

Jan Rupp

Genre and Cultural Memory
in Black British Literature

Ansgar Nünning und Vera Nünning (Hg.)

ELCH

Studies in English Literary and Cultural History

ELK

Studien zur Englischen Literatur- und Kulturwissenschaft

Band 47

Jan Rupp

**Genre and Cultural Memory
in Black British Literature**

 Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier

Rupp, Jan: Genre and Cultural Memory
in Black British Literature / Jan Rupp.-
Trier : WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2010
(ELCH ; Band 47)
Zugl.: Gießen, Univ., FB 05, Diss., 2009
ISBN 978-3-86821-270-9

Umschlaggestaltung: Brigitta Disseldorf

© WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, 2010
ISBN 978-3-86821-270-9

Alle Rechte vorbehalten
Nachdruck oder Vervielfältigung nur mit
ausdrücklicher Genehmigung des Verlags

WVT Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier
Bergstraße 27, 54295 Trier
Postfach 4005, 54230 Trier
Tel.: (0651) 41503, Fax: (0651) 41504
Internet: <http://www.wvttrier.de>
E-Mail: wvt@wvttrier.de

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This book is the slightly revised version of my PhD thesis submitted and defended at the University of Gießen in May 2009. That place is an increasingly distant memory now, but my appreciation of my time there has only grown since leaving Gießen. Many of my fellow PhD students have acknowledged the excellent opportunities for postgraduate studies at this university. As a matter of ‘genre memory’ and personal experience, I want to add to their praise in my acknowledgements, too. I drew a lot of inspiration from numerous lectures, colloquia, master classes, research groups, and conferences while participating in the International PhD programme (IPP) “Literary and Cultural Studies”. Writing a dissertation has been known to be a solitary undertaking, and being able to punctuate long hours of work with a more dialogical and intellectually exciting exchange of ideas was a privilege. My first and greatest thanks go to my supervisors Prof. Dr. Ansgar Nünning and Prof. Dr. Marion Gymnich, who as founding director of the Gießen graduate school and as the then coordinator of the IPP respectively have done much to establish a collaborative network and lively post-graduate community while always being available for personal consultation. I owe them special thanks indeed for their commitment, support and encouragement. In the context of the IPP, Prof. Dr. Wolfgang Hallet, too, gave some valuable advice and constructive comments. Moreover, I have benefited greatly from being a member of the Sonderforschungsbereich “Erinnerungskulturen” – my thanks to the speaker, Prof. Dr. Jürgen Reulecke, who agreed to sit in on my PhD committee.

I wish to express my gratitude to the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes for awarding me a scholarship. For accepting my book for publication I thank Dr. Erwin Otto of Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier and the series editors of “ELCH – Studies in English Literary and Cultural History”, Prof. Dr. Ansgar Nünning and Prof. Dr. Vera Nünning.

Birgit Neumann, Astrid Erll, Britta Freitag, Meike Hölscher, Simon Cooke and many others have been wonderful colleagues, mentors, friends, and readers of parts of the manuscript for this book. To my parents and family, thank you for your support, company, and so much more.

Heidelberg, October 2010

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Memorial Turn, Generic Turn, and Black British Fiction at the Turn of the New Millennium	1
1.2 <i>Genre</i> in Black British Literary Studies and Cultural Memory Studies	7
1.3 Aims – Methods – Structure	14
2. <i>Genre</i> – A Cultural Memory Studies Approach	19
2.1 Constructivist but Nevertheless Constructive: Reconceptualizing Genre	19
2.2 Genre Memory and Memory Genres: A Bakhtinian Perspective	24
2.3 The <i>Genre of</i> and the <i>Genres in</i> : Intertextuality and/versus Genre, and the Example of Black British Fiction	33
2.4 Genres in the Literary and Commemorative Field	42
2.5 <i>Forms</i> : Narratological Categories for the Analysis of Genre	49
2.6 <i>Functions</i> of Genre for Cultural Memory	58
3. Black British Genres along a Continuum of Transformations: Three Types and a Model of Genre-mediated Cultural Memory	67
3.1 <i>Alternative Cultural Memory</i>	72
3.1.1 An Alternative Creation Myth: Fred D’Aguiar’s <i>Bethany Bettany</i> (2003)	75
3.1.2 Historical <i>Bildungsroman</i> : Hari Kunzru’s <i>The Impressionist</i> (2002)	85
3.1.3 Echoes of Divisive History: Caryl Phillips’s <i>A Distant Shore</i> (2003)	95
3.2 <i>Cultural Memory in Crisis</i>	105
3.2.1 Reticence to Myth: Bernardine Evaristo’s <i>Lara</i> (1997)	108
3.2.2 Memorial Culture in Transformation: Zadie Smith’s <i>White Teeth</i> (2000)	118
3.2.3 Oblivious to Myth: Monica Ali’s <i>Brick Lane</i> (2003)	128
3.3 <i>Constructing New Myths</i>	138
3.3.1 The Founding Myth of Migration and Black Europe in Mike Phillips’s <i>A Shadow of Myself</i> (2000)	141

3.3.2	From War to Windrush: The Founding Myth of 1948 and the Memory of the Second World War in Andrea Levy's <i>Small Island</i> (2004)	151
3.3.3	Tricksters and Street Culture: The Founding Myth of Black Urban Experience in Diran Adebayo's <i>My Once Upon a Time</i> (2000)	162
4.	The Dynamics of Genre and Cultural Memory – A Conclusion	173
5.	Bibliography	179
5.1	Primary Literature	179
5.2	Secondary Literature	180

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Memorial Turn, Generic Turn, and Black British Fiction at the Turn of the New Millennium

Black British literature is certainly less in need of introduction than two or three decades ago, especially following the “belated ‘arrival’ of black Britain as an academic discipline” (Nasta 2002: 3).¹ The emergence and consolidation of it as both a symbolic and a social system has made talk of “the black British genre” (Thompson 2005: 152) not uncommon. Yet the terms of classification are contested. Both ‘black’ and ‘British’ have been called into question, and it is consensus that for the common signifier to be maintained it needs to make room for internal differentiation. As Stuart Hall (1992: 309) has noted, “this ‘black’ identity [...] continues to exist *alongside a wide range of other differences*”. Next to ethnicity, consideration of these “different cultural traditions” (ibid.) has included gender, generation, religion, and more recently also location (Procter 2003; Cuevas 2008).

There is a much less nuanced picture where cultural memory is concerned. Where it is discussed, it is usually in the sense of “counter-memory” (Foucault 1977; Zemon Davies/Starn 1989a), by which literature is seen to record a “history of our otherness” (Bouchard 1977: 8). Literature, in this view, is an important surrogate medium for all those memories which are marginalized by dominant accounts and systems of power. In “cultural memory studies” (Erl/I/Nünning 2008), the notion of counter-memory corresponds with insights into the essential plurality of memory. This plurality is also acknowledged by referring to cultural memory in the plural, cultural *memories*, or in terms of “memory cultures”². These insights are no doubt highly pertinent regarding the “amnesia that has overtaken British popular memory about its imperial past” (Hall 2007: 6). But while black British writers engage in “the *re-telling* of the past” (Hall 1994: 393), their histories of otherness are not only defined by difference to popular memory – they are also internally differentiated. Black British texts no longer put forward a blanket imperative to remember or a plea for “re-membering” (Bhabha 1994b: 63) only. More than before, they are informed by a debate over specifically what to remember, what past(s), and how. With the commemorative moment of the Windrush anniversary in 1998, the 2007 bicentenary of the abolition of the slave trade in the United Kingdom, and the currency of memory studies in the academy, few issues have so energized black British writing and its institutions over the past few years as the debates about Britain’s colonial and postcolonial legacies.

¹ See Ball (2007: 621), who remarks that “anthologies and studies of ‘Black British literature’ are largely a twenty-first-century phenomenon”.

² This is the title and key concept of a collaborative research centre at the University of Gießen (1997 – 2008).

These debates have addressed (but rarely in a systematic fashion) the question of the “‘memoryficcational’ power of literature” (Erlil 2004: 306).³ What is the potential of literature not only to reflect, but to actively shape, to ‘make’ memory? This, it could be argued, has always been a more pertinent issue in black British than in many other areas of literature. Here, writers are heirs to the far-flung history of colonialism and imperialism, even if they do not have to deal with it by default, and even if this history is an increasingly distant past. But the memorial turn in the humanities and the interest in issues of memory and commemoration in society more broadly have created a new, or at least qualitatively different, culture or frame of reception.⁴ Texts which overtly deal with history and memory, such as the counter-narratives of slavery by writers like Caryl Phillips and Fred D’Aguiar, are celebrated for retrieving alternative accounts. Likewise, the absence of such memorial references is noted at a time when “myth has become a literary necessity” (Dawes 2005: 269). There is not only a return but also a “strained engagement with the question of myth and tradition” (ibid.) within the current emphasis on commemoration. Yet other writers “construct new myths for the Black British world” (ibid.: 271) and seem to regard themselves as heirs primarily to the more recent and more domestic history of post-WWII multicultural Britain. The result is not only the retrieval but an ongoing construction and reflection of a plurality of cultural memories.

This multi-faceted “memory work” (Kitzmann et al. 2005) finds itself in various forms of tension with a range of recent cultural and social criticism. For example, in his *Postcolonial Melancholia*, Paul Gilroy (2005: 94) expresses a warning reminder that “the hidden shameful store of imperial horrors has been an unacknowledged presence in the British political and cultural life”. As Gilroy (ibid.) expands, “[i]t is not too dramatic to say that the quality of the country’s multicultural future depends on what is now done with it”. Statements like these highlight a (twenty-first century) situation in which the connection between black British literature and the memory of imperial history thrown into relief. As a matter of both the production and the reception of literature, memory work appears as a central expectation confronting the black

³ Sic; from the Latin *ficcation* or *ficare/facere*, to make.

⁴ Memorial turn is a frequent tag attached to the ongoing interest in memory across the humanities. In a much-quoted statement, Jan Assmann (1992: 11) has suggested: “Alles spricht dafür, daß sich um den Begriff der Erinnerung ein neues Paradigma der Kulturwissenschaft aufbaut.” Doris Bachmann-Medick (2006: 16) notes that technically, a turn is different from a paradigm shift in that a paradigm shift tends to be located within the confines of an academic discipline, while a turn always reaches across disciplines and is therefore more attuned to an interdisciplinary field like cultural studies. Bachmann-Medick also describes the successive cultural turns in cultural studies as developing further and diversifying the field rather than aiming to replace earlier turns in the way a paradigm shift is usually understood to replace an earlier paradigm. Without going too far into this distinction here, I cite as much in support and elaboration of the memorial turn rather than Assmann’s juxtaposition of paradigm and the German singular ‘Kulturwissenschaft’.