Hypercanonical Joyce

Ward, Kiron

DOI:
10.1080/0950236X.2022.2003088

Textual Practice

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rtpr20

Hypercanonical Joyce: Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*, creative disaffiliation, and the global afterlives of *Ulysses*

Kiron Ward

To cite this article: Kiron Ward (2021): Hypercanonical Joyce: Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*, creative disaffiliation, and the global afterlives of *Ulysses*, Textual Practice, DOI: 10.1080/0950236X.2022.2003088

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2022.2003088

TEXTUAL PRACTICE
https://doi.org/10.1080/0950236X.2022.2003088

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Hypercanonical Joyce: Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*, creative disaffiliation, and the global afterlives of *Ulysses*

Kiron Ward

ABSTRACT
Roughly two-thirds of the way through Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners* (1956), there is a section highly redolent of the 'Penelope' episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922). Commonly referred to as 'Summer', the section's similarity to 'Penelope' has not gone unnoticed among either Joyce or Selvon scholars; to date, however, only J. Dillon Brown (2013) has offered a substantive reading of the connection. This article seizes on the relative absence of critical discussion of Selvon in Joyce studies to consider what might be the particular responsibilities that Joyce studies bears when reading Joyce's global afterlives. Drawing on critical debates around the concept of global modernism, I discuss the terms of Joyce's canonisation and his use in 'diffusionist' models of literary history. Building on Kandice Chuh's (2019) analysis of the combined effects of liberal representational politics and hypercanonicity in literary studies, I contend that future studies of Joyce's global reception and influence should seek to establish mutually transformative intercultural dialogue, which in turn requires opening the field to unsettling Joyce's position in literary studies – and, to that I end, I propose that Selvon's novel provides an exemplary model of engagement with Joyce through 'creative disaffiliation'.

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 21 December 2020; Accepted 3 November 2021

KEYWORDS Molly Bloom; Penelope; global modernism; Black British writing; Anglophone Caribbean literature; influence studies; curricular multiculturalism; whiteness

This article emerges from an oft-made but little-elaborated observation: that there is a passage about two-thirds through Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners* (1956) that bears a conspicuous resemblance to the 'Penelope' episode of James Joyce's *Ulysses*. Typically referred to as the 'Summer' or 'summer-is-hearts' section, its Joycean quality is obvious in its form alone: one single, unpunctuated paragraph, that immediately recalls Molly Bloom's famous monologue. 'Summer' echoes 'Penelope' at the level of content, too: just as Molly recalls past erotic encounters and fantasises new

CONTACT Kiron Ward kironward@gmail.com

ones, 'Summer' describes Moses Aloetta and 'the boys' liming in Hyde Park, cruising for sexual encounters, and negotiating the complexities of erotic desire as racialised subjects in the imperial centre.[1]

Contemporaneous reviewers of *The Lonely Londoners* noted the similarity, although, as J. Dillon Brown points out, it was not quite enough to convince British reviewers that the novel was 'of any real political, social, or cultural concern to a British audience'.[2] Within the significant body of critical work on Selvon and *The Lonely Londoners*, the connection continues to be noted – although, with the exception of Brown, analysis of the connection tends to be limited to either flagging its existence or holding it up as one of the many examples of how Selvon's literary language subverts European traditions.[3] This is fair: there is more than enough in the novel, and its quasi-sequels, without getting into the detail of Joyce studies. Indeed, in a novel replete with echoes of Dickens' *Bleak House* and references to Arthurian myth – a novel that opens with a nod to Eliot's *The Waste Land* ('One grim winter evening, when it had a kind of unrealness about London … ') and closes with one to Conrad's *Heart of Darkness* ('He watch a tugboat on the Thames, wondering if he could ever write a book like that … ') – one should be wary of overstating the significance of a singular allusion to Joyce (*TLL* 1, 139). In context, the allusion arguably speaks as readily to Joyce's contemporaneous reputation as a representative of Anglophone high culture as it does to anything specific to *Ulysses* (although, as I argue below, Selvon is likely responding at both levels).

Yet for all their legendary industry, Joyce scholars have not got around to Selvon.[4] The absence of commentary on *The Lonely Londoners* from the perspective of Joyce studies is in some ways surprising: although 'Summer' can certainly be read without getting into the minutiae of 'Penelope', elaborating on allusions to Joyce and theorising Joyce's global influence are among the field's specialties.[5] Even from the perspective of modernist studies more broadly, at a time when its investment in late colonial and postcolonial literatures is growing thanks to the push for transnational, global, and planetary perspectives on the field, it is notable that this connection has only been substantively considered by Brown, in a smart and expansive chapter of *Migrant Modernism*.[6] What might it mean that such exceptionally productive fields as Joyce studies and modernist studies have left this stone relatively unturned? Isn't the afterlife of *Ulysses*, a canonical work of Anglophone modernism, in *The Lonely Londoners*, one of the foundational novels of both the Black British and Anglophone Caribbean canons, worth some focused attention?

Of course it is; but for Joyce studies, and modernist studies at large, in 2022, the Joyce-Selvon connection is more complicated than a case of a heretofore underestimated allusion or unrecognised influence. Or, at least, it *should* be more complicated than that – because studying Joyce's global afterlives raises thorny questions about what we do when we read for

Joycean allusions and when we attribute Joycean influence, particularly to writers who, like Selvon, have been important in the development and institutionalisation of 'minoritised' literary fields. While influence as such is not reducible to allusion, which can happen with or without any formal, stylistic, or other substantial influence, in a literary landscape already dominated by *Ulysses*' canonical cachet, it can be too easy to take allusions as proof of influence, which in turn shores up *Ulysses*' canonical cachet further – a tautological process that Kandice Chuh argues is a key feature of 'hypercanonical status'.[7] Indeed, claims of Joycean engagement are not neutral: they loop that text into Joyce's cultural capital, for good or ill. As such, it is vital that any consideration of Selvon's engagement with Joyce avoid either using Selvon as a staging post in a Joycean genealogy of the novel or framing Joyce as Selvon *avant la lettre*. To make either move would be unfair to both authors. On the one hand, Selvon's achievement, including his use of Joyce, deserves to be heard on its own terms, without being transformed into further evidence of Joyce's prowess or of the diffusion of European aesthetics to the rest of the world. On the other, while Joyce's position as a colonial subject of the British Empire is not in question, it would be at best counterproductive to conflate Selvon's experience as an Indian Trinidadian in London with Joyce's as a Catholic Irishman in Trieste, Zürich, and Paris; as Mark Wollaeger puts it, 'no one wants Joyce the God of Modernism to become Joyce the Patron Saint of the Colonized'.[8]

As such, I am less interested in conjecturing on the relative lack of critical attention to the Joyce-Selvon connection than I am in considering the critical responsibilities and possibilities of reading Joyce's reception and influence. This necessitates a frank discussion of the ways Joyce's afterlife has been conceived in literary history. Moreover, if we are to stake a claim for Joyce's continued relevance in his transcultural ubiquity – which is to say his importance to literatures often introduced to academic study under the institutional signs of 'postcolonialism' and 'world literature' – then what steps can be taken to ensure that the interaction is not one-sided? How can Joyce studies ensure that those literatures go on to inform new perspectives on Joyce – that Selvon's use of Joyce informs future approaches to Joyce studies? This is to engage with Wollaeger's piercing critique of the tendency of Joyce studies 'to reuse existing theoretical templates under the rubric of postcoloniality'.[9] How can studies of Joyce's global reception and influence ensure that they do not develop readings of Joyce that posit a 'postcolonial' or 'transnational' or 'global' Joyce which is substantively indistinguishable from existing approaches to Joyce? What can we do to ensure that Joycean reception and influence studies deliver us to new critical ground?

Since, as Jonathan Goldman has cannily observed, the extent of Joyce's canonicity and international renown is such that, for Joyce scholars, the world 'has become a hunting ground for *Ulysses* allusions',[10] there is a risk

that reading Joyce's global afterlives can become a critical activity committed to the preservation of Joyce as a transcendent literary figure through which European modernism diffuses to the rest of the world. At the centenary of *Ulysses*' publication, I want to make a claim against any such hypercanonical transcendence while at once making a positive claim for the value of studying *Ulysses*' global reception and influence. In the ambivalences of *Ulysses*' global afterlives, we can, if we allow ourselves, find different ways of understanding relationships between the 'canonical' and the 'minoritised', and thereby open the field to new critical formations. In what follows, I consider the history of Joyce's canonicity across the field of global modernist studies, before turning to the Joyce-Selvon connection. *The Lonely Londoners*, I propose, can be used as a model for considering simultaneously Joyce's canonicity and his European particularity: Selvon's use of Joyce is not simply one passing allusion among many to the canon, but a carefully considered engagement with and disaffiliation from Joyce that is only legible when Joyce is taken as *both* an avatar for European universality *and* particularity. For Selvon, canonicity itself is meaningful, and as such Joyce's difference is not identical to the difference of others – and in Selvon's creative disaffiliation from Joyce, we find a model for studying *Ulysses*' afterlives that can take us beyond the shores of reified canonicity.

Joycean confirmation bias

Joyce's canonicity is such that references to him and his works pop up in all sorts of places, expected (the works of writers associated with him or writing in his shadow) and less expected (t-shirts, television series, popular music, internet memes, political speeches by US presidential candidates, an Irish Navy patrol vessel); and, as Goldman suggests, study of these references can be used to create both 'a version of literary history' and to assess 'how products of high culture determine our reading practices'.[11] Indeed, if, as Harold Bloom famously contends, 'poetic history … is indistinguishable from poetic influence',[12] then it follows that those with the longest afterlife are likely to shape the terms of literary history. It is in this activity – the extrapolation of narratives of literary history and theories of reading practice from the evidence of Joyce's 'afterlife' – that Joyce's reception and influence are often built into theories of global modernism (and world literature more broadly).

It is certainly a legitimate task, then, for Joyce studies to trace Joyce's reception and influence: it is not an insular pursuit with no wider consequence. By tracing the afterlives of so widely circulated an author as Joyce, we can readily develop many different kinds of stories about modernism and its legacies, as many Joyce scholars have done to great effect.[13]

Nevertheless, as Goldman points out, there comes a point in the detection of influence at which the question of intentionality rears its head:

> the activity of searching for textual allusions to *Ulysses* raises theoretical complications, because the results will depend on how deep one feels like digging … Are such resonances intentional, and if so, how do they affect our understanding of these works? For some, such intentionality is irrelevant; any echo of Joyce inflects the text's meaning, regardless of the author's aims. With this in mind, we can consider the impulse to find such references, and see that this approach imposes Joyce as a reading filter over other cultural products.[14]

I do not intend to attempt to resolve intractable questions about intentionality – it is enough for the purposes of this essay to say that intentionality can never be proven and move on – but Goldman's warning about how the impulse to find references can turn Joyce into a filter is crucial. Although Goldman does not say so explicitly, over-eagerness to identify phenomena as containing traces of Joyce and therefore bearing Joycean influence – to see Joyce everywhere, as if 'other cultural products' were a Rorschach test – presents a serious risk to the legitimacy of the study of Joyce's afterlives. Is Joyce's use of *Hamlet* such that any subsequent text's engagement with *Hamlet* is also an engagement with Joyce? Are there certain words (ineluctable, metempsychosis, parallax) over which Joyce has a monopoly? Is any text that stages a shift to a woman's perspective automatically Joycean?

These are purposely hyperbolic hypothetical examples – and the answer to each is, of course, *no* (even if they might each legitimate a comparative reading). Influence can only convincingly be argued for through close reading, which necessarily resists such superficial proposals. My point is to illustrate the kinds of hermeneutic traps that Joyce's hypercanonicity can set. It can become too easy for what Ariela Freedman calls 'the tendency to spot the Joycean' to give way to confirmation bias, finding Joyce wherever one looks.[15] Goldman gives the example of Elvis Costello: '"Battered Old Bird" (1986) mentions burgundy, breakfast, a type-writer, and "the MacIntosh man" – four signature details of Bloom's day'.[16] Another example might be Josef von Sternberg's crime film *Underworld* (1927), which features, to no discernibly Joycean end, a character named Buck Mulligan. 'Battered Old Bird' and *Underworld* each have plausible deniability: neither Costello nor von Sternberg makes substantive use of *Ulysses* or even the idea of *Ulysses*, even as the components of an allusion are there. Both can be read as engaging with *Ulysses*, but in neither case does doing so illuminate much about the text in question.[17] Both simply attest, like so much else, to Joyce's cultural prominence – and at a certain point we may have to concede that, on account of his ubiquity, Joyce's influence in and of itself is mostly unremarkable. We may do well to remember Jorge Luis Borges' contention, in 'The Approach to Al-Mu'tasim', that, for all the 'dazzled

admiration of critics', 'points of congruence' with canonical texts may in fact be such texts' least interesting feature.[18]

Firstness, diffusionism, and canonicity

Nonetheless, incidents of Joycean confirmation bias can be useful in understanding the nature of Joyce's canonicity and the way it is used to construct histories of literature – and among these the most notorious is surely Charles R. Larson's study *The Emergence of African Fiction* (1971). In this study, Larson explicitly argues, among other things, for the modernist qualities, of such now-canonical writers as Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, and Ayi Kwei Armah. Overall, the study demonstrates, in the words of one reviewer of the revised edition, 'a Western approach to African literature so inflexible and so insensitive that it is difficult to take anything Larson has to say … seriously' – and his egregious use of Joyce to that end has become an infamous and originary case in African literary studies.[19] The nadir comes in Larson's discussion of Armah: in addition to numerous toe-curling inaccuracies and assumptions, he claims to prove that Armah's novel *Fragments* (1970) 'shows an indebtedness to Joyce' on the basis of its dedication to 'Ama Ata & Ana Livia'.[20] Since Anna Livia is a character in *Finnegans Wake*, Larson contends that the reference to 'Ana Livia' ought to be read as a sign that the reader should place the Joycean reading filter over *Fragments*. Needless to say, this connection is strained at best; the claim of a Joycean debt proved so enervating to Armah as to lead him to renounce his commitment not to write articles about his writing and publish a legendarily blistering response,[21] entitled 'Larsony, or Fiction as Criticism of Fiction', in which he confesses to 'have never read even a single work by Joyce' and clarifies that the dedication is to the Puerto Rican activist Ana Livia Cordero, not Joyce's fictional Anna Livia Plurabelle.[22]

While Larson's example is extreme – an instance of spurious close reading, of both *Fragments* and *Finnegans Wake*, couched in frankly racist assumptions about Armah's personal life and sustained by a lack of basic research, little of which stands corrected in the book's revised edition[23] – his turn to Joyce as a predecessor for Armah is representative of a trend in the study of global modernism: that is, the figuring of Joyce as an origin point for formal prose experimentation. This is a trend that dates to some of the earliest critical uses of Joyce: indeed, his relatively quick canonisation occurred on the basis of his formal innovations, and this has shaped how his work has been understood in the history of modernism from a relatively early stage. Ezra Pound is a key figure in understanding this process: a foundational and highly perceptive early reader of Joyce, Pound's famous ideal

type for literary history prioritised formal innovation as its dominant criterion:

> the best history of literature, more particularly of poetry, would be a twelve-volume anthology in which each poem was chosen not merely because it was a nice poem or a poem Aunt Hepsy liked, but because it contained an invention, a definite contribution to the art of verbal expression.[24]

As Natalia Cecire puts it, Pound's model 'places forms in time in a particular way, arguing for *firstness*: the first use of a given form'.[25] And, as many recent scholars of global modernism have noted, such use of firstness is inherently 'diffusionist',[26] in that it constructs literary history according to the diffusion or spread of innovation, usually from Europe to the rest of the world. Pound demonstrates exactly this critical use of Joyce's firstness and diffusionism as early as 1928, in a discussion of William Carlos Williams' *The Great American Novel* (1923) and John Rodker's *Adolphe* (1920):

> The two books are greatly different. *The Great American Novel* is simply the application of Joycean method to the American circumjacence. The *Adolphe* … brings the Joycean methodic inventions into a form; slighter than *Ulysses*, as a rondeau is slighter than a canzone, but indubitably a 'development', a definite step in general progress of writing … [27]

For Pound, Williams and Rodker are equally legible through their respective readings of *Ulysses* – both are the only 'offspring of *Ulysses* … possessing any value' – and what, he implies, makes *Adolphe* more valuable than *The Great American Novel* is the sense that it is a progressive step in 'the genealogy of writing [that] stems from *Ulysses*'.[28] As such, firstness is the dominant criterion, and Joyce's firstness a waystation of which Williams is derivative and on which Rodker may be building. For Pound, the innovations of the first are diffused to all succeeding literature worthy of the term; indeed, his 'best history of literature' is homologous with Bloom's history of poetry that is 'indistinguishable from [a history of] poetic influence'.[29]

In a genealogy of firstness, Joyce's work determines the emergence of later fiction: *Ulysses* produces *The Great American Novel* and *Adolphe* just as *Finnegans Wake* produces *Fragments* (with all due respect to Pound's Joycean readings of Williams and Rodker, for which there are convincing textual arguments). Joyce's innovations, since they came first, diffuse across the world and inform all subsequent literature. My point here is not to conflate Larson's unconvincing reading with Pound's convincing one, but to demonstrate the roots of this critical usage of Joyce's perceived firstness in the construction of literary history in literary studies – one that is certainly exacerbated by his popularity and ubiquity. For Pound and Larson, the motor of literary history is the transmission of the innovations of those who came first (or who are perceived to have come first) – and it is this conception of change in literary history that, when combined with Joyce's

canonisation-through-firstness (as opposed to his content), can encourage the Joycean confirmation bias that leads to the will to see traces of Joyce in everything. The study of Joyce's reception and influence ends up as a feedback loop that testifies to the already-settled canonicity of Joyce.

Diffusionist models of literary history have come under a great deal of criticism in recent years, particularly in response to the at once field-defining and doggedly diffusionist studies of Franco Moretti and Pascale Casanova.[30] In *Distant Reading*, Moretti draws on his corpus of 'Modern European Literature' to propose that Joyce, along with Franz Kafka, is one of 'the two greatest innovators of the twentieth-century novel', with each offering a split in the path of the history of the novel: the 'pattern of polarization' between Joyce's 'total irony of pluristilism' and Kafka's 'terrible seriousness of allegory' structures the world history of the novel.[31] Likewise, in *The World Republic of Letters*, Casanova sees both modernists, like Arno Schmidt and Henry Roth, and certain postcolonial writers, like Njabulo Ndebele and Salman Rushdie, as making up the world literary space's 'Joycean Family' – a conspicuously genealogical metaphor that groups together writers 'escaping a state of literary and political dependence' under the sign of Joyce's legacy.[32] In both Moretti and Casanova, versions of literary history are modelled using Joyce's afterlife: for them, his transcultural reception and influence is so great as to structure the concept of 'world literature'.

The problem with these models is not simply that they are Eurocentric: they are inaccurate too. By overvaluing Joyce's firstness, it becomes easy to propose diffusionist models of literary history that undervalue, or outright ignore, the possibility of innovations that emerge beyond the parameters signified by Joyce's firstness. Accordingly, Alexander Beecroft notes that the studies of Moretti and Casanova have 'the perhaps unintended effect of re-inscribing a hegemonic cultural centre, even as their avowed desire is to globalise literary studies'.[33] In less forgiving terms, Susan Stanford Friedman argues that both Moretti and Casanova 'articulate the patterns and forces underlying literary history decontextualised from any other historical conditions', leading to dangerous simplifications: while, Moretti turns the West into 'the site of discursive creation' and the non-West 'local materials', Casanova's Gallocentrism ensures that Paris is 'the dominant core [that] remains the reference point for comparison'.[34] In both cases, literary history is reduced to a centre-periphery, or dominant-dominated, binary that at once overestimates the impact of Europe and underestimates the creative agency of artists and networks outside of the West. As Jahan Ramazani has recently argued, 'To reduce world literary transmission to this single structure is to occlude the mutually transformative nature of intercultural literary dialogue'.[35] Indeed, Alys Moody's and Stephen J. Ross' recent anthology, *Global Modernists on Modernism*, provides a definitive evidence base

that contradicts diffusionist models of global modernism.[36] But the most powerful statement against this use of firstness and diffusionism comes from Armah's response to Larson:

> Now this language of indebtedness and borrowing and influence is usually a none too subtle way Western commentators have of saying Africa lacks original creativity. […] Naturally. Because Africa is inferior; the West superior. As African Literature develops, the best of it must become less African, more Western. The very best of it won't even be African at all.[37]

As Moody and Ross note, study of global modernism that 'defines its texts either by their conformity to Western models or by their historical links with Western artists or milieus will always be open to [Armah's] devastating charge'.[38] If we are to continue to study the reception and influence of *Ulysses* – which, as a novel that has unquestionably been widely received and is highly influential – then it is incumbent on us to find ways of doing so that do not repeat the both empirical and ethico-political problems engendered by Joyce's canonisation-through-firstness and diffusionist models of literary history.

Hypercanonicity and literary studies

The examples of Larson, Pound, Moretti, and Casanova demonstrate that Joyce's canonicity-through-firstness has contributed to a tendency to understand his reception and influence in terms of the diffusion of his supposed firstness. The risks of this are akin to that of Joycean confirmation bias: a model that envisions Joyce as 'foreign form' and the rest of the world as 'local content', or that makes of Joyce a yardstick for non-European achievement, rather quickly becomes a filter that highlights Joyce at the expense of everything else. But as Moody and Ross remind us, although 'Western modernism was one of the central problems for non-Western modernism … the relationship between any given modernism and the West, while always central and contested, was not derivative'.[39] By valuing Joyce's afterlife in terms of his firstness, the ways Joyce has been contested by non-Western writers are at risk of being overlooked or recognised only as proof of Joyce's achievement, rather than understood as valuable on their own terms and as partners in mutually transformative intercultural dialogue. The challenge, therefore, is to conceive terms for reading Joyce's reception and influence without the baggage of his canonicity-through-firstness.

In the years since Moretti and Casanova, modernist studies has looked to move beyond Eurocentric paradigms particularly, expanding in what Douglas Mao and Rebecca Walkowitz have described as 'temporal, spatial and vertical directions'.[40] Undertaking a similar expansion within the subfield of a single author, however, re-states the difficulties of moving beyond the canon, especially when that single author has been upheld as a

canonical norm in the global diffusion of modernism. Joyce's canonicity can indeed be an asset to the expansion of modernist studies: as Freedman argues, Joyce's canonicity, along with the related tendency to 'spot the Joycean', can be marshalled as a strategy for 'bringing marginal figures toward the centre' and 'to the attention of the Anglophone academy'.[41] While the wealth of transcultural work in Joyce studies demonstrates just how productive this approach can be,[42] depending on Joyce's canonicity as the occasion for 'bringing marginal figures toward the centre' privileges analyses of Joyce's positive diffusion across the world and leaves the nature of Joyce's canonicity uninterrogated. As a method for expanding Joyce studies, it reiterates the most intractable problems of diffusionism: the normativity of Joyce's firstness is upheld and the challenge to 'the centre' of modernist studies is limited to the superficial question of inclusion. How mutually transformative can a dialogue with Joyce be if his canonicity is a precondition of that dialogue? Freedman is attentive to the risks of this strategy, noting that 'we need to be careful about the danger of … a superficial labelling of the "Indian Joyce" (Desani, Rushdie), "the Caribbean Joyce" (Walcott), "the Brazilian Joyce" (Lispector, Luzama), "the Israeli Joyce" (Grossman) and so forth', and for her part offers a highly adept reading of Mulk Raj Anand's Joycean engagement.[43] Nonetheless, I propose that it is incumbent on future studies of Joyce's global reception and influence to take a conscious step beyond the occasion of Joyce's canonicity if the field is to avoid 'superficial labelling' and to account more fully for the variety of Joyce's afterlives.

The difficulty, for Joyce scholars, resides in the tension between, on the one hand, the assumption that we should lobby for the importance and significance of Joyce and, on the other, the knowledge that literary studies at large is – as it should be – evolving in ways that will change the kinds of importance and significance attributed to Joyce, especially as the long-term effects of postcolonial critique continue to re-orient literary studies at large. Ultimately, Joyce studies has little to fear from such change: given the culture that has developed around him, as the range of Joycean global afterlives demonstrates, there is simply not much more to be gained in arguing for his importance and significance (though that is not to say that we should not seek to shape the discussions of what makes him so important and significant). What should worry us, however, is the effect of continuing to make such a claim in a culture already saturated by Joyce's ubiquity – that is, of turning him into a transcendent, 'hypercanonical' figure. As Chuh has recently noted, the effects of 'hypercanonicity' on literary studies can be deleterious, leading to a critical stasis which limits a field's expansion to 'diversification' (by which she means 'Liberal representational politics').[44] In a discussion of curricular multiculturalism in the USA, Chuh turns to

Herman Melville as an example of the 'obviously tautological' effects that hypercanonicity has had on the field of American literature:

> Melville has indeed been central to American Literary history, because he has been upheld as such by Americanist critics; and because he is central to American Literary history, he can be made to speak transcendentally to sketch the future of the field. The instance of Melville becomes generalized in this way and reinscribes his hypercanonical status. We seem to arrive, unchanged, at our point of departure … [45]

Joyce's status in modernist studies is comparable, and the consequences of reinscribing Joyce as hypercanonical are equally high. That said, while the tautological nature of hypercanonicity is itself an obstacle to a field's development, it is important to understand that the obstacle it poses is not to the expansion of a field as such: rather, as Chuh argues, the association of the hypercanonical text with literary and aesthetic greatness limits the terms on which minoritised literatures can be included in the field. In a system in which minoritised literatures are validated 'as a sign of a commitment to diversity', such literatures are often 'framed and studied in terms of authenticity, racism, and resistance rather than literariness per se'.[46] As such, while the hypercanonical text is taken to exemplify literary and aesthetic greatness, the minoritised text is taken as a particular representation of 'difference' and 'politics'.[47] 'Greatness' and 'difference' are presented as divergent, incompatible concepts, aligned respectively with 'aesthetics' and 'politics'. As Chuh writes:

> Critically discussed and institutionally valued through standards of authenticity and bureaucratic investments in diversity, the distinctively aesthetic qualities of [minoritised literatures] and the metacritical questions of whether or to what ends it is important to study those distinctive qualities has been underaddressed.[48]

We should understand hypercanonicity as a phenomenon that limits critical dynamism, stultifying literary fields by contributing to the division between 'aesthetics' and 'politics' that characterises superficial curricular diversification. We surely want Joyce to remain a force for critical dynamism in modernist studies, and we surely do not want Joyce to become an obstacle to engagement with the aesthetics of minoritised literatures. This necessitates being comfortable enough with Joyce's cachet to contribute to a version of literary studies that ensures our critical endeavours take us somewhere other than our 'point of departure' – even if that means participating in the de-centring of Joyce in literary studies.

What I am proposing is not so glib as the removal of Joyce from Joyce studies: literary studies as a whole is better served when Joyce studies can account for Joyce's reception and influence without reinscribing the primacy of Joyce's canonicity and thereby tangling with the problems of

hypercanonicity. In the study of Joyce's global afterlives, this means asking how we can study Joyce's transcultural reception and influence in a way that ensures mutually transformative dialogue – and it is in these terms that Selvon's Joycean engagement in *The Lonely Londoners* is exemplary. While Selvon's achievement is comprehensible particularly in the aesthetic terms that, as Chuh suggests, hypercanonicity obfuscates, his use of Joyce towards these aesthetic ends takes the form of a contestation that I contend we should read as 'creative disaffiliation'. What makes *The Lonely Londoners* such a compelling example of *Ulysses*' afterlife is that Selvon's use of *Ulysses* is legible both in terms of its canonicity, or greatness, *and* its difference, or particularity. For Selvon, while Joyce is different and particular, he is not identically different or particular: reading the novel closely, we see how the aesthetic of the novel depends on being able to identify both the cultural capital and the whiteness of *Ulysses*. Registering the afterlife of *Ulysses* in *The Lonely Londoners*, we gain an important example of how the study of Joyce's afterlife can indeed contribute both to unsettling the terms of Joyce's (hyper-)canonicity and to making visible the distinctive aesthetic qualities of minoritised literatures.

'Summer-is-hearts'

As noted, 'Summer' stands as the novel's most conspicuous engagement with *Ulysses* – but I would argue that Selvon's use of Joyce is foreshadowed earlier in the novel, in a subtle and instructive reference to Molly Bloom's famous final words. Selvon frames his later invocation of 'Penelope' in a conversation between Tolroy and Tanty about the broken-down marriage of Agnes and Lewis. Lewis, after 'put[ting] such a beating on Agnes that she left him for good' (*TLL* 55), has been asking Tolroy, and the rest of his male friends, if he can help him find where Agnes is staying. Tanty refuses to tell Tolroy, explaining that Agnes plans to have Lewis charged with assault:

> 'Bring him up for assault!'
>
> 'Yes, I advice her. That's the only way to stop him, the way he getting on'.
>
> 'And she say yes?'
>
> 'Yes, she say yes. So you just wait and see'. (*TLL* 58)

In Derek Attridge's helpful schema for categorising Joycean influence, this constitutes a 'nod':[49] Tanty's reported 'Yes, she say yes' quite clearly resembles, and therefore alludes to, Molly's 'yes I said yes I will Yes' (*U* 18.1608-9). But this 'Yes' carries a resonance different to that of Molly's acceptance of Bloom's proposal: the collective 'Yes' of Agnes and Tanty transforms Molly's affirmative into a direct challenge to the masculinity of

Lewis and 'the boys'; not 'I will Yes' but the combative 'yes. So you just wait and see'. As Moses has warned Lewis, 'women in this country not like Jamaica, you know. They have rights over here, and they always shouting for something' (*TLL* 54). It is as if the 'Yes' of Agnes and Tanty signals participation in this new sexual economy: not exactly Molly's 'Yes' of mutual dependence and desire, but a 'Yes' that nevertheless asserts, like Molly, an expressive agency beyond the understanding of the male protagonists. In Selvon's interrogation of the loneliness of his Londoners, the operations of sexuality and desire are at the fore – and in this, 'Penelope', before we even reach 'Summer', is linked to the new sexual economy created by migration and urbanity.

It is less surprising, then, that Selvon should choose to make 'Summer', his most sexually explicit episode by far, one that resembles 'Penelope' so clearly. That formal resemblance constitutes Selvon's second, and most obvious, nod to 'Penelope', to which he adds two more subtle nods at the very end of the section:

> … all these things happen in the blazing summer under the trees in the park on the grass with the daffodils and tulips in full bloom and a sky of blue oh it does really be beautiful then to hear the birds whistling and see the green leaves come back on the trees and in the night the world turn upside down and everybody hustling that is life that is London … (*TLL* 101)

In the rhythm of these lines, with their accumulating conjunctions and attention to nature, and in the choice of the word 'bloom', Selvon nods to 'Penelope', deepening the section's formal Joycean connection with specific details. But to what end? Attridge's taxonomy is again helpful: these nods to 'Penelope' help to establish a thematic 'echo', which is when 'the work in question establishes a link with the precursor through some type of similarity' either in style or theme.[50] Just like the final moments of 'Penelope', the end of 'Summer' figures a rapt and libidinous nostalgia: while Molly conflates memories of Gibraltar and Poldy's proposal, Selvon's narrator recalls the exceptional state of the London summer, when nature comes back to life 'after all them cold and wet months' (*TLL* 93). But the echo does not lead to the same orgasmic affirmation as 'Penelope'; Selvon strikes a decidedly flatter and more ambivalent tone:

> … oh lord Galahad say when the sweetness of summer get in him he say he would never leave the old Brit'n as long as he live and Moses sigh a long sigh like a man who live life and see nothing at all in it and who frighten as the years go by wondering what it is all about. (*TLL* 101-2)

While Galahad, who is a new arrival to London, is still swept up by the magic of the London summer, Moses, who has seen a few, looks at his friend and finds in the prospect of yet another summer an existential dread. In 'Summer', then, Selvon makes a series of nods to Joyce – performs a

proximity to him – only to then diverge from him. 'Summer' does not re-voice Joyce: it disidentifies Moses from Molly. Between the re-voicing of Molly's 'Yes' by Agnes and Tanty and the disidentification of 'Summer', Selvon's use of 'Penelope' seems to ask us to take 'Penelope' as a foil for something in the lives of 'the boys' – as if 'Penelope' is meant to signal something that contributes to or participates in Moses' feeling of loneliness and futility.

Moses' 'long sigh' is elaborated upon most clearly at the very end of the novel, as he feels the boredom of London more and more, 'But it reach a stage … where he get so accustom to the pattern that he can't do anything about it' (*TLL* 138). Moses stands by the Thames, thinking that 'Under the kiff-kiff laughter, behind the ballad and the episode, the what-happening, the summer-is-hearts, he could see a great aimlessness, a great restless, swaying movement that leaving you standing in the same spot' (*TLL* 138-9). This sense of stasis is the heart of Moses', and the boys', loneliness; as Susheila Nasta writes, 'By the end of the novel Moses is aware of a meaningless repetition and circularity in the group's existence'.[51] But if summer is a reminder of the futility of existence for Moses, what makes it so exceptionally sweet for a naïf like Galahad? The reference, in 'Summer', to 'the green leaves come back on the trees and in the night the world turn upside down' is key: summer is like carnival, in which the world as it is lived is temporarily transformed into something 'parodic, egalitarian, and subversive'.[52] When summer arrives:

> … all them girls throw away heavy winter coat and wearing light summer frocks so you could see the legs and shapes that was hiding away from the cold blasts and you could coast a lime in the park … and on a nice day every manjack and his brother going to the park with his girl and laying down on the green and making love … (*TLL* 92)

Unlike the winter, when the Dickensian fog obscures the view of anything beyond one's immediate vicinity, the summer provides Londoners a momentary glimpse of everything and everyone: it re-orients Moses and the boys within a city suddenly visible and brimming with libidinal possibility. This is the promise of the London summer: 'when summer come is fire in the town big times fete like stupidness and you have to keep the blood cool for after all them cold and wet months you like you roaring to go' (*TLL* 93).

Nonetheless, as Kate Houlden persuasively argues, this carnival is not the exceptional state it seems: although Selvon appears to frame his characters as triumphantly 'conquering the city through its women', 'Summer' actually provides a highly stratified picture of the operations of sexuality and desire in London.[53] Even as we hear that 'to talk of all the episodes that Moses had with woman in London would take bags of ballad Moses move through all the nationalities in the world and then he start the circle again'

(*TLL* 93), the encounters Selvon represents are determined entirely by socio-economic status and race. Initially, the women of 'Summer' are sex workers, with whom the boys 'negotiate ten shillings or a pound', and migrant domestic workers, since 'everybody know how after the war them rich English family sending to the continent to get domestic' (*TLL* 92, 93). Selvon then focuses at greater length on the 'rich English' themselves, particularly those who look to Moses and the boys for more transgressive activities: a voyeur who 'play as if he fall asleep and give Moses a free hand' and another who 'want to pay Moses to go with [a] woman', a wealthy 'pansy' who Moses humours, and women who 'can't get big thrills unless they have a black man in the company' (*TLL* 96, 98, 99, 101). In each of these encounters, the apparent sexual freedom of the summer looks more like the freedom of wealthy white English people to fetishise the poor and the racialised. As Selvon writes:

> … the cruder you are the more the girls like you you can't put on any English accent for them or play ladeda or tell them you studying medicine in Oxford or try to be polite and civilise they don't want that sort of thing at all they want you to live up to the films and stories they hear about black people living primitive in the jungles of the world … (*TLL* 100)

When Moses sighs his long sigh in the face of Galahad's excitement at the memory and prospect of the London summer, he is feeling, as Houlden puts it, that 'The "wild" element of the city's sex life is not so much the freedom offered by London, as the racialised sexual fantasies animating British life'.[54] In one of the novel's most famous scenes, Galahad thinks of the regular racist humiliations to which he is subjected, and speaks to the 'colour of his hand':

> 'Colour, is you what causing all this, you know. Why the hell you can't be blue, or red or green, if you can't be white? You know is you that cause a lot of misery in the world. Is not me, you know, is you! I ain't do anything to infuriate the people and them, is you! Look at you, you so black and innocent, and this time so you causing misery all over the world' (*TLL* 77)

Galahad, in his own innocence, tries to convince himself that racism can be understood in terms of the most superficial aesthetics – as if the meanings attributed to racial difference boil down to basic colour theory. In Galahad's exuberance at the end of 'Summer', Moses hears that he is yet to understand that the libidinous thrill of the summer is part of the same phenomenon that keeps him from being able to find a steady place to live.

Houlden, following in the footsteps of critics like Michel Fabre and Nasta, emphasises the novel's 'calypso aesthetics', arguing that 'Summer' draws particularly on calypso's 'more subversive aspects' in order to process 'the boys' own ambivalent responses to white sexual transgression'.[55] So what exactly is the Joycean engagement there for? What is 'Penelope' being made to stand

for in 'Summer'? Why does 'Penelope' step in as an alienating factor in Moses' ballad? Since the section focuses at such length on white sexual transgression, and suggests, in its final lines, that Galahad's enthusiasm for summer is connected to his position within the racialised sexual economy of London, I contend that Selvon draws on 'Penelope', and the risqué reputation of *Ulysses* by extension, as a marker of the white woman's sexual transgression. When Selvon disidentifies Moses from Molly, Molly stands in for an idea of the liberated white woman whose sexual liberation depends upon race as a site of fetish.[56] Moreover, when Selvon has Agnes and Tanty appropriate Molly's 'Yes', he intimates that the rights Caribbean women are seizing may equally be premised on a fundamentally racist conception of the Caribbean man.[57] Indeed, one of Molly's most conspicuous fantasies hinges explicitly on the transgression of interraciality:

> … I was thinking would I go around by the quays there some dark evening where nobodyd know me and pick up a sailor off the sea thatd be hot for it and not care a pin whose I was only do it off up in a gate somewhere or one of those wildlooking gipsies in Rathfarnham had their camp pitched near the Bloomfield laundry to try and steal our things … that blackguardlooking fellow with the fine eyes peeling a switch attack me in the dark and ride me up against a wall without a word or a murderer anybody … (*U* 18.1410-1419)

The erotic potential of 'wildlooking gipsies' is contingent on Molly's understanding of them as racialised others, complete with primitive and criminal tendencies – and in this moment Molly does indeed figure as bound up in the 'racialised sexual fantasies animating British life'.[58]

This is not to say, of course, that Selvon's disidentification of Moses from Molly means that Moses stands outside of this dynamic: notwithstanding the impossibility of doing so, his behaviour throughout 'Summer' and the book as a whole demonstrates that, for all his sighing and ambivalence, he is more often than not willing to take part in London's sexual economy. As Moses thinks, immediately before lamenting the stasis 'under the kiff-kiff laughter', he will wait until after the summer to decide whether to return to Trinidad, because 'the summer does really be hearts' (*TLL* 137). It is to say that in Selvon's use of Joyce, he invites his readers to understand 'Penelope' – its style and content – in terms of whiteness, not formal firstness. In 'Summer' itself, Selvon's calypsonian aesthetic subsumes the Joycean one, subverting it by casting it as a form that ultimately excludes and alienates Moses and 'the boys'. The very final vignette of 'Summer', immediately preceding Moses' long sigh, makes this clear. We hear of a Jamaican who was once picked up by 'a woman in Chelsea in a smart flat with all sorts of surrealistic painting on the walls and contemporary furniture in the G-plan':

> … the poor fellar bewildered and asking questions to improve himself because the set-up look like the World of Art but the number not interested in passing on any knowledge she only interested in one thing and in the heat of emotion she call the Jamaican a black bastard though she didn't mean it as an insult but as a compliment under the circumstances … (*TLL* 101)

Beyond simple confirmation of the diagnosis of blackness as a site of fetish, this story forces the reader to consider that the 'World of Art' and access to it may not necessarily be free of the politics of the exclusionary status quo, or 'aesthetically autonomous',[59] and may in fact depend upon the denigration of the Black subject for its integrity. Given *Ulysses*' reputation as 'high modernism', we can take this vignette as a hint that we should read the section's appropriated Joycean form as a cipher for that same 'World of Art'. Moreover, that it leads to the Jamaican man giving the woman a 'thump' (*TLL* 101) recalls the circumstances that lead to the combative 'Yes' of Agnes and Tanty, as if the behaviour of the woman in Chelsea is equally implicated in the new forms of agency that Caribbean women exercise in London. Appropriating 'Penelope' for the novel's 'ballads', Joyce's canonical firstness is re-cast as whiteness' aesthetic of fetishism – one end of the continuum of anti-Black racism. *Ulysses*, artfully subverted by Selvon's distinctive calypsonian aesthetic, becomes little more than the function of the racialised sexual economy of Britain.[60]

Creative disaffiliation

If the goal of the study of Joyce's global afterlives should be mutually transformative dialogue that does not return us 'unchanged, at our point of departure', the case of *The Lonely Londoners* is exemplary of both the potential and difficulty of that study. Selvon draws on Joyce's canonisation-through-firstness and casts that formal experimentalism as a factor in the alienation and isolation of his protagonists – which is to say that he requires his readers to understand Joyce both in terms of his canonicity, or greatness, *and* his difference, or particularity. The example of Selvon's use of Joyce in *The Lonely Londoners* cuts across the categorical divisions that, per Chuh, liberal representational politics sustain in literary studies. Indeed, Selvon engages with Joyce so as to subordinate 'Penelope' entirely to his calypsonian aesthetic: in addition to the above reading of the 'Yes' of Agnes and Tanty and the form of 'Summer', we could also consider how the novel disrupts the Ulyssean model by placing its subversion of 'Penelope' in its middle, rather than at its end, or how the episode's decoupling from a single consciousness epitomises its move away from singular protagonists towards collective ones. Selvon's contestation of *Ulysses* can be understood as the inverse of the 'creative affiliation' that Srininvas Aravamudan sees in G.V. Desani's *All About H. Hatterr*: while Aravamudan makes a claim for Desani's

achievement through his affiliative rather than imitative relationship to Joyce, I want to make an equal claim for Selvon's achievement through a process of creative disaffiliation that makes the considered disidentification from Joyce integral to his aesthetic. As the example of *The Lonely Londoners* demonstrates, reading with an eye for 'creative disaffiliation' may provide one method towards a study of Joyce's afterlife that unsettles the terms of hypercanonicity while making legible the distinct aesthetic qualities of minoritised literatures.

Notes

1. Sam Selvon, *The Lonely Londoners* (Penguin Books Limited, 2014), p. 92. Hereafter all citations in-text.
2. Isabel Quigly, 'Review of *The Lonely Londoners*, by Samuel Selvon', *Spectator*, 14 December 1956, p. 882; Gwendolen Freeman, 'Review of *The Lonely Londoners*, by Samuel Selvon', *Times Literary Supplement*, 21 December 1956, p. 761; J. Dillon Brown, *Migrant Modernism: Postwar London and the West Indian Novel* (Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press, 2013), p. 129.
3. Besides Brown, work that references Selvon's use of Joyce includes: Kathie Birat, 'Seeking Sam Selvon: Michel Fabre and the Fiction of the Caribbean', *Transatlantica*, 1, 2009 <http://journals.openedition.org/transatlantica/4259> [Date accessed 7 August 2019]; Clement H. Wyke, *Sam Selvon's Dialectal Style and Fictional Strategy* (Vancouver, BC: University of British Columbia Press, 2011), p. 47; Peter J. Kalliney, *Commonwealth of Letters: British Literary Culture and the Emergence of Postcolonial Aesthetics*, Modernist Literature & Culture, 20 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), p. 137; Jean-Jacques Lecercle, 'Three Accounts of Literary Style', *CR: The New Centennial Review*, 16.3 (2016), pp. 151–71; Patrick Herald, '"The Black", Space, and Sexuality: Examining Resistance in Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners*', *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature*, 52.2 (2017), pp. 350–64 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021989415608906>; Kathie Birat, 'Making Sense of Memory in the Writings of the Caribbean Diaspora: Sam Selvon's London Calypso', *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 55.6 (2019), pp. 824–35 <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449855.2019.1683349>. For foundational readings of how Selvon subverts English traditions and mythologies in *The Lonely Londoners*, see: Michel Fabre, 'From Trinidad to London: Tone and Language in Samuel Selvon's Novels', in Susheila Nasta (ed.), *Critical Perspectives on Sam Selvon* (Lynne Rienner Publishers, 1988); Sushiela Nasta, 'Setting Up Home in a City of Words: Sam Selvon's London Novels', in Susheila Nasta and Anna Rutherford (eds.), *Tiger's Triumph: Celebrating Sam Selvon* (Dangaroo, 1995), pp. 78–95; Roydon Salick, *The Novels of Samuel Selvon* (Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2001).
4. There are a couple of minor exceptions: John Brannigan briefly considers the parallel 'Summer' draws in an essay on Joycean influence on postwar British literature and John Culbert briefly considers Selvon's representation of London alongside Joyce's of Dublin, without specific reference to 'Summer.' John Brannigan, 'Joyce Will Attend: The Joyce Tour of Postwar Literature', in John Brannigan, Julian Wolfreys, and Geoff Ward (eds.), *Re: Joyce: Text. Culture. Politics* (Macmillan Press Ltd., 1998), p. 208; John Culbert, 'The

Wake of Ulysses', in *Paralyses: Literature, Travel, and Ethnography in French Modernity* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2010).

5. Key studies of Joyce's transcultural influence include: Robin William Fiddian, 'James Joyce and Spanish-American Fiction: A Study of the Origins and Transmission of Literary Influence', *Bulletin of Hispanic Studies*, 66.1 (1989), pp. 23–39 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1475382892000366023>; Karen Lawrence (ed.), *Transcultural Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); Ariela Freedman, 'Global Joyce', *Literature Compass*, 7.9 (2010), pp. 798–809 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-4113.2010.00739.x>; José Luis Venegas, *Decolonizing Modernism: James Joyce and the Development of Spanish American Fiction* (London: Legenda, 2010); Brian L. Price, César A. Salgado, and John Pedro Schwartz (eds.), *TransLatin Joyce: Global Transmissions in Ibero-American Literature* (New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014); Martha C. Carpentier (ed.), *Joycean Legacies* (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015).
6. J. Dillon Brown, *Migrant Modernism: Postwar London and the West Indian Novel* (University of Virginia Press, 2013), pp. 103–33. Kalliney does mention the connection in passing; Kalliney, *Commonwealth of Letters*, p. 137. Key studies that connect Selvon to modernism specifically include: Simon Gikandi, *Writing in Limbo: Modernism and Caribbean Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1992); Jed Esty, *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009); Matthew Hart, *Nations of Nothing but Poetry: Modernism, Transnationalism, and Synthetic Vernacular Writing*, Modernist Literature & Culture (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Thomas S. Davis, *The Extinct Scene: Late Modernism and Everyday Life* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2015); Mpalive-Hangson Msiska, 'Wide-Angled Modernities and Alternative Metropolitan Imaginaries', in Susheila Nasta and Mark U. Stein (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Black and Asian British Writing* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2020), pp. 227–45 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108164146.016>; Mary Lou Emery, 'Questioning Modernism: The 1950s–1960s', in Raphael Dalleo and Curdella Forbes (eds.), *Caribbean Literature in Transition, 1920–1970* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 37–51 <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108850087.004>.
7. Kandice Chuh, *The Difference Aesthetics Makes: On the Humanities "After Man"* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019), p. 39.
8. Mark Wollaeger, 'Joyce and Postcolonial Theory: Analytic and Tropical Modes', in Richard Brown (ed.), *A Companion to James Joyce* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2008), pp. 174–92 (p. 174) <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405177535.ch11>.
9. Wollaeger, p. 180.
10. Jonathan Goldman, 'Afterlife*', in Sean Latham (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Ulysses* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), pp. 33–48 (pp. 34, 40) <https://doi.org/10.1017/CCO9781139696425.005>.
11. Goldman, p. 40.
12. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford University Press, 1997), p. 5.
13. This is a very rich field, but major transcultural examples include: Srinivas Aravamudan, 'Postcolonial Affiliations: *Ulysses* and *All About H. Hatterr*', in Karen R. Lawrence (ed.), *Transcultural Joyce* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998); César Augusto Salgado, *From Modernism to Neobaroque:*

Joyce and Lezama Lima (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University Press, 2001); Jessica Schiff Berman, 'Comparative Colonialisms: Joyce, Anand, and the Question of Engagement', *Modernism/Modernity*, 13.3 (2006), pp. 465–85 <https://doi.org/10.1353/mod.2006.0056>; Patricia Novillo-Corvalán, *Borges and Joyce: An Infinite Conversation* (Oxford: Legenda, 2011); Norman Cheadle, '*Ulysses* in Buenosayres: Leopoldo Marechal's Encyclopedia Argentina', *James Joyce Quarterly,* 55.1 (2017), pp. 135–151.

14. Goldman, pp. 39–40.
15. Freedman, p. 801.
16. Goldman, p. 40.
17. In the case of *Underworld*, Richard Brody has suggested that Mulligan's name may have been used for its 'whiff of the illicit,' since at that time *Ulysses* was banned in the US. Richard Brody, 'Buck Mulligan in Hollywood', *The New Yorker*, 16 June 2011 <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/richard-brody/buck-mulligan-in-hollywood> [Date accessed 3 February 2021].
18. Jorge Luis Borges, *Collected Fictions*, trans. by Andrew Hurley (London: Penguin, 1998), p. 86.
19. David Maughan Brown, 'Review: *The Emergence of African Fiction* by Charles R. Larson', *English in Africa*, 6.1 (1979), pp. 91–96 (p. 93).
20. Charles R. Larson, *The Emergence of African Fiction* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1972), p. 268.
21. As Ode S. Ogede writes, 'We should be grateful for Charles Larson's invidious comments, which rattled Armah out of his shell to take up the practice of the artist who is also a critic.' Ode S. Ogede, 'Angled Shots and Reflections: On the Literary Essays of Ayi Kwei Armah', *World Literature Today*, 66.3 (1992), pp. 439–44 (p. 439) <https://doi.org/10.2307/40148362>.
22. Ayi Kwei Armah, 'Larsony, or Fiction as Criticism of Fiction', *First World*, 9.2 (1977), pp. 1–14 (p. 7).
23. Brown notes that in the revised edition 'the "debt" to Joyce becomes a (still pretty far-fetched) "similarity" to Joyce, but the phrases which seem to attribute to Larson an intimate personal knowledge of Armah are allowed to remain.' David Maughan Brown, pp. 91–92.
24. Ezra Pound, 'How to Read', in T.S. Eliot (ed.), *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound* (New York, NY: New Directions Books, 1968), pp. 15–40 (p. 17).
25. Natalia Cecire, *Experimental: American Literature and the Aesthetics of Knowledge* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2019), p. 27.
26. This usage of the term 'diffusionist' comes from anthropology and world history, particularly the work of J. M. Blaut, and is used throughout recent major studies of global modernism by Wollaeger and Eatough (2013) and Hayot and Walkowitz (2016). J. M. Blaut, *The Colonizer's Model of the World: Geographical Diffusionism and Eurocentric History* (Guilford Press, 1993); Mark Wollaeger and Matt Eatough (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms* (Oxford University Press, 2013); Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (eds.), *A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2016).
27. Ezra Pound, 'Dr Williams' Position', in T.S. Eliot (ed.), *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound* (New York, NY: New Directions Books, 1968), pp. 389–398 (p. 397).
28. Pound, 'Dr Williams' Position', pp. 397, 396.
29. Bloom, p. 5.

30. Particularly: Franco Moretti, 'Conjectures on World Literature', *New Left Review*, 1 (2000), pp. 54–68 <http://newleftreview.org/II/1/franco-moretti-conjectures-on-world-literature>; Franco Moretti, 'More Conjectures', *New Left Review*, 20 (2003), pp. 73–81 <http://newleftreview.org/II/20/franco-moretti-more-conjectures>; Franco Moretti, *Distant Reading* (London: Verso, 2013); Pascale Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, trans. by M.B. DeBevoise (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 2004); Pascale Casanova, 'Literature as a World', *New Left Review*, 31 (2005), pp. 71–90.
31. Moretti, *Distant Reading*, pp. 28–29.
32. Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, pp. 330–36.
33. Alexander Beecroft, 'World Literature Without a Hyphen', *New Left Review*, 54, (2008), pp. 87–100 (p. 88).
34. Susan Stanford Friedman, *World Modernisms, World Literature, and Comparativity* (Oxford University Press, 2012), p. 502 <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195338904.013.0021>.
35. Jahan Ramazani, 'Form', in Eric Hayot and Rebecca L. Walkowitz (eds.), *A New Vocabulary for Global Modernism* (New York, NY: Columbia University Press, 2016), pp. 114–129 (p. 127).
36. Alys Moody and Stephen J. Ross (eds.), *Global Modernists on Modernism: An Anthology* (London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2019).
37. Armah, pp. 6, 12.
38. Moody and Ross, p. 4.
39. Ibid., p. 11.
40. Douglas Mao and Rebecca L. Walkowitz, 'The New Modernist Studies', *PMLA*, 123.3 (2008), pp. 737–48 (p. 737). Mao has since clarified clarified this statement: 'the new modernist studies was as much a matter of fresh approaches as of larger range of objects studied' as it was the temporal, spatial, and vertical expansion. Douglas Mao, 'Introduction: The New Modernist Studies', in Douglas Mao (ed.), *The New Modernist Studies* (Cambridge University Press, 2021), pp. 1–22 (p. 3) <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108765428.001>.
41. Freedman, p. 801.
42. See endnotes 6 and 13.
43. Freedman, p. 801.
44. Chuh, p. 37.
45. Chuh, p. 39.
46. Chuh, p. 17.
47. Chuh, p. 17.
48. Chuh, p. 17.
49. 'A nod occurs when, in fiction, a writer makes an overt acknowledgement of Joyce or Joyce's writings in passing. It might be an allusion or an actual quotation.' Attridge's other 'rough categories' are the 'assertion,' the 'echo,' and the 'counter-signature'. Derek Attridge, 'Foreword', in Martha C. Carpentier (ed.), *Joycean Legacies* (Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2015), pp. vii–xx (pp. ix–x).
50. Attridge, p. xi.
51. Susheila Nasta, *Home Truths: Fictions of the South Asian Diaspora in Britain* (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2002), p. 80.
52. John Thieme, '"The World Upside Down": Carnival Patterns in *The Lonely Londoners*', in Martin Zehnder (ed.), *Something Rich and Strange: Selected Essays on Sam Selvon* (Leeds: Peepal Tree Press, 2003), pp. 51–64 (p. 55).

53. Kate Houlden, 'Sam Selvon's *The Lonely Londoners* (1956), White Sexual Desire and the Calypso Aesthetic', *Journal of West Indian Literature*, 20.2 (2012), pp. 24–37 (p. 26).
54. Houlden, p. 29.
55. Houlden, p. 32. See also: Fabre; Sushiela Nasta.
56. Molly's race is, of course, more complicated than 'white': she describes herself as looking like a 'jewess … after [her] mother' (*U* 18.1184), Lunita Laredo, who was presumably a Sephardic Jew. That said, while Molly is ambiguously raced, there is little evidence in *Ulysses* to suggest that she experiences racial difference in the same way as more obviously racialised characters, like Leopold Bloom and Cissy Caffrey; as such, it is plausible for Selvon to identify Molly, rightly or wrongly, with whiteness. See: Jonathan Quick, 'Molly Bloom's Mother', *ELH*, 57.1 (1990), pp. 223–40 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2873252>; Casey Lawrence, '"The Link between Nations and Generations": Cissy Caffrey as Racialized and Sexualized Other in James Joyce's *Ulysses*', *Joyce Studies Annual*, 2018.1 (2018), pp. 108–21.
57. That Selvon exhibits misogyny and misogynoir in *The Lonely Londoners* is a point that was memorably made at the Commonwealth Institute for Caribbean Writers conference in 1987: during a reading from *The Lonely Londoners* George John recalls that 'to everyone's amazement, this West Indian woman walks up the spiral stairway from the floor to the rostrum and slaps him twice, hard. He was insulting black women, she shouted.' This moment deeply shocked Selvon, who attempted to address it in a 1991 preface to the last of his London novels, *Moses Migrating* (1983). George John in Jeremy Taylor, 'Play It Again Sam: Remembering Samuel Selvon', *Caribbean Beat*, 1 July 1994 <https://www.caribbean-beat.com/issue-11/play-it-again-sam-remembering-sam-selvon> [Date accessed 19 August 2021].
58. Houlden, p. 29.
59. Kalliney argues that 'Late colonial and early postcolonial intellectuals, for their part, were strongly attracted to the modernist idea of aesthetic autonomy,' particularly as it promised that 'cultural institutions could be exempt from the systems of racial and political hierarchy operative elsewhere—that a work of art could be judged solely by its imaginative merits, not by reference to the racial status of its creator.' Kalliney, *Commonwealth of Letters*, pp. 5–10.
60. This is not to undermine readings of Selvon's universalism, which, as Brown points out, is integral to ideas of cosmopolitanism in his early work, but to insist on his critique of the power structure of whiteness as equally integral to the novel. J. Dillon Brown, *Migrant Modernism*, p. 105.

Acknowledgement

I would like to thank Myles Oldershaw for his advice in conceiving this essay and his generous and thoughtful comments on its first draft.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).