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Introduction
According to the Oxford English Dictionary, the word insular, derived from the Latin insula, is first and foremost the adjectival form of the noun island. The OED has insular’s first definition as: “Of or pertaining to an island; inhabiting or situated on an island” (OED Online: “insular” 1.a). The definition seems straightforward and impartially descriptive enough, but as most English-speakers know, this adjectival form of the word island, when deployed metaphorically, is almost always condescending. The condescension surfaces clearly in the OED’s fourth and final definition for the term insular: “Pertaining to islanders; esp. having the characteristic traits of the inhabitants of an island (e.g. of Great Britain); cut off from intercourse with other nations, isolated; self-contained; narrow or prejudiced in feelings, ideas, or manners” (OED Online: “insular” 4.a).

If this final definition were not so altogether familiar, its irony would be surprising. Peeling ourselves away from English’s naturalized pejorative stance regarding insularity or islandness, and recalling that this stance is not natural but rather grows out of specific historical and cultural processes, we might ask: Why would English, as a language originating on an island, naturalize a sense of loathing toward its geography of origin? This type of linguistically encoded anti-insularity would feel unsurprising, even expected, among several languages of the European continent. And indeed it is true that the French, Spanish, and German terms for island can be used in ways analogous to English’s pejorative sense. But for English to acquiesce to this pejorative definition of insularity seems like an uncharacteristic capitulation to the continent’s claims to superiority, a strange admission that Britain’s islandness somehow attests to a naturally inferior status vis-à-vis its rivals on the putatively superior continent.

How, then, did English attain this linguistically encoded loathing for its own island origins? For a partial answer, I would point toward the influence of the British colonies in North America. During the eighteenth century, many colonists and revolutionaries in North America were thinking continentally, speaking and writing in ways that were refashioning English in distinctly anti-insular terms aimed specifically at Britain. Recall that the North American revolutionaries referred to their congress and army as the Continental Congress and the Continental Army, and contextualize this recollection with some of
Thomas Paine’s revolutionary statements in the 1776 pamphlet *Common Sense*: “Small islands not capable of protecting themselves, are the proper objects for kingdoms to take under their care; but there is something very absurd, in supposing a continent to be perpetually governed by an island” (Paine 90–91). In this pamphlet, which saturated the reading public of British North America, Paine deplored seemingly narrow British affronts to Americans’ allegedly broad “continental minds.” He explained that “in this extensive quarter of the globe, we forget the narrow limits of three hundred and sixty miles (the extent of England) and carry on our friendship on a larger scale” (Paine 1986[1776], 85). Here, Paine’s assessment of Britain’s islandness converges with the *OED’s* final definition of insularity. And in light of such proto-US–American comparisons between the putatively superior form of the continent and the ostensibly inferior form of the island, it seems telling that the *OED* first marks English’s pejorative use of the term *insular* in 1775, a year after the colonists valorized their congress as *continental* in a rhetorical move that was calculated not only to underscore unity among the colonies but also to cast aspersions on British islandness or insularity.¹

The pejorative sense of the term *insular* has found fertile ground in English as continentally-minded American speakers have outnumbered British speakers. And, as Michelle Ann Stephens and I have observed elsewhere, the pejorative sense of the term has also attained a notable place in the field imaginary of Transnational American Studies, as some of the field’s most prominent transnationalist voices have repeatedly distanced themselves from previous generations of American Studies scholars by referring to older Americanist scholarship as *insular*. Indeed, the term *insular* appears frequently and almost rhythmically in transnational Americanist assessments of earlier eras, contrasting an earlier “insular” American Studies that was border-bound against a valorized outward-looking Americanist transnationalism. In these transnational Americanist assessments, the term *insular* is paired with an array of vexed attributes: the static, the self-enclosed, the parochial, and the disembedded (Roberts and Stephens 2013, 3; Roberts 2013, 124).² These attributes are insularity’s negative accruals as the concept of islandness has found framing within an English reified by an Americanism that is built, as is showcased in Paine’s statements, on a sense of the grandeur of continental space. Indeed, one might refer to this static, self-enclosed, parochial, and disembedded conception of insularity as a continentalized view of the geographical form of the island. And in light of this anti-insular Americanization of the English language, it is unsurprising that the US Supreme Court, when handling the set of post–Spanish-American War cases called the *Insular Cases*, found that the US Constitution did not follow the flag to the new US possessions of Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. Rather, armed from the outset with a continentalized and pejorative view of the insularity of the spaces it was contemplating, the Supreme Court bestowed upon these island possessions the vexed status of “foreign…in a domestic sense” (quoted in Burnett and Marshall 2001, 1).

But what would a de-continentalized view of islandness look like? One entrance into such a view comes through a writer of postcolonial archipelagic American French, the Martinican theorist Édouard Glissant. Glissant’s 1981 *Le Discours antillais* explains:

Ordinarily, we look at insularity as a mode of isolation, a sort of spatial neurosis. In the Caribbean, however, each island is an opening […]. It is only for those anchored to the European continent that insularity equals imprisonment. The Antillean imaginary frees us from suffocation.

*(Glissant 1981, 427; trans., Glover 2010, 1)*
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Rather than acquiescing to the European continent’s pejorative stance on insularity, Glissant re-envisions insularity from his position among the islands of the Caribbean. Here, an island is not self-enclosed and narrow but is, rather, “an opening.” When considered in the context of Glissant’s view of insularity, the question that is often implicitly asked in transnational Americanist discussions (i.e., how can American Studies become less insular?) needs to fall by the wayside. In its place, I would suggest another set of questions: What would happen if American Studies scholars turned away from easy reliance on Paine’s continentalized stance on islandness and instead considered Glissant’s decontinentalized insularity? What shifts might take place in American Studies if scholars were to proceed from the assumption of a distinctly open insularity? How would Americanist treatments of island spaces (including the oft-discussed *Insular Cases*) change as a result of this decontinentalized view of insularity? In terms of scholarly practice and political engagement, what precisely might it mean to understand each island as “an opening”?

In approaching these and other questions, Stephens and I have edited a collection of some 20 essays titled *Archipelagic American Studies*, in which we describe “the archipelagic Americas” as “the temporally shifting and spatially splayed set of islands, island chains, and island-ocean-continent relations” which have included the cultures of US imperialism but have more broadly “exceeded US-Americanism and have been affiliated with and indeed constitutive of competing notions of the Americas since at least 1492” (Roberts and Stephens 2017, 1). Archipelagic American Studies, then, becomes:

a mode of American studies dedicated to tracing the interrelations of America (as a contingent and elastic space constellated by oceanic waterways, two continents, and uncounted islands both within the hemisphere and beyond via the sinews of empire) and the broader planetary archipelago. This tracing of the interactive and constitutive relationships between (to borrow a phrase from W. E. B. Du Bois) “America and the islands of the sea” holds in productive tension the insights produced by such newly emerging fields as island studies and ocean studies, attentive to the materialities of archipelagic existence as well as to the ways in which the island’s wide deployment as a metaphor has continually exerted influence on those materialities.

(Roberts and Stephens 2017, 10)

The collection shares (and plots multiple points of relationship between) the Caribbean–based vectors of archipelagic concern that surface in the *American Quarterly’s* 2014 *Las Américas Quarterly* special issue, and the Pacific–based archipelagic inquiries of the same journal’s 2015 *Pacific Currents* special issue. The open, comparative insularity of this approach to American Studies permits an archipelagic interlacing of transnationalism’s set of new regionalisms. An archipelagic American Studies re-envisions these new regionalisms as, to borrow from Cuban writer Antonio Benítez-Rojo’s description of an archipelago, existing in an interdependent state of “discontinuous conjunction” (Benítez-Rojo 1996, 2). As Chamorro poet and scholar Craig Santos Perez has written: “This archipelagic turn offers a promising analytic to navigate the transnational, transatlantic, transpacific, transindigenous, and transhemispheric turns in the now discontinuous archipelago of American studies” (Perez 2015, 619). Viewing each island as an opening, the archipelagic frame may stitch together multiple micro-regional sites (i.e., individual islands and other specific littoral and pelagic spaces) not into a transnational macro-region (e.g. the transpacific or transatlantic, the hemispheric or the circum–Caribbean) but into a terraqueous network cutting across region in which island-openings ranging from Java
in Indonesia to Iceland in the North Atlantic may facilitate and invite comparative commentary on their conjunctions and disjunctions, similarities and variations, collisions and clefts, all within contexts that both illuminate and exceed questions of colonialism and post-colonialism, environmental degradation and environmental stewardship, neoliberalism and radical politics, and cosmopolitanism and créolité.

But again, in terms of scholarly practice and political engagement, what precisely might it mean to understand islands as openings that function regionally and transregionally, existing as archipelagic links within and across oceanic and continental spaces? To start, one must understand that Glissant’s notion of the island-opening is a far cry from the mode of thought that is critiqued by Cook Island Puka-Pukan writer Florence "Johnny" Frisbie in her 1948 novelistic memoir *Miss Ulysses from Puka-Puka*:

> I have heard traders […] say that when you have seen one atoll you have seen them all; but that sort of people sees nothing in an island except copra, shell, pearls, home-brew, and women […]. What they mean is that copra and trade, beer and women are the same on all islands.

(*Frisbie 1948, 185*)

Against the traders’ continentalist view of island interchangeability, one might consider the mode of comparison discussed by Benedict Anderson in *The Spectre of Comparisons: Nationalism, Southeast Asia and the World* (Anderson 1998). As described by Anderson, this comparative mode can elicit a “kind of vertigo” or a “dizzying moment” as it interferes with efforts to “matter-of-factly experience” the here and now, asking us to see “simultaneously close up and from afar.” Anderson’s first metaphor for this mode of comparison is “an inverted telescope,” a mode of seeing he first experienced in the archipelagic Southeast Asian nation of Indonesia in 1963 as he heard President Soekarno praising Hitler as “clever.” Anderson’s second metaphor for this mode of comparison is “the spectre of comparisons,” a phrase he draws and translates from Filipino patriot José Rizal’s phrase, in the 1887 novel *Noli Me Tángere*, “el demonio de las comparaciones” (Anderson 1998, 2).

Anderson names his comparative heuristic for Rizal’s phrase, even if he does not quote substantially from the scene. But I want to do so in order to draw out the unstated archipelagic implications of Anderson’s comparative approach. In *Noli Me Tángere*, the mestizo hero Ibarra has recently returned to Manila after seven years in Europe, and his sensory experience of the city reminds him of his youth spent in the Philippines. But the sight of Manila’s:

> botanical garden drove away his cheerful memories: the spectre/devil of comparisons placed him before the botanical gardens of Europe, among the countries where a great deal of willpower and much gold is needed to coax a leaf to sprout or a flower to open its calyx; even more, this applied to the gardens of the faraway colonies, rich and well-tended and open, all of them, to the public…

> The view of the sea disappearing in the distance!

> “On the far shore is Europe!” thought the young man.

(*Rizal 1887, 43*)

Here, the protagonist compares Europe and the Philippines, or the nations of Europe and the colonies more generally. This is not a comparison in which (to borrow I. A. Richards’s classic terminology regarding metaphor) Europe is the vehicle for the tenor of the colonies, nor are the colonies the vehicle for the tenor of Europe. Rather, the nations of Europe and the
colonies are brought into comparison via a specific spatial genre, the garden, which serves as an analogical trigger (an opening for comparison) between the two sets of spaces. In a similar way, though he leaves it unacknowledged, Anderson’s very notion of comparison—which hinges on a comparison between first a vertiginous experience in Indonesia and then a dizzying reading of a foundational novel of the Philippines—is triggered and subtended by a spatial genre, that of the nationalized archipelago, which is a category innovated and championed by both the Philippines and Indonesia. As an Indonesianist by training, Anderson found his geographical starting place in the genre of the archipelago. His usually implicit comparative geographical assumptions become, briefly, explicit at a certain point in The Spectre of Comparisons while he compares Indonesia and Burma: “Burma had the ill-luck not to be a free-floating archipelago” (Anderson 1998, 327). Here, the archipelago—and not the continental site—emerges as the default geography.

Reading Anderson thus, one arrives at a handful of ways in which islands become, in Glissant’s term, openings. On one hand, within the context of American Studies, noting the comparative priority Anderson gives to archipelagic space offers a new vista onto continent-island relationality, with this new relationality emerging as something of a photographic negative vis-à-vis the traditional view: now Canada (with its vast 36,000-island Arctic Archipelago) and the United States (which due largely to its sprawling archipelagic holdings controls more ocean territory than nearly any other country) might not exist as continental nations with some affiliated insular afterthoughts, but rather be reconceived as archipelagic nations that are each also affiliated with a portion of the North American continent. One might also look, as Yolanda Martínez-San Miguel has done, to the fact that certain colonial-era maps referred to the present-day Caribbean as the Mexican Archipelago (Martínez-San Miguel 2017, 157–165), and wonder about the contingent (and theoretically reversible) cultural-historical processes that gave priority to a continental Mexico rather than a now forgotten archipelagic imagination of Mexico. Furthermore, and having a great deal to do with how Americanists might go about theorizing linkages among these various arenas of the archipelagic Americas, examining the source text for Anderson’s comparative heuristic reveals the way in which a spatial genre (for Ibarra the garden, for Anderson the archipelago) may serve as an opening, an analogical trigger prompting otherwise unforecasted comparisons that do not see islands as interchangeable but rather apprehend islands as existing within a planetary archipelago that is as rife with discontinuity as it is with conjunction.

To illustrate how the island-opening functions as a spatial genre and analogical trigger that cuts across region and instigates the formation of transregional insular associations or archipelagoes, I want to devote space to imagining one such assemblage. This assemblage, or series of insular interlinkings, reveals the archipelagic frame as attaining purchase not only in regard to inter-island relationality but also, and perhaps more surprisingly, in relation to island-continent relationality.

Willa Cather’s 1918 novel My Ántonia has been praised as the culmination of her “west authentic” aesthetic (Stegner 1997, 237), and its narrator, Jim Burden, is someone of a preponderantly US-continental mindset: as an adult “he goes off into the wilds hunting for lost parks or exploring new canyons,” he is “still able to lose himself in those big Western dreams,” and his “interest in women is as youthful as it is Western and American” (Cather 2006, 6). Indeed, his dedication to a continental mindset is such that he recalls in the novel that as a boy working the farm in Nebraska, “I got ‘Robinson Crusoe’ and tried to read, but his life on the island seemed dull compared with ours” (Cather 2006, 59). Meanwhile, his winter expeditions to the middle of an iced-over river—when “we skated up to the big island and made bonfires on the frozen sand”—merit only a single sentence in the novel.
And yet in spite of Jim Burden’s continentalism, his recollections of Crusoe and the riverine island forge a link between the geographical thematics of *My Ántonia* and those of another piece of fiction in Cather’s oeuvre, her 1902 short story “The Treasure of Far Island,” which focuses on two childhood friends’ return, now as adults, to Far Island, “an oval sand bar, half a mile in length and perhaps a hundred yards wide, which lies about two miles up from Empire City in a turbid little Nebraska river.” As the narrator explains,

…the island is known chiefly to the children who dwell in that region, and generation after generation of them have claimed it; fished there, and pitched their tents under the great arched tree, and built camp fires on its level, sandy outskirts […]. Every summer a new chief claims it and it has been called by many names.

*(Cather 1970, 265)*

As if the description of a successively reclaimed island in the shadow of a place called Empire City weren’t enough to suggest a link between this 1902 short story and the United States’ contemporaneous wars in the Philippines over Spanish and Filipino claims to the archipelago, the story has the co-protagonists recalling that one of their childhood friends “is commanding a regiment in the Philippines” *(Cather 1970, 277)*, and it has them unearthing an old treasure chest that they buried years ago, containing, among other items, an alleged “Spaniard’s heart in a bottle of alcohol” *(Cather 1979, 280)*. No doubt the alcohol-preserved “heart” was buried as a token of one of their fanciful gothic adventures during childhood, but now, in a story published during the first years of the twentieth century, the Spaniard’s heart emerges from the sandy shores of Far Island with new valences in light of the Spanish-American and Philippines-American Wars, simultaneously romanticizing and criticizing the US fight for the islands, against the Spanish colonialists and the First Philippine Republic, as an adult version of child’s play.

A critical attentiveness to the spatial genre of the island, then, unexpectedly links the continentally oriented narrative economy of *My Ántonia* to a continentally oriented US political economy that at the turn of the century found itself nonplussed, as Susan K. Harris has illustrated in *God’s Arbiters* *(Harris 2013)*, by the United States’ ultimate goals in asserting control over the Philippines archipelago. From thence, the insular interlinking continues, say, to a 1903 short story published by Frank R. Steward in *The Colored American Magazine*. Steward served as a captain in the US military in the Philippines during the Philippines-American War and became a provost judge in the Philippine city of San Pablo *(Logan 1982, 569)*. His story, “The Men Who Prey,” tells of Duncan Lane, a white captain who, leaving his wife behind in Texas during the Philippines-American War, begins “matrimoning”—or concubining—with a Filipina woman named Jacinta. As the omniscient narrator describes it, Jacinta holds fast to

a dream of a big ship, a long journey, railroad cars swift-running, great cities, wonders and marvels without end in the land of the Americanos, and amid all a large house in the far-off country, numerous servants, and a husband so tall, so loving, so white.

*(Steward 1903, 723)*

In this description, we see Steward projecting the subjectivity of a Filipina woman imagining a vast “land of the Americanos,” as continentally attuned adjectives of magnitude (such as *big, large, and tall*) stack one on top of the other, culminating in the sublime whiteness (viewed admiringly by Jacinta and cynically by Steward) of the Americanos’ continental space.
Jacinta’s image of the vast land of the Americanos contrasts implicitly the Filipina/o worldview described by prominent Filipino writer and historian Nick Joaquin in the essay “A Heritage of Smallness”: for Filipinos, “society...is a small rowboat,” “geography...is a small locality,” “enterprise [...] is a small stall,” “industry and production [...] are the small searchings of each day,” and “commerce [...] is the smallest degree of retail” (Joaquin 1988, 217). Bootlessly longing for white American continental grandeur, as Steward represents it, Jacinta remains confined to her small non-white world on the island of Luzon in the Philippines.

Yet as confined as she may feel, the very sense of confinement is a critical opening to another—tropologically analogous—Island, an Island of confinement that is also racialized. In his 1941 book 12 Million Black Voices: A Folk History of the Negro in the United States, black US writer and intellectual Richard Wright observes: “The word ‘Negro,’ the term by which, orally or in print, we black folk in the United States are usually designated, is not really a name at all nor a description, but a psychological island.” “This island,” Wright explains, “…is situated in the midst of the sea of white faces we meet each day; and...its rocky boundaries have remained unyielding to the waves of our hope that dash against it” (Wright 2002, 41).

Using the figure of the island to convey a sense of isolation is common enough, and is consistent with Chicago School sociologist Robert E. Park’s commentary during his 1932 commencement address at the University of Hawai‘i, when he drew an analogy between Hawai‘i’s “rigidly defined [...] geographical location” and the sonnet form’s “rigorous limitations” (Park 1932, 698). And yet, the fact that innumerable islands are interlinked by representations of island-confinement belies the very sense of isolation asserted by the clichéd representation. Crusoe’s seemingly isolated island in My Ántonia is fundamentally archipelagic, linking up with Far Island of Cather’s short story, which links up with Jacinta’s island in “The Men Who Prey,” which links up with Wright’s island in 12 Million Black Voices and Park’s image of Hawai‘i as an island-sonnet.

Indeed, the putatively isolated island is itself so ineluctably linked to uncounted other islands that, rather than following Park in looking toward the self-contained sonnet for a poetic allegory of the island, we might look toward the first paragraph of Steward’s story of Duncan Lane and Jacinta, which is written as follows:

You know the giddy youth who makes sport of the hearts of women; and the rake with his mournful wake of passion-wrecked victims. Yet the hearts they break and the souls they take are women who understand. But what will you say of the men who prey upon the brown children of the bosky?

(Seward 1903, 720)

The paragraph’s rhyme and rhythm mark it as a ballad disguised as prose, as is revealed by the realignments produced by a handful of added line- and stanza-breaks:

You know the giddy youth who makes
Sport of the hearts of women;
And the rake with his mournful wake
Of passion-wrecked victims.

Yet the hearts they break and the souls they take
Are women who understand.
But what will you say of the men who prey
Upon the brown children of the bosky?
Of these men who prey, Du Bois would say, as he did in a December 1925 Crisis editorial, that they were “American skunks scuttling from the island and leaving their helpless and innocent bastards to beg and perish, and their deserted mothers to starve or serve as prostitutes to white newcomers” (Du Bois 1925, 61). Steward’s two-stanza ballad—which is suggestively replete with serialized asymmetrical relationships of gendered and racialized varieties—is one that might extend indefinitely, with new stanzas appended to previous stanzas in a theoretically endless procession, operating not linearly but instead branching out, cutting back, and cutting across and through the many islands of archipelagic American space. And regarding the ballad as a genre, its stanzas might be taken as a model of island-openings, varying in content across time and space while maintaining formal variations and similarities from stanza to stanza, hanging together like an archipelago, in which the story of the archipelagic Americas and their interactions with the planetary archipelago is a transregional and multidirectional network of connections among microregional spaces. This is an ever multiplying set of spaces and relationalities which, as Monique Allewaert has suggested in her description of an archipelagic American approach,

proposes that totality cannot be reduced to one—the nation or the globe or the world—since it is produced through relays between many islands that give rise to alternate modernities that are in relay with, yet also exceed, existing totalities, whether global or local.

(Allewaert 2016, 126)

Like the ballad stanzas that sit disguised as prose at the beginning of Steward’s short story, the archipelagic Americas and their relation to the planetary archipelago have existed as largely illegible within an Americanist transnationalism that often sees islands as insular in the pejorative sense and has followed, though usually unintentionally, the precedent set by Paine and others in framing continental vastness as the measuring stick.

Recalling the term insular’s shift toward the pejorative, as the continuum moved from British to American English, one might imagine the potential for another tectonic shift in the term’s use, also brought about by a change in English-speakers’ demographics. When Richard Wright attended the postcolonial Bandung Conference held in Indonesia in 1955, he listened to the variety of Englishes spoken by representatives of the conference’s 29 Asian and African participant countries and wrote in his 1956 travelogue The Color Curtain:

I felt while at Bandung that the English language was about to undergo one of the most severe tests in its long and glorious history. Not only was English becoming the common, dominant tongue of the globe, but it was evident that soon there would be more people speaking English than there were people whose native tongue was English […]. Alien pressures and structures of thought and feeling will be brought to bear upon this our mother tongue and we shall be hearing some strange and twisted expressions …. But this is all to the good; a language is useless unless it can be used for the vital purposes of life, and to use a language in new situations is, inevitably, to change it.

(Wright 1994, 200)

For expressions that may seem “strange and twisted” to some American or British English-speakers, I have in this essay drawn on Glissant’s archipelagic French and Rizal’s archipelagic
Spanish, seeking to counteract what Filipino law scholar Jay Batongbacal has critiqued as “the weight of decades of biases brought about by training in disciplines developed and dominated by Western continental countries” (Batongbacal 1998, 183). From here Americanists might also consider the potential payoffs of giving increased attention to archipelagic Englishes—not merely to the archipelagic English of the British Isles (as John Kerrigan has gestured toward (Kerrigan 2008)) but to the variety of archipelagic Englishes associated with, say, the Caribbean, the Philippines, and Hawai‘i, as well as with other archipelagic regions across the planet where English is less naturalized but still functions as a lingua franca in certain circumstances. How might these Englishes—influenced by structures of thought and feeling associated with archipelagic languages such as Hawaiian, Tagalog, indigenous Caribbean languages, and Indonesian, among others—not only roll back the current pejorative valences of the English term insular but also, and more importantly for Transnational American Studies, help Americanists to decontinentalize our implicit and pervasive assumptions regarding island-continent relationality? Within an American Studies that is attentive to the planet’s archipelagic Englishes and these Englishes’ translational interactions with other island-affiliated languages, the following question may not be merely “strange and twisted” but also urgent: How can American Studies become more insular? 6

Notes
1 In 1623 John Donne famously offered the following:

No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main.
If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend’s or thine own were.

(Donne 1999, 103)

This pejoratively torqued use of the island metaphor, no doubt betokening a sympathy with continental Europe, assures us that English already harbored a sense of anti-insularity before the 1770s.

2 Beyond the question of insularity’s meaning, the standard transnational Americanist narrative of mid-century American Studies as closed-off and border-bound is complicated by a glance at the first issue of American Quarterly (Spring 1949), which contains eight articles, all of which have strong transnational orientations or valences, with titles such as “American Influences on Contemporary Italian Literature,” “On What It Is to Be French,” and “The Projection of America Abroad.”

3 In thinking through the place of the archipelago in relation to Anderson’s comparative framework, I have benefited from email discussions with Susan Gillman. For an excellent discussion of Anderson, comparison, and archipelagic form, see Gillman (2017).

4 My translation from Rizal’s Spanish.

5 For commentary on Steward and his literary output, see Murphy (2010, 87–120); and Gruesser (2012, 76–82).
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