

criticism can aspire to. Any bigger claim within the academic enclosure is a trick" (362). Standing after the chapter "Philosophy" and before the chapter "History and Culture," literature has no special status in the enterprise. While Spivak's ethical and intellectual commitments are genuinely high-minded, not least in their response to the totalization to which *de Man* (to whom the book is dedicated) is prone, they have their own illusions. The illusions, partly utopian and partly nostalgic (see pages 207–209, 306, and 318–319 on the nostalgia haunting Spivak), are marked by the following incoherence: "High theory 'passing' as 'resistance' is part of the problem" (398), yet . . . "Yet, against all straws in the wind, one must write in the hope that it is not a deal done forever, that it is possible to resist from within" (113, at the beginning to "Literature"). The resistances that Spivak often brilliantly finds are, to my mind, are inscribed in the texts, not imperiously or magisterially imposed upon them — "In the story itself," she says at one point, lies "resistance to Development . . . as aboriginal resistance" (142) — and I would prefer to see them used in the service of directed movement, not just of her kind of destabilizing deconstruction.

CHAPTER FIVE

Rethinking the Colonial Model

Walter D. Mignolo



"Rethinking literary history," as the basic statement of purpose of this book, implies that we rethink not only the concept of literature but also the concept of history. They are, so to speak, sisters or brothers in Western discursive self-formation from its "origin" in ancient Greece to the current conceptualization and practice in the North Atlantic. The Martinican writer, philosopher, and cultural critic Édouard Glissant insists on the differences between History and Literature, on the one hand, and history and literature, on the other.¹ Glissant's distinction is not a question of difference and deferral within the closure of Western logocentrism, with the colonial difference as its outside. Rather, Glissant underlines the historicity of the colonial difference and the emptiness of a cultural practice that has to be conceived as literature because it cannot be conceived as Literature. Furthermore, the fact that it has to be conceptualized as literature is a double negation: the subordination of literature to Literature and the emptiness of the unnamed that becomes literature. This is indeed the play of the colonial difference that not only establishes the categories but that at the same time imprints the rules of the game for those who, like Glissant, write from the colonial difference itself.

THE COLONIAL DIFFERENCE

The colonial difference (as in Glissant's literature and history) is exteriority in the sense used by the French philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas: That is, the outside that is declared as such from the inside, like the Jews in the formation of Europe and the colonial areas of the planet in the historical process of Western discursive self-formation since, approximately, the sixteenth century.² The idea of a Western civilization was not clear before then, for there was a time when Western Christians inhabiting what is today Europe were marginal in relation to the center constituted by what is today the Middle East. The colonial difference that Glissant underlines in the domain of literature and history is therefore constitutive of modernity, one of the essential ideas in the Western discursive self-formation. From the Renaissance (or the Early Modern period) on, the colonial difference began to be traced in temporal and spatial locations. In the organization of time, the idea of the Middle Ages testifies to the power and the need of this colonial difference. In the organization of space, the colonial difference appears in constructing the exteriority of the Christian world.

the Moors, the Amerindians, the African people transported to the Americas as slaves, the Orientals rearticulated by the presence of Jesuit missions in China since 1582. Exteriority names precisely those ambiguous places in which what is strange and seemingly outside is at the same time inside by the sheer fact of being named. If it is correct to maintain today that there is no outside of the modern world system, there are still places of exteriority—places linked to the West because the West needs them for capitalistic expansion but at the same time maintains the difference. Therefore, exteriority has a double edge, which is the double edge of the colonial difference. On the one hand, it is the named place of shame or of inferiority. On the other, it is the assumed place of pride and equality. Glissant's distinction assumes, rather than names, the colonial difference from within the local history of slavery in the Caribbean.

Glissant's predicament appeared shortly before the debate about third-world literatures between United States Marxist thinker and literary critic Fredric Jameson and Indian Marxist Aijaz Ahmad.³ Ahmad made a point that should not be lost in the subsequent discussion his controversial book and his often extreme and dogmatic arguments elicited. What in my view bothered Ahmad was what he perceived as a blind spot in Jameson's argument, although Ahmad did not argue in terms of the colonial difference, an argument that, as a Marxist, he may not be willing to endorse. Jameson's blind spot would be that, when literature is produced across and from the colonial difference, it becomes dependent on Literature. This interpretation is suggested in Jameson's argument when he himself characterizes third-world literature as national allegory and compares it with the aesthetic dimension of Western Literature. If Ahmad felt that he was being theorized in a position of an object of study, it was because there was something beyond his personal engagement with Jameson (whom he recognized as one of his intellectual mentors), and beyond the common ground that both could have, as Marxist thinkers. What prompted the debate, I would claim, was neither a personal problem nor a conflict of perspective within Marxism itself. The debate was basically motivated by the colonial difference upon (and not from) which Jameson's argument was built. Ahmad, instead, was arguing from (and not upon) the colonial difference. This is the disruption of the colonial difference in which I will locate my meditation here on history, literature, and the history of literature.

Similar concerns can be detected in what I would like to call Chakrabarty's dilemma. Historian and member of the South Asian Subaltern Studies group, Dipesh Chakrabarty has argued on several occasions that the Subaltern Studies project shall not be celebrated as the third world arriving at the point of being able to write its own history.⁴ Chakrabarty's claim is that, as long as subaltern histories are framed within the norms of history as an academic discipline, they will remain within the epistemic frame of modern and Western historiography. Absorbed by History, subaltern historiography will remain as history. Historiography (as well as other disciplines) as practiced in the third world should be considered, according to this argument, a subaltern discipline and not just a discipline whose field of study is subalternity. Chakrabarty's dilemma echoes Glissant's distinction between History and history. However, Chakrabarty's critical reflections come from within historiography itself as a discipline, while Glissant's critical reflections on history come from outside historiography, mainly from philosophy and literature. Nevertheless both of

Americas in Glissant, and British education and the colonization of India in Chakrabarty.⁵ In the case of India and the Caribbean, the accessibility of the system of education and the force of the modern university were not the same. However, the legacy of African slavery in the formation of a Black Creole population in the Caribbean meant more difficulties in accessing higher education. Despite this and despite their divergent perspectives, Glissant and Chakrabarty have raised the issue of writing (e.g., literature, history, sociology, philosophy, and so forth) and the colonial difference.

Now that the question of Literature, literature, History, and history has been outlined and the colonial difference brought into focus, it is time to bring them all together. We shall ask whether the rethinking we are engaged in, in this volume, is of literary history or of history of literature. Literary history, in this case, will mean that history itself (the act of knowing) is literary (a writing practice distinguished from academic disciplines), while history of literature would imply a distinction between knowing (history) and the known (literature). A similar distinction could be made, in fact, if we replace *history* with *theory*.⁶ Both expressions remain, however, within Western categories, and both presuppose alphabetic writing and a given set of languages: the classical linguistic roots, Greek and Latin, and the modern vernaculars, mainly western European (Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, English, German, French). Chinese, Japanese, Bengali, Aymara, or Arabic literary histories exist either as something else, beyond the contact with Western conceptualization, or as a translation of Western conceptualization of cultural practices. In both cases, the sameness and the difference with Western categories are where the colonial difference dwells, where the coloniality of being emerges. Neither history nor literature has an ontological status, and both of them function differently within the narrative of Western civilization and within the narrative of the modern/colonial world. Certainly there are practices in non-European languages with some kind of writing, and one can suppose that there is a sense of the past recorded in some way in any imaginable human community. But Literature and History are Western categories to name, describe, and classify certain Western practices and, by the same token, to fabricate the colonial difference.⁷

Thus, within this logic, several scenarios present themselves to rethink literature, history, and the history of literature:

1. One scenario would be that of rethinking literary history (as well as the relationships between literature and history) within modernity itself as a field that has received a considerable amount of attention in the past twenty years. Let us call this scenario the discursive model of literature, history, and of literary history.⁸ Within this discursive model two orientations could be detected. One remains within discursive analysis itself, even when the discourse in question is historiography. The other is linked to hermeneutics, to the horizon of expectations, and to Michel Foucault's archeology and genealogy. Mario Valdés, in his chapter in this volume, addresses this second orientation and takes it beyond what the orientation originally allowed. On the one hand, Valdés introduces a geohistorical dimension absent in the discursive model entrenched in the epistemology of modernity. And, on the other

2. A second scenario is what Linda Hutcheon identifies in her chapter as "the national model." The national model contains the same ambivalence that the nation-state does. The nation-state and the national model in literary history have a surprising endurance (that Hutcheon shows in her chapter) at the same time as they are constantly being undermined by minority groups claiming their civil and cultural rights from below and from transnational corporations imposing their needs from above. What may need more detailed analysis, however, would be the "imperial difference" that cut across the national model since the eighteenth century. The consolidation and hegemony of northern European nations went hand in hand with the construction of the imperial difference and the distinction between the North and the South, embedded in the cultural discourse in France, Germany, and England. Why, for instance, did Spanish peninsular and Portuguese literatures not have, on university curricula and in comparative literature meetings and publications, the same relevance that English, French, and German literatures did? The paradigm, or perhaps the canon, of modern literature was mainly established in three languages: German, French, and English. Spanish (peninsular), Portuguese, and Italian literature were relegated to a secondary level, as the International Comparative Literature Association bears witness. The national model analyzed in detail by Hutcheon, in this volume, is a model that was forged and consolidated at the same time that the imperial difference, between northern and southern Europe, was being established. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the imperial difference was cast in terms of religious rather than geopolitical terms. The imperial difference, in the making of Europe, had two decisive moments. One was the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula and the emergence of the "enemy from within"; the other was the Reformation and Catholic Reformation that divided Christianity and prepared the ground for the future division between North and South.⁹ However, the distinction North-South was not yet an issue. The South became an issue for the first time in the eighteenth-century Europe of Nations (from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 until the end of Napoleon's regime) that concludes with the imaginary "heart of Europe" (England, France, and Germany) in Hegel's *Lessons in the Philosophy of History* (1822). The remaking of the imperial difference and the reinscription of the south in the current Europe of Nations (that is, the European Union) is under way, even though the legacies of Orientalism are still well grounded. As a consequence, Spain and Portugal are being supported, but Turkey faces serious difficulties to be considered "one of them."

3. A third scenario would be to rethink literary history as well as the relationships between literature and history from the exteriority of the colonial difference, as illustrated above through Glissant and the Jameson-Ahmad debate, and the dilemma of writing history in the third world. To outline this scenario, the scenario of the colonial difference, is the main goal of this chapter. References to the second scenario (the national model and the imperial difference) will be made, since the colonial difference was reinscribed in the national model (as the concept of internal colonialism clearly implies) at the same time that, from the eighteenth century on, it was rearticulated with the imperial difference.

However, an effort will be made to underline what I see as the irreducible difference between talking about the colonial difference and talking from it. I do not want

the difference in compatibility shall be maintained. This is the difference I see underlining the Jameson and Ahmad debate; I also see Glissant and Chakrabarty talking from the colonial difference rather than about it. Or, if you wish, they too talk about but mainly they talk from, not of course from essential identities but basically from colonial histories. Without this distinction, knowledge would remain in the disincorporated world of universal categories. The irreducible difference must be maintained. Otherwise, the risk is substantial of absorbing all possible epistemic locations within the universal grammar of modern epistemology and cultures of scholarship. When this happens, the colonial difference is erased and recast in a thematic "aboutness" that justifies a (legitimate) political concern about solidarity with "people without history." Obviously, the history was always there, but being told as nonhistory, as it is widely accepted nowadays.

Basically, then, my reflections here are framed in terms of literature, history and the colonial difference. My specific contribution, vis-à-vis that of the others in this volume, is to look, on the one hand, at the transition in Western (literary) history from the Renaissance concept of poetry to the Enlightenment concept of Literature, as we will see,¹⁰ and, on the other, at the making of the colonial difference when poetry and literature are put in contact and in conflict with what looks similar but that is nonetheless different in Amerindian cultures.¹¹ This was indeed reproduced in the nineteenth century vis-à-vis oral traditions in Africa, *khittab* in the Arabic world, or *brush talk* in China, as we shall see.

WHAT IS THE COLONIAL MODEL?

The basic feature of the colonial model is the colonial difference that framed not only the notion of literature and history, but also every aspect of the social and epistemic sphere, including, of course, ethics, religion, and science, as conceived and practiced from Copernicus and Galileo to Newton. How does this model work?

Let me begin with an example from philosophy. In the late 1950s, a leading Mexican scholar of pre-Columbian studies wrote an important book titled *Nahuatl Philosophy*.¹² He was quickly criticized for defining philosophy as a set of practices and knowledges among the Aztecs that could not have been easily assimilated to what in the sixteenth century or in the 1950s was understood by philosophy in the Greco-Roman and modern European tradition. A few years later, the same author, Miguel León-Portilla, had the chance of replying to his critics. I cannot reproduce here his brilliant and, at the same time, problematic argument. León-Portilla proposed that the expansion of Western culture made unavoidable the use of Western categories to describe non-Western societies and cultural practices. However, one can argue that León-Portilla could have used Nahuatl expressions denoting and describing the act of thinking and reflecting about the nature of the universe, of human life, of the organization of society, and the regulation of the behavior of its members, and so on. He could have assumed, for example, that before Western expansion, people all over the world, and particularly those who built impressive civilizations before the sixteenth century, must have possessed some kind of "thinking" practice and, most likely, a conceptualization or description of what they were doing when they were engaged in certain kind of thinking.

2. A second scenario is what Linda Hutcheon identifies in her chapter as "the national model." The national model contains the same ambivalence that the nation-state does. The nation-state and the national model in literary history have a surprising endurance (that Hutcheon shows in her chapter) at the same time as they are constantly being undermined by minority groups claiming their civil and cultural rights from below and from transnational corporations imposing their needs from above. What may need more detailed analysis, however, would be the "imperial difference" that cut across the national model since the eighteenth century. The consolidation and hegemony of northern European nations went hand in hand with the construction of the imperial difference and the distinction between the North and the South, embedded in the cultural discourse in France, Germany, and England. Why, for instance, did Spanish peninsular and Portuguese literatures not have, on university curricula and in comparative literature meetings and publications, the same relevance that English, French, and German literatures did? The paradigm, or perhaps the canon, of modern literature was mainly established in three languages: German, French, and English. Spanish (peninsular), Portuguese, and Italian literature were relegated to a secondary level, as the International Comparative Literature Association bears witness. The national model analyzed in detail by Hutcheon, in this volume, is a model that was forged and consolidated at the same time that the imperial difference, between northern and southern Europe, was being established.

From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, the imperial difference was cast in terms of religious rather than geopolitical terms. The imperial difference, in the making of Europe, had two decisive moments. One was the expulsion of the Jews from the Iberian Peninsula and the emergence of the "enemy from within"; the other was the Reformation and Catholic Reformation that divided Christianity and prepared the ground for the future division between North and South.⁹ However, the distinction North-South was not yet an issue. The South became an issue for the first time in the eighteenth-century Europe of Nations (from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 until the end of Napoleon's regime) that concludes with the imaginary "heart of Europe" (England, France, and Germany) in Hegel's *Lessons in the Philosophy of History* (1822). The remaking of the imperial difference and the reinscription of the South in the current Europe of Nations (that is, the European Union) is under way, even though the legacies of Orientalism are still well grounded. As a consequence, Spain and Portugal are being supported, but Turkey faces serious difficulties to be considered "one of them."

3. A third scenario would be to rethink literary history as well as the relationships between literature and history from the exteriority of the colonial difference, as illustrated above through Glissant and the Jameson-Ahmad debate, and the dilemma of writing history in the third world. To outline this scenario, the scenario of the colonial difference, is the main goal of this chapter. References to the second scenario (the national model and the imperial difference) will be made, since the colonial difference was reinscribed in the national model (as the concept of internal colonialism clearly implies) at the same time that, from the eighteenth century on, it was rearticulated with the imperial difference.

However, an effort will be made to underline what I see as the irreducible differ-

the difference in compatibility shall be maintained. This is the difference I see underlining the Jameson and Ahmad debate; I also see Glissant and Chakrabarty talking from the colonial difference rather than about it. Or, if you wish, they too talk about but mainly they talk from, not of course from essential identities but basically from colonial histories. Without this distinction, knowledge would remain in the disincorporated world of universal categories. The irreducible difference must be maintained. Otherwise, the risk is substantial of absorbing all possible epistemic locations within the universal grammar of modern epistemology and cultures of scholarship. When this happens, the colonial difference is erased and recast in a thematic "aboutness" that justifies a (legitimate) political concern about solidarity with "people without history." Obviously, the history was always there, but being told as nonhistory, as it is widely accepted nowadays.

Basically, then, my reflections here are framed in terms of literature, history and the colonial difference. My specific contribution, vis-à-vis that of the others in this volume, is to look, on the one hand, at the transition in Western (literary) history from the Renaissance concept of poetry to the Enlightenment concept of Literature, as we will see,¹⁰ and, on the other, at the making of the colonial difference when poetry and literature are put in contact and in conflict with what looks similar but that is nonetheless different in Amerindian cultures.¹¹ This was indeed reproduced in the nineteenth century vis-à-vis oral traditions in Africa, *khitab* in the Arabic world, or *brushtalk* in China, as we shall see.

WHAT IS THE COLONIAL MODEL?

The basic feature of the colonial model is the colonial difference that framed not only the notion of literature and history, but also every aspect of the social and epistemic sphere, including, of course, ethics, religion, and science, as conceived and practiced from Copernicus and Galileo to Newton. How does this model work?

Let me begin with an example from philosophy. In the late 1950s, a leading Mexican scholar of pre-Columbian studies wrote an important book titled *Nahuatl Philosophy*.¹² He was quickly criticized for defining philosophy as a set of practices and knowledges among the Aztecs that could not have been easily assimilated to what in the sixteenth century or in the 1950s was understood by philosophy in the Greco-Roman and modern European tradition. A few years later, the same author, Miguel León-Portilla, had the chance of replying to his critics. I cannot reproduce here his brilliant and, at the same time, problematic argument. León-Portilla proposed that the expansion of Western culture made unavoidable the use of Western categories to describe non-Western societies and cultural practices. However, one can argue that León-Portilla could have used Nahuatl expressions denoting and describing the act of thinking and reflecting about the nature of the universe, of human life, of the organization of society, and the regulation of the behavior of its members, and so on. He could have assumed, for example, that before Western expansion, people all over the world, and particularly those who built impressive civilizations before the sixteenth century, must have possessed some kind of "thinking" practice and, most likely, a conceptualization or description of what they were

to assume implicitly that all imaginable human activity originated in Greece and expanded over the planet since the sixteenth century. Before the sixteenth century, it would have been impossible to make a statement such as León-Portilla's. For this reason, I am making here a distinction between the macronarrative of Western civilization and the macronarrative of the modern/colonial world system. The colonial difference is a consequence and a result of the second macronarrative, although it used and contributed to the expansion of the Western civilization macronarrative, which is basically a self-centered one.

The colonial difference and, therefore, the colonial model can be described as follows: Western categories of thought put non-Western categories (and the distinction I am making here is a result of the colonial difference) in a double bind. Either non-Western cultural practices are so different from Western ones that they could not be considered properly philosophy, literature, history, religion, science, or what have you. Or, on the contrary, in order to be recognized, they have to become similar and assimilated to Western conceptualizations of cultural practices and social organization. The colonial model, including the epistemic one, did not vanish with the first wave of decolonization (in the United States, Haiti, and the Latin American countries) or the second (in India, North Africa, Indochina, and the sub-Saharan countries), but persisted in the form of internal colonialism. Thus, when Linda Hutcheon reflects on the force and persistence of the national model, it should be remembered that the national model is a particular historical version of the colonial model. In the *longue-durée*, the colonial model is constitutive of the modern/colonial world system from the sixteenth century to the North Atlantic reorganization prompted by the European Union. And its survival has been assured by the possibility of reproducing the colonial difference and the exercise of the coloniality of power. The advent of modern nation-states can be seen, from the perspective of the macronarrative of Western civilization, as a step in the teleology of progress and the accession of the bourgeoisie to economic and intellectual power. From the point of view of the modern/colonial world system, this macronarrative had two simultaneous functions. On the one hand, the emergence of the nation-state in Europe contributed to the consolidation of the narrative of Western civilization and redefined colonialism. On the other hand, nation-state building after decolonization (both the first phase in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries and the second phase, after World War II) became a replica, although with a completely different history, of the European model. Thus, nation-state never superseded coloniality; it was redefined in relation to colonialism in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Decolonization was never really achieved, either in the first phase or in the second phase. Decolonization should be conceived as a process in which important steps have been taken, but it remains as a project rather than an achievement. Of course, this is not new. A similar statement could be made in relation to emancipation that remains as a project within modernity itself, rather than a finished process. Consequently, the colonial model was embedded in the building of nation-states, as it is imbedded today in globalization and the weakening of the state by the forces of transnational finance and corporations. In the domain of culture, the colonial model is as alive today as it was in the sixteenth or even the nineteenth centuries. The difference is that the criticism of its limits is rising not only from within modernity but also, and perhaps mainly, from the exteriority of the modern/colonial world. The effort to think and imagine possible futures from the exteriority of the modern/colonial world. The

among others, Franz Fanon, Aimé Césaire, and Amílcar Cabral. More recently, such projects rethinking borders and centers have been growing in the Caribbean, Asia, Africa, Latin America, and southern Europe.¹³ Criticism of modernity from within (e.g., Marxism, postmodernism) is necessary but not sufficient. Criticism from the left is also part of the expansion and exportation of Western categories of thought. The colonial difference brings to the foreground precisely that space that has been silenced, knowledges and cultural practices that have been deprived of their own categorization and, instead, redescribed from the perspective of Western categories, whether from the right or from the left.

A critique of the colonial model reveals the fact that literature, history, philosophy, and so on, are all regional practices whose conceptualization is part of the imaginary of Western civilization. From the sixteenth century on, such a conceptualization began to be transmitted (exported and/or imported) to other regions of the planet beyond Europe and into languages beyond the colonial languages of modernity (Spanish and Portuguese first; English, French, and German later). Sarmiento, in nineteenth-century Argentina, is an example of exportation/importation of concepts and ideas. He enthusiastically endorsed the civilizing mission in nineteenth-century Argentina, similarly to the endorsement of developmental projects by Latin American governments after World War II.¹⁴ And this was precisely León-Portilla's dilemma with *philosophy* among the Nahuatl. He needed to recognize their thinking as significant — as philosophy — and by doing so played into the civilizing mission/developmental pattern. León-Portilla's solution was the opposite to Glissant's, which confronted the problem of the epistemic colonial difference directly.

To further develop this argument, I will take the emergence of the modern/colonial world and its imaginary as a point of reference. My use of *imaginary* here follows Glissant's and understands it in geopolitical rather than in psychoanalytic terms.¹⁵ This imaginary is basically grounded in the making and remaking of the colonial difference and the tensions and conflicts that go with it. Thus, the colonial model is constitutive of such an imaginary. Its initial moment was the eruption of Indias Occidentales (and in its later transformation the imagined entity became America) in the European consciousness and the need to remodel the world based on a previous Christian tripartite division of the world described in the well-known T-in-O map. As it is well known, the T-in-O map summarized the Christian imaginary. The map was contained in a circle (and "O") divided by an horizontal line locating Asia on the top of the circle and a vertical line that divided the lower part (and therefore the making of the "T") into Europe and Africa.¹⁶ The emergence of Indias Occidentales, later America, in the European consciousness had two consequences. One was the extension of Ptolemy's map and the integration of the newly discovered lands in a world-map; and, second, the projection upon it of the Christian imaginary by adding America to the previous tripartite division of the planet. Needless to say, such a conceptualization of the planet is not a mirror of an ontological reality but particular to Christian cosmology,¹⁷ and to what thereafter became Western civilization. But by no means was it universal.

Since my focus in rethinking literary history is the colonial difference, I assume that the sixteenth century was the century in which an emerging commercial circuit brought about a redefinition of various orders of the imaginary (in geopolitical terms) on both sides of the Atlantic. The description of "capitalism, modernity,

concept used to categorize certain kinds of verbal practices until the eighteenth century)¹⁹ and history both contributed to the making of the colonial difference and, consequently, to the building of the imaginary of the modern/colonial world. History, of course, came first since one of the crucial initial questions asked by Spanish men of letters was how could the Amerindians have history if they did not have letters.²⁰ Literature, or poetry, was not an issue of concern. Amerindian lack of alphabetic writing was, from the perspective of the dominant imaginary (History and Literature), a sweeping judgment that included the lack of both defining elements and the existence of something that could have been framed as literature and history. Thus, literature was implied through the question of the letter, since, by the sixteenth century, literature (poetry) was assumed to be alphabetic written pieces according to a given set of characteristics defined by rhetoric.²¹ Thus, once again, we encounter the double articulation of the colonial difference.

LANGUAGE AND GEOPOLITICAL DIVIDES: CONTINENTS, NATIONS, AND PERIODS

In pursuing this argument further, it would be important to say that rethinking literary history entails rethinking the complicity between literature, history, and alphabetic writing in Western culture. But this is only half of the story. The other half is language, that is, what languages are spoken in a given place, which ones are written languages and, among the written languages, which ones are alphabetic written languages. Furthermore, among alphabetic written languages, the issue is which ones are colonial languages and which ones are not. When Spanish missionaries in the sixteenth century thought of alphabetic writing, the languages they had in mind were Greek and Latin as foundations of the modern/colonial vernacular languages, as the paradigmatic present. But certainly they did not have in mind Hebrew and Arabic, which were the languages of the infidels and whose alphabet was not Greco-Latin. What was at stake was an implicit philosophy of language with deep religious underpinning.²² As a consequence, among the features that shaped the field of Literature (whose history began to be written in the nineteenth century) were Greek and Latin languages as the foundation of discourse classification. Poetry/Literature was defined in relation to other discursive forms, with their grounding in Greek and Latin philosophy and rhetoric—written, of course, in those classical languages. The dawn of Western vernacular languages built on and transformed the Greco-Roman's legacy.²³ From the sixteenth century onward and beyond these domains, there was also the geopolitical space of the colonial difference: the conflictive encounter of previous civilizations with the emerging Western civilization. The immense set of verbal practices and non-Western languages began to be conceptualized in terms of alphabetic writing, that is, Literature and History. In this movement, the colonial difference was established as the difference that shall be converted to the same, although becoming the same shall be done in such a way that will also remain as different. That is how coloniality of power drew the colonial difference between *Literature* and *literature*, between *History* and *history*. Coloniality of power, not exactly colonial power, has been defined by Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano as one particular aspect of power that, founded on a racial classification of people on the planet, became a crucial and constitutive strategy of modernity. In this way, the

of modernity as the modernity of power. Quijano revealed the other side, the coloniality of power. You can think about these two metaphors as the power of modernity and the power of coloniality.²⁴ The colonial difference is the exteriority of modernity and the proliferation of differences with Western civilization since 1500 is a consequence of the coloniality of power.

Consequently, rethinking literary history entails also rethinking the complicity among race, the distribution of languages, and territory in the modern/colonial world. What are the relations and historical connections among place, writing, telling stories, and producing knowledge? And once literature and history were accepted as new activities, how did they accommodate themselves to an activity whose conceptualization was alien to them? This question is not relevant, of course, for those who assumed the universal value of (Western) alphabetic writing and the system of genres attached to it. Missionaries and men of letters were making the colonial difference. Moors, Amerindians, and African slaves (but also Oriental languages and cultures) were placed in and by the colonial difference and had to respond to it.²⁵

Now, when Jameson wrote his classical and controversial article on third-world literature and late capitalism, his purpose was indeed to break down the very structure of genres and languages that structured the canon of Western literature that I have just alluded to. This aspect of the argument failed to impress Ahmad, which is understandable since he was not concerned with the need to open up the canon in the American academy that intellectuals of leftist persuasion were fighting for. And in this respect, Jameson's article is a signal contribution to such local debates and an indirect invitation to rethink literature, history, and literary history in order to bring into the picture third-world literature. But at this point and rethinking Literary History/history of literature, the consideration of three issues is in order:

1. How is it that third-world writers and intellectuals dwelling in third-world countries react, intersect, use or ignore Jameson's proposal? Ahmad's was certainly one reaction to it. Or, independently from Jameson, how do third-world writers and intellectuals conceive of or think about third-world literature or the canon and the colonial difference? Furthermore, what about the Western canon in third-world countries and the literary texts from the third world integrated to the Western canon? The canon has become a problem in the third world, at least in Latin America, as a response to and reflection of the issue being discussed in the United States academy, but the discussions I know of are oblivious to the role of colonial difference in canon formation. What does it mean to think from Bolivia, Tunisia, or India where, if Jameson is right, literature is mainly a national allegory? And if it is, what is really at stake—literature, literary history, or the nation? A detailed answer to such questions would require more extensive work in rethinking literary history than what I can undertake here. However, it is necessary to put some preliminary ideas on the table.²⁶ First of all, a basic concern of third-world education, from a leftist perspective, will not be, of course, to bring "first-world" literature into the curriculum (as Jameson does), since that was precisely the colonial project of modern and imperial nations in their making of the colonial difference. From the perspective of the third world, whether their literatures are national allegories is somehow irrelevant. However, the concern of third-world intellectuals about literature, society, and history is undeniable, although their focus may not necessarily

literature: one eye on Europe; the other, on the nation. Brazilian critic Antonio Cândido, on the other hand, is concerned with the relationships between literature and economic development. Peruvian critic Antonio Cornejo-Polar is concerned with literature and heterogeneity in a country in which the ideal of a homogeneous nation was basically hampered by the colonial difference. Brazilian critic Roberto Schwartz brought to the foreground the colonial difference under his formula of "displaced ideas" in the ideological commerce between Europe and Brazil. And Argentinian literary and cultural critic Beatriz Sarlo echoes all the previous concerns by theorizing what she called "a peripheral modernity." None of these critics refer to the colonial difference and the coloniality of power, perhaps because all of them paid more attention to modernity than to "coloniality." It is natural for Latin American intellectuals, particularly on the Atlantic Coast, to assume that colonialism ended at the beginning of the nineteenth century and to ignore the coloniality of power that permeates the modern/colonial world system. None of them pays much attention to canonicity or to whether third-world literatures are national allegories.²⁷

2. Secondly, since the idea of the third world was invented from the perspective of the "First," the perspective from the third world would not necessarily be the same, although it is often assumed to be, as in the case of Sarmiento's assumption of the civilizing mission. It would invoke, instead, the kind of perspective introduced by Glissant in his distinction between *Literature* and *literature*. From such a perspective the question is not one of transforming or changing the canon, but questioning radically the formation and the complicity between the Western canon and colonialism.²⁸

3. Would it be wrong to say that United States literature is also, and in a significant way, a series of national allegories? I do not think so. Are not French and German novels, at least those of the nineteenth century, national allegories also? If the answer is yes, and I think it is, then the question is no longer the alliance between the third world and literary national allegories, but the alliance between literature, allegory and nation-building in the West, as exported through colonization to the third world. Then, rethinking the colonial model must of necessity confront the colonial difference so embedded in national allegories as a feature of third-world literatures. Investigation of this topic may lead us to an understanding of what Jameson implied when he stated that, although third-world literatures do not compare at the same level with European literatures (he mentions Joyce and Proust), their value resides elsewhere. Certainly, in a statement such as this, the colonial difference is at work, since (western) European literatures remain the point of reference. Furthermore, since Joyce's writing itself cannot be detached from the colonial difference, it can be enacted in and from the third world, and in other locations such as Ireland. When Antonio Cândido, in 1974, reflected on literature and underdevelopment, it was implicit in his reflections that the concept of underdevelopment was not limited, during the cold war, to the sphere of economy alone.

The Western literary canon and literary historiography were and still are components of the project of modernity, even when they are challenged and criticized from inside.²⁹ While I believe that rethinking literary history from within the imperial difference is necessary (and some of the chapters in this volume...

that is, literary history from the colonial difference. This means thinking at the intersection of languages and cultural practices alien to the genealogy that goes from Greek to Latin and on to western and southern European imperial languages, and no longer independent of such traditions. The imperial difference, instead, establishes hierarchies within Europe itself. Europe as conceptualized by Hegel in his lessons on universal history had a center and several peripheries. "The three sections of Europe require therefore a different basis of classification," said Hegel. And he divides the pie as follows. The first part is southern Europe. The mountain chains that run through France separate Italy from France and Germany. He adds, "Greece also belongs to this part of Europe. Greece and Italy long presented the theatre of the World's History; and while the middle and north of Europe were uncultivated, the World-Spirit found its home here." As you may notice, Spain and Portugal are absent in Hegel's scheme. There are indeed two macronarratives that intersect in Hegel's geopolitical mapping of Europe. One is the macronarrative of Western civilization, of which Greece and Italy (Rome) offered the foundation. The other is the macronarrative of the modern/colonial world system, to which Spain and Portugal contributed in the founding with their overseas control of the Atlantic in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The imperial difference is the silence in Hegel's southern Europe. The silence becomes even louder when Hegel mentions that the second portion is the "heart of Europe." "In this center of Europe" — Hegel clearly stated — "France, Germany and England are the principal countries." That is, these were three countries in the process of becoming the new colonial powers, replacing Spain and Portugal. The third part of Europe (the northeastern states) presents a new scenario that connects Europe with Asia.³⁰

At the time Hegel was writing, it was already clear that Spain and Portugal, on the one hand, and Russia, on the other were on the margin of Europe or of the West.³¹ Hegel has described, indeed, the imperial difference within Europe itself, determined from the perspective of the second stage of modernity. At the time Hegel was writing, the imperial difference was drawn on two fronts (Europe in the south, and Europe in the northeast). Simultaneously, the colonial difference was redrawn by the emergence of Orientalism (which was the interest of new colonialisms, British and French) that displaced Occidentalism (which was the interest of Spain, Portugal, and Western Christians). This new nineteenth-century geopolitical map had enormous consequences for literature and for the history of literature. First of all, the national model analyzed by Hutcheon emerged at this junction. Second, comparative literature, a scholarly practice nonexistent before then, saw the light as a necessary consequence of comparing (national) literatures. And third, Russian and Spanish literatures paid their dues to the new geopolitical configurations in which both countries remained on the margin of the heart of Europe. The disadvantage of Russia and Spain was that they were border countries, in contact with those areas of the world where the line of the colonial difference (e.g., Orientalism at this point in time) had to be traced. Orientalism, indeed, included both: Asia in contact with Russia, and Islam (North Africa and the Middle East) in contact with Spain. The national model was a local version of the colonial model, since Hegel's universal history spilled over into the history of literature. If the heart of Europe was the reference point for mapping universal history, so were the (national) literatures of England, France, and Germany for the universal history of literature. Russia and

exteriority occupied by the Americas in the sixteenth century. Last but not least, the Americas were redefined in the new world order. South (Latin) America suffered the consequences of the marginal role occupied by Spain and of the fact that North (Anglo) America enjoyed the consequences of the central role of England in Hegel's Europe. When, in the eighteenth century, America was perceived as the future of Europe, it was Anglo, and not Latin, America that was receiving the honors. However, in both Americas and also in Haiti, decolonization brought everybody, from Patagonia to Labrador, into the national model of languages and literatures, and into the State as the model of the secular world.

Since Hutcheon deals with these issues in her chapter, I will jump now to the problem faced today by those who confront the task of writing and rethinking literary history. Valdés describes in detail two projects devoted to the literatures of the Americas and of eastern Europe. I will consider, briefly, two more, one already completed, the other in the process of completion. The first was coordinated by Ana Pizarro, a Chilean literary critic, and published by the *Memorial de América Latina* in São Paulo.³² The elaboration of the project took several years and involved some of the most distinguished Latin American literary and cultural critics (e.g., Antonio Cándido and Roberto Schwarz from Brazil, Angel Rama from Uruguay, Domingo Migliani from Venezuela, Beatriz Sarlo from Argentina, Ana Pizarro from Chile, and Gutierrez Girardot from Colombia). And it was a project conceived within the institutional frame of the International Association of Comparative Literature. All had been involved and had already published extensively when the project began to be discussed and elaborated in 1984. And the main trust of the project was to write a New Latin American literary history from a Latin American perspective. This need is understandable given the role of Latin America in history, since the eighteenth century, and its position in the entire process of nation-building. The three volumes were published 1993, 1994, and 1995 consecutively. I have elsewhere referred to this project³³ as a "successful failure." The project that was seeking a new history of Latin American literature ended up by recognizing the impossibility of writing such a history. The recognition came because of a concept of Latin America (and Latin American literature) grounded in the legacies of the Spanish and Portuguese colonialism and limited to the national languages of Spain and Portugal. This was the subcontinental model; it was, indeed, the colonial model recast by the national ideologues and nation-builders after decolonization (first half of the nineteenth century). This model ignored Amerindians as well as African Latin Americans. Consequently, it ignored, on the one hand, important Amerindian languages (Nahuatl, Quechua, Aymara, languages of Mayan roots), but also French and English Creole in the Caribbean. Once this broader context began to corrode the subcontinental-colonial model, it was difficult, and it soon became impossible, to write such a new history. The final outcome was entitled "América Latina: Palavra, Literatura e Cultura." (The title is in Portuguese, and the articles are in both Spanish and Portuguese.) There are several articles, mainly in the first volume devoted to the colonial period, on Amerindian languages and literatures. Furthermore, there is a section, with two articles, one devoted to the Anglophone and the other to the Francophone Caribbean. The three volumes were presented, finally, as a collection of essays chronologically arranged.

I am tempted to borrow Sheldon Pollock's title of his own project to characterize

literary history of South Asia? The project, now near completion, is not a literary history but a "literary cultures in history" project. Pollock, in his lengthy introduction, offers a brief history of previous literary histories and strong arguments to move in a different direction.

In Pollock's formulation "literary cultures in history" moves away from the tyranny of the literary text to encounter the materiality of aural and visual interactions, the diversity of languages and structures in a given region, and cosmologies to which aural and visual interactions respond, and which they maintain and transform. When the point of reference is South Asia, coloniality is unavoidable and, with coloniality, literary history has to confront the moment and the continuity of the rift between the languages of the region and the arrival of European languages and the very concepts of literature and history. From that moment on, literary histories of South Asia, or similar regions, cannot avoid the colonial difference and the structures of power inherent in it. Thus, when Pollock proposes to change the perspective and look at literary cultures in history rather than writing a new literary history of South Asia, he has displaced in a significant way the very notion of literature. But, at the same time, he is also displacing the idea of history by confronting his project with the frame imposed by area studies. Although area studies was mainly a social sciences enterprise, in which language was a tool or the neutral instrument of a triumphant scientific march, it redefined the place of literatures in the areas under study, particularly in the third world. Thus, in rethinking the colonial model, area studies is an issue that can no longer be avoided, for several reasons. First, when third-world cultural production is accepted as literature (as in the cases of Latin American literary boom or of Salman Rushdie), the colonial difference tends to be erased and incorporated into a universal notion of Literature. The problem is precisely the effort made by third-world writers to conform to the expectations of Literature, as Glissant would have it, and to make the reader forget the colonial difference. Current efforts in Africa, Asia, and Latin America, to reinscribe "minority" (and not just "minor") languages are projects with a different orientation than those similar to the Latin American literary boom. That they are different does not imply that there are better. It simply means that the colonial difference is first made visible by the restitution of minority, colonized languages. The second reason is that the erasure of the colonial difference should come (indeed cannot but come) from subaltern perspectives. Otherwise, there is always a risk of maintaining the colonial difference by reproducing literary texts in "major" and "minor" languages and literatures (that is, challenging the imperial difference) and suppressing "minority" (where the colonial difference is at work) languages and literary cultures.

The Oxford University Press volumes, under the general direction of Linda Hutcheon and Mario Valdés, have responded to this challenge in their own way, but also in terms of literary cultures instead of literary history. While they emphasize comparative studies rather than literary cultures in history, as Pollock does, it is also true that Pollock gives to comparativism a distinguished place in his project. It cannot be otherwise when you deal with language diversity and, above all, with the colonial difference. Or, as Pollock puts it:

[A] defining factor of a literary culture in history turned out to be the problematic idea of history itself, in another, the very absence of the literary, in yet another,

Hutcheon and Valdés cut the pie differently, but with similar concerns. They avoided offering a chronological sequencing of information and opted for mapping out the material ground, the formation of cultural institutions that are part of the production and dissemination of literary cultures.³⁶ The novelty of this project shall be seen also in the teamwork of each of the volumes' sections and in the interdisciplinarity of the participants. Examination of literary cultures and not literary texts brings to the foreground the social and institutional aspects of a complex practice that goes beyond the tyranny of texts and their interpretation. These forthcoming projects are clearly an invitation to revisit periodization as a key strategy of the colonial model.

SPATIAL PERIODIZATION AND THE MODERN/COLONIAL SYSTEM

If time was the triumphal symbol of modernity, which was defined as being at the crest of the present, time was simultaneously a weapon of coloniality of power, placing the colonial world in the doubtful place of those who did not arrive yet. The main reason I have to frame my argument in light of the modern world system is, first, to avoid the macronarrative of Western civilization, and its relentless narrative of progress, civilization, and development. The modern world system tells the story of a sociohistorical organization and a transformation of the imaginary of Western civilization that involves diverse peoples around the planet, and beyond Greece as the "origin." The modern world system is not, of course, outside Western civilization. It is a deviation, in the sense that it constitutes itself by creating an exteriority that is part of its own being. That is precisely what I call the colonial difference. While modern world system is a sociohistorical frame that describes the world we are still living in (the world of capitalism, modernity/coloniality, and the growing Atlantic circuit, from the sixteenth century to its hegemonic position in the nineteenth century), world-system analysis refers to a disciplinary perspective in the social sciences.³⁷ I start from the modern world system, but quickly depart from it by introducing the colonial dimension. I also depart from world-system analysis by introducing the epistemic colonial difference and decolonization as the final destination of scholarly analysis. In brief, I conceive three macronarrative frames (which I will identify by number): macronarrative one (Western civilization, mainly philosophical); macronarrative two (the modern world-system analysis, mainly in the social sciences), and macronarrative three (the modern/colonial world system, mainly the wide array of critical reflections on modernity/coloniality). The first two are critiques of modernity and colonialism from the epistemic perspective of modernity itself; the third is the space of critical reflections on modernity and colonialism from the perspective of coloniality.

I need the modern world system here because of its departure from the narrative of Western civilization and its origin in Greece. I have to depart from it because of the limitation of its frame. It has been built from the perspective of modernity itself as if coloniality was a derivative effect rather than a constitutive dimension. Like postmodern theories in general, an internal critique of modernity in the humanities, world-system analysis is an internal critique of modernity from the perspective of the

the location of a different critique of modernity in both the macronarrative of Western civilization and the macronarrative of the modern world system. Therefore, my rethinking of the colonial model in literary history goes together with my thinking of the location from which the rethinking may take place. In this regard, Glissant provides the model to rethink Literature and History from literature and history, that is, from the colonial difference in the modern/colonial world system.

Periodization has to be double-sided—spatial and not only temporal. The macronarrative of Western civilization (like all the critics of Western logocentrism) presupposes a chronology that goes from antiquity to the Middle Ages, to the Renaissance, to the Enlightenment, to the modern and contemporary. The macronarrative of the modern world system begins in Italy, in the fifteenth century, with the economical formation that made capitalism, colonialism, and the industrial revolution possible. Outside of the frame of Western civilization, the Middle Ages is really in the middle of nothing. The modern world-system narrative tells a different story, without any middle and including the rest of the planet, the colonized areas. Although different in scope and goals, the narratives of Western civilization and of the modern world system have both been inscribed in the project of modernity since the Renaissance. Neither offers the perspective of coloniality, which means the view from different historical and colonial experiences—in the Americas, in Asia, in Africa. Thus, periodization becomes spatial, nothing other than the location of diverse moments of the coloniality of power in which cultural practices and their conceptualization are at stake. In the case at hand, in the rethinking of the colonial model of literature and history, the singularity of the colonial differences is linked to the structure of power exercised in the material and institutional domains of aural and visual interactions—both within the modern world system (the colonial difference) and in the exteriority of the modern/colonial world system (the colonial difference). If periods have to be maintained because they are helpful in certain ways, they will be spatial more than temporal, and they will help in charting the movement of historical capitalism and colonization, which are overlapping rather than neatly successive, coexisting in contradiction rather than superseding one another. The image of and the expectations for newness and its corollaries—vanguard—so ingrained in and important for the linear chronology of Western civilization's frame will lose their clout. Spatial periodizations revealing the work of the coloniality of power is one way of rethinking the colonial model and of conceiving of literary cultures in the modern/colonial world system.

From the perspective of the modern/colonial world system we can imagine, then, three complex, spatial periods:

1. The period of colonization is a complex, nonsimultaneous event when we consider the Americas, the Caribbean, North Africa, and India, for example. Furthermore, the overall period has different rhythms depending on the colonizing country and the stage in the history of capitalism during which colonization takes place. Education, language, literacy, literature, and history will be shaped according to the languages and verbal practices under colonial rules.
2. The period of decolonization, which has to be conceived also as nonsimultaneous,

Hispanic-American countries). On the other hand, in Asia and in Africa it happened much later, starting with 1947 in India, and in the 1960s in Algeria and Tunisia. Consequently, the question of languages, literature, and history in each case varies. While in the Americas, during the nineteenth century, literature and history were mainly focused on nation-building, in North Africa in the second part of the twentieth century, the focus was on decolonization and the dangers of, rather than the enthusiasm for, nation-building.³⁸ In one case, decolonization coincided with the initial moment of nation-building in Europe. In the other case, decolonization coincided with nation-building in its decline, being challenged and displaced by transnationalization and global economy.

3. The current transnational period and the change of direction of global migrations. Up to the end of World War II, and beginning in the middle of the nineteenth century, when the first steamboat was constructed and railroads were installed all over the world, migration was mainly a movement within the imperial difference. European migrations to the Americas until the war were migrations from the center to the periphery. Since that time massive migrations have been taking place from the third to the first world. Regarding languages and literatures, the first wave of migrations remains within the imperial languages and literatures, either as major or minor. But, in the second wave of migrations, "minority" languages began to enter and transform the scenario of the modern/colonial languages of the North Atlantic. Linda Hutcheon correctly underlines, in her chapter in this volume, that new models should emerge from this new situation. The limits of the national model, the belief in the purity of language, the unity of territory, and cultural and racial hegemony are what the second wave of decolonization and the end of the cold war contributed in making evident. But this is also the moment in which the coloniality of power and the colonial model take on a new face. The crisis of the national model is not necessarily yet a crisis of the colonial model.

Be that as it may, a renewed concept and practice of comparatism will have a new role in this spatial mapping of the modern/colonial world system for several reasons. First, instead of comparing a German with an Italian novel or any other genre (which, after all, are all in the same boat), it will compare narratives in Sanskrit or Greek, independent of the notion of literature but very attentive to the modern/colonial world system and to the colonial difference. In this way, instead of assuming that there is something called literature that can be compared, comparison will illuminate the processes by which certain aural and visual practices came to be conceived as literature and bestowed with the coloniality of power. And, for the national period, bestowed with the national spirit. Comparison would center on the making and the unmaking of the colonial difference, both in literary practices and in literary scholarship, as floating signifiers to which particular traditions and conceptualization had been attached.³⁹

Since literary histories are always written in the present, the particular present in which we are rethinking literary history in this volume is a transnational present, questioning the national principles under which literary histories have been written since they began to be written. For, there was no such thing as literary history in ancient Greece and Rome, but only modern (post-Enlightenment) literary histories

France or in post-Partition India) or (sub)-continental literary histories (e.g., South Asian, Latin American, western European, North African, and so forth) has changed too. There are several interesting problems to be considered here, in comparing colonial differences and writing postnational literatures.⁴⁰ I will elaborate on some examples to make these considerations more tangible.

In the sixteenth century, History encountered its double limits, first, because Spanish missionaries, soldiers, and men of letters could tell the story and the history of their own deeds in the *Indias Occidentales*. This was the name used throughout by Spanish intellectuals, notaries, and officers of the Crown; America, in passing, has a different story to which I will come a bit back later. But the question of *history*, *religion*, and even, later on, *poetry* (since, as we have seen, at the time *literature* was not a current term and when it was used it referred to "everything alphabetically written") toward 1600 became a conceptual network drawing the epistemic colonial difference. On the other side of the definitional dividing line, whatever it was, it was not religion, poetry, or history, but it had to be rendered as history with a difference, the colonial difference. The epistemic confrontation was brutal. The Amerindians did not have the opportunity and the means to self-define for foreign eyes: immediate access to the printing presses lay in the hands of the Europeans, controlling the circulation and dissemination of information. But perhaps neither did they have the need to make sense of the foreigners who arrived and invaded their territory — because invasion it was, not just encounter or contact. If Las Casas had two religious standards, one for the pagan antiquity of Greeks and Romans and the other for the Amerindians, the same happened in all spheres of knowledge for the invaders. In sixteenth-century Europe, history was a powerful genre for producing, organizing and disseminating knowledge. This was History. For the Amerindians, preserving the past was indeed important and they had several ways to do that for the Europeans, however, that was history, and thus the Amerindians were seen as people without History.⁴¹ The same could be said for European concept of Poetry. The Aztecs engaged in ceremonies where song, dance, and decoration of the body all went together, and the purpose was not the same as the European practice of poetry. The Aztecs, of course, had a name for it: "in xochitli, in cuicatl" ("flower and song"). This, for the Spaniards, was literature.⁴² The rift was, in both cases, related to the difference in writing practices and in the conceptualization of such practices.⁴³ History and Poetry were, for sixteenth-century Europeans, a practice closely related to alphabetic writing; not so for the Amerindians, for sure, whose writing conventions were not those of the alphabet. Words, in other words, were conceptualized in alphabetic writing as units of speech, rather than as instructions to organize dates, events, or identify social functions visually (although not alphabetically). There was a split in the conceptualization of history, and the split produced the epistemic colonial difference.

Now, consider some of the problems confronting someone who rethinks the literary history of South Asia instead of the Americas. The language situation is significantly more complex, particularly for literary cultures in a more than two-millennia-old language (like Sanskrit), almost three-millennia-old (like Persian) and a three-hundred-year-old language (in India, at least), English, that is becoming a world language. To that, of course, should be added millennia-old languages such as Hindi, Bengali, Urdu, and so forth. Shall the story of these two-millennia-old languages and "literatures" be encapsulated in recent post-Renaissance categories

and because it has been done, reproducing the colonial difference, we need urgently to rethink literary histories: it is not only literary practice that gets in our way, but the very concept of literary history that becomes more cumbersome.

Thinking spatial periodization through and from the colonial difference brings translation into a different light,⁴⁴ since translation has been theorized, until recently, by assuming alphabetic writing and European languages and literatures as reference points. When the colonial side of the modern world was seen in terms of exteriority, the modern/colonial world was brought into the picture, and translation was conceived, enacted, and reproduced as the foundational tool for conversion. Translation, since the sixteenth century, operated in two directions guided by the same goal: conversion to Christianity and, later on, conversion to civility. More recently, the two directions have been guided by the principles of development and modernization. Coloniality of power established the order and direction of translation throughout the modern/colonial world. The past half-century is as good as any other period to illustrate the point I am making. Science and philosophy are translated from English, German, and French into other languages. Translations from other languages into English, German, and French are not scientific or philosophical contribution to knowledge, but, rather, content from other cultures or civilizations. Translation, seen through the colonial difference, brings a new dimension to literary cultures in history and periodization as it allows the examination of strategies of translation in "literary" (aural and visual) cultures, crossed by the coloniality of power. Translation, thus conceived, brings new light to transculturation as originally conceived by Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz. Translation as transculturation is precisely what literary cultures (instead of literary texts), as conceived by Pollock, and by Hutcheon and Valdés, requires.

Let me explain how and why. The concept of transculturation, introduced in 1940 by Ortiz was needed to correct the one-directional process of translation and acculturation in British anthropology as articulated by Polish anthropologist (resident in Britain), Bronislaw Malinowski. Geopolitically, transculturation underlined that cultural transformations do not only go from East to West but also from West to East and from north-south to south-north as it was, above all, a concept emerging in postcolonial Cuba. Like any postcolonial process today, it was a process of nation-building in a dependency relation. This relation of dependency, basically defined by the coloniality of power, was more difficult for Malinowski to perceive in England. Or if he did, he perceived it from one of the ends of the spectrum, the end where dependency and coloniality of power are generated. Aware of how the colonial difference works, and how the coloniality of power is enacted, Malinowski only saw acculturation, where Ortiz was seeing transculturation.

Now, transculturation in Ortiz is a complex concept that will help us here to displace the canonical understanding of translation, generally limited to writing and very much engraved in the imaginary of the modern/colonial world, shaping the colonial difference. When Ortiz talks about transculturation in terms of human communities, he is thinking in terms of cultural diversity in Cuba. But when Ortiz talks about transculturation of commodities, of the social life of things, he goes beyond the nation and reaches out to what today is conceptualized as the modern/colonial world. Ortiz said all of this and more in Spanish, the reason he remained for a long time untranslated into the hegemonic languages of knowledge (English,

But let us explore transculturation further and move to the domain of commodities in the making of the modern/colonial world imaginary and on how it can contribute to the rethinking of the colonial model. Ortiz points out that tobacco reached the Christian world along with the changes brought about by the Renaissance and Reformation in Europe. He suggests an interesting connection between harmless stimulants—tobacco, chocolate, tea, and coffee—and the supremacy of reason over belief in modern Europe:

One might say that reason, starved and benumbed by theology, to revive and free itself, needed the help of some harmless stimulant that should not intoxicate it with enthusiasm and then stupefy it with illusions and bestiality, as happens with the old alcoholic drinks that lead to drunkenness. For this, to help sick reason, tobacco came from the Americas and came also chocolate. And from Abyssinia and Arabia, about the same time, came coffee. And tea made its appearance from the Far East. . . . Other spices and nectars were needed that should act as spurs of the senses and the mind. And the devil provided them, sending in for the mental jousts that initiated the modern age of Europe the tobacco of the Antilles, the chocolate of Mexico, the coffee of Africa and the tea of China. Nicotine, theobromine, caffeine, and theine—these four alkaloids were put at the service of humanity to make reason more alert.⁴⁵

These observations are relevant to rethinking the colonial model. At large, as well as the place of literary history in it. First of all, Ortiz needed the concept of transculturation to underline the double process of transformation in the social life of things and their historical consequence. Translation, instead, and particularly when it became entrenched with the coloniality of power, privileges a double direction with a final destination. First, from the past to the present (e.g., translations from Greek and Latin in the making of the Renaissance and Enlightenment present) and, second, translation from modern European into colonized languages in order to propagate Christianity, the civilizing mission or to promote development and to expand the market. Transculturation, therefore, allows for a better description of the modern/colonial world necessary to rethink the colonial model in literary history. The first kind of translation, from Greek and Latin into modern (vernacular) European languages contributed to building the foundation of modernity as distinguished from tradition within the same *episteme*. The second kind of translation contributed to building the foundation of the West as distinguished from other geopolitical regions of the globe. Modernity joined coloniality at this juncture and the colonial model was mapped. History, as a narrative, contributed in both directions. And so did poetry during the Renaissance and literature after the Enlightenment. Literary history came late, in the nineteenth century, but, as I have been arguing, it complemented translations in both directions. On the one hand, it helped translation in building the Greco-Latin genealogy of European literatures and history; and, on the other, it contributed to the mapping of the reproduction of the colonial difference by distinguishing European poetry/literature from non-Western cultural practices. The national model that Hutcheon analyzes here did not overthrow the colonial model. On the contrary, it changed its configuration, as can be seen in the case of South Asia presented by Sheldon Pollock.

The modern museum (of art, of natural history, of anthropology) in Europe or North America is a good example of the canonical view of translation. Transculturation

colonial difference will bring naturally the necessity of rethinking translation and transculturation. The system of genre, in the Western tradition will have to be significantly altered. For example, literature by indigenous people is flourishing in Latin America, although not in the same way that has made Native American literature visible in the United States. Narratives are being published in native languages; weekly magazines in which this literature is published include discussions on social issues, indigenous rights, indigenous social movements, and so forth. However, beyond the surface of a standard weekly magazine published by Amerindian communities or of narratives published by Amerindian authors in Spanish or Amerindian languages, a system of genres alien to the Renaissance tradition and European literary institution is constantly at work. If, precisely, the Renaissance tradition remained, although transformed, as a ground of modern Western literature, its visibility does not imply the erasure of indigenous people's memories. It only means that indigenous memories remain invisible to the West. I am not talking here about ancestral memories of indigenous people, but memories of the present, the constant present of the modern/colonial world. Non-Western memories remain as the location of the difference, the colonial difference from subaltern perspectives. Future histories of literature would have to look at the opening and transformation of writing in languages that have been in subaltern position during the five hundred years of the consolidation of Western modernity and expansion of Western coloniality. At the intersection of translation, transculturation, and spatial periodization, literature becomes a floating signifier, without grounding in Greece and Rome, floating in the colonial difference of the modern world system. Translation should also become practice without grounding, without privileged languages or system of genres, and aware of the colonial model (e.g., framed by coloniality of power and colonial differences) that framed Western views of literature and history.

DOUBLE CONSCIOUSNESS AND THE COLONIAL DIFFERENCE

African-American sociologist W. E. B. Du Bois is justly recognized for introducing the concept of "double consciousness" into the vocabulary of the social sciences and the humanities.⁴⁶ Double consciousness, however, is not only a description of African Americans (in the United States). I would suggest that it is a description of the colonial difference from a subaltern position. What I mean is that the memory of slavery and the colonial difference in which blacks have been located (both in the colonial and national period, as implied in Du Bois's concept of double consciousness and his concerns about how to be simultaneously black and American) goes beyond the experience of black Americans. The very constitution of the colonial model implies the colonial difference, and the colonial difference generates in those who occupy a subaltern perspective a double consciousness. Double consciousness could not be a state of mind of colonizers or of nation-builders driving toward the homogenization of the nation-state, to which literature and history have contributed so much.

However, the concept of double consciousness could help in rethinking the white and *mestizo* Creoles (Latin and Anglo) in the Americas in relation to the production of literature and history.

The Creole consciousness, as it was articulated in their history and literature, had two historical moments. The first was the awareness of being a nation without the state during the colonial period in both Americas. The second was the awareness of being Americans of European descent in the margin of the West (in both Americas). It was precisely this feeling of being Western but not quite like Europeans, that defined the Creole double consciousness in the Americas. Certainly, the colonial difference was not the same in the case of African Americans (in both Americas and the Caribbean) and Creoles and their literatures and histories. White and *mestizo* Creoles were in a position of building the nation, and using literature and history to that end. Amerindians and African Americans suffered the consequences of the colonial model, being implemented by nation-builders who simultaneously reproduced the colonial model as forms of internal colonialism. The later distinction, introduced by Jameson, between first and third-world literatures has its origin in the nineteenth century, during the first wave of postcolonial literatures produced by white and *mestizo* Creoles, Latin and Anglo.

In Latin America, and before the emergence of the lettered city analyzed by Angel Rama,⁴⁷ Amerindian intellectuals at the end of the sixteenth and the beginning of the seventeenth centuries wrote histories and chronicles in which a particular configuration of double consciousness was at work. At the time, the question was not formulated in terms of how to be Amerindian and Spanish (or Christian) at the same time, but in the form of conflict between the needs and the forms of preserving and reproducing memory. In these histories and chronicles, written either in either Spanish or Amerindian languages, the colonial difference appears in terms different from those authored by Spaniards. In Amerindian narratives, the colonial difference brought about a double consciousness articulated in terms of writing, time and memory.⁴⁸ Narratives from the Spanish perspective naturally maintained a clear distinction between European Renaissance genres, in which the narrative was cast, and the New World topics of the narrative. I write *naturally* because Spanish men of letters (as well as French and English, in the nineteenth century) assumed that European Renaissance genres were the universal frame in which to talk about the diversity of the world. There is no room for double consciousness in a perspective that is monotopic through and through. Double consciousness is not only a question of the enunciation, but also a question of the enunciation. Consequently, I would like to argue that what is missing in all history of literatures known until today is precisely the focus on double consciousness, which is to say, on the enunciation from the colonial difference. For that very reason, translation and transculturation should become fundamental tools for future literary histories.

I have been emphasizing *memories* and *the past* rather than *literature* for reasons that should be obvious by now and that are at the core of rethinking literature and literary history. We have seen that Poetry in the Greek tradition was conceived in terms of mimesis, and was associated with alphabetic writing during the Renaissance. When Literature, as in Glissant formulation, displaced Poetry as the generic name of an educated practice in the eighteenth century, it carried with it that legacy of mimesis and alphabetic writing to which it added an aesthetic dimension.⁴⁹ Such is, of course, the canonical outline of a literary history which, like many other histories, begins in Greece. Now, the story, of which mine is just a sketch, never existed as such: it was an invention of the Renaissance. Before that time, the story

already made this point, it is crucial to keep it constantly in mind. Up to the twelfth century, to offer a point of reference, the amount of interaction between Greek, Arabic, and Latin was the same, in spite of what might have been said from the perspective of any one given language and culture about the other. During the Renaissance, Arabic began to be imagined as the interior exteriority of a world order that began to change, particularly with the defeat of the Moors by the Castilians at the end of the fifteenth century. Once Arabic vanished from the view of emerging vernacular languages with their links to Greek and Latin, the lineage and the backbone of Western civilization were reconfigured and the making of colonial differences became possible. Literary history, in modern times, followed suit and located the origin of poetry, drama, and epic (the pillar of literary history) back in Greece.

The problem, of course, is not that sixteenth-century Europe invented its own genealogy in literary as well as in other kinds of history. The problem is not that sixteenth-century Europe made history a central concept of its cosmology. The problem is that this particular or regional genealogy was projected to a universal dimension. One of the reasons it is so difficult to get out of the dichotomy particular/universal is that the universalization of a historical particular deprived all other imaginable particulars of the will and the right to universality. Thus, Literature imposed itself and controlled, as colonial difference—the diversity of literatures. Therefore, to rethink literature and literary history at this point means to bring colonial difference into the light, and take it beyond the dichotomy of the particular-universal. Translation, from the perspective of colonial difference (that is, from subaltern perspectives), as described above, could be a methodological tool to decolonize both the concepts of literature and of literary history.

If a literary history (in these examples from the Americas) is at all possible, its origins shall be located at that moment in which the Greco-Roman literary legacies find their discontinuity in the encounter with the literature (songs, narratives) of Anahuac and Tawantinsuyu.⁵⁰ This first discontinuity within the classical tradition that the Americas brought about is also the moment of intersection of the two macronarratives of the Western world: the macronarrative of Western civilization and the macronarrative of modernity or, better yet, of modernity/coloniality and the modern/colonial world. This originary discontinuity is simultaneously the emergence of the colonial difference that was reproduced in subsequent imperial articulations of the modern/colonial world. Thus, literature and literary histories in the modern colonial world were practiced and conceived of in two interrelated domains:

1. literature and history as two genres in the rhetorical distribution of discourse and as institutional practices linked to alphabetic writing and the Western conception of literacy;
2. literature and history were imagined—in a recursive manner—as belonging to a given language and to a given territory, at the same time that there was a given set of languages (e.g., modern vernacular) in which such imaginary was put in place. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century this version of the colonial model was enacted under the leadership of the church-state; from the eighteenth century on, the leader-

Consequently, literary history of/in the Americas—as in/of South Asia, Maghreb, France, or Mexico—must of necessity reject the universalizing of one single type of human practice into the very definition of *literature*. Literary cultures in history as defined above shall be understood as the materiality of aural and visual cultural practices. The conceptualizations of such practices are, on the one hand, particular to a given local history and, on the other, have been in conflictive dialogue, in the past five hundred years, with Western civilization and the modern/colonial world.⁵¹

For instance, Howland relates that *hanzi* or *kanji* were Chinese characters used by educated men for purposes of literary and official communication.⁵² It was possible, therefore, for the Chinese and the Japanese, to converse by writing (as by e-mail today) since writing was common to both but aural language was not shared. Brushtalking was the designation for this particular kind of interaction. Howland adds,

As a language phenomenon, then, the brushtalks are neither speech nor text; they defy these primary categories. The brushtalks are rather, I believe, the purest example I have seen of a *written linguistic code*. . . . We can provisionally think of this code as “Chinese writing,” and consider them similar to what the Chinese would call *hanwen* and the Japanese *kanbun*. Indeed, the code incorporates aspects of both Chinese and Japanese languages.⁵³

This is entirely different from what occurs in the West. However, “brushtalks” cannot be described without reference to Western civilization’s inherent distinctions between speech and writing, literacy and orality and its concomitant system of genres. Now, the interesting question is whether at this point a history of literature can be conceived of in China or Japan, that is, independently from the West, without contamination with Western artistic (literature) or disciplinary (literary history) practices. It may not be possible any longer due to the nineteenth-century relations between China and Japan with the West: and, in the twentieth century, because of Maoist China, or because of capitalism. Would the colonial difference explain this impossibility, even though neither China nor Japan were colonized by the West in the same way than Mexico or India had been? In Japan, *Bungaku* as translation of *literature* did not exist before the Meiji restoration of 1868; that is, before the contact with the West began to intensify. This phenomenon can be easily understood since it is one of the foundational strategies in the making of colonial difference.⁵⁴ A category such as *indians* to name all the inhabitants in the New World did not exist. Each community had its particular name, as much as in Japan different cultural practices had their names.⁵⁵ In Japan *kanbun* designated Chinese script and *kanbungaku* became the name to designate any text written in *kanbun*. However, coloniality of power was maintained and the colonial difference reproduced, even though there was no territorial settlements as there were in the Americas, in South Asia, or in Africa. The colonial difference here goes beyond territorial possession or political control: it is the hidden spirit of Western civilization engrained today in ever expanding capitalism’s new forms of coloniality, the global coloniality of power.⁵⁶

To push this argument further, let us recall the Borgesian story about Averroes.⁵⁶ In this story Averroes is translating Aristotles’ *Poetics* and he pauses because he does not know how to translate *imitation* from Greek to Arabic. From the window of his study he sees a crowd of children playing in the garden. The reader is shown the

that they are pretending to be something different from what they are, Averroes returns to his desk but, surprisingly for the Western reader, he still does not find a satisfactory translation of the word *mimesis*. At the time of Averroes' translation of Aristotle, Latin, Greek, and Arabic interacted daily in the Mediterranean. However, *mimesis* was not a concept that came naturally in the Arabic language; thus the paradox of Borges's story. It was not a lack, of course, since Greek philosophy did not relate then to Arabic within a structure of power, of the imaginary of the modern/colonial world. Consequently, if new histories of literatures are possible (and necessary), they have to become histories of the making (colonial discourses) and unmaking (decolonizing discourses) of colonial difference in the ample domain of writing, such as telling stories, singing, performing, addressing death, as in ancient Mexico "in xochitl, in cuicatl," remembering the past, and imagining the future. (See Hutcheon, in this volume.) That is, they must operate in the domain of creativity that goes beyond the institutional control of learned institutions from the university to those private clubs or reading groups⁵⁷ for the promotion of arts and literatures. Literary cultures in history have been crossed by colonial differences, and this crossing could become the domain for future histories of literatures whose project would be oriented toward undoing the colonial model.

LITERATURE AND HISTORY IN COEXISTING COLONIAL/SUBALTERN MODERNITIES

The nineteenth century was a period of transformation in the imaginary of the modern/colonial world and, consequently, in the role of literature and history in the making of the colonial difference. However, such changes do not appear as radical when viewed from the consolidation of the very concept of national languages, national literatures, national histories, and national histories of literatures. The nineteenth century was the period of consolidation of Europe of Nations and of a new stage of global, colonial expansion. Decolonization in the Americas (the United States, Haiti, Spanish America) was either ignored or remained marginal in the universal history set up by Hegel in 1822.⁵⁸ The first English colonies in the Americas obtained independence in 1776. In 1804, Black Creoles and some slaves recently brought from Africa were successful in obtaining the independence of Haiti, guided by the philosophy of the Rights of Man and of Citizens and the French Revolution of 1789. Between 1810 and 1830 new nations emerged out of the end of Spanish vicerealties. This period in European history also marks the transition from Dutch, English, and French colonialism before the (French and the industrial) revolutions and the hegemony of the Spanish Empire to its nineteenth-century version when England and France took the civilizing mission into their own hands.

Social movements and profound social transformations always go together with a literature and history that announce, enact and continue the achievements, the misgivings and doubts of those changes. What I am suggesting is that future literary histories could tell the story of how literature and history not only contributed and are contributing to political decolonization, but how they have also initiated a move toward decolonization of history and literature themselves. Glissant's distinction between *littérature* and *littérature*

wave of decolonization in the Americas and of the French Revolution. These two parallel events (decolonization in the exteriority of the system and revolution in its interior) reconverted the terms in which coloniality of power was exercised and the colonial difference mapped. Literature as national allegory was, in the nineteenth century, common to both Europe and the Americas, although at different ends of the spectrum of the colonial difference. In the Americas nation-building and decolonization were one and the same movement. In Europe, there was not, obviously, such a thing as decolonization; nation-building went together with a new wave of colonial expansion.

Let us pursue this double side of nation-building and national allegories a little bit further. Rethinking literary history might include comparative or relational studies between the first and second stages of decolonization. The first stage occurred basically in the Americas, the second stage in Asia (India) and Africa (Algeria, Tunisia, Senegal, etc.). The Cuban revolution, and its literature and history, brought a new and interesting dimension in the context of the second stage of decolonization for two reasons. One is that it is a socialist revolution projecting a socialist future, instead of the democratic one aimed at by decolonization in Africa and in Asia. However, in the larger picture of the modern/colonial world system, the Cuban revolution suffered the consequences of moving away from a form of colonialism that preached democracy and fell in the hands of the opposite, preaching socialism. The literature and the history of literature that the revolution promoted were caught in this tension. The second reason, and a consequence of the first, was the Cuban immigration to the United States that contributed to a new stage of literature, a bilingual and transnational literary production that emerged, worldwide, around the 1970s and introduced a complication into the literary historical picture.

This came into being because bilingual and transnational literature altered two basic principles of previous literary history: the unity of a given language and the unity of a given geohistorical domain (a country, a group of countries united by a common language, a continent or a subcontinent). Therefore, literature as national allegory, may not be necessarily a feature of third-world literature but of national literatures themselves after decolonization. National allegories may simply be a by-product of nation-building in Europe after the French Revolution and of decolonization in the Americas in the nineteenth century, in Africa and Asia in the second half of the twentieth century. What remain to be explored are the particularities of national allegories on each side of the colonial difference. Emancipation in Europe led to nation-building together with colonial expansion. Liberation in the Americas, Asia, and Africa was confronted with the processes of nation-building at the receiving end of colonial expansion. The "success" of the United States should not obscure the fact that nation-building in the nineteenth century was not the same in the United States as in France, England, or Germany. And this fact encroached upon the shape of literature and literary history on both sides of the Atlantic and at the two sides of the colonial divide. Once European literature (mainly French, English, and German) since the eighteenth century (in the second stage of modernity) became the model to be imitated both in the postcolonial countries of the Americas and in the new colonies in Asia and in Africa. Literature in terms of the materiality of reading and writing, telling and listening practices — and in terms of literary cultures in history — changes its configurations at the intersection of *littérature* and

I have been elaborating on from the beginning of this chapter is the tip of an iceberg that begins to melt in planetary waters.

Briefly stated, from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries, literature and history experienced a discontinuity with the classical tradition and contributed to the making of colonial difference. Thus, national allegories after the first wave of decolonization had to confront such discontinuity, while national allegories, in western Europe, contributed to the continuity of the classical tradition.⁵⁹ The colonial difference was mapped all over the world, even when nation-building was not, as in nineteenth century Africa and Asia, a concern and a motivating force as it was in Europe and in the Americas. The Arabic and Muslim world, the Americas, and China were three of the complex language/territories on which colonial difference was established. The intersection of the Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition with Christian philosophy provided the foundation of the colonial model upon which differences, the colonial differences, were conceived and described. From the nineteenth century on and until the second half of the twentieth century, literature and history maintained the Greco-Roman tradition, although transformed by the philosophy of the Enlightenment and the new articulation between bourgeois nation-state and secular universalism.⁶⁰ The *Orbis Universalis Christianus* was displaced, but not replaced, by the Kantian ideal of a *Cosmo-polis*, a global society (*polis*) that would follow the law of nature (*cosmos*). Consequently, the colonial difference was redefined in relation to the Islamic and Arabic worlds⁶¹ and China,⁶² and reconverted into new forms of colonialism (the civilizing mission instead of the Christian one) in South Asia and North and sub-Saharan Africa. Furthermore, this was also the period in which the colonial difference (that, at the time, took the form of Orientalism) was complemented, in Europe itself, by the emergence of the imperial difference — that is, the difference between the north and the south.⁶³ Future literary histories should explore the making of the imperial difference, of which Hegel was the culmination, in his lesson of universal history, and Kant a predecessor in his lectures on anthropology from a pragmatic point of view published at the end of the eighteenth century. The significance of this moment for literary cultures in history is that it coincided with a new distribution of discursive and disciplinary formation that replaced the rhetorical model that dominated literary institutions since the Renaissance.⁶⁴ Consequently, the rhetorical model had to be redefined in relation to a new order of discourses that included a new conception of sciences and, later on, the coming forth of the social sciences. The colonial model was updated as science, rather than theology, that became a guiding principle of rational inquiry and rational behavior. Reactions, adaptations and protests from the colonial difference varied considerably in relation to what happened from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century under Spanish and Portuguese hegemony and the Renaissance colonial model of literature and history. These vary considerably in two respects:

1. From the sixteenth to the eighteenth century it was still possible to think in terms of parallel verbal (oral and written) practices — at least in China, Japan, India, Islam, or sub-Saharan Africa — all of them in conflict with and aware of, but not colonized by, the West. By the end of the nineteenth century, practically the entire planet was in a situation similar to that of the Americas from the sixteenth to the eighteenth centuries. This was the moment in which Western hegemony was established, and

although it did not have hegemonic power. Early Dutch colonial establishments in South Asia were basically commercial in nature without any symbolic impact in the imaginary of the modern/colonial world. The force and symbolic power of the civilizing mission would come later, in the nineteenth century and under the leadership of England and France. This is the moment of consolidation of Western hegemony. The colonial difference was all over the place, so to speak, whether or not a given civilization or cultural unit was under direct colonial control. Literature and history, the Western concept of literature and history, contributed to these processes.⁶⁵

2. Consequently, it was not until the end of the seventeenth century that Western concepts of literature and history began their road toward universality. This moment coincided with the emergence and consolidation of the national ideology and the complicity, in it, of national languages, national literatures and national histories. Universal histories, à la Hegel, were deeply shaped by national ideology, although the colonial model remained as the main frame. Therefore, it will not come as a surprise to discover that national allegories are a by-product of this particular intersection of nationalism and coloniality in the resemantization of the colonial difference.

COLONIALITY OF POWER AND BILANGUAGE LITERATURES IN A POSTNATIONAL ERA

I have here been rethinking literary history and literary cultures in history spatially, from the sixteenth century onward. I have done so by reflecting on the space “in-between” the consolidation of Western civilization, from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment (and the imperial difference that established a spatial distribution between the two moments, the north and the south of Europe), and the making and transformation of colonial difference. In so doing, I was trying constantly to maintain on the horizon cultural practices that, from the perspective of Western civilization, were conceived as literature and history, simultaneously providing the foundation of the colonial model. It was necessary to keep within reach the multiple responses (from the Americas, Africa, or Asia) and not let them be hidden by an increasing and imposing march of literature and history as colonial models of verbal practices and narratives of the past. It was also necessary to open up a new perspective from the colonial difference, to which Glissant offered a starting point, and that is being reconceptualized as literary cultures in history.⁶⁶ In those considerations, many different languages and writing systems were convoked and compared with the vernacular and colonial languages of modern Europe and with the particular European conception of alphabetic writing. Thus, rethinking the colonial model of literature and literary history implies a rethinking from the materiality of writing systems and their order in the hierarchy established by the coloniality of power. If I have distinguished two spatial and temporal moments (rather than periods in the sense of Western macronarratives, from Greece to today's North Atlantic), I did not want to imply that once the second appeared the first vanished. To think in those terms would be to maintain the matrix of linear macronarratives and its obsession with progress and newness (as in the *avant-garde*)⁶⁷ instead of thinking in terms of

of the past in the present, particularly by bringing to the foreground the silences produced by standard literary histories based on what there is rather than on what was done.

Since the 1970s literary practice has taken a detour from national ideology and aesthetic and has begun to build a transnational landscape. It is certainly true that Sanskrit and Latin contribute to map cosmopolitan cultures.⁶⁸ But these cultures were not transnational in the same sense, since there was not a national model to work with. Transnationalism, after the 1970s, is simultaneously postnational, while in the case of Sanskrit and Latin it is a prenational cosmopolitanism. What literary cultures after the 1970s are doing is, basically, detaching languages from territories by revealing the principles underlying the consistent relations between the celebration of purity of language and purity of blood, which is a basic feature of the colonial model reconverted into the national model.⁶⁹ The question that imposes itself at this point is whether literary history of postnational literatures will still be written under the premises of national historiography or of history as a discipline. Remember that the social sciences came forth in the nineteenth century and historiography was redefined accordingly.⁷⁰ The social sciences and historiography in the nineteenth century participated in the process of nation-building. However, before coming back to this point in my concluding remarks, let me explore the question of postnational literatures further and once more take Latin America as a point of reference.⁷¹

In the national period (from early nineteenth to around 1970) literature, in Latin America, became a major cultural production of national intellectuals. By national intellectuals I mean those who, after independence and during nation-building processes, took the place occupied in the previous century by Creole intellectuals under Spanish colonial rules. National intellectuals were also creoles during the nineteenth century, and, in the twentieth century, one could talk about immigrant intellectuals. Immigrant intellectuals became entrenched in and with the national model, and, for that reason, national intellectual is a descriptive category encompassing both. Creole and immigrants have one thing in common: their sense of being out of place and displacement.

In any event, while literature and history (in the sense provided by the colonial model) were two of the major discursive genres accompanying nation-building, they did not occupy in postcolonial countries the same position that they did in the Europe of Nations: thus, the diversity of meanings that national allegory may take at different ends of the colonial difference. In postcolonial countries engaged in nation-building, politics was a constant demand; and they responded to such demands by writing literature as well as history, political tracks, and essays. The essay was a second literary genre of enormous importance during this period. As a matter of fact, and as Roberto Gonzales Echeverría suggests, two of the most influential literary works of the nineteenth century were historical essays: *Facundo: Civilization and Barbarism*, by the Argentinian writer and politician Domingo Faustino Sarmiento, and *O Sertão*, by Brazilian writer and politician Euclides D'Acuna.⁷²

National intellectuals, contrary to their Creole predecessors under Spanish rule, were seriously concerned with Europe. Their literary and historiographical practices were simultaneously concerned with building the nation and with asserting an identity different from Europe but European nonetheless. That is, they articulated national allegories in the tension of their exteriority, of their living in and experienc-

and South that had been traced in Europe: from the second half of the eighteenth century. Spatial periodization is here working at its best in the rearticulation of the colonial model in the conflictive process of nation-building and the remaking of the colonial difference.

These two general lines of concerns, the relation between the Americas and Europe and the increasing division between the two Americas, shapes literary production and literary history until the 1970s. From 1970 to today, an increasing postnational literary production has opened up a new dimension of colonial difference in several new directions:

1. the re-emergence, since the 1970s, of Amerindian languages and cosmologies;⁷³
2. the rising relevance of Francophonie in the Caribbean;⁷⁴
3. the rearticulation, from the United States and from the South, of the relationships between Latin and Anglo America;⁷⁵
4. the emergence of a powerful Latino/a literary and intellectual production in the United States.⁷⁶

A study of literary cultures in history that begins from these recent literary productions has to be attentive to bilinguals and denationalizing literary practices and historiographical narratives. Certainly, one cannot blindly endorse fragmentation and transnationalism, since these features are also being celebrated by theoreticians of transnational corporations. What is at stake, however, is the critical possibility offered by such literary practices. At once a critique of the national and the colonial model, they also offer also a critical venue against the transformation of literature into commodities by an all-encompassing market that has the power to transform criticism into commodity. For, what would be the goal of rethinking literature, history, the national and the colonial model? Why should we do anything other than to contribute to intellectual decolonization? And not, of course, only from the tyranny of the past framed by the colonial and the national model, but also from its reproduction in the present under the forms of global coloniality imposing a civilizational model guided by the market and the will to possess.

CONCLUDING REMARKS: OTHERWISE THAN LITERATURE AND HISTORY

Invoking globalization to rethink literary history is necessary, but it can hardly offer a new model for literary studies from the perspective of the colonial difference. It could indeed be a project that goes parallel to global hegemonic designs toward homogenization. At this point in history, designs for global literary history cannot be made but from the hegemonic epistemic location of the North Atlantic and grounded on the epistemological principles of modernity. Hegel's universal history cannot be reproduced under the name of global designs. A project such as the one underlined by Sheldon Pollock on the literary cultures in history in South Asia shows that the future will demand from us, humanists and social scientists concerned with the past, the multiplication of local histories, including the local histories of

Decolonization of literary history and of cultures of scholarship seem to be one of the possible roads to follow. The term *decolonization* is generally a word that signals a perspective from the third world, from those who lived and experienced the memories of colonization. The word (and the project that the word implies) is not of courses restricted to third-world discourses and intellectual projects. Decolonization can also be claimed by discourses and intellectual projects emanating from the first world. In this case, decolonization becomes a dissident and internal critique within the sphere of colonizing projects, like, for instance, that of Bartolomé de las Casas in the sixteenth century, or Jean-Paul Sartre and Noam Chomsky in the twentieth. Decolonization can be embraced from both perspectives, but they remain different: one, if made from within the local histories, projecting and enacting global designs; the other, made from the exteriority in which local histories that do not participate in the making of global designs have to deal and live with. Thus, in this case, decolonization is conceived and enacted from the perspective of the colonial difference.

My use of decolonization, as the reader may have guessed, intends to be located in and complicitous with the sphere of the colonial difference. I follow here Moroccan philosopher Abdelkhebir Khatibi, who defines decolonization as the counterpart of deconstruction. "Deconstruction," says Khatibi, "as dislocation of Western metaphysics and in the sense that Derrida has defined and practiced it, went together, in a very peculiar manner, with *decolonization* as a historical event. This encounter between deconstruction and decolonization is far from being just a simple coincidence."⁷⁷ Decolonization implies a double task or, better yet and to use Khatibi's own terms, a *double critique*: On the one hand, the deconstruction of Western logos and ethnocentrism that spread over the world; on the other hand, in Arabic societies, a critique that emerged from within their own local history. Decolonization is then a double critique from the perspective of some who, in this case, operate in two languages and within the colonial difference and in two epistemologies that have been placed in confrontation in the making of the modern/colonial world: by the Spaniards first (in the sixteenth century) and then by the French (in the nineteenth century). The irreducible difference, beyond their complicities, between deconstruction and decolonization is the monolingual limit of Derrida (*vis-à-vis* Arabic language, history, epistemology, sensibility) and the bilingual potentials of Khatibi (*vis-à-vis* both Western metaphysics and Arabic knowledge, history, and sensibility). Coloniality is precisely the conflictive bridge between the two and from which historical claims for decolonization emerge.

If Khatibi invokes decolonization from the exteriority of the modern/colonial world, philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas does it from the difference within, from the perspective of Jewish history in the modern/colonial world, after the Jewish expulsion from Spain in the late fifteenth century. Keeping in mind the coincidences and parallels between decolonization and deconstruction, we should note that in 1964 Lévinas conceived Platonism as a form of colonization. Plato's intelligible world appears, from the perspective of the anti-Platonic stance taken by contemporary philosophy, as an entity that precedes history and the languages of diverse cultures. This world, said Lévinas, dominates historical cultures. He further continues:

There would exist a culture whose role would consist in devaluing the cultures that are

If Platonic philosophy and its Western legacy are conceived as colonization, contemporary philosophy (which is anti-Platonic) faces, for Lévinas, the necessary task of decolonization: "L'oeuvre politique de la décolonisation se trouve ainsi rattachée à une ontologie — à une pensée de l'être, interprétée à partir de la signification culturelle, multiple et multivoque."⁷⁹

Lévinas's early conceptualization, cast in terms of decolonization, is what Derrida, in 1967, would reframe in terms of deconstruction.⁸⁰ In any event, both projects have one thing in common: they are critical projects of Western metaphysics from within Western metaphysics itself. Both projects are part of what I called above the macro-narrative of Western civilization. Khatibi, instead, places decolonization "in-between" both the macronarrative of Western civilization and of the modern/colonial world. Modern/colonial world means, historically, that the colonization I am referring to made the modern/colonial world was entrenched with capitalism, both its cause and consequence. To say, as Derrida does, that "Toute culture est originellement coloniale"⁸¹ is to pronounce a universal statement ("toute culture") from within the regional frame of macronarrative one, the macronarrative of Western civilization. To propose, like Khatibi, a double critique of Western metaphysics and of Arabic legacies is to pronounce a statement from the historical configuration of macronarrative three, the macronarrative from the perspective of coloniality. It was this narrative that placed the West and the Arabic world in the epistemic and political conflicts from which Khatibi conceives this double critique. And it is from positions such as that of Khatibi's or that I located my rethinking of the colonial model.

But let me still add one more specification, placing Lévinas in between Khatibi and Derrida. In one of his major books, *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*, Lévinas dedicates the book: "To the memory of those who were closest among the six million assassinated by the National Socialists, and of the millions on millions of all confessions and all nations, victims of the same hatred of the other man, the same anti-semitism." In his closing remarks to the same book he makes also a passing, but significant, remark on violence: "The true problem for us Westerners is not so much to refuse violence as to question ourselves about a struggle against violence which, without blanching in non-resistance to evil, could avoid the institution of violence out of this very struggle. Does not the war perpetuate that which is called to disappear, and consecrate war and its virile virtues in good conscience?"⁸²

The main argument of the book was to detach subjectivity from essence and install the reflection on "being" in another dimension, the dimension of human interaction, of alterity, of the relation with the other. Lévinas's reflection on *being* is pursued from the margins of mainstream Western philosophy, although Lévinas is constantly reading the philosophical canon. Lévinas speaks from the imperial difference, the location of the Jews in the modern/colonial world, the "enemies from within" since their expulsion from Spain in the sixteenth century, at the same time as the Moors (where the colonial difference began). Conceiving otherwise than being then means thinking being beyond its ontology, and beyond the Western historicity that gave rise to its interactive and interhuman dimension. If for Lévinas Jewish history allowed him to perceive being beyond the purity of Western civilization, colonial difference opens up still another dimension of being, the coloniality of being. There is significant fracture in the philosophical tradition if we read Lévinas

But not only that. In the last analysis, rethinking the colonial model implies thinking about the metaphysics of its historicity and the historicity of another metaphysical dimension.

If the politics of (epistemic) decolonization is related to a philosophy of being, there is still another space from which to pursue that reflection, and that is the space of the colonial difference. Lévinas's other cannot be exported to the colonial difference where the Western concept of subject, even if it is crossed by the imperial difference, does not hold.⁸³ Rethinking literary history from the colonial difference implies decolonizing literary history, and in its turn it implies thinking in terms of otherwise than literature and history. To pursue this project is necessary, in order to have narratives of what has been silenced: the relentless responses from the colonial difference to the relentless making of the colonial difference, more particularly, of the multiple and multivocal acts of saying that escape translation and goes beyond the interpretation of the said, that cannot be interpreted from the philosophy of being (*la pensée de l'être*) we have at hand.

Rethinking the colonial model should go together with efforts to undo it. And one way to undo it is to reveal the play of the colonial and imperial differences, to extract them from their historical naturalness and to deploy them as the work of the coloniality of power, to deploy coloniality as the other side of modernity. Consequently, if the foundations of literary histories criticized in this volume by Hutcheon and Valdés are the foundations of modernity, and a concept of Man that went together with the conceptualization of Being, literary cultures in history should go together with a diversification of Being. While Lévinas already took a crucial step in reflecting on otherwise than being, so did those who have been working on decolonization and thinking from the colonial difference in the past thirty years from Fanon to Enrique Dussel, from Khatibi to Quijano, from Amílcar Cabral to Gloria Anzaldúa.⁸⁴ They have been charting the terrain and uncovering another dimension of Being. Rethinking the colonial model, in literature and history as well as in every dimension of life, cannot be done from by assuming a universal dimension of being as cast in Western metaphysics. Another being grounded in the experience of modern coloniality is not only required, but it is already available. The question I asked at the end of the preceding section — what is at stake in rethinking literary history? — may have now one possible answer, whose formulation I leave in the readers's hands.

My sincere thanks to Linda Hutcheon, for her careful reading and insightful comments; and to Sheldon Pollock for sharing with me his manuscript and his time explaining the project on literary cultures in history, and in South Asia.

NOTES

1. Edouard Glissant, *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*, trans. J. Michael Dash (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia [1981], 1989), especially the section "History, Histories, Stories," 61–96.
2. Emmanuel Lévinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, [1961] 1969).
3. Fredric Jameson, "Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism," *Social Text* 15 (1986): 65–90. Also see 115–167.

4. Dipesh Chakrabarty, "Postcoloniality and the Artifice of History: Who Speaks for 'Indian' Pasts?," *Representations* 37 (1992): 1–26; "Provincializing Europe: Postcoloniality and the Critique of History," *Cultural Studies* 6.3 (1992): 337–357.
5. On the colonization of America, the emergence of the Atlantic commercial circuit, and the inception of modernity/coloniality, see Anibal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein, "Americanness as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World-System," *ISSA (International Social Sciences Association)* 134 (1992): 549–554 and Walter D. Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999), chap. 1. On colonial education in Spanish America, see Pilar Gonzalbo Aispurú, *Historia de la educación en la época colonial: La educación de los criollos y la vida urbana* (México: El Colegio de México, 1990); Ignacio Osorio Romero, *La enseñanza del Latin a los indios* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1990). On the education of colonial India, see Gauri Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest: Literary Study and British Rule in India* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1989).
6. Walter D. Mignolo, "Teorías literarias o teorías de la literatura?, Qué son y para qué sirven?," in *Teorías literarias en la actualidad*, ed. Graciela Reyes (Madrid: Ediciones El Arquero, 1989), 41–78.
7. Regarding History see Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of the Renaissance: Literacy, Territoriality and Colonization* (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1995), chaps. 3 and 4; regarding Literature, see Walter D. Mignolo, "Palabras pronunciadas con el corazón caliente: Teorías del habla, del discurso y de la escritura," in *América Latina: Palabras, Literatura e Cultura*, ed. Ana Pizarro (São Paulo: Memorial de América Latina, 1993), 1, 527–564; Elizabeth Hill Boone and Walter D. Mignolo, eds., *Writing without Words: Alternative Literacies in Mesoamerica and the Andes* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994); Walter D. Mignolo, "(Re)modeling the Letter: Literacy and Literature at the Intersection of Semiotics and Literary Studies," *On Semiotic Modeling*, ed. M. Anderson and F. Merrell (The Hague: Mouton de Gruyter, 1991), 357–394.
8. See Hayden White, "The Historical Text as Literary Artifact," in *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1978), 81–100; and *Figural Rhetoric: Studies in the Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999), 1–42; Lionel Gossman, *Between History and Literature* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1990).
9. Franco Cassano, *Il pensiero meridiano* (Bari: Laterza et Figli, 1996).
10. For this transition in the Spanish world, see Luis Gil Fernández, *Panorama social del humanismo español (1500–1800)* (Madrid: Editorial Alhambra, 1980). For the French world, see Marc Fumaroli, *L'Âge de l'éloquence: Rhétorique et "res literaria" de la Renaissance au seuil de l'époque classique* (Genève: Librairie Droz, 1980). For the Renaissance in general, see Barbara Kiefer Lewalski, ed., *Renaissance Genres: Essays on Theory, History and Interpretation* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986). About the transformation of poetry into literature and poetics into aesthetic, literary history, and literary criticism, see Alain Viala, *Naissance de l'écrivain: Sociologie de la littérature l'âge classique* (Paris: Editions de Minuit, 1985).
11. For a straightforward account of such conflicts see, for instance, *Literatures: Supplement to the Handbook of Middle American Indians*, ed. by Munro S. Edmonson with the assistance of Patricia A. Andrews (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1985). In this volume "literatures" are classified by languages (Nahuatl, Yucatecan Maya, Tzotzil, Quiché, Chorti Mayan), as if since time immemorial people speaking these languages had invented a concept of literature. For a critical view of these assumptions, see my "Palabras pronunciadas con el corazón caliente" and "Lógica das Diferenças e Política das Semelhanças: Da Literatura que Parece História ou Antropologia e Vice-versa," in *Literature e História na América Latina*, ed. Lígia Chiappini and Flávio Wolf de Aguiar (São Paulo: Editorial Universidad de São Paulo, 1993); see commentaries by Alfredo Bosi and José Carlos Sebe Bom Meihor 115–167.

ed. by Mario de la Cueva (South Bend, Ind.: The University Press of Notre Dame, 1966). León-Portilla did not do for the concept of philosophy what he did for the concept of history in his book *Toltecatoyotl: Aspectos de la cultura Nahuatl* (México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, 1980), where he collected and described Nahuatl's own description of their recordkeeping practices and memory retrieval. The concept of literature presents different kinds of problems that could be seen in Miguel León-Portilla, *El destino de la palabra: De la oralidad y los códigos Mesoamericanos a la escritura alfabética* (México: El Colegio de México, 1996).

13. I explore in more detail the emergence of border thinking as an epistemology grounded in the colonial difference in my book *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1999). For similar concerns from the south of Europe, see Cassano, *Il pensiero meridiano* and Boaventura de Sousa Santos, *Pe la mao de Alice: O social e o politico na pós modernidade* (Lisbon: Cortez Editora, 1995).

14. A detailed analysis of developmental ideology after World War II, lead by the United States, can be found in Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994).

15. Edouard Glissant, *Poétique de la relation* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995).

16. For a good account of the T-in-O map in relation to Christendom and the "birth" of Europe, see Dennis Hay, *Europe: The Emergence of an Idea* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1957). For the intersection between the symbolic T-in-O map and the world map as the result of travel or explorations in the sixteenth century, see Mignolo, *Darker Side of the Renaissance*, chap. 5.

17. For example, a "history of Chinese literature" that confronts the colonial difference would have to take into account the question of "writing" (David N. Keightley, "The Origin of Writing in China: Scripts and Cultural Contexts," in *The Origins of Writing*, ed. Wayne Serner [Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989], 171–202; on the question of translation of concept related to what in the West is understood by "literature" [from letter, letter of the alphabet] and history, see, for instance, D. R. Holland "Civilization as Universal Practice: The Context of Writing and Poetry" in *Borders of Chinese Civilization: Geography and History at Empire's End* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1996), 43–68.

18. This description was introduced by Anibal Quijano and Immanuel W. Allersstein in "Americanness as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World-System," *ISSA* 134 (1992): 549–554. A more detailed discussion of this idea can be found in Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs*, chap. 1. See also Enrique Dussel, "Beyond Eurocentrism," in *The Cultures of Globalization*, ed. F. Jameson and M. Miyoshi (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998), chap. 1.

19. See Viala, *Naissance de l'écrivain*, 280–295.

20. Mignolo, *Darker Side of the Renaissance*, chaps. 3 and 4.

21. See Mignolo, "Aesthetic Function, Literariness and Góngora's Poetry," in *Language and Literary Theory*, ed. B. A. Stolz, I. R. Tiunik, and L. Dolezel (Ann Arbor: Department of Slavic Studies, Papers in Slavic Philology, 1984), 443–462. See also "Palabras pronunciadas con el corazón caliente": teorías del habla, del discurso y de la escritura" in *América Latina: Palabra, literatura e cultura*, ed. Pizarro, vol. 1, 527–564.

22. See Mignolo, "On the Colonization of Amerindian Languages and Memories: Renaissance Theories of Writing and the Discontinuity of the Classical Tradition," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34.2 (1992): 301–330. Reprinted with changes in *Cultures of Scholarship*, ed. S. C. Humphreys (Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1997), under the title of "Gnosis, Colonialism and Cultures of Scholarship," 311–338.

23. See note 10.

24. For the specific concept of "coloniality of power," see Anibal Quijano, "Colonialidad del poder, cultura y conocimiento en América Latina," *América Indígena* 51 (1993): 531–632.

Sociology in Latin America (Social Knowledge: Heritage, Challenges, Perspectives), ed. R. Brito-León and H. R. Sonntag (International Association of Sociology: Proceedings of the Regional Conference, Venezuela, 1997), 27–38. For a discussion of this concept see Mignolo, *Local Histories/Global Designs*, especially the introduction and chapter 1.

25. Lloyd I. Rudolph and Susanne Hoeber Rudolph have made a similar point in the legal domain and in the case of India. They have insisted that "tradition and modernity" should not be seen as dichotomies but as dialectically bound by colonialism. I would say "by the coloniality of power" and add that tradition and modernity constitute one particular place where the colonial difference has been articulated and redefined in the modern/colonial world system. See L. I. Rudolph and S. H. Rudolph, *The Modernity of Tradition: Political Development in India* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1967), and "Occidentalism and Orientalism: Perspectives on Legal Pluralism," in *Cultures of Scholarship*, ed. S. C. Humphreys (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1997), 219–252. A similar phenomenon could be perceived in the relationship between China and the West since the arrival of the Jesuits in 1582. See Jonathan Spence, *The Chan's Great Continent: China in Western Minds* (New York: Norton, 1998).

26. On these issues, see Madhava Prasad, "On the Question of a Theory of (Third) World Literature," in *Dangerous Liaisons: Gender, Nation, and Postcolonial Perspectives*, ed. Anne McClintock, Amir Mufti, and Ella Shohat (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1997), 141–162; Mignolo, "Canon a(n)d Cross-Cultural Boundaries (Or, Whose Canon Are We Talking About?)," *Poetics Today* 12.1 (1991): 1–28.

27. David Vinas, *Literatura argentina y realidad política* (Buenos Aires: Galerna, 1961); Antonio Candido, *On Literature and Society*, trans. and ed. Howard S. Becker (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995); Roberto Schwarz, *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*, ed. with an introduction by John Gledson (London and New York: Verso, 1992); Antonio Cornejo Polar, *Escribir en el aire: Ensayo sobre la heterogeneidad socio-cultural en las literaturas andinas* (Peru: Editorial Horizonte, 1994); Beatriz Sarlo Sabajones, *Una modernidad periférica: Buenos Aires, 1920 y 1930* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones Nueva Visión, 1988).

28. For the case of India, see Bernard S. Cohn, *Colonialism and Its Forms of Knowledge* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1993); Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest*.

29. Hayden White has been consistent in looking critically at both literature and history. See his "Literary Theory and Historical Writing," in *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect* (Baltimore: The John Hopkins University Press, 1999), 1–26. Throughout his life, Ernst Bloch devoted several articles reflecting on art and literature, collected now in *The Utopian Function of Art and Literature*, trans. Jack Zipes and Frank Meklenburg (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1998). And the very concept of history continues to be critically examined from within modernity. See, for instance, *A New Philosophy of History*, ed. by F. Ankersmit and H. Kellner (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995). However, none of these important works acknowledge the regional limits of art, literature, and history as concepts. And even fewer give evidence of the difference of cultural practice beyond Western conceptual paradigms.

30. Georg W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, trans. J. Sibree (Buffalo: Prometheus Books, [1822], 1991), 102–103.

31. An interesting analysis of Spain and Russia on the margins of the West can be found in Leopoldo Zea, *América en la historia* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1957). There is an English translation: *The Role of the Americas in History*, ed. A. A. Oliver, trans. Sonja Karsen (Savage, Md.: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1992).

32. Ana Pizarro, ed., *América Latina: Palabra, Literatura e Cultura*, 3 vols. (São Paulo: Memorial de América Latina, 1993, 1994, 1995).

33. Walter D. Mignolo, "Canon and Corpus: An Alternative View of Comparative Literary Studies in Colonial Situations," *Daedalus* 1 (1991): 230.

34. Sheldon, Pollock, "Introduction," in *Literary Cultures in History: Reconstructions from*

36. See Mario Valdés, "Rethinking the 'History' of Literary History," in this volume.
37. For the modern world system as a frame, see the three classical volumes published by Immanuel Wallerstein between 1974 and 1989: *The Modern World-System. Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy*, vol. 1; *Mercantilism and the Consolidation of the European World-Economy, 1600–1750*, vol. 2; and *The Second Era of Great Expansion of the Capitalist World-Economy 1730–1840s*, vol. 3 (New York: Academic Press, 1974; 1980; 1989). For world system as an analytic perspective, see Wallerstein, "World-System Analysis," in *Social Theory*, ed. A. Giddens and J. H. Turner (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987), 309–324. For a critical perspective on Western civilization and Eurocentrism from world-system analysis, see Wallerstein, "Eurocentrism and Its Avatars: The Dilemma of Social Sciences," *New Left Review* 226 (1997): 93–107.
38. See Assia Djébar, *Fantasia: An Algerian Cavalcade*, trans. Dorothy S. Blair (Portsmouth, N.H.: Heinemann, 1993); Hélène Béji, *Désenchantement national: Essai sur la décolonization* (Paris: Maspero, 1982).
39. For a more developed argument, see Mignolo, "(Re)modeling the Letter."
40. See Linda Hutcheon, "Rethinking the National Model," in this volume. See also Pollock, "Introduction," and "India in the Vernacular Millennium: Literary Culture and Polity, 1000–1500," *Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences* 127.3 (1998): 41–74. For the global relocation of languages and literatures, see Walter D. Mignolo, "Linguistic Maps, Literary Geographies, Cultural Landscapes" and "Globalization, Civilization Processes and the Relocation of Languages and Cultures," in *The Cultures of Globalization* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1998).
41. Miguel León-Portilla, "El testimonio de la historia prehispánica" and "Una categorización de la historiografía náhuatl y de la que a ésta siguió en el siglo XVI," in *Toltecapotl: Aspectos de la cultura náhuatl* (México: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1980), 53–100; Joaquín Galarza, *In Amoxtili in Tlacati: El libro, el hombre. Códices y vivencias* (México: Tava Editorial, 1992); Mignolo, *Darker Side of the Renaissance*, chaps. 2, 3, and 4.
42. *Cantares Mexicanos: Songs of the Aztecs*, trans. John Bierhorst (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1985). On the relevance of Bierhorst translation and polemical introduction for the question of literature, see Walter D. Mignolo, "La lengua, la letra, el territorio," in *Literature and Historiography in the New World*, ed. C. Goic and W. D. Mignolo, *Dispositio* 11 (1986): 137–160.
43. Boone and Mignolo, *Writing without Words*.
44. Walter D. Mignolo and Freya Schiwy, "Translation/Transculturation and the Colonial Difference," in *Recycling. Kannibalisierung. Hybridisierung*, ed. Carlos Rincón (Proceedings of the Conference of the same title, Berlin, June 1998); Lydia Liu, ed., *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1999); Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, eds., *Post-Colonial Translations: Theory and Practices* (London: Routledge, 1999).
45. Fernando Ortiz, *Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar*, trans. Harriet de Onís (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, [1940], 1995), 206–207.
46. W. E. B. Du Bois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Vintage Books, [1905], 1990).
47. Angel Rama, *The Lettered City* (Hanover, N.H.: Ediciones del Norte, 1982).
48. There are a good number of significant works describing the categorical conflicts in the sixteenth century. On writing I have already mentioned Boone and Mignolo, *Writing without Words*. On the conflictual notion of time and memory, see Enrique Florescano, *Memory, Myth, and Time in Mexico: From the Aztecs to Independence*, trans. Albert Bork with the assistance of K. R. Bork (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1994). For the Andes, Sabine MacCormack studied the problem as articulated around the "calendar" in "Time, Space, and Ritual Action: The Inka and Christian Calendars in Early Colonial Peru," in *Native Traditions in the Postconquest World* (Washington, D.C.: Dumbarton Oaks Publications

49. Viala, *La naissance de l'écrivain*.
50. Walter D. Mignolo, "On the Colonization of Amerindian Languages and Memories: Renaissance Theories of Writing and the Discontinuity of the Classical Tradition," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 34.2 (1992): 301–330.
51. Xiaomei Chen's study of occidentalism as a counter discourse in contemporary China offers a good illustration. She analyzes the complexities of "occidentalism" discourses in post-Mao China, a discourse that could serve different purposes, anti-Mao without being pro-Western. In any event, the very fact of an "occidentalism" discourse in China shows once more the pervasive planetarization of the West, pervading cultural practices, like the television series Chen analyzes, as well as drama and other "literary" manifestations. See *Occidentalism: A Theory of Counter-Discourse in Post-Mao China* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995).
52. Howland, *Borders of Chinese Civilization*.
53. Howland, *Borders of Chinese Civilization*, 45.
54. I am grateful here to Leo Ching (Asian and African languages and literatures, Duke University) for introducing me to this topic. I am, however, responsible for the final interpretation.
55. Irene Silverblatt provides an illustrative, well-known case: that "Indians" is a European allocation of meaning to classify a diversity of people in the New World. The example that I am here equating with literature shows once more the classificatory force of coloniality of power ("Becoming Indian in the Central Andes of Seventeenth-Century Peru," in *After Colonialism: Imperial Histories and Postcolonial Displacements*, ed. Gyan Prakash (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995), 279–298).
56. Jorge Luis Borges, "La busca de Averroes," in *El Aleph* (1949); *Obras completas de Jorge Luis Borges* (Buenos Aires: Emecé Editores, 1974), 582–589.
57. See, for instance, Anne Ruggles Gere's study of U.S. gender, class, and literacy at the end of the nineteenth century in *Intimate Practices: Literacy and Women's Clubs, 1880–1920* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1997) and also Francine Masiello's study of women literacy and social class in nineteenth-century Argentina, *Between Civilization and Barbarism: Women, Nation and Literary Culture in Modern Argentina* (Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press, 1992). Of general interest and a cross-cultural and cross-time period overview on literacy and power, relevant for rethinking the colonial model in literary and historical studies, see Deborah Keller-Cohen, ed., *Literacy: Interdisciplinary Conversations* (Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1994).
58. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*, 79–102.
59. See, for instance, the canonical studies by Gilbert Highet, *The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Literature* (London: Oxford University Press, 1949) and Ernst R. Curtius, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (Bern: Francke Verlag, 1948).
60. Immanuel Kant, "Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Point of View" (1797), in *Kant on History*, ed. L. White Beck (New York: Macmillan, 1973), 11–26.
61. The relationships between Islam and the West have been extensively studied. For instance, see Norman Daniels, *Islam and the West: The Making of an Image* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1960) and *Islam, Europe and Empire* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1966); Hichem Djait, *L'Europe et l'Islam* (1983), trans. Javier Sánchez Prieto (Madrid: Libertarias/Prodhufi S., 1990). For a more general overview of Christian and Muslim relations see, Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad and Wadi Z. Haddad, eds., *Christian-Muslim Encounters* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1995).
62. For the relationships between China and the West, and for an understanding of the changes initiated since the sixteenth century, see the recent study by Spence, *China's Great Continent*.
63. Cassano, *Il pensiero meridiano*; Roberto Dainotto, "A South with a View: Europe and Its Others," *Nepantla: Views from South* 1.2 (2000), 375–390.
64. In this regard, the classic study by Walter J. Ong, *Ramus, Method, and the Decay of Dialogue: From the Art of Disputation to the Art of Conversation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), is still relevant.

65. See Pollock, "Introduction," Viswanathan, *Masks of Conquest*, and Harish Trivedi, *Colonial Translations: English Literature and India* (Calcutta: Papyrus, 1993).

66. See Valdés, in this volume, and Pollock, "Introduction."

67. See Anibal Quijano's and Immanuel Wallerstein's reflections on the modern concept of "newness" emerging with the "discovery of the New World" that becomes, at the same time, a strategy of colonization. "Newness" is a legitimization of conquest and of the evaluation of everything that is not "new." See "Americana as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern World-System." See also Linda Hutcheon, in this volume, on the same topic.

68. Sheldon Pollock, "Cosmopolitanism and Vernacular in History," Paper presented at the workshop on Cosmopolitanism, organized by Public Culture and the Committee on Southern Asian Studies (The University of Chicago, May 1999).

69. See Hutcheon, in this volume.

70. Michel Foucault looked at the emergence of the social sciences within the macronarrative of Western civilization in *Les mots et les choses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1969), while Immanuel Wallerstein et al. looked at the same phenomenon from the perspective of modern/colonial world in *Open the Social Sciences*. My argument here in rethinking the colonial model starts from Wallerstein's "modern world-system" and departs by looking at the "modern/colonial world imaginary" in which Wallerstein's theory is inscribed.

71. For a comparison with other historical regions, see Hutcheon, in this volume.

72. See Roberto González Echevarría, *Myth and Archive: A Theory of Latin American Narrative* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

73. If the re-emergence of Amerindian languages and cosmologies can be traced back, like many other social movements, to the 1970s, in literary studies the great impact was produced in the 1980s and around the five-hundred-year celebration and impugnation of the "discovery of America." See, for instance, Rolena Adorno, *Guaman Poma: Writing and Resistance in Colonial Peru* (Austin: The University of Austin, 1986); Martin Lienhard, *La voz y su huella: Escritura y conflicto étnico-social en América Latina, 1492-1988* (Dartmouth: Ediciones del Norte, 1988); Gordon Brotherston, *The Book of the Fourth World: Reading the Native Americas through Their Literature* (Cambridge: Oxford University Press, 1992). Notice that there is not yet an Amerindian or Native American intellectual community writing its own literary history. In the United States, contrary to Latin America, there is, however, a group of writers (Leslie Marmon Silko, Paula Gun Allen, Gerald Vizenor, etc.) as well as scholars and political essayists (Vine Deloria, Jr., Ward Churchill, Robert Allen Warrior) making their voices heard. See, for instance, Robert Allen Warrior, *Tribal Secrets: Recovering American Indian Intellectual Traditions* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1995). See also Arnold Krupat, *The Turn to the Native: Studies in Criticism and Culture* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1996). In Latin America, Amerindian intellectuals are certainly active and producing, but their voice is not yet loud enough.

74. On the current rethinking of Creole as language, aesthetic, and epistemology, see Edouard Glissant, *Poetics of Relations* (1992), trans. B. Wing (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1997); Jean Bernabé, Patrick Chamoiseau, Raphaël Confiant, *Éloge de la créolité*, édition bilingue français/anglais (Paris: Gallimard, 1990); Maryse Condé and Madeleine Cottenet-Hage, *Penser la créolité* (Paris: Éditions Karthala, 1995); and K. M. Balutansky and Marie-Agnès Sourieau, *Caribbean Creolization: Reflections on the Cultural Dynamics of Language, Literature and Identity* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1998).

75. The topic was mapped out by the early and ground-breaking reader edited by Gustavo Pérez-Firmat, *Do the Americas Have a Common Literature?* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1990); it was followed up by José David Saldívar's no less ground-breaking *The Dialectics of Our America: Genealogies, Cultural Critique and Literary History* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1991). More recently, Alfred Arteaga's *An Other Tongue: Nations and Ethnicity in the Linguistic Borderlands* (Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1994).

Anzaldúa's *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute, 1987) remains and will remain the classic work. In the social sciences, Mary Romero, P. Hondagneu-Sotelo, and Vilma Ortiz's (eds.) *Challenging Frontiers: Structuring Latina and Latino Lives in the U.S.* (New York: Routledge, 1997) and F. Bonilla, E. Meléndez, R. Morales, and M. de los A. Torres's, *U.S. Latinos, Latin Americans, and the Paradox of Interdependence* (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1998). In literary and cultural studies, see José David Saldívar's *Border Matters: Remapping American Cultural Studies* (Berkeley: The University of California Press, 1997).

77. Abdelkber Khatibi, "Double Critique," in *Maghreb Pluriel* (Paris: Denoël, 1983), 47-48. For an analysis of Khatibi's "double critique" and Jacques Derrida's "Le monolingualisme de l'autre," see my *Local Histories/Global Designs*, 70-85.

78. Emmanuel Lévinas, *Humanisme de l'autre homme* (Paris: Fata Morgana, 1972), 31, my translation.

79. Lévinas, *Humanisme de l'autre homme*, 33.

80. Jacques Derrida, "Semiology and Grammatology," interview with Julia Kristeva (1968). Reprinted in *Positions*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), 15-36.

81. Jacques Derrida, *Le monolinguisme de l'autre* (Paris: Galilée, 1996), 63.

82. Emmanuel Lévinas, *Otherwise Than Being or beyond Essence* (1974), trans. A. Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1997).

83. Lévinas, *Otherwise*, 176.

84. My references to Lévinas here are neither gratuitous nor do they follow a recent interest in Lévinas beyond the philosophical circuit. Lévinas has been a decisive factor in Latin American philosophy of liberation as Enrique Dussel has developed it from the initial publication of *Liberación Latinoamericana y Emmanuel Lévinas* (Buenos Aires: Editorial Bonum, 1975), to the most recent *Ética de la Liberación* (México: UNAM-Iztapalapa, 1998). What is at stake, basically, was Dussel's initial intuition that Lévinas's displacements (as Jewish) from the Western and Heideggerian concept of Being to "Otherwise than Being" opened the doors for still another displacement toward the "Coloniality of Being," in the exteriority of Western history. This metaphysical dimension finds its grounding in the macronarrative of the modern/colonial world, in the emergence of modern forms of coloniality that framed my argument in this article.