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Before his widely-read and critically-acclaimed *The Book of Negroes* (2007; published in the US as *Somebody Knows My Name*), Lawrence Hill wrote another, shorter, slave narrative, this comprising Chapter 22 in his 1997 novel *Any Known Blood*. It is encompassed by the larger story of the uncovering and collating of family stories undertaken by the main protagonist, Langston Cane V. Along with the inheritance of blood, there is a legacy of genre: Hill’s novel is thus a neo-slave narrative, a refashioning of black autobiography that relies on intersections with other genres of writing for its continued relevance. The slave narrative’s unusual prominence in the novel sustains genre-conscious exegesis of the novel, and demands particular attention to the narrative’s multilayered dynamic interactions with the larger family saga that is *Any Known Blood*. Generic braiding or *métissage* of slave narrative and family saga is fundamental to the novel’s rejection of exclusivity, to its projection of plural Black Canadianness.¹ Quoting an unpublished interview with the author, this paper discusses how both slave narrative and family memoir novel are defamiliarised and critiqued as each points to the other’s potential and limitations in a liberating confrontation. First, the paper examines the brief slave narrative and its specific and generic intertexts; the second and third sections assess the larger novel as a family saga written in – and against – the tradition of Alex Haley’s *Roots*. As the impetus of the novel both acknowledges and liberates itself from the claims of blood, so does it acknowledge and liberate itself from the legacy of intertexts. Finally, as several critics have astutely argued, the book works against fixed categories of race and nation as characters identify and frequently defy monitored boundaries. The novel’s transgression of genre boundaries is not merely the stylistic expression or intertextual symptom of the novel’s thematic transgression of racial and national boundaries; I argue that *métissage* establishes salutary conditions in which other transgressions thrive. A distinctly critical angle on slavery, migration, civil rights and other important historical

¹ Nadine Flagel completed her dissertation on international neo-slave narratives at Dalhousie University. She has taught twentieth-century literature at several universities, most recently Brock University and Simon Fraser University.
periods defamiliarises the (often) African American family saga and the slave narrative, making them vitally important to contemporary ideas about race, postslavery literature, and Canada.

**Slave Narratives and Osborne Anderson**

*Any Known Blood* depicts five generations of men, all named Langston Cane, within the framework of the present-day research and soul-searching of Langston Cane V. It prominently embeds in Chapter 22 a letter purportedly written by fugitive slave Cane I, which is thus what Gérard Genette (itemiser of intertextuality *par excellence*) calls an *autographic ad hoc hypotext*, a contrived original text that makes the rest of the novel “possible.” It is also an “analeptic or backward continuation” of the novel, to a “more satisfactory starting point” than Langston Cane V’s racial confusion outlined in the first few pages of the novel. It spins together the lengthy threads of distant historical events and the oft-tangled intragenerational and intergenerational conflicts into one skein. Chapter 22 proves to be the heart of the novel: its reconciliation with shame and family is a model for Cane V’s personal quest; it retroactively provides a model for writing practices as central to coming to terms with the racial, familial self; finally, the archival romance anticipating the document’s discovery makes it the literary nexus of the search for origins, a search that may be commonly nostalgic in postslavery novels but here is unsentimental, and is not exclusive but multiple.

In making Chapter 22 a slave narrative, Hill alludes to the literary history of African American and African Canadian literature, to its roots in autobiographical writings of fugitive slaves, aligning Cane’s story with those of Josiah Henson, Frederick Douglass, William Wells Brown, Henry “Box” Brown, Harriet Jacobs, and those interviewed for Benjamin Drew’s autobiographical sketches of fugitive slaves collected in Canada. The affiliation between this and other slave narratives is announced in the typically chronological structure, the separation of family members, the early observation of harsh punishment of slaves, the illicit literacy, the challenge to Christian hypocrisy, and the successful night escape. Moreover, the conflation of whipping with sexual violence, racism in the “free” North or Canada, and suspension of liberation in Reconstruction – “it was like slavery all over again” – are also characteristic. The influential slave narrative genre becomes an essential defining tool for the strategies of this chapter of the novel.
Yet Cane I’s narrative can be differentiated from nineteenth-century slave narratives in several aspects. Absences, silences, determine the book’s shape and speech as do presences. I repeat Genette’s claim: “The hypertext thus always stands to gain by having its hypertextual status perceived – even when the gain is assessed in negative terms.” Pierre Macherey explores these negative quantities:

The speech of the book comes from a certain silence, a matter which it endows with form, a ground on which it traces a figure. Thus, the book is not self-sufficient; it is necessarily accompanied by a certain absence, without which it would not exist. A knowledge of the book must include a consideration of this absence.

Paradoxically, critics “investigate the silence, for it is the silence that is doing the speaking.” As the work is “the product of a rupture, it initiates something new. If we have properly grasped this quality of novelty we will not confuse the work with what is extrinsic to it; we will want to distinguish it emphatically from what surrounds it.” Such ruptures and detours, in Édouard Glissant’s terms, “[work] to say without saying.” A method of “measuring silences, whether acknowledged or unacknowledged,” involves rigorous notation and analysis of ellipses, elisions, and other reductions between the intertexts – in other words becoming postmodern and “exquisitely literate in calligraphies of silence and negative space” (Retallack 272); the results crystallise into meaningful, speaking patterns. Though literary analysis of a story not told is limited, awareness of omissions emphasises certain elements of the story that is told.

Thus this is a slave narrative with a difference, largely due to the requirements of the family novel enveloping it. Chapter 22 is free of restrictions imposed by abolitionist editors or political expediency in the nineteenth century. The family saga imperative reinvigorates the slave narrative, replacing unsustainable heroic models with human-scale strengths and weaknesses, a generic change with resonance for the novel’s reflective narrator/author figure who measures himself against, as he recreates, his ancestors. Slave narratives tend to be “all trained on one and the same objective reality, they have a coherent and defined audience, they have behind them and guiding them an organized group of ‘sponsors,’ and they are possessed of very specific motives,
intentions, and uses understood by narrators, sponsors, and audience alike.”

Sekora further explains the genre’s limits:

white sponsors of slave lives strive to see such lives wholly within the history of white institutions, for such a history is safe and comprehensible to editors and readers alike….White power over black lives was so great, so disproportionately great that the slave was recipient/victim – at most re-actor.

Cane I’s departures from this pattern constitute significant reshaping of the slave narrative. The letter differs stylistically, having more dialogue, and more colloquial diction and grammar – including straightforward treatment of sexual matters. The exegetic mode brings the slave narrative closer to Hill’s usual novelistic practices, and grants Mattie, Cane I’s wife, an assertive presence. Instead of appendices and documents testifying to the ex-slave’s reliability, the family saga incorporates several pseudo-intertexts accusing Cane V of bigamy and of being a “fool and imposter.” Having no polemical agenda of moral uprightness, this family communication – with a goal of reconciliation derived from the family memoirs described below – need not flinch from unsavoury actions in Cane V’s past such as murder, adultery, and the abandonment of family. Unlike conventional antebellum slave narratives, the central focus is “a particular and individual life as it is known internally and subjectively.”

Where the conventional slave narrator persona is interested primarily in condemning slavery, and secondarily in justifying his or her own actions to the public, Cane I privately describes his actions to his long-estranged son. He need not claim to be an upstanding, upwardly mobile, and respectable individual, but can be a complex and whole individual, one whose life began in slavery but whose life is not limited to slavery.

The written version of events discovered by Cane V complement the family saga’s arc, correcting the official patriarchal family version of Cane I’s heroism as much as they defy the ideal archetype of the stoic and heroic slave narrator.

I was looking not for a hero in Langston Cane I; I was looking to create a flawed man whose flaws were major … [but] I felt I could care for and be compassionate about his flaws even as I created them…. I wanted to create a character who was scarred by his experience as a slave and whose inability to connect with his
community was, at least in my own heart, completely understandable and explicable by dint of his past experience.\textsuperscript{20}

Frederick Douglass’s first autobiography for instance creates an independent strong hero who stands up to the brutal slave driver Covey. Moynagh comments that Cane I’s story depends more on the picaresque, the perpetual outlaw’s tale.\textsuperscript{21} Slave narratives usually distance themselves from the picaresque, structuring the fugitive slave’s life around the outlaw’s identity while exculpating slaves from immoral acts.\textsuperscript{22} Thus William Wells Brown transforms his taking advantage of another slave into a condemnation of slavery:

This incident shows how it is that slavery makes its victims lying and mean; for which vices it afterwards reproaches them, and uses them as arguments to prove that they deserve no better fate. Had I entertained the same views of right and wrong which I now do, I am sure I should never have practiced the deception upon that poor fellow which I did. I know of no act committed by me while in slavery which I have regretted more than that.\textsuperscript{23}

Cane I does not excuse his choices, a telling instance of \textit{transmotivation}, “the substitution of a motive.”\textsuperscript{24} As Harris notes, Hill’s disruption of “conventional notions of heroism….works to question the ways in which African American history and myth-making are productions.”\textsuperscript{25}

The roots of some family members may be in slavery, but the slave narrative is only one of many routes to self-expression. In addition to forming the slave narrative in tension with the tradition of slave narratives, Hill forms it in tension with another antislavery intertext. Osborne Anderson, born free in the Northern US, accompanied Mary Ann Shadd to Ontario and worked there for many years as a printer before being recruited by John Brown in Chatham in 1858. The only member of Brown’s band to escape capture and punishment, Anderson published a memoir while he gave lectures on the run. Hill’s particularly Canadian stance is indicated by his finding inspiration in a writer who had strong ties to both Canada and the US. Hill’s discovery of Anderson’s document in Harpers Ferry Museum captured his imagination: “a black man as an assistant to the white man’s crusade against slavery seemed to me a fascinating dynamic.”\textsuperscript{26} Hill disclaims Anderson’s influence, stressing the greater importance of the family saga:
Cane V has messed up his life pretty badly, and I was looking for an echo, not of Osborne Anderson’s life, but an early pre-echo, an origin, of Langston Cane V’s struggle in those of Langston Cane I. So I was looking for a … literary family connection between the first and the fifth.\textsuperscript{27}

Nevertheless, an intertextual reading of Anderson highlights Cane’s different experiences and choices. Where Anderson was free-born, single, Christian, and well-connected to the activist black community in Chatham, Cane is a fugitive slave, a married but philandering father, and an atheist, who is isolated from his Oakville community. Where Anderson respected John Brown as a Moses-like liberator who believed in armed resistance to slavery, Langston Cane is skeptical of totalising religious American radicalism, criticises John Brown as a lunatic, and joins him only to avoid family and social pressure. Anderson retreated from Harpers Ferry in hopes of regrouping, but Cane gladly escapes at the first opportunity. Where Anderson testified publicly to his role in historical events, Cane becomes an indigent nonentity who breaks his silence only to his son. As opposed to Anderson’s set-the-record-straight account of a single event with little personal background, Cane’s epistle is the story of a life.

In one crucial substitution, Hill suppresses Anderson’s details about an episode and deploys Cane I elsewhere. According to Anderson and corroborating sources, John Brown ordered Anderson to take prisoner a prominent local farmer and slave owner, Colonel Lewis Washington. Anderson there received the sword of Lafayette from Washington, presumably with the intention of symbolically humiliating the slave owner and affirming that power had changed its racial composition. Rather than pursue this incident’s potential, Hill places Cane at an event at which Osborne Anderson was not present: the death of the black porter, Shepherd, who apparently resisted the attack. Though Anderson’s account justifies the shooting of Shepherd, Cane I does not. Hill comments,

I put [Cane I] there because…it’s an incredibly disturbing irony that the first victim of this raid would be a black man, and a free black man at that…. In [Cane’s] eyes it’s not an irony…in his eyes it’s horrible….I believe that one of the dictates of interesting fiction is to place your characters in situations that matter,
and that matter to them, that disturb them and shake them up. I think that Langston Cane I’s flight out of there is more emotionally understandable if he’s seen something horrific happen that in some way violates his own moral code, just seems to be beyond the pale, absolutely unacceptable.\textsuperscript{28}

The novel’s sophisticated irony and character development depend on this scene.

Osborne Anderson was not a fitting model for Cane I, precisely because he was, according to contemporaries, a “noble and devoted lover of freedom for all mankind” or “the greatest hero among the emancipated slaves in the struggle for liberty.”\textsuperscript{29} For instance, Anderson left money in the Harpers Ferry Armory, commenting that, in comparison with freedom, “wealth had no charms for us”\textsuperscript{30}; however, Cane I takes several hundred dollars from the Armory, money that “could make the difference between life and death.”\textsuperscript{31} Hill’s transformation emphasises practical survival over idealised morality of ownership.

The modifications of Anderson’s story of anti-slavery activism and slave narratives are significant alterations that tailor the chapter to the enveloping family novel. Cane I is an atavistic balance to the character of Langston Cane V (for instance, both Canes I and V have committed adultery, with tragic consequences – real or imagined – for their respective families). This narrator’s honest exposure of his own psychological fractures, crimes, and moral weaknesses, tends to echo Cane V’s self-appraisal: both like to look about them rather than charging ahead.\textsuperscript{32} Cane V, who has not found a pattern for his life in heroic ancestors, finds the freedom to accept his weaknesses and mistakes when he encounters the narrative of an ancestor who has also found relief in communicating his failings through writing. What appears to be the devaluation of the character – for Genette, the degrading of the intertextual character’s ethical stature\textsuperscript{33} – is a transvaluation, which alters characters’ motivations and then reevaluates them from the perspective of Cane V, who finds them a worthy example. Cane I permits Cane V to recognise the wholeness of his humanity while he also exemplifies that avoiding responsibilities constitutes “drifting” rather than “freedom.”\textsuperscript{34} In this novel, as in family sagas generally, “[e]ach generation has to reinvent the family past according to its own needs.”\textsuperscript{35} The modifications of Anderson’s story of anti-slavery activism and slave narratives are significant alterations that tailor the chapter to the enveloping family novel.
Family Memoirs, Family Sagas, and Slave Narrative

The protagonist may discover the source of family ambivalence in a document written by a single ancestor, but Cane V’s process of identity reformulation depends on interactions in several nations with strangers, family, lovers, and friends, and on stories of several ancestors. Because of the novel’s complex temporal construction, the slave narrative only functions in retrospect as a beginning. In this instance of métissage or generic braiding, the slave narrative is thus no single origin; the family novel it nests in supplies plurality. Hence, Any Known Blood can most accurately be thought of as “a family novel or family saga,” which is how Hill conceives of the “big, sprawling, touching, loving family story.”36 “Family saga” includes fiction and nonfiction, multiple dimensions of origins, and overtly links the novel to popular literature.37 Previous critics have been reluctant to discuss Hill’s indebtedness to fictionalised family memoirs, although Hill’s novel contains the requisite autobiographical elements, historiographic research, and researcher as protagonist – “the key convention of the historian-narrator presiding over the collection and collation of narrative elements in a search for knowledge.”38 Yet Hill rejects the family memoir’s characteristically romantic and selectively singular myths of homecoming and genealogy. The Cane family is not exclusively bound to a single origin myth, not exclusively black, not exclusively bound to one nation. To adopt David Chioni Moore’s terms, this novel traces routes – “trajectories, paths, interactions, links” – not roots39; the novel oscillates over boundary crossings, without fixing an origin site.

Hill’s novel is symptomatic of synchronous concerns over tracing family genealogies. African American and black Canadian family memoirs’ concerns have been summarised as a triumvirate of “reflection, research, and reunification” by Hill’s father, Daniel Hill.40 Such memoirs attempt to establish authenticity and credibility (relying on documentation), family rituals and codes, and intra- and intergenerational conflict over and resistance to changing family relations. These sagas’ limning of fiction and nonfiction has been in existence at least since the publication of Margaret Walker’s Jubilee (1966). The “family saga” fictionalises aspects of family memoir – self-conscious identity search in the milieu of researching family genealogies and stories, common obstacles to and opportunities for reconciliation – which complement family novels’ emphasis on individual negotiations with ritual. While family novels focus ambivalently “on the decline of the family,”41 the complementary “underlying assumption in the family novel
is that families must somehow find a way to preserve themselves.”

Ambivalence has repercussions: “[t]he protagonist’s personality exemplifies family traits, while his or her evolution (a process of self-discovery) brings about the key changes in the family.”

Influenced by Jubilee’s and Roots’s tradition of combining slave narrative and family memoir, the newer generation of African American family memoirists shows protagonists find themselves as they attempt to preserve their families against external threats of dissolution such as slavery, migration, passing. Lalita Tademy’s Cane River fictionalises several generations of the author’s ancestors. Shirlee Taylor Haizlip’s The Sweeter the Juice is devoted to her mother, tracing her siblings who “passed” into the white world. Divided to the Vein locates the white Southern members of Scott Minerbrook’s extended family who rejected a daughter’s interracial marriage and children. Come By Here explores the situation of the single black mother of the author, Clarence Major. Catherine Slaney’s Family Secrets ties a prominent black Canadian family to African Canadian history and to the author’s growing sense of racial complexity. Somerset Homecoming, by Dorothy Redford and Michael D’Orso, researches and gathers slaves’ descendants on a Southern plantation.

These memoirs, like family novels, document family decline while demonstrating that “forgetfulness of the past leads to chaos and confusion.” Memoirists illustrate omissions in official histories, attempting to marry oral and written information. They find authority in balance as they search archives to authenticate and substantiate oral histories, “using literary documents to undergird the oral tradition,” writes Margaret Walker. Slaney uses family conversations and archival research to flesh out her understanding of her forbears’ choices. Some memoirs incorporate the painstaking tedium of research and thrilling discoveries of primary sources, in oral testimony and in institutions like libraries, museums, and archives, as part of the narrative’s escalating tension:

the reality of the names scrawled before my eyes, names written in ink that had been dry more than a century, hit me in my heart….Suddenly the past seemed so near, so immediate. Here I had assumed such a distance from my parents’ world, from the lives they had lived. And now, suddenly, in a very real, very personal sense, time was squeezed, the generations were pushed together.
The memoirs discussed here all rely on paratextual photographs and/or family trees to provide documentation and guide readers. Major’s photograph tellingly depicts the mother sitting and the (authoring and authoritative) son standing above. Tademy’s *Cane River* distributes substantial documentation throughout – family trees, photographs, portraits, letters, and documents like wills, divorce decrees, and census reports. Family charts and documentary photographs establish the authoritative vantage point of one who (to adapt Hill’s titular phrase) *knows blood*, one who has done all the research and understands all the links so documented. Hill too includes a Cane family tree to guide the reader. Suggestively, Hill family letters and photographs occupy a liminal space on the book’s cover, just as his family stories loosely inform those of the Cane family, implying but not asserting the autobiographical connections between Hill and Cane.

Cane V’s “larger than life” father figures especially Cane IV – paradoxically escalate the decline of the family through their traditional authoritarian strength. They have overwritten “royal screw-ups” in the family tree until they more closely resemble “royal blood.” This falsely elevated standard of achievement and principle is one that later generations find impossible to meet. Eventually, Cane V, following a personal path to do “the right thing,” either discovers or imagines what his father calls “the politics of shame. Shame in one’s family and in one’s community.” The first Cane is, according to family lore, a hero, until Cane V discovers his flaws. The slave narrative he discovers is also ambivalent about family, its author Langston Cane I torn between freedom from all ties and his responsibilities. The slave narrative is thus a highly charged source of shame and strength that will inform the family saga for generations to come, though discoveries of his father’s cheating and stealing in university and his aunt’s prostitution have the most immediate impact on Cane I’s relations with living Canes. Like the grandfather’s adultery and venereal disease, the father’s unethical acts and the aunt’s prostitution “clearly [dispute] the discourse of genealogical purity,” to borrow Handley’s terms. They also uncover multiple, not single, routes to becoming individuals and belonging to family. As the flaws of each generation emerge, and the imperative power of each father figure diminishes, Cane V learns how shame can drive a person away from his or her family, responsibilities, community and future; he learns how to face his own shame for not measuring up to the family ideal, his marital infidelity and the loss of an infant. Family narratives’ omissions of shameful sins alter lives and negatively affect familial relationships. Cane V’s penetration of the boundary between public respectability and private shameful selves, tantamount to an unmasking of the law
of the black father, gives him the flexibility to claim membership in the family and responsibility for his life on his own terms. Like Redford and D’Orso, Cane V discovers that slavery is none too distant, and that the generations are “squeezed together.”

Memoirs heal the individual self; exploring distant sources of conflict, they often attempt to resolve current family estrangements. Hill’s novel is typical in that family memoirists often meet resistance to their endeavours, particularly from family members whose understanding of the past is challenged. Minerbrook’s white grandmother, aunt, and step-grandmother discourage or refuse to meet him; Slaney’s uncle will not recognise the family’s black antecedents until his death; Redford’s friends and family become bored with her historical obsession. Similarly, Langston Cane V’s lover, Annette, is unsympathetic to his quest, his aunt Mill tells him he is “chasing [his] tail,” and his father tries to prevent him from uncovering the past.51 As in family novels, the text shores up the family against decline, moving across geographical and racial boundaries in the interests of psychological wholeness. Frequently a memoir performs an actual “journey to close all the loops”:52 Scott Minerbrook goes south, Haizlip goes west, Redford goes rural. Family memoirs provide compelling testimony supporting genealogical research, and reunions are coded as manifestations of psychic healing:

For the first time in my life, I love me in a way I’ve never loved me before….I love my parents and grandparents and those before them in a way I never knew them, nor loved them before….

I have always been proud of who I am. And I have always appreciated the little part of me that I know. But now I have a new found appreciation of “from whence I have come.” And a new vision where I, and we as a people, must go. And now I know why we must go.53

Cane V approaches this connection closely when he discovers Cane I’s narrative. He tells his aunt “that I felt strangely connected to Langston the First. ‘I love the fact that he didn’t fit in. I love him for his mixture of weakness and dignity.’”54 The slave narrative closes the search and enables Cane to reunite his nuclear and extended family (including friends Aberdeen, Annette, Hélène and Yoyo) and envision future children at the end of the novel.
Model Family Memoir Novels: The Influence of *Roots*

*Roots*, subtitled “saga,” is the best-known example of the larger framework of *Any Known Blood*, the one specifically identified as part of Hill’s creative formation. An intertextual reading of *Any Known Blood* against *Roots* addresses questions of truth and authenticity, symbolic heroism, origins, and style. The critical debates surrounding *Roots* are particularly helpful in elucidating expectations of family memoir novels, and the role of the slave narrative as a core genre. *Roots*’ narrative power shaped Hill’s development and the project of *Any Known Blood*, just as its blockbuster impact (as book and television series) altered readers’ and viewers’ expectations of American history and literature, adjusting them to incorporate African American experiences. For many, Haley’s *Roots* contained a symbolic fulfillment as the protagonist Haley “was for the first time among his people apparently able to bridge the great historical abyss of the Middle Passage and to identify, quite precisely, his ancestral place in Africa.”

William Van Deburg suggests *Roots*’s metonymic function: “the book became a chronicle of inspiration and vicarious wish fulfillment for black Americans less able [than Haley] to spare the time, effort, and money needed for extensive genealogical research”; Van Deburg quotes Haley as stating that, “although slavery had stolen from blacks ‘all insight into what they had been, many could adopt his family patriarch as their family patriarch.’”

In *Roots*, after describing the personal significance of disentangling individual histories from the knot of general history, Haley proposes that African Americans read his family’s story as a “symbolic saga.” Through “adoption” or “symbolism,” the tale becomes representative; moreover, for some, “*Roots* does not function as fiction at all; representing not one more myth of race and sex in America, but the replacement of all such myths by the unchangeable, irrefutable truth.” More specifically, *Roots* influentially put forward what bell hooks in another context has called “a counter-hegemonic sense of history, wherein the African past, which white supremacy had taught blacks to despise, was now revered” and where one could recover the values of one’s ancestors.

The centrality of *Roots* to Hill is evident: “I read *Roots* at a time when I was just stepping into the world of literature….I’ve often believed that the things you read in your late teens or early twenties are often the things that really get you ticking and stay with you, just because you come at them in such a formative
time”; *Roots* is a “major point of reference” for *Any Known Blood*, particularly “for its celebration of an intergenerational approach to black history in America going back to Africa.”

What is written of *Roots* could be said of *Any Known Blood*: “the whole plot structure is traced along a genealogical line.” This single-source model elides many other ancestors that contribute to one’s genetic makeup: “the farther back one can trace a single ancestor, the *less and less* that ancestor represents you, except – and this is a significant point – by a process of retroactive and selective affiliation.” In the case of Langston Cane V, Cane I is merely one of sixteen great-great-grandparents. Thus the novel ostensibly gestures toward selectively nostalgic genealogical construction of origins.

The critical debate over genealogy helps to determine whether this is in fact the case. One critical view highlights the conservative function of family work, the other its liberatory function. Russell Adams deconstructs *Roots*, arguing that it perpetuates an avoidance of intellectually rigorous questioning of slavery through the overindulgence of emotion and a form of bourgeois nostalgia in genealogy, deflecting challenges to history and historical practices: “The genealogical approach to the study of the past and of the structure of group relations does not lead to a wider understanding of the social system.” For instance, Alex Haley’s *Queen*’s Irish roots, idyllic antebellum Southern life, fierce disruptions of war, race and class, and sexual titillation read bizarrely like *Gone with the Wind* and feed conservatism. In “a social climate of nostalgia and social conservatism,” the public can remain “oblivious to the extent to which the Americas have compounded identity questions.”

Alternatively, certain genealogies defy expectations, “tactically” using subjugated knowledge conjoined with memory and history of insurrectionary struggle. Rinaldo Walcott appraises the genealogical chart: “[it] bear[s] a trace to something beyond the nation, disturbing its boundaries and requiring that…we think beyond the notion of singularity. If community is at stake…it is a community which requires the active working out of the very category.”

Genealogy can provide roots, or it can provide routes. Hill’s novel, locating suppressed microknowledges in each generation’s shame and efforts to join hegemonic discourse, moves beyond singularity and renegotiates the category of community and family. Hill “recognize[s] the seductive temptations of narratives of origin, and the conspiracies of belonging that they afford, but consciously choose[s] the more difficult territory of negotiating new cultural spaces in which
more equitable futures might be constructed.”

The genealogical chart he provides is an index to subjugated knowledges whose long-term effects erupt in the protagonist’s life.

Hill’s resistance to Roots can be glimpsed biographically too. The novel in part inspired Hill to travel to Africa in the 1970s. Initially Hill separated himself from his Quebecois peers and tried to be accepted by Africans as black; later, during a severe illness, his peers’ thoughtful care of Hill drained away his need to be recognised as different from them, greatly altering his belief in pan-African origins and brotherhood. This crucial episode suggests a turn away from an idea of Africa as the edenic, original source of selfhood, the view Roots promotes. Haley’s ancestor, Kunta Kinte, as he approaches African adulthood, thinks about “how so many things … all tied together. The past seemed with the present, the present with the future; the dead with the living and those yet to be born; he himself with his family, his mates, his village, his tribe, his Africa.”

Family origins are invented through a false nostalgia. Both Haley’s and Hill’s books are quests for the black diasporic family’s roots in freedom. Haley locates freedom beyond slavery and the graphically depicted horrors of the Middle Passage in an inviolable and unreachable African sense of identity and family; in multiple border crossings, Hill finds opportunity in slavery and other oppressive circumstances. Additionally, the novel mocks Derek, the character most closely identified with a romantic undifferentiated vision of Africa. Africa First, the group purportedly kidnapping Dr. Norville Watson and Cane IV, is revealed to be a front for white supremacists attempting to provoke race war by capitalising on stereotypes of black African militancy. Instead of undifferentiated black nationalism or pan-Africanism, this novel presents references to Africa often as misleading identifications. There are no short cuts home.

The complex architecture of plot, family webs and historical situations in Hill’s novel speaks to multiple ways of becoming. Though Haley’s narrator speaks to the synchronic sense of Mandinka community composed of distant ancestors, living representatives, and unborn generations, the narrative structure itself does not hold these together. Instead, it relies on a highly linear plot: Roots begins with the birth of Kunta Kinte, chronologically leads up through generations to Haley’s birth, and arrives at his professional development and research. The chronicle of race crimes ends in the 1920s, “defusing or downplaying current political tensions” as Moore points out. Roots’s “narrative is simplistically linear, literally going from one thing to the next in a non-reflecting manner” with the result that “[w]e are not moved to think about
changing hostile social structures, but to care about the vicissitudes of respectable victims caught in their interstices.” Hill’s novel resists the straightforward chronology that can do a disservice to family stories and to the patterns of storytelling, which “focus primarily on recurrent values and themes,” according to folklorist William Wilson. Wilson acknowledges the need for framework, suggesting unity of construction “not in a linear plot leading from event to event…but rather, as in some modern novels, in the clustering of motifs around given themes, with [the storyteller] always at the center.” Any Known Blood corresponds more closely than Roots to this model as it embeds found documents and stories in the narrative proper and moves in two directions at once: first, Cane V’s travels and discoveries follow a chronological pattern; second, the embedded stories run in reverse chronology, from close to more remote ancestors. This structure highlights personal and institutional manifestations of racism through the Civil Rights period up to the present, including the Ontario Provincial Government’s attempt to “kill anti-discrimination legislation and junk the provincial human rights commission.” The generic oyster-and-pearl structure, in which the family saga contains characters’ highly individual voices, provides a central storyteller (who is becoming a professional storyteller) and a cluster of motifs picked up by other voices. This variety of generic juxtaposition avoids Roots’ abrupt shifts in narrative focus, and the first-person researcher persona manages but does not foreclose his forebears’ stories.

In Roots, the family romance establishes lineage through a master narrative of ancestral heroic identity as inheritance and the foundational origins of family strength/wealth; Any Known Blood arouses then thwarts this narrative desire. As suggested above, the anti-heroic protagonists of Hill’s novel carry a less heavy burden of representation and narrators make no claims to represent others. While the novel encompasses documents written by other intelligent and erring Langston Canes, only Canes I and V control their autobiographical narratives of self-discovery. Hill emphasises the balance between them:

I cared so much to get Langston Cane I’s story out alive and breathing that it just struck me as I was writing that what better way to deliver it than to do it in the first person, particularly I suppose because Langston V feels that he’s so adrift in relation to the other productive, forward-moving hardworking non-reflective male types that have been his ancestors, people who did things and saved themselves
rather than worrying about their relation to the world. Doers rather than thinkers….Langston Cane V somehow connects with his Langston Cane I ancestor perhaps more profoundly for the very reason that he discovers the humanity in the errors and mistakes and human failings of his ancestor. I felt that changing the point of view in delivering the story from his point of view would maximize his effect on Langston Cane V and on the reader.77

In narrative, chronological, and thematic terms Canes I and V are bookends. The single yet multifaceted, morally complex source interrupts the conventional route of upward mobility, shows the ways in which weakness might be erased and heroism constructed through selective family myth-making, and disrupts absolute patriarchal family authority.

Haley’s and Hill’s authorial ethics may also be usefully compared. As the result of Roots being “subjected – from virtually the moment of its publication – to challenges to both its historical veracity and its underlying authorship,” including international attacks on sources, legal cases of plagiarism brought by Leonard S. Brown, Jr. (dismissed), Margaret Walker (dismissed), and Harold Courlander (settled out of court), and critiques of its clichéd style, the book “has been utterly banished by the literary academy.”78 Despite the academic shift in which “the distinction between originality and plagiarism, like that between fact and fiction, has been attacked as recent, historically variable, and theoretically untenable,”79 the fascinatingly slippery status of the book’s truth claims, and the recent emphasis of cultural studies on popular texts, this family saga and its influence remain largely unstudied. Hill warily avoids Haley’s pitfalls by employing and policing conventional distinctions between fact and fiction, commenting that, “I wanted to tell a fictionalized story – truly a novel – that in some way or another spoke to me about the love of family and the love of my own family and how I imagined things might have unfolded in my own family history.”80 In his “Acknowledgments,” Hill scrupulously lists historical sources used and “hastens to emphasize that this novel is a novel. Family stories have been altered or exaggerated, and almost all of this book is invented,” creating a much more cautious contract with readers than Haley’s.81 He nevertheless evokes syncretic truth when he joins fiction-making with family memoir, speaks passionately of the inspiration provided by family history, and places Hill family documents, photos, tales and characteristics on the margins of his novel.82
Geographical and Cultural Borders

The generic intersections and intertextuality at play in *Any Known Blood* structurally set the stage for border crossings occurring in geographical and metaphorical (racial) dimensions, crossings which negotiate the meaning of America for Canadians and particularly African Canadians. *Any Known Blood* might appear to participate in a broader tendency of black Canada to construct black America as the origin of true politicised racial identity (what George Elliott Clarke calls a “Mecca of true ‘blackness’”\(^83\)), because the novel’s contemporary protagonist begins his journey of self-awareness in Baltimore, and ends it in Harpers Ferry with the discovery of Cane I’s fugitive slave narrative. According to this logic of model (American) blackness, Cane V would refresh his soul through encounters with American inhabitants and history. Seductive notions obscuring the realities of American blackness mean that “for African Canadians, *African America* signifies resistance, vitality, joy, ‘nation,’ community, grace, art, pride, clout, spirituality, and soul.”\(^84\) Moreover, the main precursor of the fugitive slave narrative is a black Canadian’s memoir, that of Osborne Anderson, a member of John Brown’s army and survivor of Harpers Ferry. Instead of a version of black America as origin, the journey to America appears to provide a distant and improved perspective on Canadian blackness, thus making African Canadianité the emphasis.

But *Any Known Blood* also challenges long-lived Canadian myths of refuge from racism and more recent multicultural myths. Many critics of black culture in Canada (such as Althea Prince, Dionne Brand, Rinaldo Walcott) mistrust the (sometimes official) hegemonic assertions of peaceful co-existence among many ethnicities, which obscure inequalities. Critiquing these assertions, Brand argues that “[a]ll immigration is seen as fleeing a horrible past/place and arriving gratefully at an unblemished present/place. So Canada presents itself as an alluring historyless place” that is antiseptic, pristine, forgetful.\(^85\) This attitude depends – as Clarke again remarks – on differentiation from the US and a reading of racial identity into the US: “English Canada’s desire to assert its moral superiority vis-à-vis the United States muffles discussions of racism, which is cast as an American problem.”\(^86\) Racial identity and racism are seen as American. “The pride…in being different from the pariah to the south obfuscates the challenges in destroying the stereotypes and rather enhances them. (Nothing we can do can be as bad.)”\(^87\) *Any Known Blood* shows the reader many instances of “as bad.” It thus crosses the boundaries of
Canadian cultural definitions, resulting in plural routes to understanding multivalent Canadian blackness.

Every Langston Cane undertakes a border crossing over the US-Canada divide. Cane I escapes slavery by crossing Lake Ontario to Oakville and establishing a new life there, evoking nineteenth-century fugitive slave narrators travelling northward. Like the fugitives Thomas Smallwood, William and Ellen Craft, and Samuel Ringgold Ward, Cane I refutes the association between Canada and freedom. The reverse chronological order of family stories contextualises the escape to freedom in Canada; a fugitive slave narrative that might otherwise be grist for whitewashed hegemonic Canadian history is cleverly preceded in the novel by violent racism perpetrated by the Oakville branch of the Klan and followed by Cane I’s own experience of segregation and second-class treatment in Canada. There is a suggestive parallel between the first and last border crossings: both the fugitive slave’s escape and the crossing of Cane V, Mill, Annette, and Yoyo into Canada take place in spite of the vigilance of slave catchers and immigration officers. As Walcott points out, Yoyo (a Cameroonian illegal immigrant in the US) is the present counterpart of the fugitive slave, for he is an “underground” refugee, and makes daring escapes. Canadian policy is not so much welcoming blacks as working to keep blacks out.

**Borders of Race and Family**

Hybridity may present a crucial theoretical challenge to simplistic dualities (as in the work of Homi Bhabha), but Hill focuses instead on its oft-painful cost to the bearer and its rare rewards. Individuals run the risk of not fitting in any community, feeling like interlopers, being forced to choose one race, and/or denying differences between races and their communities. Like mulatto, miscegenation, and amalgamation, hybridity is a deeply problematic term that also ranges in meaning, from assertions of hybrid weakness and inability to reproduce to claims of “hybrid vigor.” Hill’s version of “Zebra” mixed-race (as expressed in *The Blacker the Berry*) is, like métissage, a more neutral vehicle for the crossing of boundaries and the exploration of race (meaning both family and ethnicity). As suggested above, the acknowledgments and challenges of the legacies of genre inflect the attitude toward racial inheritance or “blood.”
As Rinaldo Walcott argues, “from the beginning of the family genealogy we must contend with the ways in which the Cane family symbolizes black North American border crossing in terms of its inter-raciality.” Early on, the uncertain race of the narrator threatens nihilism of what Walcott calls the “sliding signifier of blackness,” but the narrator’s quest for family resolves this threat. Each generation explores interracial sexual politics in tense situations. Cane I has an affair with Diana, the fictional white daughter of John Brown. Cane II becomes part of the white Quaker Shoemaker family. Cane III helps Aberdeen escape the violent repercussions of an affair with a white woman. Millicent rejects her brother, Cane IV, because he has married a white woman. Cane V’s ex-wife is white, too, as is the lover Yoyo hopes to join in Toronto. Much is at stake in crossing racial boundaries, and people who cross boundaries sustain trauma at the personal and public, physical and psychological levels. More intimate than transnational border crossing, these border crossings expand the sense of the Canadian (and American) body. In addition, as all constitute consensual relationships, they rewrite the trope of the “mixed-race black,” a trope that serves as a reminder of “white-practised violence against enslaved African women,” as carrying “the absolute tint of impurity, of blending, of remembered violence, of treachery – or treason – implicit in the flesh.” Long-lived stereotypes of the tragic mulatto figures of feminine victimhood or masculine rebelliousness are revisited as the narrator/protagonist is initially uncertain of his race, place, and plans, but are revised as the narrator’s racial identity mounts a successful challenge to precise gender and racial strictures governing sexuality.

In addition to challenging the dualistic notion of black/white races, Hill is working across boundaries of race as meaning family, too. Mill claims, first at the Harpers Ferry hotel and again at the Canada-US border, that she, Cane V, Yoyo and Annette are members of the same family. She addresses them all as her “folks,” and the border guard, though initially wary, agrees with her assessment, responding, “Have a safe trip home, folks.” They write themselves into the family saga; hence Yoyo’s articles and Annette’s letter to Langston enter the novel, the family archives. Yoyo’s presence reminds readers that although Hill has critiqued Afrocentrism, “[t]his critique…is not a dismissal of intellectual allegiances between diasporic black peoples, but rather a dismissal of an uncritical assumption of unity.” Canada’s black folks are not homogenous but heterogeneous. They “[fissure] along regional, linguistic, gender, class, and ethnic lines, thus
rendering the incarnation of race solidarity a difficult enterprise,” as the literature comprises voices of numerous “exiles, refugees, fugitives, pilgrims, migrants, and natives.”

It should by now be evident that the Cane family is not exclusively genetically defined, not exclusively black, not exclusively bound to one nation, not exclusively bound to a single myth of origins. Hill’s novel centres geographically and figuratively on freedom and family, but the book’s impetus explicitly requires that these be fluid categories. His characters expose political, national, and racial divides by identifying and crossing policed boundaries. Similarly, Hill is not exclusively bound to the slave narrative or the African American family memoir. This version of métissage or intertextual intersection edits the enclosed antislavery narrative to accord with the enveloping family saga, and addresses the saga in such a way to defer the delivery of origins. The narrative links early instances of African American and African Canadian life writing with accounts of John Brown at Harpers Ferry. The embedded slave narrative is a document that replaces unsustainable heroic models with human-scale strengths and weaknesses and functions as a distinctly Canadian and Black document (with the critique of Canadianness that Black implies). Slave narratives and African American family sagas are defamiliarised and critiqued in their proximity, through métissage resulting in the “pluralizing of blackness.”

Working alongside and against models such as Roots and contemporary memoirists, Hill creates a series of uniquely African Canadian voices, and, exploring the uses of primary genealogical and historical research, he reflects on the significance of historiography, autobiography, and fiction within one expansive family. The use of a family memoir novel as a nest, and the different quality of the Canadian environment, gives the slave narrative a chance for a rebirth of kinds; though its flight is restricted to the family tree, this fledgling slave narrative is free of many constraints on nineteenth-century slave narratives. Hill’s novel reserves a place of pride for the slave narrative, from which situation he can formulate fictional responses to ongoing questions of black and Canadian histories and identities. Encapsulating the force of the slave narrative and embedding it in a family saga does not deprive it of its power but rather forces a fundamentally optimistic and liberating generic confrontation.

I am grateful to readers Marjorie Stone, Jason Haslam, Maureen Moynagh, George Elliott Clarke, Anthony Stewart, and the editors at 49th Parallel for their comments. I also thank Lawrence Hill for his generosity with his time and insights.
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