

Referência: Penna, Camillo. "Antonio Candido's Critical Method". *Santa Barbara Portuguese Studies*, volume IV: 1997, p. 184-219.

## ANTONIO CANDIDO'S CRITICAL METHOD

Para Ismail Xavier, sem comprometé-lo.

Antonio Candido's greatest contribution to Brazilian thinking is the constitution of literary criticism as an autonomous field of knowledge, with its own separate and delimited object. This mobilizes a double movement of: first, the differentiation of the field of criticism in relation to other objects of knowledge (say, in relation to sociology), a movement responding to a profoundly "enlightened" inspiration (in the sense of the *Aufklärung*); and, second, the "incorporation" of the exteriority of social processes to the literary object, the former reconfigured as an internal border or limit of the object of research, which in literary terms is described as the articulation between text and the *real*. Applied to the study of Brazilian literature, or to its "fashioning" (*formação*), an occupation to which Candido dedicated a great part of his efforts, these two movements correspond to the two sides of the process of cultural emancipation and describe the way the subject of Brazilian literature (or Brazilian literature as subject) constitutes itself. Basically, Brazilian literature is formed in the double movement of differentiating itself from Portugal, continuing the lineage of Portuguese literature, and of integrating extraneous peoples, the "residual" (as Raymond Williams would call it), or subaltern cultures, which it reflects, incorporating them, at the same time that it excludes them, homogenizing the heterogeneous, as multiple contents subsumed within a unified (but differentiated) form. The structuring of "formation"--as in Candido's 1957 *Formação da Literatura Brasileira (Fashioning of Brazilian Literature)*--describes this integrative expansion of national representation.

There is a whole cycle of *fashionings* of Brazil. Arguably, all of these essays on Brazilian development follow the individual model of Nabuco's autobiographical

*Bildungsroman*, *Minha Formação* (1900).<sup>1</sup> My guess is that they are all “novels of development” of sorts, or, as we call it in Portuguese, *romances de formação*. The result in each case is an autonomous national subject, delimited by a separating boundary, defined by internal properties and articulated with an outside. The nature of this "putting-into-form" is the process of subjectivization, i.e. the constitution of the national subject through a double and contradictory movement of independence from (thus the intrinsic connection with dependency theory), and subjection to the system of objects which constitute the international symbolic order.

Subjectivization is not without a certain part of subjection, as Foucault would say, by which I mean that the constitution of the peripheral nation as a self-determined entity implies that the nation is constituted *within* the system of Western cultures, according to the categories molded by the West. These categories *constitute* the national identity by providing the medium in which cultural "independence" takes place, and by the same token they exclude everything that does not fit the rigorous delimitations of this rule of formation. Whence the tremendous exclusions the national subject operates: of marginal subjectivities, of oral cultures, of cultures in short which fall out of the strictly defined parameters prescribed by the Western tradition. The *Bildung* essays are accounts of this system of exclusion. They narrate the process of nation building from a genetic point of view, attempting to tackle the very same diagnosis: that of the "malformation" or of the "unformed" character of Brazil, the structurally "inorganic" (to use a term favored by Caio Prado Junior), alienated, borrowed, fragmentary, nature of the Brazilian culture. At the heart of the diagnosis lies the transplanted nature of an European culture transported to America, as well as, I would add, the history of the "supplantation" of indian and African populations, as well as of other immigrations, which will only interest these authors as elements to be integrated within the progressive "line" of national development. Like in *Minha Formação* (the title is synonym of "my education"), the solution to the problem is a modernizing, educational project, that is, the application of an organizing *form*. We can thus see the ambiguous place such a concept of *form* has in the *Bildung* essays: its lack, on the one hand, accounts for the

problematic continuation of an European tradition in a colonial country, while, on the other hand, the application of a *form* is prescribed as the solution to the problem of colonization.

In the project of literary *fashioning* Candido reconstructs a continuity in Brazilian literature, locating its linear dynamism as it is displaced from Europe to Brazil, or from the coastal elite to the people of the interior, in the popular-national synthesis of the forties (a simple projection of international hegemony to within the country itself).<sup>2</sup> The question remains as to what Candido does with the social movements which remain external to the constituted body of Brazilian literary works, but which these works need to absorb in order for "Brazilian Culture" to be. This article will be a reflection on the nature of this moving, porous limit, a border which delimits from within what it excludes from without, as Brazil becomes Brazil differentiating itself from Portugal, continuing Portugal in what is Brazil, becoming people as it excludes the people, that is, as it speaks *for* subaltern cultures. The first section below will describe the double mechanism of internalization of the outside, and of internal differentiation, at the core of Candido's method. The second section will develop the notion of "literary system," as the rule of formation of the *Formação*, the criterion that will decide which are the works to be included or excluded in the literary canon. The third section will look at the "genealogical tree" metaphor which situates Brazilian culture in the Western tradition as both a continuation and a differentiation within the "trunk" of the West, as well as briefly glance at some of the other *Bildung* accounts. The fourth section will study the case of Machado de Assis, as the point in which the literary formation of Brazil would have been accomplished. And finally, the fifth section will attempt to draw a model of Candido's method from his most famous critical intervention, the "Dialectics of Malandroism."

## **1. Inside out**

Let us follow the development of the theme of differentiation in Candido's work. It is precisely in the direction of the "differentiation" of the aesthetic that he begins to formulate his method in the dissertation of 1945 on *O método crítico de Sílvio Romero*. Sílvio Romero, he

argued, basically lacked a properly aesthetic concept of criticism, adopting instead extraliterary, extraneous factors--the racial and sociological determinism--as criterion to explain literature. (Sílvio Romero *was* a racist.) It is thus against the imperialism of the external factor as an interpretative value, the social and the racial elevated to the role of causes, their “devouring tendency,” that Candido insistently opposed the “specificity of the literary phenomenon,”<sup>3</sup> a criticism which would be based “upon [literature's] internal resources.”<sup>4</sup> One recognizes already the famous paradox from *Literatura e sociedade*, located at the heart of Candido’s critical method: “the external becomes internal and criticism ceases to be sociological, and becomes just criticism,”<sup>5</sup> which locates the social in the material substance of literature. This saturation of the literary with what borders it, incorporating inside what is outside, is therefore balanced by the opposing drive of differentiation, of multiplying distinctions where before there were none.

Thus in the same *Literatura e sociedade* Candido diagnosed the absolutism of the literary in Brazilian essay-writing, the “omnivorous” character of literature, which gave birth to the “mixed genre of the essay,” “constructed in the confluence of history and economy.”<sup>6</sup> Needless to say, this undifferentiation is connected to the *letrado*, to the figure of the “know it all” humanist intellectual, to whom Angel Rama dedicated profound pages. On the one hand Brazil’s most talented men were fiction writers and, on the other, specific sciences such as sociology were shaped in a literary form. The best examples of this omnivorous literature, that is, the literature which takes over the total field of culture, is the essay-writing of the thirties--the paradigmatic examples being Gilberto Freyre’s *Casa-Grande e Senzala* and *Sobrados e Mucambos*, as well as Sérgio Buarque de Hollanda’s *Raízes do Brasil*.<sup>7</sup> These essays would witness to a peculiar imbrication between science and literature, observation and imagination, utilizing a free form of expression akin to literary exploration in order to treat specific sociological, political, and economic subjects. This confusion of boundaries ends in the fifties. Basically, Alencar or Domingos Olímpio, for example, were, in the nineteenth century, both, at once, the Gilberto Freyre and the José Lins do Rego, the sociologist and the fiction writer, of their time. This differentiation is again the result of a double movement and in it one recognizes

the dialectical matrix of Candido's thinking: literature ceases to be privileged, the literary becomes a field among others as literature simultaneously "turns upon itself" ("specifying itself"<sup>8</sup>). This process of folding or bending upon itself, of self-reflection or self-consciousness, is the result of a double attack, from within and from without omnivorous literature. It is attacked from the outside by social sciences, and from the inside by the literary as a specific field, that is, the multiplication of objects of knowledge produces a crisis which forces literature to specify itself.

These then are the two poles in the middle of which Candido's criticism will move: an imperialism of the deterministic external factor, represented by Sílvia Romero, Brazil's first systematic literary critic; and the omnivorous literature, the literature which occupies all the cultural space. In one case the external (sociological, racial) factor ends up devouring the literary, and on the other the literary devours the external (sociology). Both are cases of excessive privilege, of one of the fields of competence exceeding its own specific mandate and overstepping its determinate boundaries. To these two extreme positions Candido opposes the specificity of the aesthetic field, a field with a limited mandate, but which in the case of Brazil is not so limited, because the literary is invested with the function of national construction.

The posing of the purity of the aesthetic field should not, at the same time, Candido argues, be confused with structuralism's closed formal universe where the autonomous text is completely cut off from any context. In this case the problem would not be as much one of boundaries or jurisdiction as much as a denial of the articulation of boundaries per se, whereby the text would be constituted as an authorial enclosure. By refusing literature its peculiar location, it would be neglecting to treat the crucial and complex limit which differentiates text from what borders it. The purity of the aesthetics should not be confounded with the substantialization of form. Structuralism should however be understood against the excesses of deterministic criticism (i.e. Sílvia Romero), and its contribution recognized, since it provided analytical tools for the study of literary texts, as well as the "conception of the work as an organism,"<sup>9</sup> that is, as an internally differentiated unit. But this internal differentiation should

not eliminate the work's articulation in the social field. In fact the organicity of the work can renew the possibilities of determinism by multiplying and varying the factors, locating them in the structure.

This concept of the work as an internally differentiated structure has a social counterpart, and here Candido's reading of the British functionalist Anthropologists of the thirties (people such as Malinowski, Radcliffe-Brown and Evans-Pritchard) has certainly left an imprint. Let us unfold the false parallelism: the organic work is marked by internal articulations which mirror the internal articulations of the social. A properly intrinsic criticism will not fail to locate in the configuration of the work the articulations of the social. Like the work, society as a whole differentiates itself in a number of functions which include literature among other functions; one should in fact learn to see in society a movement of progressive differentiation. In an Indian tribe as read by Malinowski, for example, one witnesses the undifferentiation of the artistic sphere, as it begins to detach itself from magic and technique.<sup>10</sup> When the artistic function distinguishes itself, becoming an autonomous field among others, the *socius* becomes an ensemble of different, intimately articulated functions, that is, a system or a structure.

This proposition fundamentally renovates the connection between sociology and literature. The social will only interest the literary as long as it is filtrated by an aesthetic concept, in such a way that the former will be verifiable within the actual configuration of form. Otherwise, if extraneous to the literary *formation*, localized in the *socius* and not in the text, it would pertain to sociology and not to literature. At the same time, the literary is located within the social field understood as a system of relations. Within this system literature has its specific position, corresponding to a proper function. There is apparently no parallelism between the two fields, the literary and the social, but there is articulation between the two, of one in the other. The internal organicity of the work is related to its external organicity within the social field. A fold within the immanent field of the *socius*, the literary is organized in the same fashion. Or to speak in Luckasian terms: society and history are captured within the form, and society and history as form. But once the distinction between the two different fields is established, one sees

that there *is* a parallelism of a more profound nature. Literature is a totality articulated with an outside (if such a thing as an outside to a totality can be imagined), and likewise, sociology is conceived as a totality hinged to literature.

## **2. The concept of system**

The differentiation of the literary and the constitution of its specific space seems therefore to be the crucial question posed by Candido's criticism. The significant advance presented by the *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* is to be seen in the configuration of the process of systematization of literary history leading to the constitution of the Brazilian literary canon, that is, the corpus of representative works.<sup>11</sup> Candido defines the notion of "literary system" in the first chapter of the theoretical section which initiates the *Formação*. It constitutes the conceptual matrix, the organizational principle of the whole process, its ontology, if you will, put in place of Sílvio Romero's extraneous causes, but as an internal, literary criterion. A whole movement of economy of theory is in place here if one compares the *Formação* with previous similar canons, especially Sílvio Romero's 1888 *História da Literatura Brasileira* with its long theoretical section occupying the first volume of the four volume work. The internalization of the cause in the work, the localization of the social in its internal articulation, determines a reduction of the theoretical apparatus. The historical dynamism which moves the process of construction of the literary canon, the criterion of validation which arms it, should work from within, and with strategic but minimal recourse to biographical and sociological facts.

What defines the "system" is the existence of a group of literary works connected by a common denominator which consists in the existence of an ensemble of producers, consumers and transmitters of the literary artifact or, as he will later on summarize: in the "inextricable relation [...] between work, author and public."<sup>12</sup> Again, the process of *formation* is described as a movement of differentiation: different works and producers generate a selfconscious system of interpretation of "different aspects of reality."<sup>13</sup> The simple existence of different works-producers does not configure a system. Most important is the existence of a public, which

determines the differentiation of the space into producers and consumers of literature. A system would be configured only when a community or a public exists, determining the common ground upon which literature takes place. Prior to the constitution of this common space, literature is defined by its scattered character. They are "literary manifestations" which lack the organic linking element, the "common denominator." Literature would only have become organic in Brazil in the eighteenth century with the constitution of the literary academies, and especially with the Neoclassicism of Minas. Thus the much debated exclusion of Gregório de Mattos, who would have only existed in the "local" level of Bahia and would have not actually "existed," literarily speaking, until Romanticism, when editions of his work were made available to the general public.

It is well-known, in this context, Haroldo de Campos' criticism of this "kidnapping" of the Brazilian baroque.<sup>14</sup> Candido's point, however, is not to say that Gregório was not the major poet that he was. He never denied his aesthetic quality, he fundamentally denied his literary existence in an organized, differentiated community. The point is tricky but essential if one wants to understand Candido's ontology. The differentiated community, the *system* acts here as a normative criterion for the definition of the literary field, and like any criterion, some elements are excluded. A literary work only exists configured within a system of relations. Outside it might exist physically (Gregório or Anchieta obviously actually existed, produced, and were read), but it would not have existed *organically* in a common ground, in a network of relations. What is external (Gregório or, I would add, all forms which do not correspond to the high-culture model) needs to be incorporated into the network of a system in order to acquire *reality*, not objective reality, but reality within the system. It is this genetic principle, the principle of the evolution of the Brazilian literary formation, its intrinsic dynamism--the collective aspect of the literary artifact--which determines the continuity of the literary process. Imported from anthropology, the notions of organicity, systematicity, structure, or totality (which are not synonyms but refer to a similar idea) fall short in understanding the constitution of Brazilian literature.<sup>15</sup> The *system* is the requisite for literary existence, outside the system one is *not*. It

consists quite simply in Candido's formula for the *subject* of Brazilian literature, the key for the *self-fashioning*, the civilizatory *form* in its pure form. One sees the movement from description to prescription implicit in this application of the point-of-view of anthropology to the history of Brazilian literature: this is how it works in so-called "primitive" societies, and this is how Brazilian society/literature *should* work. If it does not, one is out. A methodological (technical) criterion is also a powerful tool of exclusion. Candido defines in the following way the related notion of continuity:

When the writers' activities of a given period integrate themselves in such a system, another decisive element takes place: the formation of a literary continuity, a kind of transmission of the torch in a relay race, which assures in time the movement of the ensemble, defining the lineaments of the whole.<sup>16</sup>

This transmission, configured as a continuous teleological line, is what he calls a "tradition." Notice the subtle displacement of synchronicity into diachronicity ; the way the integration of the works in a contemporary ensemble (the integrated community of selfconscious producers-works-public) simultaneously and subreptitiously determines the variation in time, in the continuity of a tradition conceived linearly, as the relay race metaphor translates.

The systematic unity of different works integrated in a historical process constitutes the antidote to the structural fragmentariness (the "malformation") of Brazilian culture, intimately linked to its alienated origin: an European culture transplanted to the Americas and based upon the exclusionary genocide of the native habitants of the land and on the slavery of Africans. To find a genetic principle, a conductor line which guides the process consists then in a requisite for the determination of the fate of the national formation of the hegemonic literature.<sup>17</sup>

Now in "Literature and Underdevelopment" Antonio Candido shows that an important moment for Latin American Literature towards overcoming dependency from first world sources is the "capacity to produce works of the first order, influenced by previous national examples."<sup>18</sup> He names this, "a bit mechanically," "internal causality." This consists in a system of internal derivation, whereby the literary source is transferred to within the nation. Works and authors can

then refer to external sources, but only secondarily, the engine having been established internally. The example he gives is illustrating: Brazilian modernism of the twenties is to a great extent derived from European avant-garde. But already the next generation is derived directly from modernism. Thus, for example, João Cabral de Melo Neto, was influenced by Carlos Drummond de Andrade, from the preceding generation, even though Paul Valéry and the Spanish poets came into the formula as well. Foreign sources can and should be part of the synthesis (this is not a had-core nationalism), but the main point of reference has to be internal.

Protectionism against overbearing foreign models precribes the establishment of "internal causality," as a condition for national production. The inner reality of the country needs to be protected against the overdetermination of the foreign imports. The history of literature is a linear progression, a succession of representative authors in synchronic and diachronic continuity, forming a systematic serial sequence.<sup>19</sup> Clearly, such a schema which fashions development as an evolutionary process (hence the "mechanic" proviso) is completely unable to account for "lateral" connections, i.e. connections which are not configured within the evolutionary line it precribes to development. By establishing the priority of a law of affiliation (an internal affiliation which mimicks the dependent affiliation to European models, simply transferring it within) Candido dismisses, for example, the possibility of "connecting" with other Latin American, or with African authors, etc. It is not enough to say that Candido's is a descriptive statement, because this is "how it happened" at the time, and that it would change latter on.<sup>20</sup> We have seen how quickly descriptive formulations become prescriptive in this context. The genealogical development (a descriptive as well as a normative concept) retains with remarkable faithfulness a two-way street colonial structure (of import/export), reminiscent of a dependency theory scenario, which undermines the constitution of more complex networks.

Temporal serialization echoes as well societal serialization. A continuity in tradition mirrors a continuity within a given community. The key to both is the process of differentiation. In this respect it might be interesting to dwell on the way Candido's account of the beginnings of Brazilian literature is echoed by his summary of Malinowski in *Literatura e Sociedade*. As we

have seen above, when he describes the formation of the literary academies in the end of the eighteenth century, it is clear that the determining factor for him is the constitution of a collective medium, an ensemble of conscious producers and consumers of culture. The academies constitute, in a manner of speaking, an "autopublic in a country without publics."<sup>21</sup>

Consciousness is what establishes the unity of the group as such and prepares the movement of differentiation in process here. At first a specific group of writers did not exist, they were assimilated in the generic groups of elite leaders, administrators and professionals. Through the constitution of the academies, however, a group begins to differentiate itself and produces the recognizable syncretic figure of the *letrado* which will subsequently be separated into several functions, according to a system of serial bifurcation. Now in *Literatura e sociedade* Candido describes the way the artist is not distinguished from the craftsman in "archaic societies," summarizing Malinowski's account of Melanesian canoe building (in *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*). The canoe is made by a specialist helped by his relatives (the apprentices); throughout the whole process from the cutting of the tree until the release into the sea, the craftsman utters incantations, of which the "poetic tenure is very accentuated."<sup>22</sup> One is witnessing at this point to a "really indissoluble union" between technique, magic and poetry. Once the artistic function is distinguished, however, the tendency is for artists to gather in groupal formations (*confrarias*, much like the Brazilian academies), and it is through these "cohesive and differentiated groups" that art/artisanship acts on society.<sup>23</sup> This collective function of art can be seen both in primitive and in historical societies, and is decisive for oral cultures (due to the importance of keeping a tradition), as well as for Greece or for the Western Middle Ages. Subsequently--we already know the configuration of the evolutionary process--this group itself is differentiated. It is basically this functionalist system (originated in anthropology) which will be projected upon Brazilian literary formation.

### **3. The organic metaphor**

The constitution of a literary canon , the telos of the *Formação* , is inscribed in the process of political emancipation from a nineteenth century Romantic perspective, that is, from the perspective of the configuration of independent nation-states as a “major narrative of emancipation” to use Lyotard’s terminology,<sup>24</sup> a narrative which will describe the “history of Brazilians in their desire to have a literature,” as Candido paraphrases Julien Benda.<sup>25</sup> But what does the expression “desire to have a literature” mean? “Desire,” that is, the movement towards becoming oneself in the *conscious* appropriation of what one is not. Thus in “Literatura de dois gumes” Candido writes:

For the historian, the most interesting aspect of the literature in the countries of America is the adaptation of the European aesthetic and intellectual patterns to the physical and social conditions of the New World, through the process of colonization, of which it is an episode.<sup>26</sup>

The process of construction of a national literature should be seen therefore as a movement of *implantation* of Western culture in America, and as such is undistinguishable from a fundamentally conservative project. The history of the *supplantation* of Indigenous and African populations is the background, or rather the ground upon which the emancipated nation-state is constructed and points to its radical “bad consciousness,” its structurally ideological configuration and its imprisonment within exclusionary representation.

The *forming* of the nation is not without its own protectionism, a requisite for the constitution of an internal space which differentiates itself from an outside. Interestingly, in the first preface to the *Formação* , it is precisely a question of “walking out” of a national culture.

There are literatures which a man does not need to leave in order to receive culture and enrich the sensibility; there are others which can only occupy a part of the readers’s life, at the cost of irredeemably restraining his horizon. Thus, we can imagine a French, an Italian, an Englishman, a German, even a Russian and a Spanish, who only know the authors of his own land, and,

nevertheless, find in them enough to elaborate a vision of things, experiencing the highest literary emotions.

If this is unthinkable in the case of Portugal, what is to be said of a Brazilian? Our literature is the secondary branch of the Portuguese one, in turn a shrub of the second order in the garden of the muses...<sup>27</sup>

In our days this assessment will certainly appear defeatist, attesting to a clear internalization of colonial cultural parameters. It is questionable, for example, that a French, or an Italian (notice that already the Russian and the Spanish form a second rank category) would have a complete existential experience, literary or otherwise, were they to be confined to reading only their own national literatures. They would be as "provincial" as the Brazilian described by Candido, who would have read only Brazilian literature. On the other hand, this assessment marks the resolute internationalism of Candido's approach; it is what makes Brazilian literature a comparative literature, in his own words.<sup>28</sup> But this intrinsic dependency on other literatures, he argues, is what makes Brazilians so disinterested in their own literature. Of a weaker, inferior, eminently derivative quality, why read Brazilian literature? *Formação* is aimed as an antidote to this neglect. Strategically the book responds to a renewed interest for "Brazilian things," not a simple valorization of their inner, intrinsic quality--that would be pure nationalism--but a "desire" reshaped and regrounded on a clear systematization of Western literature, of which Brazil would be a part, a "branch" in the "trunk" of the genealogical tree of the West (to continue using the tree metaphor which prevails in here).

Let us briefly follow this organic metaphor. Neoclassic enlightenment is said to "*plant once and for all Western literature in Brazil*" in the eighteenth century (my emphasis).<sup>29</sup> Candido's argument is polemical; his criterion for privileging Neoclassicism over the more obvious Romanticism is strictly "enlightened." Against all assumptions, Romanticism is in fact more alienating than Neoclassicism, since in it the request for localism is prescribed by the foreign gaze. It is, in fact, in the discipline of enlightened literary parameters that "local color" would finally transpire, in Alvarenga or Basílio da Gama. (Notice that locality emerges as an

interstitial "tone," a residual *color* in the enlightened form.) The organic metaphor, repeatedly inscribed by Candido in this passage, pointing to the root of the whole question of genetic origination in *formation*, describes the integration of Brazilian culture in the "tree," so to speak, of Western letters. Brazilian difference would only be interesting as far as it is articulated systematically, that is, universality, organically, in the body of Western cultures.

Candido probably found the tree metaphor in José Veríssimo in a famous 1899 article entitled significantly "What does our literature lack." Here the metaphor is seen in its whole nineteenth century "biological," deterministic splendour:

I consider, therefore, Brazilian literature as an offshoot [*ramo*] of the Portuguese, to which sometimes it returns due to the indefectible law of atavism [sic], as we have seen in the imitation of Portuguese literary movements, or, even better, in the preoccupation, nowadays almost general among our writers, of writing in a pure Portuguese, according to the classical models of the mother-literature. This offshoot, on which were grafted other elements, is already distinguished from the main trunk because of some characteristics of its own, but not in such a way that at the first glance one does not notice that it is the same tree, only modified by the transplantation to other climates. It is possible that new grafts and the prolonged influence of the environment will slowly differentiate it more, but while the language be the same, it will always be like what happens in botanical families, a variety of the species.<sup>30</sup>

The West is seen here as a great genealogical tree, an unified organism (the trunk), differentiated in an ensemble of cultures (languages), hierarchically grouped in families, as variations of the same totality (the species), and following a movement of progression. Needless to say, this point of view is indebted to nineteenth century biologism (the notion of atavistic programming), historicism and classificatory project.<sup>31</sup> The "arborization" of cultural history seen as a linear sequence of grafts and bifurcations--where the ramifications bear the same genetic imprint as the "mother"-cultures but in a lesser, less accomplished form (the grafts)--

presupposes a model of origination and sequential decay. Canonical examples of such historiography in the twentieth century are Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West* and Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History*.<sup>32</sup> Placed in a temporal sequence where each element is positioned in relation to the whole as organs located inside an organism, each organ is both different and the same in relation to each other, each one's specificity and original contribution to civilization seen in the frame of the general common (genetic) background of their belonging to the West.<sup>33</sup> The dialectics of identity and difference is overdetermined by the identity principle, whereby specific differences are absorbed in the expansionist (bio-)logic of sameness. Defined by an identity of origin, by a lineage of which the beginning is located in Europe, or more precisely in Greece, the farther one is removed from the origin the more one lacks, the less integral one is. As such the specificity of Brazilian culture can only be found as a derivation of the Western civilization, "the civilization to which we belong."<sup>34</sup> Brazilian culture is thus a bifurcation, an offshoot grafted at the flank of the already meager Portuguese trunk.

The organizing unity of the differential process which comprises Brazilian culture as a continuation of the (Portuguese) Western tradition is thus not without its own colonial overtones, which Candido inherits from tradition. The main consequence of the internalization of the colonial process is the pervasive feeling of "lack" in relation to European national canons (as in "What does our literature lack"), anthologically registered by Sergio Buarque de Holanda, in his assertion of feeling "exiled [*desterrado*] in [Brazilian] land."<sup>35</sup> Constructed in the specular identification with the wholesome, integral figure of European nations (the totality of the whole organism projected upon the totalities of "mother"-cultures), Brazilian identity will always be lacking, precariously adapted to a reality which remains foreign to the European model *implanted* by colonization. Nationalism is subtly mixed with self-hatred. Candido puts it aptly:

[...] these ambivalences which make our patriotism a kind of self-contempt, a nostalgia of the matrix-countries and a confused adoration of the hand that punishes and exploits.<sup>36</sup>

The reemergence of the organic metaphor, detached from its overtly biological origin in the nineteenth century, in Candido's claim for the "organicity" of the literary system targets the superficiality of the Brazilian national construction, the intrinsic fragmentariness of what Paulo Emílio once called "formal Brazil."<sup>37</sup> Against "formality," the "malformation" of Brazilian culture, the recurrent atavistic mimicry of Portuguese models mentioned by Veríssimo, Candido proposes a *forming* of culture, its organic establishment, its relevance to the *real* Brazil against the frivolousness of a borrowed and essentially dependent colonial culture.

The construction of an organic unity based on the model of hegemonic European cultures is therefore at the core of the desire for a "systematization" of Brazilian literature drawn in the *Formação*. At the theoretical level, however, the idea of "system" means a significant advance, since it implies the debunking of a simplistic privilege of the local as a response to an external stimulus; it makes impossible a regressive, facile nationalism based solely on the valorization of the national as a *petitio principii*. Thus a nation cannot be seen outside the "totality" of relations which determines and modifies its reality and through which it is expressed. To see the body of cultures as an ensemble of connections precludes then the simple postulation of a "special" (one would say nowadays, "essential") reality of the local. Brazilian reality is by definition filtered through representation, and representation is a system which encompasses Brazil, but which is not reduced to it. At the same time, conceiving the nation as an ensemble of connections, itself articulated with the tradition of civilization, precludes the external existence of localisms, of "others" (Gregório does not exist, there are no women writers in *Formação*, Machado is read as a "white" writer, it is never a question of native populations, only of "indians," pre-Cabralian traditions are not included). The internalization *by* and *in* the "system" of the West, "grafted" on the trunk of civilization, prescribes that the local "plants" have to be retranslated into the language of the hegemonic culture. Gender or ethnic marks become interstitial, residual articulations (Candido's local *color*), in such a way that there ceases to be a possibility for the constitution of different kinds of subjectivities. The condition of the possibility of an "outside"--

whose existence is not completely determined, desired, constructed by the Western system--reemerges at this juncture as a pressing issue.

All of the *formation* essays of Brazil consist in the reformulation of this same structure. Nabuco paved the way, describing the inner feeling the Brazilian Euro-centric intellectual has of not belonging in Brazil, of being radically divided between a culturally bare fatherland and a cultural depth which the fatherland so radically lacks. The dialectics of the universal and the particular, of which the synthesis is the *form* of Brazilian literature, according to Candido,<sup>38</sup> finds in Nabuco a very developed statement. The compromise between the Francophile's identification with the European culture (Nabuco claims, for example, that his style in Portuguese is a simple translation of his writing in French)<sup>39</sup> and his love for his country, between "feeling" (Brazil) and "thinking" (Europe), between reality (Brazil) and aesthetics/imagination (Europe), leads, in a quintessentially *Bildungsroman* fashion, to a "giving up" of aspirations and a reshaping of everything within the limited confines of the local. Candido utters the very same "giving up" in the beginning of the *Formação*, when he states the "committed" character of Brazilian literature, intrinsically involved in the process of national construction, and having therefore to sadly "renounce imagination," the flights of fantasy which define universal literature.<sup>40</sup> It is this consciousness of the obligation of producing the nation literarily that determined Brazilian literature's character as representation (the faithfulness to documentary of sentimental reality), and constituted its dependent character to previous, external objects.

All of the *formation* accounts unfold a genetic structure where history is seen as an intrinsic consequence of the origin, attesting to a debt towards an organic model. They all consist of a diagnosis of the "unformed" character of Brazil, starting invariably with a chapter on the "origins" or the "foundations" of the problem, and proceeding to unfold its subsequent history as a manifestation of the issues which were there from inception. In Candido's as well as in Caio Prado's *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* the chapter on the "origins" is replaced by a methodological chapter, stating the interpretive grid which will be used in the book which

follows. (This replacement is not without its consequences, and I will get to this in a moment.) Each of the accounts of the *formation* contains, apart from the diagnosis of a problem, the outline of a future solution, a kind of vanishing point of the account, which the accounts promise, but which is necessarily located outside the perimeter of the narrative. In several points, and for different reasons, however, Gilberto Freyre's *Casa-Grande e Senzala* and Candido's *Formação* are exceptions. For Freyre the vanishing point is located in the past (and not in the future), since for him the diagnosis of the problem is the deterioration of the original model, when the ethnic "plasticity" of Portuguese colonization disappears. His model is, therefore, regressive, nostalgic (a prototype of the "conservative revolution" of which one has many other examples in Latin America). He defends a return to and a generalization of the original paradisiacal state of the insular sugar-mill society. Together perhaps with Sérgio Buarque de Holanda's *Raízes do Brasil* (but in a different way), he establishes a supposed cultural value (the congeniality, the flexibility of the Portuguese colonization) which compensates for a socio-political "problem" (slavery). Candido is the only one who does not propose a solution to the problem: he considers the problem solved in the second half of nineteenth century (with Machado). And he does not see in this "solution" a redeeming value for the endemic social problems which continue to be Brazil's at the time and since. In other words, he does not (like Gilberto Freyre) constitute the aesthetic as an autotelic field, an option which intrinsically endorses Brazil's hegemonic classes.<sup>41</sup> This critical distance (linked also with the distance in time which separates Candido from the object of his book, the literature of the eighteenth and nineteenth century), is at the heart of Candido's concept of critique, as it poses an articulated autonomy between socius and the aesthetic.

All of these books therefore are constructed in relation to two polarities: the origin and the end. The origin programs a linear development serially repeated in the history to come, whereas the telos of the development organizes from its virtual position the whole series. In Candido's and in Caio Prado's *Formação*, the first chapter announces the notion of "system" which will regulate their specific readings of Brazilian development. Like for Candido, the notion of "system" has for Caio Prado the sense of destructuring a non-integrated,

impressionistic criticism, establishing the history of Brazil in the general context of a universal process. Thus his *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (1942), a land mark in the development of Marxist thinking in Brazil, reads Brazilian economic history in the general context of colonialism. For him, Brazil is not to be seen as an isolated phenomenon; the country was constructed by colonization and its meaning has to be understood in the framework of an international system (the "system of colonization") of which the main motor was capitalist expansionism. This organizational principle functions very much like the "origin" in the other *formation* narratives. It consists in a genetic principle of evolution which programs development, not to a strictly organic form, but according to an arbitrary (conventional, technical, civilizatory) interpretive schema. Thus Caio Prado starts his book by formulating the "sense of colonization":

Seen from a distance, every people has, in its evolution, a certain "sense."

The latter is noticeable not in the details of its history, but in the ensemble of essential factors and events which constitute a large period of time. Whoever observes that ensemble [...] will not fail to perceive that it is *formed* of an uninterrupted master line [*linha mestra e ininterrupta*] of events which succeed in a rigorous order, and it is always directed in a determinate orientation.<sup>42</sup>

The conceptual matrix of the book, therefore, deducing from the process a "sense," is a retrospective overview, a view of the ensemble which sees the process from the perspective of its accomplishment. The orderly succession of events is regulated by the master line which contains its law of formation, its genetic principle. In the linear evolution which will follow there is in fact no evolution but simply an unfolding of the very same "sense," which recurs in every single of its segments, repeating in each unit the overall orientation of the line.<sup>43</sup> For Candido, the notion of "system" (that is, the "uninterrupted continuity of works and authors,"<sup>44</sup> the selfconscious ensemble author-work-public) acts as a similar category in the description of the development of Brazilian literature. It repeats the civilizatory mission of colonization by projecting over the historical process the model of colonization. The conventional beginning of Brazilian literature,<sup>45</sup>

locating a historical origin of which the necessity and the nature is simply derived from the method's own internal logic, is completely unable to envisage forms (literary or otherwise) which do not conform to the model which it stipulated.

Basically, the systematization of Western cultures according to a plane of organization which determines a sequence of filliations or originations annuls the possibility of an exteriority to representation. An outside, a residue to representation becomes a limit to be absorbed, internalized, properly enlightened by the power of meaning. The process here involves a double incorporation: of the European model (the Other, the form of lack, in Lacanian lingo) and of the Brazilian people (the "other") in the conservative continuous line originated in the colonial enterprise. The end result of the speculative internalization of the Other, the integration within the international signifying order, is the feeling of lack in relation to the European model, seen as plenitude, as an accomplished process, of which Brazil would be a truncated version. The expansionist logic of representation "others" the mass of multiple peoples constitutive of Brazil, attempting irresistibly to legitimate itself by the consistent ventriloquizing of the subaltern, a structural characteristic of Brazilian culture.

Speculative readings of Brazilian culture seem thus unable to separate themselves from the intrinsic colonialism involved in the internalization of the European model which is one piece with the integration in the system, and the "othering" of so-called social reality, i.e. residual cultures, excluding them while ostensibly attempting to include them, "integrating" them as heterogenous materials to be homogenized by the elite intellectual. Thus the canonical phrase by Paulo Emílio Salles: "[w]e are neither Europeans nor North Americans. Lacking an original culture, nothing is foreign to us, because everything is. The painful construction of ourselves develops itself in the rarefied dialectics of not being and being someone else [*outro*]."<sup>46</sup> Or Candido's translation of the phrase: "[...] the Brazilian can not stop spending his life hanging on the West and he has to try not to live hanging on the West. He has to try to make his own culture, but the culture he can make is a culture hung on the West..."<sup>47</sup> Brazilians fall short in relation to the wholesome model cultures, North America and Europe. We are limited to the

status of dependent, subordinate beings, "hanging on" major cultures. Yet this lack of originality which produces significant malaise, has its own supplementary benefit: the inability to claim to any originality means that everything is, in a sense, Brazilian because nothing, strictly speaking, is. The lack of proper Brazilianness creates the possibility of a general, non-substantial (figurative) Brazilianness, Brazilianness transformed then into the state of an all-encompassing virtual nationality, whereby nationality is almost a synonym to foreignness, sameness to otherness.<sup>48</sup> This would account for the resolute internationalism of Brazilian's most accomplished cultural models, be it Machado de Assis or Bossa Nova, of which the theory is formulated in Oswald de Andrade's "cannibalism," that is, the intelligent appropriation of foreign materials integrated selectively within the national subject in a composite figure.

This point of view is a strategy to deal with colonial cultural domination, which takes into account the overpowering grasp of dominant cultures over peripheral ones. But it is marked by an insidious prejudice, in that it adopts the colonial view of itself, by seeing itself as "other" in relation to itself (because it is "other" in relation to Europe). This corresponds to the aspect of internalization which I have been describing here. This system of "othering" repeats itself internally, in a diabolical multiplication, when the national subject "others" subaltern cultures, speaking for them (re-presenting them) while ostensibly annihilating them. Thus in Paulo Emílio's schema, the Brazilian dialectics is formulated as an option between non-being and being other, where "being other" corresponds to the position of being "othered" by major cultures, and "not being" to the reality of Brazil, that is, everything that is excluded by literary or political representation. All the multiple, alienated subjectivities are thus consistently alienated from national subjectivity. This is then the double alienation which marks the Brazilian (the Latin-American) intellectual. Spoken by European discourse, in relation to which *he* (the intellectual is a male) is different, his only plea for legitimacy is to speak for the other in relation to itself, the residual subjects of the nation, following a demand for otherness coming from abroad, which he alienates by becoming himself, while intimately feeling that he is not that either.<sup>49</sup>

#### 4. Machado

The *Formação* outlines the process of the construction of the canon which takes place from the eighteenth to the nineteenth century, and covers two literary movements: Neoclassicism and Romanticism. Machado de Assis is the telos of the process, the point in which the system is finally concluded, when the literary gesture reaches its maturity in selfconsciousness. The last chapter of the *Formação*, entitled "Literary consciousness," is dedicated to the foundation of criticism during the Romantic era, and the subchapter before the last is entitled "The formation of the literary canon." Emancipation is realized in self-reflection, as literature is able to reflect upon itself and propose a project for rendering Brazilian culture autonomous, formulating its own theory, of which the canon is an important part.

The last two paragraphs of the whole book deal with the 1873 essay "Instinto de Nacionalidade" by Machado de Assis.<sup>50</sup> This is the furthest edge of the circle constructed by the *formation*, its internal border, already preparing what is outside: Machado's novels of the last period. The program for Brazilian literature, its "systematization" is therefore literally formulated by Machado. We know what this famous essay proposed: in order to be Brazilian one was not required to write about "Indians" or describe exotic landscape. (Brazilian Romantic nationalism was largely descriptive, since the inscription of local reality in the form of exotic nature was considered a patriotic gesture.) Brazilians had to stop being picturesque, sentimental, documentarist. Brazilianness needed to become an "instinct," something internal, an "intimate feeling," independent from any determinate Brazilian object.<sup>51</sup> Machado's assertion foreshadows Borges' famous one, that the "truly native can frequently do without local color." Borges supports his statement by quoting Gibbon's remark that in the *Koran* there are no camels. More than that, argues Borges, the very *absence* of camels is *the* proof that the book is indeed authentic, because, for Mohammed as an Arab, the camels were part of the reality, and therefore did not need to be distinguished.<sup>52</sup>

For Machado thus, "Brazilianness" in the earlier sense, as prescribed by Ferdinand Denis' emancipatory, Romantic program, corresponded to a mirror-image of Brazil as seen by

foreigners.<sup>53</sup> Such is the paradox of the Brazilian literary system: the very form of independent culture is determined abroad. The matrix of this paradox constitutes what Candido named “double fidelity,” by which he meant the repetition at the local level of a fashion originated in Europe, whereby something of the *real* Brazil would start to appear in the intervals of the replication of the imported image (the local *color*).<sup>54</sup> "Double fidelity" is the diagnosis of Brazilian literature's essential discontinuity, the index of its malformation. Nothing would ever be learned, every generation would start afresh every time, the latest copy originated overseas would always take precedence over local reality. With this kind of predicament no true reflection could ever take place, because there is no organicity, no continuity in the process. With Machado, however, something entirely different would happen: he is able to learn from his predecessors, accumulating their experience.

Let us see how Candido works out the epistemological cut which separates Machado from the Brazilian dependent tradition which precedes him. An example of "double fidelity": Cláudio Manuel da Costa's pastoral poetry is certainly copied from Anacreonte and from closer Portuguese models, the recurrent representation of nature is stereotypical; and yet, at the same time, one perceives in Cláudio something like an “imagination of stone” which cannot be explained by the models. Something of the materiality of the hills of his native Mariana would have been transposed to the substance of his poetry.<sup>55</sup> Likewise, the two main representations of the subaltern, the shepherd and the Indian, which define respectively Neoclassicism and Romanticism, would duplicate an European type, simply transposing it to Brazil; and yet something of Brazil would transpire in the local notations, in the descriptions, in a certain poetic rhythm. "Double fidelity" is the genetic formula which is at the heart of the progression of literary history as a dependent configuration. It describes quite well the drama of emancipation, where the copy of imported literary models is superposed to the "realistic" account, mimicry to mimesis, where even the most specifically local is to be found abroad in a book, in a quintessential Latin-American, that is, Borgesian, that is, Quijotic (Menardian), drama. The

reality which literature represents can only be suspected in the hinge of representation, difference is produced in repetition, localism is subtly articulated in the fold of the copy.

One thing, however, that Candido does not say is that "double fidelity" is the formula of the formation of Brazilian literature as a hegemonic representation and aesthetization of the subaltern. What we witness here is basically the moment of expansion of colonization as seen through literature, when the latter integrates the "residual" as fictional material, processing it as a double of the European type, at the same time that colonization is being fueled by the simultaneous appropriation ( as labor) and exclusion (as political subjects) of the real social actors which these types are supposed to dub. Whence the naturalized indian originated in Europe (in Ferdinand Denis, in Chateaubriand) is superposed to the absent Brazilian indian populations, and the Greek shepherd covers the absent miner or rancher. The subaltern is barely suspected under the surface of the text, which "absents" these actors while transforming them into articulatory notations of *color*. Is there an outside here? Does the literary fabric point to what it is not, to the *real* Brazil, or is the real just a fold of the text? would ask Borges. The subject of the national literature, "conscious of integrating a process of literary formation,"<sup>56</sup> consists in this cover-up. "Double fidelity" registers the structure of the indecision between imitation and mimesis, providing the schema of the dubbing of the subaltern.

This situation changes with Machado. His critique of Indianism, writes Candido, repeats the act of Brazilian political independence from Portugal, and outlines the Brazilian literary independence as a vast project of which the closure is suspected and indicated by him. The self-conscious, critical gesture, mapping out the territory of the literature to come, literally configures the maturity of the process of *formation*.

The fact that the "realization" of this process, Machado's fictional work, is excluded from the book constitutes only one of the felicitous findings of the *Formação*, the inside already placed outside (as a vanishing point), following the general genetic structure of the *formations*. Machado's novel would "accomplish" the systematization of Brazilian literature. As such, it meant a radical "surpassing" of Alencar, or of the generation Macedo-Alencar-Antonio de

Almeida. Machado integrates the line of Romantic novelists, radicalizing the movement of emancipation indicated in Indianism, but at the same time, by transforming the national "type" into consciousness and sublimating it, he completely displaced the very meaning of the "filliation." Basically, there is nothing "objectively" Brazilian in Machado's novel, no "double fidelity," since, in this sense to be Brazilian is to see oneself through the foreigner's eyes, to internalize the representation of oneself as other. There is a whole world, maybe an ocean, between the *real* indian populations and the object of Indianism as well as the indianist novel's subject of enunciation. While the previous literature's dependence was manifested in the adoption of a national "type," Brazilian literary independence would be achieved through a multiplication of detached figures (Machado would draw indifferently from Swift, Sterne, the Bible), reverting the "monocultural," "single-crop" type of reference, all ironically integrated in the work. In spite of the multiple international references, it is the "critical consciousness" of situating himself in the continuous line of Romantic fiction, which he inherits but improves, which made Machado be who he was.<sup>57</sup> The self-conscious work of Machado's maturity is thus defined by the double process of internalization of multiple objects and their unification into a system. The dialectical surpassing and completion of the tradition which precedes him takes place in a work which is both fictional and critical, which belongs to a tradition while it is capable of reflecting upon that tradition --it is this capacity of self-reflection which constitutes the formula of the surpassing. What is Brazilian in these novels (where there is not much of Brazil thematically speaking) is the *articulation* of all these different objects. The "instinct," the internal feeling *is* the articulation, the reflection upon materials of multiple originations. In short, in the Machadian novel, echoing the program he established himself in "Instinct of nationality," one has the novel as selfconscious subject, and a first class example of the speculative schema of the work as selfproductive subject formulated in the early (Jena) German Romanticism.<sup>58</sup>

But this is not without an extremely high cost. Machados' verdict about indian populations is drastic:

It is certain that the Brazilian civilization [sic] is not linked to the indian element, nor received from it any influx.<sup>59</sup>

There is a double assassination taking place here. It is true that Indianism was not about *real* indian populations, in this sense Machado is right: there is hardly anything Brazilian in the Romantic indian. But to decree that "indians" have no place in Brazil is to deny their existence, repeating the original genocide (or ethnocide, as Clastres would say), upon which the Americas are founded. However, for Machado "Brazil" is a category which needs to establish itself as self-determining subject exclusively vis-à-vis the dependency in relation to Europe, but not in relation to its local others. It might very well be that indian populations are outside "Brazil," but it is upon the empty place these cultures occupy in the construct that Brazil as such is constituted. The expansion of the category "Brazil" so as to integrate its others, would not suffice either since the basic problem remains: the inability to give epistemological and political status to subaltern groups. To think about the indian population's "contribution" to the Brazilian culture (like when Gilberto Freyre talks about a "black contribution") is the pervasive form this "integration" takes place. The internalization of Brazilianness, i.e. the conversion of the "theme," "subject" (*assunto*) or "type" into an "intimate feeling," corresponds to the final annihilation of the subaltern, subsumed by the form of formation, as material. It is certainly not a chance the fact that such a statement of quintessential subjective (non-objective) Brazilianness comes from a "whitened" Afro-Brazilian. The internalization of Brazilianness coincides with the internalization of the protocols of Western civilization and of class convention. It generates the figure of tremendous selfcontrol which was Machado's, as one can read in Lúcia Miguel Pereira's biography.<sup>60</sup> The selfconscious subject is a white(ned) subject, subjectivized through the disciplined learning of how to become European and cultured.

I am in no way denying Machado's merits. I am simply pointing out the implications of his project. Candido's critical project of incorporating the external cause (in opposition to and surpassing Silvio Romero's determinism by an internal difference), repeats, in the critical field, the same gesture accomplished by Machado's novel. We thus see that Machado's importance for

Brazilian literature goes much beyond the accomplishments of his work. It is as a telos (a model of the finished process) projected back upon the process as a whole and programming the criticism and the literature to come that his work should be understood. We are yet to see what was left out.

## 5. The schema

"Dialectics of malandroism"<sup>61</sup> does for contemporary literary criticism what "Instinto de nacionalidade" did for nineteenth century Brazil.<sup>62</sup> In this essay, a reading of Manuel Antônio de Almeida's novel *Memórias de um Sargento de Milícias*,<sup>63</sup> one has perhaps the best example of Candido's method. The main problem he attempts to solve here (and arguably throughout his whole career), is that of "mediation," that is, the relationship between representation and reality, the secret formula of mimesis, which would reveal a true imaginary productivity. The essay consists of a brilliant contribution to the theory of realism. His target is the concept of mimesis as a direct photographic reproduction or as dependency on models (a simple realist faithfulness to a preexisting model). The question is exactly the same as in the internalization of the "external object" of Romanticism, or in the internal articulation of the aesthetics with the social. Just by looking at the external shape of the essay one finds the same structure of dialectical differentiation we have been describing all along. Candido proceeds methodically. In the first three chapters he reviews the history of the novel's reception, exposing three different attempts at accounting for the novel's effectiveness, and in each case he proves the insufficiency of the arguments presented. According to each hypothesis, which Candido treats one at a time, the novel would directly bear on: 1) a foreign literary model, the Spanish Golden Age picaresque novel; or, 2) the archetypal universal substratum of the trickster; or, 3) it would be a direct representation of the Rio de Janeiro of D. João VI's time. The three hypotheses would have in common the fact that they do not grasp *Memórias'* originality. Against each of the three arguments Candido opposes three irrefutable points, each argument in turn generating three

counter-arguments. We see how the argumentation proceeds by bifurcation, configuring an arboreous structure.

Whence the novel is not a picaresque because: 1) it is narrated in the third person and not in the first like the Spanish picaresque; 2) the protagonist does not learn from his misfortunes; at the level of the novel he is the same as he was in the beginning (contrary to the picaresque); and 3) the novel does not encompass a multiple panorama, like the picaresque did of Spanish society as a whole; it is set on a small slice of Rio de Janeiro: the downtown area. Folklore (the second argument) does not provide the solution either. The folkloric type, the universal trickster, is stylized by Manuel Antônio. Again, no direct affiliation can be established. The data is transformed by a process of generalization. He obtains the generality of the type through stylization. Its source, the novel's "material" is--according to Manuel Antônio, and we have no reason to doubt him--the reports of an old police officer. The process of "generalization," of the subsumption of facts and people to categorical paradigms has a local (as opposed to the foreign or folkloric) model: the art of political caricature, contemporary to the novel, to which no doubt Antônio de Almeida had access. It is in the political satires of the Regency period that one can find the model of "dissolution of the individual in the category."<sup>64</sup> And finally (the third argument), *Memórias* is not simply a reflection of the Rio de Janeiro of the beginning of nineteenth century because, as a document, it covers a very limited scope of reality. Spatially, it restricts itself to downtown Rio, and socially, it deals almost exclusively with "free people of modest position,"<sup>65</sup> excluding both the slaves and the sphere of power and wealth. As a document therefore the novel has a very reduced value since it basically excludes the main actors in Brazilian society of the time, the labor force and the ruling classes. Real documentary data is indeed present in the novel, but this is precisely not what interests criticism in it. Data is submitted to a "formalization or structural reduction"<sup>66</sup> whereby it is transformed in an integral element of the structure and does not exist independently. The novel is less successful when its documentary character is not integrated in the structure as a constitutive element. When

successfully formalized the real is incorporated in the fictional structure and disappears as a document.

You see how the theme of internalization of objective, isolated elements functions here. The target is, if I am not mistaken, a Lukacsian theory of realism which does not take into account the process of "formalization" of reality data. In the next two chapters Candido will proceed to develop his own theory of mimesis, pointing to an "aesthetic formalization of social circumstances."<sup>67</sup> No direct transparent reproduction of reality here. The novel *is* representative, though, in two ways: it represents social reality and it is representative of the Brazilian society, because it registers in depth the social structure, captured by the novel and which consists in a kind of "skeleton" of the novel. This "skeleton" is the dialectics of order and disorder, the mechanism of Brazilian society which the book manages to capture and encode.

This dialectics registers the schema of *both* Brazilian society and the text. Of what does it consist? In the novel the characters are distributed in two spheres, that of the law abiding citizens and that of delinquency, order and disorder. Leonardo, the main protagonist, is pulled by both poles, which are represented in the book as perfectly equivalent, thus attesting to a complete "absence of moral judgement,"<sup>68</sup> and a total disregard for the criterion of good and evil. He moves between the two poles in a dynamic which is like a "seesaw of the two poles,"<sup>69</sup> in a "capricious balancing"<sup>70</sup> in a world which seems almost devoid of hierarchies. Even the prototype of order, the representative of the law, Major Vidigal, ends up corrupted, a hybrid of order and disorder, in a symbolic representation of the final subversion of values.

Now this is the structure of the book. But *also* of the urban Brazil of the time: the structure is an encrypted figuration of the society of free men in nineteenth century Brazil. It just happens that in a society where most of the labor was done by African slaves, themselves controlled by the spheres of power, the rest of the population, comprised largely of free people, simply did not work at all, or hardly. This is a society in which "only a few people worked and the others abandoned themselves to idleness, reaping the surplus of parasitism, of contrivance, of munificence, of fortune, or of petty theft."<sup>71</sup> Avoiding both the stratum of power and the stratum

of labor, the novel concentrates strictly on the middle stratum of the free man. The ballet-like dance between order and disorder captures therefore the "rhythm" of this specific sector's life, forever moving between the two poles, in a space of "anomie," suspended from morality. This will lead Candido to formulate the provocative hypothesis of a "world without guilt," which expresses the Brazilian *difference*, in relation, for example, to the heavily moralizing American society, of which Hawthorne's *Scarlet Letter* is representative, and to which he opposes the *Memórias*. No simple *difference* here, as there was for Brazilian Romanticism, but a difference which is articulatory, hidden, encoded in the schema. But, however, just like with Romanticism, there is a generalization of a specific character (the "free men" in a society based on slavery) into the national "type" (the *malandro*). A procedure which is strictly ideological, whereby a fundamentally problematic society can be compensated by an aesthetic solution, thus hiding the root of the "world without guilt." And yet, Candido had here, with the category of a hidden form of reality, the possibility to bypass the problem of the aesthetization of difference, by posing an unrepresentable, non-national difference, the form of the particular social group of "free men" in nineteenth century Rio.

The feeling of reality in the novel--this is the main problem Candido is tackling--does not have to do with the "representation of a particular concrete data." The novel feels real because it is "constructed according to the general rhythm of society," because the structure which governs society is the same one that governs the text. It is in the intuition of the schema of the society of free men in nineteenth century Rio--which is not simply given in reality, but is hidden--and the ability to encode it in the novel that the novelist's accomplishment resides. Social reality has to be truly reinvented by the author, thus the use of imagination as a productive faculty, the *Einbildungskraft*. of German Romanticism, that is, the faculty of formalization, whereby reality is produced in form. Let it be clear: the schema is the law of construction of both society and text, it "gives consistency as much to the specific data of the real as to the specific data of the fictional world." This diagram is the "hidden" (unrepresentable) rule, the "principle of generality" of mediation, which is present in the two "series": world and fiction. It is the *form* in the strong

sense, of what organizes the world, like "a virtual triangle in a picture based on triangular schemas."<sup>72</sup>

"Dialectics of Malandroism" is exemplary of what Candido calls "structural reduction," that is, the process of construction of the world in the text, in such a way that the text constitutes an autonomous entity, "ruled by its own laws," as distinguished from the real.<sup>73</sup> The "structural reduction" consists in the delimitation of the schema, the law of configuration of mimesis. You will recognize here the question of the rendering autonomous of the work, which prescribes the distinction of the aesthetic field articulated with the socius. You will recognize as well the principle according to which external sociological data becomes internal to the text, "folding inside (the "turning upon itself") whereby the social is rearticulated from within the differentiated space of the work. There is no reflection of the real here. Candido is vehemently opposed to any straight "realist" protocol. The dialectics of order and disorder is the very articulation between the two spheres, the juncture or hinge which organizes both of them, the external border of representation.

Like "double fidelity" (the schema of Brazilian literature in its dependent stage), it is a question here of the coincidence of two levels: the level of representation (the European model in the case of "double fidelity") and of reality (mimesis of the local). Except that here the local form captures the local reality by encoding their law of formation, and not the formula of alienation. There is a point of contact between the two levels as well in the two perfectly equivalent hemispheres of order and disorder in *Memórias*, which seem to mirror each other in a world deprived of moral standards, in the middle of which circulate the protagonists.

All of these traits point to the same figure: the hidden diagram, the rhythmic, unrepresentable secret which governs mimesis. We can spot the same method in all of the most accomplished examples of his "structural reduction," which are found in a recent collection of essays entitled *O Discurso e a Cidade*. Thus, in Zola's *L'Assommoir* the *real* coagulates in symbols, in objects which have fictional functionality, "which are not only part of an environment, but also a constitutive element of the narrative sequence."<sup>74</sup> Integrated in the

narrative these objects are given intense symbolic reality, the "data is sufficient in itself, from the fictional point of view, but homologous to the reality of the world." There is an homology between fiction and socius, but the symbol has an autonomous reality in the text. At the same time the privilege of objects in Zola's fiction is pertinent socially because it refers to the objectification of life in the condition of social misery of late nineteenth century capitalism where the novel is set. "Poor people," writes Candido, "are closer to the elementary levels of subsistence."

In Giovanni Verga's *I Malavoglia* the circular reality of an enclosed rural world centered around the preservation of tradition is encapsulated in proverbs. It is in the structural presence of proverbs which recur in the novel that one finds the point of "convergence"<sup>75</sup> between the textual and the real series. Or, in Aluísio de Azevedo's *O Cortiço*, a naturalist novel modelled after Zola's *L'Assommoir*, one finds a distinguishing allegorical element of Brazil, absent in the French model. The Brazilian *difference* registered in the novel, has to do with an allegorization of nature and of the spatial configurations which are unimaginable in Zola. The point of juncture between the linguistic and the social series is the allegorization of a Brazilian nature. A nature which bears, since Romanticism, the properties of Brazilianness, returns here, in a different context, with fictional functionality.

In all of these examples the coherence of Candido's method is striking. Working in two different fields: national *formation* and textual analysis, there is a perfect homology between the two practices. In both of them it is a question of working at the limit which defines the inner and the outer border of the given object. In the field of Brazilian literary *formation*, the question is the constitution of national literature in its systematic articulation within the international order, the Western tradition or the overbearing colonial modeling. And in the field of literary studies the question is the delimitation of the field of textuality as an autonomous territory as articulated with the socius. In each of the two series one finds the same attempt at establishing an autonomous field, ruled by its own internal laws, configured according to its own specific organization. In each of them he locates himself at the very limit which distinguishes the field

from what borders it, at the juncture where the field is ready to become something else, in a dialectics of outside and inside. The "structural reduction," as he calls his method, the "diagram" (or the "schema," as I call it) is the formulation of this very limit space. It is the principle of formalization through which one field is converted into another, the "form" of difference, the touchstone of imagination. Each of these fields are conceived as totalities complete in themselves while limited by an outside which they seem to mirror. The text is a totality but it is articulated within the social totality in a sort of Spinozian parallelism. National formation is a totality integrated in the "trunk" of Western civilization (and this defines the project of Brazilian literature) while Brazilian literature attempts to find the law of its own originality.

The title of a collection of essays recently published on Candido, *Dentro do texto, dentro da vida* aptly captured the parallelism at work in Candido's method. It describes quite accurately the two-fold structure of a world without outside, where one is always inside something, always connected with something in a system of differential relations, and where the outside is always folded inwards. At the same time, if radicalized, such a statement is reversible: a world without outside means that everything is outside, and that the world has no inside. The reversibility of the two series could be a good proposition from which to start rethinking Candido from a contemporary perspective.

It is clear that his structural matrix can still be very productive for criticism. The persistent location of what I called the law of differentiation (which is at the same time the principle of generalization of form), the search for the juncture between one field and the other (the form of difference, the hidden code which distinguishes), has, I believe, great possibilities for a criticism involved in the project of establishing new subjectivities. In order for this to happen, it would have to be, however, radically modified. To begin with, the critical horizon has to be extricated from the requisite of national (State) representation, and reconfigured so as to formulate the possibility of a radical localism. The fact that form is contingent to *formation*, to a process of subjectivization points to the intrinsic construction of a subjected subjectivity. But it points as well to the possibility of new patterns of subjectivity, to new collectivities, which are

not anymore at the service of the colonial project and its production of local nationalities. Likewise, the genetic category of totality would have to be liberated from the notion of a Western lineage and relocated at the strict level of the local; it would be understood then simply as a generalization of the local, whereby totality (the form of difference, the system of relations) is internalized without being reprojected as representation, and where local collectivities could have access to generalizing form but without *being* "formed." All in all, Candido's program of peripheric national formation could indicate the way towards a science of the particular, a useful tool for minority literatures. Whether such a conversion is possible or not remains to be seen.

Camillo Penna

University of Washington

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>The long tradition of "fashionings" (*formações*) of Brazil, which begins with Joaquim Nabuco's *Minha Formação* is followed, among other works, by Caio Prado Junior's *A Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (1942), and Candido's own *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* (1957). The list is long, a fact which is symptomatic of the scope the question of *formation* takes in Brazil. A few other examples: Gilberto Freyre's *Casa-Grande & Senzala (Formação da Família Brasileira sob o Regime de Economia Patriarcal:)* (1933); Celso Furtado wrote two books entitled *Formação Econômica do Brasil* (1959) and *Formação Econômica da América Latina* (1969); Raymundo Faoro, tackling a different but related problem (that of the constitution of state bureaucracy) wrote *Os Donos do Poder (Formação do Patronato Político Brasileiro)* (1959). Even Sergio Buarque de Holanda's *Raízes do Brasil*, although it does not include the word *formação* in its title, follows exactly the same question of national development. For all this see the pertinent remarks by Arantes, Paulo and Schwarz, Roberto in: D'Incao, Maria Angela and Scarabótolo, Eloísa Faria, eds. *Dentro do texto, dentro da vida. Ensaaios sobre Antonio Candido* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1992), p.229, 230 and p.262, 263.

<sup>2</sup>The "novels of the north," as Candido calls the neorealism of the thirties (Jorge Amado, José Lins do Rego), is hailed by him in the outset of his career as a critic as a radical departure from the elite-identified, Europeanized literature that had been practiced previously in Brazil. For the first time the reality of the interior was thematized by literature, not simply as exoticist material but as a true expressive form. For the first time one saw in Brazil a novel *about* the people. Now this corresponds to the populist movement of "integration" of the people by literature, or of expansion of the boundaries of representation, but scarcely reaching the real of social forces, which remain irredeemably excluded and exterior to literary mimesis. See: Candido, Antonio. *Brigada Ligeira* (São Paulo: Editora Martins, 1945), p.44.

<sup>3</sup>Candido, Antonio. *O método crítico de Silvio Romero*. (São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1988), p.102.

<sup>4</sup>idem, p.110.

<sup>5</sup>Candido, Antonio. *On Literature and Society*. Trans. Howard Becker (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), p.145.

<sup>6</sup>Candido, Antonio, *Literatura e Sociedade*. (São Paulo: Editora nacional, 1980), p.130.

<sup>7</sup>To this list we could add as well, even though Candido does not mention it, Euclides da Cunha's *Os Sertões*. The kind of essay-writing Candido is tackling here is not unrelated from the *formação* essays. Some of the essays named above are also *fashioning* essays. The latter however are strictly defined by the "genetic" structure. The *formação* essays seem to lean more towards a specialization of their object, whereas the "mixed genre of the essay" is situated in the confluence of several spaces of knowledge.

---

<sup>8</sup>Candido, Antonio, *Literatura e Sociedade* , p.131.

<sup>9</sup>Candido, Antonio, *On Literature and Society.*, loc.cit., p.151.

<sup>10</sup>Candido, Antonio, *Literatura e Sociedade* , loc.cit., p.28.

<sup>11</sup>This does not imply the isolation of the literary from other aspects of culture. To the contrary, the notion of *differentiation* of the literary space supposes the integration of literature in a complex articulation of social practices within an organic system.

<sup>12</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Literatura e sociedade* , loc.cit., p.38.

<sup>13</sup>Candido, Antonio *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* , v. I (Belo Horizonte: Editora Itatiaia, 1975), p.24.

<sup>14</sup>Campos, Haroldo. *O Sequestro do Barroco na Formação da Literatura Brasileira: o caso Gregório de Mattos* . (Salvador: Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, 1989).

<sup>15</sup>About his debt towards anthropology see Candido's interview "Os vários mundos de um humanista." (In: *Ciência Hoje* 16, no. 91 (June, 1993)). Howard Becker quotes in his introduction to *Literature and Society* the passage which interests us: "The anthropological idea of culture, implying the ideas of totality and organicity, influenced my way of analyzing literary works....one cannot, for example, do a comparative literary analysis by taking (let's say) the function of money in Machado de Assis, in Dostoyevsky, and in Balzac, and making a comparison pure and simple. It is necessary to consider the work of Machado as a whole to see how money functions in it. It will certainly function differently than in Dostoyevsky and Balzac, seen as totalities in which it is inserted..." In Candido, Antonio, loc.cit., p.xiii.

<sup>16</sup>Candido, Antonio, *Formação* , I, loc.cit., p.24. All translations are mine.

<sup>17</sup>The problem of lack of internal cohesion in Brazilian letters had been diagnosed by Candido's critical predecessors, Sílvio Romero and José Veríssimo. Sílvio Romero stated, for instance:

"In the history of Brazilian spiritual development there is a lacuna to be considered: the lack of serialization of ideas, the absence of a genetics. In other terms: an author does not proceed from the other; a system is not the consequence of any that preceded it." Quoted by: Arantes, Paulo Eduardo, 'Providências de um crítico literário na periferia do capitalismo,' in *Dentro do Texto, Dentro da Vida* . (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1992) , p.231.

<sup>18</sup>Candido, Antonio , "Literature and Underdevelopment," in *On Literature and Society* , loc.cit., p.131.

<sup>19</sup>Readers of Candido have often referred his notion of "system" as a serial key of progression to T.S.Eliot's of "tradition," according to which each new author reconfigures the whole series, rewriting history so to speak. It is in light of this that one understands Machado's place in the *Formação*, as a cypher for reading the whole process from the point of view of its accomplishment.

<sup>20</sup>A possible antidote to this strict linear form of affiliation was defended by Candido himself in his championing of the role of Cuba in the development of a Pan-Latin Americanism. See Candido, Antonio. *Recortes* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1993), p.130-164.

<sup>21</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Formação* , I, loc.cit., p.79.

<sup>22</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Literatura e Sociedade* , loc.cit., p.28.

<sup>23</sup>Idem., p.29.

<sup>24</sup>Liotard, Jean-François. *La condition postmoderne* . (Paris: Ed de Minuit, 1979), p.54-62.

<sup>25</sup>*Formação*, p.25.

<sup>26</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Educação pela Noite* (São Paulo: Ática, 1989), p.164.

<sup>27</sup>*Formação* , I, loc.cit., p.9.

<sup>28</sup>"More than forty years ago I said that 'To study Brazilian literature is to study comparative literature.'" Candido, Antonio. *Recortes* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1993), p.211.

<sup>29</sup>*Formação* , I, loc.cit., p.17.

<sup>30</sup>Veríssimo, José, "O que falta à nossa literatura," in Barbosa, João Alexandre, ed. *José Veríssimo, Teoria, crítica e história literária* (São Paulo:EDUSP, 1978), p.63-64.

<sup>31</sup>An example of such a concept of culture is Otto Maria Carpeaux's *História da Literatura Ocidental* , published between 1959 and 1966. Written in eight volumes by this Austrian immigrant who moved to Brazil in 1939 who was extremely influential for Candido's generation, this monumental work is profoundly indebted to nineteenth century historicism. There Western literatures are hierarchized according to a specific judgement of value: the great European literatures, such as the Greek, Roman, Italian, Spanish, French, English, Russian and German; followed by the other more modest branches, the Scandinavian, the Portuguese and Polish literatures; to which is added the Provençal and Catalan literatures, extremely important in the Middle-Ages, followed by "the American branches of some of those European literatures: the North-American, the Spanish-American and the Brazilian" (quoted by Candido, Antonio, "Dialética Apaixonada" in *Recortes* (São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1993), p.92. Obviously Candido is not Carpeaux, but a similar mechanism is in place in both of them.

<sup>32</sup>Incidentally the two are quoted by Otto Maria Carpeaux in the Preface to his *Uma Nova História da Música* , in order to justify the fact that he limits himself to European music in his history of music. "The author of the present

---

book is convinced that music, as we understand it, is a phenomenon specific to the Western civilization." Carpeaux, Otto Maria. *Uma Nova História da Música*. Rio de Janeiro: Edições de Ouro, second edition).

<sup>33</sup>See about the concept of organism, the passages on Cuvier in: Foucault, Michel. *Les mots et les choses* (Paris: Gallimard, 1966), p.275-292.

<sup>34</sup>Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, Loc.cit., p.17.

<sup>35</sup>The whole quote goes: "The attempt to implant the European culture in an extensive territory, endowed with natural conditions which are, if not adverse, at least largely foreign to its millenary tradition, is, in the origin of Brazilian societies, the dominant factor and the richest in consequences. Bringing from distant countries our forms of convivality, our institutions, our ideas, and priding in maintaining all this in an environment which is often unfavorable and hostile, we are until this date exiled in our land. We can construct excellent works, enrich our humanity with new and unforeseeable aspects, elevate to perfection the type of civilization which we represent: what is certain is that all the fruits of our work or of our laziness seems to participate from an evolutionary system proper of another climate and another landscape." (my translation) Hollanda, Sérgio Buarque de. *Raízes do Brasil*. (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1982), p. 3.

<sup>36</sup>Candido, Antonio. *O Discurso e a Cidade* (São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1993), p.143.

<sup>37</sup>"My generation," writes Paulo Emílio, coincides with the "disappearance of a formal Brazil," This disappearance is linked to the significant limitation of the role of culture (and of intellectuals) in the reality of the social process. In relation to the determination of the country's fate "my generation," he writes, "cannot but seem a detail." See Neme, Mário, org. *Plataforma da Nova Geração* (Porto Alegre: Ed. Globo, 1945), p.34.

<sup>38</sup>Candido, Antonio *Formação*, I, loc. cit., p.23.

<sup>39</sup>"...[I]ndeed I reveal no secret by saying that insensibly my sentence is a free translation, and that nothing would be easier than translating it back to French, from which it proceeds."Nabuco, Joaquim. *Minha Formação* (Rio de Janeiro: Ediouro/Editora Tecnoprint), p.54.

<sup>40</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Formação*, I, loc.cit., p.27.

<sup>41</sup>In this respect see: Yudice, George, "Postmodernity and Transnational Capitalism," in: Yudice, Franco, Flores, eds. *On Edge. The Crisis of Contemporary Latin American Culture* (Minneapolis: U. of Minnesota Press, 1992), p.11.

<sup>42</sup>Prado Junior, Caio. *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1953), p.13.

<sup>43</sup>In connection with this it is striking to see what Fernando Novais writes about Caio Prado Junior's *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo*. According to Novais there is a structural relationship between this "category" (the "sense of the colonization") and the composition of the book. The category "explains the several segments" of the book, giving them meaning. Each segment enriches and confirms the foundational notion. Each segment repeats the utterance of the interpretive "key" at the end. There seems to be no true development, since one can practically read the segments in any sequence. See Novais, Fernando. "Caio Prado Junior na historiografia brasileira. In: Moraes, R., and other. Eds. *Inteligência Brasileira* (São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1986).

<sup>44</sup>Candido, Antonio. *Formação*, loc.cit., p.25.

<sup>45</sup>"Because a beginning is necessary, I took as a point of departure the Academies of Seletos and of Renascidos and the first works by Cláudio Manuel da Costa, rounding up, to make it easy, the date of 1750, in fact, purely conventional." Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, I, loc.cit., p.25.

<sup>46</sup>Salles, Paulo Emílio. "Cinema: A trajectory within Underdevelopment," in: Johnson, Randal and Stam, Robert. *Brazilian Cinema* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1982).

<sup>47</sup>Candido, Antonio, intervention in a debate on Paulo Emílio Salles, in *Filme Cultura*, 35/36, 1980, p.4,9. Quoted by Arantes, Paulo. *Sentimento da Dialética* (Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1992), p.15,16.

<sup>48</sup>Lacoue-Labarthe's translation of Diderot's "paradox on the comedian" presents striking resemblances with this theorization of Brazilian culture. "The paradox utters a *law of impropriety*, which is the law of mimesis: only the 'man without qualities,' the being without specificity, the subject without subject (absent to itself, distracted from itself, deprived of itself) is able to present or produce in general." [my translation] (Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe. *L'imitation des modernes* (Paris: Galilé, 1986), p.27.

<sup>49</sup>Since Paulo Emílio formulated his maxim a significant movement of generalization of the state of non-substantial subjectivity has taken place. Empty, constructed subjectivities are a symptom of modernity (or post-modernity, whichever you wish). Since then non-substantiality has been transformed into our common share, in the general state of humanity, be it in peripheral or in major countries, in a sort of becoming-peripheral of the major cultures. In a sense, we *all* became fakers. While recent theory has taken upon itself the task of critiquing the idea of originality or authenticity, deconstructing the claim for any privileged origination which is intrinsic to the colonial project, the fact remains that this corresponds to the specific condition of the Brazilian or the Latin-American intellectual.

---

<sup>50</sup>After quoting a passage from Machado's essay "Instinto de nacionalidade" Candido writes: "[These words] are appropriate, therefore, to close this book, where it was attempted precisely to describe the process through which Brazilians became conscious of their spiritual and social existence through literature..." Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, II, loc.cit., p.368.

<sup>51</sup>Assis, Machado de. "Instinto de nacionalidade" in Candido, Antonio and Castello, J. Aderaldo, *Presença da Literatura Brasileira. Do Romantismo ao Simbolismo* (São Paulo: DIFEL, 1976), p.113.

<sup>52</sup>Borges, Jorge Luis. "El escritor Argentino y la tradición," In: *Prosa Completa* (Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1979), vol.1, p.221. The exchange of "indians" for camels as exoticist indexes makes perfect sense in the context of a critique of authenticity: they are both exportable goods, produced specifically for export but consumed as well in the internal cultural market.

<sup>53</sup>As Candido puts it: "Hence our persistent exoticism, which *stained* [*eivou* -my emphasis] our vision of ourselves until this day, making us see ourselves as did the foreigners, propiciating, in the letters, the exploration of the picturesque in the European sense, as if we were condemned to export tropical products also in the terrain of spiritual culture." (Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, loc.cit., p.17). The paradox implicit in this protocol is more than evident, and constitutes the matrix of all the subsequent theoretical "images" of Brazil, as Candido so aptly discovered: the concept of the nation, in the origin of the nationalistic imperative of representing "reality" is itself originated abroad. The "reality" represented by early writers corresponds to a picturesque representation of difference as seen by European eyes--since Europeans lack nature, and for them Brazil is what they are not (nature)--and adopted as their own view of reality by the "natives." The claim of a national literature in Brazil is forever submitted to this model: the native, object of the self-representation of Brazilians themselves, their identity, is a national exotic stereotype, othered by the European eye. This selfsame Brazilian identity is nothing but the representation of itself as other, an identity marked from the start by difference. The French travellers who came to Rio in 1820 had lost nature. In Schiller's terms (in *On the Naive and Sentimental Poetry*) they were sentimental, and looked for the native in Brazil. But the Brazilians who started writing about *their* own reality, they, the natives, who had supposedly never lost nature, needed only to "describe" realistically local nature. They were not sentimental. The strategy put in place here is precisely to "hide" difference, and create the *myth* that in Brazil, reality was already identical to itself, i.e. that Brazil *was* nature. In Schiller's terms this would mean that Brazil was naive, in opposition to Europe, which would be *sentimental* ("They therefore will either be nature or they will look for lost nature." [Schiller, Friedrich, *On the Naive and Sentimental in Literature*, Translated by Helen Watanabe-O'Kelly Manchester: Carcanet New Press, 1981, p.35]) What is differential is the mission of mimetically registering identity. This mimesis constitutes the civilizatory mission of aesthetically founding the nation.

<sup>54</sup>"Thus the double fidelity of our novelists--attentive on the one hand to local reality, on the other to the French or Portuguese fashion. Torn fidelity, as such, difficult, which could have undermined the constitution of a true literary continuity among us, because each author and each generation tended to begin again the experiment on their own account, under the unflux of the last novelty from oversea..." (Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, II, loc.cit. 117.)

<sup>55</sup>Candido compares Cláudio to those *caipiras* who "try to disguise the marks of [their] origin by accentuating the traits learned in the city." Candido, Antonio, *Formação*, loc.cit., p.88-106.

<sup>56</sup>Idem.

<sup>57</sup>Idem., II, p.118.

<sup>58</sup>For the notion of the selfproductive work of art, see: Lacoue-Labarthe and Nancy, Jean-Luc. *L'absolu Littéraire* (Paris: Seuil, 1978).

<sup>59</sup>Assis, Machado de, "Instinto de nacionalidade," loc.cit., p.113.

<sup>60</sup>Pereira, Lúcia Miguel. *Machado de Assis*. (Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1955).

<sup>61</sup>Candido, Antonio. "Dialectics of Malandroism," in *On Literature and Society*, Trans. Becker, loc.cit., p.79-103.

<sup>62</sup>Roberto Schwarz points out the affiliation in his essay on Candido's essay "Pressupostos, salvo engano, de 'Dialética da malandragem,'" in: *Esboço de Figura. Homenagem a Antonio Candido* (São Paulo: Duas Cidades, 1979), footnote 4, p.153.

<sup>63</sup>Almeida, Manuel Antônio. *Memoirs of a Militia Sergeant*. Translated by Barrett, Linton L. (Washington D.C: Pan American Union, 1959).

<sup>64</sup>Candido, Antonio. "Dialectics" loc.cit., p.85.

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p.86.

<sup>66</sup>Ibid., p.87.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p.89.

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., p.91.

<sup>69</sup>Ibid., p.90.

<sup>70</sup>Ibid., p.95.

<sup>71</sup>Idem.

---

<sup>72</sup>Candido, Antonio. *O Discurso e a Cidade*, loc. cit.p, 115. Candido is here extremely close to the German Romantic's notion of *Darstellung* or of the Kantian schematism, the mediating principle between the category and appearances. The schema is a product of the imagination and consists in the rule according to which an object is subsumed under a concept, it is the procedure, the method of obtaining figures in space. Looking at Candido's diagram, the "mediating principle," the dialectics of order and disorder is located in between the real society of Rio and the fictionalized society of *Memórias*. Like Candido's "structural principle" (p.89), the schema of transcendental imagination, is homogeneous to both levels of representation and concept, it is the principle of generalization which connects one with the other. If one changes category for social reality, and appearance for fictional reality, one has exactly the same problem. Like Kant's schema, Candido's mediation is "generally hidden." See: Kant, Immanuel. *The Critique of Pure Reason*. (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1965). Trans. Norman Kemp Smith, p.180-187.

<sup>73</sup>Candido, Antonio. *O Discurso e a Cidade*, loc. cit., p.9.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid., p.76.

<sup>75</sup>Ibid., p.108.