

PROGRAMA DE PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM HISTÓRIA-PPGH/UNIRIO  
PROCESSO SELETIVO DISCENTE - DOUTORADO  
EDITAL N. 11/2022

PROVA DE COMPREENSÃO DE TEXTOS EM LÍNGUAS ESTRANGEIRAS -  
INGLÊS

**No texto reproduzido abaixo, fazer a tradução para o português dos trechos sublinhados.**

This essay attributes the transnational turn to anti- and postcolonial scholarship and argues that this body of thought contains an implicit critique of comparative method. In the first of two parts, the article considers the underpinnings of the transnational turn and its consequences for understanding subject-formation and, therefore, comparative method. It reflects on the lessons anti- and postcolonial scholarship can offer comparativists. From Frantz Fanon to Edward Said to Elsa Barkley Brown, anti- and postcolonial intellectuals compel attention to the transnational and caution against comparisons. The second part of the essay applies their cautions, moving to the historical literature. Taking historiography as narrative, this section selects a handful of authors from the great number of scholars who have interested themselves in comparisons of the United States and Brazil, presenting them as active agents in the construction of race and of notions of national character. It follows the ways in which the field of comparative history has been shaped by overtly political comparisons that have helped produce the very notions, subjects, and experiences of national difference that in turn attract further comparative study. Academic comparisons help make race, and they should be treated by historians of ideas and of racial construction not as methodological models but as subjects in their own right.

Since I argue in favor of a particular stripe of transnational history, I will offer a working definition, understanding that conceptions of transnational history vary. My sense is that the term was coined to distinguish this field from international history, the study of nation-states interacting as such. Transnational history examines units that spill over and seep through national borders, units both greater and smaller than the nation-state. International models have guided diplomatic history, military history, and related fields; their state focus proves less compelling for historians of non elite subjects, which in part explains the embrace of transnational method by social and cultural historians.

Transnational history does not simply cover more ground; it is not equivalent to world history—world historians, like everybody else, must still choose between transnational and international approaches.

Micol Seigel, “Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn”, *Radical History Review*, Issue 91 (Winter 2005): 62–90.