Introduction

Worldliness...assured contamination and involvement, since in all cases the history and presence of various other groups and individuals made it impossible for anyone to be free of the conditions of material existence. Nowhere is this more true than for the American humanist today, whose proper role, I cannot stress strongly enough, is not to consolidate and affirm one tradition over all the others. It is rather to open them all, or as many as possible, to each other, to question each of them for what it has done with the others, to show how in this polyglot country in particular many traditions have interacted and—more importantly—can continue to interact in peaceful ways, ways never easy to find but nonetheless discoverable in other multicultural societies...

(Said 2004)

It takes imagination and courage to picture what would happen to the West if its temporal fortress were suddenly invaded by the Time of its Other.

(Fabian 1983)

A Palestinian and American intellectual, advocate of the Palestinian cause and staunch supporter of an American humanism after and against the Eurocentric and ethnocentric humanism of colonial modernity, Edward Said is the author of an oeuvre that best represents the challenges and potentiality of a transnational humanist inquiry that opposes "nationalism, religious enthusiasm and the exclusivism that derives from [...] identitarian thought" (Said 2004, 50). Critical of the imperial politics and orientalist discourses of the West that overshadowed its others by labelling them as the naturally depraved and inferior peoples and cognizant of the contiguity of US imperialism with this old and European metaphysics of violence, Said nevertheless called for an "American humanism" that could draw on the polyglot and multicultural fabric of US culture amplified by its heritage in the "human reality" of the "huge waves of migrants, expatriates, and refugees" (2004, 47) that constitute "the central demographic and cultural fact of the United States since its inception" (2004, 47). Seeing this heritage as an advantage at a time when European countries were still struggling in the late twentieth century to deconstruct the myths of national homogeneity
and cultural purism in view of the continuous development of multicultural and diversified lifeworlds in their global cities and former imperial metropolises, Said calls for American humanism as a transnational humanist inquiry that would oppose the rhetoric and violence of nationalist and exceptionalist fantasies.

His call, however controversial, exemplifies Transnational American Studies that, following Said’s work but also bearing in mind the work of other significant transnational American critics, can be defined as a field that challenges the adjective “American” as the effect of the dominant discourses and images that are identified with the US as a supra-power or global sheriff in and across the US borders; and instead aspires to place “America” in the world, highlighting the differences and temporalities of the cultures it is made of in relation to and reciprocity with other cultures across the world. Said’s American humanism is unavoidably controversial as it binds two terms, America and humanism, which are informed by the same cultural imperialism and exceptionalism that Said analysed critically and opposed politically.

Working through the controversies of a humanistic inquiry that was accountable for rationalizing the dispossession, and the ontological and political denuding of the native, indigenous, and colonized peoples, Said also affirmed the potentiality of a world of connections that resulted from a long and indelible history of violence as well as from the affiliations that were effected by the “overlapping of cultures and intertwining of their histories” throughout colonial modernity.

The examination of these affiliations and oppositions that highlight the contemporary phenomenon of cultural hybridity that cannot make up for the destruction of indigenous knowledges and cultures nor be reduced to the myth of national cultures as insular and monolithic entities gives Said’s work its transnational and humanistic directive. Engaging the metaphysical, historical, anthropological, and political discourses that set the West as the measure for the Orient and produced a set of oppositional and irreconcilable identities, Said is here read as a trailblazer of a transnational human poetics, one that he glosses over with what he calls “American humanism” as the signpost of a multicultural and polyglot society where “everyone is an outsider to some other identity or tradition adjacent to one’s own” and where the emergence of African-American among other hyphenated American cultural experiences and discourses best represents how the American experience is not part of one group’s last or only word but rather “shares in the same worldly context as all the others” (2004: 48). Wary of the unevenness and social and political inequities involved in this worldly context, Said does not succumb to a transnational poetics of comfort that allows for any kind of “Americaneness” to function as a safety net when and where American imperialism and its hegemonic discourses subsume the transnational agenda to play the global sheriff and protect democracy in the world with all the necessary collateral damage that the wars against rogue states and terror justify. Instead, by being both Palestinian and American, thus embodying the transnational as both a diasporic subject without a state as well as a citizen of a supra-nation, he asks the difficult questions: How does one persevere as a human being in the precarious condition of statelessness? Which “frames of recognition” (Butler 2009, 5) are available to the dispossessed, whose presence is doubly denied, first in their own land and, as a consequence, within the terrain of transnational politics? What kind of a transnational polity and politics can the exilic intellectual strive to formulate while working within institutions and states for which the transnational can be the means of a “global coloniality” (Mignolo 2011, 161)? In his literary criticism and political writings on Palestine, Said consistently and perseveringly engages these questions to practice a democratic and, hence, transnational criticism that aspires to overstep the borders of the nation to dismantle the presuppositions and assumptions of its discourses of nationalism, racism, and exceptionalism, which contribute to
the consolidation of the fiction of a sovereign self, community, or nation that renders its others unnecessary, obsolete, often outside history and time. For Said, the democratic aspect of this kind of criticism that attends to the unearthed connections between texts and the world, between culture and politics, between self and other, presupposes the transnational as the terrain that is unevenly cohabited and fraught with contradictions, where both citizens, stateless persons, subalterns, immigrants, and indigenous people participate in the making of human polities that represent what Walter Mignolo calls “a decolonial pluriversality” (Mignolo 2011, 269), which can be the ground for new democratic practices and humanistic ideals.

Because Said understands the transnational as such a complex structure and experience, it is clear that his American humanism is not a naïve attempt to rewrite history or the experiences of the refugee or migrant, nor is his sense of the exilic consciousness a barren testimony of the experience of statelessness; rather, Said turns to collaborative, interdisciplinary, and transnational projects such as After the Last Sky: Palestinian Lives to produce a poetics that transcends borders (whether national or disciplinary) where resilience is aesthetic, where in resistance one might capture the image of an abiding humanism. First published in 1986 and reprinted in 1999, After the Last Sky is an “exile’s book” (Said 1999, vii) that contributes to Said’s effort to affirm the presence of a stateless people as “uncertain, questionable, unstable” (Said 1979, 4). It draws on the ontological and political condition of Palestinians living either as “internal exiles in Israel, as detainees on the West Bank or Gaza without sovereignty over land” (Said 1999, 149) or as “refugees and itinerant exiles” across the world where almost 50% of the Palestinian people are dispersed. Said’s poetic and political affirmation of the Palestinian presence is punctuated by Jean Mohr’s photographs that foreground the human condition as the center of a temporality that is yet to be narrated in its own terms and is momentarily captured by his lens as a frame from a sequence that eludes both Said and his readers. The text is divided into sections that interrupt the linearity of narration by deviating from representing the essence of Palestinian life as a whole and instead portraying the shards and fragments of different and uneven Palestinian lives. Each section of the essay develops out of the various stories of exile and transience that the photographs symptomatically reveal, while punctuating the perseverance of the individual and collective, albeit, dispersed life captured by the lens. The narrative is enhanced by Said’s intertextual references to other texts by Palestinian authors and his few but evocative childhood memories from Palestine.

“States,” the first part of the essay where Said excavates statelessness in its various states of being, paves the path to “Interiors,” where Said unearths the domestic, ontological, and political interiority of a life that persists while being restricted and contained in areas by checkpoints, barriers, and walls. The next section, entitled “Emergence,” excavates the consolidation of the Palestinian question as a question about the perseverance of the dispossessed against the exceptionalist nationalist policies of Israel rooted in the Zionist imperialist narrative. The narrative continues in “Past and Future” that demonstrates how dispersion and dispossession are constitutive of the political bios of the Palestinians and represent the possibility for a secular politics that is open to what seems utopian and impossible but constitutes the real political promise for a future that is not past. Instead this promise is rooted in the possibility of a politics of cohabitation that is not reduced to nationalism but respectful of the right of the Palestinians to self-determination and a secular bios irreducible to nationalism, or a “nostalgia for a lost transcendence” (Said 1999, 146). This hope is, however, framed by the postscript, “The Fall of Beirut,” and Said’s lament for the ruination of a polity that “responded to our needs as Arabs in an Arab world” (Said 1999, 174), a world the city housed in all of its brilliance as well as “vice and profligacy” (Said 1999, 174), a world where the Arab human could live precisely as such, and not like a rogue.
Said’s analysis is challenged by the silences and furtive glances of Mohr’s photographic subjects, whose lives resist being translated into a text that can fully document them. Displaying the liminality of these Palestinian lives that are captured in passing, or posing in their living rooms, the fields or the streets, or simply staring back at him, Mohr’s photographs become the silent interlocutor of Said’s text, “a place for wordlessness” (Marrouchi 2004, 114). Their conversation makes the text embody its transnational politics. Representing the Palestinian as the other who perseveres despite the colonial tactics of Israel and the amnesiac strategies of the international community that often sees Palestinian life as nuisance, at best, or as rogue life, at worst, the text embodies the transnational politics it aims to transform. The product of a transnational collaboration between a Palestinian intellectual and a photographer of Jewish origins, the text interrupts the international community of readers it addresses with the “time of the other” (Fabian 1983, 35) in order to challenge the politics that have predetermined her omission and extinction, what Elizabeth Povinelli calls “the governance of the prior” (Povinelli 2011, 36). The affirmation of the presence of the Palestinians, while highlighting the ongoing history of colonization and dispossession that threatens their political existence, conjures the long history of dispossession of the indigenous and the subaltern people across the world that are put under erasure as the ones left outside the time of progress and invokes the ongoing history of migration, exile, and banishment that repeatedly confronts the US and Europe. The history of walls, fences, and camps is after all a transnational history with specific registers in the US and European histories that record the long catastrophe of the human, which Said conjures through the allusions he makes to the other histories with which the Palestinian shares ties such as the American Indians, the African Americans, the Cypriots, and others (Said 1999, 159). These transnational connections challenge the American component implicated in these histories of dispossession: the transnational approach for Said becomes a filter through which the nation and in this case the American nation are to be critiqued and challenged.

The photographs are not an accompaniment to the essay but rather a counterpoint to it. Using Said’s musical term, the counterpoint, is apropos of the antinomy in the text between the photograph (as both an archive and an act of witnessing) and the essay that translates the non-discursive properties of the photograph into written discourse. The written text thus opens the photograph both to the alterity it records and to an internal self-differentiation that both word and image capture in a specific place and time that cannot be repeated nor forgotten and remains forever present. While the photographs often foreground a human subject in pain that can educate its viewers on compassion and thus relieve them of the responsibility to act, in this text, the photograph is not an anaesthetic to the pain of others but rather the aesthetic source of a levity, an everyday life thick with its cultural materiality and practices. Said’s essay translates the life captured by Mohr’s photographs into a human poetics to punctuate the obdurate presence of the subjects of the photographs against the discourses of the State of Israel and its corroborating western allies, including of course the US, that try to force the Palestinians into a political and ontological disappearance. The text sets images against the kind of transnational politics that a transnational poetics reframes by way of giving presence to the resilience of communities across borders. The photograph captures the temporary, precarious and lived present of its subject while interrupting, albeit momentarily like a flash, the temporality of the reader who reads in safety. The two times contradict each other: time lived in precarity and conditionality as opposed to time lived in the certainty and comfort that the act of reading about the predicament of others always requires. The reader asked to contemplate this condition of statelessness and exile in one’s homeland has the luxury of an undeniable right to a secure present readily available to him or
her and certain to always arrive. The contradiction between these two different kinds of present that the text affiliates is effectuated by the aesthetic quality of Mohr’s photographs, each of which becomes for Said what Jacques Derrida calls a “scene of deciphering” (Richter 2010, xxvi). Said and Mohr’s non-dialectizable conversation thus puts deconstruction into practice by setting the interiority of Palestinian lives as a frame that resists its reduction to a cumulative narrative. Word and image share a contrapuntal relation that affirms the interior of social and political life, of survival and perseverance, and remains open without closure as a testimony that is already inherited and sustained in the future that is already present, even if the now, the present time framed by the photographs, is circumscribed by the aesthetic frame of the photograph and, by extension, by the walls and borders that the State of Israel has imposed on the Palestinians and their lands under a long state of emergency. What Said achieves is not a mere repetition that further explicates the photographs but a re-invention of this life from its fragments and ruins; reconstituted in Said’s text, the representation of this life interacts with other texts that encode Palestinian life in a variety of aesthetics and discourses, from Palestinian poetry and novels, to essays and archaeological narratives, that, few as they may be when compared to the multiple registers of the national narratives of Israel, grant Palestinian life a literary presence. This act of translation that expounds on the details of the facts that each photograph records by bearing witness to the singularity of its subject matter (Richter 2010, xxv) impels deconstruction as the analysis that defers and delays the fact not to refute it by succumbing to relativism and political irresponsibility which, for Said, are one and the same, but rather to reconstitute it in contexts that in their historical concreteness and specificity “gather strands of contemporary allusion into a new and often unexpected structure of feeling” (Said 1999, 157).

This is crucial for Said who struggles against the disappearance of Palestinian life from all kinds of secular discourses that can punctuate how “we too [that is Palestinians] are subject to time, development, change, and decline, a fact that must dispel any notion that Palestinians are a sort of essentialized paradigm of permanent homelessness and terror” (Said 1999, 162). To fight off the symptoms of this paradigm, he restores the ecology of Palestinian existence (Said 1999, 18) back to the concreteness of its livity writing it “min-al-dakhil” [from the interior] (Said 1999, 51). Does the stateless life as life in internal and external exile have an interiority that cannot be walled off, controlled, policed, fragmented as it is by the ongoing colonialism? What are its own sociogenic codes that enable it to be autopoetically instituted in a condition of permanent exile? This is an exile that is not the privileged condition of the intellectual in exile that Said appropriates as a constitutive part of his work that is the antidote to the impossibility of a return to a native land but exile as summed up by the inglorious existence of a native Arab inhabitant of Palestine-Israel. In Said’s words, this existence is “linked negatively to encomiums about Israel’s democracy, achievements, excitement” and has “slipped into the place occupied by Nazis and anti-Semites,” a discursive event that has reduced Palestinian lives to the place of the rogue “known for no actual achievement, no characteristic worthy of esteem, except the effrontery of disrupting Middle East peace” (Said 1999, 17). Acknowledged or rather tolerated as a people “with no rights” or as “resident aliens,” they are “other” and opposite, a flaw in the geometry of resettlement and exodus (Said 1999, 17); with no “Einstein, no Chagall, no Freud or Rubinstein” and “no Holocaust to protect us with the world’s compassion” (Said 1999, 17), as Said stresses, they are less than human. Yet, there here they are: obdurate in their presence, persevering in their existence. Embroidering a poetic analysis out of Mohr’s photographs, Said explores the interiority of that life with “rich, cool interiors which outsiders cannot penetrate” (Said 1999, 49); in their domestic spaces, other makeshift and transient, other more permanent and bourgeois, they
are portrayed in a regular everydayness that gives the impression of a continuity of existence. This everyday life extends from the interior of houses to camps, to the farms of refugee labor, to the tourist market in Jerusalem, to life in the streets where the mundane scene of a street vendor can suddenly give its place to an incident (Said 1999, 16)—a young boy throwing a stone at a passing military jeep—that becomes an event that reveals how tension can instantly build into the idleness of the everyday.

The subjects of these photographs are turned into minor histories that crack the grand narrative of Zionism and “the historiographical presumption of progressive history that supports the idea of Zionism as the unfolding realization of an ideal” (Butler 2009, 99). This progressive history that omits the other is characteristic of the different histories of colonial and imperial expansion; it is not surprising therefore that Said should compare the Zionist narrative of settler colonialism in Palestine to American puritanism both in After the Last Sky and in the Question of Palestine. The prophecy-fulfillment narrative of the Puritans arising from the Old Testament provides the blueprint for the colonial vision of Zionism that saw the natives as an impediment to its plan of translating the empty land, the terra nullius, into what in 1630 John Winthrop called a “city upon a hill” aboard the famous Arbella; the Puritan ideology heavily relied on the hypothesis the Zionists would repeat with the same, if not narrower, vision that would not permit the advantage of historical hindsight that three centuries later should have afforded them the knowledge of the expropriation and destruction of Native American people and their culture, the history of slavery, and the long durée of racism. They rather chose to repeat the colonial policies of the Puritans with the “exact same narrowness of vision” (Said 1999, 106); the success of their settler colonialism “depended on the ability to master the land, transforming the virgin territories into something else—a farm, a village, a road, a canal, a railway, a mine, a factory, a city, and finally, an urban nation” (Kolodny 1984, 4), thus secularizing the “providentially ordained narrative, so fundamental to the discourse of the American Puritans” (Spanos 2012, 108) and translating it into American exceptionalism. This affiliation between Zionism, American exceptionalism, and the European context of imperialism spreading to incorporate the international, that is, non-western, world enables Said to read these specific photographs transnationally and their cultural and political domain as part of a larger narrative in which the Palestinian question is interpolated in the histories of the Armenians, the Jews, the Irish, the Cypriots, the American blacks, the Poles, the American Indians, at those terrifying frontiers where the existence and disappearance of peoples fade into each other, where resistance is a necessity, but where there is also sometimes a growing realization of the need for an unusual and, to some degree, an unprecedented knowledge.

(Said 1999, 159)

In “Sephardim in Israel: Zionism from the Standpoint of its Jewish Victims,” Ella Shohat further contributes to the list of the intertwined histories of expropriation and their overlapping territories and thus the challenge of unprecedented knowledge by excavating the genealogy of the Oriental Jew, the Sephardim or the Third World Jewish people forced into the Zionist narrative as the national pariahs that would be the negative, albeit integrated, other of the Ashkenazi, that is, European and thus superior Jews of the State of Israel. Rewriting the history of these African and Asian Jews as the history of the “Jewish cave-dwellers” (Shohat 1997, 44), the State of Israel developed processes of integration through subjection in its interior, thus repressing the history of the constituency that symbolically
threatened the nationalist myth of a homogeneous nation of expropriated Jews from around the world. Their affinity ties with the Palestinians and other Arabs in Israel, the possibility of a shared space created from an affiliation between their histories of expropriation, their pariah status, despite the obvious unevenness between the Sephardim and the Palestinians, reveal the imperialist ideology and practices that, for Shohat, relate to the “strong aversion to respecting the right of self-determination of non-European peoples” that the “present regime in Israel inherited from Europe” (Shohat 1997, 66). Adding this history to Said’s long list of expropriated constituencies and their communities, Shohat argues that the linking of the histories of oppression within the national agendas as well as across them conjures the specters of imperialism and nationalism; these specters embody the possibility that the victims they represent will alert the oppressed to perceive the “linked analogies between their oppressions” (Shohat 1997, 65). This linking, immanent in narratives that engender such unprecedented knowledge through impossible comparisons, dares to challenge the punctuation of certain histories of human disaster over others and instead read them contrapuntally and transnationally, against the nationalist narratives that project the myth of the singular, pure identity.

An example of such a reading is Said’s *Freud and the Non-European*, where Said demonstrates how Freud in *Moses and Monotheism* examines the founder of Jewish identity as a non-European Egyptian and, thus, as the example of the “inherent limits that prevent it from being fully incorporated into one, and only one, Identity” (Said 2003, 54). For Said, Freud’s “writing travels across temporal, cultural, and ideological boundaries in unforeseen ways” (Said 2003, 24); Said’s reading of Freud in late style helps him attend to a politics of identity that “cannot be thought or worked through itself alone […] but through that originary break or flaw which will not be repressed” (Said 2003, 54). This reading discloses two important facts about Said’s anti-Zionism: it is a strategic anti-essentialism against all identity politics and an effort to contemplate the possibility of a radically alternative politics beyond nationalism. As William V. Spanos argues, although Said “recognized the necessity of nationalism in the struggle of colonized peoples for self-determination and liberation, he saw this as a strategic and not essentialist need” (Spanos 2012, 137). For Said, Moses, a figure of the “Arab Jew” is a figure “within which ‘Arab’ and ‘Jew’ cannot be dissociated” (Butler 2012, 30) that summons the need to envision a politics beyond the identity politics of antagonism in a bi-national state about which, in *Parting Ways*, Butler wonders whether it can proceed “beyond both the nation and the binary of Jew/Palestinian that is belied by both the Arab Jew and the Palestinian Israeli” (Butler 2012, 31). The radically alternative politics is not to see the other in oneself or even the self as other but to be able to read identity contrapuntally, as an “open secular element” (Said 1999, 150) that refuses to abide by the “symmetry of redemption” (Said 1999, 150), which navigates the fulfilment of the Zionist project so far off from the original figure of Moses who represents the “diasporic, wandering, unresolved, cosmopolitan consciousness of someone who is both inside and outside his or her community” (Said 2003, 53). This history of dispossession and expropriation is a shared history, which underlies the history of the nation-state, be it the US, Israel, or other, marked by the history of walls, fences, camps, and the stateless people that this history has produced often with a progressive vengeance. In this light, Said prods at the narrative of the Holocaust as an incomparable experience, unique in its dimensions of human catastrophe, and compares it to the continuous political and ontological expropriation of the Palestinians as one of the stateless people in late modernity. The risky affiliation that Said attempts here can be the source of a radically alternative politics that is able to ask the question of why the history of the disaster of one people can be exploited for the persistent catastrophe of another. It also asks the
question “whether such histories might not produce the possibility of a new politics for those lands in which the rights of the refugee would be paramount, in which no one would be excluded from citizenship in an effort to minimise heterogeneity” (Butler 2012, 110). Such risky affiliations force their readers and spectators into asking how national narratives that prevail in current transnational analyses that propound the need to overcome the nationalist agendas continue to propagate the ideologies of imperialism. In the current debates on transnational imaginaries that arise beyond the structures of national myths, how do the people without a state (their numbers growing as evinced in the tide of refugees) or the subaltern and minority cultures that live in partitioned states appear as an example of a humanity that can be the source of other sociogenic codes and other communities? Communities like the one Said imagines in After the Last Sky, when the persistent presence of these Palestinian lives from the past and in the present attest to the need to think about the possibility of a bi-national state “in which Israel and Palestine are parts, rather than antagonists of each other’s history and underlying reality” (Said 2003, 55). In this narrative, the water-seller (Said 1999, 141) features not as the relic of the primitive or the exotic subject of the picturesque Orient but as the living testimony of an ongoing life interrupted by the State of Israel that has yet failed to erase him; he thus stands for the life of a human, who, second-class citizen as he may be, “plies the streets, hawks his wares, and goes on as he was” (Said 1999, 141).

This figure also challenges another narrative that States and not just the State of Israel are linked with: the master narrative of a humanity in which the human beings with access to rights and their frames of representation tend to forget the growing numbers of human beings without rights such as the stateless peoples, the refugees and the immigrants without documents, who remain outside the definition that equates human with Man, and who still have to fight for the fundamental right of all rights, what Hannah Arendt calls “the right to have rights” (Arendt 1951, 176). After the Last Sky moves into the interior of the precarity and yet “prevailing attitude” (Said 1999, 100) of the Palestinians who find the ways of “turning presence into small-scale obduracy” and “producing themselves” (Said 1999, 108) through work that contributes to the maintenance of their public and private spaces and the creation of persevering attachments to things and practices, however small or insignificant they might be at least to the onlookers and colonizers. It exemplifies Said’s practice of a transnational American analysis whose center is the decentering of a consolidated vision of the world while attending to the lived temporalities of all peoples in the world whether with or without a state and whose aim is not to forget the past but critically engage it by fighting against nationalism, religious fanaticism and racism so that the present remains open to the ones who are here or arriving to inherit it.

Notes

1 See for instance Pease (2009) and Kaplan (2002).
2 This is the title of Chapter One in Culture and Imperialism; Said views modern cultures not as insular entities but as reciprocally, albeit unevenly, constituted within colonial modernity.
3 Johannes Fabian calls this phenomenon of distancing the other in order to incorporate him or her into the “time of the observer” (1983, 25) the “denial of coevalness” (1983, 31).
5 See Roberts (2014) and Meeks (2002).
6 Drawing from Theodor W. Adorno’s analysis of Walter Benjamin’s theorisation of constellation, Nina Morgan and I have defined reconstitution as the process that “both engages previously untried affiliations and relations and unavoidably returns to the previously set contexts from which concepts and
objects are wrenched” (Karavanta and Morgan 2008, 19). Reconstellation thus foregrounds their allusive and contrapuntal ties (ibid.).

7 I draw on Sylvia Wynter’s unpublished essay “On Being Human as Praxis” and her rigorous critique of humanism. See also Wynter’s “Towards the Sociogenic Principle: Fanon, Identity, the Puzzle of Conscious Experience.”

8 See Sacvan Bercovitch’s analysis of Winthrop’s famous sermon aboard the Arbella in the “Ends of Puritan Rhetoric” in The Rites of Assent. See also Susan Howe’s reading of the rhetorical violence of Winthrop’s discourse in The Birth-mark, which aptly demonstrates Bercovitch’s argument that “history and rhetoric” are the “two kinds of violence” upon which relies the discovery of America, “the modern instance par excellence of how metaphor becomes fact, and fact, metaphor” (Bercovitch 1992, 71).
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