have not found reviews for all the pre-*Wide Sargasso Sea* texts on both sides of the Atlantic which leads me to assume the texts might not have appeared widely in all Atlantic regions prior to the post-1966 resurgence of interest in Rhys’ work. In some cases, it is clear that a given novel was published, though perhaps not reviewed, on both sides of the Atlantic. For example, as I mention previously, I could find no British reviews of *Voyage in the Dark*, but a section of *The New York Times* titled “Book Notes” makes it clear that an American publisher bought the rights to publish the novel in the US after it had been published in England. Again as I mention earlier in the chapter, two American reviews of the novel do exist; but whether or not it was available in the West Indies in the 1930s remains a mystery. Finally, I have in fact been unable to find a single review of *Good Morning, Midnight* on either side of the Atlantic which suggests Rhys and her texts were well on their way to obscurity before this novel was published in 1939. The two *New Republic* suggest this downward trajectory began as early as Rhys’ second novel, mentioning *After Leaving Mr. Mackenzie* as it does in two articles concerned with “Neglected Books.” The first, by M.C. (“More About Neglected Books.” *The New Republic*, May 23, 1934), reports that the novel is “not widely read but distinctly out of the ordinary” and the second, written by the publisher Alfred A. Knopf (“More Sale Figures on ‘Neglected Books.’” *The New Republic*, July 11, 1934), asserts that the novel “sold 1,990 copies in the regular edition and then stopped selling entirely, leaving 196 copies to be remaindered.” As available research databases expand their content, other reviews of Rhys’ work will likely turn up. But at present, a simple comparison of the handful of reviews that surround Rhys’ early 1920s and 30s texts and the multitude and regional diversity of those concerned with *Wide Sargasso Sea* lends the latter text an inherently more profound sense of transatlanticity since it was published and received widely around the Atlantic world.

---


21 In her notes accompanying the novel, Judith L. Raiskin establishes this connection between “the good man” and William Hart Coleridge as well as the excellent, English-style education available to West Indians on Barbados (Rhys, Wide Sargasso Sea 58n5).


23 In some ways, the residue of empire has only recently or never really left this space. Canada, for example, has only had what one might consider full, declared independence from the UK since the 1926 Balfour resolution. It nevertheless still recognizes the ruler of England as its head of state. In places such the Cayman Islands, Aruba, and the Falkland Islands, colonial bonds between European powers and American territories remain even stronger.

24 See also Benedict Anderson, Imagined Communities, 84: “The lexicographic revolution in Europe, however, created, and gradually spread, the conviction that languages (in Europe at least) were, so to speak, the personal property of quite specific groups—their daily speakers and readers—and moreover that these groups, imagined as communities, were entitled to their autonomous place in a fraternity of equals.”


CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION: TRANSATLANTICISM BEYOND ANGLO-SAXON
TOTALS AND INTERNATIONAL STATES OF MIND

As the historical and on-going narrative of interaction between Europe, Africa, and the Americas suggests, the development and continued existence of the transatlantic community is more extensive than the modern moment and the particular writers this dissertation focuses on, no matter how remarkably the community manifested itself in the early and middle twentieth century. Nevertheless, very few investigations into the development and nature of the transatlantic imagined community as I have outlined it exist. Of course, various studies of “transatlanticism” are available, but they all too often limit the entire space to the US and Europe. Obsessed with Anglo-Saxon totals at the expense of transatlantic diversity, these inquiries are frequently even more limited, using the banner “transatlantic” to label studies that focus exclusively on the relationship between and the sense of community shared by the US and the UK. Of course, some of these discussions appropriately frame their limitations, and one could allow the others to exist without comment if they were minor segments of a larger discursive tableau. This isn’t the case, though. Instead, this limited and bipolar model of transatlantic community seems to have monstrously overgrown its proper boundaries and, like a synecdoche out of sorts, obscures the larger whole for which it stands.

Texts such as Martin Green’s 1977 monograph *Transatlantic Patterns: Cultural Comparisons of England with America* and Paul Giles’ more recent *Virtual Americas*: 254
Transnational Fictions and the Transatlantic Imaginary undermine the diverse richness of the transatlantic imagined community as this study conceives it, essentializing as they do the multiphonous dialogism of the space into a more limited pair of elements, namely, the US and the UK. Contrasting considerably with the comprehensive and diverse ways Paul Gilroy’s Black Atlantic and this dissertation construct the space, Green’s text in particular illustrates a certain amount of intellectual stagnation infecting the topic. Namely, studies such as his suggest that nearly one hundred years after Henry James expressed weariness for the comparing and contrasting of national elements typical of the “‘international’ state of mind” (Henry James to William James 213), this mindset lived well into the late twentieth century. As Giles’ monograph suggests, it exists in the twenty-first as well.

This international state of mind is not limited to the discussions of academics either. It continues to frame popular conceptions of transatlanticism as well. For example, in an extensive section entitled “A Nation Apart” a November 2003 special issue of The Economist titled Greatest Danger? Greatest Hope?: Special Issue on America pursues a path of inquiry remarkably similar to Green’s by analyzing, comparing, and contrasting the differences and similarities between the contemporary United States and the European Union. While it is a limited version of the one this dissertation aspires to discuss, such a recent and widely distributed (re)consideration of transatlantic community does suggest that the topic still makes for engaging, relevant, and even saleable reading in the modern day. Indeed, with the rise of globalized systems of commerce, the spread and increased dominance of American goods and culture, and as once politically, culturally, and ideologically unified organizations such as NATO search new ways to define
themselves as confederations, it seems considerations of the US-EU relationship have rarely been as pertinent as at the beginning of the twenty-first century. In fact, interest in comparing these two traditional cultural and economic power-centers of the West goes back centuries. As it is well aware, *The Economist* joins a long tradition of inquiry. Alexis de Tocqueville (whose famous impressions of America *The Economist* article relies heavily on), Charles Dickens, Mark Twain, Aldous Huxley, Umberto Eco, and Bernard-Henri Lévy—these and still other writers such as Niall Ferguson, Christopher Hitchens, and Simon Schama have tried to make sense of the European-American relationship from the eighteenth century onward into the present day. Ultimately, though, the topic of transatlantic community and even the more general topic of transatlantic relations seems staled and limited by tradition and almost half a millennium of existence.

*The Economist* article and these recent books suggest, even now in the early twenty-first century discussions of transatlanticism do not seem to have progressed much beyond the way people envisioned and framed their discussions in 1888, even though this particular quarter of the global village has changed drastically in the years since. Thus, while these discussions help emphasize the enduring currency of transatlantic community and suggest interested parties continue to see value in constructing and analyzing it as a unique space within the larger tapestry of worldwide cosmopolitanism, the conversation desperately needs a recentering else we find ourselves using an antiquated duality to understand a contemporary plurality. One task for future inquiries into the transatlantic imagined community, then, would be an adjustment in tactics, working continually toward discussions of transatlantic community and broader transatlanticism that move beyond simple comparisons and contrasts of national elements. We should work to
develop more constructive conceptual frameworks of the space and engage in more complex debates regarding the community. This is but one task among many, though. James’ vision of the transatlantic community as an Anglo-Saxon total seems to have endured alongside the tired methodology he took exception with. Appreciating the diversity of the transatlantic space, which even the Master seems to have been unable to do when compared to Nancy Cunard and Jean Rhys, is not accomplished by methodological adjustments alone, then. Conceptual adjustments are also necessary. Put simply, it is no longer appropriate to conceive of the transatlantic community as bipolar. Whether or not it was ever proper to do so is, of course, a matter for debate; but at the very latest, this dissertation puts forth evidence that since the time of Nancy Cunard and Negro the transatlantic community has been more complex and more diverse than the Anglo-Saxon totality formed by the US and Europe. Likely, it has been so for many more years. Further discussions of the transatlantic imagined community would do well, then, to define such an ambiguity and investigate the community’s eighteenth century roots more fully than the fourth chapter of this study was able to. Not only would this further articulate how the community grew out of empire and the various revolutions of the late 1700s and 1800s, such studies could also help establish the historical and inherent diversity of the transatlantic space which has been, for far too long, discussed in exclusively white, European-American terms. As this suggests, subsequent studies into the transatlantic community—whether looking back into its origins, exploring its present, or looking forward into its future—would do well to augment the presence of the West Indies and Africa in the general discussion of transatlantic community.
In the past fifty years, these traditionally marginalized and impoverished areas of the Atlantic world have asserted their aesthetic identities into the complex web of transatlanticism in especially prominent ways. And as these areas further develop their presence and influence in this community, it becomes more and more imperative to extend the sorts of questions this dissertation raises to include the established and emerging literatures of the West Indies, South America, and Africa. To the traditional voices of the Atlantic world, then, we must add these “others”: the multi-cultural and multi-racial experiences that have always been swarming about, but all too often marginalized within, the discussion of transatlanticism community. To be fair, this dissertation merely hints at the participation of such people in the transatlantic dynamic. But to vindicate it, this study does not center on the literature of the late twentieth/contemporary twenty-first century: the time in which such voices have arisen most vigorously. Rather, its primary focus is on the literary modernism of the twentieth century and the destabilized national identities inherent to this moment. Certainly, it would be worthwhile for critics to investigate the roles Negrophilia and Primitivism played within the modern transatlantic community and define the ways other minority perspectives contributed to it as well. But further studies of transatlantic community would do well do look beyond this particular timeframe and investigate the heirs of Henry James, Nancy Cunard, and Jean Rhys: Atlantic peoples of color who have, in the past half-century, found more culturally assertive modes of literary expression that have earned them a more prominent place within the transatlantic literary canon.

Helping further this idea, new research by critics such as Simon Gikandi and Charles W. Pollard draw a very clear line of development connecting European-
American modernism of the early 1900s and the literature of the emerging Atlantic world. Linking the twentieth-century dissemination of European modernism throughout the world with the rise of English-language (post)colonial literatures, Simon Gikandi suggests,

... without modernism, postcolonial literature as we know it would perhaps not exist. ... There is not much literature in the European languages in either Africa, the Caribbean, or India before the advent of Modernism. ... It is when modernism was introduced into the canon [of academic, English-language literature], sometimes reluctantly, that postcolonial creativity bloomed.

(Gikandi, “Modernism in the World” 421-22)

Gikandi suggests this “blooming” began during the 1950s with writers such as J.P. Clarke, Wole Soyinka, and Christopher Okigbo. Likewise, Jahan Ramazani argues,

... far from being an obstruction that had to be dislodged from the postcolonial windpipe, Euromodernism—in one of the great ironies of twentieth-century literary history—crucially enabled a range of non-Western poets after World War II to explore their hybrid cultures and postcolonial experience. (446)

Ramazani gives the same rough time period of influence as Gikandi, and lists many of the same writers, adding Kamau Brathwaite, Derek Walcott, and Okot p'Bitek of Uganda to the list. I would argue that a sense of transatlantic community is intrinsic to these lines of reasoning, suggesting as they do that the aesthetic and social ideologies we often associate with white, Euro-American modernism—that is, traditional “transatlantic” or “Anglo-American” modernism—actually helped create and even thrived in a much more racially and geographically diverse Atlantic space. Thus, it seems that questions such as
the following need to be addressed within the discussion of transatlanticism at-large and the more specific transatlantic community this dissertation tries to establish. Critics would doubtlessly find it fruitful to follow the leads of Gikandi, Pollard, and Ramazani and investigate the ways in which transatlantic modernists such as James, Cunard, and Rhys influenced and prepared the way for later twentieth-century writers in Europe, the US, Africa, and the West Indies. Related questions abound: in what new ways have the writers of the emerging Atlantic world imagined representations of and disseminated a sense of transatlantic community? How do these representations differ from and/or find a contiguous identity with those of their forebears? What sorts of identity paradoxes and ideological complexities, if any, necessitate the continuation of transatlantic community in the late twentieth century/early twenty-first century? Why have these writers from Africa and the West Indies looked across the Atlantic and appropriated European-American aesthetic forms and ideologies? What made these forms and ideologies appealing and, as Gikandi and Ramazani argue, even necessary for the cultural articulations of Africa and the West Indies which grew out of, in many cases, very different sorts of anxieties and preoccupations? Since so many of these figures write from a position of (post)coloniality and hope to address both the roots and legacy of Atlantic imperialism, adding late twentieth century/early twenty-first century African and West Indian writers to the discussion of transatlantic community would also help simultaneously define contrary temporal ambiguities by helping us look backward and forward at the same time: back to the growth of transatlantic community out of empire and forward to what appears to be its enduring contemporaneity.
Specifically, texts such as V.S. Naipaul’s *The Enigma of Arrival* and *A Way in the World* and Wilson Harris’ *Guyana Quartet* fixate on concerns that are themselves radical extensions of those explored in this study. As with the moderns, these texts represent geographical spaces in which tidy divisions between traditional national and cultural identities have disintegrated and become unstable. Unlike the moderns, though, who could look back to a time or who were themselves of a generation when such divisions thrived, Naipaul, Harris, and other literary figures such as poet Derek Walcott know nothing but cultural and linguistic hybridity and the conflation of radically disparate elements into inescapable cultural creoles. For the moderns, national and cultural homogeneity, even if not outright purity, were the general norm from which their own experiences of heterogeneity and quest for meta-nationality diverged. For Walcott, Harris, and Naipaul, there exists no original homogeneity from which to deviate. Cultural and aesthetic heterogeneity and the forms of compound nationality that developed in the modern moment are the accepted norm and the starting place from which to write. Therefore, unlike the modernist writers explored in this dissertation, the world of Walcott, Harris, and Naipaul is an integrated transatlantic world which has incorporated, even if not fully synthesized, the dichotomy of preceding generations into one hybridized, dialogic whole. In a phrase, these post-modern writers are inheritors of the transatlantic community their modern forbearers helped create; but the nature of the community under their watch and their perception of it is radically different. Thus, the nature of the transatlantic community under these different conditions certainly warrants further explanation, elucidation, and inquiry.
Additional late twentieth-century texts would doubtlessly prove similarly rewarding if read as representations of transatlantic community. J.M. Coetzee and Kazuo Ishiguro, for example, follow more Jamesian forms of European-American interaction and probing character introspection in their respective novels *Foe* and *The Remains of the Day*. However, as a novel concerned with both transatlantic imperialism and minority discourses as well as white, European literary culture, *Foe* could act as a sort of bridge between the work of Walcott, Harris, and Naipaul and more solidly “Anglo-Saxon” texts such as *The Remains of the Day* and even *The Golden Bowl*. Creating a textual space that includes both European and non-European national elements as well as the sorts of geographical spans one sees in *Wide Sargasso Sea* and *Negro*, *Foe* is an excellent example of a novel that imagines the Atlantic world as a community and that appropriately represents its essential diversity. *Foe* is also exceptionally meta-textual, meditating as it does on the nature of authorship and the process of narrative construction. As an imagined community rendered and disseminated by written, often narrative artifacts such as novels and newspapers, it would be worthwhile to investigate *Foe*’s meta-narrative and meta-textual elements as cogitations upon the more theoretical, narratological aspects of imagined communities in general and the transatlantic imagined community in particular. Such self-reflexive aspects also make *Foe* uniquely intriguing in the canon of transatlantic literature, representing as it does the very processes that bring imaginings of the transatlantic community into being and questioning the authority writers claim over such texts. Set in the eighteenth century, *Foe* also, like *Wide Sargasso Sea*, provides a glimpse into the earliest days of transatlantic community and its development out of empire. The novel’s timeframe also makes it a representation of the
earliest days of the novel; and as such, it would likely help answer questions critics might have about the intertwined destinies of the novel-as-genre and Andersonian nationalism.

Ishiguro’s *The Remains of the Day* is similar to *Foe* in that it intensively explores certain character consciousnesses and represents a community of traditional Atlantic world national groups. Set in the early twentieth century and dealing exclusively with white American and European characters, though, the novel is more limited in this way than the diverse works of Walcott, Harris, Naipaul, and Coetzee. However, these concerns also give it an acute relevance to the concerns raised in this dissertation and make it an inviting subject for building models (albeit more traditional, primarily Anglo-Saxon ones) of transatlantic community. In fact, the novel’s preoccupations with national identity, the cultural chiasmus I outline in chapter two, and Jamesean forms of Anglo-Saxon totality might suggest *The Remains of the Day* is improperly absent from this study. But while the temporality and concerns of its narrative are distinctly modern, it was published in 1989. Since this dissertation looks at the reception of *The Golden Bowl, Negro, and Wide Sargasso Sea* in the context of earlier modernist moments, *The Remains of the Day* was likely published too late to find a fully compatible partnership with these other texts. The essential methodology I set out, though, could be used in an additional study of Ishiguro’s novel. Applying the sort of reading to Ishiguro’s novel that I apply to *The Golden Bowl, Negro, and Wide Sargasso Sea* would doubtlessly prove fruitful as *The Remains of the Day* is, without a doubt, the most direct later twentieth-century representation of transatlantic community as this study outlines it. As such, applying this study’s model of transatlantic community to *The Remains of the Day* would allow critics to discover, through its contemporary reviews, the nature of representing, receiving, and
disseminating the transatlantic community in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The very fact that a writer would, in the 1980s, look back on the modern manifestation of this community and find so great a success in doing so suggests something about the enduring relevance of this community and, possibly, about the way it was remembered and represented in the late twentieth century. In this way, The Remains of the Day could help define something essential about the way in which the community operated in the 80s and 90s, whether as a dependent, nostalgic recreation of the past or as an empowered, authentic version in its own right that is merely acutely conscious of its past. Finally, because of the sorts of issues it raises about the relationship of modernism to that which followed it, Ishiguro’s novel also seems to further support certain arguments mentioned in this study, namely those of Susan Stanford Friedman, Simon Gikandi, Wai Chee Dimock, that hold the traditional boundaries of modernism are too exclusive and too rigid. Indeed, the narrative of The Remains of the Day is so appropriate to the concerns of this study and its thematic concerns so precisely modern that critics could be forgiven for interpreting it as a work of classical modernism as it is, at the very least, a uniquely precise representation of it. In this way, it and Wide Sargasso Sea share a certain sensibility, challenging as they do critical models of modern temporality and retroactively claiming a place in the canon of traditional literary modernism.

There are myriad other ways in which critics could extend the core concerns of this dissertation. Certainly, there are additional late-twentieth/early twenty-first-century novels that exude a sense of transatlantic community. A recent article in Modern Fiction Studies, for example, argues that the 2004 Thomas Pynchon novel Mason & Dixon negotiates models of Atlantic collectivity similar to the ones developed in this study.
There are also particular aspects of this dissertation that could be filled out. For example, I have merely hinted at the ways in which James, Cunard, and Rhys thought of themselves as transatlantic nationals, preferring instead to study the textual skein of this particular imagined community. It would be interesting and worthwhile to further explore the letters, diaries, and other personal literature of such figures and discover the ways in which James, Cunard, Rhys, and other transatlantic modernists viewed themselves as members of the transatlantic imagined community. But while this conclusion has focused on these types of literary topics, the life of this community infuses and draws from several other discourses as well. Thus, I want to close with two broader ways in which I think critics could engage with this dissertation’s model of transatlantic community.

First, as I mention in chapter three, there are certain political developments in the Atlantic world such as the Atlantic Charter which are not literary per se but nevertheless can be interpreted as textual and political representations of transatlantic community. Blending political science, history, literary studies, and other disciplines, one could read this historical paper trail using documents from Atlantic history as further evidence that the US, Europe, Africa, and the West Indies have traditionally imagined themselves as a community. Charting the development of and generational differences between these manifestations back to the origins of Andersonian nationalism would, of course, be a worthwhile part of such a study. At its essence, though, this form of investigation would extend our notions of what constitutes an object of literary analysis and challenge our notions of mimesis. Putting political documents such as the Atlantic Charter under literary scrutiny and analyzing them as a representational imaginings of something larger, even making symbols of them, are acts of aestheticization. They extend our very notions
of what "literature" actually is. More specific to the aims of this dissertation, analyzing
the political and historical record of Atlantic charters, correspondences, treaties, bills of
sale, and any number of other legal, political, and commercial documents would expand
the body of textual imaginings that represent and disseminate the transatlantic community
Like the contemporary reviews I examine, doing so would also help establish the social
totality of the community, broadening it from the domain of aesthetes and intellectuals to
include the "everyday" world of politics, business, and general public life. Related socio-
political investigations of the transatlantic imagined community would include questions
about the UN and the growth of similar international confederacies. I mention NATO
earlier in the chapter, and another example would of course be the now defunct League of
Nations. One could investigate whether such international "nations"—compound,
unfinalizable, and dialogic communities composed of traditional national unities like the
transatlantic nation I outline—grow out of anxieties similar to those that formed the
modern transatlantic community? Were they all symptoms of the same historical moment
or did the transatlantic imagined community provide these others with an inspiring and
generative legacy out of which to develop themselves? How have confederations like the
UN and NATO represented and disseminated themselves? Addressing the wider, socio-
political web of which the transatlantic nation was a part, it seems plausible the imagined
community this dissertation identifies and analyses is actually a part of a larger trend of
national instability and international alliances that arose in the twentieth century world.
During high and later modernism, this meant World War confederations such as the
Allied, Central, and Axis powers wherein nations began to envision themselves not only
as isolated nation-states but also as communities of complex international alliances grouped around common causes and against common enemies.

Finally, there is one additional in way in which critics could develop the notion of transatlantic community beyond traditional literary analysis. Investigating the textual means by which the transatlantic imagined community represents and circulates itself has lead me to believe that during the twentieth century a transatlantic publishing industry and marketplace developed within the larger transatlantic community. As modernism circulated ideas and texts broadly in the Atlantic world and the idea of transatlantic community began to assert itself, the populations of that Atlantic world clearly began to demand textual artifacts that represented their sense of community and that helped textually bridge their geographical gaps. The business of publishing seems to have responded to such demands by producing texts of a transatlantic nature. Additionally, many publishers made business adjustments that moved their firms away from various regionalisms and toward transatlantic business models. It was during this period that the great contemporary Western publishing houses such as Simon & Schuster, Random House, Penguin, and HarperCollins took shape via various European-American mergers and acquisitions. Such unions and the transatlantic business collectives they formed allowed these publishers to set up offices all around the Atlantic world and, in a very real way, build themselves into the transatlantic (rather than English or American) publishing houses we know today. The correlation between these business shifts and the transatlantic imagined community has yet to be determined, of course, but it is clear that as they merged, these publishers began to produce works that are palpably transatlantic. I hint at the presence of such texts and the transatlantic publishing community elsewhere in the
dissertation. In chapter two, for example, I mention the work of critics Michael Anesko, Sara Blair, and Michael Lund, all of whom have put forth the idea that Henry James’ *fin de siècle* prose created an internationalist (by which they mean “transatlantic”) genre distinguishable by its preoccupation with European-American interactions. Chapter two also discusses ways in which Henry James’ fiction participated in and hastened the solidification of the European-American publishing industry into one community of copyright protection and publishing imprints. This trend seems to have been so well established that the transatlantic publishing community and marketplace existed well into the later part of the twentieth century. As I mention in the fourth chapter, in the 1960s publisher Andre Deutsch seems to have conceived of the transatlantic space as a single literary marketplace bound by similar literary concerns for which he produced transatlantic texts. Publishers, in turn, were eager to circulate and produce these sorts of narratives for Atlantic-world readers. With its portraits of Americans roving about Europe (and even Africa in Ernest Hemingway’s case) the entire canon of Lost Generation literature—including the popular works of Hemingway, Scott Fitzgerald, and Gertrude Stein—could be read as productions of this transatlantic publishing marketplace. Similar geographies and themes infuse the works of Paul Bowles, Saul Bellow, and William S. Burroughs, especially novels such as *Sheltering Sky* (1949), *The Adventures of Augie March* (1953), and *Naked Lunch* (1959).

Moreover, there are more than a few instances of periodicals that represent and disseminate the notion of transatlantic community, suturing the intellectual space of the Atlantic world into a single collective. In the introduction, I mention contemporary scholarly journals such as *Symbiosis, Journal of Transatlantic Studies*, and *Atlantikos;*
and there are likely others as well. Even though they more or less focus exclusively on
the connections between the US and Europe, there are also several belletristic monthlies
that try to connect the writers and culture of the Atlantic world into a single textual space.
This in turn suggests that writers, readers, and publishers perceive the Atlantic world as a
single, rather than divided, intellectual and aesthetic region. In many cases, the very titles
and editorial goals of these periodicals bear evidence of this unity. Examples would
include *The Atlantic [Monthly]*, *The Paris Review* (based in New York), Ford Maddox
Ford’s *The Transatlantic Review*, and the second incarnation of the same title published
from 1959-77 in New York and London. Such periodicals offer readers a wide swath of
material from both the US and Europe; and in so doing, they stand as representations of a
key ideology. Namely, they suggest the essential dialogism of two sides of the Atlantic
world and imply the literatures produced in each region belong in the same textual space.
As such, they bear further evidence of the transatlantic publishing industry and, like
certain novels and newspapers, help the Atlantic world textually represent, market, and
circulate its sense of itself as an imagined community.

Perhaps nothing visually represents this community so well as the publishing
device of Ford’s *Transatlantic Review*. This device was printed on the cover of each of
the twelve issues, atop the table of contents, and depicts a rising wave on the verge of
cresting right. Running in the opposite direction, there is a small sailboat rising along the
wave’s right side from an unseen trough toward the wave’s crest. Arcing along the top
left side of the circle containing this scene is the word *FLUCTUAT*: the third-person
singular of the Latin verb *fluctuare* in the present tense and active voice. This verb
translates variously as “to be wave-like,” “to move up and down.” Extended into the
realm of symbolism, it can mean “to be tossed about” or “to waver.” (The English adoption of this verb is of course fluctuate.) The Latin verb also hearkens to the motto of the city of Paris: “FLVCTVAT NEC MERGITVR”: that is, “tossed by the waves, she does not sink” or, more literally, “floating and not sinking.” One can reasonably interpret this device in any number of ways, then; but as it concerns this study, I think Ford’s publishing device can be read as a graphical representation of the transatlantic imagined community. As the introduction discusses, this community is organized around a space of “perpetual movement” and delineated by a porous “border of mystery” (Woolf, The Voyage Out xii; Woolf to Clive Bell 356). Clearly, the boat in Ford’s device is on the move in a similarly ambiguous watery frontier. But the boat remains afloat and undeterred in such a space. In the same way, the transatlantic community has maintained and continues to maintain itself against considerable geographical challenges. Riding high along a great wave, the boat like the community it represents finds ways to assert itself and ways to endure. Moreover, like the various instances of print capitalism imagining and disseminating the transatlantic community, boats are agents of connections, of communication, of delivery. Before the age of air travel and long-distance communications and well into the twentieth century, they were the primary means by which cultures connected across the Atlantic. Boats such as the one depicted in Ford’s device, allowed for transatlantic dialogue and unity in the same way the transatlantic imagined community and its textual lifeblood historically have. As concerns this study, I argue that in the early and middle twentieth century certain individuals tossed about in a tempest of destabilized national identity formed a new sort of collective to counter the storm and reorganize the historically integrated Atlantic world. And out of
the fragmented national identities and destructive national politics of their day, these transatlantic moderns used literature to create community from chaos.
While we are both clearly sanguine about the future of the transatlantic relationship, both Laura M. Stevens and I accept it is in a state of transition. Echoing my own sentiments in the main text, Stevens writes, “Although the importance of this ocean to the regions that surround it is obvious, this focus also has ironic resonance with the current political landscape, in which Euro-American relations are less certain than they have been since World War II. It makes sense that a collective scrutiny of the Atlantic as a site of intercultural circulation would occur as events including the meltdown of diplomatic relations preceding the recent invasion of Iraq have shown that the firm Euro-American alliances of the Cold War cannot be taken for granted” (“Transatlanticism Now,” American Literary History 16.1 [2004]: 94).


See Stacey Olster, “A ‘patch of England, at a three-thousand-mile off-set’? Representing America in Mason & Dixon,” Modern Fiction Studies 50:2 (Summer 2004): 283-302. As chapter four does with Wide Sargasso Sea, Olster positions the Pynchon novel as a portrait of national development out of imperial subjugation. This article is also noteworthy for its progressive avoidance of the sorts of comparisons and contrasts inherent to the international state of mind. By including considerations of slave and Native American cultures, he also avoids making the study too narrowly Anglo-Saxon, diversifying the nascent American national space that Mason and Dixon work their way through in an appropriately multi-cultural way.

As the main text suggests, there have been two major journals published entitled The Transatlantic Review. The first was published by Ford Madox Ford in 1924 and the second by Joseph F. McCrindle from 1959-77. For information on the former, see Bernard J. Poli, Ford Madox Ford and The Transatlantic Review (Syracuse: Syracuse UP, 1967). For information on the latter, see McCrindle’s introductions to Stories from the Transatlantic Review (London : Gollancz, 1970), i-xi and Behind the Scenes: Theater and Film Interviews from the Transatlantic Review (Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1971), i-x.
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