What Is at Stake in *Comparing the Literatures*?

⊙ José Luís Jobim
Fluminense Federal University

Abstract: This paper will present and discuss a few questions raised in David Damrosch's *Comparing the Literatures: Literary Studies in a Global Age*, a book that, divided into chapters based on some selected keywords, develops relevant thematic nuclei, bringing to the fore literary authors, critics, and theorists.

Keywords: comparative literature, translation, world literature, trasnational literary experience, linguistic imperialism

CLC: I1 **Document Code:** A **Article ID:** 2096-4374(2023)01-0053-12

DOI: 10.53397/hunnu.jflc.202301006

What is at stake in a book significantly titled *Comparing the Literatures: Literary Studies in a Global Age*? The answer cannot be simple, because neither the author nor his work is. For David Damrosch, the production of comparative knowledge involves, among other things, our relationship with the comparatists and the comparisons that preceded us. That is why he proposes to offer in his book "a broadly historical sweep from the turn of the 19th century to the present, looking particularly at turning points in the lives and work of people who remain vitally relevant for our present concerns and debates" (7).

In fact, throughout his book, Damrosch not only returns to many issues that have been present in Comparative Literature at least since the 19th century, but he also includes broader ones that concern the Humanities and the production and transmission of knowledge. In the reflection developed throughout the chapters, in dialogue with critics, theorists, and literary authors, Damrosch seeks to discuss the framework, the conceptual matrix, and the modes of argumentation in relation to where the comparatist's work is situated. It is a reflection that takes place in a context in which a complex framework already exists: questions have already been formulated, histories have already been written, and opinions have already been issued on comparatism. So although

comparing the literatures can be an activity carried out by a singular person, the book reminds us that it is practiced within a cultural system in which many past traces of activities and traditional forms of action rooted in previous moments become meaningful.

In *Comparing the Literatures*, Damrosch also takes up many of the ideas he expressed throughout his career, some of which have raised a number of objections, made by different authors and in different circumstances. He often dialogues with these objections, even when he does not explicitly mention their authors—maybe because these objections have been more (or less) reiterated by different authors, *mutatis mutandis*. This dialogue neither takes place only in one chapter alone nor is only about a specific issue—in fact, sometimes it is not even visible to readers who are unfamiliar with the interlocutors or with the arguments, but it is no less important because of this.

Comparing the Literatures is a book that, divided into chapters based on some selected keywords, develops relevant thematic nuclei, bringing literary authors, critics, and theorists to the fore. Damrosch discusses contemporary or previous works in a broad, general, and unrestricted way, without shying away from taking a position on the most thorny issues. It is a book in which both the wide spectrum of readings made by the author and his care about diversity and inclusion are evident—thus avoiding accusations already made to other comparatists, that they focus only on a limited number of authors and European countries. The inclusion effort is aimed not only at other continents, but, in Europe, at authors and works from countries outside the France/Great Britain/Germany circuit. As there are many issues addressed by Damrosch, throughout the 386 pages of his book, I will limit myself to just commenting on some of them here.

1. Translation

The question of translation, which has been identified as central to comparatism at least since the 19th century, is approached from several different angles and in more than one chapter. Damrosch's critical analysis ranges from the treatment ascribed to this question by the founders of the first journal of *Comparative and World Literature* in his opening chapter "Origins" to the 21st-century discussion about translation.

In his fifth chapter ("Languages"), Damrosch begins the subsection entitled "Translating the Untranslatable" with a mention of the 20 "Theses on Translation" that open Emily Apter's *The Translation Zone*. As the first one is "Nothing is Translatable," Damrosch already states: "Assumptions of untranslatability are often as much ideological as linguistic, as when an ineffable sacred language is held to be the only medium in which the divine message can be fully conveyed" (178). His explicit reference is to the Qur'an, widely considered to be untranslatable— "a stance that hasn't at all impeded its worldwide dissemination, both in Arabic and in what a nonbeliever might think are translations" (178) —but the readers most connected with issues in the field of Comparative Literature may also think of the 2004 *Dictionnaire des intraduisibles*, which (in

apparent contradiction to its own title) was translated into English by Apter herself, and by Jacques Lezra and Michael Wood, and published by Princeton University Press in 2015.

According to Damrosch, "ideas of untranslatability were heightened during the modernist period, when writers were praised for writing difficult works in a style uniquely their own" (180)—and he brings a series of examples, from Benedetto Croce to Marinetti, from T. S. Eliot to Robert Frost. For Damrosch, a certain interpretation of Frost's declaration that "poetry is what is lost in translation," cited as a general truth could lead to the idea of untranslatability related to a unique (and untranslatable) meaning supposedly present (as an inherent ontological condition) in a poem. And this would be problematic: "Any scholar who endorses Frost on untranslatability should give up writing literary criticism as well" (180).

He argues that, in fact, it is common in national literary systems for translated "national" and "foreign" works to coexist in the same period, which should lead to the consideration that these translated works are not "external" to national systems, in fact, they are a constituent part of them. Therefore, it would be necessary to reformulate the criteria for the inclusion or exclusion of authors and works in histories of national literatures, which normally exclude everything that has not been originally written in the national language. The permanence of this exclusion would be in clear contradiction with the facts:

> From the sixteenth century until Sterne's day, Spanish and French works would often have outnumbered homegrown productions in London booksellers' shops. Their plots, themes, and imagery made their way into English writing in much the same way as local material would do, adopted by writers who didn't cordon off translated works in some separate mental folder from English-language originals. Nor were major English works always published in England, or even in English. Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*— written in Latin and published in Holland in 1516—was never published in England during More's lifetime; it only became part of "English" literature (narrowly defined) in 1551, when it was finally published in London in an English translation. Scholars in semiperipheral cultures have long been well aware of the active presence of translated works as constitutive parts of national traditions, though these insights have rarely been developed by literary historians in more hegemonic cultures. (214-215)

On a personal note, when Damrosch's discussion about translation included George Steiner's argument (in *After Babel*) that there have been (and still are) so many thousands of human tongues because, particularly in the archaic stages of social history, there have been so many distinct groups intending to keep from one another the inherited, singular springs of their identity, and engaged in creating their own semantic worlds, their "alternities," I have to confess that an interesting contrast came to my South American mind. Davi Kopenawa's narrative, explaining the differences between the languages, goes in the opposite direction to that of the Tower of Babel. As is known, the narrative of the Tower of Babel (Genesis 11:1-9) elaborates an explanation for

the fact that human beings speak different languages: men soon after the Flood spoke a single language and migrated eastwards, until they arrived at a place where they decided to build a city and a tall tower that reached the sky. God, then, confused their speech so that they could no longer understand each other. In the Yanomami shaman's version, the entities Omama and Remori decided that the different people created by them should not speak the same language:

> Omama and Remori decided that the different people they had created should not possess the same language. They thought that using a single language would provoke endless conflicts between them because one group's evil words could be heard by all the others without impediment. This is why they attributed other modes of talking to the outsiders and then separated them on different lands. While making these languages open inside them, they warned them: "You will not hear the words of others. You will only understand your own and that way you will only quarrel among yourselves. The same will be true of them." (Kopenawa and Albert 166-167).

Comparing the version of the Tower of Babel and that of Remori/Omama, perhaps we can say that the biblical narrative has a certain character of punishment (God will make mutual understanding based on the use of a single language impossible), while the Amerindian one has a character of protection or containment of possible conflicts, which would arise if everyone spoke the same language and could understand mutual verbal aggressions.

2. Biography and Humor

Comparing the Literatures is above all the work of an erudite author with a wide and varied view of the field. Damrosch structured his argument into chapters that could as well be transformed into books (Origins; Emigrations; Politics; Theories; Languages; Literatures; Worlds; Comparisons), and he also adopted an interesting strategy for treating these themes. Instead of directly referring to the varied and complex subjects he deals with, he often preferred to adopt a "biographical" approach, so to speak. Perhaps intending to make it easier for the non-specialized reader, he chose to include the lives of the authors he studies together with the discussion of the arguments they developed. The strategy is unusual, perhaps because it requires a more comprehensive knowledge than what would be required if it were just to discuss the arguments.

Of course, if I also wanted to use some "biographical" data from Damrosch to explain this strategy here, perhaps I would argue that his brother Leopold had already used the "biographical" approach before, but I believe it is more appropriate to connect his approach to the work of Michael Holquist, whom Damrosch mentions in his acknowledgments. Holquist published with Katherina Clark a very important book on Mikhail Bakhtin, in which the life of the Russian critic is explored—a book that was also a kind of "biography" of Bakhtin's ideas, relating them

to the various periods in which they emerged in his life, as well as to the facts concerning their emergence. To some extent, Damrosch follows their path, but there are significant differences. First, Damrosch does not deal with only one author, studied in detail, as Holquist and Clark did, although (like Holquist and Clark) he attributes meaning to the articulations between the ideas and the lives of the authors he studies. Secondly, when dealing with the authors and their works, he adds some humor to his scholarly writing—many times openly directed toward himself, turning the reader's attention away from certain serious criticism he is making at the very same time.

For example, speaking of René Etiemble, the famous *enfant gâté* of French comparatism, who sardonically asserted that any imbecile pretending to engage in research would be able to get a fellowship, funds, and an institute of his own, whereas translators, in whom comparative literature was interested only as "intermediaries," did not have these benefits, Damrosch says: "Even imbeciles with their own institutes—myself included—must now be engaged with translation to an extent that Étiemble himself might not have anticipated" (169-170).

In another passage from the book, after criticizing the Warwick Research Collective (WReC) for not listing a single work in any language other than English, and for never referring to the originals when discussing foreign-language novels, Damrosch cites their claim that Comparative Literature's insistence on multilingualism is more often the leading edge of an unambiguous fetishism of language (and hence of the authority of professional experience) than of any commitment to cultural dialogue or social mutuality, but he also adds the WReC may have a point with Apter:

> Though she is certainly committed to cultural dialogue, she sprinkles her prose with French terms (*en soi, décalage, forçage*) that seem to have more to do with banking on the cultural capital of French than with any lack of English equivalents for phrases that add—what shall I say?—a certain *je ne sais quoi* to her upmarket style. (194)

Important questions about origins in the first chapter are presented through the life and opinions of different characters, notably Madame de Staël and Herder, Hugo Meltzl and Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett—although other characters, European and non-European, are also mentioned. As could be expected, Madame de Staël and Herder are also compared by Damrosch:

> They shared broadly common Enlightenment roots, but in their lives and work Herder and de Staël display a series of binary oppositions of Saussurean proportions: Johann Gottfried Herder, philosopher-preacher of humble German origins, the great promoter of folk poetry, an ardent apostle of German nationalism, a committed Lutheran and devoted family man, struggling to make ends meet; across the Rhine, the wealthy aristocrat Germaine de Staël, famous for her Parisian salon, something of a freethinker, something more of a libertine (her five children had four different fathers), a widely traveled cosmopolitan but devoted to her glittering life in Paris, until Napoleon forced her into exile in her moated chateau on the shore

of Lac Léman. (15)

Following his "biographical" strategy, Damrosch in addition to presenting literary data (both were creative writers—Herder a talented poet, de Staël a best-selling novelist—who explored social and political themes in their prolific writings) brings information about their personal lives and also points out some aspects of their work that are not the most widely mentioned.

As is well known, Herder has been often presented as an example of a kind of "cultural nationalism," which adopts the conception of nationalism as an inherited identity, believing that nationality is an inheritance received by being born in a certain country, belonging to a certain race, and speaking a certain language, among other things. Consequently, from this position, it is believed that, regardless of the individual's will, he/she always already acquires, at birth, the "spirit" or "soul" of the people to which he/she belongs. Kohn has already stated that Herder was the first to insist that human civilization is based not only in universal manifestations but also in national and peculiar ones, adding that the creative forces of the universal become primarily individual not in the singular human being but in the collective personalities of human communities (31). Men would be above all members of their national communities; only as such could they be truly creative, through the language and traditions of their peoples. Popular songs (folk songs) and folklore, until then entirely left out, would have been seen by Herder as the great manifestations of the immaculate creative spirit.

Damrosch relativizes this "cultural nationalism," even bringing arguments from Gervinus—an "ethnonationalist" so to speak, who proclaimed the complete abandonment of foreign models for national literature, and thought that Herder imitated the *Reliques of Ancient English Poetry*, by Thomas Percy (a foreigner!).

Of course, we would have to take into consideration that, in the 19th century, the structuring of nation-states as supposedly autonomous entities was also responsible for the emergence of inter-nationalism, the relationship between these entities. And in Herder's case, the relationship between a consolidated and neighboring nation-state (France) and another one that would only be consolidated in the second half of the 19th century (Germany) was at stake. Gervinus's accusation was part of this context, as Damrosch pointed out:

> Yet Herder's internationalism was neither a reflexive Anglophilia nor an anxious Francophobia; instead, it was the fruit of deep reflection on the uncertainties of cultural belonging in a radically relativistic world. Language and literature may be the best index of national identity, but Herder understood language, literature, and national identity itself as common products of ceaseless flux. (19-20)

To Damrosch, Herder's early comparatism in a semiperipheral location would result in a nationalist internationalism, seeking through comparative study both to highlight the integrity of German culture and to combat any nationalistic vanity, stressing the common humanity, of which

any particular culture would be just one expression (22-23).

Madame de Staël's *De la littérature*, on the other hand, is seen as having a great impact in valorizing women's writing over against the prestige of the dominant male tradition, besides her most known impact on the discussion of local color—or her "emphasis on literature's responsiveness to its society," in Damrosch's words (27). Particularly interesting to me was the example of her relevance for peripheral locales far from France that Damrosch quotes in his book: Antonio Candido's remark about *Niterói: Revista Brasiliense*—a journal published (in Portuguese) in Paris in 1836, that quotes Madame de Staël and also adapts her ideas about the rejection of old canons and the creation of a national literature based on local color (Magalhaens 138). For South American literatures, both the adoption and the rejection of local color were (and in a certain way still are) a crucial part of the discussion about literature itself—and it is not casual that two of the most important authors of the19th and 20th century (Machado de Assis and Jorge Luis Borges) have written about it.[1]

The presence of Candido and many other "peripheral" critics in Damrosch's book, by the way, is a demonstration of his willingness to reach out to other scholarly communities. As a Yale-trained scholar, in a certain way, Damrosch manages to distance himself from the Euro-universalism that he attributes to René Wellek (305), who in his groundbreaking *Theory of Literature* admitted the importance of other parts of the world (the "Orient" and Latin America) but did not include a single name from outside Europe and North America in the index of that book. Damrosch is very careful to avoid the limitations of Wellek: in the index of *Comparing the Literatures* the reader will find authors from all over the world.

Damrosch is also very much critical about "linguistic imperialism": "English, French, and (to a diminishing degree) German are the privileged languages of international theory" (146-147). He points out that almost all of the prominent theorists from the global South today write in English or French—and their prominence cannot be separated from this fact:

> People writing in Chinese or Hindi, or even in the global languages of Spanish or Portuguese, are far less prominent. They are usually encountered only in one or two of their works, often translated decades after they were published, in contrast to the speed with which almost any work by Spivak or Kristeva will be translated into their language. (147)

We know that this is a recurring question in comparative studies since at least the 19th century, when Ferdinand Brunetière himself wrote that the national spirit depended on a language, the evolution of which, determined by "airs, waters and places" (69), reflected in its trajectory the images of the native land; on a language spoken by ancestral inhabitants, and thus blessed by them with a traditional meaning that would not be understood by those who did not utter their first words in this language (or hear it before doing so as babies); on a language, in short, illustrated by its masters and, based on their models, available to be emulated by all those who try to write according to those models.

Damrosch also points out, when he discusses Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett and Hugo Meltzl as "peripheral" authors (31), their achievements and limitations, when seeking alternatives to the dominant modes of literary and cultural study (the nationalistic and the cosmopolitan):

> Writing from borderline positions both culturally and institutionally, Posnett and Meltzl understood the ease with which cosmopolitanism could collapse into its seeming opposite, becoming a form of imperial nationalism. Both in their complex personal positions and in their intellectual agendas, Meltzl and Posnett offer important early models for a global comparatism today, even as the eclipse of their projects offers cautionary lessons we should still heed. (Damrosch 31)

Even with due reservations—because, as Damrosch wrote, both Meltzl and Posnett presented ideas that are still interesting today—the comparatism in the work of both cannot be separated from the context of that time, in which European colonial expansion, with the seizure of territories in different parts of the globe, and the need to understand (to better control) the populations and living conditions in the colonies, generated a series of bibliographic productions that ranged from the reports of travelers, through the testimonies of transplanted Europeans, to the work of researchers in various fields of knowledge. As a result, a large volume of texts was then published that disseminated a series of representations—about landscapes, populations, and life in general in the colonies—that were widely used in comparisons.

These representations, consciously or unconsciously, had a comparative bias, as the European authors of these texts directly or indirectly compared what they found in the colonies with what they knew in their respective homelands. In this way, as many comparatists have already demonstrated, the elements found in the colonized land gained a meaning that was more related to European ideas or theories than to the reality of the colonies. Damrosch is very much aware of these questions when he wraps up the history of 19th-century comparatism:

> The early history of comparative studies includes Herder's nationalist internationalism, de Staël's feminist cosmopolitanism, Posnett's social evolutionism, Meltzl's utopian polyglottism, and Koch's strategically German comparatism as well. This history is neither a linear story of progress nor a war of attrition between cosmopolitan comparatists and their nationalistic rivals. Instead, we see the early comparatists' shifting attempts to mediate their own internal mixtures of internationalism and national belonging, to wrestle with intractable problems of language and translation, to look at European literature as a whole, and to take account of the new worlds opened up by agents of empire and the much older literatures uncovered by Egyptologists and Assyriologists. By the century's end, an international network of scholars was working to understand both European and non-European literatures in their own contexts and in relation to literatures elsewhere. Their collective work set the stage for the growth of the discipline far from the precincts either of the Asiatic Society of Bengal or of the University

of Berlin. (48-49)

3. National Versus Comparative Literature?

Writing at the very end of the 19th century, Brunetière (62-63) said that criticism, authorized by the conclusions of scholars, philologists, and grammarians, has taught us that in that century national literatures had tried to concentrate on themselves, transforming themselves into the expression of the spirit of their people and their consciousness, as well as their respective traditions (in a Herderian way, we could perhaps add). However, Brunetière also wonders whether this movement of nationalist concentration might not in itself be proof of the reciprocal interpenetration between different literatures and of the fear that they will thus lose their most "original" native qualities (66). This fear, he argues, is present not only in literature, but also in culture, in which interpenetration is active, continual, and irresistible. Exaggeration in literary nationalism is thus, in Brunetière's opinion, a way of resisting the trend towards cosmopolitanism.

The *Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum*, edited by Hugo Meltzl and Samuel Brassai was one of the cases brought about by Damrosch to discuss the tension between cosmopolitanism and nationalism in the 19th century. Not only was the *Acta* radically plurilingual, but it also proposed to compare masterpieces of world literature and had a Herderian emphasis on oral and folk materials: "Meltzl was attempting a synthesis of Goethe's elitist globalism with Herder's populist emphasis on the folk, making the *Acta* more a refinement within German cultural debates than an alternative to them" (37-38).

If the *Acta* tried to counter the literary nationalism of the European great powers by including masterpieces of other cultures or by including the literatures of smaller countries, nevertheless the overarching context was different, according to Damrosch:

> Throughout the nineteenth century, the scholarly bias toward the literatures of a few major powers was reinforced by a bias toward major languages. Writers living in Hungary and writing in Hungarian were thus doubly disadvantaged, a dilemma emphasized at the century's end by the Danish comparatist Georg Brandes. (35)

Particularly interesting for me was the mention of the critic and historian Georg Brandes, whose book *Main Currents of Nineteenth-Century Literature* dealt with the literatures of England, France, Germany, and Italy, but not of Denmark, the country where he was born. This reminded me of Tobias Barreto (1839-1889), the Brazilian author of *Outline of Comparative Literature in the 19th Century*. As a basis for comparatism, Barreto believed in a European-based universalism, to be conveyed in the literature of the 19th century and he also thought that the study of foreign languages and literatures was a characteristic feature of his time. Barreto argued that, as a

consequence of the exchange of ideas, the cultured nations made Europe and a good portion of America unique. Nevertheless, for him, these supposedly unique peoples were hierarchically constituted and the few languages and literatures that mattered to him did not include the Portuguese (103-104). Like Brandes, Barreto excluded his own country's literature, arguing:

> In the present century, only four nations, Germany, France, England and Italy, have been at the head of the literary movement, and only their literatures deserve the title of *Weltliteraturen*, as the Germans say, or universal literatures. Everything that is good, useful and has been thought, written and spoken in any other place, in this or that epigone country, has always been a repercussion of the original thinking of the four main countries. (Barreto 106)[2]

In literary studies, a certain conception that Comparative Literature is opposed to the disciplines of "national" literatures still circulates. From time to time professors of those disciplines or comparatists reinforce this conception. Franco Moretti, for example, verbalized this supposed opposition in his "Conjectures on World Literature," but Damrosch does not agree with Moretti's position that the main justification for the study of world literature and for the existence of departments of comparative literature is being a thorn in the side, a permanent intellectual challenge to national literatures—especially the local literature. Damrosch argues that, although this position can be considered progressive in the United States, as it opposes isolationist nationalism (which, by the way, was on the agenda when Donald Trump adopted the motto "America first"), it does not take into account other factors:

> Among colonized or otherwise dominated populations, literature has long been a prime force for fostering national identity and rallying opposition to imperial or hegemonic powers, and as we've seen with Hu Shih, literary nation-building has often had a significant comparative and international dimension. A dismissively antinationalistic stance can't do justice to the internationalism of many national literatures. (208)

In fact, the repeated presence of "foreign" authors translated into "national" literary systems certainly indicates that the historical panoramas of those systems should include "translated foreigners" as an integral part, since it is difficult even to imagine a "national" literary tradition in isolation, without any bridge to other traditions. And if the criterion for a literary work to be "national" is to have been produced in a national territory, there would still be other arguments, according to Damrosch:

> Émigrés and heritage populations have frequently written in languages other than the predominant national language, but until recently American poets who wrote in Spanish or Yiddish were rarely included in survey courses or anthologies of American literature, while

> Irish and Welsh were banished outright from the curriculum in nineteenth-century England. Even in the case of a major canonical writer such as Milton, only his English-language poetry is commonly taught: no survey anthology of English literature that I know of includes any of Milton's Latin poems. Though Milton was fluent in Latin and proud of his poetic ability in the language of diplomacy and of humanistic inquiry, we take it for granted that his Latin poems aren't worth our while—a judgment that most of us have made without ever having read any of them. Similarly, Ghalib, who wrote both in Persian and in Urdu, is beloved in India as an Urdu poet and ignored as a Persian poet—even though Ghalib himself preferred his Persian poems to his Urdu ones. (213)

If "national literature" disciplines tend to divide their syllabus into historical sections, in which the literary periods studied have their own canons—which include only authors who write in the "national" language, then works that are not written in this language tend to be excluded. In my continent, for example, that would be the case of the narratives in Amerindian languages.

4. Important Questions

One of the most relevant features of *Comparing the Literatures* is the synthetic formulation of the author's opinions, which appear throughout the book, often after long digressions or discussions with other authors. As this paper does not intend (and cannot) be comprehensive, I will only comment on some of these formulations, in addition to those that have already been presented and discussed in previous passages of this paper.

I think Damrosch's claim that comparatists should not only have a good understanding of what they mean by "literature" but also consider that a literature includes the assemblage of works that make up a literary culture, its canon, and its historical tradition, is crucial. As he explains, "This is no obvious question, especially with the many traditions created outside the Western world, or within the West itself in periods before the general adoption of the belletristic conception of literature formulated in eighteenth-century France" (208).

I have also highlighted Damrosch's ideas about the mutual disregard of comparatists and people working in a single literature, but it is never enough to quote him, when he says that everyone doing comparative work needs to think more creatively about the vitality of the national traditions with which—and against which—comparatists engage (209) or when he says that it is no longer necessary to oppose the national to the cross-cultural or the comparative to the global: "A nation-based study can treat global issues as they emerge in a given time and place, and the two ends of the local-global spectrum can join when we consider the world within the nation" (314).

I also agree with Damrosch when he says that a prime purpose of cross-cultural comparison—no matter how it is labeled—is to open out and test our concepts against a wider range of historical and cultural forms of expression, as many of our comparatist colleagues do, including works

produced beyond the Eurozone (318). For me, in this respect, his most important statement is not in his conclusion, but in his introduction:

> There is no single set of languages, canon of texts, or body of theory that every comparatist needs to know, but each of us ought to get a good sense of the options available to us under each of these categories, and to know what we're doing when we make our choices of materials and methods. (Damrosch 7)

If all comparatists adopted this quotation as a kind of motto, our field would be in better condition today.

Notes

1. Cf. José Luís Jobim, *Literatura comparada e literatura brasileira: circulações e representações*. Makunaima; Editora da Universidade Federal de Roraima, 2020. www.edicoesmakunaima.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/literatura-comparada-e-literatura-brasileira.pdf.
2. More information about Barreto's work in Jobim, "North-South Comparatism: New Worldism, Theories of Lack and Acclimatization." *Journal of Foreign Languages and Cultures*, vol. 6, no.1, 2022, pp. 26-37.

Works Cited

Barreto, Tobias. "Traços de literatura comparada do século XIX" (1877). *Estudos alemães*, the legacy of Silvio Romero, Rio de Janeiro: Laemmert and Cia, 1892, pp 103-200.

Brunetière, Ferdinand. "La littérature européenne au XIXe siècle." *Revue des Deux Mondes*, LXIXe anée, quatrième période,vol. 156, 1899, pp. 2-77.

Damrosch, David. *Comparing the Literatures: Literary Studies in a Global Age*. Princeton UP, 2020.

Kohn, Hans. *Nationalism: Its Meaning and History*. D. Van Nostrand, 1955.

Kopenawa, Davi, and Bruce Albert. *The Falling Sky: Words of a Yanomani Shaman*. Translated by Nicholas Elliott and Alison Dundy, Harvard UP, 2013.

Magalhaens, Domingos José Gonçalves de. "Ensaio sobre a história da literatura do Brasil." *Nitheroy, revista brasiliense*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1836, Dauvin et Fontaine, pp. 132-159.