

Notes

CHAPTER 1

1. Nancy K. Miller, *But Enough about Me: Why We Read Other People's Lives* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2002), 1–26, 111–25.
2. Henry J. S. Maine, *Ancient Law* (1861; rpt. Boston: Beacon, 1963), 26.
3. Judith Modell, *Kinship with Strangers: Adoption and Interpretations of Kinship in American Culture* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1994), 2, quoting Maine, *Ancient Law* and commenting.
4. See Kath Weston, “Forever Is a Long Time: Romancing the Real in Gay Kinship,” in *Naturalizing Power: Essays in Feminist Cultural Analysis*, ed. Sylvia Yanagisako and Carol Delaney (New York: Routledge, 1995), 88, and the essays in *Relative Value: Reconfiguring Kinship Studies*, ed. Sarah Franklin and Susan McKinnon (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2001).
5. Cf. attempts to conceal adoption in Barbara Melosh, *Strangers and Kin: The American Way of Adoption* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2002), 225.
6. Katarina Wegar, in *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship: The Debate over Sealed Birth Records* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), 97, observes that “between April 1993 and March 1994, the adoption theme was featured 113 times in nationwide radio and TV news programs.” Many of these either directly involved the Schmidt-DeBoer case or were contextualized with regard to it. For comparison, divorce and separation, which occur more frequently, were only discussed 97 times.
7. In this book I deal with the issue of claims of both kinds of parents themselves and also with the issue of the relative influences of heredity and environment. On this second point, I am aware of recent research showing, for example, that certain hereditary tendencies are activated only in certain environments, so that treating these factors as dichotomous is too simple. However, when they are mentioned in literature, usually they tended to be treated as opposed.
8. Janet Beizer, “One’s Own: Reflections on Motherhood, Owning, and Adoption,” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 21, no. 2 (2002): 245.
9. Sigmund Freud, “Family Romances,” in *Complete Psychological Works*, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth, 1959), 9:237–41. Freud argues that these fantasies are also disguised ways of manifesting the child’s affection for original parents, who can be seen as appearing in them exalted in rank.
10. Though the central characters in these works were not legally adopted, the transfer to a new household while their ancestry is kept secret puts them in situations close enough to those of modern adoptees that I will use the current

terms. The happy and disastrous adoption stories correspond approximately to the two kinds of adoption novels identified by Patricia Howe in “Fontane’s ‘Ellernklipp’ and the Theme of Adoption,” *Modern Language Review* 79 (1984): 121, and developed further by Tess O’Toole, “Adoption and the ‘Improvement of the Estate’ in Trollope and Craik,” in *Imagining Adoption: Essays on Literature and Culture*, ed. Marianne Novy (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001). Howe suggests that disastrous adoption plots are more frequent in German literature than in English.

11. Barbara Estrin sees the most important myth shaping our view of adoption as the one that sees identity as determined by “blood ties.” While my approach is consistent with hers in many ways, I believe that the happy adoption story that erases the child’s past and genetic relatives is also an influential myth. See Barbara Estrin, “Ending in the Middle: Revisioning Adoption in Benjamin Wilkomirski’s *Fragments* and Anne Michaels’s *Fugitive Pieces*,” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 21, no. 2 (2002): 277.

12. See Betty Jean Lifton, *Journey of the Adopted Self: A Quest for Wholeness* (New York: Basic, 1994), 146–273, for more discussion of the complexities of reunions of adoptees and birth parents.

13. Many of those discussions have focused on literature from societies without formal legal procedures for adopting children, where, however, informal adoption could take place. Some of the same books, such as *Oliver Twist*, could be considered under either category, but grouping them with literature about adoption facilitates a close look at relationships within the text, not just at the child in isolation, and also at their connections with later novels and cultural fantasies, such as the frequent pretense that adoptees are orphans; see Betty Jean Lifton, *Twice Born: Memoirs of an Adopted Daughter* (New York: Penguin, 1977), 9–13. The literary and social history of bastardy is also relevant to adoption in literature, although the position of a person born and raised by the same single mother is quite different from the position of one born outside of marriage and adopted by someone else. Some of the critics who have discussed orphans, foundlings, and bastards in literature without much reference to the social history of these conditions are Northrop Frye, in *The Secular Scripture: A Study of the Structure of Romance* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1976) (mysterious birth); Edward Said, in *Beginnings: Intention and Method* (New York: Basic, 1975) (orphanhood); Peter Brooks, in *Reading for the Plot: Design and Intention in Narrative* (1984; rpt. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1992) (orphanhood and surrogacy); Marthe Robert, in *Origins of the Novel*, trans. Sacha Rabinovitch (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1980) (the bastard and the foundling); Marie Maclean, in *The Name of the Mother: Writing Illegitimacy* (London: Routledge, 1994); and Michael Ragussis, in *Acts of Naming: The Family Plot in Fiction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988). See also Marc Shell, *Children of the Earth: Literature, Politics, and Nationhood* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), and *The End of Kinship: ‘Measure for Measure,’ Incest, and the Ideal of Universal Siblinghood* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1988); and Eileen Simpson, *Orphans: Real and Imaginary* (New York: Signet, 1990).

14. Jean Paton, writing as Ruthena Hill Kittson, *Orphan Voyage* (1968; rpt. Cedaredge, Colo.: Country Press, 1980). Paton wrote most of this book in the late 1950s.

15. Betty Lifton writes, “Inherent in the adoption process is the expectation that the child is to regard the birth parents *as if dead*,” in *Lost and Found: The Adoption Experience* (1979; rpt. New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 14. As of 2005, only six states—Kansas, Alaska, Tennessee, Alabama, New Hampshire, and Oregon—give the American adoptee unequivocal rights to identifying information about their biological parents; see Adam Pertman, *Adoption Nation: How the Adoption Revolution Is Transforming America* (New York: Basic, 2000), 32, 82. Records are open with some reservations in Illinois, Delaware, Montana, Ohio, and Vermont.

16. See Drucilla Cornell, *At the Heart of Freedom: Feminism, Sex, and Equality* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1998); and Mary Lyndon Shanley, *Making Babies, Making Families: What Matters Most in an Age of Reproductive Technologies, Surrogacy, Adoption, and Same-Sex and Unwed Parents* (Boston: Beacon, 2001) for discussions of multiple parenting and the need to give up ideas that parenthood is unique ownership.

17. Rickie Solinger, *Wake Up Little Susie: Single Pregnancy and Race before Roe v. Wade* (New York: Routledge, 1992). Some today argue for the restigmatization of illegitimacy. In a pattern continuous with the history Solinger discusses, many whites easily stigmatize illegitimacy among blacks.

18. See Barbara Melosh, “Adoption Stories: Autobiographical Narrative and the Politics of Identity,” in *Adoption in America: Historical Perspectives*, ed. E. Wayne Carp (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 227–30, especially on Katrina Maxtone-Graham’s *An Adopted Woman* (New York: Remi, 1983); some she discusses vary this pattern.

19. “The study requires volunteers who were adopted and have never met their birthmother to submit the following information: 1. A copy of the non-identifying information or whatever documents that best describes the adoptee’s birthmother at the time of the adoption. 2. A photo of adoptee at approximately the same age as adoptee’s birthmother was at the time of relinquishment.” Posted on Adoption News Service, July 10, 2003. This is encouraging people to imagine the impossible; the real person’s appearance would inevitably be a disappointment.

20. Barbara Katz Rothman, *Genetic Maps and Human Imaginations* (New York: Norton, 1998).

21. See, for example, Sandra Patton, *BirthMarks: Transracial Adoption in Contemporary America* (New York: New York University Press, 2000), 43–45, 91–92.

22. Adrienne Rich, *Blood, Bread, and Poetry: Selected Prose, 1979–1985* (New York: Norton, 1986).

23. See Elise V. Lemire, “From Blood to DNA: The Failed Narratives of Interracial Kinship,” paper presented to the Annual Meetings of the Modern Language Association, Chicago, December 28, 1999; and Rothman, *Genetic Maps*, 16.

24. See Margaret Homans, “Adoption and Essentialism,” *Tulsa Studies in Women’s Literature* 21, no. 2 (2002): 264, on the limitations of the cultural information for transracially adopted children recommended by social workers.

25. Mary Waters, *Ethnic Options* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 91. Subsequent references will be included in the text.

26. Alan Wolfe, “The Return of the Melting Pot,” *New Republic*, December 31, 1990.

27. Quoted by Henry Louis Gates in “Integrating the American Mind,” in *Loose Canons* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1992), 116.

28. Enthusiasm about adoption in America of the 1920s and 30s, discussed by Vivian Zelizer, *Pricing the Priceless Child: The Changing Social Value of Children* (New York: Basic, 1985) 189–95, coincided with enthusiasm for multicultural education. Today transracial adoption is becoming popular in previously monocultural Norway, leading to many complications: see Signe Howell, “Self-Conscious Kinship: Some Contested Values in Norwegian Transnational Adoption,” in Franklin and McKinnon, *Relative Value*, 203–23.

29. See Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, 15–16.

30. Solinger, *Wake Up Little Susie*, 14–17; Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, 12–50.

31. Solinger, *Wake Up Little Susie*, 19.

32. Ellen Goodman, *Paper Trail: Common Sense in Uncommon Times* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2004), 138. The essay, “Meet Your Children,” 137–38, originally appeared August 29, 1993. For further reflections on this issue, see Mary Watkins and Susan Fisher, *Talking with Young Children about Adoption* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), 217–19. See also Beizer, “One’s Own.”

33. Gates, *Loose Canons*, 175. Transcultural adopters who write about this include Drucilla Cornell, “Reimagining Adoption and Family Law,” in *Mother Trouble: Rethinking Contemporary Maternal Dilemmas*, ed. Julia E. Hanigberg and Sara Ruddick (Boston: Beacon Press, 1999), 213–15; and Emily Prager, *Wuhu Diary: On Taking My Adopted Daughter Back to Her Hometown in China* (New York: Random House, 2001). On complications of international adoption, see Homans, “Adoption and Essentialism,” Andrew Elfenbein and John Watkins, “Papadada: Reinventing the Family,” *Tulsa Studies* 21, no. 2 (2002): 301–18, and Alice Jardine, “Dolphins, Dying Rooms, and Destabilized Demographics, Or: Loving Anna in a Transmodern World,” *Tulsa Studies* 21, no. 2 (2002): 333–45.

34. I would like to think that on balance Dorothy benefited as well. It is unlikely that without me she, a devout Catholic of the 1950s and 1960s, would have divorced Frank and lived happily ever after, given the fact that after he died, she entered the convent (though she left after a year and a half). And Geraldine has spoken with surprising fondness of the atmosphere in the Florence Crittenton home, which was apparently warmer than her own parents provided. Nevertheless, all of us were scarred—especially Geraldine, who didn’t feel she had a choice about where I went—by some aspects of adoption practice at the time. To give another perspective, people from families somewhat like Geraldine’s have, as I think of it, “escaped” into worlds I would consider

less restrictive. I tend to doubt that I would have had as much courage as they, but who knows?

35. For a critical contextualization of international adoption, see Claudia Castaneda, “Incorporating the Transnational Adoptee,” in Novy, *Imagining Adoption*, 277–99.

36. Betty Jean Lifton, *Twice Born: Memoirs of an Adopted Daughter* (New York: Penguin, 1977), 3.

37. Jean Paton, *The Adopted Break Silence: The Experiences and Views of Forty Adults Who Were Once Adopted Children* (Philadelphia: Life History Center, 1954); Paton [Kittson], *Orphan Voyage*.

38. Maxton-Graham, *An Adopted Woman*.

39. Occasionally I encounter the claim that *adoptee* has negative connotations. However, it is used by many perceptive, respectful writers and is much less clumsy than “adopted person” or “adopted people.”

40. Carolyn Steadman, *Landscape for a Good Woman* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1987); Gayle Greene and Coppelia Kahn, *Changing Subjects: The Making of Feminist Literary Criticism* (New York: Routledge, 1993); Rachel Brownstein, *Becoming a Heroine: Thinking about Women in Novels* (New York: Viking, 1982); Suzanne Juhasz, *Reading from the Heart: Women, Literature, and the Search for True Love* (New York: Viking, 1994). Note also the 1996 MLA Forum “The Place of the Personal”; and Diane P. Freedman, Olivia Frey, and Frances Murphy Zauhar, eds., *The Intimate Critique: Autobiographical Literary Criticism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1993).

41. See recent summaries of the controversy in Wegar, *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship*, 43–71; and Lifton, *Journey of Adopted Self*, esp. 91–108. An influential book emphasizing psychological damage continuing after adoption is Nancy Newton Verrier, *The Primal Wound: Understanding the Adopted Child* (Baltimore: Gateway, 1993). Watkins and Fisher, in *Talking with Young Children*, bridge the gap to some extent because they emphasize the reality of the adoptee’s history, favor openness, interview some parents in open adoptions, but focus on studies of nonclinical populations that conclude that adoptees are for the most part as psychologically healthy as nonadoptees.

42. Wegar, *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship*, 121–23, 135–37, takes a similar position.

43. This last view is the way my student Mary Beth Magin applied standpoint theory in her excellent term paper in my Adoption Literature course of spring 2003, discussing especially Jeanette Winterson’s *Oranges Are Not the Only Fruit*.

44. Judith Modell, “Natural Bonds, Legal Boundaries: Modes of Persuasion in Adoption Rhetoric,” in Novy, *Imagining Adoption*, 221.

45. David Kirk, *Shared Fate: A Theory of Adoption and Mental Health* (New York: Free Press, 1964).

46. Nancy Cott, “Historical Perspective: The Equal Rights Amendment Conflict in the 1920s,” in *Conflicts in Feminism*, ed. Marianne Hirsch and Evelyn Fox Keller (New York: Routledge, 1990), 44–59; Joan Scott, “Deconstructing Equality-versus-Difference: Or, the Uses of Post-structuralist Theory for

Feminism,” in Hirsch and Keller, 134–48; Jane Gallop, conversation at conference on psychoanalysis and feminism, 1980.

47. See Christa Hoffmann-Riem, *The Adopted Child: Family Life with Double Parenthood* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction, 1990).

48. Denise Riley, “Am I That Name?” *Feminism and the Category of “Women” in History* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1988). Riley has written at least one poem, “The Castalian Spring,” in the persona of someone who does not wish to have her life or writing categorized with reference to the circumstances of her birth—her “sociologized self.”

49. See Wegar, *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship*, 65.

50. Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, 54–68, shows these as frequent reasons for the consistent American preference for adopting girls, in the records of the Children’s Bureau of Delaware, by contrast with the more common preference of biological parents-to-be for boys. From the 1930s to 1960s, some wanted to adopt boys because they wanted more spirited or athletic children.

51. Michaela DiLeonardo, “The Female World of Cards and Holidays: Women, Family and the Work of Kinship,” *Signs* 12, no. 3 (1987): 440–53.

52. Marianne Hirsch, *The Mother/Daughter Plot: Narrative, Psychoanalysis, Feminism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989).

53. Sara Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking: Toward a Politics of Peace* (New York: Ballantine, 1989), 48–51.

54. Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, 51.

55. Modell, *Kinship with Strangers*, 229, 238.

56. Jackie Kay, *The Adoption Papers* (Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe, 1991), 23. See also the adoptive mother quoted in Beizer, “One’s Own,” 244: “I change his diapers, I feed him, I sit up with him at night when he’s sick; of course he’s my own.”

57. Adrienne Rich, “When We Dead Awaken: Writing as Re-Vision,” in *On Lies, Secrets, and Silence* (New York: Norton, 1979), 35.

58. For more on adoption in earlier American literature, see Carol Singley’s forthcoming book, *Brave Bonds: Adoption and American Literature*.

59. See my *Engaging with Shakespeare: Responses of George Eliot and Other Women Novelists* (1994; rpt. Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1998).

60. Whitney Balliett, *The New Yorker*, in Albee, *The American Dream and The Zoo Story* (New York: Plume, 1997), 54.

61. See Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, for a contrast of Native American adoptees in Kingsolver’s novels with those in Sherman Alexie’s *Indian Killer*.

CHAPTER 2

1. Paton [Kittson], *Orphan Voyage*, 15.

2. Lifton, *Twice Born*, 1. In these editions, she gives her childhood city, Cincinnati, the name of Corinth, where Oedipus was raised; in the 1998 edition, she drops the pseudonym.

3. Lifton, *Twice Born*, 4; see also 3, 5, 6, 83, 88, 106, 147, 149, 153, 171, 240.

4. H. J. Sants, “Genealogical Bewilderment in Children with Substitute

Parents,” *British Journal of Medical Psychology* 37 (1964): 139. Lifton uses Sants in *Lost and Found*, 48–50, and Paton footnotes his interpretation of *Oedipus*, which she read after she developed her own, on *Orphan Voyage*, 15. E. Wayne Carp, *Family Matters: Secrecy and Disclosure in the History of Adoption* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 154–55, discusses Sants’s influence and his reliance on literature and psychoanalytic theory. Sants quotes Watling’s translation (Penguin, 1947), but adds the third “I.”

5. Sophocles, *Oedipus Rex*, ed. R. D. Dawe (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), commentary to l. 780, p. 171. This is more exact than “bastard,” the translation in *Oedipus the King*, trans. David Grene, in *Sophocles I*, in *The Complete Greek Tragedies*, ed. David Grene and Richmond Lattimore (1954; New York: Washington Square, 1957), from which subsequent quotations of Sophocles indicated parenthetically in the text are drawn. I have also consulted the text and translation in *Sophocles*, ed. and trans. Hugh Lloyd-Jones (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1994).

6. Bernard M. W. Knox, *Oedipus at Thebes: Sophocles’ Tragic Hero and His Time* (1957; New York: Norton, 1971). Cf. the emphasis on Oedipus’s “knowingness” in Jonathan Lear, *Open Minded: Working Out the Logic of the Soul* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 33–55.

7. Sigmund Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, in *Complete Psychological Works*, trans. James Strachey (London: Hogarth Press, 1900), 4:262.

8. Freud, *The Interpretation of Dreams*, 4:261–62.

9. I have a vague recollection of my freshman college English teacher, Sister Mary St. Francis, saying that Oedipus was adopted. But when I look at my notes for that class, I don’t find that point—perhaps it seemed too obvious to note. I do find more conventional criticism and the warning, “Don’t interpret a play as a fragmentary biography of a real person,” and an extraordinary number of doodles, as if there were more things than usual being said that I didn’t write down, and yet I had too much nervous energy to do nothing. The only other page with as many doodles was the page on Dante.

10. John Gould, “The Language of Oedipus,” in *Modern Critical Interpretations: Sophocles’ Oedipus Rex*, ed. Harold Bloom (New York: Chelsea House, 1988), 145.

11. Gould, “The Language of Oedipus,” 158.

12. See Gerald Else, *Aristotle’s Poetics: The Argument* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), 349.

13. The first chapter of my dissertation, written when I was just beginning to be able to talk to my friends about being adopted, was on the Greek tradition behind Shakespeare’s recognition scenes. My dissertation research revealed to me, among other things, that in Greek terms I did not know who I was. No wonder I decided to turn aside from tragic recognitions to comic ones in my dissertation.

14. Use of the term *blood* with regard to biological kinship comes from the ancient (false) tradition, found, for example, in Hippocrates, that semen (once thought to be produced by both men and women) is refined blood. See Lemire, “From Blood to DNA”; also Thomas Laqueur, *Making Sex: Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990), 35.

While Aeschylus's Apollo, in *The Eumenides*, frees Orestes from the charge of parent-murder by saying that the mother is not a true parent but only nurse of the father's seed, the ancient Greeks held several theories of generation, and the mother's contribution was debated. See Sarah Pomeroy, *Families in Classical and Hellenistic Greece: Representation and Reality* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 96–97; and Laqueur, 55–57. I would like my readers to think here about how much more emotional force the term *blood parents* has than the term *genetic parents*. That emotional force also involves a suggestion of potential violence, actualized in particular in such popular works as the musical *Blood Brothers*, in which two brothers, one of them adopted, are doomed to kill each other if they meet, and P. D. James's detective novel *Immaculate Blood*, analyzed by Wegar in *Adoption, Identity and Kinship*, 102–7. However, in Lloyd-Jones's literal translation, *blood* does not occur with reference to kinship in *Oedipus*.

15. Pietro Pucci, *Oedipus and the Fabrication of the Father: Oedipus Tyrannus in Modern Criticism and Philosophy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992), 2.

16. Pucci, *Fabrication of the Father*, 111. The Greek construction translated “that begot me” is sometimes used restrictively and sometimes not, so Pucci's argument is not conclusive.

17. See Pomeroy, *Families in Greece*, 122, quoting from Isaeus 2.13, which is, however, later than Sophocles.

18. A. R. W. Harrison, *The Law of Athens: The Family and Property* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 84–88.

19. Pomeroy, *Families in Greece*, 21. She emphasizes that descent lines were constantly in danger of dying out.

20. W. K. Lacey, *The Family in Classical Greece* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1968), 145–46.

21. Mark Golden, *Children and Childhood in Classical Athens* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1990), 142. However, Golden supports this with a quotation (Isaeus 2.18) in which an adopted son argues that he “cared for and respected [his adoptive father] as if he were my father by birth.” If this point has to be made, Golden says, it is not to be taken for granted.

22. Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 98.

23. S. C. Humphreys, *The Family, Women, and Death: Comparative Studies*, 2d ed. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1993), 7, 65. Her evidence is from the fourth century B.C. *Oedipus* was first produced earlier, ca. 430–428 B.C.

24. See Richmond Lattimore, *The Poetry of Greek Tragedy* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1958), 82; Peter Burian, “Myth into *Muthos*: The Shaping of Tragic Plot,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, ed. P. E. Easterling (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 186.

25. Jan Bremmer, “Oedipus and the Greek Oedipus Complex,” in *Interpretations of Greek Mythology*, ed. Jan Bremmer (London: Croom Helm, 1987), 45.

26. Nancy Demand, *Birth, Death, and Motherhood in Classical Greece* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1994), 22.

27. Demand, *Birth, Death, and Motherhood*, 6.
28. Nicole Loraux, “Kreousa the Autochthon: A Study of Euripides’ *Ion*,” in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context*, ed. John J. Winkler and Froma I. Zeitlin (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 188, sees such exposure as “first and foremost a denial of paternity.” Golden, *Children and Childhood*, 23, and Demand, *Birth, Death, and Motherhood*, 6, note the gender issue; Golden the economic ones, 88–89. See also Mary Lefkowitz and Maureen B. Fant, *Women in Greece and Rome* (Toronto: Samuel-Stevens, 1977), directions to expose a child if it is a girl (91); as part of a marriage annulment (41); if it is “puny and ill-shaped” (54). Thanks to my colleague Nicholas Jones, and to Patricia Storace, who used the Lefkowitz and Fant anthology of documents as source for a poem in the persona of an ancient Greek who directs his wife, “If it is a girl, expose it.”
29. John Boswell, *The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (New York: Pantheon, 1988), 4–49.
30. Dawe, *Oedipus Rex*, 171; Pucci, *Fabrication of the Father*, 99–100. See also Frederick Ahl, *Sophocles’ Oedipus: Evidence and Self-Conviction* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1991), 142–43.
31. Froma I. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Greek Literature* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 335; Harrison, *The Law of Athens*, 84. I am particularly struck by this etymology as a reader of English Renaissance literature because Sir Philip Sidney, in his *Apologie for Poetry*, says that poets were often called “makers,” and Ben Jonson, in his epitaph “Upon my First Son,” refers to his (biological) son as “his best piece of poetry.”
32. Humphreys, *Family, Women, and Death*, 67. See also Elizabeth S. Belfiore, *Murder among Friends: Violations of Philia in Greek Tragedy* (New York: Oxford, 2000), 4–9.
33. Humphreys, *Family, Women, and Death*, 74.
34. Dawe, *Oedipus Rex*, 171.
35. Parental love also appears in Oedipus’s words to his children at the end.
36. Cf. Meredith Skura, *The Literary Use of the Psychoanalytic Process* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 51: “The horrible deeds are not Oedipus’s fault, but rather a vast Freudian slip of the universe.” For more comments on Freudian readings see below.
37. Philip Vellacott, *Sophocles and Oedipus: A Study of Oedipus Tyrannus with a New Translation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1971); on the other hand, Ahl, *Sophocles’ Oedipus*, argues that there are many gaps in the train of evidence that convinces Oedipus of his ancestry and incest: he believes the worst, which is not necessarily true.
38. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 293.
39. Lifton, *Twice Born*, 153.
40. The words translated as “foulness” and “sinner” here are all forms of the Greek word *kakos*. Lloyd-Jones translates the first as “sickness” and the second and third as “evil.”
41. Lifton, *Twice Born*, 3.
42. Gould, “The Language of Oedipus,” 155, 158.
43. See Weagar, *Adoption, Identity and Kinship*, 103, though she sees these

images as presenting the adoptee not just outside society but also “outside the natural order of things.”

44. Some groundwork for this influence was laid by Erik Erikson, the psychoanalyst who in *Childhood and Society* and *Young Man Luther* developed the idea of the identity crisis. See Jonathan Arac, “Toward a Cultural Genealogy of the U.S. Discourse of Identity: *Invisible Man* after Fifty Years,” *Boundary 2* (2003): 195–216, esp. 206–10. Lifton discussed adoption frequently with Erikson, a “half-adoptee,” as she calls him, who learned about his paternal ancestry as an adolescent. See *Twice Born*, 274–75.

45. Lifton, *Twice Born*, 267. In the 1998 version of the book, she cuts this, but keeps the earlier declaration that “she who raises the child is the mother” (219).

46. Paton, *Orphan Voyage*, 89.

47. Paton, *Orphan Voyage*, 257.

48. Sophocles, *Oedipus at Colonus*, trans. Robert Fitzgerald, in *Sophocles I*, ll. 974–78.

49. Froma I. Zeitlin, “Thebes: Theater of Self and Society in Athenian Drama,” in Winkler and Zeitlin, *Nothing to Do*, 159.

50. Euripides, *Ion*, trans. Anne Pippin Burnett (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), 128.

51. On the other hand, Rebecca Bushnell, contrasting the two plays, notes that *Ion* “is no one in Athens and has no voice, except as his birth ensures it,” in *Prophesying Tragedy: Sign and Voice in Sophocles’ Theban Plays* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988), 119.

52. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 337.

53. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 335. The passage quoted is her translation of ll. 1532–36.

54. Euripides, *Ion*, 125.

55. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 295. She is quoting ll. 1324 and 1363.

56. This is a kind of anticipation of Christian societies fearing cuckoldry but having at the center of their religion a Child being reared by his mother and foster-father—except that the biological fatherhood in this case was imagined as nonsexual and Joseph knew about it.

57. Zeitlin, *Playing the Other*, 334.

58. Euripides, *Ion*, 115.

59. Boswell, *Abandonment of Children*, 3–4, 107.

60. Charles Segal, *Oedipus Tyrannus: Tragic Heroism and the Limits of Knowledge* (New York: Twayne, 1993), 44–47.

61. David Denby, *Great Books: My Adventures with Homer, Rousseau, Woolf, and Other Indestructible Writers of the Western World* (New York: Touchstone, 1997), 111.

62. James Shapiro, personal communication, July 30, 2000. In this conversation, he also said that adoptees sometimes tell fascinating stories at this point in his class.

63. Kenneth Burke, “Literature as Equipment for Living,” in *The Philosophy of Literary Form*, 3d ed. (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of Califor-

nia Press, 1973), 293–304. Burke writes that a work of literature may be considered “the strategic naming of a situation. It singles out a pattern of experience that is sufficiently representative of our social structure, that recurs sufficiently often *mutandis mutatis*, for people to ‘need a word for it’ and to adopt an attitude towards it. Each work of art is the addition of a word to an informal dictionary” (300). This is all relevant to the way literature influences how we imagine adoption.

CHAPTER 3

1. This and all other quotations from Shakespeare, except as noted, are taken from *The Complete Works*, ed. David Bevington, 4th ed. (New York: HarperCollins, 1992); this is from *Tempest* 1.2.120.

2. Barbara Estrin, *The Raven and the Lark: Lost Children in Literature of the English Renaissance* (Lewisburg, Pa.: Bucknell University Press, 1985), while noting that such plots in literature “predicate that the biological parents are superior to the adoptive ones,” also writes that “the good of art appears in the adoptive sections where the supremacy of inheritance is superseded by the idealization of the replacement” (14).

3. C. L. Barber, “The Family in Shakespeare’s Development: Tragedy and Sacredness,” in *Representing Shakespeare: New Psychoanalytic Essays*, ed. Murray M. Schwartz and Coppélia Kahn (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1980), 188.

4. Angela Carter, *Wise Children* (1991; New York: Penguin, 1993), 180.

5. See Laqueur, *Making Sex*, 25–43, and his explanation (55–57) of how the encyclopedist Isidore of Seville, still influential in the Renaissance, simultaneously holds “that only men have sperma, that only women have sperma, and that both have sperma” (55). See also Janet Adelman, “Making Defect Perfection: Shakespeare and the One-Sex Model,” in *Enacting Gender on the Renaissance Stage*, ed. Viviana Comensoli and Anne Russell (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1999), 23–52; and Francois Jacob, *The Logic of Life: A History of Heredity*, trans. Betty E. Spillman (1973; Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993), 25. See Laqueur, 38, on “seeds” as refined blood; see also Aristotle’s belief that the fetus feeds on menstrual blood, which accounts for the resemblance of children to their mothers, in Ian Maclean, *The Renaissance Notion of Woman* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), 37. For a classic, influential text of another dimension of belief in “blood,” the natural love of parents for their children, combined with a description of how Nature uses women’s blood to feed the seed, see Plutarch, “On Affection for Offspring,” in *Moralia*, 16 vols., trans. W. C. Helmbold (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1970), 6:343–53. For still other Renaissance notions of blood, see Gail Kern Paster, *Body Embarrassed: Drama and the Disciplines of Shame in Early Modern England* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993), 64–112.

6. Children’s difference from their parents was sometimes explained as the influence of the maternal imagination: see Clara Pinto-Correia, *The Ovary of*

Eve: Egg and Sperm and Preformation (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997), 128–30. For other explanations related to the condition of both parents at conception, see Paster, *Body Embarrassed*, 167–72.

7. For the early modern comparison of teachers to gardeners, see Rebecca Bushnell, *A Culture of Teaching: Early Modern Humanism in Theory and Practice* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), 73–116. On the influence of wet nurses, see Valerie Fildes, *Breasts, Bottles, and Babies: A History of Infant Feeding* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1986), 168–78. See also Paster, *Body Embarrassed*, 197–201, on early modern wet-nursing and its transformations in drama.

8. Dionyza's words resonate ominously with some contemporary cases of infanticidal nursing, mostly of illegitimate children: see Keith Wrightson, "Infanticide in Earlier Seventeenth-Century England," *Local Population Studies* 15 (1975): 10–22. Thanks to Frances Dolan for sending me a copy of this article.

9. See Elizabeth Archibald, *Apollonius of Tyre: Medieval and Renaissance Themes and Variations* (Bury-St. Edmunds: D. S. Brewer, 1991), 145.

10. See Geoffrey Bullough, ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 6 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1966), 396–405, 445–53, 518–29. Wilkins's Pericles alone motivates this secrecy, by telling the nurse that Marina should be "brought uppe as the daughter of Cleon and Dyonyza, lest that the knowledge of her highbirth, should make her growe proud to their instructions" (524).

11. Unlike Marina's prototype in these sources, Perdita, Guiderius, and Arviragus have no lines commenting on their discovery of a different set of parents, and the foster parents and birth parents in each play make alliance by the end.

12. F. D. Hoeniger, introduction to *Pericles*, ed. F. D. Hoeniger, Arden Edition (London: Methuen, 1963), lxxviii, notes that Pericles' role as music teacher is emphasized in the sources.

13. Terence Cave, *Recognitions: A Study in Poetics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 289.

14. As Janet Adelman points out, they also rearticulate, benignly, "the deadly mergers of the beginning—the collapse of mother, wife, and daughter in Antiochus's daughter's body and the attendant collapse of Pericles's masculine identity." *Suffocating Mothers: Fantasies of Maternal Origin in Shakespeare's Plays, "Hamlet" to "The Tempest"* (New York: Routledge, 1992), 197.

15. Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 197–98.

16. Geoffrey Bullough, ed., *Narrative and Dramatic Sources of Shakespeare*, vol. 8, *Romances* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), 22–23. The number is four if we count Imogen's relationship with her stepmother as an adoption.

17. Susan Baker, "Personating Persons: Rethinking Shakespearean Disguises," *Shakespeare Quarterly* 43 (1992): 312.

18. See Meredith Skura's "Interpreting Posthumus' Dream from Above and Below: Families, Psychoanalysts, and Literary Criticism," in Schwartz and Kahn, *Representing Shakespeare*, 212–15.

19. Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, 8:6–7.
20. Ann Thompson, “Cymbeline’s Other Endings,” in *The Appropriation of Shakespeare*, ed. Jean Marsden (New York: St. Martin’s, 1992), 207–8. Thompson also has some fun with reviewers’ habit of “counting the number of separate explanations or revelations: I have found totals of fourteen, twenty-four and just about every number in between” (204).
21. John Boswell, *The Kindness of Strangers: The Abandonment of Children in Western Europe from Late Antiquity to the Renaissance* (New York: Vintage, 1988). Such a requirement is also present in a number of the newly discovered private adoption contracts in early modern France discussed by Kristin Elizabeth Gager, *Blood Ties and Fictive Ties: Adoption and Family Life in Early Modern France* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 101–2.
22. Thompson, “Cymbeline’s Other Endings,” 212.
23. Carol Thomas Neely, *Broken Nuptials in Shakespeare’s Plays* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1985), 202.
24. Baker, “Personating Persons,” 312.
25. Fawnia’s “natural disposition did bewray that she was borne of some high parentage” (Robert Greene, *Pandosto*, in Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, 8:175), but specific resemblances do not, for example, strike her father, and thus he pursues her without suspecting that his love is incestuous. Shakespeare also added discussion of the physical resemblance between the Bastard and his father to his historical source for *King John*. See Phyllis Rackin, *Stages of History: Shakespeare’s English Chronicles* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1990), 187, 190.
26. Anne Barton, “As You Like It and Twelfth Night: Shakespeare’s Sense of an Ending,” *Shakespearian Comedy*, Stratford-upon-Avon Studies 14, ed. D. J. Palmer and Malcolm Bradbury (New York: Crane, Rusak, 1972), 176.
27. Shaw, “Cymbeline Refinished” (1937), quoted in Thompson, “Cymbeline’s Other Endings,” 213.
28. On that prejudice, see Stephen Collins, “‘Reason, Nature, and Order’: The Stepfamily in English Renaissance Thought,” *Renaissance Studies* 13 (1999): 312–24; see Neely, *Broken Nuptials*, 174, on the desexualization and sanctification of mothers in the romances through real and mock deaths. The foster mother in *Pandosto* begins as a misogynist caricature who threatens to cudgel her husband “if hee brought any bastard brat within her dores,” though eventually she nourishes “it so clenly and carefully as it began to bee a jolly girle, in so much that they began both of them to be very fond of it” (Greene, *Pandosto*, in Bullough, *Narrative and Dramatic Sources*, 8:174, 175).
29. See Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 9–10 and passim, for a detailed analysis of the varying roles of mothers and fantasies about mothers in Shakespeare’s canon. Hermione and Thaisa are less idealized early in the play than after they reappear. Only two other plays, *Romeo and Juliet* and *Merry Wives of Windsor*, include mother-daughter relationships; in both, those relations are rather cool and distant, to tragic effect in *Romeo and Juliet*.
30. Paster, *Body Embarrassed*, 179.
31. Collins, “Reason, Nature, and Order,” 320–21. On polarization in

views of women, see for example, Mary Beth Rose, *The Expense of Spirit* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1988), 4–5.

32. Compare the presence of the idealized mothers Ceres and Juno in the masque of *The Tempest*.

33. Doreen Delvecchio and Antony Hammond give a list of examples in *Pericles*: see their introduction to *Pericles, Prince of Tyre*, ed. Delvecchio and Hammond (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 47–49. See also Neely, *Broken Nuptials*, 191–92; and Marianne Novy, *Love's Argument: Gender Relations in Shakespeare* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 171–74.

34. For an interpretation of the cross-gendered imagery emphasizing male nurturance, see Novy, *Love's Argument*, 174; for the view that it involves male appropriation of female procreative power that excludes women, see Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*, 197–98 (which also emphasizes the repression of sexuality); and Marilyn Williamson, *The Patriarchy of Shakespeare's Comedies* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1986), 165.

35. Bevington glosses this passage as referring to grafting, a metaphor also used of adoption in some twentieth-century writing, such as *Perspectives on a Grafted Tree*, ed. Patricia Irwin Johnston (Indianapolis: Perspectives Press, 1983).

36. See Gal. 4:5–7 and Rom. 8:12–17. Gager has speculated that, in spite of clerical hostility to adoption discussed by Jack Goody, “the Christian theology of ‘adoption through baptism’ might very well have aided in sustaining adoption traditions for families interested in having a non-natal child to stand as their heir” (*Blood Ties*, 69; see also 44–46). Perhaps some ambitious historian will discover records notarizing adoption in England as Gager has done in France. But see Goody, *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983), 72–75, 99–102.

37. Paster, *Body Embarrassed*, 273.

38. Beatrice Gottlieb, *The Family in the Western World from the Black Death to the Industrial Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 160; these customs are discussed with specific reference to the late sixteenth and early seventeenth century in Ivy Pinchbeck and Margaret Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), 25–26. Gottlieb claims that apprenticeship often began around age seven, but Ilana Krausman Ben-Amos finds that ten, twelve or later were much more likely ages, though younger children could be boarded out for such reasons as schooling, outbreaks of plague, poverty, or parental death; see her *Adolescence and Youth in Early Modern England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994), 54–64. Her view of the ages of apprentices is supported by Paul Griffith, *Youth and Authority: Formative Experiences in England, 1560–1640* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 33. Lawrence Stone discusses what he calls a “mass exchange of adolescent children, which seems to have been peculiar to England,” in *The Family, Sex, and Marriage in England, 1500–1800* (New York: Harper and Row, 1977), 107. Lori Humphrey Newcomb discusses *The Winter's Tale's* source, *Pandosto*, in relation to the widespread institution of adolescent service, in “The Romance of Service: The Simple History of *Pandosto's* Servant Readers,” in *Framing Elizabethan Fictions: Contemporary Approaches to Early Modern Narrative Prose*,

ed. Constance Relihan (Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press, 1996), 117–39. I am grateful for a prepublication copy of this essay, which now has been revised into a chapter in Lori Humphrey Newcomb, *Reading Popular Romance in Early Modern England* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2001).

39. Heather Dubrow, *Shakespeare and Domestic Loss: Forms of Deprivation, Mourning, and Recuperation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 162. She deals with the relation of the romances to the threat of parental death on pp. 166, 189–93. See also her comments on parental death, step-parenting, and theatricality on pp. 165 and 170. I am grateful for a prepublication copy of this chapter, which is expanded from “The Message from Marcade: Parental Death in Tudor and Stuart England,” in *Attending to Women in Early Modern England*, ed. Betty S. Travitsky and Adele F. Seeff (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1994).

40. Gottlieb, *Family in Western World*, 133. Frances E. Dolan, *Dangerous Familiars: Representations of Domestic Crime in England, 1550–1700* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994), 168, has argued that *Winter’s Tale* in particular is a displaced, aestheticized resolution of anxiety about infanticide.

41. Paster, *Body Embarrassed*, 276.

42. See Adelman, *Suffocating Mothers*; and also Skura, “Interpreting Posthumus’ Dream.”

43. Daniele Barbar, *Italian Relations* (1551), in *How They Lived*, ed. Molly Harrison and O. M. Royston, vol. 2 (Oxford: Blackwell, 1963), 267–68; quoted in Gottlieb, *Family in Western World*, 162. She notes criticism of this pattern eventually developing in England, beginning with William Penn, and argues that “some people were genuinely puzzled by why they were doing what was expected” (161).

44. See Hoeniger, introduction, xxv.

45. Hoeniger notes, “There are few plays by Shakespeare for which as much evidence is available to testify to their popularity on the stage during the early decades of the seventeenth century” (introduction, lxvi–lxvii).

46. On the connection between sealed records and illegitimacy, see Wegar, *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship*, 36.

47. *Bastard Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (1998): 8. Thanks to Marley Greiner for the reference.

48. See Alison Findlay, *Illegitimate Power: Bastards in Renaissance Drama* (New York: Manchester University Press, 1994), 128, on Goneril and Regan as “bastardised.”

49. Peter Laslett, “Long-Term Trends in Bastardy in England,” in *Family Life and Illicit Love in Earlier Generations*, ed. Laslett (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 113–15, on the increase in the illegitimacy rate; on changing social attitudes, see Pinchbeck and Hewitt, *Children in English Society*, 200–206. See also Michael Neill, “‘In Everything Illegitimate’: Imagining the Bastard in Renaissance Drama,” *Yearbook of English Studies* 23 (1993): 270–92, esp. 273.

50. Findlay, *Illegitimate Power*, 128.

51. Garry Leonard, “The Immaculate Deception: Adoption in Albee’s Plays,” in Novy, *Imagining Adoption*, 116.

52. Findlay has calculated this figure; she believes that the main reason is that women already suffered from the inability to inherit under the law, so loss of inheritance because of bastardy was less dramatic for them (*Illegitimate Power*, 5). This point is also made by Neill, “In Everything Illegitimate,” 275.

53. On the larger number of female adoptees who search, see Wegar, *Adoption, Identity, and Kinship*, 65. Shea Grimm deplors the lack of men in previous adoption reform organizations, and boasts that “Bastard Nation’s membership is over 30 percent male,” “Birth of a Nation,” *Bastard Quarterly* (spring 1997) 1, no. 1:1.

54. Neill discusses the connections between the idea of bastardy and forbidden mixture (“In Everything Illegitimate,” 277–78).

55. The term *bastard* identifies someone as outside of a family. It probably derives from the Old French *bast*, meaning “pack-saddle,” and thus “distinguishes the placeless pack-saddle child from the offspring of the marriage bed” (Neill, “In Everything Illegitimate,” 273).

56. Novy, *Engaging with Shakespeare*. See also the anthologies I edited, *Women’s Re-Visions of Shakespeare: On Responses of Dickinson, Woolf, Rich, H. D., George Eliot, and Others* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990), *Cross-Cultural Performances: Differences in Women’s Re-Visions of Shakespeare* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1993), and *Transforming Shakespeare: Women’s Re-Visions in Literature and Performance* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1999).

CHAPTER 4

1. Christopher Flint, *Family Fictions: Narrative and Domestic Relations in Britain, 1688–1798* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 16. He discusses the controversies in both disciplines, as does, more briefly, Susan Greenfield, *Mothering Daughters: Novels and the Politics of Family Romance, Frances Burney to Jane Austen* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2002), 14–17.

2. Flint, *Family Fictions*, 20.

3. Peter Laslett, “Introduction: Comparing Illegitimacy over Time and across Cultures,” in *Bastardy and its Comparative History*, ed. Peter Laslett, Karla Oosterveen, and Richard M. Smith (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 13.

4. Toni Bowers, *The Politics of Motherhood: British Writing and Culture, 1680–1760* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 7–14.

5. George K. Behlmer, *Friends of the Family: The English Home and Its Guardians* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), 272–300.

6. Penny Martin, *Victorian Families in Fact and Fiction* (New York: St. Martin’s, 1995), 135.

7. Cf. Ragussis, *Acts of Naming*, 38: “The history of fiction charts an attack on the name as stigma.”

8. Henry Fielding, *Tom Jones*, ed. John Bender and Simon Stern (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996), 111. Subsequent references will be parenthetically included in the text.

9. Frances Burney, *Evelina*, ed. Kristina Straub (New York: Bedford, 1997), 200. Subsequent references will be parenthetically included in the text.

10. Charles Dickens, *Bleak House*, ed. Norman Page (New York: Penguin, 1971), 566. Subsequent references will be parenthetically included in the text.

11. Charles Dickens, *Oliver Twist*, ed. Kathleen Tillotson (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966), 332. Subsequent references will be parenthetically included in the text.

12. Charles Dickens, *Great Expectations* (New York: Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1948), 366. Subsequent references will be parenthetically included in the text.

13. Christine van Boheemen, *The Novel as Family Romance: Language, Gender, and Authority from Fielding to Joyce* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1987), 47, suggests this possibility. See also Homer Brown, “Tom Jones: The Bastard of History,” *Boundary 2*, vol. 7, no. 2 (1979): 201–33.

14. See *Enlightened Self-Interest: The Foundling Hospital and Hogarth*, ed. Rhian Harris and Robin Simon, catalog of an exhibition at the Thomas Coram Foundation for Children (London: Draig Foundation, 1997).

15. T. G. A. Nelson, *Children, Parents, and the Rise of the Novel* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1995), 174–75, claims that the child is “presumably left on the parish,” but he thinks that Molly is sent to Bridewell, whereas in fact she is discharged to her parents (167). The point remains that Fielding does not clarify what happens.

16. Van Boheemen, *Novel as Family Romance*, 80.

17. Van Boheemen, *Novel as Family Romance*, 79.

18. John Sutherland, *Can Jane Eyre Be Happy? More Puzzles in Classic Fiction* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997), 23.

19. See Peter Coventry, *The Image of Childhood*, rev. ed. (New York: Penguin, 1967), 29–51.

20. See Grahame Smith, “The Life and Times of Charles Dickens,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Charles Dickens*, ed. John O. Jordan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 4; and Robert Newsom, “Fictions of Childhood,” also in Jordan, 92–93.

21. Laura Berry, *The Child, the State, and the Victorian Novel* (Charlottesville: University of Virginia, 1999), shows that *Oliver Twist* also contributes to the debate over the New Poor Law.

22. Norris Pope, *Dickens and Charity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1978), 179; Ruth McClure, *Coram’s Children: The London Foundling Hospital in the Eighteenth Century* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), 253, 307. The connection between the two Brownlows was pointed out by Laura Schattschneider in “Mr. Brownlow’s Interest in *Oliver Twist*,” *Journal of Victorian Culture* 6, no. 1 (spring 2001), 46–60. See also Jenny Bourne Taylor, “Received, a Blank Child: John Brownlow, Charles Dickens, and the London Foundling Hospital,” *Nineteenth-Century Literature* 56 (2001): 293–363.

23. Catherine Waters, *Dickens and the Politics of the Family* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 31.

24. Goldie Morgentaler, *Dickens and Heredity: When Like Begets Like* (New York: St. Martin’s, 2000), 39. Morgentaler contextualizes this with the

Victorian belief that “such matters as the state of mind of the parents and the degree of their affection for one another at the time of conception had a bearing on the personality of the engendered child.” This belief goes back to views held in the Renaissance and before about the impact of the circumstances of conception. Dickens revises Shakespeare’s Edmund’s argument relating his superiority to his bastardy because he was conceived with “fierce quality” and not “’tween asleep and wake.”

25. Morgentaler discusses in detail the relation between portraiture and heredity in Dickens, taking this incident as a point of departure; she calls Oliver’s emotion about the portrait “mystical heredity. . . an intuition of kinship” (*Dickens and Heredity*, 40), but in fact Oliver does not know why he is responding so strongly.

26. Ragussis, *Acts of Naming*, 41–43.

27. See Waters, *Dickens*, 36, on the final “pastoral retreat” and the “restorative powers of nature and imagination.”

28. Morgentaler, *Dickens and Heredity*, 43.

29. See Morgentaler, *Dickens and Heredity*, 35, for more examples of Dickens portraying parents and children as similar in appearance. As Morgentaler shows, however, Dickens would present parent-child resemblance in a more complicated way in some of his later novels, for example, in *Dombey and Son*, as an ideal related to paternal egotism (53), and in *David Copperfield*, as a matter of learned behavior (68). See Valerie L. Gager, *Shakespeare and Dickens: The Dynamics of Influence* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996) for more on Dickens’s intense relationship with Shakespeare.

30. Carolyn Dever, *Death and the Mother from Dickens to Freud: Victorian Fiction and the Anxiety of Origins* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 7, 23.

31. Charlotte Brontë, *Jane Eyre* (London: J. M. Dent, 1993).

32. “A Progress” is the title of the chapter in which Esther is introduced, echoing the subtitle of *Oliver Twist, A Parish Boy’s Progress*, as well as Defoe’s *Pilgrim’s Progress*, still very influential at this time.

33. See Newsom, “Fictions of Childhood,” 99, which describes *Bleak House* as “virtually an anti-*Jane Eyre*” and suggests that Brontë influenced “Dickens’ turn to first person narratives,” although he claimed that he had never read *Jane Eyre*.

34. See the discussion of the doll in Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 88.

35. See Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 90.

36. Sandra Gilbert and Susan Gubar, *The Madwoman in the Attic* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1979). The use of *Jane Eyre* in Jeanette Winter-son’s *Oranges are not the Only Fruit*, an autobiographical novel about an adoptee, is especially interesting.

37. See for example Anny Sadrin, *Parentage and Inheritance in the Novels of Charles Dickens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 64; and Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 102.

38. See Ragussis, *Acts of Naming*, 90.

39. Van Boheemen, *Novel as Family Romance*, argues that it is only after

Esther has acknowledged her dead mother that “the taboo on her sexuality is lifted,” and that her confession of her attraction to Alan is “avoiding the mistakes of her mother,” 122.

40. See Ragussis, *Acts of Naming*, 253n.

41. A similar name is used satirically in *Tom Jones*, 178, where Mrs. Honour, Sophia’s maid, emphasizes that her birth, in marriage, is better than Tom’s.

42. See Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 84.

43. See Ragussis, *Acts of Naming*, 101, on Ada’s symbolic maternity here.

44. See Jonathan Arac, *Commissioned Spirits: The Shaping of Social Motion in Dickens, Carlyle, Melville, and Hawthorne* (1979; New York: Columbia University Press, 1989), 132, on environmental influence on Esther’s diffidence parallel to environmental influence on Phil and Jo.

45. Jane Austen, *Mansfield Park* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1965), 325.

46. See Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 90.

47. Morgentaler argues that in *Great Expectations* Dickens “discard[s] heredity as a determining force in human development” (*Dickens and Heredity*, 72). Possibly Pip’s identity as parentless is emphasized further by Pocket’s nicknaming him Handel, since the historical Handel was a governor of the Foundling Hospital and frequently conducted and played music there. See McClure, *Coram’s Children*, 70.

48. As Waters shows, his images of them deriving from the shape of the letters also accord with Victorian stereotypes of masculinity and femininity (*Dickens*, 151).

49. Waters comments on the oddness of Pip’s association of these two different women, and also on Mrs. Joe’s social pretension (*Dickens*, 154–55).

50. Waters makes this point, saying that Magwitch wants “to make Pip a gentleman so as to revenge himself upon the moneyed social class he holds responsible for his victimization” (*Dickens*, 158). She also notes that the fact they are both victimized by Compeyson highlights this parallel, and that “by adopting personal schemes of vengeance in response to the experience of social injustice, Miss Havisham and Magwitch inevitably embrace the ideology they struggle against and are defeated” (171).

51. Waters comments on the novel’s construction of Pip’s choosing between gentility and domesticity in terms of the contrast between Estella and Bidley (*Dickens*, 163–64).

52. I owe these observations to Emily Hipchen, in her commentary on a previous version of this chapter.

53. Betty Jean Lifton, *Lost and Found*, 51–52, discusses similar behavior among some adoptees, and similar explanations by some psychiatrists.

54. This difficulty may show the continuing impact on me of the closed-record system. With a different view of Pip and Estella, Edgar Rosenberg writes, “Very likely, like Lohengrin’s Elsa, he would have talked out of turn during their honeymoon.” See “Putting an End to *Great Expectations*,” in *Great Expectations*, ed. Edgar Rosenberg (New York: Norton, 1999), 503.

55. Hirsch, *Mother-Daughter Plot*, 47, 50.

56. Hirsch, *Mother-Daughter Plot*, 46.

CHAPTER 5

1. Bernard Semmel, *George Eliot and the Politics of National Inheritance* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).

2. See Behlmer, *Friends of the Family*, 272–300, on what he calls de facto adoption and its abuses. See also Martin, *Victorian Families*, 135.

3. George Eliot, *The Mill on the Floss*, ed. Carol T. Christ (New York: Norton, 1994), 90. Rosemarie Bodenheimer, *The Real Life of Mary Ann Evans: George Eliot, Her Letters and Fiction* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1994), 32, notes that in her youth, Eliot “never had a family member who understood or shared anything about her intellectual ambition or her emotional volatility,” and, of course, during her adulthood most of her relatives rejected her because of her relationship with Lewes. Semmel, *George Eliot*, 16, also discusses this issue.

4. See Gordon Haight, “George Eliot’s Bastards,” in *George Eliot’s Originals and Contemporaries*, ed. Hugh Witemeyer (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1992), 76–86. Bodenheimer makes the connection to *Silas* (*Real Life*, 207).

5. *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight, 9 vols. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1954–78), 1:94, 4:183. Further references to this edition will be included parenthetically in the text, using the abbreviation GEL.

6. George Eliot, *Middlemarch Notebooks: A Transcription*, ed. John Clark Pratt and Victor Neufeldt (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979), 56. This was probably recorded 1871–72.

7. Maine, *Ancient Law*, 26.

8. Eliot, *Middlemarch Notebooks*, 204. This was recorded in 1869.

9. Bodenheimer, *Real Life*, 188. Because Lewes had not immediately sued his wife for divorce upon discovering her infidelity, he was not allowed to do so later as it continued.

10. Bodenheimer, *Real Life*, 230.

11. George Eliot, *A Writer’s Notebook, 1854–1879, and Uncollected Writings*, ed. Joseph Wiesenfarth (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1981), 23. This dysphoric adoption plot is the germ of the Tito Baldassare plot in *Romola*.

12. On the use of adoption to exemplify a nurturing relationship aware of difference, see Susan Gubar, “Empathic Identification in Anne Michaels’ *Fugitive Pieces*: Masculinity and Poetry after Auschwitz,” *Signs* 28, no. 2 (2002): 249–76. Gubar argues that the adoptions in Michaels exemplify empathy, which recognizes difference, rather than sympathy, “which supposes affinity among people” (253).

13. Page references are taken from *Silas Marner* (London: Everyman, 1993).

14. See Howe, “Fontane’s ‘Ellernklipp.’”

15. This difficulty in imagining adoptees as adults still appears in recent journalism. See David W. Matta, “A Cryin’ Shame,” *Pittsburgh City Paper*, May 10, 1996, 1, 12–14. This article about the open-records movement, interviewing adults, is illustrated, on the newspaper’s front page, with a photograph of a screaming baby, and on p. 12 with a blurred photo of a young child. It can

be argued that the legal discourse on the closed-records side also treats adoptees as children.

16. Michael Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion: "The Jewish Question" and English National Identity* (Durham: Duke University Press, 1995), 105, 189.

17. *Sybil*, 65–66, quoted by Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 191.

18. Susan R. Cohen, "'A History and a Metamorphosis': Continuity and Discontinuity in *Silas Marner*," *Texas Studies in Literature and Language* 25 (1983): 416.

19. Bodenheimer, *Real Life*, 206. Sandra Gilbert, in "Life's Empty Pack: A Literary Daughteronomy," *Critical Inquiry* 11 (1985): 355–89, treats Eppie's move from her mother to Silas as an allegory for the transition from mother to father in a typical girl's life, considering fatherhood as essentially a "social construct." Some writers associate adoptive links with chance, but Gilbert claims that "God-free Cass . . . is only by chance (casus) her natural father" (363).

20. Nancy Paxton, *George Eliot and Herbert Spencer* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991), 110.

21. The name of the most famous of the opiates frequently used for children in the nineteenth century was Godfrey's Cordial. Eliot's name choice for her character resonates with his own deliberate unconsciousness of his responsibilities, and perhaps also with the sense that Eppie is better off without Godfrey, as well as without Godfrey's Cordial. See Virginia Berridge and Griffith Edwards, *Opium and the People: Opiate Use in Nineteenth-Century England* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987), 99.

22. See Frye, *The Secular Scripture*, 101–2, 161.

23. Godfrey buys the land on which Silas lives in the process of starting a dairy, a kind of substitute for the children whose absence bothers Godfrey and Nancy so much. As Nancy's sister says, "There's always something fresh with the dairy." This involvement with natural growth produces discoveries that motivate Godfrey's decision to attempt to reclaim Eppie.

24. Paxton, *Eliot and Spencer*, 114, has commented on the rewriting of *Winter's Tale* both in Eppie's decision and in the discussion of gardening. I quote *Winter's Tale* 4.4.95–97 from the *Complete Works*, ed. David Bevington, 3d ed. (Glenview, Ill.: Scott Foresman, 1980). Eliot quotes this passage in GEL 4:364, 4:469, and elsewhere.

25. George Eliot, *Romola*, ed. Andrew Sanders (New York: Penguin, 1980), 148.

26. George Eliot, *Felix Holt*, ed. Peter Coveney (New York: Penguin, 1972), 149. Page references will be given parenthetically in the text.

27. See my *Engaging with Shakespeare*, 69–93.

28. Eve Sedgwick, *Epistemology of the Closet* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990), 75–82, analyzes Proust's use of Racine's *Esther* in relation to parallels and contrasts between hidden Jewish and gay identity. When I was in grade school and certainly did not know Racine, Handel, Proust, or Eliot, I wrote a short story about a girl named Esther who disguises herself as a boy so she can go to Bethlehem with the Three Wise Men.

29. It has been suggested that he should have known he was Jewish because he was circumcised. However, his mother was so opposed to Judaism that she

might not have had him circumcised, and, on the other hand, nineteenth-century English Gentiles were often circumcised for health reasons. See Sutherland, *Can Jane Eyre Be Happy?* 169–76.

30. For a detailed discussion of this theme in *Deronda*, see Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 143–75.

31. George Eliot, *Daniel Deronda*, ed. Graham Handley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988), 142. Page references will be given parenthetically in the text.

32. Though adoption was not formalized in England at the time, soon after the book was published, a defense of adoption on the Roman model assumes that it means assimilation and equates it with the naturalization of immigrants, so Sir Hugo's desires for Daniel would not have been unexpected for most readers. See Edward Augustus Freeman, "Race and Language," *Contemporary Review* 29 (1877): 711–41, excerpted in *Images of Race*, ed. Michael D. Biddiss (New York: Holmes and Meier, 1979), 214–35.

33. This critique of adults' casual attitude toward the children whose fate they determine is a subtler version of that made in "Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story," where Caterina is expected by Lord and Lady Cheverel "to be ultimately useful, perhaps, in sorting worsteds, keeping accounts, reading aloud, and otherwise supplying the place of spectacles when her ladyship's eyes should wax dim." See *Scenes of Clerical Life*, ed. Thomas A. Noble (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 104. At this point Caterina is not to be adopted; when her singing voice is discovered, "Insensibly she came to be regarded as one of the family" (111), but the attitude to her is still instrumental.

34. Ironically, there was a nineteenth-century view, articulated among others by the German anthropologist Riehl, one of whose works Eliot had earlier reviewed with praise, that Jews were "rootless": see George L. Mosse, *The Culture of Western Europe* (New York: Rand-McNally, 1971), 82–84.

35. *Adam Bede*, chap. 4.

36. Quoted in Bodenheimer, *Real Life*, 214.

37. Bodenheimer, *Real Life*, 227–30.

38. This is not true in *The Spanish Gypsy*, where Gypsy tradition is described in secular terms.

39. In his 1877 review in *Contemporary Review*, Edward Dowden related *Deronda* to the contemporary rise of nationalism; see the excerpt in *George Eliot: The Critical Heritage*, ed. David Carroll (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1971), 446. In her next book after *Deronda*, Eliot celebrated nineteenth-century revivals of national traditions; see "The Modern Hep! Hep! Hep! Hep!" in *Impressions of Theophrastus Such* (1879), ed. Nancy Henry (Iowa City: University of Iowa Press, 1994), 142–47. On changing modes of nationalism in the nineteenth century, see Benjamin Barber, *Jihad vs. McWorld* (New York: Ballantine, 1995), 159–60; and Eric Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism since 1780* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 101–23. On the greater biological emphasis in late-nineteenth-century racial theory, see Robert J. C. Young, *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture, and Race* (London: Routledge, 1995), 118–41; and George W. Stocking Jr., *Victorian Anthropology* (New York: Free

Press, 1987), esp. 63, 116, 143. In a notebook that includes material on Jewish history relevant to *Deronda*, Eliot also records evidence of hereditary gestures found in Darwin and Galton. See William Baker, ed., *Some George Eliot Notebooks: An Edition of the Carl H. Pforzheimer Library's George Eliot Holograph Notebooks*, vol. 3, ms. 711 (Salzburg: Institut für Anglistik und Amerikanistik, 1980), 13.

40. Haight, *George Eliot* (New York: Oxford, 1968), 469–71; Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 261–63.

41. Brownstein, *Becoming a Heroine*, 208, discusses this strategy.

42. William Baker, *George Eliot and Judaism* (Salzburg: Institut für Englische Sprache und Literatur, 1975), 64–66. Cf. Gillian Beer, *George Eliot* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986); and Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*. Eliot's views on this were not unusual. See Stocking, *Victorian Anthropology*, 63–64, 106, 235–36. In “The Modern Hep, Hep, Hep” Eliot takes a surprisingly constructivist view of “that national education (by outward and inward circumstance) which created in the Jews a feeling of race, a sense of corporate existence, unique in its intensity” (150).

43. Dever, *Death and the Mother*, 157, shows that Mordecai “represents, more than anyone else in the novel, the potential fulfillment of [Daniel's] eroticized phantasy of maternal reunion.”

44. Beer, *George Eliot*, 54.

45. Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 97.

46. Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 263ff.; quote is from 281.

47. Ragussis, *Figures of Conversion*, 289.

48. “Notes on the Spanish Gypsy and Tragedy,” in *A George Eliot Miscellany*, ed. F. B. Pinion (Totowa, N.J.: Barnes and Noble, 1980), 126–27.

49. The significance of this essay in relation to women's conflicts in many of Eliot's works is discussed by Susan Meyer, *Imperialism at Home: Race and Victorian Women's Fiction* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1996), 127–30.

50. Young, *Colonial Desire*, 6, writes that in the nineteenth century *hybrid* “was used to refer to a physiological phenomenon; in the twentieth century it has been reactivated to describe a cultural one.” I am not using the word in the nineteenth-century sense involving a crossing between species or races.

51. Gillian Beer, *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot, and Nineteenth-Century Fiction* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983), 201.

52. See Young, *Colonial Desire*, 17; and Hobsbawm, *Nation and Nationalism*, 33, 108.

53. David Marshall, *The Figure of Theater* (New York: Columbia, 1986), 219.

54. Beer, *George Eliot*, 109.

55. Modell, *Kinship with Strangers*.

56. Eliot's stepsons sometimes called her “Mother,” but according to Bodenheimer (*Real Life*, 192) she usually signed herself “Mutter”—both a German translation and a pun—and that is how Charles and sometimes the others addressed her.

57. As the previous chapter has shown, emphasis on good adoptive fathers is common in the British fiction of Eliot's time and before. Perhaps she is more unusual in her lack of interest in critiquing adoptive mothers—the chief example would be Lady Cheverel. It is interesting to compare the dynamics of Eliot's writing about adoptive fathers with those of Anne Michaels in *Fugitive Pieces*, as discussed by Gubar, "Empathic Identification," 253. Like Michaels, Eliot is interested in showing the adoptive parent acknowledging difference, and Silas, who has suffered betrayal and expulsion from his community, experiences regeneration through adoption comparable to that discussed by Gubar (255).

58. Paxton, *Eliot and Spencer*, 110, 215. However, belief in maternal instinct may be expanded to suggest the basis for women's fitness to adopt. See Julie Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own: Adoption and the Changing Culture of Motherhood, 1851–1950* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2000), 103–4, or for that matter Eliot's own description of "the feminine character," which I will quote shortly.

59. This theme is treated, for example, by Meyer in *Imperialism at Home*. However, I disagree with her argument that gender issues are displaced onto racial issues. As she indeed observes, there are many moments of protest against women's subordination in the novel. For more discussion of these, see Novy, *Engaging with Shakespeare*, 123–24, 130, 132.

60. See Meyer's comments in *Imperialism at Home*, 158–60, on how Daniel combines self-assertion and self-sacrifice at the end, while Fedalma's self-sacrifice allows her no self-assertion.

61. See Tess O'Toole's chapter on Eliot in her book in progress on adoption in Victorian literature, *'Native Slip from Foreign Seed': Adoption in the Nineteenth-Century British Novel*.

62. Cohen, "History and Metamorphosis."

63. See for example unsigned review, *Saturday Review*, September 16, 1876, in Carroll, *George Eliot*, 377, which asks, "what can be the design of this ostentatious separation from the universal instinct of Christendom, this subsidence into Jewish hopes and aims?"

64. Terence Cave, introduction to *Daniel Deronda*, ed. Cave (New York: Penguin, 1995), xvii–xviii; see esp. xii–xxii.

65. Meyer, *Imperialism at Home*, 191.

66. See Lifton, *Lost and Found*, 54–57. His extended sense of responsibility can also be read as a sign of his hereditary connection with the Jewish tradition of social concern (a message that I believe very few of Eliot's English readers would have received, because the dominant image of Jews was so negative).

67. See comments on biological nationalism in relation to Nazism and adoption fiction in Estrin, "Ending in the Middle," 276, 278. Yet such ideas persist, and occasionally surface, even in academic writings; see, for example, Richard J. Hernstein and Charles Murray, *The Bell Curve* (New York: Free Press, 1994), which met many refutations.

68. James Carroll's *Constantine's Sword: The Church and the Jews* (Boston: Houghton, 2001) has influenced my thinking about the depth of Christian anti-Semitism.

CHAPTER 6

1. Paton [Kittson], *Orphan Voyage*, 39.
2. Paton, *The Adopted Break Silence*.
3. Jean Paton, personal communication, 1993, 2001. His name is not given in the book. Other biographical details come from Mel Gussow, *Edward Albee: A Singular Journey* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1999).
4. Albee didn't much like the term, but defended the style he shared with Beckett, Ionesco, and other Europeans, in "Which Theater Is the Absurd One?" *New York Times Magazine*, February 25, 1962, rpt. in *The Modern American Theater*, ed. Alvin B. Kernan (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1967), 170–75. Kernan in his introduction says that Albee "for many represents the best hope for the future of our theater" (11).
5. Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, 2.
6. See Carol Singley, "Building a Nation, Building a Family," in *Adoption in America: Historical Perspectives*, ed. E. Wayne Carp (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2002), 53.
7. Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own*, 22; Carp, introduction to *Adoption in America*, 7–9.
8. Behlmer, *Friends of the Family*, chap. 6.
9. Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own*, 128.
10. E. Wayne Carp, *Family Matters* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1998), 53–54. This was the reason given by Sheldon Howard and Henry Hemenway, two vital statisticians, in their proposal.
11. Carp, *Family Matters*, 110.
12. Maxwell Anderson, *The Bad Seed: A Play in Two Acts . . . the Dramatization of William March's Novel "The Bad Seed"* (New York: Dodd, 1955).
13. See Carp, *Family Matters*, 17–19.
14. Albee, *American Dream*, 98. Subsequent page references will be given parenthetically in the text.
15. Paton, *Adopted Break Silence*, 152.
16. Jean Paton, personal communication, 1993, 2001.
17. Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own*, 5, 4.
18. Carp, *Family Matters*, 97.
19. Typically, gay and lesbian youths feel different from their parents, in a way analogous to that of some adoptees, and both homosexuality and adoption break the link between sex and procreation. See Lifton, *Journey of Adopted Self*, 122–24, for more discussion of such commonalities.
20. See Leonard, "The Immaculate Deception," 123–24.
21. Berebitsky, *Like Our Very Own*, 130; Gussow, *Edward Albee*, 22.
22. Leonard, "The Immaculate Deception," 134–35.
23. Gussow, *Edward Albee*, 22–23.
24. Kirk, *Shared Fate*, 114–15. Kirk did important research on adoption in Canada in the 1950s and 1960s, especially with regard to the issue of the difference of the adoptive family; the first edition of his book was published in 1964.
25. Albee had left his parents at twenty, feeling their requirements were so

restrictive that they were in effect throwing him out. He never saw his father again, but renewed contact with his mother much later, after she had a heart attack.

26. Gussow, *Edward Albee*, 13.

27. Wayne Carp shows this change taking place most clearly during the 1950s: “Social workers’ attitudes became more rigid and less forthcoming, while adoption agencies’ policies of disclosure and cooperation gave way to secrecy and legalism” (*Family Matters*, 107). But Elizabeth Samuels, “The Idea of Adoption: An Inquiry into the History of Adult Adoptee Access to Birth Records,” *Rutgers Law Review* 53, no. 2 (2001): 367–436, shows that as late as 1960, 40 percent of the states still opened birth certificates for adult adoptees, and most of these records were closed in the 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s.

28. See for example Marshall D. Schechter and Doris Bertocci, “The Meaning of the Search,” in *The Psychology of Adoption*, ed. David Brodzinsky and Marshall Schechter (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 73; Leonard, “The Immaculate Deception,” 119, 130.

29. Lifton, *Twice Born*; Florence Fisher, *The Search for Anna Fisher* (New York: Fawcett Crest, 1973).

30. See especially Arthur D. Sorosky, Annette Baran, and Reuben Pannor, *The Adoption Triangle: The Effects of the Sealed Record on Adoptees, Birth Parents, and Adoptive Parents* (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1978). Carp, *Family Matters*, 148, emphasizes the influence of these researchers.

31. *Roots* was televised in 1977; Carp, *Family Matters*, 164–65, discusses its role in promoting genealogical research nationally and in gaining understanding for adoptee searchers. One article he cites, “Everybody’s Search for Roots,” *Newsweek*, July 4, 1977, 25–38, a cover story, with discussion of both these aspects, is in my own file of adoption-related clippings; my own search was proceeding at the time. Adoption groups such as Florence Fisher’s Adoptees’ Liberty Movement Association (ALMA) often use a quote from Haley, e.g., “The truth of his origins is the right of every man,” in their newsletters.

32. Open records were recommended by an English parliamentary commission. Probably this change was influenced partly by the fact that open records already existed in Scotland.

33. Wendy Wasserstein, *The Heidi Chronicles and Other Plays* (New York: Vintage, 1991). The Madonna and Child pose is not written in the script, but was used in the 1989 New York production, and emphasized by a background slide show of Madonna and Child statues and paintings. The published script gives the final image as “a slide of Heidi triumphantly holding Judy in front of a museum banner for a Georgia O’Keefe retrospective” (249), an image that emphasizes Heidi’s career as well as linking her with an artist whose flower paintings are often associated with female genitals. A later play about a single woman who adopts is *Approximating Mother*, by Kathleen Tolan. This play takes a more detached approach to the adoptive mother on whom it focuses; a musician, she has not found a man she could marry without compromising too much, and at the end of the play, to amuse her child, she is making up songs about potty training. Compare also Timberlake Wertenbaker’s *Break of Day*, a

British play about a group of friends in which one couple adopts and another one meets the adoptee girlfriend of their son, who is searching for birth parents.

34. Harvey Fierstein, *Torch Song Trilogy*, (New York: Samuel French, 1979).

35. In Dove's earlier version (Brownsville, Ore.: Story Line Press, 1994) he kills her; in the revised version (3d ed., Ashland, Ore.: Story Line Press, 2000), in which she has given him up because others convince her it is best for him, he is supposed to kill her as part of the rebellion, but she kills herself instead.

36. Caryl Churchill, *Top Girls* (New York: Samuel French, 1982), first produced at the Royal Court (London), 1982.

37. Thanks to Carol Schaefer for sending me the text of her play, performed off-Broadway in 2002, by e-mail, and for her comments when I gave a version of this chapter at the American Adoption Congress in 2002. References will be located in the text. The echo in the protagonist's name of Bridget, Tom Jones's birth mother, is probably just a coincidence; the name functions more here as a suggestion of Irish Catholic tradition.

38. Verrier, *The Primal Wound*, 12.

39. A very recent play, Paul Harris's *Lost and Found*, performed at the small Upstart Theater in New York City in May 2003, presents Ken, a troubled adoptee but a successful salesman, meeting Rachel, his birth mother, a successful anthropologist, and her husband, Tom. Tom is angry at the previous secrecy, and not used to the idea of sharing Rachel with another person (Ken is very similar to his dead father, still vivid in Rachel's memory). Ken says some very bitter things, but at the end they all look forward to a continuing relationship.

40. Lanford Wilson, *Redwood Curtain* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1993), premiered in Seattle, January 1992. *Redwood Curtain* was performed on television in 1993 and has been adapted into a film. There was a performance of the play as part of a Wilson festival in Cincinnati in 2001. John Olive, *Evelyn and the Polka King* (New York: Theatre Communications Group, 1992), was commissioned and first produced by Mad River Theatre Works, West Liberty, Ohio, 1991. I saw it at the City Theater in Pittsburgh in 1993. Page references to both of these plays will be included in the text. Lanford Wilson is the best-known playwright of those I discuss, apart from Albee, and he, like many American playwrights, is known for his portrayal of dysfunctional families. His parents were divorced when he was five, and he was separated from his father until he was nineteen, when he spent a year in San Diego getting to know him again—one of the few biographical details available to suggest the origins of any of these playwrights' involvement in the adoption/search experience. See *Lanford Wilson: A Casebook*, ed. Jackson R. Bryer (New York: Garland, 1994), xvii.

41. The generally favorable review of the Cincinnati production, Rick Pender, "Searching for Roots," *City Beat*, April 26–May 2, 2001, says, "Wilson's script includes some odd moments about Geri having magical powers, and those moments come across as false in this production."

42. See the discussion of gender among searchers in chapter 1.

43. I learned about this play from Josephine Mu's paper "Korean Adoptee Experience in Recent Plays by Theater Mu," presented to the Meeting of the Modern Language Association, New Orleans, 2001. Mu is an Asian-American theater, but the focus on Korean adoptees is understandable when we find that there are ten thousand Korean adoptees in Minnesota, more than in any other state except California. Shiomi is himself Japanese, and it may be partly in view of the strained history between those two countries that editions of this play emphasize the role in its creation of interviews with Korean adoptees and also of a Korean drummer and director.

44. Rick Shiomi, *Mask Dance*, in *Bold Words: A Century of Asian American Writing*, ed. Rajini Srikanth and Esther Y. Iwanaga (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 2001), 364.

45. I am grateful for receiving the text of this play by e-mail. Page references will be included in the text.

46. Anita Gates, September 21, 2001, E5. Weedman first performed this play in Seattle; by the time she played it in New York, she was known as a correspondent for Comedy Central's *The Daily Show*.

47. I have found one American play that deals with the extended family after reunion, Rachel Rubin Ladutke's *Grace Notes*, performed in April 2000 by the Gemini Theater of Pittsburgh.

48. Schechter and Bertocci, "Meaning of the Search," 66–67, summarize twelve studies of searchers between 1973 and 1987 and find that in all of them most searchers were female. Most searchers were in the twenty-five to thirty-four age range, though they extended from teenagers to seventy-year-olds.

49. See Leonard, "The Immaculate Deception," 115.

50. Edward Albee, *The Play about the Baby* (New York: Dramatists Play Service, 2002). Page references will be included in the text.

51. Kristine Thatcher, *Emma's Child* (New York: Dramatists Play Service, 1997), was first produced by the Oregon Shakespeare Festival, by which it was commissioned, in 1995. It won the 1995 Susan Smith Blackburn Award, and three awards in 1997, including one from Resolve, a national self-help organization for dealing with infertility. In recent years it has been performed in regional theaters in Seattle, Denver, Los Angeles, Reno, and elsewhere, and continues to get good reviews. Jane Anderson, *The Baby Dance* (New York: Samuel French, 1992), was originally produced by the Pasadena Playhouse, State Theatre of California. Page references for both will be included in the text. My discussion of *The Baby Dance* is based on the published script; I note a few contrasts, but many more of the lines I quote, which are among the places where the play's satire is strongest, are cut from the video.

52. The men in both would-be adoptive couples are Jewish, and their wives are Christian or Christian-raised. As I will discuss in a minute, anti-Semitism becomes an open issue in *The Baby Dance*.

53. Pertman, *Adoption Nation*, 189, 199.

54. The video was made for Showtime. Jane Anderson both wrote and directed the adaptation.

55. Leonard, "Immaculate Deception," 111.

56. See Leonard, "Immaculate Deception," 111–32, for more on the rele-

vance of *Zoo Story*, *Who's Afraid of Virginia Woolf*, and *Tiny Alice*, as well as *The American Dream*, to the experience of Albee as an adoptee.

CHAPTER 7

1. There are surprising affinities between the “lost cultures” explored by these two novelists. As Daniel Boyarin points out, “They are simultaneously seen as noble cultural ancestors of the groups that dominate them (Christian Europeans and white Americans, respectively) and denigrated as marginal and backward relics”: “Europe’s Indian, America’s Jew: Modiano and Vizenor,” in *American Indian Persistence and Resurgence*, ed. Karl Kroeber (Durham: Duke University Press, 1994), 200. In *Pigs in Heaven*, Annawake will explicitly compare Cash’s desire for custody to that of the parent in the Baby M case who wanted a child with his heredity because he was a Holocaust survivor. See Barbara Kingsolver, *Pigs in Heaven* (New York: Harper and Row, 1993), 281.

2. Barbara Kingsolver, *The Bean Trees* (New York: Harper and Row, 1988), 18. Subsequent quotations from this edition will be included parenthetically in the text.

3. This novel can thus be related to what Jay Clayton calls “the remarkable series of political novels that came out in the last decade focusing on U.S. relations with Latin America and the Caribbean, and with refugees from those regions.” *The Pleasures of Babel: Contemporary American Literature and Theory* (New York: Oxford, 1993), 114.

4. Kingsolver’s training as a biologist and experience as a science writer shows up in passages such as these.

5. The importance of the doll to Turtle may recall the way Esther in *Bleak House* survives her motherless condition and toxic “godmother” partly by her relationship to a doll.

6. Compare Clayton’s discussion of the importance of rituals, and in particular rituals of sacrifice, in contemporary North American fiction, *Pleasures of Babel*, 110–18, though Kingsolver’s rituals are not as bloody as most of those he discusses.

7. Kingsolver has an interest in the classics of Greek literature, among others. In an interview, she states that she wanted to keep Taylor’s vocabulary small to make the novel realistic and accessible, but also says she wants the novels to have “enough complexity to keep more educated and more sophisticated readers interested and challenged. So the references to Homer’s *Odyssey* or the references to Walt Whitman are in there, and some people will get them.” See Donna Perry, *Backtalk: Women Writers Speak Out* (New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1993), 153. Her use of Homer’s *Odyssey* is discussed by Roberta Rubenstein in “Homeric Resonances: Longing and Belonging in Barbara Kingsolver’s *Animal Dreams*,” in *Homemaking: Women Writers and the Politics and Poetics of Home*, ed. Catherine Wiley and Fiona R. Barnes (New York: Garland, 1996), 2, 11, 13.

8. One of the critics who has recalled this connection is Kenneth Burke. See *Philosophy of Literary Form*, 311, where he says of Aristotelian catharsis,

“The shock value of Freudian analysis exemplified the same process in tiny ‘closet dramas’ of private life (the facing and burning-out of conflict).”

9. See Annette Wannamaker, “‘Memory Also Makes a Chain’: The Performance of Absence in Griselda Gambaro’s *Antígona Furiosa*,” *Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association*, fall 2000; Athol Fugard’s 1973 play *The Island*, about a performance of *Antigone* in a South African prison; and, on the Mothers of the Plaza de Mayo, Rita Arditti, *Searching for Life: The Grandmothers of the Plaza de Mayo and the Disappeared Children of Argentina* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999).

10. Judith Butler, *Antigone’s Claim: Kinship between Life and Death* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2000), 22.

11. Lou Ann’s words echo a traditional Judeo-Christian way of dealing with a child’s death: see for example Ben Jonson’s “On My First Son”: “Seven years thou wert lent to me, and I thee pay, / Exacted by thy fate, on the just day.”

12. Barbara Kingsolver, interview by Lynn Karpen, *New York Times* June 27, 1993, 9.

13. William Byler, “The Destruction of American Indian Families,” in *The Destruction of American Indian Families*, ed. Steven Unger (New York: Association on American Indian Affairs, 1997), 1. Kingsolver’s Annawake claims that in the 1970s, “A third of all our kids were still being taken from their families and adopted into white homes” (75), but this is an exaggeration of how many were adopted, since the 25–35 percent figure includes children living in foster care or institutions. Still, there was “pressure on local welfare agencies to provide Indian children for adoption . . . in the prosperous post–World War II era,” according to Robert Bensen’s introduction to *Children of the Dragonfly*, ed. Bensen (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2001), 12. In mid-1970s Minnesota, “more than 90 per cent of non-related adoptions of Indian children [were] made by non-Indian couples” (Byler, 2), and this was apparently the norm elsewhere as well. Byler writes that when Indian children were removed from their families, they rarely had legal counsel, and the grounds were usually vague charges of “neglect” or “social deprivation” that did not respect Indian child-rearing practices (3, 2). In 1978 the Indian Child Welfare Act responded to these problems by giving tribes control over child placement.

14. In *The Bean Trees*, Lou Ann goes to a clinic while pregnant and is struck by the fact that the pamphlet about prenatal care she receives is illustrated not by a picture of a pregnant woman but by a picture of a mother and baby (29).

15. Although Kingsolver’s doctor doesn’t mention this, it is also common among people of Mediterranean ancestry, and occurs in about 75 percent of adults worldwide. See Robert Berkow, ed., *Merck Manual of Medical Information*, home edition (Whitehouse Station, N.J.: Merck Research Laboratories, 1997), 535.

16. Ruddick, *Maternal Thinking*, 40, defines “mother” as “a person who takes on responsibility for children’s lives and for whom providing child care is a significant part of her or his working life.” She uses the term “male mother” on p. 41.

17. I owe this point to Emily Hipchen, who made it in comments on an ear-

lier version of this chapter. Some adoptive mothers of infants have breast-fed, but it wouldn't be possible for one adopting a child of Turtle's age. Taylor's interest in feeding Turtle milk could have come not only from advertising, as she analyzes it—"The people look so perky in those commercials" (295)—but also from an attempt to compensate for not being able to nurse her.

18. See Perry, *Backtalk*, 165.

19. *Bean Trees* has established that Kingsolver is interested in Antigone, and Annawake has a name beginning and ending the same way and having the same number of letters, but another Cherokee calls her "Wideawake Annawake," so her name must not have four syllables.

20. See for example Byler, "Destruction of Indian Families," 3, 5.

21. Cf. Kingsolver's memories in *High Tide in Tucson: Essays from Now or Never* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995), 101: "My grandfathers on both sides lived in households that were called upon, after tragedy struck close to home, to take in orphaned children and raise them without a thought . . . one generation later that kind of semipermeable household had vanished, at least for the white middle class."

22. So many of Kingsolver's character names have resonance that I must note the echo here of the network of Florence Crittenton Maternity Homes, for unwed mothers who would give up their children, in spite of the different spelling. Kingsolver may be suggesting parallels between his confinement of the Indians and the birds and these homes' confinement and domestication of pregnant women while preparing them to give up their children. See Solinger, *Wake Up Little Susie*, and Regina Kunzel, *Fallen Women, Problem Girls: Unmarried Mothers and the Professionalization of Social Work, 1890–1945* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1993), which use these homes' records. The name of Turtle's birth mother, Alma, also alludes to adoption history since the name chosen for Florence Fisher's pioneering search group, Adoptees Liberty Movement Association, resulted in that acronym. The organization's website, www.almasociety.org (accessed December 17, 2004), identifies *alma* as "the Spanish word for soul."

23. Gundi, who says, "When I was a girl in Germany we read a little story in school about the Hopi, and I wanted to grow up to be an Indian" (152), is Kingsolver's mockery of a familiar fascination. Now to Gundi the Navajo reservation where she buys jewelry is "people living in falling-down mud houses with television antennas and bottles stacked by the door" (155).

24. Circe Sturm, *Blood Politics: Race, Culture, and Identity in the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2002).

25. According to Sturm, *Blood Politics*, the Cherokee Nation is "remarkable for having no minimum biogenetic standard, no minimum degree of blood, for citizenship," 89: though every enrolled citizen must have a Cherokee ancestor, in 1996, 29 percent of the tribe, more than fifty thousand members, had "a Cherokee blood quantum somewhere between 1/64th and 1/2048" (88). Largely because of this openness, the Cherokees are the second largest tribe in the United States, and between 1982 and 2000 went from forty thousand to well over two hundred thousand (97). Sturm explores "five indexical markers of

Cherokee identity other than blood ancestry: phenotype, social behavior, language, religious knowledge and participation, and community residence and participation” (110). All of these can be affected by individual choice except phenotype. But one of Sturm’s informants notes that “in the communities, people who are whiter feel a need to compensate, to put on a ribbon shirt or weave a basket” (115). Sturm points out that “Cherokees almost always refer to their religious and spiritual leaders as full-bloods, no matter how phenotypically mixed they may look” (126).

26. However, many communities have a Cherokee Baptist Church that uses Cherokee language and rituals, though not the stomp dance. See Sturm, *Blood Politics*, 127.

27. Sturm, *Blood Politics*, 208.

28. In *High Tide in Tucson*, Kingsolver recounts a trip to the Heard Museum with her five-year-old, which concludes with her satisfaction when the girl answers her question, “Who are the Native Americans?” with, “They’re people who love the earth, and like to sing and dance, and make a lot of pretty stuff to use. . . . And I think they like soda pop. Those guys selling the fry bread were drinking a lot of Cokes” (157). Again the emphasis is on behavior in the present, and not on idealized purity.

29. Kingsolver’s presentation of this ritual portrays a hybridity in Cherokee culture comparable to that discussed by Clayton in ethnic writers (*The Pleasures of Babel*, 125).

30. She changed only a few “factual” details from the first novel. In *Pigs in Heaven*, she places somewhat more emphasis on the persistence of Turtle’s trauma. Here she never willingly lets go of Taylor, whereas she did in *The Bean Trees*, and her comfort object is a flashlight called Mary. In *The Bean Trees* she was able to bury and leave the less alarming transitional object, the doll Shirley Poppy. In *Pigs in Heaven* Turtle is described as unusually quiet, although she seemed to have gone beyond that stage in *The Bean Trees*. The reason for these changes is probably that the more Turtle’s injuries are stressed, the harder it is to argue that she should be totally separated from Taylor. In *The Bean Trees* Taylor’s great-grandfather was Cherokee; here it is her great-grandmother. This must be because descent is claimed in the female line. And while *Bean Trees* implies that Turtle’s previous name was April, here it is Lacey, after the character on the television show *Cagney and Lacey*. The name change suggests how assimilated to American popular culture Turtle’s birth mother was, and could also suggest a longing for female friendship.

31. She says she’ll marry “When Gabe says he’ll come to my wedding” (55), and there are other suggestions that losing her twin has turned all her emotional energies outside her family into work for the Cherokee Nation. With her productive work and the affection she shows for her family and coworkers, the novel manages to suggest that somehow she is both emotionally healthy and traumatized.

32. Several of my students, at least one of whom was lesbian, felt that this was implied, especially with lines like these about her childhood family: “All those penises! You all had me surrounded like a picket fence. . . . nothing personal against your body organs. But men are just not necessarily always the solution” (332–33). Annawake may simply be reacting against her brother’s

comment, “You just need you a man, that’s all,” in a way that many women would regardless of sexual orientation. She has earlier said, “I oftentimes have communication problems with my heart” (312), which could include problems understanding her sexuality but need not.

33. But historical period and class are also important in determining how often this happens. See Kingsolver’s own memories of permeable families previously quoted in note 21.

34. Elizabeth Bartholet, *Family Bonds: Adoption and the Politics of Parenting* (New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1993). Bartholet comments approvingly on the success of transracial adoptees who “have grown up in white families, which tend to live in either relatively white or integrated communities” (104), regards “the elimination of racial hostilities as more important than the promotion of cultural difference” (112), and says relatively little about the need for transracially adopting parents to educate themselves or their children about their children’s culture. Contrast with the quote from the adoptive mother borrowed from Christine Ward Gailey, further on in this chapter.

35. Kristina Fagan, “Adoption as National Fantasy in Barbara Kingsolver’s *Pigs in Heaven* and Margaret Laurence’s *The Diviners*,” in Novy, *Imagining Adoption*, 260. This novel is read more positively, as imagining “the kind of reconciliation that the sensitive implementation of the [ICWA] act can effect,” by Pauline Turner Strong, “To Forget Their Tongue, Their Name, and Their Whole Relation: Captivity, Extra-tribal Adoption, and the Indian Child Welfare Act,” in Franklin and McKinnon, *Relative Value*, 486. Far from sentimental about either “Indian blood” or adoption, Strong argues that “the reckoning of identity through ‘blood quanta’ . . . is at once a ‘tragic absurdity’ and a ‘tragic necessity’ for many contemporary Native Americans in the United States” (468), and that “Adoption across political and cultural borders may simultaneously be an act of violence and an act of love” (471).

36. Sturm, *Blood Politics*, 89.

37. Bertolt Brecht, *Threepenny Opera*, in *Plays*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New York: Arcade, 1993), 141.

38. Modell, *Kinship with Strangers*, 235, 238.

39. Shanley, *Making Babies*, 23. This revises “De-essentializing Family Ties: Feminist Reflections on Transracial and Open Adoption,” paper presented at a meeting of American Society for Political and Legal Philosophy, September 2, 1999, 27. I thank Iris Young for a copy.

40. Shanley, *Making Babies*, 40.

41. However, as Barbara Melosh writes, “In fact, in the last twenty years the model of family as ‘proprietorship’ has been strengthened with legislation and judicial decisions that make parental rights paramount, and that have diluted the old standard of ‘best interest of the child’” (personal communication, January 2002).

42. Kingsolver, *High Tide in Tucson*, 154.

43. Perry, *Backtalk*, 165.

44. Clayton, *Pleasures of Babel*, 144. His adoption novels include Kaye Gibbons’s *Ellen Foster*, Rosellen Brown’s *Civil Wars*, Dori Sanders’s *Clover*, Vicki Covington’s *Gathering Home*, and Ann Tyler’s *Saint Maybe*.

45. See Christine Ward Gailey, “Ideologies of Motherhood and Kinship in U.S. Adoption,” in *Ideologies and Technologies of Motherhood: Race, Class, Sexuality, Nationalism*, ed. Heléna Ragoné and France Winddance Twine (New York: Routledge, 2000), 14.

46. Though skeptical about much of the cross-cultural learning advised to adoptive parents, Margaret Homans points out that her daughter’s “having listened to the speech of Hunan Province during gestation and for nine months after her birth constitutes a physical inscription of culture on her body” (“Adoption and Essentialism,” 264).

47. Personal communication, in a response to this chapter.

AFTERWORD

1. See, for example, Joyce Maguire Pavao, *The Family of Adoption* (Boston: Beacon, 1998); Elinor B. Rosenberg, *The Adoption Life Cycle* (New York: Free Press, 1992); David M. Brodzinsky, Marshall D. Schechter, and Robin Marantz Henig, *Being Adopted: The Lifelong Search for Self* (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

2. Margaret Laurence, *The Diviners* (1974; rpt. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).

3. See Margaret Laurence, *Dance on the Earth: A Memoir* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989).

4. Toni Morrison, *Jazz* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992). Citations will be included parenthetically in the text.

5. Chang-Rae Lee, *A Gesture Life* (London: Granta, 1999), 356.

6. Oscar Hijuelos, *Mr. Ives’ Christmas* (New York: Harper, 1995).

7. In an essay, “Road from the Isles,” written a few years before the novel, and connected with it by the author in a later reprinting, Margaret Laurence discusses her own ethnic origins as a Lowland Scot, her fantasy identification with the Highlanders, and the surprising lack of personal connection that she felt at visiting the lands associated with the traumas of Highland Scottish history. Her conclusion, like Morag’s, associates her identity with her own remembered Canadian past. See Margaret Laurence, *Heart of a Stranger* (1976; rpt. Toronto: Seal, 1980), 158–72.

8. See Pavao, *Family of Adoption*, 91: “Loss is a pervasive issue. We deal with it in many different ways. Some of us are pack rats and keep everything. . . . Our rooms are cluttered and piled high with things that we can’t lose, because we’re trying to calm our feelings about the people that we’ve lost. Some of us go to the other extreme and keep nothing.” However, I would not claim that all adoptees behave in one or the other of these extreme ways.

9. Quoted by Gates, *Loose Canons*, 110.

10. Stuart Hall, “Ethnicity, Identity, and Difference,” *Radical America* 23, no. 4 (1989): 19.

11. Gloria Anzaldúa, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987), 79.

12. Sean O'Casey, *Juno and the Paycock*, in *Three Plays* (London: Macmillan, 1957), 71.

13. See Melosh, *Strangers and Kin*, 76–88, on procedures of religious matching.

14. Margaret Moorman, *Waiting to Forget: A Motherhood Lost and Found* (New York: Norton, 1998), 168.