Knowledge is a matter of parts and the whole. We speak about texts and images, compare and agglomerate them into categories. We break texts into fiction and non-fiction, into disciplinary fields like philosophy, literature, and history. These divisions are also temporal or contextual because literature or letters became more specific with the development of the German and, later, global research university, so that departments and faculties from the nineteenth century onward developed in literary, historical, and philosophical fields in which specialists came to guard their texts, sometimes the way dragons guarded their hoard. Often, texts by the same author could be studied in these and other fields, but with different methodologies. In the eighteenth century, for instance, Voltaire could write philosophy, history, and literature, something the modern research university would have made more difficult had he been on faculty.

Within each of these disciplines were sub-disciplines like social history, economic history, cultural history, and intellectual history, or Continental philosophy and analytical philosophy, or English literature, Chinese literature, comparative literature, and world literature. Finding a field theory was a difficult task in a proliferation of fields and sub-fields. Thus, literary studies had contending claims among national literatures, comparative literature, and world literature. What was and is to be done? That I am trained in history and literature only complicates matters in this context of universities from the nineteenth century forward, partly because of the specialization of knowledge, but also because there are more and more fields and schools of theory and practice. With imperial expansion and with globalization, nations were important as part of internal colonization, before the external colonization of exploration and settlement. Nations needed national literatures at the heart of empire, but at the same time, they were producing conditions for comparison within and
between empires and of world institutions and literatures that intensified from the time of Goethe onward. As such, the expansion and globalization of the European empires simultaneously developed nationalism, comparison, and transnationalism, the very conditions that allow the coexistence of national literature, comparative literature, and world literature. There are, then, tensions, frictions and divisions, but also a complementarity of the three.

I

This three-part relation—national, comparative, world—coexists and overlaps as well as, at times, appearing to be rivalrous. Chinese literature is itself, but China itself, before being a modern nation, had changing boundaries, foreign dynasties, and influenced neighbouring countries such as Korea, Japan, and Viet Nam in literature, culture, and language. Although Chinese has more linguistic continuity than the languages of European states, it also has experienced changes in which the literature of the state or nation, of the empire, and of the adjacent world overlapped. Over the centuries, China has developed a far-reaching diaspora in Asia, and later in the Americas, Caribbean, Europe, and Africa. Some Chinese write in Mandarin, but others compose in other languages within China, and, overseas, Chinese writers might write in Mandarin and in another language, such as French or English. One can be Chinese in many ways over time. Some Chinese writers cannot read, speak, or write their ancestral language. Identity and literature are intricate.

For instance, the fictional worlds of Ha Jin and Yan Geling illustrate this difference within a national literature and suggest the centrifugal forces that operate alongside the centripetal ones of national literary culture. Both of these writers, as Guo Rong has noted, left China in the 1980s and attended graduate programs in the United States. Both write in different languages. Whereas Yan uses Chinese for the most part, Jin mainly employs English. Nonetheless, they were both out of China, which gave them a different perspective to consider their native land and their people (see Guo). Within Chinese literature, for instance, there are vast numbers of interests, themes, and genres over time. One such aspect of Chinese literature is the family saga in twentieth-century fiction in China. As Xinhui Liu has maintained, the purpose of the family saga novel is to show how the writer interprets history against which the family is represented and “the textualization of history” is achieved. The role of historical context for the saga novels, and the role of literary rhetoric in mediating history, are significant. Liu concentrates on family saga novels in the Republican period, Mao’s era, and the 1980s and 1990s. Like Guo’s analysis, Liu’s work, despite focusing on mainland China, has implications beyond Chinese literature to East Asian Studies, comparative literature, and world literature, owing to the importance of historicism and of historical fiction in her discussion (see Liu). Theory and close reading widen the perspective and include national, comparative, and world culture.
and literature.

Chinese literature is not alone in these porous boundaries among the national, the comparative, and the world or international. Greek and Roman literature and the Bible, for example, influenced French literature. Vernacular texts had similar transnational lives. Petrarch’s sonnets, for example, influenced Wyatt and Surrey in England as well as Du Bellay in France. French, like Italian, owed its very existence as a Neo-Latin or vernacular language to the Latin. These are just a few strands in a complex web. The borders of France have changed over time, and the langue d’oc and langue d’oil are just two divisions in the linguistic world of France as it became a centralized state, and what we have come to call a nation. Internal colonization of areas in which German, Breton, Dutch, Italian, and other languages and dialects were spoken are part of the element of the French language in French literature. With the expansion of the French empire, French spread to Canada, Africa, Asia, and elsewhere. French literature became literature in French. French became part of other literatures, such as Belgian and Canadian literatures. The literature of exploration, settlement, and empire in French also became an aspect of the cultural and literary history of Brazil and the United States for instance, depending on whether non-fiction is considered part of literature (as it often is) and how one classifies texts (where the author is born or lives or writes), so that Jean de Léry and Alexis de Tocqueville may be part of Brazilian and American literature, respectively (on Léry, see Bruyère, Lestringant, Pinheiro, Rosenstreich, Yandell; on Tocqueville, see Kaledin and Perrin; see also Hart, “Images of the Native”, “Portugal and the Making of the English Empire”, Representing the New World). Much can be disputed, but one might also think of Franz Fanon as being part of French literature as well as of literature in French. Part of the nationalism that grew up in Europe affects this judgement, but need not be the sole basis for whom to include. France colonized itself into a nation before, or even while, growing into an empire “outre mer.”

A certain intertextuality exists, so that English literature also becomes literature in English. English, even more than French, has changed. It was strictly a Germanic language before the Norman invasion of 1066, which brought in Norman French, so that, although these Norse or Northmen were relatives, they spoke a romance language derived from Latin. Old English, like Latin, also included translations of religious and biblical texts, so that in England, the Venerable Bede, who wrote in Latin, who mentioned Caedmon, a poet who wrote in Old English, who, along with the anonymous Beowulf poet, helped, with his sacred verse, to forge a vernacular literature beside the Latin texts. Beowulf, written in Old English, a language barely recognizable as English to modern English speakers, is about the eponymous protagonist, a prince of the Geats in southern Sweden, in the sixth century, who promises to defeat a monster in Denmark. This epic poem, probably written in the eighth century in a manuscript from about 1000 and not published until 1815, is about the Germanic and Scandinavian past that the Angles, Saxons, and others looked back to from England, the kind of world to which Hamlet alludes. The Vikings, in another
wave, terrorized England, and there was a confrontation between these pagans and their Christian relatives. The continental Germanic world and England were related closely, but there were also states or tribes, and chieftains and kings, who vied and battled one with the other. Thus, this epic belongs to England, and also to the Germanic and Scandinavian world, and is one of the first great works, in an earlier form of a language that no one could have predicted would become a, and perhaps the, global language. *Beowulf* becomes an ur-text for all those who speak, write, and read English as a first language or an acquired or second or third language.

The matter of French in England is not an easy one: the French of Normandy was not the French of Paris (see Kibbee). William the Conqueror is buried in Caen because he was the Duke of Normandy who happened to become the king of England. Normandy had a claim to England after the successful invasion of 1066, William's descendants laid claim to the crown of France, and Anglo-Norman French was spoken by the nobility in England, although William had kept Latin and English as the languages of England. Western France was part of the English claim or realm until it shrank under the Tudors and even Calais was lost. People wrote in Latin, French, and English in England. Chaucer, like Dante and Petrarch, chose to write in the vernacular. Thus, languages coexist within national boundaries, including in England, so what is English literature until the death of Chaucer in 1400? For centuries, Latin was the language of western Europe, but coexisted with other languages. The invasion of England by the Normans complicated the matter after the Romans withdrew from Britain, their colony and their guards, the Angles and Saxons, seem to have invited their relatives back home in northern Germany to settle. Cornish, the language of Cornwall, a Celtic language related to Welsh, Irish, and Scottish Gaelic, but also to Breton, the language of Brittany, part of France, is something that was stamped out in the internal colonization of England. The Celtic languages of King Arthur, who himself may have been a Romano-Celtic prince, were crushed or marginalized in the British Isles. It might be said that the Celts, themselves a remnant of an empire that seems to have spread along the Danube, were transnational just as the Romans and Germans were. So many of these groups overlapped in shifting territories. The actualities and mythologies of life and art mixed over time.

National literatures, like nations themselves, became imagined or invented through mythology or even propaganda. The more we examine the categories of national, comparative, and world (international) in literature and politics, the more they overlap and merge and even sometimes dissolve. They are distinct in some ways, but not in others. That phenomenon has implications for those who advocate for national and world literatures. Comparative literature may be able to weather this overlapping dissolution because comparison is one of the ways of establishing the contours of national and world literatures, but comparison can even be a tool that establishes and disestablishes comparative literature itself. Comparative literature is a liminal or threshold field, perhaps a figure of overlap between national and world literatures in a Venn diagram.
Languages and empires tend to be transterritorial, or what we have come to call transnational. Germany and Austria, for instance, are closer to the origins or heart of the Celts or Celtic “empire” than Brittany, Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, parts which still have people whose first language is a Celtic language. Britain became England and then, in the first decade of the eighteenth century, Britain, and then, formally, the United Kingdom during the first year of the nineteenth century; this is also paralleled by the expansion of England internally to control Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, and the growth of an English empire from 1497, with the voyage of Giovanni Caboto or John Cabot. This voyage, in the wake of Columbus, was also to a region in which the Vikings had been, in addition to their settlements near Naples and in Sicily, Normandy, Kiev, and Dublin, not to mention the Danelaw in eastern England. Even after England became unified, the multiple legacies, internally and externally, of Celt, Roman, and German/Viking makes it difficult to see a “pure” or unified identity linguistically, culturally, or literarily. The colonizers are also colonized. English writers, like Chaucer, have classical and French and Italian influences, Boccaccio being one of the authors on which Chaucer drew. Shakespeare read Ovid and Montaigne, and his sonnets could not have been written without Wyatt and Surrey, who adapted and translated Petrarch, whereas Spenser’s sonnets, Amoretti, whose title belies the Italian origins of the sonnet, have a connection to Du Bellay’s sonnets in French (on the sonnet, see Cousins and Howarth). For instance, the Englishing of Petrarch over time is something Thomas Roche presented in his fine edited volume (see Petrarca, Petrarch in English).

National literatures were and are multinational and invite comparison. The world of literature is the literature of the world. When English literature expanded into the English colonies in the New World, the models were English but also classical and European. As I have argued elsewhere, English culture was based on translation (Hart, “Portugal and the Making of the English Empire”, Representing the New World; see also Cheyfitz). Richard Hakluyt the Younger’s work as an editor of voyages and travel texts is a good example of the paradox of building a nation and its textual inheritance while relying on foreign tongues and cultures to do so (on Hakluyt and John Florio, see Pirillo). Hakluyt commissioned translations of texts from other languages to promote colonization, partly in response to the examples of Portugal and Spain, which had begun colonization in earnest earlier than England and France (see Carey and Jowitt, and Sacks). In order to strengthen England, Hakluyt advocated expansion and colonization, particularly of northern America (on Hakluyt and others for plans on colonizing North America, see Mancell, Envisioning America, Hakluyt’s Promise; see also Hart, “Portugal and the Making of the English Empire”, “Strategies of Promotion”; on Hakluyt’s books and associates, see Payne). English was not a major language then; it expanded its horizon through the translation of foreign languages. In the coming years, John Milton was more the poet of New England than was William Shakespeare, and he had a great impact on American writers like Melville and not simply on English poets like Blake (Blake; Grey; see Hart, “Review
Milton (1608-74), a classical scholar and poet, was deeply biblical and was, as I have argued, a European poet, and, with the spread of English, a world poet (Teskey, *The Poetry of John Milton*; see Hart, “Review Article”). Milton’s learning of Greek is indicative of his multilingual and comparative approach, even though he is a pillar of English literature. According to Harris Francis Fletcher, Milton “took his grammar to the Gospel of John in Greek, construed it, translated it, retranslated his Latin into English, took the English and translated it back into Latin, the Latin back into Greek, and finally he compared his Greek with the text from which he had started” (Fletcher 1. 254). Besides writing poetry in Hebrew, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French, and English, Milton had a composite sense of versification that allowed him to comprehend metre in all these languages. Moreover, Milton understood their grammar, syntax, vocabulary, and literature, and was trained in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Syriac (Fletcher 1. 283, 290; see Hart, “Review Article”). Gordon Teskey also reminds us of Milton’s multilingual nature as a poet, recounting how Milton was taught to write imitations of Greek and Latin poetry, particularly Virgil, Horace, and Ovid (Teskey, “Introduction” viii). For Teskey, Milton’s Latin poetry was vital to the development of the style of his English poetry (Teskey, “Introduction” viii-ix). Between 1624 and 1637, Milton composed fifty-two poems in four languages (Teskey, “Introduction” 23). Milton is English, European, and global, part of English literature, literature in English, comparative literature, and world literature.

Milton was influential in New England, but in time, the Thirteen Colonies became the United States, so that colonial American literature, as part of English literature, became American literature (see Vendler). The English Empire had ceded to the British Empire in the first decade of the eighteenth century, and the first British Empire ended with the War of Independence and the treaty in 1783. New France had come under the rule of the British Empire in 1763. For a brief moment from about 1763 to 1775, Québec, largely French-speaking, and colonies such as Newfoundland and Nova Scotia were part of a British Empire in North America. The literature produced there, in French and English, was technically in a British political realm, so for a while, Nova Scotia and Massachusetts were part of the same literary and cultural network, not, as they later were (from 1867), parts of American and Canadian literature. Even after 1867, when British North America became Canada, which became independent in domestic matters, Canadian literature was part of a wider literature of the British Empire. British literature might be said to contain English, Canadian, Australian, and other literatures. Oliver Goldsmith and his grand-nephew, also named Oliver Goldsmith, were both poets, and the younger Oliver wrote *The Rising Village* with the older Oliver’s *The Deserted Village* as a model. The younger Goldsmith was born in New Brunswick, but died in Liverpool in England, where his father, Henry, an officer in an Irish regiment in the War of Independence, was from. This Goldsmith family included two poets writing in English and moved across borders.

Canadian literature involved texts written in French and English, and others
wrote in Canada in other languages then as they have since. For French-speaking inhabitands of Canada, the literary models of France were of more concern before and after the Seven Years’ War. Marc Lescarbot’s pageant about Neptune, Théâtre de Neptune, at Port-Royal in 1606 was the first theatrical production in French America and his history of New France—Histoire de la Nouvelle-France (1609)—was a major contribution to French and Canadian culture (see Hart, Representing the New World; Lescarbot). The very bilingual and bicultural nature of European inhabitants in what came to be Canada destabilizes the idea of a national literature in the national language. Comparison and centrifugal forces are inevitable. The aboriginal peoples of the New World, including in Canada, migrated a great deal, so that when Samuel Champlain arrived in New France and visited the villages of Stadacona and Hochelaga, later Québec City and Montréal, respectively, which Jacques Cartier had visited in the 1530s, he found a different nation or group of indigenous peoples than those Cartier had met. The indigenous peoples had their own myths, religions, and stories before the contact with the Vikings, English, and French. The Vikings had long been in Greenland and were in Newfoundland-Labrador before William the Conqueror had invaded England. The Norse Sagas belonged to Norway and Iceland. Eric the Red, or Eiríkr Thorvaldsson, settled Greenland in the later tenth century and his son, Leif Ericsson, explored the coast of North America about 1000.

We compare mythologies in Canada, as Leonard Cohen had once done in one of his collections of poetry, Let Us Compare Mythologies (1956). Cohen’s novel, Beautiful Losers (1966), is a fiction written in English in the tradition of the European novel, but represents a narrator who is researching Kateri (Catherine) Tekakwitha or Tekauïta, an aboriginal woman and a saint, as part of its framework (see Cohen, Beautiful Losers). Native writers in English, like Jeannette Armstrong, write their own views of Canada and the literary and colonial legacy of Europe and Britain. In a poem I like to cite or quote as a teacher and writer, “History Lesson,” Armstrong reinterprets the history of the western hemisphere and of Canada in the wake of Columbus (see Armstrong; Hart, “Seeing Double”, Interpreting Culture). Aboriginal peoples have been writing their interpretations for centuries, and their Christianization and the destruction of Aztec and Inca documents make it difficult for us to have their version of events from the point of view of pre-contact or early contact. Garcilaso de la Vega (El Ínca), part Spanish, part Inca, wrote his commentaries, and what became, in English translation, The Broken Spears, is a mediated version of events from an Aztec point of view, which is quite different from that represented in Diaz’s Conquest of Mexico.

Natives, like the various members of the Algonquian language family, have had long contacts with the English and French and their descendants in Canada and the United States. The Cree dictionary in Alberta in western Canada was compiled as a means of forging and solidifying the Cree language (LeClaire). Cree belongs to the Algonquian languages, which cross the borders of what is now Canada and the United States. John Eliot had translated the Old and New Testaments into the
Massachusetts Algonquian language, published in 1661 and 1663, respectively. Roger Williams also worked closely with related Native groups in Rhode Island and wrote *A Key to the Language of America* (1643), the first study of Native American languages, concentrating on Narragansett, an Algonquin language (see Williams). One of my own ancestors, John Throckmorton, was a friend, neighbour, and correspondent of Williams (who knew Edward Coke, Oliver Cromwell, and John Milton), and was part of that group that left the authority of the Massachusetts Bay Colony for what became Rhode Island, perhaps the first seat of religious tolerance in the English-speaking world. Borders—and there were disputes of boundaries between the Massachusetts Bay Colony and Rhode Island—were a European insistence that were not really apt to take into account that aboriginal groups of the same nations were divided between the United States and Canada after the American Revolution. My own family, and many others of English and European backgrounds, like that of Margaret Atwood, were separated from their cousins. It seems that Atwood’s family was at Salem, as mine was, and that familial experience seems to have affected her to write about New England in *The Handmaid’s Tale* (1985) (on her responses to people and works, including the relation of this novel to a journey in Afghanistan, see Atwood, *Curious Pursuits*). Like Atwood, who uses Cambridge, Massachusetts for some of the topography of that novel, I find that this ancestral trace and time at Harvard rekindled my sense of New England as a family place and they have been the scene of my poems (*Hart, Breath and Dust*). The matter is more complicated, as it is for so many, as my grandparents were English, and my parents and my family have English ties still. With Huguenot ancestors on both sides, and having been educated and worked in French and English, I am at sea when it comes to one nation, one tongue or one nation, one literature. Canada is becoming more and more multilingual and multicultural while also needing to understand the role of indigenous peoples there (see Day; Hart, “Canadian Literature”; O’Bryan et al.; Taylor). In Canada, owing to colonization, indigenous peoples speak English and French, and some speak many other tongues as their first languages. Some only speak English and French, as other aboriginal peoples and those of mixed European and Native backgrounds in the Americas speak only Spanish or Portuguese.

History is about migration, but cultures and societies are especially mixed in conflict and at the borders between groups. Mediators, interpreters and translators, such as La Malinche, Squanto, Étienne Brûlé, and Louis Riel, find themselves in awkward, dangerous and liminal positions between cultures. As I have discussed elsewhere, Cortés saw two Spaniards, Jeronimo de Aguilar and Gonzalo Guerrero, who were taken captive: the first wishing to return into the Spanish fold and the other wanting to remain in aboriginal society (Campbell; Duffy; Greenblatt; Hart, “Mediation”; Höfele and von Koppenfels; Metcalf; Seed). This phenomenon of cultural mediators crosses empires and territories, so that it may be “national,” but it is already between or among cultures, European and aboriginal. The pattern does not begin with French Canada, but was established early. The Europeans had used translators and medi-
tors for a very long time before they arrived in the New World. In the Americas, alliances through relationships or marriages complicated matters and created new cultures, a mixing that seems to have threatened the original “pure” cultures, which were mixed and “impure” themselves.

Cultures, languages, and literatures are mobile and mixed, like peoples. Each person and each people is of the world and contains comparisons. Nations and national literatures are not hermetic, but comparative literature and world literature cannot exist without local or national stories to compare or to aggregate in an ever-changing “world.” Each of these levels of literature is different, but each needs the other. Traditionally, comparative literature needs at least two texts or authors from two different cultures to compare, and world literature builds on national and comparative literature to study literatures across the globe, most often in translation. The knowledge of specialists in national literatures, especially their linguistic prowess, permits others to branch out. The erosion of the study of languages in English-speaking countries endangers the emphasis on multilingualism in comparative literature and is an impetus for world literature as a way to reach students. Some comparative literature programs have courses in world literature. The relation among the three levels of literature is evolving.

II

Here, I shall think about my own interests and writing over decades in order to confirm the categories or fields of national, comparative, and world literatures, to suggest how porous their boundaries are, how much overlap they have, and how interdependent they are. The figures I have chosen from those I have discussed over the years are Shakespeare, Columbus, Bartolomé de Las Casas, and Father Matteo Ricci. They are good test cases, the first as one who may not have travelled outside his country, and the others as figures of European expansion and cultural contact with other peoples. All these figures rely on their linguistic and cultural backgrounds, but also reach out beyond in comparative and other or “world” contexts.

The national is made up of other nations or cultures. We all have our own ways into literature as children and students, the fairy tales we think are from our national language or tradition that happen, for English speakers, sometimes to have come from Germany, Denmark, France, Italy, and elsewhere, the modern European drama in translation, the novels and poetry in languages we do not know but wish we did. English literature was also a European and world literature as well as a national literature, both because of the origin of the language and influences from ancient and modern languages on the same territory or in neighbouring places, and because England, then Britain, had become most probably the largest and wide-reaching empire in history. There were colonies that had literatures in English. Shakespeare became a central part of English literature and education at home and in the colonies.
Shakespeare is also a figure of English, European, comparative, and world literature. During the mid-to-late 1970s and early 1980s, I spent a good deal of time on Shakespeare, taking a course, attending theatre performances, watching films, and then writing a dissertation on his use of irony and history, how genre affected his shaping of history in his narrative and theatrical presentation, as well as composing articles and revising a book on Shakespeare. Irony, which is central to Shakespeare's histories, goes back to Socrates; the rhetorical uses of irony were something about which rhetoricians following up on Greek rhetoric, such as Cicero and Quintilian and their successors, knew much. Philosophical irony was an extension and exploration of Socrates as *eiron*. The ancients, like Ovid, and the moderns, like Montaigne, had influenced Shakespeare, and the tools with which literary scholars, intellectual and cultural historians, and philosophers regarded Shakespeare sometimes owed much to Continental and world contexts. For instance, I found that Friedrich Schlegel deemed paradox the soul and source of irony, and that he asserts that through irony's recognition of the world of paradox can we understand the contradictions of life.

Owing to limitations of space here, I will say that my discovery was that the German Romantics were the first to recognize Shakespeare's refusal to judge his characters—his artistic objectivity—as a form of irony, that irony was the very principle of his art, or of art generally, and of which Shakespeare was the exemplar. Shakespeare, then, was at the centre of their theory of irony, and these German Romantics, through Bishop Connop Thirlwall, and also through Coleridge and John Keats, transformed English and English-speaking Shakespearean criticism. Keats's well-known view of Shakespeare as having negative capability would have been less likely, or perhaps even impossible, without the German contribution. Here is comparative, European, and "world" feedback. Moreover, I argued that Shakespearean irony is an instrument of objective realism, creating a balance, being like Hegel's "infinite absolute objectivity" and Kierkegaard's "mastered irony." Paradoxically, the ironist is ironical, but the ironist, by controlling his ironical part, shapes his work. Here is a continuation from the German Romantics about how important the Continent was for English and English-speaking theories of irony and views of Shakespeare in an intellectual, philosophical and cultural context (Hart, "Irony"; see Hegel 88-94; Kierkegaard 260-75, 282-89; Schlegel 114). Shakespeare as a world author is something much witnessed in the four-hundredth anniversary of his death, including the conference held in Shanghai in March of 2016, and the World Shakespeare Congress in Stratford and London in July and August of 2016.

Other figures who are not English have had effects on English-speaking culture and English literature, literature in English, and comparative literature and world literature: Columbus, Bartolomé de Las Casas, and Father Ricci. They are all part of the expansion of Europe and their contact with other cultures in the search for Asia, especially for China. Expansion increased the power of Spain and Europe, but its centrifugal forces also weakened the centripetal force of national identity.

Cultural figures, authors, and explorers cross boundaries metaphorical as well as
literal. They are figures. Columbus is not simply a figure of Spanish history, politics, culture, and literature, but becomes parts of those of other countries such as England, the United States, and the countries of the western hemisphere (see Bartosik-Velez; Knobler; Sale). Like Shakespeare, Columbus has been the subject of dozens of biographies and many portraits, engravings, and other likenesses (see Hart, “Images of the Native”, Columbus, Shakespeare, and the Interpretation of the New World). Columbus’s Journal is supposed to be a description of what he saw, a ship’s log, but it is used to tell a story, and is contested and interpreted in a multitude of ways (see Columbus; Simcox). The originary moment of Columbus is intricate both textually and contextually. Columbus is known for the “discovery” of the New World, at least from the European point of view, as the aboriginal peoples did not have to uncover their existence and that of their lands. Like Shakespeare’s poetry, Columbus’s writing is a fetish or talisman, but both figures have become associated with the controversies surrounding European expansion and colonialism. Columbus sought to open up the world for Spain beyond Spain by seeking a direct western passage by sea from Europe to Asia, and finding a new world was problematic for him. He could not admit that he had come upon new lands, but adhered to his claim, at least rhetorically, that he had reached Asia. Columbus made Spain famous and infamous.

Explorers from other countries, such as England and France, emulated Columbus, but they also used texts and images to create what was much later called the Black Legend of Spain. In Discoverie of Guiana (1596), Walter Ralegh, poet, soldier, and courtier, suggested that England emulate, rival, and displace Spain, bringing up the lost opportunity that Henry VII had to employ Columbus: “The West Indies were first offered to her Maiesties Grandfather by Columbus, a straunger” (Ralegh 99). In The English Empire (1685), Nathaniel Crouch, or R.B., discusses Columbus, “after whose example several others made further Discoveries” (see R.B.). Jeremy Belknap meditated on the four-hundredth anniversary of Columbus’ landfall, seeing Columbus as “one of the few who had begun to think for themselves” (Belknap 19). Here, Columbus becomes a figure for this new country, the United States, to forge its history and identity. Joel Barlow, an American poet, employs Columbus for his epic, The Columbiad. In his epic, Tasso uses Columbus as an ekphrasis, whereas Barlow makes him the hero of his poem (see Barlow). Harriet Munroe’s Columbian Ode (1893), written for the World’s Columbian Exposition in Chicago, does not mention Columbus by name, and leads to a Columbia triumphant in the seas and skies. In 1992, both commemorations and protests marked the landfall of Columbus, as part of the indigenous peoples looking at the damage that first contact had done to them and their habitat (Gentry and Grinde; Hart, Columbus, Shakespeare, and the Interpretation of the New World; Summerhill and Williams).

Las Casas, whose family had connections to Columbus, also produced a text—A Short Account of the Destruction of the Indies (1542, pub. 1552)—that exerted great influence in other countries and became part of the Black Legend or La Leyenda Negra, a complex of texts, images, and attitudes representing anti-Spanish sentiment,
in which the Spaniards are made out to be cruel in the Old World and the New World
in a kind of typology of cruelty (on Las Casas and the Black Legend, see Clayton).
The French and English translated his work at times of crisis from 1579 onward.
He is controversial because he is often praised by the French, English, and others
for his representation, or is blamed by them for his misrepresentation of Spanish
colonization in the New World. Other countries translated Las Casas and used his
work to build anti-Spanish propaganda. Although at first the French and English
sought to emulate Spain, they, along with the Dutch, drew on writers like Las Casas
to develop the Black Legend (see DeGuzmán; Greer et al.; Hart, “French and English
Translations”, Representing the New World; Maltby; Sánchez).

A key text in this legend, as we have seen, was Las Casas’s A Short Account. Jacques
Miggrode’s translation of Las Casas’s Brevisíssima relación, which was printed in
Antwerp (1579), then in Paris (1582), and finally in Lyon (1630), stressed the tyr-
anny and cruelty of the Spaniards. The English translation of Las Casas’s text, The
Spanish Colonie, Or Briefe Chronicle of the Acts and gestes of the Spaniards in the West
Indies, called the newe World... (1583), relied on Miggrode’s French translation rather
than on the Spanish original (see Hart, Representing the New World; Saint-Lu; on Las
Casas, see Hernández). These translations are just a small part of the web that came
out of Las Casas’s text, which also involved images and words of cruelty, and the role
of translation and intertextuality shows an overlap of the literatures and cultures in
Latin, Spanish, French, English, Dutch, and other languages. National, comparative,
and international (world) elements coexist and vie in the competition of religious,
imperial, and political power and ideology.

This kind of textual mobility and translation of study and translation itself, as
well as the translation of empire, may also find an illustration in a text by Father
Matteo Ricci (Limadou, Limatou), a Jesuit who cofounded the mission in China with
Father Valignano. Ricci wrote his diary in Italian. Later, it was translated into Latin
and published in 1615 by Father Nicola Trigault. The diary was brought from Macao
to Rome, along with an account of the death and burial of Ricci. Three centuries
after Marco Polo, Ricci was responsible for reopening China to the West. Following
this publication of the diary, this text had four Latin editions, three in French, and
one each in German, Spanish, and Italian. Moreover, there were excerpts in English
in Purchas His Pilgrim in 1625. However, it was not until 300 years after Ricci’s
death that Father Tacchi Venturi published the original diary in Italian. In 1953,
the Ricci diary appeared in a fuller English translation of Trigault’s Latin version
by Father Louis J. Gallagher (Hart, Poetics of Otherness; on the rites controversy, see
Minamiki). This text has become important in the relations between China and the
West and in the religious history of the church and of exploration and settlement.
It is a significant work in English but has a complex comparative and international
(world) context. There is an intricate connection between writer and translators to
readers in the production and reception of Ricci’s diary about China, perhaps in a
similar fashion to that of Marco Polo and Rustichello da Pisa, his fellow prisoner in
Genoa and perhaps his fellow creator of *The Travels of Marco Polo* (see Hart, *Poetics of Otherness*; Hsia; Spence).

Like Milton after him, Shakespeare is English and a key figure in English literature, but I have argued that he is also a comparative and international (world) author, who draws on classical and modern sources outside of England or Britain as sources as well as for stories, those most migratory of entities. Shakespeare’s schooling in Latin and Greek and his ability to read other languages provides an element of comparison and intercultural or world literature and culture. The nature of translation, intertextuality, and reception in Columbus, Bartolomé de Las Casas, and Father Ricci is national, comparative, and international, so to limit each figure to national or comparative or world literature would be one-eyed.

III

To choose among national, comparative, and world literatures is a false choice. They are complementary. We cannot deny that we have nations today, partly created from internal colonization, and that colonization went hand in hand with external colonization for states such as England and France, as well as for Russia, China, India, Canada, and the United States. Polities like France and England were not places where French and English alone were spoken, despite attempts to overwhelm other languages such as Cornish or Breton. Boundaries also shift. With expansion, English and French literatures become even more comparative and global or worldly. The American colonies, later the United States, have produced literature in English. In Canada, literatures in French and English are produced. Moreover, in these multicultural countries, literature is written in many languages. Authors and readers can be multilingual.

In England itself, Hakluyt, Shakespeare, and Milton use other languages to forge English and English literature and culture. Paradoxically, identity is based on otherness. The expansion of England into Britain into the British Empire, and the growth of Anglo-Saxon from a dialect or small Germanic language to perhaps the world language, is an accident of history. This very growth in language, culture, and literature has made English literature into literature in English, and is now a matter of many cultures and part of comparative literature and world literature. It is also true of France and China, where to be French or Chinese in France or China and elsewhere is more complex than ever.

The linguistic, cultural, and political borders of countries have changed over time, so territory is not the only way to look at literatures. The Welsh speak more English than they once did. Spanish texts were first in the part of Mexico that was lost to the United States in the 1840s. There were also written texts, oral stories, and images in indigenous languages in the New World. For the indigenous peoples, the Europeans were explorers, uninvited guests, invaders, settlers, colonists, and the like. Once
the Europeans arrived, they made claims on lands that were not theirs. Alaska was Russian. Parts of the United States were in British North America (now Canada). Families move. They have their own histories as writers and readers do.

In all this, the starting point could be India, China, or Indonesia, or the like, and the point of view would be different. There is no one centre, but identity and otherness, unity and multiplicity are bound together. There are many national, comparative, and world literatures. Texts and images are mobile and multiple, even if they can also be used to assert identity. The one and the other are intertwined, and the same is true in fields, and in the ways we divide and unite under the rubric of literature.
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