INTRODUCTION

1. For contemporary conceptions of the Bildungsroman, see Moretti ch. 1; and Fraiman ch. 1. For a recent discussion of the origins of the term “Bildungsroman” that emphasizes its historical association with cosmopolitanism and modernity, see Boes. On the Bildungsroman in the European context, see, in addition to Hirsch, Bakhtin ch. 4; and Moretti. For a recent critique of the Bildungsroman tradition in a global framework, see Slaughter, particularly ch. 2.

2. For the Bildungsroman as a genre of women’s literature, see, e.g., Abel, Hirsch, and Langland; and Fuderer for a bibliography through 1990. For a reevaluation of distinctions between male and female Bildungsromane, see L. Ellis, particularly ch. 1.

3. Two prominent nineteenth-century examples of novels of formation with male protagonists—Dickens’s *David Copperfield* (1849–50) and *Great Expectations* (1860–61)—are exceptions that paradoxically support such a claim: the protagonists of these two novels are, if not consistently feminized, at least frequently placed in feminized positions. Dickens’s narrative voice always assumes a mixed (male and female) audience, and there is little in David or Pip’s psychological trajectories of susceptibility to manipulation, social anxiety, and hopeless love that would debar identification from a conventionally feminine point of view.

4. The boundary between novels of courtship and novels of formation, particularly early in the nineteenth century, is not rigid, and *Pride and Prejudice* is, in fact, often discussed as an example of the female Bildungsroman, perhaps because of the relative many-sidedness with which Elizabeth Bennett and her relationships are represented, compared to a courtship heroine such as Pamela or Frances Burney’s Evelina. Susan Fraiman, for example, takes the novel as presenting the suppression or undoing of development: Elizabeth Bennett’s apparent progress toward a triumphant romantic ending is shadowed by “a darker, downward vector: the narrative that passes Elizabeth from one father to another and, in doing so, takes her from shaping judgments to being shaped by
them” (63). I am not entirely persuaded, however, that Fraiman’s examples of Elizabeth’s “humiliation” at the hands of patriarchy outweigh the impression left by Elizabeth’s ability to compel Darcy to propose not once but twice; to continue her “lively, sportive manner of talking” to him (Austen 297) until almost the novel’s last page; and to feel quite undiluted “delight” in attaining at last “all the comfort and elegance of their family party at Pemberley” (294). In other words, it seems to me to make as much sense to read *Pride and Prejudice* as a positive exemplar of the category of the novel of courtship as to read it as a negative example of the novel of formation.

5. James acknowledges the precedence of Shakespeare and of George Eliot but insists that their heroines are “typical, none the less, of a class difficult, in the individual case, to make a centre of interest” and that the “slimness” of their heroines are “never suffered to be sole ministers of [the work’s] appeal, but have their inadequacy eked out with comic relief and underplot, as the playwrights say, when not with murders and battles and the great mutations of the world” (11).

6. Identification has been more systematically theorized as a viewer experience within psychoanalytic film theory, especially in the work of feminist film theorists such as Laura Mulvey, Mary Ann Doane, and Kaja Silverman. Such work recognizes and builds on the spectacular immediacy of the experience of visual identification as well as the centrality of the visual in Freudian and Lacanian scenes of identification—the child’s vision of the parents’ genitals as representing what it has or lacks or of its own autonomy figured in the mirror. As I have already suggested above, however, identification is the subject and mainspring of verbal as well as visual narrative (including verbal narratives of visual scenes).

7. For the “mock reader,” see Gibson; for the “narratee” see Prince; for the “implied reader,” see Iser 27–38.

8. According to Ross Chambers, reading is “transactional” in the sense that it is produced by a relationship of exchange between reader and narrative: “in that it mediates exchanges that produce historical change, it is transactional, too, in that this functioning is in itself dependent on an initial contract, an understanding between the participants in the exchange as to the purposes served by the narrative function” (8). On the basis of this transaction, narrative is not hermetic but “has the power to change human situations” (7), and its study cannot only be formal or structural but “must open eventually onto ideological and cultural analysis of these enabling agreements” (9)—an obligation to which narratological theorists have increasingly acceded since these words were written in the early 1980s.

9. See also Schweickart: “Does the text control the reader, or vice versa? For David Bleich, Norman Holland, and Stanley Fish, the reader holds controlling interest. Readers read the poems they have made. . . . At the other pole are Michael Riffaterre, Georges Poulet, and Wolfgang Iser, who acknowledge the creative role of the reader, but ultimately take the text to be the dominant force. To read, from this point of view, is to create the text according to its own promptings” (36).

10. The passage of time, of course (perhaps this is what Rabinowitz means by “historical situation”), also separates audience members from each other and from the author’s ability to have a “firm knowledge of the actual readers who will pick up his or her book.” Rabinowitz later discusses temporal “problem[s] of recovery” (33–34).

11. Spivak writes of *Frankenstein*: “Within the allegory of our reading, the place of both the English lady [i.e., Margaret Saville, the narrative’s internal addressee] and the unnamable monster are left open by this great flawed text. It is satisfying for a postcolonial reader to consider this a noble resolution for a nineteenth-century novel” (909).
Comparison between two iterations of a narrative may also, of course, privilege chronological priority, the original over the adaptation. See J. Sanders 32–41 for a discussion of adaptation, originality, and plagiarism in contemporary literature.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Many readers—most of them women, many of them writers—have written about their attachment to Little Women and particularly to Jo March. See, e.g., the essays in Alberghene and Clark. See also Sicherman 246–47, 256–64.

2. “Cathectic” refers to “the fact that a certain amount of psychical energy is attached to an idea or to a group of ideas, to a part of the body, to an object, etc.” (LaPlanche and Pontalis 62). Schwartz’s “psychical energy” is directed here both to the ideas for which Little Women stands (authorship) and to the object that embodies them (the book itself).

3. For a reading of a “pedagogic erotics” based on identification within Little Women, see Kent 43–59.

4. On eighteenth- and nineteenth-century women readers, see also Badia and Phegley.

5. See Heller 94–114 for a discussion of Hazlitt’s emphasis on imagination, particularly imaginative identification with fictional and dramatic characters; and 43–45 for a discussion of Coleridge’s view of the pedagogical value of imaginative literature and literary identification.

6. On connections between sympathy and melodramatic spectacle in nineteenth-century literature, see Jaffe. See Warhol for a recent analysis and defense of affective reading and film-viewing in the sentimental and melodramatic tradition.

7. For a complex analysis of the “countermovement of desire within Eliot’s central characters that can be seen to divert them from any orientation to others at all, and to turn them irrevocably inward instead” (117)—that is, partly, the difficulty for those characters of achieving and maintaining sympathy—see Kucich ch. 2.

8. Ablow has a different reading of the ethical situation brought about by the pain of identification that accompanies sympathy, for both characters and readers, in The Mill on the Floss. She suggests that “Maggie’s understanding [of Lucy’s and Philip’s pain] is made wholly unselfish by her consciousness of having caused it. This consequence is almost unbearably painful. Yet it is also deeply ethical” (88); similarly, Eliot’s “willingness to accept responsibility for Maggie’s fate constitutes the ethically valuable position, binding the novelist to both the character and the reader by bonds of remorse” (3).

9. The early twentieth century also saw the popularization in English aesthetics, through the writing of Vernon Lee, of the term “empathy,” from the German “Einfühlung,” to describe a reader’s or viewer’s affective investment in a work of art. Currently, “empathy” is a term used in a variety of contexts in philosophy and psychology; for an account of its uses, see Keen ch. 1.

10. On Freud’s emphasis on oral incorporation and cannibalism as an expression of and figure for certain primary identifications, and later in Lacan, see Barzilai 115–21.

11. See Mitchell pt. 1 for a discussion of the distinction between drive-related and relational origins.

12. Brooks argues for the importance of “Freud’s progressive discovery of the transference, which brings into play the dynamic interaction of the teller and listener of and to stories, the dialogic relation of narrative production and interpretation.” This consider-
atation, Brooks suggests, “should . . . help us complicate, and refine, versions of narrative analysis that do not take account of the relations of tellers and listeners” (50). While transference, and the figure of the analyst, fall outside the scope of my reading, I share Brooks’s emphasis on the “dialogic relation of narrative production and interpretation.”

13. On Freud’s disavowal of literary technique, see Fuss 4–5; and Jacobus 197–204.

14. Often Freud resolves such circularities by assigning their elements to hierarchical locations within a developmental narrative, so that, for example, a confusion between identification and object-choice is “primitive”: “At the very beginning, in the individual’s primitive oral phase, object-cathexis and identification are no doubt indistinguishable from each other” (EI 23). See Butler for an argument that the “dispositions” are effects of an unacknowledged prior social prohibition on homosexual desire (Gender Trouble 57–65).

15. For discussions, with differing emphases, of the ideologically normalizing tendency and logical instability of the classical opposition between identification and desire, see (in addition to Fuss, cited above) Butler, Gender Trouble 35–78 and Bodies 93–119 and 239–40; Sedgwick, Tendencies 73–103; Kent 7–15 and passim. See Sinfield for a taxonomy of the possible combinations produced by keeping in place the binarisms of male/female, gay/straight, and identification/desire while freeing them from any necessary relation to each other.

16. See Woolf, Death of the Moth 176–86. For a discussion of how Woolf herself is represented within the middlebrow “Great Books” culture of the mid-twentieth-century United States, see Silver 68–78.

17. Brantlinger locates the beginning of this cultural conflict between visual and written narrative earlier, in the first couple of decades of the twentieth century, when “the cinema . . . was just coming into its own. Cultural critics of various ideological persuasions lined up to prophesy that this new technology of entertainment . . . would mean the death of reading, of literacy, and of the wholesome book-culture of the past. The activity of novel-reading, which to many diagnosticians of cultural disease had seemed so dangerous to the mental health of the reading public from the 1700s down to [Virginia Woolf’s famous date] ‘December, 1910,’ and sometimes beyond, now seemed benign and even healthful to those who looked upon movies as toxic. Exactly the same arguments would be repeated, of course, about television” (209–10).

18. Keen reviews contemporary psychological and neuroscientific research on empathy in ch. 1, and the limited empirical studies of empathy toward others as a result of reading in ch. 3.

19. This suspicion of the ideological functioning of identification is often part of a more general suspicion of the ideological function of fictional realism. In this analysis, in Harry Shaw’s summary, “realist representation is said to be naively transparent and malignantly totalistic. . . . The realist attempt to represent the complexities of a given historical moment turns out to be simply an attempt to ‘naturalize’ that moment, to make its working seem part of nature, not culture, to deny that it is a product of contingent historical forces” (9; emphasis in original). Readerly identification with fictional characters, ratifying the representation and “reality” of their experience, enhances the “natural[ized]” representation and thus the denial of historical agency.

20. On Brecht’s dramatic theory and his opposition to Lukács, see Eagleton 63–72. For examples of the mistrust of identification, see Brecht 91–99. Brecht is cited as the “first Marxist theorist” to focus on the “identification effect” (89) by Balibar and Macherey; for a similar analysis applying specifically to English realist fiction, see Gagnier, 163–73, also discussed below.
21. Williams’s readings of the way this “negative identification” plays out for Victorian authors are nevertheless more sympathetic than condemning. See ch. 5, on industrial novels, and 175–79 on Gissing.

22. For the mixed nineteenth-century responses to Daniel Deronda, see Carroll 360–447.

CHAPTER TWO

1. See Barzilai ch. 2 for an overview of the argument of this essay.

2. The novel’s displacement of moral significance was evident, and distressing, to many Victorian reviewers. “What does it all come to except that human life is inexplicable, and that women who feel this find the feeling painful?” wonders the Saturday Review’s reviewer uncomfortably (Carroll 117); Sir Edward Bulwer-Lytton finds that “this remarkable writer does not enough weigh what is Agreeable or Disagreeable” (Carroll 121); and the popular novelist Dinah Mulock Craik asks “What good [the novel] will do?—whether it will lighten any burdened heart, help any perplexed spirit, comfort the sorrowful, succour the tempted, or help bring back the erring into the way of peace . . . ?” (Carroll 156).

3. For an exhaustive account of Eliot’s allusions to Corinne, see Moers ch. 9. For a reading of Corinne as “a feminist text engaged with issues of subjectivity as process” see Miller 165; for a reading of Corinne as “openly celebrat[ing] the value of European book culture,” see Peterson 80. Peterson also analyzes representations of the “reader protagonist” (3) in some nineteenth-century English and French novels, including The Mill on the Floss and Jane Eyre. For her discussion of reading as a “process of identification [which] constitutes a fantasy process in which readers shape, change, and adapt the text, sometimes even rewrite it, until it can meet and deal with their wishes and fears so that their fantasies may ultimately be gratified,” in both real-life readers and reader-protagonists, see 29–36.

4. For a reading of The Mill on the Floss as more straightforwardly a revenge fantasy on Maggie’s behalf, see Moers 266–67.

5. Peterson notes that in her childhood reading of illustrated religious books such as The History of the Devil, “Maggie’s tendency is to split herself in two and to identify with each of the main characters in the picture” (190).

6. For a discussion of the brother–sister relationship as a template for nineteenth-century representations of heterosexual relations, see V. Sanders, particularly 101–3 for The Mill on the Floss.

7. On their first occasion alone, Maggie takes Stephen’s arm, as the narrator suggests that “there is something strangely winning to most women in that offer of a firm arm” (408). Later, the “winning” effect will be reversed, as a reverie on “the beauty of a woman’s arm” (441) ends with Stephen “dart[ing] towards [Maggie’s] arm, and shower[ing] kisses on it” (442). For discussions of the erotic significance of the arm in the novel, see Homans, “Maggie’s Arm,” particularly 175–77; and Ramel.

8. The full coincidence of novelistic with romantic closure in the nineteenth-century novel—a completely achieved “marriage plot”—is surprisingly rare in the nineteenth-century novel, and its incidence diminishes as the century advances. The subdued projected union of Lucy and Stephen in The Mill on the Floss anticipates, for example, the completely disenchanted return of Grace Melbury to her unfaithful husband, Fitzpiers, some thirty years later, at the end of Hardy’s novel The Woodlanders (1887). In a more
comic mode of deflation, Margaret Oliphant’s *Phoebe, Junior* (1876) concludes with its heroine rejecting the interesting suitor to whom she is romantically attracted in favor of a dull but respectable young man through whom she will be able to fulfill her political, rather than romantic, ambitions.

9. In addition to Maggie and Lucy and Romola and Tessa, variations of this pattern occur with Dinah Morris and Hetty Sorel in *Adam Bede* (1859); and with Dorothea Brooke and Rosamund Vincy in *Middlemarch* (1871–72). In *Adam Bede*, Dinah’s renunciations (first of worldly ambition in her preaching, then of spiritual ambition when her sect bans women preachers) enable her to take over the elements of the marriage plot—Adam’s love and a reproductive future—from Hetty, whose selfish desires bring her exile and death. In *Middlemarch*, Dorothea and Rosamond both survive and marry, but Dorothea’s renunciations (of her inheritance from Casaubon and of her intellectual ambitions) earn her romantic love and authorial approval, while Rosamond becomes Lydgate’s vampiric “basil plant” (680). Further, Eliot maintains a difference of physical, reflective of moral, scale between the monumentalized protagonist and her infantilized counterpart: Dinah “appears above the middle height for a woman” and is first presented preaching, whereas Hetty, churning butter, has “a beauty like that of kittens, or very small downy ducks making gentle rippling noises with their soft bills, or babies just beginning to toddle and to engage in conscious mischief” (*Adam Bede* 83); similarly, Romola is Titianesque beauty, with hair “of a reddish gold colour, enriched by an unbroken small ripple, such as may be seen in the sunset clouds on grandest autumnal evenings” (*Romola* 93), first seen engaged in reading to her father, while Tessa is introduced with emphasis on her “blue baby-eyes” and “baby face” as she offers milk and bread to Tito Melema (68, 69).

10. Showalter writes, in 1980, “In the 1970s, Eliot became the most difficult and controversial figure for feminist literary criticism, the focus of a troubled anger that testifies to her lively and enduring reputation and to the cycles of projection and rejection that have been part of her critical history” (299). See also Ablow 71n7 for references to feminist critical responses to Eliot.

11. McLaughlin offers a straightforwardly biographical reading of the novel; Homans (*Bearing the Word* ch. 6) analyzes, from a psychoanalytic point of view, the connections among Eliot’s representations of the brother-sister relationship in *The Mill on the Floss* and the “Brother and Sister” sonnet sequence, Eliot’s reading of Wordsworth, and her own sense of literary authority; Carlisle, “Autobiography as Discourse,” argues that “the further the novel moves from the facts of Eliot’s life, the more genuinely it becomes autobiography” (179); and Peterson suggests that while “autobiographical in spirit” (182), *The Mill on the Floss* also draws inspiration in plot and character from the writing of George Sand.

12. For a discussion of Beauvoir’s ambivalence, if not naiveté, on the question of representation, see Angelfors 66.

13. For the sake of clarity and to avoid collapsing the represented with the writing subject, I will refer to the author and the first-person narrator of *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter* as “Beauvoir,” and her protagonist, the younger self whose story she tells, as “Simone.”

14. On Beauvoir’s identification with Eliot, see also Showalter 299–302. For an argument that Beauvoir’s adult commitment to Existentialism retrospectively shapes her representation of her childhood, see Moi 26–30.

15. Beauvoir uses pseudonyms for some characters in *Memoirs of a Dutiful Daughter*. Zaza’s family name, given by Beauvoir as “Mabille,” is Lacoin.
16. On Beauvoir’s repeated attempts to tell Zaza’s story, see Angelfors 64–66 and Beauvoir, *Prime of Life* 121–23 and 269.

17. In fact Simone has several earlier, briefer introductions to the dark girl/blond rival plot, first when as a child she sees a film, *Le Roi de Camargue* (1921; dir. André Hugon), in which the hero is engaged to “a sweet blonde heroine, a simple peasant girl” whom he deserts for a “lovely dark gipsy” (MDD 53, 54), and later when, reading *Little Women*, she discovers “the news of Laurie’s marriage to Jo’s young sister, Amy, who was blonde, vain, and stupid. . . . The man I loved and by whom I thought I was loved had betrayed me for a little goose of a girl” (104–5).

18. On the complex ways in which this reference “act[s] as a break upon the engine of heterosexual romance” see Cohen 157–58.

19. On George Eliot’s trajectory from anonymity to revelation of her identity to the creation of “George Eliot,” see Bodenheimer ch. 5.

20. For an overview and discussion of Beauvoir’s representations of lesbianism, see Simons. Melanie Hawthorne places Beauvoir’s own same-sex attachments in the context of her pedagogical persona (*Contingent Loves* 55–83). For Beauvoir’s own representations, see *Letters to Sartre*; for her categorical denial of engaging in lesbian relationships, see Schwarzer 112.

21. A. Hughes argues that Sartre replaces Zaza as “a partner in a mirror-relationship” who takes on the status of the phallic mother (129).

22. In Beauvoir’s French, Zaza does not “seem” to gaze reproachfully at Simone, but simply does so: “elle me regardait avec reproche [she was looking at me reproachfully]” (503; my translation).

23. Beauvoir “published essays, organized and directed the Comité pour Djamila Boumphie, and was the co-author, with Halimi, of a book that sought to expose the young woman’s torture while condemning the general brutalities of the colonial situation” (Caputi 120). See also Beauvoir and Halimi, introduction and app. A.

24. For a less sympathetic discussion of Beauvoir’s relationship to a national and racial other, see Staedtler-Djédji, who concludes that “the descriptions of Simone de Beauvoir in *La Force des Choses* I reflect a certain resentment in the face of the reality of Africa, but also a total absence of intercultural communication” (215; my translation).

25. On the publication travails and history of *Nervous Conditions*, see Zwicker 3–8.

26. See S. Gallagher and Willey and Treiber for discussions of the novel’s rapid absorption into pedagogical canons in the United States. For examples of criticism that combines feminist and postcolonialist emphases, see, e.g., Zwicker, Andrade, Willey, and Androne, all in Willey and Treiber; see also Young, ch. 4. See Mule; and Andrade for readings of *Nervous Conditions* as within the conventions of the Bildungsroman. See Primorac on Zimbabwean fiction and its contexts, esp. 104–17 for her reading of *Nervous Conditions*.


28. The Southern Rhodesia Literature Bureau was created in 1954 for the publication of literature in two languages, Shona and Ndebele. According to Simon Gikandi in the *Encyclopedia of African Literature*, “Predominantly mission-trained potential writers
attended Literature Bureau new and aspiring writers’ workshops, where they learned the ‘dos’ and ‘don’ts’ of writing literature in the political context of colonialism. . . . The rules established at these workshops led to the crystallization of a literary tradition that most Zimbabwean writers have had to reckon with. In addition, the resultant literature grew under the watchful eyes of publications officers whose job was to ensure that writers did not publish politically subversive works” (Gikandi 495).

29. In *The Three Golliwogs*, for example, the eponymous blackface dolls are named Gollie, Wollie, and Nigger. Blyton remained mainstream well into the twentieth century. In one review of a study of Blyton, two contemporary literary scholars remember reading Blyton in Angola (then Portuguese West Africa) and Zimbabwe (then Rhodesia) (Olson 294–95); another remembers receiving a copy of *The Three Golliwogs* as “a presentation copy from an English Sunday School for perfect attendance” (Olson 296). I read Blyton’s girls’ school series in England in the 1970s.

30. A *New York Times* article from 1899 on “attar of roses” recalls the days of “the grandmothers, or possibly even the great-grandmothers,” when “the slender little bottle of attar of roses flourished in all its glory,” and explains that “Bulgaria is the chief country from which comes the attar . . . while a very considerable amount is also made in Germany” (“Story of Attar of Roses” 6).

CHAPTER THREE

1. See Barzilai 81–83 for a discussion of the differences between Winnicott and Lacan in regard to the concept of mirroring.

2. For a different account of the motive and effects of Gaskell’s biography, see D’Albertis ch. 1.

3. Sharon Connor, in an essay on “loneness” in Brontë’s letters, provides a succinct summary. In the period from 1829–1855 covered by Brontë’s published letters, “There was a particular emphasis on the problem of so called ‘excess women,’ those half a million or more extra single women ‘discovered’ by the 1851 census, who were supposedly doomed never to marry. . . . Many articles and essays in the press during this period were asking questions such as ‘What shall we do with our old maids?’ and discussing the perceived problem of middle-class women who would never be able to find a husband” (91). Connor also discusses the letter to Nussey and distinguishes between “single” and “lonely” (94–95).

4. See also Berlant and Warner for a foundational argument about the destruction of intimacy, particularly queer intimacies, under the ideology of “heterormativity,” in which “intimate life” becomes “the endlessly cited elsewhere of political public discourse, a promised haven that distracts citizens from the unequal conditions of their political and economic lives, consoles them for the damaged humanity of mass society, and shames them for any divergence between their lives and the intimate sphere that is alleged to be simple personhood” (553).

5. For an analysis of the distinction between Arnold’s and Brontë’s representations of isolation, see Gilbert and Gubar 401–2. They suggest that “While male poets like Arnold express their desire to experience an inner and more valid self, Brontë describes the pain of women who are restricted to just this private realm. Instead of seeking and celebrating the buried self, these women feel victimized by it; they long, instead, for actualization in the world” (402). See also Loeffelholz 97; and Jacobus 41.
6. On the normative direction of Shirley’s conclusion, see Bodenheimer; and Gilbert and Gubar. See Wilt for arguments for a more radical interpretation of the novel’s conclusion.
7. See, e.g., the review by G. H. Lewes of Shirley (Allott 160–70).
8. See also Ferguson, “Memory” 169 and Simmons 75 for a summary of Kincaid’s references to Jane Eyre.
9. Kincaid’s statement that “it said that it was truly an African novel” presumably refers to the novel’s blurbs, since Nervous Conditions itself, as discussed in the previous chapter, makes copious reference to Tambu’s own familiarity with English literature. Different printings of the novel sport different back and front covers and copy. One Seal Press edition (c. 1988, published 2002) has a blurb from The African Times that calls the novel “Another example of a bold new national literature . . . one which bears no mimicry of European forms and experience”; a later Seal Press edition (2004) does not include this blurb.
10. Oddly, Shockley considers Kincaid and her protagonist as “African American” subjects (see 46 and passim), although Kincaid and her protagonist are both, in fact, West Indian, raised under an English colonial regime, and come to the United States only as young adults. See Yost for another analysis of Lucy’s relationship to Villette.
11. See A Small Place (1988), Kincaid’s polemical account of the contemporary situation of Antigua, as a former colony largely dependent on a tourist economy.
12. See Viswanathan, particularly the Introduction, for an influential analysis of colonialist pedagogy as hegemonic, although one focused on India. For a discussion of the effects of colonialist pedagogy specifically on women, see Katrak ch. 3.
13. The mother-daughter relationships, and particularly the implication of the mother in the transmission of colonialist ideologies, in Kincaid’s work have been frequently discussed by critics. On this relationship in Lucy, see Bouson ch. 4; and Ferguson, Where the Land Meets the Body 123–28.
14. Dangarembga plans to continue Tambu’s narrative in a third volume; see Rooney 62.
15. On Kincaid as an angry writer, see Ferguson, Land 95–96. For examples of U.S. reviews of A Small Place that discuss Kincaid’s anger, see Kakatuni, 16; and Nicholson, “The Exile’s Bitter Return” x14.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. On the connection among closetedness, coming out, knowledge, and recognition, see Sedgwick, Epistemology 3–4 and 67–90.
2. The definitions are, respectively, OED, “queer,” adj., def. 1a; def. 1, “Special Uses,” “queer theory” (n.). Despite the homonymial, punning possibilities, “queer” and “query” do not, according to OED, share etymological roots.
3. For a thorough discussion of the “versioning” of Woolf as an iconic cultural figure of the female intellectual, see Silver.
4. See, for example, Gay. The S. Ellis introduction provides a useful summary of debates over Woolf’s relationship to the Victorian period.
5. See “George Gissing” (CE 1: 297–301) and “Notes on D. H. Lawrence” (352–55).
6. Woolf’s Modernist oeuvre canonically begins with Jacob’s Room (1922), her third
novel. This emphasis can be justified by Woolf’s own estimate of Jacob’s Room as the work in which she “[has] found out how to begin (at 40) to say something in my own voice” (qtd. in Froula 63). But Woolf made a similar assertion earlier, while writing The Voyage Out: “I should say that my great change [in working on successive drafts of the novel] was in the way of courage, or conceit; and that I had given up adventuring after other people’s forms” (qtd. in Froula 22).

7. On the readerly persona of Woolf’s literary criticism, see also Dusinberre; Cuddy-Keane; and Caughie ch. 6.

8. For another analysis of Woolf’s allusiveness, see Dusinberre.

9. Helen Ambrose explicitly rejects angelic domesticity in her mentorship of Rachel: “Nor did she encourage those habits of unselfishness and amiability founded upon insincerity which are put at so high a value in mixed households of men and women” (VO 137).

10. Although Potter’s and Daldry’s films and Cunningham’s novel have all been received as queer texts, they have also all been controversial in that role. For a discussion of the reception of and an analysis of the representation of queer sexuality in Orlando, see Silver 225–34.

11. For a discussion of the internal and external pressures of Victorian sexual ideology on Woolf’s representations of lesbian sexuality, see Cramer Introduction.

12. Moore, like De Salvo, reads The Voyage Out in terms of Woolf’s imputed psychological state while writing it, as “the novel in which Woolf is least able to transform her own material, and Rachel Vinrace is her most unsuccessful creator figure” (82).

13. Moments in which Helen experiences or expresses contentment with her heterosexual role abound, often in contradistinction to the dissatisfaction of less adaptable characters. For example, St. John Hirst, represented as more actively dissatisfied with heterosexual norms (and particularly with women), remarks with some frustration as he watches Helen work at her embroidery:

“You’re absolutely happy” . . .
“Yes?” Helen enquired, sticking in her needle.
“Marriage, I suppose,” said St. John.
“Yes,” said Helen, gently drawing her needle out.
“Children?” St. John enquired.
“Yes,” said Helen, sticking her needle in again. “I don’t know why I’m happy,” she suddenly laughed, looking him full in the face. (VO 233)

While we can register Helen’s elusiveness here—she is at once the Trojan seductress (Hirst calls her “the most beautiful woman I’ve ever seen”) and Penelope, shielding her evasion of unwanted suitors behind her needlework—we have no reason to doubt her stated contentment. At the hotel dance, as well, she exhibits frank sensual pleasure—“She seemed to fade into Hewet, and they both dissolved in the crowd” (170). Helen is often elusive and not always admirable; but she is also often admired and sometimes even rudely direct. It seems to me precisely part of the “complex, multilayered style” to which Cramer refers that the reader cannot pin the narrative to any one attitude toward Helen Ambrose (or to Clarissa Dalloway or Mrs. Ramsay) nor fix Helen herself in any single attitude or identity—and this lack of fixity can itself be counted as part of Woolf’s effort to “begin to describe my own sex” (Diaries 3: 3), rather than as an effect of the repression of such an effort. See Froula 38–56 for a consideration inter alia of Helen as a “wife, mother, friend (especially of men), and complaisant mentor” to Rachel (46). For a discussion of Helen as the “Great Mother” see Moore.
14. For another reading of queer silence in the novel, in this case surrounding the character of Miss Allen, see Hunn.

15. Hirst is conventionally read as based on Lytton Strachey; see, e.g., Lee 210 and 252–54. Lee describes The Voyage Out as “euphemistic but clear about St. John’s homosexuality” (210), but I think the degree to which this meaning is “clear” might depend upon the reader.

16. Woolf sniffs, for example, that Ulysses (which the Hogarth Press declined to publish) exhibits “the conscious and calculated indecency of a desperate man who feels that in order to breathe he must break the windows. At moments, when the window is broken, he is magnificent. But what a waste of energy! And, after all, how dull indecency is, when it is not the overflowing of a super-abundant energy or savagery, but the determined and public-spirited act of a man who needs fresh air!” (“Character in Fiction” 434). On Woolf’s desire to “[tell] the truth about [her] own experiences as a body and speak the truth about [her] passions” (“Professions” 240) see Cramer introduction, 118; on her resistance to polemic, again in the context of a writer (Lawrence) particularly concerned with sexuality, see Cuddy-Keane 33. For Woolf herself as a polemicist, see J. Marcus, Art and Ardor chs. 5 and 6.

17. Important for any comparison of Hall and Woolf is the strong argument made by Jane Marcus for Woolf’s intertextual awareness of, inspiration by, and allusive inclusion of The Well in A Room of One’s Own (J. Marcus, “Sapphistory” 164–79).

18. See Barnes 91–99 for her complete discussion of the operation of sympathetic identification in Uncle Tom’s Cabin.

19. The conditions that, in the antebellum United States in the 1850s, made Uncle Tom’s Cabin an electrifying public document—the union of a broadly popular genre (the sentimental novel), a mainstream religious form (Evangelical Protestantism), and a pressing public cause (abolitionism)—did not obtain in Edwardian and Georgian England. And Hall even before the publication of The Well was hardly as persuasive a public mouthpiece as Stowe. Her persona and history—daughter of parents who separated when she was young; wealthy; Catholic; more-or-less publicly partnered with a woman separated from her husband—connoted decadence rather than respectability.

20. The publication of a several biographies of Hall, including the most sympathetic and thorough, Sally Cline’s Radclyffe Hall: A Woman Called John, makes it possible for interested readers to have those responses not only to Stephen but also to Hall herself, given her anti-Semitic and proto-fascist inclinations (see Cline 336–37 and 360–61) and the predatory and manipulative elements of her relationship, in her last years, with Evgenia Souline (see Cline pt. 5).

21. Sir Philip dies when a tree that he is cutting down falls on him (115), echoing D. H. Lawrence’s strikingly homophobic novella “The Fox” (1923), in which a falling tree kills the more butch of two women, freeing her feminine partner to marry the man who wielded the axe. (On Hall’s interest in Lawrence, see Cline 269–70.)

22. On technologies of sexuality, see Foucault, particularly 116–20. On the medicalization of lesbianism, see Chauncey; on the “construction of homosexuality” by sexology, see Weeks. For a summary of some assertions of the negative impact of sexology on women’s same-sex interactions in particular, and also the possibilities for resistance, see Doan, “Sexology’s Intervention” 199, 211.

23. Epstein, who cites Laqueur’s account of the historical development of these forms (29–30), argues that “the case report . . . produces a context around groupings of symptoms and signs and findings and articulates these data into a narrative whose goal is to move toward explanation, therapy, and resolution” (75).
24. Storr discusses another case in *Psychopathia*—that of Ilma S.—in similar terms: “Even as Krafft-Ebing records his power over Ilma, he records her resistance too. The intensity of his treatment of her is, at least in part, a response to the intensity of her refusal [to be “cured”]. . . . Indeed all of the case histories in *Psychopathia Sexualis* reveal their subjects to be not just material, unruly or otherwise, for Krafft-Ebing’s categories, but complex sites of negotiation” (23). Some of the case histories, however, reveal this complexity more clearly than others. I am not the first reader to take Sandor as the most appropriate object for Stephen’s identification: see, e.g., Prosser 158; and O’Rourke 3. But against such certainty, see Storr: “Hall does not actually tell us which chapter Stephen is reading. Even that section of chapter 4 which pertains particularly to homosexuality or ‘inversion’ is full of diverse possibilities” (12).

25. The identification is particularly apt to the extent that Stephen can be understood to have taken the place of the brother whom she was supposed to be.

26. For a discussion of the biblical narrative of Ruth and Naomi in *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit*, see Cosslett 16–20.

27. As Sally Munt notes with justified skepticism, “It is lesbian folklore that Radclyffe Hall’s life with Una Troubridge”—one of the “two women” to whom Rule refers—“was a happy one. Perhaps we tell ourselves this in order to mitigate the pain of her fictional protagonist” (206). The more complex reality, including the inauspicious beginning of the relationship with Troubridge, while Hall was living with another woman, and the unhappy ménage à trois of their last years together, is detailed in Cline’s sympathetic biography (91–126, 311–78) and in Souhami’s startlingly hostile one (79–99, 288–416).

28. See Roof, particularly chap. 4, for another discussion of the “heteronarrative” domination of fictional conventions. The arguments of both Abraham and Roof have the effect of elevating historical (for Abraham) and experimental Modernist (for Abraham and Roof) narratives over those of the domestic novel tradition that Hall belongs to. For a defense of the romance plot in lesbian narrative, see Juhasz.

29. On relations between Woolf and Winterson see also Booth.

30. Artistic manifestos date as a writer’s interests and practice change; however, the editorial content of Winterson’s website, jeanettewinterson.com, remains consistent with the positions taken in *Art Objects*.

31. Winterson aligns herself with one of Matthew Arnold’s ideological descendants, Harold Bloom, on the necessity of art (AO 5–6).

32. Winterson herself observes, “I can find little to cheer me between the publications of *Four Quartets* (1944) and Angela Carter’s *The Magic Toyshop* (1967)” (AO 41; also cited by Pykett 60n12). This notable lacuna in her self-construction has not prevented critics from analyzing her as a postmodern author; see, e.g., Doan, “Jeanette Winterson’s Sexing the Postmodern.”


34. Thanks to Elizabeth Young for pointing out the structural parallel between anagram and identification.

36. See, however, Bailey for a discussion of the role of the fairytales in Jeanette’s “narrative reconstruction” of her identity; Cosslett on Winterson’s use of the Bible, Mallory, and *Jane Eyre*; and DeLong’s Irigarayan analysis of Winterson’s figure of Tetrahedron. See also Onega ch. 1.

37. See Woolf, *Roger Fry* 33.