

the changing profession

Hemispheric Studies

RALPH BAUER

Historical Overview

WHEN, IN 1990, GUSTAVO PÉREZ FIRMAT ASKED, “DO THE AMERICAS HAVE A COMMON LITERATURE?” HE WAS RESPONDING TO A FLEDGLING

critical endeavor that had been pioneered during the previous decade in only a handful of studies, by such Latin Americanists and literary comparatists as M. J. Valdés, José Ballón, Bell Gale Chevigny, Gari Laguardia, Vera Kutzinski, Alfred Owen Aldridge, and Lois Parkinson Zamora (“Cheek” 2).¹ Although “inter-American literary studies”—the comparative investigation of the “literatures and cultures of this hemisphere” as one unit of study—seemed to Pérez Firmat “something of a terra incognita” in 1990 (“Cheek” 1–2), the hemispheric conception of American studies had originated in the United States some sixty years earlier with the Berkeley historian Herbert Eugene Bolton (1870–1953), who argued, in his seminal 1932 presidential address to the American Historical Association, for an “essential unity” in the history of the Western hemisphere (472). Although the contributing historians in Lewis Hanke’s 1964 collection of essays *Do the Americas Have a Common History?* gave this “Bolton Thesis” a decidedly mixed review, the thesis provided the inspiration for Pérez Firmat’s landmark collection and a starting point for much subsequent hemispheric scholarship. Meanwhile, inter-American studies has had a strong tradition in Europe that is, in fact, older than Pérez Firmat’s or Hanke’s collection. As early as the 1950s, the eminent Italian Americanist Antonello Gerbi was publishing his groundbreaking works in comparative hemispheric and Atlantic history, which studied the early modern polemic about the degenerative influences the New World environments had on plants, animals, and humans.² Also, Hans Galinsky, at the University of Mainz, was exploring the literature of the European discovery and aesthetic forms such as the baroque in the early Americas from a comparative perspective in the 1960s.³

In the United States, comparative inter-American scholarship saw a steady increase during the 1990s, with the publication of important works in literary criticism by Earl Fitz (*Rediscovering*), Djelal Kadir

RALPH BAUER is an associate professor of English and comparative literature at the University of Maryland, College Park. He is the author of *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures: Empire, Travel, Modernity* (Cambridge UP, 2003), the translator of *An Inca Account of the Conquest of Peru*, by Titu Cusi Yupanqui (UP of Colorado, 2005), and a coeditor of *Creole Subjects in Colonial America: Empires, Texts, Identities* (U of North Carolina P, forthcoming 2009).

(*Columbus*), Antonio Benítez Rojo (*Isla*),⁴ Renata Mautner-Wasserman (*Exotic Nations*), Lois Parkinson Zamora (*Usable Past*), Gordon Sayre (*Sauvages*), Doris Sommer (*Proceed*), and others.⁵ That decade also saw the publication of important comparative cultural and sociopolitical histories by such historians as Claudio Véliz (*New World*), Tom Sullivan (*Cowboys*), and Lester Langley (*Americas*), as well as works on inter-American relations like *Close Encounters of Empire*, edited by Ricardo Donato Salvatore, Gilbert M. Joseph, and Catherine C. LeGrand. The decisive development in hemispheric studies in the United States, however, was the “discovery” of the hemisphere by American studies in the wake of that discipline’s turn from a United States-centered multiculturalism toward a trans- and postnationalism during the 1990s.⁶ In 1991, José David Saldívar published his seminal *The Dialectics of Our America*,⁷ in which he invoked José Martí’s notion of “nuestra América” (“our America”) to connect such United States minority writers as the African American Ntozake Shange and the Chicano Arturo Islas with Latin American writers like the Colombian Gabriel García Márquez and the Cuban Alejo Carpentier. In the same year, Hortense Spillers published her edited collection *Comparative American Identities*, which gathered essays, by scholars from multiple disciplines, on marginal racial and gender identities in the United States, Canada, the Caribbean, and Central America. Programmatic calls in prominent American studies venues echoed these publications, culminating with Janice Radway’s 1998 presidential address to the American Studies Association (ASA), in which Radway urged scholars to cease using *America* as a default term for the United States and, remarkably, considered the possibility of renaming the association the Inter-American Studies Association (19).⁸

Since 2000, we have witnessed a veritable explosion of scholarly activities in hemispheric studies, including the launch of new

journals and the publication of special issues devoted to hemispheric studies in established journals,⁹ book series,¹⁰ literary anthologies,¹¹ digital archives,¹² university-based study programs,¹³ transinstitutional studies networks,¹⁴ congresses,¹⁵ seminars,¹⁶ and the formation of new professional organizations championing a hemispheric approach to American studies.¹⁷ This explosion of hemispheric scholarly activity has even led some commentators to speak of a “hemispheric turn” in American studies—a variation on Shelley Fisher Fishkin’s call for a “trans-national turn” in her 2005 presidential address to the ASA.¹⁸ This hemispheric turn has manifested itself in virtually all the subdisciplines of American literary and cultural studies, such as colonial, nineteenth-century, and twentieth-century American literature,¹⁹ as well as regional²⁰ and ethnic studies.²¹ However, it has also raised difficult disciplinary, institutional, political, and methodological questions, especially since the new research agendas in American studies have begun to intersect and overlap with those in other disciplines, such as Latin American studies, comparative literature, and especially inter-American studies as traditionally conducted both in Latin America and in the United States. For example, most literary scholarship in inter-American studies had typically been comparative in methodology and based in comparative literature or Latin American studies programs. By contrast, the “new” hemispheric American studies was largely based in English or American studies departments; was methodologically rooted in (multi)cultural studies and postcolonial theory, with their emphasis on questions of race and ethnicity; and was focused primarily on the United States in a hemispheric context, especially the relation of its borders to ethnic minorities in the United States (mainly Latinas and Latinos). Since it would be impossible to consider all the unwieldy facets of this recent hemispheric turn in this essay, I would like to focus on a few

questions in detail and then briefly consider some of the recent directions in hemispheric studies.²² I will emphasize literary scholarship rather than sociological and historical studies with a hemispheric orientation.

The “Hemispheric Turn” in American Studies

Earl Fitz has recently noted that “though we have seen interest in the Inter-American project wax and wane through the years, we are now living in a time when, for a variety of reasons, interest in Inter-American relations suddenly looms larger and more urgent than it ever has before” (“Inter-American Studies” 13). The various reasons for this sudden energy in hemispheric studies reflect different disciplinary perspectives. Generally, however, it seems safe to say that the recent hemispheric turn in American studies manifests the larger move toward trans- or postnational perspectives across the humanities, commencing during the 1980s with the postcolonial critiques of the modern nation-state as an ideological or “imagined” construct of Western capitalist culture based on imperial or neocolonial forms of economic exploitation.²³ As a variant of the recent transnational turn in American studies, though, the hemispheric approach, in its assertions (or assumptions) of affinities or parallelisms among the histories and cultures of the New World, has occasioned more than one uneasy reflection on political grounds. Some observers have been quick to discern a United States imperialist or neocolonialist agenda for the Americas behind this critical impulse, connecting it with the North American Free Trade Agreement, the proposed Free Trade Area of the Americas, and economic domination of Latin America by the United States in the name of globalization. The hemispheric approach has been suspected of complicity with a mystification of the important differences between historical experiences, especially between those of Latin America and of the United States—a mystification that

would undermine the national integrity and sovereignty of Latin American nation-states in the face of United States economic imperialism. While some suspicions toward United States–based hemispheric scholarship are particular to the recent hemispheric turn in American studies since the 1990s, others have troubled the field of inter-American studies virtually since its inception.

To appreciate the complexity of this issue, we must remember that, as Claudia Sadowski-Smith and Claire Fox have pointed out, the general idea of the nation-state has traditionally had connotations in Latin American studies that are different from those that it had in American studies, especially in neoliberal trans- or postnational American studies. Whereas American studies scholars often view the nation-state as the agent of hemispheric or global hegemony and its borders as artificially constructed or “imagined,” Latin American studies scholars more typically view the nation-state as a protection against United States cultural, economic, and military expansion. This difference is in part due to the fact that, unlike American studies, which is attempting to cast off a nationalist slough, Latin American studies (at least in the United States) has never had the perceived “problem” of a narrowly nationalist orientation. Indeed, the idea of Latin America was invented, as Walter Dignolo has reminded us, in the nineteenth century by French and American intellectuals to undermine the newly independent nations’ claims to sovereignty in the region and, thus, to rationalize continued European and North American economic exploitation.²⁴

To the extent that Latin American intellectuals have embraced the notion of one Latin American cultural identity, they have typically attempted to theorize this cultural identity in opposition to, rather than in hemispheric unity with, the United States in the face of that country’s aggressive hemispheric imperialism since the nineteenth century. The Uruguayan philosopher José Enrique Rodó (1872–1917), for

example, in his important essay *Ariel* (1900), spoke of North American modernity as a culture of a brutish “Calibán”—epitomized by Benjamin Franklin’s pragmatist utilitarianism, materialism, and liberal democratism—that stood at the gates of the Latin American civitas, still inhabited by the “Arielesque” cultural spirit of Romance aristocratic idealism (22, 83). On the other end of the political spectrum, the Cuban Roberto Fernández Retamar (1930–) appropriated Shakespeare’s Caliban as a symbol of Latin America’s cultural heritage of colonialism, racial otherness, and mixture in his seminal essay *Calibán* (1970), opposing him to the imperialist culture of the North American Prospero. Despite their important disagreements, Rodó and Fernández Retamar shared the rhetorical strategy of defining a Latin American culture against that of the United States.

From the perspective of Latin American intellectual history, then, the notion of a hemispheric history or literature is inescapably implicated in the legacy of United States imperialism. Indeed, this profound suspicion of an imperialist political agenda motivated the Mexican historian Edmundo O’Gorman’s attack on the Bolton thesis in Hanke’s collection (“Do the Americas”). Although O’Gorman had himself provided a seminal contribution to hemispheric studies in his inquiry into the history of the idea of America (the continent) going back to the sixteenth century (*Invention*), he strongly objected to the terms of Bolton’s hemisphericism, especially to his idea of “culture progress,” which, O’Gorman feared, compared the United States and Latin America in a way that assumed United States cultural development as normative and resulted in assessments of Latin America as “lagging behind”—in need of external assistance to become more like the United States (“Do the Americas” 109).²⁵

Inter-American or Latin American studies scholars in the United States have voiced a similar discomfort about the recent hemispheric

turn in American studies. They are suspicious less of the idea of hemispheric studies per se than of a tendency, manifest in some recent hemispheric forays launched from within the American studies academy, to regard the hemispheric archive as a critical tabula rasa.²⁶ In a recent article, “Inter-American Studies or Imperial American Studies?” Sophia McClenen, a scholar with comparative training and a distinguished record in inter-American and Latin American scholarship, asks whether “inter-American studies represent the latest variation on the Monroe Doctrine of patronizing Latin America” (394). She cautions that “Latin Americanists might see such a move [the hemispheric turn in American studies] as signaling a transition from covert to overt invasion of the rich Latin American canon.” In particular, she takes aim at Radway’s presidential address, charging that

Radway’s proposition assumes that inter-American studies does not already exist, that it is a field available for exploration and development and that the members of the American Studies Association could simply rename themselves inter-Americanists. . . . What would an inter-American studies housed in English and History departments in the United States and taught by monolingual faculty be, if not an example of US intellectual expansionism? (402)

McClenen’s critique signals the ambivalence toward a hemispheric turn in American studies among some scholars who have been engaged in inter-American literary studies all along; who have received the linguistic, archival, and methodological training necessary for comparative and inter-American scholarship; and whose institutional affiliation is often outside English or American studies departments. In other words, their suspicions concern less the idea of inter-American studies than the terms on which American studies is turning hemispheric.

The trans- or postnationalist critique of the idea of the nation-state prevalent in

hemispheric American studies holds, then, political implications that are likely to give pause to Latin Americanists, whether based in Latin America or the United States. However, some United States scholars of minority cultures that have traditionally had a complicated relation with the United States nation-state and its proclaimed identity as a “nation of immigrants” have also expressed ambivalence. For example, it may seem surprising, even paradoxical, that the study of Native American literatures in the New World remains by and large one of the fields that is most segregated along disciplinary lines defined by Eurocentric borders dividing nation-states and languages, if recent tables of contents of major publishing venues in Native American studies such as *American Indian Quarterly* and *Latin American Indian Literatures*, as well as conferences sponsored by these journals, are an indication. Hemispheric perspectives on Native verbal traditions in the Americas are taking shape slowly, despite the comparative historical work by Roger Nichols, John Price, and others; notable exceptions in literary scholarship like the work of Gordon Brotherston (*Book*); calls by such theorists of Native American literatures as Jack Forbes to “regard the Americas as a single unit for literary study” and to envision a Native American studies that is “hemispheric in dimension” (18, 23); and the emphatically hemispheric orientation of some powerful cultural institutions, including the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, DC.²⁷ Besides the usual institutional and linguistic challenges inherent in all comparative or transnational scholarly endeavors, some Native American studies scholars have registered political concerns. Jennifer Andrews and Priscilla Walton have pointed out that “to move toward a hemispheric model that subordinates the idea of nation to hemispheric geopolitical affiliations at a time when many aboriginals are attempting to make land claims and assert their sovereignty is to discount the need, however contradictory, for stable notions of the nation-

state, which would allow such negotiations to take place” (600–01).

Similarly, some have expressed concerns about the relation between African American studies in the United States, a discipline that grew out of the civil rights struggles of the 1960s, and hemispheric studies. Ifeoma Nwankwo has wondered whether the “fact that the most vocal proponents of the ‘new’ hemispherist American Studies have been primarily Latino/Latina studies and Latin American studies scholars” has not “left the place of U.S. African American studies in the hemispheric Americanist movement unclear” (“Promises” 188). Indeed, much of the hemisphericist critical vocabulary appears to be at odds with the terms of both traditional (United States) African American literary criticism and the more recent transnational critical discourse of diaspora and a “black Atlantic.”²⁸ In transnational American studies, the comparative hemispheric (North-South) approach has often stood in opposition to the transatlantic (East-West) or “diasporic” models more familiar in recent African American critical discourse. Although the “Atlantic” or “circum-Atlantic” studies model has recently subsumed the hemispheric and the transatlantic models,²⁹ some methodological tension remains between these two smaller models. The hemispheric approach has traditionally emphasized the relations of each New World culture to its Old World counterpart—affinities of language, cultural heritage, or racial ancestry, for example—whereas the transatlantic approach has emphasized the relations (comparative, genealogical, etc.) among the literatures and cultures of the New World. In other words, whereas the transatlantic approach has focused on the first part of hyphenated cultural self-identifications (*African American*, *British American*, *Spanish American*, etc.), the hemispheric approach has highlighted the second part of these identities, *American* standing, of course, for the hemisphere. As a consequence, the hemispheric model has often depended

on assumptions of cultural creolization or acculturation due to historical experience in the frontiers or “contact zones” of the New World,³⁰ while the transatlantic has typically grounded transnational analyses on assertions of cultural retentions from the Old World to the New. In African American historiography, especially, the tension between acculturationist and retentionist approaches has been bound up with difficult questions of minority cultural identity reaching back to the early-twentieth-century debates between E. Franklin Frazier and Melville Herskovits.³¹

Despite some of these sensitive geopolitical and disciplinary issues surrounding hemispheric studies, however, scholars in most areas of American studies have widely come to accept a point made by inter-Americanists for a long time—that the name *America* has rightfully belonged to the entire hemisphere since its invention by the German map maker Martin Waldseemüller at the dawn of the sixteenth century and that its equation with the United States is a relatively recent act of “rhetorical malpractice” (Chevigny and Languardia viii). In the following section, I will turn, briefly, to questions of methodology by considering a few exemplary recent works in subfields of literary hemispheric scholarship.

Recent Approaches to Hemispheric Studies

In the introduction to his collection, Pérez Firmat outlines four basic methodologies that seem to him to characterize most of the inter-American literary scholarship of the 1980s: the “*generic*” approach comparatively juxtaposes two or more texts not so much by genre as on the basis of their engagement with some common historical experience in the New World (racial and cultural mixture, for example); the “*genetic*” approach traces textual genealogies and intertextual dialogues across the Americas (Sarmiento’s “re-writing” of Cooper, for example); the “*appositional*” approach involves the comparative juxtapo-

sition of formal or poetological (and mostly European) traditions or continuities in the literatures of the New World (the poetics of the baroque, for example); and the “*meditative*” approach focuses on texts that have an inter-American or comparative dimension already embedded in them (the writings of José Martí, for example [3]).

While Pérez Firmat’s taxonomy remains a useful starting point for considering recent hemispheric methodologies, the methodological choices available to scholars are somewhat circumscribed by their historical or cultural archives. For example, in early American studies genetic or meditative approaches offer little promise, since there were few direct inter-American literary relations during the colonial period.³² While a number of themes are common to the colonial literatures of the New World, few people would speak of “a common literature” of the colonial Americas, and hemispheric scholarship in early American literary studies has therefore tended to adopt comparative generic or appositional approaches that are triangulated through a reference point in Europe.³³ For example, although the colonial savants Cotton Mather, a New Englander, and Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora, a New Spaniard, were both known at the Royal Society of London, Alicia Mayer González, when studying the “*dos Americanos*” together, had to rely on a comparative triangulated Atlantic model that juxtaposed the two colonials’ (somewhat divergent) receptions of European scientific thought emanating from the larger transnational ideological context that she called the “*Reforma-Contrarreforma*,” which cut across national and imperial boundaries (53). Similarly, a triangulated Atlantic model was adopted by the Latin Americanist Stephanie Merrim, who compared how early American women writers like Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz and Anne Bradstreet appropriated the European formal tradition of the spiritual biography (esp. ch. 3); by Jorge Cañizares-

Esguerra, who (though a historian by training) studied what he called the “satanic epic” in New England and Spanish America (*Puritan Conquistadors*); and by David Boruchoff, who juxtaposed New English and New Spanish missionary writings in terms of their uses of the *translatio* trope. Even the hemispheric scholarship on the early modern literature of discovery, travel, ethnography, and captivity, much of which was widely translated and published across national boundaries, has tended to be comparative and triangulated.³⁴ An exciting and promising avenue for comparative early American studies that tests not only Pérez Firmat’s notion of a hemispheric “literature” but also the traditional concept of literary history more generally has recently emerged in the study of what Mignolo has called “colonial semiosis” (*Darker Side*)—the encounter and interaction between European (alphabetical) and indigenous (nonalphabetical) sign systems, such as Iroquois wampum belts, Andean quipu, or Mexica pictographs. While scholars have explored these semiotic encounters in their distinct disciplines and national archives for some time, their work is now coming together in collaborations and at conferences, as well as in comparative articles and books (e.g., Rasmussen).³⁵

The general dearth of inter-American literary relations across imperial boundaries during much of the colonial period rapidly changed in the late eighteenth century, especially as the European empires in the New World began to crumble in the fifty-some years between the 1760s and the 1810s.³⁶ The interest American nations—particularly the United States—have in each other’s literary cultures assumes a more intense (and sinister) tone with the rise of American imperialism and westward expansionism in the aftermath of the Monroe Doctrine (1823) and especially in the context of the annexation of Texas (1845) and the Mexican-American War (1846–48), through the Spanish-American War (1898), and into the twentieth century.

Not surprisingly, much recent hemispheric scholarship in nineteenth-century American studies has taken a postcolonial studies approach to a primarily Anglo-American archive in order to offer ideological critiques of the connections between United States nationalism and United States imperialism in the hemisphere during this period.³⁷ However, several studies also engage with the interactions between United States and non-United States (and non-English language) American texts, tracing inter-American literary genealogies even while their primary geographic focus remains largely on the United States. Kirsten Gruesz’s pioneering *Ambassadors of Culture* (2002) excavates the (long-neglected) literary presence of Latinos and of Spanish-language texts in the United States during the nineteenth century, comparatively tracing their movement across political and linguistic boundaries, in literary anthologies, English translations, and critical receptions, as well as in journalism. Similarly, Anna Brickhouse, in *Transamerican Literary Relations* (2004), recovers the hemispheric genealogies of the literary flowerings in the United States during the American Renaissance, demonstrating canonical Renaissance writers’ intimate engagement with Spanish America and the circum-Caribbean. Finally, Rodrigo Lazo, in *Writing to Cuba* (2005), studies Cuban-exile newspapers published in New York and New Orleans between the Mexican-American War and the United States Civil War, demonstrating an intense, ambivalent engagement with the question of an intervention by the United States in Cuba led by such important exiles as Cirilo Villaverde and José Martí.

Martí (1853–95), a Cuban-exile revolutionary, has figured prominently in other recent works of hemispheric studies, mainly those on twentieth-century literature. Fernández Retamar was the first to revive Martí’s writings, in his attempt to theorize a Latin American cultural identity. José Ballón considered them in a hemispheric context in

Autonomía cultural americana (1986), though merely in comparison with the literary nationalist Ralph Waldo Emerson's writings. Since the publication of Saldívar's *The Dialectics of Our America* (1991), however, Martí has also been frequently invoked as a theorist of hemispheric studies. Like Rodó's idea of the "Arielesque" spirit or Fernández Retamar's concept of the "Calibanesque" cultural identity of (Latin) America, Martí's notion of "our America" had mapped an "American" cultural identity along geographic boundaries—"our" America standing for (culturally and racially mixed) Latin America and the "other" America referring to the imperialist (predominantly white) United States. But because Martí lived in exile in the United States and wrote sympathetically of its oppressed racial and ethnic minorities, later commentators have interpreted Martí's "our America" to include the non-Anglo-Saxon inhabitants of the United States and, thus, have regarded him as an "architect of the hemispheric pan-nationalism" (Gillman 328).

Yet it is debatable whether Martí warrants such a title.³⁸ Martí's recent prominence as a progenitor of hemispheric studies may in part be explained by the fact that his notion of *nuestra* (vs. *otra* ["other"]) *América* resonated with American studies scholars who had been reared on the conceptual binaries of postcolonial and race theories during the 1980s and 1990s (self/other, colonizer/colonized, West/rest, etc.), thus facilitating the use of conceptual tools from United States cultural studies in hemispheric studies once American studies scholars looked beyond the borders of the United States nation-state. As envisioned by Saldívar, for example, this hemispheric literary history was based less on direct inter-American genealogies of literary influence and more on a "negative" genealogy derived from a "dialectical" or antithetical posture opposing the dominant Eurocentric understanding of literary history. The dialectic of our America "redirects," he wrote, "the Euro-centric focus

of earlier scholarship in American Studies and identifies a distinctively postcolonial, pan-American consciousness" (xi).

If Martí's (and Saldívar's) idea of *nuestra América* depended heavily on racial categories and notions of racial otherness, much recent hemispheric literary scholarship has exploited racial mixture (*mestizaje*) and cultural creolization as topoi that cut across national boundaries in the hemisphere. Critics of twentieth-century literature, and some others,³⁹ have drawn also on such Caribbean theorists of creolization as Édouard Glissant, Jean Bernabé, Patrick Chamoiseau, and Raphaël Confiant. But especially since the (English) publication of Benítez Rojo's *The Repeating Island* (1992), hemispheric Americanists have theorized the Caribbean as a nodal point for the hybrid cultures of the hemisphere at large. Michael Dash, in *The Other America: Caribbean Literature in a New World Context* (1998), saw the Caribbean as a microcosm of the hemisphere, as paradigmatically syncretic and transculturated (3–5). Also, Monika Kaup and Debrah Rosenthal's *Mixing Race, Mixing Culture: Inter-American Literary Dialogues* (2002), though not specifically concerned with the Caribbean, aimed to "remap . . . the Americas as a multicultural and multiracial hemisphere, constituted through hybrid narrative geographies" and to "chart . . . a transracial Other America, in José Martí's sense, from between the cracks of the dominant cultural map of the Americas" (3). Finally, in *Reworlding America* (2006), John Muthyala aims to synthesize the ideas of hemispheric thinkers such as José Martí (but also Bolton and O'Gorman) and of postcolonial theorists of subalternity and creolization (mainly Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and Glissant). Muthyala argues that the history of narrative in this hemisphere can be understood as a dialectic between "worlding" (originally Spivak's phrase) and "reworlding" America—between the European imperial inscription of a hemispheric terra incognita

and a critical (or literary) practice that would unsettle this Eurocentric inscription by interrogating the “cultural, political, economic, and social processes that bring the world into America and America into the world” (2).

Many of the recent confluences in the United States between hemispheric studies and cultural and postcolonial studies thus fall into Pérez Firmat’s category of the generic approach. While generic approaches to hemispheric studies have largely derived their critical terminology from Anglo-American literary criticism, there has been a hot debate in Latin American studies about the applicability of Anglo-American theoretical concepts, such as those originating with postcolonial or critical race theory, to Latin America.⁴⁰ By contrast, the effectiveness of Latin Americanist critical currencies in the Anglo-American context has recently been tested on theories of the baroque, neobaroque, and New World baroque. The concept of the baroque was first applied in the historiography of Counter-Reformation art by nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century art historians and has become a critical staple in Spanish and Spanish American (literary) history. (The baroque is a golden age in Spanish literary history, as the Renaissance is in English literary history). During the second part of the twentieth century, the term *baroque* was appropriated by such influential Latin American cultural historians, theorists, and writers as José Lezama Lima, Severo Sarduy, and Alejo Carpentier, who began to theorize the baroque as a quintessential and trans-historical (Latin) American form of cultural “expression” (regardless of period in literary history)—often in a self-consciously postcolonialist contradistinction to the “gothic” culture of Anglo-America.⁴¹ As Lois Parkinson Zamora applies it in her recent *The Inordinate Eye*, the concept of a “New World baroque” leans on this Latin American critical tradition to describe a particularly Latin American formal and cultural aesthetics originating with

sixteenth-century Catholic syncretism and still at work in the fiction of Carpentier and Borges. Although she asserts there that the baroque is “foreign to US cultural history” (xvi), the concept of the neobaroque has recently been tested as a comparative category also in the Anglo-American realm by such inter-Americanist critics as Monika Kaup and Antonio Barrenechea.⁴²

While much recent work in transnational and especially hemispheric American studies begins with a critique of the legacy of American exceptionalism that has burdened American studies since its beginnings, one potential pitfall of hemispheric American studies is, as Paul Giles has recently noted, “the prospect of simply replacing nationalist essentialism predicated upon state autonomy with a geographical essentialism predicated on physical contiguity” and to assume an “organic relationship between culture and geography” (649–50). Indeed, as Sophia McClennen observes, every category of analysis that is grounded in ontological arguments is ultimately subject to deconstruction, and she therefore proposes foregrounding ethical, not ontological, motivations in the hemispheric study of the Americas (“Area Studies” 182). The potential pitfalls of hemispheric American studies lurk, then, in any attempt to transpose the age-old epistemological binaries that have burdened American studies (culture/nature, ideology/experience, Europe/America, Self/Other, *otra/nuestra*) to a hemispheric scale. The field’s promise resides in a better understanding of these binaries, as part of a larger history that reaches back to the sixteenth-century European search for the terrestrial paradise and the fountain of youth in the Western terra incognita—the modern version of the alchemist’s quest for the quintessence and self-transformation. Setting out to “discover” the cultural or literary essence of “our” hemispheric America, like that of “our” United States, wrongly ascribes an ontology to an idea that has always, Edmundo

O’Gorman reminds us, been an invention (*Invention*). If hemispheric American studies cannot “discover” the cultural essence of a hemispheric America in the tabula rasa of unfamiliar textual terrains, it can study the rich and diverse history of this idea. But to do this, it must engage not only with historical documents but also with their critical and philosophical tradition in the present, even though they may be published in languages and venues different from those that American studies scholars are accustomed to reading.

NOTES

This essay has benefited from conversations in recent months about hemispheric studies with Juan Bruce-Novoa, Vera Kutzinski, Caroline Levander, and others. I thank all of them for sharing their insights. My special gratitude goes to Sophia McClennen and Claudia Sadowski-Smith, who have read and commented on parts of this essay. Finally, I thank my research assistant Mary Frances Jimenez for her help with the research for this essay. Any errors or misjudgments are my own.

1. Pérez Firmat cites Valdés; Ballón; Chevigny and Laguardia; Kutzinski, *Against the American Grain*; Mac-Adam; and Zamora, *Writing*. To this list, we could add Fitz, “Old World Roots”; Aldridge; Jehlen; and Benítez Rojo, a compressed version of whose *La isla que se repite* (1989) also appeared in Pérez Firmat’s collection. While this essay focuses on literary scholarship, historians and social scientists contributed important studies to comparative hemispheric American scholarship in the 1980s, including Morse, *Espejo* and *New World*, and Langley, *America*.

2. Gerbi’s *La disputa* was published in 1955 but not translated into Spanish until 1960 and into English until 1973.

3. Galinsky, “Kolonialer Literaturbarock” and “Exploring”; more recent examples include Breinig, *Inter-amerikanische Beziehungen* and *Power*; also Breinig and Lösch; Müller-Vollmer and Frank; and Heide.

4. Benítez Rojo’s *La isla que se repite* was published in 1989 and was translated into English as *The Repeating Island* in 1992.

5. See also Jackson; Payne; Sedycias; and Cohn.

6. Landmark works of transnational or postnational scholarship in American studies published during the 1990s and 2000s include Kaplan; Pease; Kaplan and Pease; Rowe; and Streeby. Studies from outside American studies proper that had an impact on the field include Roach; Mignolo, *Local Histories*.

7. A compressed version of this book had already appeared in Pérez Firmat’s collection.

8. See Porter for a similar call. Other seminal 1990s publications in this vein include Belnap and Fernández; Wertheimer.

9. E.g., the *Review of International American Studies* was launched in 2006 and the journal *Comparative American Studies* in 2002; in both journals, hemispheric studies figures prominently, though not exclusively. For examples of special issues devoted to hemispheric studies, see Fox, *Critical Perspectives*; Kadir, *America*; Moya and Saldívar; Shukla and Tinsman; and Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Literary History*.

10. See, e.g., the new Oxford series *Imagining the Americas*, coedited by Caroline Levander and Anthony Pinn.

11. For examples of literary anthologies with a hemispheric orientation, see S. Castillo and Schweitzer; Bauer and Parini.

12. E.g., the *Rice Americas Digital Archive* (www.ruf.rice.edu/~americas/archive) and the *Early Americas Digital Archive* (www.mith2.umd.edu/ead/).

13. Examples include Vanderbilt’s Center for the Americas, directed by Vera Kutzinski (www.vanderbilt.edu/americas/English/index.php); SUNY Buffalo’s Center for the Americas and Duke’s Center for North American Studies, which broadened its original focus from Canadian studies to include comparative and international-relations research about the United States, Canada, and Mexico; Wesleyan University’s American studies department, which offers “Comparative Americas” courses alongside classes focused solely on the United States; the program in inter-American studies in Penn State’s comparative literature department; the Comparative American Studies Program at Oberlin (www.oberlin.edu/CAS/); the Hemispheric Institute on the Americas at UC Davis (hia.ucdavis.edu); Duke’s Center for North American Studies, which in 1998 broadened its original focus on the United States to include Canada and Mexico; and NYU’s Hemispheric Institute of Performance and Politics (hemi.nyu.edu). Outside the United States, many programs in “North American studies” have long adopted a transnational perspective by focusing on the United States and Canada. Examples include the Renvall Institute for North American Studies at the University of Helsinki; the Swedish Institute for North American Studies at the University of Upsala; the John F. Kennedy Institute for North American Studies, in Berlin; and the North American Studies Program at McGill University, in Montreal. (I thank Claudia Sadowski-Smith for pointing out to me these programs abroad.)

14. E.g., the Tepoztlán Institute was formed in 2003 with the mission to “facilitate an intensive dialogue between North American and Latin American graduate students and junior and senior faculty members” (*Tepoztlán Institute*). A number of these networks, such as the Inter-American Cultural Studies Network, had already originated during the early 1990s, especially in Latin America.

15. E.g., Reflections on the Future: Hemispheric Dialogues on the Intersections of Latina/o-Chicana/o-Latin American(s) Studies, UC Santa Cruz, 20–21 Feb. 2004 (als.ucsc.edu/hemispheric_dialogues/events/conf2004.html); In Comparable Americas: Colonial Studies after the Hemispheric Turn, Newberry Lib. (Chicago), 30 Apr. 2004 and Univ. of Chicago, 1 May 2004 (www.newberry.org/renaissance/conf-inst/challenges.html); and the Early Ibero/Anglo Americanist Summit, held in Tucson in 2002 (www.mith2.umd.edu/summit/Ibero_anglo.html), in Providence in 2004 (www.mith2.umd.edu/summit/home.html), and to be held in Saint Augustine in 2010 (www.mith2.umd.edu/fellows/bauer/summit3/index.html).

16. E.g., the 2007 National Endowment for the Humanities seminar Hemispheric American Literature (dir. Adams and Levander) set out “to explore the new possibilities for American literary study opened up when ‘America’ is understood not as a synonym for the isolated United States, but as a network of cultural filiations that have extended across the hemisphere from the period of colonization to the present” (*Hemispheric American Literature*).

17. Although the new International American Studies Association was founded not exclusively to promote hemispheric scholarship but rather to create a supra-national institutional structure for American studies scholarship, it has explicitly emphasized the hemispheric approach since the beginning. According to its Web site, its mission is to further “the international exchange of ideas and information among scholars from all nations and various disciplines who study and teach America regionally, hemispherically, nationally, and transnationally” (*International American Studies Association*).

18. These commentators include contributors to Eric Slauter and Lisa Voigt’s collection of essays on early American studies, a work in progress based on papers delivered at the conference In Comparable Americas: Colonial Studies after the Hemispheric Turn; for a review of this event, as well as of other work in hemispheric early American studies, see Parrish.

19. Examples of hemispheric scholarship on the colonial period published since 2000 include Sayre, *Indian Chief*; Bauer, *Cultural Geography*; S. Castillo; Cañizares-Esguerra, *Puritan Conquistadors*; Voigt; Brickhouse, “Hemispheric Jamestown”; and Bauer and Mazzotti. Hemispheric scholarship on the early republic and on nineteenth-century American literature includes Gruesz; Brickhouse, *Transamerican Literary Relations*; Kazanjian; Lazo, *Writing* and “Famosa Filadelfia”; Murphy; Goudie; Alemán; DeGuzman (whose scholarship reaches into the twentieth century); Dunkerley; and Levine. Scholars who write on twentieth-century American literature from a hemispheric perspective include Madureira (on Brazil and the Caribbean); Muthyala (who also has a chapter on colonial literature); and D. Castillo (who also has a chapter on the anonymous nineteenth-century novel *Jicoténcal*). Hemispheric literary-critical scholarship originating

from a Latin Americanist context published during this period includes Fitz and McClennen; Taylor (on performance). Examples of important historical hemispheric scholarship include Fernández-Armesto; Elliott (for the colonial period).

20. See, e.g., Cohn; Smith and Cohn; Pratt Guterl; and Greeson.

21. Examples of hemispheric scholarship on African American literatures include Nunes; Kutzinski, “Fearful Asymmetries”; Wilks; Braziel; Handley; Cox; Delgadillo; Nwankwo, *Black Cosmopolitanism* and “Promises”; Stephens; McKee Irwin; and Kaup, “Our America.” On Chicana/o and Latina/o literature from a hemispheric perspective, see Gruesz; Fox, “Hemispheric Routes”; and Adams. On ethnic Asian literatures in the Americas, see Goellnicht; Ong; Hu-DeHart; Lee; and Chuh. On Arab Americans and Muslims, see Ette and Pannewick; Marr.

22. One of the notable aspects of recent hemispheric American scholarship that I will not be able to consider here concerns inter-American comparisons between Canadian and other national literary cultures in the Americas. For just some examples of the growing body of scholarship on this issue, see Price; Goellnicht; Adams; and Sadowski-Smith and Fox.

23. Of course, this larger move toward a transnational understanding of the past affected not only the scholarship on New World cultures but also that on the Old World, as Renaissance and eighteenth-century studies, e.g.—traditionally focused on the literatures and cultures of Europe—have shown an increasing interest in the archives of empire and the extra-European colonial world. On the Renaissance, see Greenblatt; Greene, *Unrequited Conquests* and “Wanted”; and Fuchs. On the eighteenth century, see, Kaul; McLeod; Festa; and Roach.

24. Louis Napoleon invented the term *Latin America* to justify French rule in Mexico; see Mignolo, *Idea*.

25. For a discussion of O’Gorman’s critique of the Bolton thesis, see my “Notes”; also Fox, “Commentary,” and Barrenechea, “Good Neighbor.”

26. From my point of view as an early Americanist who has served on the editorial boards of several journals, such as *American Literature* and *Early American Literature*, this tendency has been especially notable with regard to Spanish-language texts that now make up the canon of early American literature. American studies scholars often submit essays on writers like Álvaro Núñez Cabeza de Vaca, Gaspar de Villagrà, or the Inca Garcilaso de la Vega without engaging with the voluminous scholarship on these texts produced by scholars in Latin American studies (and, often, in Spanish).

27. Luis Fernando Restrepo and Kirstin Erickson organized the panel Indigenous America in the Comparative Literature and Literary Studies Programs Curriculum at the 121st annual conference of the MLA in 2005. Also, several recent conferences organized with the support of public universities abroad and at home,

private organizations, and professional organizations have increasingly embraced a hemispheric perspective. In July 2007, Oliver Scheiding, in collaboration with Kristina Bross and Restrepo, organized at the University of Mainz the conference Native American Studies across Time and Space, which was cosponsored by the University of Mainz and the Fritz Thyssen Foundation (www.amerikanistik.uni-mainz.de/symposium/index.html). In April 2008, Bross organized a conference called Prophetstown Revisited, which embraced a hemispheric vision of Native studies, especially evident in the keynote address, by W. Richard West, the former director of the National Museum of the American Indian in Washington, DC (matrix.msu.edu/ptown2008/toi.html). Finally, in May 2008 UC Davis hosted Discursive Practices: The Formation of a Transnational Indigenous Poetics, a Native American studies hemispheric conference (irca.ucdavis.edu/discursive-practices/en/).

28. See Gilroy for the idea of a black Atlantic. Although I wouldn't agree with Nwankwo that this has resulted in a "dearth" of hemispheric scholarship on African American literatures in the New World ("Promises" 188), she is correct in pointing out that the recent hemispheric turn in American studies has often emphasized theoretical concepts (such as the "border") that may seem somewhat at odds with the traditional critical discourse of African American studies (the importance of race as a general concept in hemispheric American studies notwithstanding).

29. For an overview of Atlantic studies, see Cañizares-Esguerra and Seeman; on the term *circum-Atlantic*, see Roach.

30. The frequently invoked term *contact zone* famously originated with Mary Louise Pratt's *Imperial Eyes*. Of the works to come out of the postcolonial studies movement, Pratt's book is among those that have had the most influence on the current transnational turn in American studies.

31. Whereas Frazier, a sociologist, had argued in his study of the African American family that the "acculturation" forced on African slaves in the New World formed the beginning of African American culture in the New World, Herskovits, in his celebrated critique of Frazier, *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact* (1938), emphasized the continuities connecting African American cultures with their African roots, giving impetus to a "retentionist" school in subsequent anthropological scholarship. However, between the 1940s and 1980s, anthropologists such as Fernando Ortiz, Kamau Brathwaite, and Sidney Mintz and Richard Price—though all acknowledging cultural continuities from the Old World to the New—reemphasized the importance of new cultural formations, proposing models that they called "transculturation" (Ortiz), "creolization" (Brathwaite), and "culturation" (Mintz and Price).

32. For the most part, literary and cultural exchanges across imperial boundaries in the early Americas were

triangulated through Europe, because of the mercantilist protectionism of the major empires in the New World. Thus, information or texts could travel, like tobacco, from Brazil to Lisbon, and from there to London and Boston, but not (legally) from Brazil directly to Boston.

33. See, e.g., the forthcoming issue of *Revista Iberoamericana* on Atlantic triangulations, whose guest editors are Nina Gerassi-Navarro and Eyda Merediz. For examples of comparative studies of colonial American literatures, see n19, above.

34. Sayre, *Savages and Indian Chief*; Bauer, *Cultural Geography*; S. Castillo, *Performing*; and Voigt.

35. I am thinking here of the symposia Early American Mediascapes, organized by Matt Cohen and Jeff Glover at Duke University in February 2008, and Codes in Conflict, organized by David Lowenstein and the Center for Early Modern Studies at the University of Wisconsin in March 2008. Comparative hemispheric scholarship in print on this issue is, for the most part, still in progress (like Cohen and Glover's *Early American Mediascapes* and Birgit Rasmussen's *Queequeg's Coffin: Alternative Literacies and the Making of Early American Literature*).

36. Wertheimer; Bauer, "Colonial Discourse" and "Hemispheric Genealogies"; Gustafson; and Goudie.

37. Examples include Wertheimer; Kazanjian; DeGuzman; Kaplan; Streeby; and Murphy.

38. Examples of appeals to Martí as a theorist of hemispheric studies include Belknap and Fernández; Heide; and Kaup, "Our America." For comparative scholarship on racial hybridity, see Hiraldo. Oscar R. Martí discusses the ways in which Martí has been read and misread in this century.

39. Goudie, e.g., applies Caribbean theories of creolization to the literary culture of the early United States republic.

40. The literature on these issues is vast. For a couple of examples, see Klor de Alva; also Hill.

41. See esp. Lezama Lima's *La expresión americana* (1959); Véliz discusses the "baroque" cultural heritage of Latin America in contradistinction to the "gothic" tradition in Anglo-America. During the heyday of the formalist movement in the 1960s, some prominent New Critics, such as René Wellek, Austin Warren, and Leo Spitzer, attempted to see the concept as a transnational aesthetic movement applicable also, e.g., to Restoration English literature (especially the poetry of Dryden), while Hans Galinsky coined the term "colonial literary baroque" regarding the literature of colonial Virginia ("Kolonialer Literaturbarock").

42. See Kaup, "Neobaroque"; also Barrenechea, "Salvaging." Kaup is at work on a book project entitled *Neobarroco: Transamerican Fictions of Modernity and Counterconquest*, which investigates how, in its transmission from Europe to the Americas, the baroque is transculturated and transformed into a decolonizing mode in the theory and literature of the Americas. Barrenechea is

working on a book project entitled *Archival Templates: Monsters, Maps, and New World Chronicles in the Encyclopedic Novel Tradition in North America*, which studies the fictional and metahistorical reimagining of the early modern encounter between Europe and the Americas in nineteenth- and twentieth-century “encyclopedic” novels.

WORKS CITED

- Adams, Rachel. “The Northern Borderlands and Latino Canadian Diaspora.” *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 313–27.
- Aldridge, Alfred Owen. *Early American Literature. A Comparative Approach*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1982. Print.
- Alemán, Jesse. “The Other Country: Mexico, the United States, and the Gothic History of Conquest.” *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 75–95.
- Andrews, Jennifer, and Priscilla L. Walton. “Rethinking Canadian and American Nationality: Indigeneity and the 49th Parallel in Thomas King.” *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 600–17. Print.
- Ballón, José. *Autonomía cultural americana: Emerson y Martí*. Madrid: Pliegos, 1986. Print.
- Barrenechea, Antonio. “Good Neighbor / Bad Neighbor: Boltonian Americanism and Hemispheric Studies.” *Comparative Literature*. Forthcoming. Print.
- . “Salvaging Melville’s America: Baroque Revision in *Terra Nostra*.” *America’s Worlds and the World’s Americas / Les mondes des Amériques et les Amériques du monde*. Ed. Amaryll Chanady, George Handley, and Patrick Imbert. Ottawa: Legas, 2006. 465–73. Print. *Americas* Ser. 5.
- Bauer, Ralph. “Colonial Discourse and Early American Literary History: Ercilla, the Inca Garcilaso, and Joel Barlow’s Conception of a New World Epic.” *Early American Literature* 30.3 (1995): 203–32. Print.
- . *The Cultural Geography of Colonial American Literatures: Empire, Travel, Modernity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003. Print.
- . “The Hemispheric Genealogies of ‘Race’: Creolization and the Cultural Geography of Colonial Difference across the Eighteenth-Century Americas.” *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 36–56.
- . “Notes on the Comparative Study of the Colonial Americas: Further Reflections on the Tucson Summit.” *Early American Literature* 38.2 (2003): 281–304. Print.
- Bauer, Ralph, and Jay Parini. *The Colonial Americas*. Boston: Thomson, 2008. Print. *Wadsworth Themes in Amer. Lit.* 1.
- Bauer, Ralph, and José Antonio Mazzotti, eds. *Creole Subjects: The Ambiguous Coloniality of Early American Literatures*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P; Williamsburg: Omohundro Inst. of Early Amer. Hist. and Culture, forthcoming. Print.
- Belnap, Jeffrey, and Raúl Fernández, eds. *José Martí’s “Our America”: From National to Hemispheric Cultural Studies*. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. Print.
- Benítez Rojo, Antonio. *La isla que se repite: El Caribe y la perspectiva posmoderna*. Hanover: Norte, 1989. Print. Trans. as *The Repeating Island: The Caribbean and the Postmodern Perspective*. Trans. James Maraniss. Durham: Duke UP, 1992.
- Bolton, Herber Eugene. “The Epic of Greater America.” *American Historical Review* 38.3 (1933): 448–74. Print.
- Boruchoff, David. “New Spain, New England, and the New Jerusalem: The ‘Translation’ of Empire, Faith, and Learning (Translatio Imperii, Fidei ac Scientiae) in the Colonial Missionary Project.” *Early American Literature* 43.1 (2008): 5–34. Print.
- Braziel, Jana Evans. “Trans-American Constructions of Black Masculinity.” *Callaloo* 26.3 (2003): 867–900. Print.
- Breinig, Helmbrecht, ed. *Interamerikanische Beziehungen: Einfluß-Transfer-Interkulturalität. Ein Erlanger Kolloquium*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert, 1990. Print. *Lateinamerika-Studien* 27.
- , ed. *Power, Counter-power, and Discourse: Case Studies on Inter-American Relations and Their Cultural Representation since the Late 19th Century*. Spec. issue of *ZAA* 40.4 (1992): 301–80. Print.
- Breinig, Helmbrecht, and Klaus Lösch, eds. *Transculturations: Latin American Presences in US Culture since the Late Nineteenth Century*. Spec. issue of *ZAA* 47.4 (1999): 298–377. Print.
- Brickhouse, Anna. “Hemispheric Jamestown.” *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 36–56.
- . *Transamerican Literary Relations and the Nineteenth-Century Public Sphere*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004. Print.
- Brotherston, Gordon. *Book of the Fourth World: Reading the Native Americas through Their Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992. Print.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. *How to Write the History of the New World: Histories, Epistemologies, and Identities in the Eighteenth-Century Atlantic World*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2001. Print.
- . *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550–1700*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006. Print.
- Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge, and Erik Seeman, eds. *The Atlantic in Global History, 1500–2000*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice, 2006. Print.
- Castillo, Debra. *Redreaming America: Toward a Bilingual American Culture*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2005. Print. *SUNY Ser. in Latin Amer. and Iberian Thought and Culture*.
- Castillo, Susan. *Performing America: Colonial Encounters in New World Writing, 1500–1786*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.

- Castillo, Susan, and Ivy Schweitzer, eds. *The Literatures of Colonial America*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2001. Print.
- Chevigny, Bell Gale, and Gari Laguardia, eds. *Reinventing America: Comparative Studies of the Literature of the United States and Spanish America*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1986. Print.
- Chuh, Kandice. "Of Hemispheres and Other Spheres: Navigating Karen Tei Yamashita's Literary World." *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 618–37. Print.
- Cohn, Deborah. *History and Memory of the Two Souths: Recent Southern and Spanish American Fiction*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1999. Print.
- Cox, Timothy. *Postmodern Tales of Slavery in the Americas: From Alejo Carpentier to Charles Johnson*. New York: Garland, 2001. Print.
- Dash, Michael. *The Other America: Caribbean Literature in a New World Context*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 1998. Print. New World Studies.
- DeGuzman, Maria. *Spain's Long Shadow: The Black Legend, Off-Whiteness, and Anglo-American Empire*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2005. Print.
- Delgadillo, Theresa. "Singing 'Angelitos Negros': African Diaspora Meets Mestizaje in the Americas." *American Quarterly* 58.2 (2006): 407–30, 552. Print.
- Dunkerley, James. *Americana: The Americas in the World around 1850*. London: Verso, 2000. Print.
- Elliott, John H. *Empires of the Atlantic World: Britain and Spain in America, 1492–1830*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006. Print.
- Ette, Ottmar, and Friederike Pannewick, eds. *Arab-Americas: Literary Entanglements of the American Hemisphere and the Arab World*. Frankfurt am Main: Vervuert; Madrid: Iberoamericana, 2006. Print.
- Fernández-Armesto, Felipe. *The Americas: A Hemispheric History*. New York: Mod. Lib., 2003. Print.
- Fernández Retamar, Roberto. *Calibán: Apuntes sobre la cultura en nuestra América*. México: Diógenes, 1971. Print.
- Festa, Lynn. *Sentimental Figures of Empire in Eighteenth-Century Britain and France*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2006. Print.
- Fishkin, Shelley Fisher. "Crossroads of Cultures: The Transnational Turn in American Studies." *American Quarterly* 57.1 (2005): 17–57. Print.
- Fitz, Earl. "Inter-American Studies as an Emerging Field: The Future of a Discipline." *Rethinking the Americas: Crossing Borders and Disciplines*. Ed. Cathy L. Jrade. Spec. issue of *Vanderbilt E-Journal of Luso-Hispanic Studies* 1 (2004): 13–28. Web. 30 Oct. 2008.
- . "Old World Roots / New World Realities: A Comparatist Looks at the Growth of Literature in North and South America." *Council on National Literatures / Quarterly World Report* 3.3 (1980): 8–11. Print.
- . *Rediscovering the New World: Inter-American Literature in a Comparative Context*. Iowa City: U of Iowa P, 1991. Print.
- Fitz, Earl, and Sophia McClennen, eds. *Comparative Cultural Studies and Latin America*. West Lafayette: Purdue UP, 2004. Print.
- Forbes, Jack. "Colonialism and Native American Literature: Analysis." *Wicazo Sa Review* 3 (1987): 17–23. Print.
- Fox, Claire F. "Commentary: The Transnational Turn and the Hemispheric Return." *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 638–47. Print.
- . ed. *Critical Perspectives and Emerging Models of Inter-American Studies*. Spec. issue of *Comparative American Studies* 3.4 (2005): 387–515. Print.
- . "The Hemispheric Routes of 'El Nuevo Arte Nuevo': The Pan American Union, Cultural Policy, and the Cold War." Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Studies* 223–48.
- Frazier, Edward Franklin. *Race and Culture Contacts in the Modern World*. New York: Knopf, 1957. Print.
- Fuchs, Barbara. *Mimesis and Empire: The New World, Islam, and European Identities*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001. Print.
- Galinsky, Hans. "Exploring the 'Exploration Report' and Its Image of the Overseas World: Spanish, French, and English Variants of a Common Form Type in Early American Literature." *Early American Literature* 12.1 (1977): 5–24. Print.
- . "Kolonialer Literaturbarock in Virginia: Eine Interpretation von 'Bacon's Epitaph' auf der Grundlage eines Forschungsberichtes." *Amerika und Europa. Sprachliche und Sprachkünstlerische Wechselbeziehungen in amerikanistischer Sicht*. Ed. Hans Galinsky. Berlin: Langenscheidt, 1968. Print.
- Gerassi-Navarro, Nina, and Eyda Merediz, eds. *Otros estudios transatlánticos. Lecturas desde lo Latinoamericano*. Spec. issue of *Revista Iberoamericana*. Forthcoming. Print.
- Gerbi, Antonello. *La disputa del nuovo mondo: Storia di una polemica, 1750–1900*. Milan: Riccardo Ricciardi, 1955. Print. Trans. as *The Dispute of the New World: The History of a Polemic, 1750–1900*. Trans. Jeremy Moyle. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 1973.
- Giles, Paul. "Commentary: Hemispheric Partiality." *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 648–55. Print.
- Gillman, Susan. "Afterword: The Times of Hemispheric Studies." Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Studies* 328–36.
- Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1992. Print.
- Goellnicht, Donald. "Of Bones and Suicide: Sky Lee's *Disappearing Moon Café* and Fae Myenne Ng's *Bone*." *Modern Fiction Studies* 46.2 (2000): 300–30. Print.
- Goudie, Sean. *Creole America: The West Indies and the Formation of Literature and Culture in the New Republic*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2006. Print.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. Print.

- Greene, Roland. *Unrequited Conquests: Love and Empire in the Colonial Americas*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1999. Print.
- . “Wanted: A New World Studies.” *American Literary History* 12.1–2 (2000): 337–47. Print.
- Greeson, Jennifer Rae. “Expropriating *The Great South* and Exporting ‘Local Color’: Global and Hemispheric Imaginaries of the First Reconstruction.” Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Studies* 116–39.
- Gruesz, Kirsten. *Ambassadors of Culture: The Transamerican Origins of Latino Writing*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2002. Print.
- Gustafson, Sandra. “Natty in the 1820s: Creole Subjects and Democratic Aesthetics in the Early Leatherstocking Tales.” Bauer and Mazzotti.
- Handley, George. *Postslavery Literature in the Americas*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2000. Print.
- Hanke, Lewis, ed. *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. New York: Knopf, 1964. Print.
- Heide, Markus. “Ambivalent Vistas: José Martí’s ‘Our America,’ Nineteenth-Century Pan-Americanism and Hemispheric American Studies.” (*Anti-*)*Americanisms*. Ed. Michael Draxlbauer, Astrid Fellner, and Thomas Fröschl. Wien: Lit, 2004. 89–105. Print. *American Studies in Austria*.
- Hemispheric American Literature: An NEH Summer Seminar at Columbia University in the City of New York, June 18–July 21, 2007*. Natl. Endowment for the Humanities. Web. 28 Oct. 2008.
- Herskovits, Melville. *Acculturation: The Study of Culture Contact*. New York: Augustin, 1938. Print.
- Hill, Ruth. “Between Black and White: A Critical Race Theory Approach to Caste Poetry in the Spanish New World.” *Comparative Literature* 59.4 (2007): 269–93. Print.
- Hiraldo, Carlos. *Segregated Miscegenation: On the Treatment of Racial Hybridity in the U.S. and Latin American Literary Traditions*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.
- Hu-DeHart, Evelyn. *Across the Pacific: Asian Americans and Globalization*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1999. Print.
- International American Studies Association*. Intl. Amer. Studies Assn. Web. 28 Oct. 2008.
- Jackson, Richard L. *Black Writers and Latin America: Cross-Cultural Affinities*. Washington: Howard UP, 1998. Print.
- Jehlen, Myra. *American Incarnation: The Individual, the Nation, and the Continent*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1986. Print.
- Kadir, Djelal, ed. *America: The Idea, the Literature*. Spec. issue of *PMLA* 118.1 (2003): 1–208. Print.
- . *Columbus and the Ends of the Earth: Europe’s Prophetic Rhetoric as Conquering Ideology*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992. Print.
- Kaplan, Amy. *The Anarchy of Empire in the Making of U.S. Culture*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 2005. Print.
- Kaplan, Amy, and Donald Pease, eds. *Cultures of the United States Imperialism*. Durham: Duke UP, 1993. Print.
- Kaul, Suvir. *Poems of Nation, Anthems of Empire: English Verse in the Long Eighteenth Century*. Charlottesville: UP of Virginia, 2000. Print.
- Kaup, Monika. “The Neobaroque in Djuna Barnes.” *Modernism/modernity* 12.1 (2005): 85–110. Print.
- . “‘Our America’ That Is Not One: Transnational Black Atlantic Disclosures in Nicolás Guillén and Langston Hughes.” *Discourse* 22.3 (2000): 87–113. Print.
- Kaup, Monika, and Debra Rosenthal. Introduction. *Mixing Race, Mixing Culture: Inter-American Literary Dialogues*. Ed. Kaup and Rosenthal. Austin: U of Texas P, 2002. xi–xxix. Print.
- Kazanjan, David. *The Colonizing Trick: National Culture and Imperial Citizenship in Early America*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2003. Print.
- Klor de Alva, Jorge. “Colonialism and Postcolonialism as (Latin) American Mirages.” *Colonial Latin American Review* 1.1–2 (1992): 3–23. Print.
- Kutzinski, Vera. *Against the American Grain: Myth and History in William Carlos Williams, Jay Wright, and Nicolás Guillén*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987. Print.
- . “Fearful Asymmetries: Langston Hughes, Nicolás Guillén, and Cuba Libre.” *Diacritics: A Review of Contemporary Criticism* 34.3 (2004): 112–38. Print.
- Langley, Lester. *America and the Americas: The United States in the Western Hemisphere*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1989. Print.
- . *The Americas in the Age of Revolution, 1750–1850*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1997. Print.
- Lazo, Rodrigo. “La Famosa Filadelfia’: The Hemispheric American City and Constitutional Debates.” Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Studies* 57–74.
- . *Writing to Cuba: Filibustering and Cuban Exiles in the United States*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2005. Print.
- Lee, Rachel. *The Americas of Asian American Literature: Gendered Fictions of Nation and Transnation*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1999. Print.
- Levander, Caroline F., and Robert S. Levine, eds. *Hemispheric American Literary History*. Spec. issue of *American Literary History* 18.3 (2006): 397–656. Print.
- . eds. *Hemispheric American Studies*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 2007. Print.
- Levine, Robert. *Dislocating Race and Nation: Episodes in Nineteenth-Century American Literary Nationalism*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2008. Print.
- Lezama Lima, José. *La expresión americana*. 1959. Santiago: Universitaria, 1969. Print.
- MacAdam, Alfred. *Textual Confrontations: Comparative Readings in Latin American Literature*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1987. Print.

- Madureira, Luís. *Cannibal Modernities: Postcoloniality and the Avant-garde in Caribbean and Brazilian Literature*. Charlottesville: U of Virginia P, 2005. Print.
- Marr, Timothy. "Out of This World: Islamic Irruptions in the Literary Americas." *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 266–93.
- Martí, Oscar R. "Jose Martí and the Heroic Image." *Belnap and Fernández* 317–38.
- Mautner-Wasserman, Renata. *Exotic Nations: Literature and Cultural Identity in the United States and Brazil, 1830–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1994. Print.
- Mayer González, Alicia. *Dos americanos, dos pensamientos: Carlos de Sigüenza y Góngora y Cotton Mather*. México: U Nacional Autónoma de México, 1998. Print.
- McClennen, Sophia. "Area Studies Beyond Ontology: Notes on Latin American Studies, American Studies, and Inter-American Studies." *A contracorriente* 5.1 (2007): 173–84. Print.
- . "Inter-American Studies or Imperial American Studies?" *Comparative American Studies* 3.4 (2005): 393–413. Print.
- McKee Irwin, Robert. "Memín Pinguín, Rumba, and Racism: Afro-Mexicans in Classic Comics and Film." *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 249–65.
- McLeod, Bruce. *The Geography of Empire in English Literature, 1580–1745*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- Merrim, Stephanie. *Early Modern Women's Writing and Sor Juana Inés de la Cruz*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP, 1999. Print.
- Mignolo, Walter. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality, and Colonization*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1995. Print.
- . *The Idea of Latin America*. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005. Print.
- . *Local Histories / Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000. Print.
- Morse, Richard. *El espejo de Próspero: Un estudio de la dialéctica del Nuevo Mundo*. Trans. Stella Mastrangelo. México: Siglo Veintiuno, 1982. Print.
- . *New World Soundings: Culture and Ideology in the Americas*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1989. Print.
- Moya, Paula, and Ramón Saldivar, eds. *Fictions of the Trans-American Imaginary*. Spec. issue of *Modern Fiction Studies* 49.1 (2003): 1–180. Print.
- Müller-Vollmer, Kurt, and Armin Paul Frank, eds. *The Internationality of National Literatures in Either America: British America and the United States, 1770s–1850s*. Göttingen: Wallstein, 2000. Print.
- Murphy, Gretchen. *Hemispheric Imaginings: The Monroe Doctrine and Narratives of U.S. Empire*. Durham: Duke UP, 2005. Print.
- Muthyala, John. *Reworlding America: Myth, History, and Narrative*. Athens: Ohio UP, 2006. Print.
- Nichols, Roger. *Indians in the United States and Canada: A Comparative History*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1998. Print.
- Nunes, Zita. *Cannibal Democracy: Race and Representation in the Literature of the Americas*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2008. Print.
- Nwankwo, Ifeoma C. K. *Black Cosmopolitanism: Racial Consciousness and Transnational Identity in the Nineteenth-Century Americas*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2005. Print.
- . "The Promises and Perils of US African American Hemispherism: Latin America in Martin Delany's *Blake* and Gayl Jones's *Mosquito*." *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 187–205.
- O'Gorman, Edmundo. "Do the Americas Have a Common History?" *Do the Americas Have a Common History? A Critique of the Bolton Theory*. Ed. Lewis Hanke. New York: Knopf, 1964. 103–11. Print.
- . *The Invention of America*. 1958. Westport: Greenwood, 1972. Print.
- Ong, Aihwa. *Flexible Citizenship: The Cultural Logics of Transnationality*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999. Print.
- Parrish, Susan Scott. "The 'Hemispheric Turn' in Colonial American Studies." *Early American Literature* 40.3 (2005): 545–53. Print.
- Payne, Johnny. *Conquest of the New Word: Experimental Fiction and Translation in the Americas*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1993. Print.
- Pease, Donald, ed. *National Identities and Post-Americanist Narratives*. Durham: Duke UP, 1994. Print.
- Pérez Firmat, Gustavo. "Cheek to Cheek." Introduction. Pérez-Firmat, *Do the Americas* 1–6.
- , ed. *Do the Americas Have a Common Literature?* Durham: Duke UP, 1990. Print.
- Porter, Carolyn. "What We Know That We Don't Know: Remapping American Literary Studies." *American Literary History* 6.3 (1994): 467–526. Print.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge, 1992. Print.
- Pratt Guterl, Matthew. "An American Mediterranean: Haiti, Cuba, and the American South." *Levander and Levine, Hemispheric American Studies* 96–115.
- Price, John. *Native Studies: American and Canadian Indians*. Toronto: McGraw, 1978. Print.
- Radway, Janice. "What's in a Name?" *American Quarterly* 51.1 (1999): 1–32. Print.
- Rasmussen, Birgit Brander. "Negotiating Treaties, Negotiating Literacies: A French-Iroquois Encounter and the Making of Early American Literature." *American Literature* 79.3 (2007): 445–73. Print.
- Roach, Joseph. *Cities of the Dead: Circum-Atlantic Performance*. New York: Columbia UP, 1996. Print.
- Rodó, José Enrique. *Ariel*. 1900. Ed. Gordon Brotherston. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967. Print.

- Rowe, John Carlos, ed. *Post-nationalist American Studies*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000. Print.
- Sadowski-Smith, Claudia, and Claire F. Fox. "Theorizing the Hemisphere: Inter-Americas Work at the Intersection of American, Canadian, and Latin American Studies." *Comparative American Studies* 4.1 (2004): 5–38. Print.
- Saldívar, José David. *The Dialectics of Our America: Genealogy, Cultural Critique, and Literary History*. Durham: Duke UP, 1991. Print.
- Salvatore, Ricardo Donato, Gilbert M. Joseph, Catherine C. LeGrand, eds. *Close Encounters of Empire: Writing the Cultural History of U.S.-Latin American Relations*. Fwd. Fernando Coronil. Durham: Duke UP, 1998. Print.
- Sayre, Gordon. *The Indian Chief as Tragic Hero: Native Resistance and the Literatures of America, from Moctezuma to Tecumseh*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 2006. Print.
- . *Les Sauvages Américains: Representations of Native Americans in French and English Colonial Literature*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1997. Print.
- Sedycias, João. *The Naturalistic Novel of the New World: A Comparative Study of Stephen Crane, Aluisio Azevedo, and Federico Gamboa*. Lanham: UP of America, 1993. Print.
- Shukla, Sandhya, and Heidi Tinsman. *Our Americas: Political and Cultural Imaginings*. Spec. issue of *Radical History Review* 89 (2004): 1–250. Print.
- Smith, Jon, and Deborah Cohn. *Look Away! The U.S. South in New World Studies*. Durham: Duke UP, 2004. Print.
- Sommer, Doris. *Proceed with Caution, When Engaged by Minority Writings in the Americas*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1999. Print.
- Spillers, Hortense. *Comparative American Identities*. New York: Routledge, 1991. Print.
- Stephens, Michelle. "I'm the Everybody Who's Nobody': Genealogies of the New World Slave in Paul Robeson's Performances of the 1930s." Levander and Levine, *Hemispheric American Studies* 166–86.
- Streeby, Shelly. *American Sensations: Class, Empire, and the Production of Popular Culture*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002. Print.
- Sullivan, Tom. *Cowboys and Caudillos: Frontier Ideology of the Americas*. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1990. Print.
- Taylor, Diana. *The Archive and the Repertoire: Performing Cultural Memory in the Americas*. Durham: Duke UP, 2003. Print.
- Tepoztlán Institute*. Tepoztlán Inst., 31 Aug. 2007. Web. 16 Oct. 2008.
- Valdés, M. J., ed. *Inter-American Literary Relations*. Proc. of the Xth Cong. of the Intl. Compar. Lit. Assn. New York: Garland, 1985. Print.
- Véliz, Claudio. *The New World of the Gothic Fox: Culture and Economy in English and Spanish America*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1994. Print.
- Voigt, Lisa. *Writing Captivity in the Early Modern Atlantic: Circulations of Knowledge and Authority in the Iberian and English Imperial Worlds*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P; Williamsburg: Omohundro Inst. of Early Amer. Hist. and Culture, 2009. Print.
- Wertheimer, Eric. *Imagined Empires: Incas, Aztecs, and the New World of American Literature, 1771–1870*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999. Print.
- Wilks, Jennifer M. "Writing Home: Comparative Black Modernism and Form in Jean Toomer and Aimé Césaire." *Modern Fiction Studies* 51.4 (2005): 801–23, 980. Print.
- Zamora, Lois Parkinson. *The Inordinate Eye: New World Baroque and Latin American Fiction*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2006. Print.
- . *The Usable Past: The Imagination of History in Recent Fiction of the Americas*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997. Print.
- . *Writing the Apocalypse: Historical Vision in Contemporary U.S. and Latin American Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989. Print.