

Written in 1966

**THE RISE OF URBAN CULTURE IN BRAZIL:
THE ROLE OF THE INTELLECTUAL, 1896-1905**

Miguel Marín Bosch

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in the Faculty of Political Science and for the Certificate of the Institute of Latin American Studies, Columbia University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	2
The Significance of the 1896-1905 Period	2
The Study of Cultural History	4
Chapter	
I. THE RISE OF URBAN CULTURE IN BRAZIL	6
“O Rio Civiliza-se”	6
The Decline of “Neo-Colonial” Brazil	7
The Rise of Urban Brazil	9
Republican Regionalism	11
Urbanism and Culture	12
II. THE PATRIARCHS OF URBAN CULTURE	14
The Bacharel and the City	14
The Autonomy of the Urban Intellectual	17
The Conflict of Individual Interests	18
The Academy of Compromise	22
III. THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN RESEARCHER	25
Anti-Romanticism and the Rise of Criticism	26
New Methods and New Interests	30
The Changing Approach to History	32
The Interest in Race	37
IV. THE SEARCH FOR BRAZIL	40
An Awareness of Brazil	40
Brazil as a Problem	42
Brazil Defended	44
Brazil as a Future	47
CONCLUSION	49
Epilogue: “O Modernismo”	50
BIBLIOGRAPHY	54

INTRODUCTION

To Max Leclerc, a French journalist sent to Rio de Janeiro in 1889 to report on the circumstances surrounding the establishment of a republic in Brazil, the outstanding characteristic of the Brazilian people was their passivity.¹

This quality was less apparent in their political life. They had watched the collapse of the monarchy in November, 1889, with a calmness which bordered on disinterest. In fact, their entire history was punctuated by similar reactions to change; theirs was the placid history of a passive people who had “never known a heroic age.”²

A passive imitation of European modes of dress and thought was also the keynote of what meager cultural life Leclerc noted in the Capital. He was surprised by the slavish imitation of the local intelligentsia to the dictates of French literature and British tailoring, both of which were followed to a degree that could only be called absurd within the context of Brazilian society. All this led Leclerc to doubt that any Brazilian culture existed at all.

A very different impression was created in the mind of Stefan Zweig when he visited Rio some fifty years later. In his view, the Brazilian was not so much passive as calm, gentle and well mannered, qualities that seemed admirable in light of Europe’s wartime reversion to savagery. More important, he found much to praise in Brazilian culture. Where Leclerc had seen only an enormous void Zweig noted a “considerable cultural achievement,” which he viewed as most praiseworthy given the relative recency of its development.³

What explains this wide discrepancy between the observations of Max Leclerc and Stefan Zweig? How and why did the status of Brazilian culture change between 1890 and 1940? What role did the intellectual play in changing the status of that culture? To what extent had the Brazilian intellectual been instrumental in the creation of a “Brazilian culture” during the Old Republic? This essay is an attempt to answer some of these questions.

The Significance of the 1896-1905 Period

The focus of this essay has been fixed on the decade from 1896 to 1905 which in many respects is a distinct period in the early history of the Brazilian Republic. It was a time of transition from the chaos of the middle 1890’s to the relative stability attained by the economic and political system which was to emerge after 1905. These were the years when the Brazilians could begin to evaluate their new political system.

The administration of Prudente de Moraes (1894-98) had begun on a note of uncer-

¹ Leclerc’s articles appeared in France in the *Journal des Débats* (1889-1890) and were later published as *Lettres du Brésil* (Paris, 1890).

² Max Leclerc, *Caras do Brasil*, trans. Sérgio Milliet (São Paulo: Edit. Nac., 1942), p. 115.

³ Stefan Zweig, *Brazil: Land of the Future*, trans. Andrew St. James (New York: The Viking Press, 1941), p. 164.

tainty about the new President's ability to pacify the country, to restore financial and administrative order, indeed to govern Brazil. Although his financial policies were disastrous, Prudente did succeed in clearing the atmosphere of rancor, discontent, and conspiracy that had characterized politics in the early '90's.⁴ His successors, Campos Salles (1898-1902) and Rodrigues Alves (1902-06), who were also *paulistas*, were able not only to stabilize the economy but also to restore public confidence in civilian rule. Thus, to a large extent, they were responsible for this "period of euphoria in republican history."⁵

By 1906 the political situation had changed once again. The "harmony" of paulista rule was successfully challenged by Minas Gerais with the election of Afonso Pena. Henceforth, with few exceptions, the Presidency was to be held alternately until 1930 by representatives of São Paulo whose economy was based on coffee and of Minas Gerais where the predominant industry was cattle-raising, an arrangement that came to be known as the "politics of café com leite." For the coffee industry, 1905 also marked the climax of a decade of overproduction and consequent price decline. When an unprecedented coffee harvest was forecast for 1906 the first measures for a valorization system were enacted.⁶ Thus, although the coffee sector increased its political influence during this period, the country also became aware of the problems inherent in basing its progress on the monoculture of the crop.

Intellectually, the turn of the century also appears as a period of transition. It witnessed the final rejection of Romanticism and the decline of Bohemian intellectual life, on the one hand, and the emergence of several new literary styles and the establishment of a more organized intellectual life, on the other. This decade was marked by the flowering of those literary figures who had initiated their careers under the Empire. Machado de Assis, Joaquim Nabuco, Rui Barbosa, Sílvio Romero, and many others were, to a large extent, the products of what João Cruz Costa has described as the "waves of new ideas" of the 1860's and 1870's.⁷ This was the generation which had matured during the lively ears of the 1880's.⁸ And these were the writers who, after the civil strife of the 1890's, welcomed the calm of the administrations of Campos Salles and Rodrigues Alves. Like these two presidents (both of whom had served the Empire), the Brazilian intellectuals were able to adapt to and profit from the political and economic changes which some of them opposed. Their art and thought also benefited from this lull in the early history of the Republic during which they finally could begin consciously to gauge the state of their craft and define — or redefine — their position within Brazilian society.

However, Brazilian thought and intellectual life, like Brazilian society, had been changing since about 1850. But whereas in 1900 the masses still seemed passively to accept the government imposed upon them by the elite, as early as the 1860's the Brazilian intel-

⁴ José Maria Bello, *História da República* (4th ed.; São Paulo: Companhia Editôra Nacional, 1959), p. 167.

⁵ João Cruz Costa, *A History of Ideas in Brazil: The Development of Philosophy in Brazil and the Evolution of National History*, trans. Suzette Macedo (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1964), p. 237.

⁶ Pierre Denis, *Brazil*, trans. Bernard Maill (ed. rev.; London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1911), pp. 243-244 ff.

⁷ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, chapter 4.

⁸ See for example Richard N. Morse, "Some Themes of Brazilian History," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LXI (1962), pp. 159-182.

lectual had begun to realize his own potential. During the abolitionist campaign, in particular, poets and orators alike became aware of their roles as agents of social reform. Not only was their “art” instrumental in renovating the society in which they lived, but it in turn also was affected by the changes in that society. And though their outlook was still very aristocratic, their works began to reveal a certain social consciousness. Similarly, though their literary style continued to reflect the best European models, it ceased to be merely decorative. Brazilian intellectuals no longer imitated passively; they had begun to imitate *actively* and, in so doing, they began to realize what one historian has called their *creative role* in assimilating and transforming foreign ideas and styles.⁹

The Study of Cultural History

Before concluding these introductory remarks it should be noted that there exist but few studies of Brazilian thought which go beyond the traditional limitations of cultural history. In the field of intellectual history the works of Fernando de Azevedo and of João Cruz Costa are pioneer efforts. The former’s *Brazilian Culture*¹⁰ and the latter’s *A History of Ideas in Brazil* are attempts to describe the evolution of Brazilian thought and education in terms of the society in which they evolved. Most other studies (monographs or surveys) are merely descriptions of particular works or individual thinkers. Even in the field of literature (perhaps the most studied aspect of Brazilian culture) there has been a lack of studies on literary life.¹¹

Although in recent years foreign scholars, especially North Americans, have shown much interest in Brazil, their attention has been focused primarily on social and economic, rather than cultural history.¹² For example, the works of Professor Stanley Stein, which are indicative of this new interest, suggest the effectiveness of studying Brazil with modern social science research methods.¹³

However, the approach to cultural history remains very traditional; consequently, it is open to criticism from the “new” school of social historians. For example, it has often

⁹ Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, *Monções* (Rio: C. E. B., 1945), p. 7.

¹⁰ Fernando de Azevedo, *Brazilian Culture*, trans. William Rex Crawford (New York: Macmillan, 1950). The edition used here is *A cultura brasileira: introdução ao estudo da cultura no Brasil* (4th ed.; São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1964).

¹¹ One exception is Brito Broca, *A vida literária no Brasil: 1900* (2nd ed. rev.; Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1960). See also the review of this book by Wilson Martins, “Vida literária literatura,” *Anhembi* (São Paulo), Ano VII, XXV, No. 75 (fev., 1957), 571-575.

In the field of literary criticism, however, much has been done. Sílvio Romero, José Veríssimo, and Araripe Junior initiated, at the close of the nineteenth century, a movement towards a more rigorous criticism of texts which has found some noteworthy successors in Mário de Andrade, Agripino Grieco, Sérgio Milliet, Oto Maria Carpeaux, Antônio Cândido, Afrânio Coutinho, and Alceu Amoroso Lima.

¹² One exception is Richard M. Morse, *From Community to Metropolis: A Biography of São Paulo* (Gainesville: Univ. of Florida Press, 1958), which incorporates cultural history into a description of the economic and social evolution of that city. See also Thomas E. Skidmore, “‘Uma Imensa Carta sem Endereço’: Brazil’s Search for National Identity in the Old Republic,” unpublished paper prepared for the Sixth Luso-Brazilian Colloquium, Cambridge, Mass., and New York City, September 7-13, 1966.

¹³ See especially, *Vassouras: A Brazilian Coffee County, 1850-1900* (Cambridge, Mass. Harvard Univ. Press, 1957), and the review of this book by Charles Wagley, *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXVIII (1958), 420-422.

been maintained that cultural historians deal with but a “microscopic portion” of a society in a given epoch and that they have hitherto failed to develop a method by which the influence of the spiritual and material contributions of a minority on the majority of the population can effectively weighed.¹⁴

In my opinion, cultural history should not be considered as separate from social history; it should be studied as part of it. An analysis of the work of the intellectual without a consideration of the social framework in which he operated is likely to be, at best, artificial. Likewise, a study of any modern society which does not include a long look at that society’s intellectual life is bound to remain incomplete. The artists, thinkers, and writers of a given society in a given epoch are as much a part of that society as its peasants, workers, landowners, serfs or merchants, and each group acts upon the others. It is with this idea that I approach the study of Brazilian thought at the turn of the twentieth century.

¹⁴ Jaime Vicens Vives, *Aproximación a la historia de España* (3rd ed.; Barcelona: Editorial Vicens-Vives, 1962), pp. 15-16.

CHAPTER I

THE RISE OF URBAN CULTURE IN BRAZIL

In 1923 João Capistrano de Abreu, one of the leading Brazilian historians of his day, confided to a friend that he was thinking of moving from Rio de Janeiro to São Paulo. The Capital no longer seemed attractive to a seventy-year-old man whose best historical studies were behind him. But his friend did not agree:

I find it a bad idea not only because we would be separated, but also because I think that you will be unable to adapt to the new environment. After a certain age it is very difficult to change successfully one's *habitat*. You would be sad if you left your friends and *habitués* and your libraries. The habitual stop at Briguiet's or Garnier's where one always finds one friend or another; research at the Historical Institute or at the National Library....¹⁵

The environment which Carlos Werneck described had not been the atmosphere of Rio in 1875 when, as a young man, Capistrano de Abreu arrived from the northern state of Ceará. As late as 1890 Leclerc had spoken of the need of making Rio "healthy" if it hoped to attract Europeans in the numbers that were then emigrating to the River Plate region. The Capital of Brazil, he had written referring to the grave problem of yellow fever, "does not have the reputation of what we might call a 'health resort.'"¹⁶

To most Europeans Rio de Janeiro in 1890 was still less attractive than Buenos Aires, Montevideo or Santiago de Chile; but to many young Brazilian intellectuals it was — and had been for several decades — the most alluring city in the country. Had Leclerc revisited Rio during the administration of Rodrigues Alves he would have probably conceded that, even according to the strictest of European standards, the Capital was now a cosmopolitan city. This was the Rio Werneck referred to in his letter to Capistrano de Abreu.

"O Rio Civiliza-se"

During the first decade of the twentieth century and, in particular, during the administration of Rodrigues Alves, Rio de Janeiro began to lose its semi provincial character. In a few years the city was transformed both materially and spiritually from "a vast Afro-Portuguese village, infectious and pestilent, [and] with all of the rancidity left by the fall of the Imperial Court ... [into] a great airy *urbs*, healthy, with a modern profile, [and] reflect-

¹⁵ Letter from Carlos Werneck to Capistrano de Abreu, Oct. 12, 1923, *Correspondência de Capistrano de Abreu* (Rio: Ministério de Educação e Cultura, 1954-56), III, 193.

¹⁶ Max Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 14. On yellow fever see, for example, Georges Raederstoerffer, "'Pasteur et le Brazil,'" *Revue de l'Amérique Latine* (Sept.-Oct.), 1931, based on unpublished correspondence between Pedro II and Louis Pasteur.

ing the best of European models.”¹⁷

The changes in the physical environment of the Brazilian Capital were largely the result of the efforts of two men. One was the city’s Prefect, Pereira Passos, whom one historian has compared to the Baron Haussmann of the *belle époque* of Paris.¹⁸ His symbol was the pickaxe: he planned new buildings and modernized old streets, and one of the most notable results of his redevelopment programs was the remodeling of the Rua do Ouvidor into the Avenida Central. The other man was Oswaldo Cruz (1872-1917) who came to be known as the *mata-mosquitos* or “mosquito-killer.” After studying at the Pasteur Institute of Paris, Cruz returned to Brazil and was appointed Director General of Public Health by President Rodrigues Alves. He immediately undertook a well-planned campaign against yellow fever, and his *campanha sanitária* was so successful that, despite some well organized opposition (including an armed rebellion in November, 1904, against his *despotismo sanitário*), by 1906 he had virtually eradicated the so-called “curse of Brazil.”

The efforts of Pereira Passos and Oswaldo Cruz contributed to Rodrigues Alves’ reputation as a renovator. And the physical transformation of the Capital was accompanied by (and in part produced) a similar spiritual renovation. The *cariocas* were imbued with a sense of growing optimism, a feeling which was shared by other Brazilians. Conscious of the great changes which Brazil was undergoing, Euclides da Cunha wrote on New Year’s Day of 1900 of “the abyss between the night of yesterday and the morning of today.”¹⁹ And nowhere was this change so apparent as in the country’s Capital.

The transformation of Rio de Janeiro, however, should not be exaggerated. Compared to other Latin American cities (such as Buenos Aires or Montevideo) or to the changes of a century earlier in Rio itself, the transformation of the Capital was not as dramatic as some writers would have us believe. As the historian Manoel de Oliveira Lima wrote in 1908: the transformation of Rio at the time of João VI was, in its day, “as significant as the one which has just taken place.”²⁰ Brazil had, moreover, been changing from an almost completely rural to a partly urbanized nation for over fifty years.

The Decline of “Neo-Colonial” Brazil After 1850

Scholars have recently pointed to the second half of the nineteenth century as a period of significant economic, social, and political change in Brazil. After the 1860’s, writes Caio Prado Júnior, Brazil “became aware of the meaning of modern progress.”²¹ Another economic historian sees the period as one of transition from a sugar to a coffee economy and points to the “spirit of *associação*” of the 1850’s and 1860’s (a spirit which the eco-

¹⁷ Eduardo Friero, Review of *A vida literária no Brasil: 1900* by Brito Broca, *Kriterion* (Belo Horizonte), X (jan.-jun., 1957), 253-254.

“O Rio civiliza-se” was the slogan Figueiredo Pimentel used for his column, “Binóculo,” which appeared in the *Gazeta de Notícias*.

¹⁸ Broca, *A vida literária*, p. 3.

¹⁹ *O Estado de São Paulo*, January 1, 1900, quoted by Olímpio de Sousa Andrade, *História e interpretação de “Os sertões”* (São Paulo: Edart, 1960), p. 231.

²⁰ *Dom João VI no Brasil*, (2nd ed.; Rio: Livraria José Olympio Editôra, 1945), III, 951.

²¹ *História econômica do Brasil* (São Paulo: Edit. Brasiliense, 1945), p. 179.

conomic maverick Mauá so dramatically embodied) as the beginning of the process of transformation of Brazil from colony to nation.²² And although a consensus will probably never be reached as to the exact nature and dates of this change, the fact remains that “the second half of the nineteenth century saw the greatest changes in Brazilian history.”²³

This is the period Stanley Stein has characterized as the breakup of “neo-colonial” Brazil.²⁴ The process of disintegration became more intense toward the end of the century with the rise of republicanism and the collapse of the monarchy. However, the decline of neo-colonial Brazil cannot be explained by politics alone; more important perhaps are the social and economic factors which had begun to transform Brazilian society. In São Paulo, for example, the 1880-1900 period was marked by the disintegration of an economic system based on slave labor and the emergence of a “competitive social order” based on free labor.²⁵

During the last quarter of the nineteenth century, coffee finally linked Brazil’s economy to world economic waves with all of the benefits and risks which this dependence implied: between 1870 and 1900 Brazil’s coffee production tripled and by the latter date it accounted for two-thirds of the world’s output.²⁶ As a result, the south-central states established themselves as the economic leaders of the country and as the representatives of a modern, republican Brazil — as opposed to the neo-colonial Brazil which sugar, the North-east, and the Monarchy had symbolized.²⁷

The expansion of coffee-growing was made possible, in part, by an increase in the supply of free labor. The abolition of slavery accounted for part of this increase, but perhaps even more significant were the waves of immigrants that began to swell the ranks of the country’s working classes. And, of the estimated 803,000 foreigners who entered Brazil between 1872 and 1900,²⁸ an increasing majority went to São Paulo. In 1888, for example, that state absorbed 91,226 of the 133,253 immigrants who arrived.²⁹

Between 1872 and 1900 the country’s total population increased from 10.1 to 17.3

²² João F. Normano, *Brazil: A Study of Economic Types* (Chapel Hill, N.C.: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1935), chapter IV. See also Lídia Besouchet, *Mauá e o seu tempo* (São Paulo: Anchieta, 1942), and Anyda Marchant, *Viscount Mauá and the Empire of Brazil: A Biography of Irineu Evangelista de Sousa (1813-1889)* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1965).

²³ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 82.

²⁴ “Latin American Historiography,” *Social Science Research in Latin America*, ed. Charles Wagley (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1965), p. 86.

²⁵ Florestan Fernandes, *A integração do negro à sociedade de classes* (Rio: Ministério de Educação e Cultura, 1964), p. iii and chapter I.

²⁶ See the figures in Denis, *Brazil*, p.238.

²⁷ However, in at least one respect the rise of coffee reinforced Brazil’s “neo-colonial” status: it made the country’s traditional dependence on one export crop stronger than ever. See Caio Prado Júnior, *História econômica*, pp. 179-180.

²⁸ Celso Furtado, *The Economic Growth of Brazil*, trans. R. W. de Aguiar and E. C. Drysdale (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1963), p. 140.

²⁹ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 608. See also, T. Lynn Smith, *Brazil: People and Institutions* (rev. ed.; Baton Rouge: Louisiana State Univ., 1963), *passim*.

million.³⁰ However, this 70 per cent increase was not uniform; in general terms, internal migrations and immigration shifted the relative density of the population from the North to the South. In 1872 approximately one-third of all Brazilians lived in the region comprised by Paraíba, Alagoas, Pernambuco, and Bahia, and another third in the area covered by Minas Gerais, the Capital, Rio de Janeiro, and São Paulo; by 1900 the latter region contained 7,141,576 people or over 40 per cent of the country's total population, while the former had 4,787,426 or 27 cent.³¹

The most far-reaching consequence of the development of coffee and of the population transfer was the shift of Brazil's economic center from "the sugar cane plantations of the North to the coffee fields of the South."³² The change, however, was more than geographic; the rise of the "Coffee King" – and all that this process involved – created a new pattern of economic life which, especially in the São Paulo area, approximated modern capitalism. Unlike the sugar plantation owner, the coffee *fazendeiro* both encouraged and relied upon an economic system based on free labor, on advanced agricultural techniques, and on an improved marketing system which could meet the growing foreign demand for his product. The coffee *fazenda*, moreover, was not as self-sufficient as the sugar plantation; and the coffee-planter increasingly relied upon urban centers, since it was there that he bought food supplies hitherto grown locally. In very simplified terms, then, the rise of coffee signified the rise of urban Brazil and the decline of rural or neo-colonial Brazil.

The Rise of Urban Brazil

As late as the early seventeenth century, the few cities which dotted the largely unexplored Portuguese colony in America were nothing more than "poorly constructed villages which, isolated from the rest of the world, grew without any preconceived plan."³³ In contrast to Spanish America, urban development in Brazil began only in the eighteenth century and did not increase significantly until the nineteenth century.

Life in the coastal cities such as Recife, Bahia, and, above all, Rio de Janeiro was transformed profoundly in the nineteenth century largely as a result of the transformation of the agricultural economy which had begun to change during the eighteenth century. The prestige of the *senhores* of the "*casas-grandes*" was supplanted by that of the merchants of the *sobrado*.³⁴

The growth of cities in Brazil, however, cannot be explained by economics alone. More significant perhaps was the increasingly important political role of the colony vis-à-

³⁰ Direction Générale de Statistique, *Annuaire Statistique du Brésil. 1^{ère} Année (1908-1912)*, Vol. I: *Territoire et Population* (Brésil: Imprimerie de la Statistique, 1916), p. 252.

³¹ Adapted from *ibid.*, pp. 262-269.

³² Bello, *História*, p. 14. According to Furtado (*Economic Growth*, p. 160), the economy of the South-Center developed on the "basis of a transfer of manpower from the regions of lower productivity i.e. the Northeast." A similar pattern of "transhumance" took place in the Amazon region during the early years of the twentieth century when rubber boomed.

³³ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 131.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 144-145.

vis the metropolis, symbolized by the transfer of the Capital of the Portuguese Empire from Lisbon to Rio de Janeiro in 1808, thus insuring the latter's preeminent position in nineteenth-century Brazil.

Rio de Janeiro, however, had been growing at a fast rate for over four decades before becoming the seat of the Portuguese Court. In 1763 it had replaced Bahia as the political center of Portugal's American colony — a move which presaged the shift of Brazil's economic center from the North to the South-Center — and by 1808 its population was about 130,000 or five times that of 1750. During the nineteenth century the city continued to grow both as an economic center and as the political and administrative Capital of Brazil. By 1890 it was "the most important South American port, receiving manufactured goods from all of the world's commercial powers and exporting about two-thirds of the world's coffee."³⁵

Another city, however, was to benefit even more from the increase in coffee production. Professor Richard M. Morse has described the beginnings of São Paulo's surge in the late 1880's:

Between 1886 and 1893 the population increased three-fold, from 44,030 to 129,409. Railways, fanning out from São Paulo, gave it dominion over a far-flung coffee frontier. Coffee wealth subsidized the advent of tens of thousands of European immigrants, many of whom were drawn to the *paulista* capital, where nascent industries and rapid urbanization offered livelier promises than did the *fazendas*. In short, the city now exhibited a complex of energies which guaranteed it the hallmarks of a metropolis: industry, commerce, public utilities, banking, ornamental parks and buildings, cultural diversions and a fast-expanding populace.³⁶

It was in urban centers such as São Paulo that the foundations were established for Brazil's increased — though still modest — industrialization during the 1890-1920 period.³⁷ The agent of this process was the paulista who, as a new "economic type," made his appearance towards the end of the nineteenth century.³⁸ In 1890 Max Leclerc described this new type as "hardworking and prudent." São Paulo, he added, "is growing at an extraordinary rate for a city of the interior; but there is nothing false about this fever or advance. Seeing the paulistas at work, one is forced to believe in their achievements."³⁹

In many ways the paulista transcended the geographic limits which his name implies, and he came to symbolize that sector of Brazil's fast-growing population which was benefiting most from the growth of urban centers. As an "urban type," therefore, the paulista "was to be found predominantly in the states of Rio de Janeiro, Minas Gerais, and, of

³⁵ Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 57.

³⁶ "São Paulo Since Independence: A Cultural Interpretation," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV (1954), 419-444. Quote appears on p. 430.

³⁷ Charles Morazé, *Les trois âges du Brésil: essai de politique* (Paris: Librairie Colin, 1954), pp. 23-37. See also, Denis, *Brazil*, chapter VII; Caio Prado Júnior, *História econômica*, pp. 167-168ff.; and George Wythe, "Brazil," *Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan*, S. Kuznets et al. (Durham, N. C.: Duke Univ. Press, 1955).

³⁸ Normano, *Brazil*, chapter III.

³⁹ Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 65.

course, São Paulo, and he could be identified with the capitalist” class which, according to Richard M. Morse, had begun to make its presence felt during the 1872-1890 period.⁴⁰ Under the Republic this group was to become the standard-bearer of “modern,” urban Brazil. Its orientation was primarily material and, in many ways, clashed with the more traditional values of Brazilian society:

With the passage of urban Brazil into the republican era Gilberto Freyre associates a denial of the humanistic and intimately experienced Afro-Portuguese heritage. Family heirlooms of silver and jacaranda were auctioned off to foreigners and replaced by more modish acquisitions from Europe.... One spoke of the abstract complexities of coffee valorization, but no longer of the ‘valorization of the Brazilian man — of the man and of the people.’⁴¹

These new “urban capitalists” were, for the most part, coffee fazendeiros who had migrated to the cities. Once in the cities, they ceased to be simply rural barons and adapted quickly to the ways of industrial exploitation. Their interests were industrial, bureaucratic, intellectual and, above all, commercial rather than “rural.” As Fernando de Azevedo has observed: “Cities grew in [Brazil], as in so many other civilizations, because from the mass of the rural population emerged a class of men who sought to make a living from buying and selling products or, in other words, from commerce.”⁴²

Republican Regionalism

The advent of the Republic coincided — and in some ways reinforced — the process of socio-economic change which had been taking place in Brazil since about 1850. As envisioned by the initial leaders Brazil was to be a Federal Republic: the events of 1889 represented a victory for those who had fought the political centralization of the Monarchy. But with the disappearance of the Emperor (the symbol of national unity) and with the rise of new economically powerful states, national politics was reduced to regional conflicts, and those regions with the strongest economic interests came to dominate “federal” politics.⁴³

On paper, the Constitution of 1891 and Rui Barbosa’s economic policies were inspired by federalist ideals. In practice, however, they benefited directly the new commercial interests of the developing urban centers.⁴⁴ For example, the Constitution of 1891 con-

⁴⁰ *From Community to Metropolis*, p. 169.

⁴¹ Richard M. Morse, “São Paulo Since Independence,” p. 432. Reference is to Gilberto Freyre, “O período republicano,” *Boletim bibliográfico*, I, No. 2 (jan.-março, 1944), 61-72.

⁴² See also, Richard M. Morse’s study of São Paulo, *From Community to Metropolis*, which traces the development of a nucleated urban center within a dispersive agrarian area. See Part II of that book for a description of the “formation of an urban mentality.”

⁴³ It is generally agreed that regionalism increased after 1889. As used here, “regionalism” is just another way of identifying the interests of the individual states. It is interesting to note that to Brazilian politicians federalism was probably synonymous with regionalism. During the Old Republic national or “true political parties disappeared” (Denis, *Brazil*, chapter IV) and national leaders were replaced by *paulista* or *mineiro* Presidents who relied on local “colonels” (Morazé, *Les trois ages*, 103). The President was thus more a broker of the power of the states than a leader of the nation.

⁴⁴ Stanley Stein, Lecture at Columbia University, March 15, 1965.

firmed the judicial and administrative autonomy which the states had enjoyed since the decree of 15 November 1889 established the Republic. This meant, among other things, that the states were free to create their own civil guards (which in later years would result in the embarrassing situation of some states having a militia more powerful than the Federal Army). Barbosa's Banking Law of 1890, calling for the creation of three regional banks to make credit available to all Brazilians, also had unexpected results, since those who were best prepared to take advantage of these new credit facilities were the paulistas.

The Provisional Government of Marshal Deodoro da Fonseca was forced, then, to make concessions to regional interests. Among others, it decentralized the educational system. The Constitution of 1891, for example, left primary education to the states. Theoretically, this was one way of expanding education horizontally for it encouraged those areas which until then lacked schools to create their own centers of orientation. But the policy had unexpected results. As Fernando de Azevedo has noted, the regional educational systems that were then established were to delay the formation of a "national education" and soon became centers of resistance to new ideas.⁴⁵

The states soon began to take advantage of their new autonomy. For example, between 1894 and 1907 no less than seven new historical and geographic institutes were founded in as many states: Bahia and São Paulo in 1894, Santa Catarina (1896), Paraná (1900), Rio Grande do Norte (1902), Paraíba (1905), and Minas Gerais (1907). Patterned after the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute which had been established in Rio de Janeiro in 1838, these institutes brought the number of such regional societies to ten.⁴⁶ In 1901, moreover, Pernambuco established its own academy of letters while Campinas (in São Paulo) became the headquarters of the Center of Science, Letters and Arts.

These state and local institutions were a product of regional sentiments which the Republic indirectly encouraged and an expression of the new urban culture which was emerging in Brazil.

Urbanism and Culture

With the rise of urban centers during the latter part of the nineteenth century, there was an increase in cultural activity in Brazil. The formation of a national culture, however, was hampered not only by a growing regionalism but also by a poor system of communication. The result was that in each of the regions of significant economic activity intellectual elites appeared but remained isolated from each other because of the vast distances. Communication among the various intellectual centers was extremely difficult and took place only through the focal point of the country's Capital or through "illustrious individuals" who, "like giant trees planted at long distances could touch each other with their highest

⁴⁵ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 640. This process of educational decentralization went more or less unchecked until 1928 when the educational reforms of the Federal District presaged the reversal of this trend after 1930.

⁴⁶ Three had been founded under the Empire: Pernambuco (1862), Alagoas (1869), and Ceará (1887), all three, interestingly enough, in the Northeast. See *The World of Learning, 1964-65* (15th ed.; London: Europa Publications Ltd.), pp. 131-165.

branches.”⁴⁷

The process of urbanization was most intense in the coffee-growing region and, with the transfer of Brazil’s economic center from the North to the South-Center, the country’s intellectual center shifted from Recife to Rio de Janeiro. Once again, intellectual life seemed to follow the “rhythm and evolution of economic cycles.”⁴⁸

However, the development of culture within a given region should not be exaggerated nor should one overestimate the extent of urbanization in turn-of-the-century Brazil.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, by 1900 Brazil had in fact changed to some degree:⁵⁰ during the second half of the nineteenth century, coffee had provided the bases for the beginnings of modernization and urbanization which, especially in the South-Center affected the development of culture.

⁴⁷ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 309.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ One way of gauging the degree of socio-economic change in Brazil is to assess the size of the middle class. From Professor John J. Johnson’s description of the urban middle sector’s “late bid for power” it is apparent that Brazil’s middle class remained – compared to Argentina, Uruguay, and Chile — relatively small until the 1920’s. See *Political Change in Latin America: The Emergence of the Middle Sectors* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958), chapter 8.

⁵⁰ Stein, *Vassouras*, p. 289.

CHAPTER II

THE PATRIARCHS OF URBAN CULTURE

By the 1890's Brazilians and foreigners alike had begun to realize that cities — especially those of the south-central plateau — offered a variety of novel opportunities for economic and social advance. Cities absorbed the rural migrant and European immigrant and, in turn, produced a series of new human types or social groups which, in the context of the decentralization policies of the Republic, increasingly challenged the political power of “the great agricultural exporting groups.”⁵¹ If, in a sense, the clash between these new urban groups and the traditional rural sector constituted a minor revolution, it must be understood that this “revolution” took place not between social classes but rather between two segments of a single, upper class. In general, then, the urban environment can be said to have stimulated social and economic change in Brazil by producing a variety of new urban interest groups who quickly challenged and neutralized the once-all-powerful rural gentry. This rural-urban conflict, however, was more than just one of conflicting economic interests; it was also a clash between two opposing philosophies of life, between two antithetical views of Brazil. And the protagonist in this struggle was the new class of urban intellectuals.

The Bacharel and the City

With the growth of cities — first as political and administrative centers and later as economic ones — the opportunities for Brazilian intellectuals multiplied and, as a group, they too migrated to the urban centers. Among other things, the cities provided the intellectuals with innumerable publication facilities such as newspapers and publishing houses, many of which were founded in the 1890's.⁵²

The most alluring cities were those with faculties of law which, because of the absence of universities, also attracted many youths who were more interested in philosophy and literature than in law. Such was the case of João Capistrano de Abreu (1853-1927) who left his native Ceará in 1869 with the hope of entering the faculty of law at Recife. Finding that his interests were more literary than juridical, however, he left six years later for Rio,

⁵¹ Furtado, *Economic Growth*, p. 192.

⁵² There were also many short-lived *revistas* and journals. The following is a list of those newspapers and publishing houses which were founded in the nineteenth century and still exist today (*The Europa Year Book 1966* [London: Europa Publications Ltd., 1966], pp.101-103):

Newspapers: *Correio da Manhã* (1901) and *Jornal do Brasil* (1891) in Rio, *Correio Paulistano* (1854) and *O Estado de-São Paulo* (1875) in São Paulo, *A Tribuna* (1894) in Santos, *Diario de Notícias* (1875) in Bahia, *Folha do Norte* (1896) in Belem, *Minas Gerais* (1892) in Belo Horizonte, *Correia do Povo* (1895) in Pôrto Alegre, and *Diario de Pernambuco* (1825) and *Jornal Pequeno* (1897) in Recife.

Publishers: Casa Publicadora Batista (1901), Editôra Vozes (1901) and Editôra Paulo de Azevedo (1854) in Rio; Companhia Melhoramentos de São Paulo, Indústrias de Papel (1890) in São Paulo; and Editôra Globo (1883) in Pôrto Alegre.

where “an intelligent young writer with a graceful style” could pursue a career in journalism.⁵³ In Rio, he developed an interest in history and by 1879 had secured a job with the National Library. Four years later he competed successfully for a professorship in the Imperial College of Pedro II, the Capital’s best secondary school.

Rio de Janeiro also attracted some intellectuals who were already well-established elsewhere. Sílvio Romero (1851-1914), for example, left the Northeast where he was one of the leaders of the “School of Recife” and moved to the Capital. As Brazil’s political, administrative, and economic center, Rio had, of course, been a center of attraction for *bacharéis* ever since the arrival of João VI. But during the latter part of the nineteenth century, not only Rio but other cities as well began to attract the young graduates of the law faculties. Rather than return to the “patriarchal *fazendas* and *engenhos* upon graduation,” the bacharéis went to the cities where they embarked upon careers in journalism, politics, diplomacy, and even industry.⁵⁴

The growth of cities, then, increased the opportunities for the bacharel or “bachelor of arts” who, like the *sacerdote* and the *militar*, for centuries had been an agent of metropolitan control. With the transfer of the Portuguese Court to Brazil and the creation in 1827 of the law faculties at São Paulo and Olinda (the latter was moved to Recife in 1854), the bacharel group expanded its influence within Brazilian society to such an extent that the reign of Pedro II was known as the reign of the college graduates.⁵⁵

The Republic — partly through its decentralization policy — both encouraged the formation of bachareis and doutores and perpetuated their aristocratic position within Brazilian society.⁵⁶ Like the Empire, the Republic recruited many of its administrators and politicians from among these college graduates. The bacharel’s law diploma, moreover, soon ceased to be merely a prerequisite for a legal career; towards the end of the nineteenth century his ruby ring was symbolic of his membership in an “elite of culture and urbanity.”⁵⁷

Between 1890 and 1910 eight new law faculties were founded: two in Rio and one each in Bahia, Belo Horizonte, Fortaleza, Curitiba, Manaus, and Pôrto Alegre. Located mostly in the Center and South of Brazil, these law schools were founded to meet the demands of an increasing population and a growing economic and political system.⁵⁸

The education offered by the new law faculties, like that of the old ones, remained very traditional. Graduates from these schools still preferred politics to economics and were more inclined to concern themselves with providing Brazil with a “political and juridical

⁵³ This is how José de Alencar (1829-1877) described Capistrano de Abreu in a letter of introduction he had written for the young writer, quoted by Hélio Vianna, *Capistrano de Abreu: ensaio bio-bibliográfico* (Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1955), p. 7.

⁵⁴ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 146.

⁵⁵ See Gilberto Freyre, *The Mansions and the Shanties*, trans. Harriet de Onís (New York: Knopf, 1963), chapter XI.

⁵⁶ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 303.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 288.

⁵⁸ It should be noted that three engineering schools were also founded during this period but, for the most part, Brazil’s social and economic conditions did not yet call for the creation of specialized technical schools. These would have to wait until after 1930 (Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 734).

structure” than to face and solve its “technical problems.”⁵⁹ The curriculum of the law faculties continued to reflect the influence of Portugal and, in particular, the “rigid and formalistic” study of Roman and canon law which a Coimbra education had for centuries symbolized.⁶⁰ It also mirrored the cultural values of the plantation society from which most of the bacharéis emerged.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, as the decline of the plantation system became increasingly obvious (especially in the Northeast), the bacharéis became more and more hesitant to return to the fazendas. As city life became more attractive, moreover, they even began to criticize the society from which they had come. Luiz Martins has characterized this group of bacharéis as a “parricide generation,” equating the revolt against aristocratic, rural Brazil with a revolt against parental authority. This clash was but one aspect of the growing conflict between urban and rural Brazil and it was, essentially, a conflict between the philosophy of life of a declining rural Brazil and that of a growing urban Brazil. “They were two worlds in conflict, two opposing views of life, two divergent concepts of morality, liberty, society, [and] human dignity.”⁶¹

However, not all of the urban bacharéis were drawn from the ranks of the rural gentry. Toward the end of the century they also numbered many “sons of the modest and relatively unimportant commercial and bureaucratic middle class.” These representatives of “the new bourgeoisie” — the product of the “modest development of capitalism in Brazil” — had “infiltrated into the generation then entering the country’s law schools”⁶² and had taken advantage of the social opportunities offered to graduates of the military academies. The career of Tobias Barreto (1839-1889) is often singled out as representative of this increased social mobility. According to Hermes Lima, Barreto came from “the brilliant lower classes, the group of humble background and mixed racial origin, who thanks to the academies had invaded public and intellectual life in Brazil, proclaiming the new society in the making.”⁶³ But such examples are misleading. To be sure, by the end of the century many of Brazil’s intellectual leaders were of “humble background” and even more came from the then emerging urban merchant and bureaucratic bourgeoisie. By and large, however, the majority was still drawn from the aristocracy — both rural and urban — and, interestingly enough, it was men like Rui Barbosa, Joaquim Nabuco, and Sílvio Romero who, more than those of more modest background, were to lead the reaction against neo-colonial Brazil. The reaction began in the cities, nurtured by an atmosphere of change and a new sense of freedom.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 299. Leclerc (*Cartas*, p. 36) observed that Barbosa’s first public statement concerning the economy (December 31, 1889) was more of a literary document than an economic report.

⁶⁰ Bello, *História*, p. 63.

⁶¹ Luiz Martins, “O patriarca e o bacharel,” *Revista: do Arquivo Municipal* (São Paulo), Ano VII, LXXXIII (maio-jun., 1942), 7-36. Quote appears on p. 7. See also Sergio Buarque de Holanda, *Raízes do Brasil* (2nd ed. rev.; Rio: José Olympio, 1948), chapter V, where he discusses this conflict in terms of a social imbalance caused by the activities of the urban bureaucrats, on the one hand, and the patrimonial functionaries, on the other.

⁶² Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 83.

⁶³ Quoted by Cruz Costa, *ibid.*, p. 187.

The Autonomy of the Urban Intellectual

During most of the nineteenth century Brazilian intellectuals were “prisoners of patriarchal values.”⁶⁴ In other words, the bacharel was a victim of the very same aristocratic interests which he represented and his cultural horizon was limited by the traditionalist concept of society which his own privileged social position symbolized. Like the sacerdote and militar, the bacharel depended on the plantation system and, as the intellectual spokesman for this system; his ideas had to conform to those that would insure its existence. In short, the scope of his activities was limited by his dependence on those groups whose main interest was the preservation of the *status quo*.

The rise of cities in Brazil significantly changed this relationship between the bacharel and the plantation society. To most intellectuals the urban centers offered more than just better professional opportunities; upon arrival they realized that the city was also a means of freeing themselves from the restrictive dependence on the rural gentry.

The urban environment broadened the bacharel’s cultural horizon, once restricted by the shadow of the casagrande or fazenda; it stimulated his mind and encouraged novelty. Thus in the city a man like Sílvio Romero widened his activities beyond that of lawyer and philosopher by writing poetry and pieces of literary criticism for the newspapers; and Machado de Assis was inspired to write psychological novels and short stories about urban life and to meet the demands of newspaper-writing with a new form of literature, the one- or two-page *crônica* or chronicle.

Above all, the city provided the bacharel with something which had been denied the *homem rural*: the possibility of changing Brazil. It was during the abolitionist campaign that the urban Brazilian intellectual dramatically demonstrated his newly found autonomy of action. Slavery was loudly and publicly condemned by men who very often were but one generation removed from the very same patriarchal society which for centuries had thrived on slave labor. Thus when Joaquim Nabuco (1849-1910), one of the most articulate abolitionists, attacked slavery in the name of social justice, he was also undermining the economic basis of the political power of the rural aristocracy from which he came.

The republican campaign was also carried out largely in the urban centers⁶⁵ and it often involved the same individuals who were adamant abolitionists. For example, there was Annibal de Mesquita Falcão (1859-1900), the son of a wealthy Recife family who travelled about Brazil lecturing on republicanism and against slavery.⁶⁶ Not all abolitionists, however, were republicans; Nabuco, for example, supported the Monarchy — although he failed to realize that by attacking slavery he was undermining one of the foundations of the Empire.

⁶⁴ Florestan Fernandes, Lecture at Columbia University, October 18, 1965.

⁶⁵ It should be remembered that republicanism was, and had been since the 1870’s, strongest in the south-central region. In 1889, there were 74 republican newspapers in Brazil, of which one third were in São Paulo and 33 in the later states of Minas Gerais, Rio de Janeiro, and Rio Grande do Sul: of 239 Republican Clubs, 197 were in the South-Center.

⁶⁶ Falcão is probably best remembered for the lecture he delivered in Rio in 1883. Published that same year, it remains one of the outstanding abolitionist tracts because of its historical perspective and sociological insights. See *Formula da civilização brasileira* (Rio: Edit. Guanabara, 1933).

For decades the bacharel had been the leader of the Empire's Liberal and Conservative parties. By assuming the leadership of the abolitionist and republican campaigns, the bacharel ceased to serve the Monarchy and became identified with the revolutionary elements within Brazil. The bacharel, however, was revolutionary only insofar as he was a critic of the existing order. His confidence in the idea that by changing the law one changed society was, if anything, indicative of the fact that his attitude towards change was still very traditional.

As the spokesman for abolition and republic, the bacharel inculcated into his audiences his own conviction that legal reform was a panacea for Brazil's social and political problems. If an abolitionist, he embellished his dry, legal prose with imagery drawn from the verses of such abolitionist poets as Castro Alves. The bacharel, however, was often more realistic than the Romantic poets. For example, Agostinho Marques Perdigão Malheiro (1824-1881) opposed slavery because it was "absolutely incompatible with the juridical, political, social, moral, and religious ideas" of the nineteenth century, and he reinforced his argument with a very realistic consideration: slavery had ceased to be economical.⁶⁷

If a republican, the bacharel also stressed the need for legal rather than violent change. As the main architect of Brazil's new legal order, Barbosa's attitude is dramatically representative: he believed that simply by providing Brazil with a federalist constitution he could transform the country into a Federal Republic.

Rui Barbosa (1849-1923) typified, perhaps more than any other single individual, the urban bacharel.⁶⁸ Orator, politician, economist, *letrado*, writer, and stylist, Barbosa soon became identified with conspicuous knowledge, a phenomenon which the urban environment encouraged. An individual who could opine intelligently on most any subject — or at least that is what the majority of the populace believed —, Barbosa became, long before his death, a legendary figure.⁶⁹

The Conflict of Individual Interests

During the latter half of the nineteenth century, then, the cities provided the intellectual with an autonomy which encouraged him to think about and act freely within Brazilian society. The urban environment also permitted him to form literary or intellectual associations independent of political and economic interest groups. But before discussing how the intellectuals organized themselves, it is important to stress the fact that during the early 1890's they were still far more concerned with their individual careers than with forming a harmonious group within Brazilian society.

⁶⁷ *A escravidão no Brasil*, (São Paulo: Edições Cultura, 1944), II, 155 and 157-230. This work was first published in 1867.

⁶⁸ In *Rui Barbosa e João Ribeiro* (Rio: Ministério de Educação e-Cultura, 1958), Joaquim Ribeiro goes so far as to write: "The generation which constructed Brazilian liberalism, which under the Empire ... extinguished slavery, and which under the Republic founded the federal system, ... can be called, without a doubt, Rui's generation" (p. 3).

⁶⁹ For a revisionist view see R. Magalhães Júnior, *Rui: O homem e o mito* (Rio: Editora Civilização Brasileira 1964); for an idea of the high esteem in which Barbosa was held by the "people" see the book of contemporary cartoons by Herman Lima, *Rui e a caricatura* (Rio: Casa de Rui Barbosa, 1949).

In Brazil, writes Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, “each individual asserts himself among his peers, heedless of community law, concerning himself exclusively with what distinguishes him from the others.”⁷⁰ During the early years of the Republic this generalization can very easily be applied to Brazil’s intellectuals. The political mood of the time electrified their emotions and newspapers provided them with an excellent opportunity to assert their personal views and to attack their political foes.

Divergent political views were, then, one reason for the many conflicts among intellectuals during the 1890’s. Some, like Manoel de Oliveira Lima and Joaquim Nabuco, remained faithful to monarchic ideals and feared that with the Republic Brazil would fall prey to caudillo-types such as those which had plagued Spanish America. Oliveira Lima was an extreme case of what Gilberto Freyre has called *saudadismo monárquico* or “monarchic nostalgia”;⁷¹ he was so disenchanted with the Republic that he even backed the restoration movement which would have made Dom Luiz the third Emperor of Brazil.

Joaquim Nabuco, on the other hand, seems to have felt more skepticism about the Republic than nostalgia for the Monarchy. His attitude is reflected in “Ilusões Republicanas,” a column he wrote for *O Jornal do Brasil*, a monarchist paper founded by Rodolpho Dantas in 1891. The column, however, was short-lived: “republican exaltation” of the early 1890’s did not tolerate any kind of opposition and, when the offices of *O Jornal* were stoned, the Ministry of Justice notified Dantas and the Editôr of another monarchist paper (*O Brasil*) “that the government could not guarantee the life of the writers nor the integrity of the presses.”⁷² Nabuco went into exile; from London he wrote a friend that “a militant or once-practicing monarchist *cannot* live, for the time being, in [Brazil], and even less under Floriano than Deodoro.”⁷³

Monarchists were not alone in their dislike of Floriano Peixoto. Republicans also attacked him because he had assumed dictatorial powers which, though probably necessary in the faction-torn country, frustrated the ideals of the initial leaders of the Republic. Rui Barbosa soon became “the loudest voice of the opposition” to Peixoto and “not only in the Senate but in the *Jornal do Brasil* (of which he became Editôr) and before the Supreme Court, he intrepidly defended Floriano’s opponents.”⁷⁴ Nevertheless, Barbosa was also forced into exile and he too went to England, “the great tree of liberty in the modern world.”⁷⁵

While still in London, Barbosa set forth his views on Liberalism in a series of articles for the *Jornal do Comercio* which were later published as *Cartas de Inglaterra* upon his return to Brazil in 1896. These views were challenged by Afonso Celso, an ardent mon-

⁷⁰ Quoted by Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 187.

⁷¹ Preface to Oliveira Lima, *Formação histórica da nacionalidade brasileira* (Rio: Editôra Leitura, 1944), p. xiii. Freyre notes, however, that by associating himself with such “mystics of Republicanism” as Salvador de Mendonça and Euclides da Cunha, Oliveira Lima “seems to have attenuated his extreme nostalgia for the monarchy” (pp. xiii-xiv).

⁷² Carolina Nabuco, *A vida de Joaquim Nabuco* (Rio: Edit. Nacional, 1928), p. 293.

⁷³ Quoted by Carolina Nabuco, *ibid.*

⁷⁴ Bello, *História*, p. 102.

⁷⁵ Rui Barbosa, *Cartas de Inglaterra* (2nd ed.; São Paulo: Saraiva, 1929), p. 161.

archist, and the lively debate which took place between the two was published in the Brazilian press.⁷⁶

The debate was typical of the mid-1890's; it corresponds to that moment in the history of the Old Republic when Brazilian intellectuals, aroused by the specter of militarism, turned their attention to the political problems of Brazil. To be sure, intellectuals had always been, to some degree, politicians. But now they voiced their opinions while remaining outside of the political life of the country. They discussed and clarified their political views publicly. Interestingly enough, most of these debates took place in Brazilian papers during the regime of Peixoto, who to many intellectuals represented nothing more than a crude expression of caudillismo and who was often attacked for prohibiting public discussion.⁷⁷ In fact, it could be argued that Floriano Peixoto indirectly encouraged intellectual activity in Brazil: by arousing their emotions, he encouraged many ideas concerning Brazil and the Republic; by forcing some individuals into exile, he unintentionally provided intellectuals with time to reflect and with the opportunity to view their country from a different and wider perspective.

Peixoto affected the lives of Brazilian intellectuals in a number of other ways. To those who, like Joaquim Nabuco, were drawn from the country's aristocracy, the advent of Floriano Peixoto — a *caboclo* from the Northeast who seemed to cater to the interests of the emerging bourgeoisie — signified the end of an era. Upon his return from Europe, Nabuco realized that Brazil had changed: the country's political life was no longer dominated by men of aristocratic background like himself or Afonso Celso but by a new (and, to Nabuco, less attractive) type. As Graça Aranha later recalled, "Brazil had fallen victim to all of the most primitive instincts, to the most coarse of aspirations." Nabuco's immediate reaction was to withdraw from political life:

... as tradition evaporated or was extinguished, there emerged a 'new man'. He was the product of miscegenation — the flower of the masses. He invaded the society from which his uncertain ancestors had been excluded. He was vindictive like the son of a slave who had freed himself and spiteful like a pariah who has long sought revenge. Before the invader, the more delicate spirits, like Joaquim Nabuco, withdrew themselves and sought the refuge of their own thoughts.⁷⁸

⁷⁶ The debate was triggered by Barbosa's comments on a book by Arthur Balfour, *The Foundation of Belief, being Notes Introductory to the study of Theology* (London: Longman, Green & Co., 1895). Celso interpreted Barbosa's stress on religion as indicative of a change in the ideology of the author of the decree of January 7, 1890, separating Church and State in Brazil. Barbosa replied in an article (May, 1895) entitled "My Conversion," which remains as one of the most eloquent statements on Liberalism by a Brazilian.

⁷⁷ For example, Barbosa (*Cartas de Inglaterra*, p. 130) wrote: "The country is not interested in being governed according to the formula of this or that system, but rather in being well governed; and good governments are those tempered and modified by discussion."

Not all intellectuals opposed Peixoto. Raul Pompéia, the young author of *O Ateneu* (1888), defended Peixoto (even after 1894) as vehemently as others had attacked him. Politics gave way to personal slander and, it is said, the violence of these attacks was the reason behind Pompéia's suicide on Christmas Day, 1895, at the age of thirty-two.

⁷⁸ Quoted by Carolina Nabuco, *A vida de Joaquim Nabuco*, p. 295.

Thus the abolitionist par excellence retreated from the society which his campaign had in part produced.

Nabuco's self-imposed isolation, however, was short-lived. By 1900 he was back in public life and soon became the leader of another campaign: Pan Americanism. He served as minister to Great Britain and in 1904 he became the Republic's first ambassador to Washington where he died in 1910. Not all monarchists, however, reconciled themselves to the new political system.⁷⁹ Afonso Celso, for example, remained apprehensive about the Republic and was often attacked for being too much of a monarchist, *filho de papai*.⁸⁰

As the 1890's progressed, most of the more aristocratic intellectuals came to realize that the Monarchy was, indeed, a thing of the past. This decline in monarchic sentiment was undoubtedly accelerated by the increased militancy of the more exalted (*exaltados*) defenders of the Republic. Republican intransigence — already manifest during Peixoto's rule — was confirmed at Canudos, Bahia, in 1896-1897. The government's reaction to the revolt of Antônio Conselheiro proved, if anything, the extent to which republicans were willing to resort to violence if they felt that their position was in danger. To the more exalted republicans, the religious fanatics of the *sertão* posed a threat to the Republic; to politicians in Rio, the followers of Antônio Conselheiro were monarchists and reactionaries and they had to be crushed. "It was only after Canudos had disappeared and the passions which it had aroused subsided that Brazilians understood their tragic error;"⁸¹ it was only afterward that they learned the real meaning of the Canudos revolt.

Republican intransigence accelerated the decline of monarchic sentiment during the 1890's, but the eclipse of monarchism, as an ideal, was also part of a more general change: the rejection of Romanticism in Brazil. The golden years of the Empire had, in effect, coincided with the heyday of Romanticism and, to a large extent, the abolitionist campaign had been the last and most dramatic campaign still "carried out under the banner of Romanticism — guided far more by the heart than by reason."⁸² The 1890's were to mark the beginning of the end of Romanticism in Brazil and there is no more dramatic example of this decline than the career of José do Patrocínio.

An abolitionist and a monarchist, Patrocínio was a man of humble origin. The son of a Negro washerwoman and a priest, he was one of the most popular *oradores do povo* or spokesmen for the people, and the abolitionist campaign seemed to have been designed

⁷⁹ In "O republicanismo de Joaquim Nabuco," *Revista do Arquivo Municipal* (São Paulo), Ano XVIII, CXLVIII (jun., 1952), 51-108, Pericles da Silva Pinheiro argues that Nabuco's correspondence shows that while never espousing formally the republican label, he had always worked for the *ideals* of the Republic. This view is similar to that of José María Bello, who believes that Brazilians were always "latently" republicans and speaks of the "hibernation" of the republican ideal (*História*, p. 17).

⁸⁰ See Lúcio de Mendonça, *Caricaturas instantâneas* (Rio: Editôra S. A., A Noite, 1939), pp. 78-79. These "caricatures" appeared in 1896 in the *Gazeta de Notícias*.

The memory of Dom Pedro was particularly dear to men like Celso and other monarchists like Eduardo Prado. Luiz Martins interprets this *saudade* as remorse, the remorse which inevitably haunts all parricides — since it was Celso's generation which had ousted the Emperor, a father image ("O patriarca e o bacharel," pp. 22ff.).

⁸¹ Bello, *História*, p. 170.

⁸² Broca, *A vida literária*, p. 11.

especially for him, a romantic liberal by instinct. On the day slavery was finally abolished no one was more acclaimed in Rio de Janeiro than Patrocínio on the night of May 13, 1888, “midst fireworks and lights ... someone is to have said to the hero: ‘What a beautiful day for you to die, Patrocínio!’”⁸³

For many abolitionists, 1888 had been the high point in their lives. Nabuco eventually substituted Pan Americanism for abolitionism; but Patrocínio, like so many other “romantic monarchists,” was unable to find another “cause.” During the 1890’s he faded as quickly as the *Cidade do Rio*, the abolitionist paper he had founded.

From the foregoing it can be concluded that during the early 1890’s Brazilian intellectual life reflected the political turmoil which accompanied the advent of Floriano Peixoto. By the late 1890’s, however, politics lost its monopoly over the minds of Brazilian intellectuals and they turned to more literary matters. Nowhere was this change so apparent as in Rio de Janeiro where literary life, after having been “completely disrupted by the naval revolt and the florianista reaction of 1893,” exuded a new vigor.⁸⁴

The Academy of Compromise

During the era of relative calm and economic stability which began with the administration of Prudente de Moraes, politics ceased to be the main concern of Brazilian intellectuals who now preferred to meet regularly to discuss literature. Informal literary societies appeared throughout Brazil, and in Rio de Janeiro intellectuals met in French bookstores to discuss the most recent works from Europe, in private homes or in the *cafés literários* (the Brazilian equivalent of the French *salons*). The latter, in fact, were so popular that, according to Brito Broca, literary life in the early years of the twentieth century almost eclipsed the literature of the period.⁸⁵

In the Capital, however, the growth of these informal literary societies was partly stunted by Pereira Passos’ campaign to remodel the city; his program called for the construction of new streets which disrupted cafe life. The opening of the Avenida Central, for example, broke up the “small groups [of intellectuals] which met during the afternoons at different points on the Rua do Ouvidor.” As an expression of the “Bohemian Generation of ’89,” these salons suffered still another setback with the creation, in 1896, of the Brazilian Academy of Letters which marked the growing “*aburguesamento*” of the Brazilian intellectual community.⁸⁶

The idea of an academy of letters was nothing new in Brazil. In the eighteenth century there had been several literary and scientific societies — products of the Enlightenment and of the intellectual needs of the then Portuguese colony. During the nineteenth century, there appeared several learned societies, most of them patterned after Rio’s very famous and very aristocratic Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute. Like the many geographic and historical societies which appeared at the end of the nineteenth century, the

⁸³ *Ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 4.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 272.

⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8, 11.

Brazilian Academy of Letters can also be seen as the product of the growth of urban centers in Brazil. But in many other ways, the Academy was to be a unique institution.

Unlike most of the regional cultural institutions which appeared in nineteenth-century Brazil and especially during the first decade of the Republic, the Brazilian Academy of Letters was organized as a *national* society, bringing together individuals from different regions and with divergent political views and intellectual interests. As such, the founding of the Academy can be considered as a compromise among intellectuals for the sake of culture.⁸⁷

The idea of an academy grew out of the informal meetings of a group of intellectuals whose main interest was “*as letras*.” They met afternoons in the offices of the *Revista Brasileira*, a literary review founded by José Veríssimo in 1895. Graça Aranha has left an excellent description of these meetings — the genesis of the Academy — which should be quoted at length:

The *Revista* dated from 1895 when the country was [finally] pacified after the civil war. José Veríssimo, its founder, was not only a magnificent man of letters but also a shrewd organizer, energetic, and devoted worker. The intellectuals were spiritually tired of the politics. The mature men were disillusioned; the younger men, angry. Brazilian politics was marked by an ominous absence of intellectuals, and literary pursuits were the only refuge for talent. The *Revista Brasileira* had the gift of tolerance and harmony. In its pages and in its offices there flourished quietly a true spirit of fraternity among men of the most divergent outlooks. It was wonderful to find there militant monarchists, ... outspoken republicans, ... socialists, ... anarchists Politics did not disturb that literary sanctuary. What was of interest there was literature to which Machado de Assis gave the most expressive stamp. It seems as if there has never been a more intellectual salon than that of the *Revista Brasileira*. It was a permanent reception and, every afternoon, each individual, in his own way, participated freely in these intellectual exercises. One could hear Taunay tell or; better still, watch him ‘act out’ a personal anecdote, listen to the whispering murmur of Machado de Assis as he voluptuously dissected one of life’s episodes, fill oneself with the sonorous harmony of Nabuco, follow the paradoxes of Araripe Júnior, witness the “demolitions” of José Veríssimo, delight in the secret and exalted music of Raimundo Correia, live, in short, in that atmosphere of sentimental enthusiasm. And it was there that one confirmed his faith in the undying culture with the hope of glory. There had never been in this country greater spiritual pleasure for a young Brazilian.⁸⁸

⁸⁷ In a recent book, *A consciência conservadora no Brasil* (Rio: Editora Saga, 1965), Paulo Mercadente has studied the “moderation” of Brazil’s elites which, throughout the country’s history, has prevented revolutionary change from becoming bloody conflicts through “conciliatory” acts. The study, however, omits mentioning the compromising attitude of the intellectual elites as reflected in the founding of the Academy of Letters.

⁸⁸ Quoted by Carolina Nabuco, *A vida de Joaquim Nabuco*, pp. 308-309.

An outgrowth of these informal literary sessions, the Academia Brasileira de Letras was founded on December 15, 1896. As an *organized* society, it contrasted with the many literary salons — casual and Bohemian in spirit — which then existed in Rio de Janeiro, and its first President, Machado de Assis, gave it the aura of prestige which it has maintained to the present.

Joaquim Maria Machado de Assis was in many ways the natural choice to head the new society. He had dedicated most of his fifty-seven years to literary pursuits and, despite his humble origins, had risen to a position of preeminence among the socially privileged. By the mid-1890's, this mulatto was probably the most admired writer in Brazil and his novels and short stories had already been acclaimed for their style and content and, above all, for their trenchant insight into human nature and their dry, subtle humor.⁸⁹ Never interested in politics himself, Machado de Assis was, moreover, admirably suited to playing the role of broker of literary culture among a group of individuals with highly divergent political views.

Love of literature was, in fact, what bound together the original thirty members of the Academy which, like its French model, would soon number forty. And the interest in literature must have been great since it did away with past political animosities and personal antagonisms among such disparate individuals as Joaquim Nabuco, José Veríssimo, Sílvio Romero, José do Patrocínio, and Rui Barbosa (who upon Machado de Assis' death in 1908 would become President). These were all men of great literary talent, and membership in the new guild soon became a much-coveted honor, much like that of the venerable Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute.⁹⁰

Unlike the latter, however, the Academy was independent of the national government. Endowed by Francisco Alves, a wealthy Portuguese, it has remained financially autonomous and, from the beginning, it gave Brazilian intellectuals a sense of literary independence. Just as Machado de Assis provided the group of *littérateurs* who met in the offices of the *Revista Brasileira* with a prestigious leader, the Academy gave Brazilian letters the direction it was seeking. As Joaquim Nabuco said at its first formal meeting on July 20, 1897, the Academy was a symbol of the independent development of Brazilian literature.⁹¹

⁸⁹ In 1881 he had published *Memórias póstumas de Bras Cubas* — which marked his definitive break with Romanticism — and in 1891 *Quincas Borbas* which, together with *Dom Casmurro* (1899), would become the outstanding trilogy of novels of Brazilian letters. José Veríssimo would later write that Machado de Assis was the “highest expression of literary genius” in Brazil (*História da literatura brasileira* [2nd ed.; Rio: F. Alves & Cia., 1929] p. 411).

Not every literary critic acclaimed Machado de Assis. In 1897 Sílvio Romero published a lengthy essay attacking his style and humor. See *Machado de Assis* (2nd ed.; Rio: José Olympio, 1936).

⁹⁰ For an example of what it meant to a Brazilian intellectual to be admitted into the Brazilian Academy of Letters see João Ribeiro's acceptance speech of November 3, 1898, in *Revista da Academia Brasileira de Letras*, No.1 (julho, 1910), 178-185. Cf. Eduardo Prado's acceptance speech when he was elected a member of the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro on August 9, 1901; see Sebastião Pagano, *Eduardo. Prado e sua época* (São Paulo: Editôra “O Cetro”, n.d.), pp. 265 and 275.

⁹¹ *Revista da Academia*, I, 175-176.

CHAPTER III

THE EMERGENCE OF THE MODERN RESEARCHER

In turn-of-the-century Brazil, the intellectual was no longer dependent on this or that interest group, rural or urban. He was, rather, free to act in accordance with his own interests. The urban intellectual had become a professional writer, a journalist, an historian. Machado de Assis, for example, has often been considered Brazil's first professional writer since he lived mostly on an income derived from his literary production. Euclides da Cunha was a journalist; João Capistrano de Abreu began as a journalist but soon discovered he could earn a livelihood by writing and teaching history; and Farias Brito has been singled out as Brazil's first "professional philosopher."⁹²

The professionalization of the Brazilian intellectual is also reflected in the founding of other academies of letters, academies of science, and regional historical and geographic institutes. These new learned societies were in part the by-products of the social and economic changes which had been taking place in Brazil during the second half of the nineteenth century and which have been described in the first two chapters of this essay. But their appearance at the turn of the twentieth century corresponded also to a variety of new interests — literary, scientific, and cultural — of Brazilian intellectuals. Before describing these new intellectual pursuits, however, it is necessary to note briefly that, despite the many changes, the attitude of the intellectuals toward Brazilian society remained very elitist. The organization of the new societies — patterned mostly after the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute — is indicative of the persistence of this attitude.

At the end of the nineteenth century the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute was still the most aristocratic cultural society in Brazil. The Presidency of the Institute (which for decades had been held by the Emperor Pedro II) was a most prestigious position. From 1891 to 1906 it was held by a former President of the Supreme Court, Olegarico Herculano de Aquino e Castro. As the Institute's historian, Max Fleuiss, wrote:

Venerable are all those great names of our countrymen who were overwhelmingly proud to have held the Presidency, a post once occupied by the greatest and most unforgettable Brazilian, Dom Pedro II.⁹³

⁹² Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 426. Farias Brito (1862-1917) was probably the outstanding Brazilian philosopher of his day. His ideas concerning the scientific bases of philosophy (though not original) were influential, especially among the Symbolist poets. An eclectic thinker, he was held in high esteem by contemporaries — even Romero respected him — and has often been identified with the *espiritualistas*, having written *Base física do espírito* (1912) and *Mundo interior* (1914). See Sílvia Rabelo, *Farias Brito ou uma aventura do espírito* (Rio: José Olympio, 1941).

⁹³ *L'Institut Historique et Géographique du Brésil* (Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1938), p. 16.

Another important position was that of Perpetual Secretary which, from 1891 to 1905, was held by Henrique Raffard, who was succeeded by Max Fleuiss. Joaquim Nabuco was the Institute's official Orator from 1897 to 1899, and he was succeeded by Antônio Ferreira de Souza Pitanga, 1900-1906.

The works of these aristocrats of culture are themselves indicative of their elitist position within Brazilian society. The writings were addressed to a highly sophisticated audience, and it was impossible for most of the country's literate minority to share in the vast knowledge of the intellectuals. They simply spoke different languages. Manoel de Oliveira Lima (1867-1928), for example, wrote in French and English. While Brazil's minister to Belgium in 1911, he taught at the Sorbonne and was very familiar with contemporary French politics. Thus it is not strange to find in his works on Brazilian history many allusions to French politicians. The following is taken from *Dom João VI no Brasil*:

It was as if in the moderate France of Ferry and Ribot — not in the radical France of Clemenceau and Briand, verging on Socialism — M. Jaurès and M. Millerand had suddenly been called to preside over the Council.⁹⁴

Intellectuals such as Oliveira Lima remained aloof from everyday occurrences in Brazil and preferred to live in Europe or at least in the company of a bookshelf of French and English authors. Joaquim Nabuco called these men “butterflies” of intellect, products of the transitional epoch which Brazil was then experiencing. Thus he described Eduardo Prado in his diary:

Eduardo: Proof of our present-day dispersion. The advances of the century — the opportunities of the land, of travelling, of loitering [his word] all over the planet — rather than a *globe trotter*, he was a *globe rocker*. Let us not feel sorry that some lives are spent in this manner, because God has made butterflies very beautiful, the most ephemeral of things. Let us try to understand that. We are in the midst of uprooting the past and we have yet to take root in the future — in that state of fluctuation, of freedom we become dilettantes, courtiers of our own pleasures, etc.⁹⁵

But Nabuco, like most of his contemporaries, was aware that a change was taking place in Brazil and that a new type of intellectual was coming to replace the dying breed of dilettante “butterflies.” The change was gradual, however, and for a time both types could be called representative of Brazilian thought.

Anti-Romanticism and the Rise of Criticism

When in 1904 Sílvio Romero wrote that the large number of poets in Brazil was indicative of the superficiality of his country's culture, he was not criticizing the writers of verse

In 1906, the Institute's membership included (with year of election): Count d'Eu (1864), Miguel Juárez Celman (1883), and Julio A. Roca (1899), as “Honorary Presidents”; Alberto dos Santos Dumont (1903) was one of 50 “Honorary Members”; Capistrano de Abreu (1887), Afonso Celso (1892), Araripe Júnior (1893), Max Fleuiss (1900), Sílvio Romero (1901), Rui Barbosa (1902), and Euclides da Cunha (1903), were among the 50 “Effective Members”; while Oliveira Lima (1895, Belgium) Joaquim Nabuco (1896, United States), and João Pandiá Calógeras (Minas Gerais, 1905), were “Corresponding Members.”

⁹⁴ *Dom João VI no Brasil*, III, 1133.

⁹⁵ Quoted by Carolina Nabuco, *A vida de Joaquim Nabuco*, p. 300.

Eduardo Prado (1860-1901) was born in São Paulo and, the son of a distinguished family, he divided his time between his coffee fazenda at Brejão and his Paris apartment. He died of yellow fever a few weeks after having been elected, to the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute.

alone.⁹⁶ He was, rather, attacking Brazil's intellectuals in general and their dilettante and Bohemian attitude in particular. Romero was well-known and greatly feared for such harsh judgments — a characteristic of his style which makes his works difficult to evaluate —, but in this case he was not too far from the truth. Many of his contemporaries were in fact still prisoners of the superficial knowledge which went along with the *beletrismo* Leclerc had described over a decade earlier.⁹⁷ Romero, moreover, was on safe ground because he himself could never be identified with the “butterfly” group; he was a product of the “waves of new ideas” which took hold in late nineteenth-century Brazil.

Historians have often pointed to the end of the Paraguayan War as the beginning of a new era in Brazil's intellectual history. “About 1870,” writes João Cruz Costa, “a new period opened in the history of Brazilian thought. A variety of new ideas, originating in the philosophy of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, began to permeate Brazilian intellectual life. Positivism, naturalism, evolutionism, in short, all the modalities of European thought of the nineteenth century, now found expression in Brazil and contributed to a remarkable advance of the critical spirit.”⁹⁸ Of these, positivism was probably the most important: its influence was reflected in the creation of technical and military schools, in the stress on method over words, and in the cataloguing fever which took hold during the 1880's.⁹⁹ The role of Positivism in late nineteenth century Brazil, however, has often been exaggerated. As Cruz Costa has written, Positivism, contrary to common belief, was not a decisive influence on the advent of the Republic even though the rise of positivist thinking was simultaneous with the beginnings of Republican propaganda.¹⁰⁰

The end of the nineteenth century did, however, witness the rise of a spirit of criticism, and with it came the eclipse of Romanticism which for decades had monopolized the style and thought of Brazil's intellectuals. The country's material advance, modest as it was, fostered a more scientific outlook which, it was soon apparent, came into direct conflict with what might be called the ‘Romantic outlook’ of most intellectuals. The key to the anti-Romantic reaction was not, however, the espousal of a new ideology or literary style. To be sure, the realism and naturalism of many writers strengthened the rejection of Romanticism,¹⁰¹ but the change was more in outlook than in doctrine: during the 1860's the

⁹⁶ Sílvio Romero, *História da literatura brasileira* (6th ed.; Rio: José Olympio, 1960) V, 1649 and 1651.

⁹⁷ Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 161.

⁹⁸ *History of Ideas*, pp. 76-77.

⁹⁹ For example, in 1881 the National Library in Rio prepared *O catálogo da exposição de história do Brasil* which, according to José Honório Rodrigues (“Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia brasileira,” Introduction to *Correspondência de Capistrano de Abreu*, I, xl), was the “greatest bibliographical undertaking ever produced in Brazil.”

¹⁰⁰ João Cruz Costa, “O positivismo no Brasil,” *Revista Brasiliense* (São Paulo), 5 (maio-jun., 1959), 12-21. See also chapter 5 (“The Advent of Positivism”) in *History of Ideas* where he writes: “From 1894 to 1898, the year in which the last circular of the Apostolate appeared over the name of Miguel Lemos, the decline of Positivism can easily be traced. Henceforth Positivism was to become restricted to the religious sphere” (p. 181). This view should be compared to that of Ivan Lins, *História do positivismo no Brasil* (São Paulo: Editora Nacional, 1964).

¹⁰¹ Perhaps the most widely read of these novelists was Aluisio Azevedo (1858-1913) who, like so many others, had begun writing in a romantic style but soon took up the realism and naturalism of Flaubert and Zola. In 1881 he published *O mulato* and later *Casa de pensão* (1884) and *O cortiço* (1890). Inglês de Sousa (1853-1918), another writer from northern Brazil, wrote one of the first realist novels, *Coronel sangrado*

young intellectuals, “impatient with the obstinacies of regional tradition and with the discursive yearnings of romanticism,” became “imbued ... with the nationalism of the Paraguayan War and turned their attention to programmatic campaigns for abolition of slavery and for republican government.”¹⁰² As Sílvio Romero noted:

The Paraguayan War was a kind of moment of crisis....After 1870 it was impossible for Romanticism, with its illusions and its mirages, to continue. The mood was one of disgust and of crisis.

The more resolute spirits took up the arms of criticism and began to study and learn, counseling their countrymen as to the road of reality, opening our eyes as to our rustic and harmful ignorance.¹⁰³

This new attitude manifested itself in a variety of ways:

As Joaquim Nabuco, who entered the [São Paulo] Academy in 1866, recalled decades later, escapades and Bohemian living were out of style, and elegance and intellectual prestige were highly respected His classmate Rui Barbosa recollected that student abolitionists did away with the masonic rituals and occultism that had fascinated the romanticists. ‘Our whole plan was to react in the open; every object of our activity was public; all our instincts conduced toward the light.’¹⁰⁴

The intellectuals’ desire to “react in the open” ‘was not confined to political and social protest; it was also reflected in numerous scholarly works, many of which challenged the established tenets and traditional views in law, science, philosophy, history, and literature. The spirit of criticism became so widespread, in fact, that less than twenty-two years after the end of the Paraguayan War Sílvio Romero was able to proclaim, in the first edition of his *História da literatura brasileira* (1888), that a new era in the history of Brazilian letters and thought had dawned in 1870. This was the period of “critical reaction and naturalism,” he wrote, “in which we seek to rediscover our traditions in light of realistic ideas.”¹⁰⁵

Where had these “realistic ideas” come from? Romero insisted throughout his life that they had originated in the North and had been brought south by such men as João Capistrano de Abreu, Tristão de Alencar Araripe Júnior (1848-1911), and, of course, by Romero himself.¹⁰⁶ Specifically, the “new thought” had emanated from the School of Recife in Pernambuco where “a mestizo, the Germanist Tobias Barreto Sergipe, flung open

(1877), but his fame rests largely on two later works: *O missionário* (1888) and *Contos amazônicos* (1892). Julio Ribeiro (1849-1890), the author of *A carne* (1888), and Raul Pompéia (see note 77 above) should also be mentioned.

¹⁰² Richard M. Morse, “São Paulo Since Independence,” p. 428.

¹⁰³ *Machado de Assis*, pp. 74-75.

¹⁰⁴ Richard M. Morse, “São Paulo Since Independence,” pp. 428-429.

¹⁰⁵ *História da literatura brasileira*, I, 57. Romero divided the development of Brazilian literature into the following four periods: formation (1500-1750), autonomous development (1750-1830), Romantic transformation (1830-1870), and critical reaction and naturalism (1870-).

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, V, 1659, and *Machado de Assis*, pp. 75-76. Romero was often criticized for having exaggerated the role of the North, but there seems to be no question that in Rio de Janeiro “things moved more slowly” (*Machado de Assis*, p. 75).

windows in the North, through which blew [in Graça Aranha's phrase] 'a gust of free thought and modern culture that quickened many minds.'"¹⁰⁷

To Barreto, "modern culture" meant contemporary European thought, especially German. He "was beyond all doubt the first to propagate German philosophical ideas in Brazil" although, ironically, "he got to know German philosophy through the works of French writers."¹⁰⁸ The materialism of Ludwig Büchner and Ernst Haeckel (especially the latter's *The Riddle of the Universe*) as well as the works of Ludwig Noiré, Schopenhauer, and Von Hartmann (who greatly influenced Farias Brito), were read and absorbed by Barreto and his followers in the North as intensely as Comte and Spencer were read in the South. In fact, the speed with which contemporary European thought was absorbed by Brazilian intellectuals during the last decades of the nineteenth century was such that it has led João Cruz Costa to conclude: "We knew more of Europe than we did of events in the different parts of the Empire. Our importers of ideas, the cultural elites concentrated in the coastal areas, were avid for news of the doings in the great European cultural centers, often neglecting to find out what was going on at home."¹⁰⁹

The School of Recife, and in particular the Pernambuco "Germanist" group, was, however, significant not solely because it imported German philosophy into Brazil; its true importance in late nineteenth-century Brazil is derived, rather, from its role as leader of the process of "energizing the old Brazilian mentality."¹¹⁰ This process took many forms, but none was as important as the road of criticism which Brazilian thought took under the guidance of intellectuals such as Sílvio Romero. By the end of the century, intellectuals all over Brazil were applying the critical method to all aspects of culture. In literature, for example, the "true end-of-the-century spirit ... was a spirit of criticism that represented a deepened seriousness toward the nation and its future."¹¹¹ Thus, besides works of social criticism — such as da Cunha's *Os sertões* and Graça Aranha's *Canaã* —, there appeared Brazil's first modern literary critics and historians: Romero, Veríssimo, and Araripe Júnior.

It seems paradoxical that the North, which for decades had been declining economically and losing its human resources to other regions, should have taken the lead in the "intellectual effervescence" which characterized the second half of the nineteenth century. It is ironic also that this "new thought" grew to full flower in Rio de Janeiro where in the 1890's the influence of European and especially French culture had reached unprecedented

¹⁰⁷ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 183. Graça Aranha was one of Barreto's "most distinguished and enthusiastic disciples" (*ibid.*, p. 188).

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 189.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 184.

¹¹⁰ Graça Aranha, quoted by Cruz Costa, *ibid.*, p. 183.

"While in the South," writes Cruz Costa, "the Positivist current was carried on by Spencerianism, in the North the German ideas influenced a group of Recife intellectuals, among them a number from Sergipe. It was principally the latter who made up the Pernambuco 'Germanist' group or the 'Teuto-Sergipan School', as it was ironically called by Carlos Laet" (*ibid.*, p. 186).

¹¹¹ Samuel Putnam, "Literature," *Brazil*, ed. Lawrence F. Hill (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947), p. 219.

heights.¹¹² But most historians today agree that the School of Recife led the transformation of Brazilian thought in the second half of the nineteenth century although it is true that the South, especially Rio de Janeiro, soon achieved a preeminent position in Brazilian intellectual life as a result of the arrival from the North of men like Sílvia Romero and Capistrano de Abreu.

New Methods and New Interests

At the end of the nineteenth century, Brazilian thought and intellectual life exuded a new vigor which might have flowered earlier had it not been for the social and political strife of the early 1890's. This was the period when intellectual pursuits — finally having parted ways with politics — at last monopolized the minds of Brazilian intellectuals. These were the years when Brazilian writers began to experiment with a variety of new styles, when historians developed revisionist theories and, perhaps most important of all, when science and the scientific method finally appeared.

The advent of science manifested itself on several fronts. As a subject, it was pursued by a small but significant number of Brazilians, many of whom gained world renown. In 1903, for example, Oswaldo Cruz, as Director of Public Health, undertook the campaign to eradicate yellow fever in Rio de Janeiro. At this time also, Barbosa Rodrigues began to reorganize the Botanical Garden which João VI had created. In 1898 Santos Dumont flew over Paris in a balloon and in 1906 he repeated the feat in his plane (the "14-bis") which, according to one observer, was literally "the most memorable minute in the history of aviation."¹¹³

Foreign scientists also came to Brazil. Hermann von Ihering was invited to head the Paulista Museum which had been founded 1893. In 1907, Orville Derby was named head of the newly-created Department of Geology and Mineralogy in Rio. Joaquim Nabuco, then ambassador to the United States, publicly invited American scientists to go to Brazil to take "scientific inventory of our Nature before it is too mutilated," and he asked for aid from the United States in order to advance scientific knowledge in his country.¹¹⁴

This was the period when Oto de Alencar (1874-1912) made some of his most important contributions to mathematics, when the Maguinhas Institute, "one of the country's great scientific institutions," was founded (1901).¹¹⁵ But perhaps most important of all, these were the years when the scientific method invaded all aspects of Brazilian culture.

The "scientific approach" is reflected in the "classifying" and "cataloguing" spirit of many writers. There was Max Fleuss at the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute, there was Nina Rodrigues whose efforts to classify the Negro will be discussed below along

¹¹² In 1890, for example, there was only one French newspaper. By the late 1890's, however, there were many and even the *Jornal do Comércio* had articles in French. See Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 58 and note 8, p. 58.

¹¹³ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 389.

¹¹⁴ "Scientific Possibilities in Brazil," Remarks at Washington University's Annual Dinner (February 16, 1907), pp. 1 and 6.

¹¹⁵ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 239. In 1902 Oswaldo Cruz became the head of the Maguinhas Institute, today the Oswaldo Cruz Institute. However, the importance of science during this period should not be exaggerated. For example, it was not until 1917 that the National Academy of Science was founded.

with Sílvio Romero's works on the Indian, Negro and Portuguese in Brazil, and there was a new group of intellectuals who were seeking to renovate and "re-classify" the language of Brazil.

The interest in Portuguese, as a language, which became evident in Brazil at the turn of the twentieth century, ultimately came to a climax with the agreements signed by Portugal and Brazil in 1931 and 1938, which sought to give uniformity and consistency to written Portuguese.¹¹⁶ The problem of uniformity was a prime concern of José Veríssimo. "This poor Portuguese of ours," he wrote, "does not have two, — note well, two writers, — who write it in same way, who have the same orthography."¹¹⁷ Veríssimo, it should be noted, believed that Brazil had to develop a typically Brazilian Portuguese which, combined with scientific knowledge and method, would lead to the intellectual emancipation to which men like Romero so fervently aspired. This ideal was expressed very well by Euclides da Cunha (who did so much to prove that a "Brazilian" Portuguese did exist): "Our maximum pride should be that the Portuguese should have difficulty in translating us."¹¹⁸

The most important contributions to philology were made by José Ribeiro (1860-1934), usually acclaimed as Brazil's first philologist of Portuguese. Like Sílvio Romero, Ribeiro had gone to Rio de Janeiro from Sergipe, and from his arrival in 1880 he demonstrated a keen interest in grammar and the Portuguese language. A dedicated student, Ribeiro "lived in the library."¹¹⁹

One of the products of Ribeiro's constant study of the language was his *A língua nacional* in which he tried to demonstrate that there were many "Brazilianisms" (*brasilianismos*) in the Portuguese language spoken in Brazil. He was in fact one of the first to point out the many differences between the Portuguese of the mother country and that of Brazil. Like Veríssimo, he was aware that the language had to be defined or, better still, re-defined. He was a staunch defender of the idea of an independent language, one which would be the basis for an independent Brazilian culture. Thus Ribeiro was instrumental in clarifying two fundamental aspects of language: its existence as an end in itself, and its existence as a means, as a cultural tool. The first is seen in his *Floresta de exemplos*, a series of short pieces or "cases" written out of idleness and for the sake of the language itself. The second aspect of the language is reflected in his interest in Brazilianisms, correct spelling and

¹¹⁶ See Afrânio Peixoto, "Reforma ortográfica," *Handbook of Latin American Studies*, III (1937), 446-449.

¹¹⁷ José Veríssimo, "A reforma da ortografia portuguesa: a ortografia portuguesa," *Revista da Academia*. I (julho, 1910), 77. This was the first volume of the review of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, the publication of which had been delayed thirteen years because of financial problems. The *Revista* was designed to contribute "actively and effectively in the development of literary culture in Brazil." It contains speeches, poetry and articles on literature, and the first number reflects the "new interests" of Brazil's turn-of-the-century intellectuals. It included, among other things, two other articles on Portuguese orthography, a project for a "bibliographic dictionary," as well as some of the speeches given at the Academy between 1897 and 1910.

¹¹⁸ Quoted by Renato de Mendonça, "Los tres más grandes prosistas del Brasil: José de Alencar, Machado de Assis y Euclides da Cunha," *Cuadernos Americanos*, III, 5 (sept.oct., 1944), 154-171. Quote appears on p. 169.

¹¹⁹ Joaquim Ribeiro, Introduction to João Ribeiro, *Cartas devolvidas* (2nd ed.; Rio: Libreria São José, 1960), p. iv.

proper usage.¹²⁰ It was this “vernacularist reaction” which, combined with the critical analysis of texts carried out by Romero and Veríssimo, helped “destroy the Romantic idols and gave our [Brazilian] letters and thought new direction.”¹²¹

The Changing Approach to History

The state of historical research at the turn of the-century is indicative of the transformation of Brazilian thought and literature in general. As was the case with most of the other disciplines, the approach to history remained very traditional, and political history continued to be the primary concern of Brazilian historians.¹²² Yet, around 1900, Brazil’s historians had already begun to manifest an interest in the social and economic aspects of their past which they now approached in a more scientific way.

In his preface to the Brazilian edition of Oliveira Lima’s *Formação. histórica da nacionalidade brasileira*, Gilber Freyre underlined the fact that Oliveira Lima had stressed politics at the expense of “facts of economic interest and sociological processes of Brazil’s national development.”¹²³ Political history had, of course, been the main interest of Brazilian historians in the nineteenth century. Some, like Francisco Adolfo Varnhagen (1816-1878), had been diligent researchers, but they nevertheless failed to use the methods of “sociology” and were unable “to understand the facts in their origins, in their relation to more general and important facts from which they derive, [and] to generalize the actions and formulate theories....”¹²⁴

These are the words of João Capistrano de Abreu, the most distinguished member of a group of “prestigious dissidents” who, at the end of the nineteenth century, sought to revise Brazil’s traditional historiography.¹²⁵ The group included such men as Joaquim Nabuco, Sílvio Romero, Euclides da Cunha, Alfredo de Carvalho, Nina Rodrigues, João Ribeiro, and João Capistrano de Abreu. Capistrano de Abreu, in particular, shared Varnhagen’s dedication to historical investigation and constant search for more complete documentation,¹²⁶ but he differed from his illustrious predecessor in that he showed a definite preference for

¹²⁰ *Floresta de exemplos* (2nd ed.; Rio: Livraria São José, 1959), and *A língua nacional* (2nd ed.; São Paulo: Editôra Nacional, 1933).

¹²¹ Joaquim Ribeiro, *Rui Barbosa e João Ribeiro*, p. 51. See also, Veríssimo, *História da literatura*, pp. 22-23.

¹²² This tendency towards political history can be seen in the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*. See Rollie E. Poppino, “A Century of the Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro,” *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1953), 307-323. See also Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, pp. 297-298.

¹²³ P. x. However, it should be noted that there is much social history in Oliveira Lima’s *Dom João VI no Brasil*.

¹²⁴ João Capistrano de Abreu, “Necrologio de Francisco Adolpho de Varnhagen, Visconde de Pôrto-Seguro,” *Jornal do Comércio*, dezembro 16-20, 1878. Appended to Varnhagen *História geral do Brasil*, (3rd. ed.; São Paulo: Weiszlog Irmãos, n.d.), I, 502-508.

¹²⁵ Freyre Preface to Oliveira Lima, *Formação histórica da nacionalidade brasileira*, p. xi.

¹²⁶ His correspondence is full of requests for articles in foreign reviews (such as the *English Historical Review*), books on Brazil published abroad, and for newly-discovered documents. For example, see the letter he wrote to Oliveira Lima (who was then in England), February 21, 1900, *Correspondência*, III, 9.

sociology, geography and ethnology.¹²⁷

By 1900 Capistrano de Abreu was undoubtedly the most respected historian Brazil had ever had. Even Sílvio Romero, who was little inclined to praise contemporaries, called him the most erudite in Brazilian matters who has existed to this day, surpassing even Varnhagen, João Lisboa, Joaquim Caetano, Silva Paranhos, and Cândido Mendes....¹²⁸ Today, Capistrano de Abreu's contributions to Brazilian history and historiography are considered the basis for a more modern approach to Brazil's past. As José Honório Rodrigues has written: Capistrano de Abreu "substituted the concept of culture for that of race, renewed Brazilian ethnography with studies of the indigenous population, gave importance for the first time to social history and customs with *Capítulos de história colonial*, and ... for the first time described, in 1910, the system of 'casa-grande e senzala' and its importance in the North."¹²⁹

Capistrano de Abreu had been born in 1853 in the province of Ceará. By 1869 he was in Recife but, unable to enter the Faculty of Law, he moved to Fortaleza where he associated himself with a group of young poets and intellectuals. In the early 1870's he went to Rio de Janeiro (which was to be his home until his death in 1927) with the hope of becoming a journalist. In the Capital, his interests shifted from literature to history and geography and by 1879 he was working at the National Library where he became thoroughly familiar with the literature in the field. As early as 1874, fully imbued with Spencer, Comte, Taine, Buckle, and Agassiz, he had planned to write a history of Brazil which would "show the permanent influence of nature on civilization," and in 1879 he wrote of sixteenth-century Brazilian society as an "organism of an inferior type" whose "structure remained undefined" and whose "functions were not yet differentiated." In the 1880's, however, his attachment to Positivism waned. As José Honório Rodrigues has noted, Capistrano de Abreu's research in the National Library, the influence of geographical and anthropological studies, his reading of Varnhagen, and his exposure to the German methods of historical criticism, were to change the young historian from an historical positivist to an historical realist.¹³⁰

By the late 1890's, Capistrano de Abreu had established himself as one of the foremost historians of Brazil. In 1883 he had competed successfully for the professorship in history at the Imperial College of Pedro II,¹³¹ and for the rest of his life he dedicated him-

¹²⁷ He considered sociology the "most splendid conquest of the nineteenth century." See *Ensaio e estudos* (Rio: Briguiet, 1931-38), I, 117. While not a geographer, he was a "renovator of geographic studies," according to Artur Ferreira Reis, "Capistrano: geógrafo," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, 221 (1953), 139-151.

¹²⁸ Romero, *História da literatura*, V, note on p. 1813.

¹²⁹ Rodrigues, "Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia," p. lii. See also letter from Capistrano de Abreu to Pandiá Calogeras, February 22, 1910, *Correspondência*, I, 359-361.

¹³⁰ Rodrigues, "Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia," pp. xxxix and xli.

¹³¹ In order to apply for this professorship, a candidate had to submit a thesis on the assigned topic: the discovery of Brazil and its development in the sixteenth century. *O descobrimento do Brasil e seu desenvolvimento no século XVI* (1st ed., 1883) earned him the chair because, according to José Veríssimo, whereas the rest of the theses submitted were "good summaries of Varnhagen," Capistrano de Abreu's was a well-argued, original, and succinct work. See Vianna, *Capistrano de Abreu*, p. 23.

self to the advancement of historical knowledge in Brazil. In 1899, he published *Caminhos antigos e o povoamento*, a work directed at a learned public and destined to affect Brazilian history-writing in much the same manner as F. J. Turner's *The Frontier in American History* (1893) influenced American historiography. With this work, Capistrano de Abreu gave the sertão and its western frontier a new importance and interpretation. When the book appeared, the interest of Brazilian historians was still largely concentrated on the coastal society and the history of the Atlantic seaboard communities. Capistrano de Abreu showed what role the sertão and the *caminho* had played in the historical development and "westernization" of Brazil and how, in turn, the settler of the sertão was forced to adapt to the "barbaric" nature of the backlands — all of which resulted in a new and distinctly Brazilian personality.¹³²

In 1899, at the moment that Brazil was preparing to celebrate the 400th anniversary of its discovery, the chair of history at the College of Pedro II (now the Ginásio Nacional) was abolished and incorporated into a chair of world history.¹³³ The government was, in a sense, turning its back on its own past and on the Brazilian historians Antônio Gonçalves Dias, Joaquim de Macedo and João Capistrano de Abreu (the three who had held the chair of Brazilian history since its establishment in 1849). Capistrano de Abreu was offered a new chair but refused; and he now dedicated himself completely to the study of Brazilian historiography: he published articles on valuable manuscripts, solved historical controversies and continued to translate works from German.¹³⁴

In the following years Capistrano de Abreu collected material for a synthesis of colonial history which was to be the practical climax of his long theoretical training in historical writing. In 1907 he published *Capítulos de história colonial, 1500-1800*, now considered by most critics to be his greatest work.¹³⁵ Since 1890, he had planned to write "a modest history, in broad strokes and long stitches." This was not the grand history which the young man in Ceará had thought of writing after reading Spencer, Buckle, Taine, and Comte. It was rather an attempt to "collect much scattered material with the hope of interpreting better certain facts and drawing attention to certain aspects [of colonial history] which until then had been underestimated."¹³⁶ It was also to be a history guided by the

¹³² Rodrigues, "Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia," pp. liii-liv.

¹³³ Vianna, *Capistrano de Abreu*, p. 39. The move was decreed in the "Código dos Institutos Oficiais de Ensino Superior e Secundário," drafted by the Minister of Justice and Interior, Epitácio Pessoa. See also, Hélio Vianna, "O ensino da história do Brasil no curso secundário," *O ensino da história no Brasil*, Artur Ferreira Reis et al. (México, D.F.: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e História, 1953), p. 40.

The preparations for the celebration of Brazil's 400th anniversary included the publication of the *Livro do Centenário* (Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1900-1902), in three volumes, sponsored by the Association of the Fourth Centenary of the Discovery of Brazil. It was a collective effort and included contributions by Capistrano de Abreu and Sílvio Romero.

¹³⁴ Capistrano de Abreu was self-taught and this explains in part his free-lancing attitude towards history. His interests were varied: he read the *Nation* from New York and the *Manchester Guardian* and, besides German, he read English, Spanish, Latin, Italian, and Dutch.

¹³⁵ See, for example, Vianna, *Capistrano de Abreu*, p. 53; Castro Rabello, *Capistrano de Abreu e a síntese histórica* (Rio: Livraria São José, 1956), p. 32; and Rodrigues, "Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia," pp. xlfff.

¹³⁶ Letter to Barão do Rio Branco, April 17, 1890, *Correspondência*, I, 129-131. It should be noted that Capistrano de Abreu never wrote the "grand" history of Brazil he had planned.

Rankeian spirit of historical criticism.

By 1903 there was still no “História.” Capistrano de Abreu was busily planning hundred-page introductions to each of the volumes of his edition of Varnhagen’s *História geral*. These introductions were to be “syntheses of the corresponding period.”¹³⁷ However, except for the first volume, the work he actually completed was limited to notes, comments, and identification of sources. Nevertheless, the study of primary sources resulted in a series of articles on “História Pátria” which appeared in 1905 in the magazine *Kosmos*. These articles, along with the work on Varnhagen, were to form the nucleus of *Capítulos de história colonial* which was finally published in January, 1907.

The work consists of eleven chapters. The first is a description of the geographic setting, the flora and fauna, the linguistic and ethnographic distribution of the aboriginal tribes, and what might be called the ‘Indian legacy’. The second chapter describes the “exotic factors” of Brazilian history: Portuguese society on the eve of the discovery, and the Negro, who brought from Africa “a happy note which contrasted with the quiet Portuguese and the gloomy Indian.”¹³⁸

Chapters III and IV deal with the early discoveries and explorations and with the initial conflicts among Europeans over Brazil. The next two chapters are a discussion of the *capitanias* (hereditary and royal), and it is here that Capistrano de Abreu begins to speak of the emerging ‘nation’, the ‘organism’ of the new society. In Chapter VII he points out the influence of the French and Spanish in the formation of Brazil. In Chapter VIII, a brief summary for a discussion of the Dutch in Brazil, he underlines the importance of the defeat of the Dutch in Pernambuco and speaks of the pride of the Pernambucans who now felt superior to the rest of the ‘Brazilians’.

In chapter IX Capistrano de Abreu describes the settling of the interior, the sertão. Chapter X is a description of the slow process of territorial expansion and the disputes incurred with neighboring territories. The book ends with a picture of Brazil around 1800. In this final chapter (“Three Centuries Later”), he describes the people, the land, and the new society. Using many travelers’ accounts to form a picture of social classes, industry, ethnographic groups, and religion, he concludes, on a Spencerian note: “there was no public life because there was no society; public matters were of no interest and were not known.” The Brazilians of the early nineteenth century hardly knew if there was peace or war, and they lacked a national conscience.¹³⁹

The emphasis in *Capítulos de história colonial* is unquestionably on the social and economic aspects of Brazil’s history. There is very little political, administrative, military or diplomatic history. In fact, it represents in Brazilian historiography the first attempt to combine geography, ethnology, social and economic history, and folklore. Capistrano de Abreu was, indeed, Brazil’s first “historian-sociologist.”¹⁴⁰

¹³⁷ Letter to Guilherme Studart, April 20, 1904, *ibid.*, 162.

¹³⁸ *Capítulos de história colonial* (4th ed.; Rio: Briguier, 1954), p. 60.

¹³⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 337.

¹⁴⁰ Vianna, *Capistrano de Abreu*, p. 57. In later life he took an interest in the Indian languages, and in 1914 he published *rã-txa hu-ni-ku-ĩ*, a grammar and dictionary of the language of the Caxinauás which Alfredo de

João Capistrano de Abreu was representative of the “generation of materialism” which sought to inter-relate the social sciences and to ally them to the natural, physical, and biological sciences.¹⁴¹ His thought was therefore guided by the ideas of Comte, Darwin, Spencer, Taine, Buckle, and later influenced by German geographic determinism. His historical works, moreover, reflect more the influence of Buckle’s study of the “masses” than the individual or heroic history of a Carlyle. In fact, his concept of history verged on the “anti-heroic.” Thus it is not strange that in *Capítulos de história colonial* he omits any mention of Tiradentes since, “for him, the makers of Brazilian history were simple men, common men.”¹⁴²

Capistrano de Abreu’s ideas and approach to Brazil’s past were typical of a small but distinguished group of Brazilian intellectuals at the turn of the twentieth century. The works of Sílvio Romero reflect similar interests, for he was also eager to understand Brazil and hoped to change the way in which his country’s past and present were studied.¹⁴³ Thus when Euclides da Cunha’s *Os sertões* appeared in 1902, Romero immediately praised the work, applauding not only da Cunha’s style but the fact of his interest in the rural masses of Brazil.¹⁴⁴

Like Capistrano de Abreu, da Cunha “was well ahead of the historiography of his time, dealing more with the cultural and social aspects of the drama of Canudos than with its political aspects.”¹⁴⁵ In the years between the publication of his masterpiece and his tragic death in 1909, Euclides da Cunha — whom Gilberto Freyre has called Brazil’s greatest sociologist — became increasingly interested in history. In 1907 he published *Contrastes e confrontos* and *Perú vs. Bolívia*; in 1908, *Martim Garcia* and *Castro Alves e seu tempo*; and, in 1909, *A margem da história*. A year before his death, the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* republished an essay in which he reviewed Brazil’s history in the nineteenth century and lamented the fact that politics had played so important a role in Brazil’s evolution: “We are the only case in history of a nationality created by a political theory. We went, in one jump, from the homogeneity of a colony to a constitutional regime, from charters to laws.”¹⁴⁶

The slowness of Brazil’s *social* evolution — in contrast to its rapid political advance — became the subject of many literary works at the turn of the twentieth century. The same year *Os sertões* appeared, Graça Aranha’s *Canaã* was published. Often considered Brazil’s first social novel,¹⁴⁷ *Canaã* reflects not only an increasing concern on the part of

Carvalho described as “a veritable miracle of science and patience.” See letter of Capistrano de Abreu, February 16, 1914, Correspondência, III, 299.

¹⁴¹ Afrânio Coutinho, *Euclides, Capistrano e Araripe* (Rio: Ministério da Educação e Cultura, 1959), p. 72.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 71. See also *Ensaio e estudos*, I, iii.

¹⁴³ These included, besides literary history and criticism, folklore, ethnography, politics, philosophy and poetry. See the list of Romero’s works in *História da literatura*.

¹⁴⁴ Romero, *História da literatura*, V, 1777.

¹⁴⁵ Sousa Andrade, *História e interpretação*, p. 214.

¹⁴⁶ “Da Independência á Republica,” vols. 113-114 (1908), pp. 21-22. This essay was first published in *O Estado de São Paulo* (May, 1901) as “O Brazil no Seculo XIX.”

¹⁴⁷ See for example Gilberto Freyre, “Relación de la literature moderna del Brasil con los problemas sociales brasileiros,” *Cuadernos Americanos*, IV, 3 (mayo-junio, 1945), 114-133, especially p. 123.

Brazilian intellectuals for their country and its future but also the growing interest in race in late nineteenth-century Brazil.

The Interest in Race

By the end of the nineteenth century, reality became permanent in [Brazilian] literature, and the writers of the twentieth century were to inherit this wealth of discovery. They received, in addition, fresh guidance on the realistic and nationalistic road, from two great figures at the turn of the century: Euclides da Cunha, who was to set an indelible seal of regionalism on Brazilian literature; and Graça Aranha, who was to become the prophet of Brazilianism at the expense of foreign influences.¹⁴⁸

José Pereira de Graça Aranha (1868-1931) was another of Barreto's disciples who moved to Rio de Janeiro. He initiated his literary career with *Canaã*, a novel "social in theme and Symbolist in style, an excellent example of the fusion of realism, idealism and nationalism, characteristic of the eclectic inspiration at the beginning of the century."¹⁴⁹ Like da Cunha, Graça Aranha was concerned with Brazil's social evolution and in *Canaã* he posed the problem in terms of immigration and of contemporary race theories. At one point in the narrative, two newly-arrived German youths discuss Brazil's past and future as follows:

- Herr Lentz: "It is not possible to have civilization in this country.... The land itself, with its violence and exuberance, is a great obstacle ..."
- Herr Milkau: "But ... you are well aware of how nature has been conquered here, how man is triumphing"
- Lentz: "But what has been achieved is almost nothing, and the effort has been largely that of Europeans. The Brazilian is not an agent of progress; he is a hybrid"
- Milkau: "... It is through fusion that races civilize themselves; and the encounter between the more advanced races and the virgin, savage races is ... the basis for the rejuvenation of civilization...."¹⁵⁰

Was Brazil doomed because its population was racially mixed? Was the Negro capable of achieving "civilization" without miscegenation? Was the *mestiço* an "agent of progress"? Graça Aranha and his contemporaries were as confused as Milkau and Lentz. Euclides de Cunha, himself part-Indian, spoke of the *mestiço* — mulatto, *mameluco*, or *cafuso* — as a "degenerate" type, a hyphen between two races ... lacking the physical energy of his savage ancestors and without the intellectual elevation of his ancestors on the other

¹⁴⁸ Arturo Torres-Ríoeseo, *The Epic of Latin American Literature* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: Univ. of California Press, 1961), p. 247.

¹⁴⁹ Alceu Amoroso Lima, *Quadro sintético da literatura brasileira* (2nd rev. ed.; Rio: Agir, 1959), p. 69.

¹⁵⁰ *Canaã* (11th ed. rev.; Rio: Briguiet, 1959), pp. 41-42.

side.”¹⁵¹

It seems ironic that in this period of “scientific” investigation Brazil’s intellectuals were so confused about race. But it was precisely because of nineteenth-century European scientific theories about race and environment that interpretations such as those of Euclides da Cunha appeared around 1900. As Samuel Putnam wrote in the introduction to his translation of *Os sertões*:

A Spencerian positivism, in philosophy and in science, was in the very air that was breathed by the Brazilian intellectual of the eighties and the nineties, and Cunha’s work is impregnated with it — with its virtues and errors, its scientific half-truths and untruths, as in the field of anthropology, for example.... Euclides, like his fellows, drank all this in; and from Europe came such imported fare as Buckle, Bryce, Taine, Renan, Ratzel, Gumplowicz, and Gobineau.... This led to a rigid biologic determinism, tending to become fatalism ...”¹⁵²

In spite of their “rigid biologic determinism,” Brazil’s turn-of-the-century intellectuals made important contributions to what might be called “mestiço studies.” As early as 1845, the Bavarian naturalist Karl Frederick Philipp von Martius (1794-1868) had suggested that racial mixture had given Brazilian history and society “a very particular stamp” and that it might even produce a “new and marvelously organized nation.”¹⁵³ During the nineteenth century, however, Brazilians rarely addressed themselves to this matter, and when they did it was usually to condemn mestiçagem as “very sad degeneration,” as Gobineau did.¹⁵⁴

In general, nineteenth-century writers preferred to study the Indian or Negro individually.¹⁵⁵ In literature, for example, there were José de Alencar’s *indianista* novels, *O Guarani* (1857) and *Iracema* (1865), and during the abolitionist campaign the Negro was also idealized.¹⁵⁶ But with the rejection of Romanticism and the advent of a more scientific approach came a more realistic appreciation of the Indian and Negro in Brazil. For example, it was not until the 1890’s that Brazilians began “to interpret scientifically” the contribution of the Negro to Brazilian culture and society. Specifically, it was Raimundo Nina

¹⁵¹ *Rebellion in the Backlands (Os Sertões)*, trans. Samuel Putnam (Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press, “Phoenix Books,” 1944), p. 85.

¹⁵² *Ibid.*, pp xii-xiii. See also Gilberto Freyre, *Actualidade de Euclides da Cunha* (Rio: Casa do Estudante do Brasil, 1941).

It is said that upon meeting da Cunha, Sílvio Romero (whose ancestors were “genuine Portuguese”) is to have exclaimed: “But he is a perfect *cariri* Indian.” See Sousa Andrade, *História e interpretação*, p. 24. See also Robert E. Conrad, “The Negro in Brazilian Thought in Colony, Empire and Republic,” unpublished Master’s Essay (Columbia University, History, 1964), especially pp.127-156 on “Racism in the Republic.”

¹⁵³ “Como se deve escrever a História do Brasil,” *Revista Trimensal de História e Geographia* (now the RIHGB), VI, No. 24 (janeiro, 1845), 381-403.

¹⁵⁴ Quoted by Georges Raederstoerffer, *Le Comte de Gobineau au Brésil* (Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines, 1934), p. 51. There were, of course, some exceptions; Annibal Falcão (*Formula*, pp. 131ff), for example, believed that racial mixture was a means for progress and national unity.

¹⁵⁵ For example, Martius, *Das Naturell, die Kranheiten das Arzthum und die Heilmittel der Uberwohner Brasiliens* (1844), and Couto de Magalhães, *O selvagem* (1876).

¹⁵⁶ See Raymond S. Sayers, *The Negro in Brazilian Literature* (New York: Hispanic Institute, 1956).

Rodrigues (1862-1906) who, having studied the Negro in Bahia in the late 1880's (before Rui Barbosa ordered the destruction of the records of slavery in 1891), was to make several lasting contributions: *As raças humanas e a responsabilidade penal no Brasil* (1894) and later *Os africanos no Brasil* and *Fetichismo africano na Bahia*.¹⁵⁷

It was largely through the efforts of Sílvio Romero, however, that many turn-of-the-century intellectuals began to appreciate the importance of racial mixture in the for- other literatures, and his important conclusion was that Brazilian literature was the product of three fundamental factors: environment, race, and foreign influence. "From the interaction of these three agents on the ideas and feelings of a given people" there results "a national literature."¹⁵⁸

Romero lamented that literary critics in Brazil had been primarily preoccupied with the influence of foreign ideas and styles and had overlooked the importance of race and environment. He considered race as the most important of the three "components" of Brazilian literature, and went so far as to suggest that the "amalgamation" of Portuguese, Indian, and Negro would result in a "new type," in a distinct "historical race."¹⁵⁹

Romero, then, considered every Brazilian a mestiço, if not biologically at least culturally. He was convinced, moreover, that the idea of a mestiço Brazil had originated in Brazil and not, as Graça Aranha believed, with Martius. Romero's critique of the "deified ideas" of Martius — a critique which should be accepted as one coming from a nationalist rather than an impartial historian — was based on the conviction that these ideas had originated with "national authors," such as Varnhagen, Gonçalves Dias, Francisco Lisboa, João Ribeiro, Capistrano de Abreu, and, of course, Romero himself. It was more than a question of fact; it was a matter of national pride. "It would be a disgrace for the Brazilian nation," he wrote, "if it would have had to rely on Martius to teach it two of the most trivial things ...: the division of the country into zones, and the need to study the three races which make up the [Brazilian] nation."¹⁶⁰

¹⁵⁷ On the importance of Nina Rodrigues, see, for example, Newton Freitas, *Alôs afro-brasileiros* (Buenos Aires: Emece-Editôres, 1942), p. 11, and Oliveira Vianna, *Raça e assimilação* (2nd ed. rev.; São Paulo: Editôra Nacional, 1934), pp. 20-21. For a recent summary of the state of research on race relations in Brazil see the suggestive paper by Octavio Ianni, "Os estudos sobre relações raciais no Brasil," Unpublished paper read at the Conference on Race and Class in Latin America during the National Period, sponsored by Cornell University and Columbia University, New York City, December 16-18, 1965.

¹⁵⁸ *História da literatura*, I, 266.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 287 and 290.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, V, 1521 and 1522.

CHAPTER IV

THE SEARCH FOR BRAZIL

During the twenty years following the advent of the Republic, Brazil's international position was greatly enhanced. By 1902 Brazil had re-established its credit abroad. A year before the Treasury had paid off the £1,120,000 loan which had been contracted during the administration of Prudente de Moraes, and Brazilians could feel proud that their country had paid its debts and was now even a creditor to Uruguay and Paraguay.

It was largely through the efforts of the Barão do Rio Branco that Brazil gained much of its prestige abroad. Relations improved with the Spanish American republics and the United States. If in 1889 Brazil attended its first inter-American conference, the First Pan-American Conference held in Washington, D.C., by 1906 Brazil was host to the Third Pan-American Conference. It was on this occasion that Rio Branco (a baron of the Empire and now the Republic's Foreign Minister) "had an unmatched opportunity for enlarging the republic's social prestige."¹⁶¹

Under the leadership of Foreign Minister Rio Branco (1902-1912), moreover, Brazil bought the territory of Acre from Bolivia, raised the status of its legation in Washington to the rank of embassy, named Joaquim Nabuco Brazil's first ambassador to the United States, and sent Rui Barbosa to the Second Peace Conference at the Hague in 1907. Most important, Brazil settled a number of difficult boundary disputes with its many neighbors. As one Brazilian diplomat has written:

In the history of civilization, Rio Branco will live on as the demarcator of Brazil's territorial greatness. Among the Brazilian people and around his memory a legend has been created, a legend comparable to that of Napoleon in France and San Martin in Spanish America.¹⁶²

Just as Rio Branco was instrumental in defining Brazil territorially, so Brazilian intellectuals were beginning to take an interest in Brazil as a nation and to define what they meant when they spoke of *brasilidade*.

An Awareness of Brazil

One of the most interesting aspects of Brazilian thought at the turn of the twentieth

¹⁶¹ Pedro Calmon, quoted by Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 236.

¹⁶² Renato de Mendonça, *El Brasil en la América Latina* (México, D.F.: El Colegio de México, "Jornadas" vol. 13, n. d.), p. 28.

Historian, politician, and diplomat, José Maria da Silva Paranhos (1845-1912), later Barão do Rio Branco, "was a statesman who would have been remarkable in any country," according to James Bryce, *South America: . Observations and Impressions* (New York: Macmillan, 1912), pp. 416-417. For a recent study of Rio Branco's role in the diplomatic maneuverings of the Old Republic, see E. Bradford Burns, *The Unwritten Alliance: Rio-Branco and Brazilian-American Relations* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1966).

century is that intellectuals, as a group, began to reveal an acute awareness of the country in which they lived. To some, Brazil — with its many problems — was a source of much concern, sometimes even of pessimism. To others, Brazil was a source of constant pride or, at least, of optimism. But all shared a single concern: to learn and write about Brazil.

The intellectuals' awareness of Brazil was partly the result of their reaction against European models. But it was also an outgrowth of their desire to apply critical and scientific methods — paradoxically, European in origin — to a study of their country.

Sílvio Romero was one of the leaders of the reaction against *macaqueação* (aping or imitating foreigners). His goal was to study the Brazilian reality and, though his approach was largely that of an historian of literature, he studied — or at least commented on — virtually every aspect of Brazilian life, past and present. He did not, like Milkau, view Brazil with “immigrant eyes.” Looking at his country with very Brazilian eyes, Romero sought to “locate” his country within the world, within humanity. He attempted to explain the Brazilian *national* character by writing a history of Brazilian literature based on popular folklore and on ethnic considerations. Concerned with what Europeans thought of Brazil — he had been impressed by Buckle's “picture of Brazilian backwardness —, he did not react with words of empty nationalism but rather sought to explain Brazil within the context of the then recent scientific innovations of historical analysis.¹⁶³

As early as 1888 Romero had lamented the lack of serious works on Brazil by Brazilians and had suggested a number of methods for studying his country. He recommended, for example, that in order to study Brazil it was necessary to leave the cities — Belem, São Luis, Recife, Bahia, Rio de Janeiro, São Paulo, Pôrto Alegre — and study the rural population.¹⁶⁴ Few, if any, Brazilians had previously made the rural masses an object of serious inquiry and, even now, few realized the significance of Romero's advice until, “in the dawn of the republic, the sertão made its dramatic appearance on the scene of Brazilian life, revealing tragic aspects of our formation.”¹⁶⁵ Not until the struggle at Canudos, documented and analyzed by Euclides da Cunha in *Os sertões*, did Brazilians become fully aware of the many weaknesses of their country's *national* foundations.

Sílvio Romero was only one of the new class of Brazilian intellectuals who pressed for a fresh examination of his country's institutions. Optimist or pessimist, internationalist or isolationist, northerner or southerner, journalist or historian, the Brazilian intellectual at the turn of the twentieth century was demonstrating an increased awareness of a great variety of aspects of Brazilian life. It is not surprising, therefore, that it was during this period that the Brazilian novel, “essentially social in genesis,” began to emerge, “concerned with

¹⁶³ Romero, *História da literatura*, I, 57, 70, and 87.

¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 286. See also, *ibid.*, V, 1629-1630. This idea — that Brazil's cities were not “typical — was expressed by several other writers and even some foreigners. See Leclerc, *Cartas*, p. 29.

¹⁶⁵ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 229. However, some writers had made the *urban* masses the subject of many works. The novelist Aluísio Azevedo, for example, had the “ability to see and write about the movement of the masses, something which no other Brazilian novelist had,” Sérgio Milliet, Introduction to Azevedo, *O cortiço* (São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editôra, 1962), p. 15.

things seen and the impression made by them upon the ever-sensitive native observer.”¹⁶⁶ In the process of becoming aware of themselves as Brazilians, of seeking to define brasilidade, and of searching for national common denominators, many intellectuals were brought to confess that their country did, in fact, have many unresolved problems.

Brazil as a Problem

Around 1900, then, Brazil’s intellectuals became increasingly involved in defining “national” problems.¹⁶⁷ Some, like Manoel Bomfim (1868-1932), concerned themselves with the problems of America and of the American man as a whole. In 1903, for example, Bomfim published *A America latina: males de origem: estudo de parasitismo social*. However, most thinkers still exuded a certain confidence in Brazil and believed — though, in retrospect, somewhat naively — that Brazil’s problems could be solved easily. The *seccas*, for example, were the concern of various authors. Coelho Neto (1864-1934), the author of *O sertão* (1896), and Afonso Arinos (1868-1916), who in 1898 published a collection of stories entitled *Pelo sertão*, were among those writers who introduced “themes in which the problems of the land and the people of Brazil are expressed. Another half-caster, Lima Barreto, with less art than Machado de Assis but with deep feeling, wrote of the social aspects of the country’s ‘bourgeois comedy.’ In Lima Barreto, as in Euclides da Cunha, the social currents that were to become influential after 1919 begin to appear.”¹⁶⁸

Euclides da Cunha’s involvement with Brazil’s problems is perhaps the most dramatic example of how a turn-of-the-century intellectual became interested in his country and how, in turn, his country’s problems influenced his writings. Many intellectuals were, to be sure, aware of the strength of the ruling elites; but they also realized that, if the elites retained control of Brazil’s destiny, they did so more by the momentum of the past than by mastery of the present. No one was more aware of the limitations of the elites’ control than Euclides da Cunha, whose imagination was captured by the spectacle of a Brazil weighed down by the legacies of centuries but attempting to achieve political stability and economic and social advance. Da Cunha, moreover, “was able to see how contradictory the social, political, and economic scenery of his land was, and how paradoxical and ridiculous was the attitude of the intellectual elite of this time, absorbed in the contemplation of Europe.”¹⁶⁹

Euclides da Cunha’s criticism of the Brazilian elites and of his fellow intellectuals was not the product of personal animosity but rather an outgrowth of his deep-rooted love for his profession.¹⁷⁰ A mestiço of modest background, Euclides da Cunha moved to Rio de Janeiro in 1878 and later became a journalist in São Paulo.

¹⁶⁶ Samuel Putnam, “The Brazilian Social Novel (1935-1940),” *The Inter-American Quarterly*, II, No.2 (April, 1940), 5-12. Quote from p. 6.

¹⁶⁷ Government officials also reflected this involvement. In 1897, for example, the Minister of Industry, Transportation and Public Works, Joaquim Murinho, warned of the irregular and dangerous growth of the government’s bureaucracy. See Joaquim Murinho, “Política brasileira: introdução ao relatório,” *Revista do Instituto Historico e Geografico Brasileiro*, 219 (avril-junio, 1953), 239-265.

¹⁶⁸ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 239.

¹⁶⁹ João Cruz Costa, “Evolución de la intelectualidad brasileña en la primera fase del siglo XX,” *Cuadernos Americanos*, XXI, 3 (mayo-junio, 1962), 255-262. Quote from p. 257.

¹⁷⁰ *Contrastes e confrontos* (6th ed.; Pôrto: Chardron, 1923), p. 267.

In the mid-1890's, he found himself in the midst of the monarchist-republican battles which were then raging in the *Editôrial* pages of the Brazilian press. And it was at this time that the sertão made its dramatic appearance on the Brazilian scene. To many, the events at Canudos symbolized the struggle between monarchists and republicans. To the latter, in fact, the revolt of Antônio Conselheiro was nothing more than another monarchist conspiracy.

Da Cunha was sent to Canudos where he documented the events of the rebellion in a series of reports for the newspaper *O Estado de São Paulo*. It was not until 1898, however that he converted his observations into a work of literature working by day on the construction of a bridge in São José do Rio Pardo (state of São Paulo) and by night on his great masterpiece.¹⁷¹ Life in São Paulo was, perhaps ironically, a great inspiration to him. "Everything in the paulista city seemed to work with him. Even the geographic setting and social atmosphere. — vigorous, animated, and rich — provided him with the perfect contrast with the scorched and very poor sertões where an abandoned people agitated, a people who would become the coarse characters of the epic with which he was preoccupied."¹⁷² By the beginning of the twentieth century, the bridge had been completed and Euclides da Cunha had put the finishing touches on his book.

In *Os sertões* Euclides da Cunha developed, above all, a nationalist theme.¹⁷³ He was, to be sure, recounting a specific episode which to most Brazilians was current events, but he did so with such insight and mastery that the book transcended the limitations of the subject matter; it exposed the tragedy of Brazil's northeastern backlands not for Europeans to see (*para o inglez vêr*) but rather *para o brasileiro vêr*.

Many of the themes which da Cunha first enunciated in *Os sertões* are present in his later writings. In *Contrastes e confrontos* he speaks of a "Plan for a Crusade" against the droughts of the Northeast. His interest in folklore is revealed again in subsequent works, and the dialogue between nature and history, which he first developed in *Os sertões*, was expanded in the monograph on Brazilian history which was published in the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* in 1908.

It was in this same essay that Euclides da Cunha developed even further the idea of the dichotomy between the coast and the interior of Brazil. He made the rest of Brazil aware of the problems of the Northeast and showed his contemporaries how different the coast was from the interior and how disparate the South was from the North. Just as the revolt at Canudos shook many peaceful hearts in the late 1890's, so da Cunha's description of those same events shocked many intellectuals in the early 1900's.

¹⁷¹ A military engineer, da Cunha realized the weakness of his literary education. In São José, however, he became the friend of Francisco de Escobar who taught him "method" and facts and made him read the classics. Da Cunha, moreover, was surrounded not only by Escobar's books but also by such scientific "experts" as the geologist Orville Derby. His desire for a polished work is seen in the many changes in style between the original newspaper accounts and the final version, parts of which Sousa Andrade presents in double columns in *História e interpretação*, pp. 182-193.

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, p. 320.

¹⁷³ See Paulo Dantas, "'Os sertões' como tema literário," *Revista Brasiliense*, V (maio, 1959), 86-105.

Brazil Defended

Not all of Euclides da Cunha's contemporaries shared his disparaging view of Brazil's past and present; many intellectuals, in fact, gave evidence of a "robust and sincere optimism."¹⁷⁴ It was an era of growing nationalism, and to writers like Sílvio Romero patriotism was as important a guide for study as was truth.¹⁷⁵ But it should be remembered that, although many intellectuals displayed great optimism with regard to Brazil's potential, it was only a small group that attempted to defend Brazil's past and present.

What aspects of Brazilian history inspired Brazilian intellectuals to feel proud about being Brazilian? To some, the monarchy was and had been a source of pride. While admitting that the restoration of the monarchy was impossible,¹⁷⁶ men like Afonso Celso looked back on the days of Dom Pedro II with nostalgia and pride. Had not the monarchy saved Brazil from the evils of caudillismo?¹⁷⁷ Had not the monarchy abolished slavery?

Abolition especially was viewed with much pride: many believed that the year 1888 had ushered in a new era of hope and progress. Many, in fact, believed that abolition had done away with one of the causes of Brazil's social "underdevelopment." Thus, abolition was the answer which many gave to critics who, like Euclides da Cunha, complained of the slowness of Brazil's social evolution.

Brazil was defended also against foreign critics. Afonso Celso, for example, wrote that the weaknesses of the Brazilian character were "faults rather than inveterate vices" and that they could be corrected by education. "The principal cause of some of our worst tendencies [he went on to say] has been done away with: slavery,"¹⁷⁸

But why had Brazil been among the last to abolish slavery in Latin America? Eduardo Prado felt that it had been because of the example set by the United States: Brazil "would not have maintained for such a long time that iniquitous institution if the greatest nation of America had not attempted to legitimize it"¹⁷⁹ Afonso Celso disagreed, for he felt that Brazil "s solution to the slave question was very Brazilian and had nothing to do with imitation of the United States: "If it is true that Brazil delayed in abolishing slavery, it is also true that no other country solved the question in a more intelligent and honorable manner." Had not the United States fought a war over slavery?¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁴ Gilberto Freyre, Preface to Oliveira Lima, *Formação histórica*, p. xi.

¹⁷⁵ *História da literatura*, I, 48.

¹⁷⁶ They probably agreed with Barbosa who pointed out that it would be impossible to take away from the provinces their newly attained "federalism" and very difficult to "popularize" a new prince. See *Cartas de Inglaterra*, p. 131.

¹⁷⁷ This view of the monarchy as a preventive force is still widespread. See, for example, O. H. Haring, *Empire in Brazil* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1958), pp. 157ff., and Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, p. 184.

An ardent monarchist, Afonso Celso believed that Dom Pedro had been the greatest figure in Brazilian history and must have been particularly pleased when, in 1912, he was selected President of the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute, a position long associated with the Emperor.

¹⁷⁸ Afonso Celso, *Porque me ufano do meu paiz* (2nd ed.; Rio: Laemmert & Co., 1901), pp.110-111.

¹⁷⁹ Eduardo Prado, *A ilusão americana* (3rd ed.; Rio: n.p., 1953), p. 96.

¹⁸⁰ *Porque me ufano*, p. 236. Quote from p. 235.

There was nothing about Brazil that did not make Afonso Celso feel proud of being a Brazilian, and his *Porque me ufano do meu paiz* (1900) — a book intended for popular reading¹⁸¹ — is a testimony to his irrevocable pride. That “it corresponded in full ... to the spirit of the times”¹⁸² is perhaps an exaggeration, although there can be little doubt that it summed up the feelings of many optimistic Brazilians at the turn of the twentieth century. The theme of the book was that to be a Brazilian meant “distinction and advantages.” To be sure, there were several countries which were “more prosperous, more powerful, more brilliant” than Brazil, but “none more worthy, richer in well-founded promise, more enviable.”¹⁸³ And, Afonso Celso concluded, “in the last analysis, the Brazilian lives a happier life than the Germans, French, English, and his days are more peaceful, cheerful, and more full of hope. Thus, there is in being a Brazilian the pleasure of a benefit, an advantage, a superiority.”¹⁸⁴

Afonso Celso’s pride in Brazil’s “peaceful” solution to the question of slavery corresponded to his more general admiration of the tranquility of his country’s history. “If there is not an abundance of extraordinary events in the history of the fatherland,” he argued, “there is an absence of depressing or shameful ones.”¹⁸⁵ Brazil, for example, had never been defeated or humiliated by a foreign power. There were, moreover, countless other reasons to feel proud of Brazil: the vastness of the land, its beauty and riches, the variety and agreeableness of its climate, the absence of natural calamities, the “noble preachings of its national character,” its chivalrous and dignified relations with other countries, and the many “glories” which its future held in store. Finally, Celso stressed the harmony of life in Brazil and the countless opportunities open to all “classes.”¹⁸⁶

Although Celso refused to admit that there was racial conflict in Brazil, he was well aware that over 50 per cent of Brazilians were of mixed blood. If he was proud of the excellence of each of the racial groups, he reserved his highest praise for the product of miscegenation. “The Brazilian mestiço,” he wrote, “does not in any way denote a physical or intellectual inferiority.... He is capable of any progress. He has produced great men in every sphere of social activity. São Paulo, where the most considerable amount of mixing with the Indian took place, is at the vanguard of our civilization.”¹⁸⁷

Brazil, however, was not completely free from danger and, like many of his contemporaries, Afonso Celso was aware of certain threats to the nation. For one thing, given the size of Brazil, there was the danger that it might break up into several smaller states. But despite the federalism of the epoch, Celso had faith in the unity and homogeneity of

¹⁸¹ Celso made use of the works of, among others, Eliséé Reclus, Southey, Pôrto Seguro, Wappaeus, João Francisco Lisboa, Barão do Rio Branco, and João Ribeiro. He did not footnote, however, “because the work was intended for a wide audience,” *ibid.*, p. 261, note.

¹⁸² Wilson Martins, “Vida literaria e literatura,” p. 572.

¹⁸³ *Porque me ufano*, p. 3.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 157. Celso rejected the idea that Brazil’s history was “placid.” It was not, he wrote, as “pale and fastidious” as some say for it contained some epic events: the Jesuits, *bandeirantes*, the war against the Dutch, the war of the Palmares, and some episodes during the Paraguayan War (*ibid.*, p. 165).

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 66-67.

¹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 105.

Brazil. Intervention by a foreign power was another threat, and Celso, like Barbosa, was aware of Brazil's lack of defense materiel.¹⁸⁸ But if to some Argentina loomed as the potential enemy, to most there was no greater foe than the United States and, to a lesser degree, Pan Americanism.

The Paraguayan War had marked the end of Brazil's isolation and the beginnings of Brazilian diplomacy can be traced to the 1870's.¹⁸⁹ By the end of the century it found itself a part of the Pan American movement toward greater continental unity. Republicans and monarchists alike had sought to dissuade the provisional government from involving itself too deeply with the rest of the continent. Euclides da Cunha was only one of many who addressed himself to the question of "South American Solidarity." His disdain for South America was based on a deep-rooted pessimism with regard to "the *governments* and the 'governments' (ironically underlined or put in quotes)" of the continent.¹⁹⁰ He urged therefore, a policy of "splendid isolation:"

If South American solidarity is a beautiful but absolutely impossible ideal which would only link us to the traditional disorders of two or three irretrievably lost countries and thus render incompatible the severe demands of true progress – let us forget it.

Let us continue — in our past and splendid isolation — into the future; and, conscious of our vigor, [let us proceed] toward the vindication and defense of the Amazon region, where Humboldt's prophetic vision has revealed to us the greatest theater of all civilization on earth.¹⁹¹

Many of the arguments against Pan Americanism had been summed up in Eduardo Prado's *A ilusão americana*, perhaps the best documented attack against a "United America" by a Brazilian. The book, which Barbosa recommended to all the "enthusiasts of American friendship,"¹⁹² first appeared in Brazil and Portugal in 1893 but was immediately banned for fear of embarrassing the United States government. A second edition appeared in 1895.

A ilusão americana can be considered a precursor to Rodo's *Ariel*. It was evidence of the growing mistrust of the United States' intentions which some Latin Americans felt at the end of the nineteenth century. Yet the book must also be understood as the personal testimony of one Brazilian intellectual.

When Eduardo Prado attacked Pan Americanism he was rejecting the cultural values of the United States and upholding those of Brazil:

It is time to react against the insanity of absolute fraternity which some

¹⁸⁸ In his preface to *Cartas de Inglaterra*, Barbosa wrote that he had just read Guillermo Hein's *Las armadas de guerra sud-americanas* (Buenos Aires, 1895) and feared that Brazil's military unpreparedness might prove an "irrestistable temptation" for Argentina (pp. 125-126).

¹⁸⁹ Bello, *História*, p. 9.

¹⁹⁰ *Contrastes e confrontos*, p. 235.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 242. Da Cunha was undoubtedly referring to the rubber boom, but he did not live to see how short this economic cycle was to be.

¹⁹² *Ilusão*, p. iii, and *Cartas de Inglaterra*, p. 163.

have attempted to impose upon Brazil and the great Anglo-Saxon republic, from which we are separated not only by great distances, but also by race, religion, character, language, history, and popular traditions.

The fact that Brazil and the United States occupy the same continent is but a geographic accident to which it would be childish to attribute an exaggerated importance.¹⁹³

Prado believed that the “American spirit” was one of violence whereas the Brazilian or “Latin spirit” was a “juridical” one which maintained “a certain respect for human life and freedom.” Brazil and Latin America owed nothing to the United States, not even the “moral force which permitted them to achieve their independence.” (It was England that inspired the colonies of the Southern Hemisphere to rebel). Intellectually, the benefits which Brazil had received from the United States were “nothing special” and it was evident that the best foreign accounts on Brazil and its nature had been written by German, French, English, and Danish scholars. And although Spanish America had eagerly adopted the North American political “formula,” it had done so by “denying the traditions of its race and history, sacrificing these to the foolish principle of political artificiality and legislative exoticism.” A fervent monarchist, Eduardo Prado condemned Brazilians not only for having imitated the United States’ position on slavery but also for having copied its political system: “‘Let’s copy, copy;’ thought the fools [i. e., republicans]: ‘let’s copy and we too will achieve greatness.’ We should have said, ‘Let us be ourselves, let us be what we are, and only then will we be somebody.’”¹⁹⁴

A ilusão americana was, in, short, a listing of the deficiencies of the United States. By implication, however, it was a testimonial to the attributes of a Brazil which had nothing to gain from an imitation of the institutions and moral precepts of its neighbor to the north. Prado’s criticism of the United States was, in many respects, a defense of Brazil.

Brazil as a Future

By 1900 monarchists and republicans alike gave evidence of a regained confidence in Brazil. If in 1890 Nabuco had felt “his dreams of greatness for Brazil collapse with the monarchy,” by the early 1900’s he was serving the republican government, and another monarchist, Afonso Celso, could proclaim that Brazil would become the fulfillment of early conquistadors’ dream of El Dorado.¹⁹⁵ “Let us have confidence,” he counseled the youth of his day. “there is an immanent logic: with such ingredients for greatness, there can only be a great conclusion.”¹⁹⁶

At the beginning of this century [wrote Arthur Dias in 1904] there were only four flags unfurling their colors over communities larger than the

¹⁹³ *Ilusão*, p. 5. Cf. Rio Branco and Nabuco, especially the latter’s’ view of Pan Americanism as a “civilizing” force, expressed in “Lessons and Prophecies of the Third Pan-American Conference,” remarks at the Liberal Club of Buffalo, New York, on February 20, 1907.

¹⁹⁴ Prado, *Ilusão*. The above quotes are taken from 99, 9, 101, 27 and 97.

¹⁹⁵ Carolina Nabuco, *Vida de Joaquim Nabuco*, p. 288, and Celso, *Porque me ufano*, p. 55.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 257-258. Written on the 400th anniversary of the discovery of Brazil, Celso’s didactic book was dedicated to his sons, Afonso and Carlos, and to Brazil’s youth in general.

Brazilian Republic and they were: England; ...Russia; ...China; and the United States.... Of all these great countries, however, none has the territorial homogeneity, and what is still more important, none has the homogeneity of its race as Brazil has.¹⁹⁷

Arthur Dias' compendium, *The Brazil of Today*, was one of many descriptive books on Brazil which appeared at the beginning of the twentieth century. "The eyes of the whole world are now on Brazil," began another. "Whosoever visits Brazil has the same impression: Brazil will be the great new power of the twentieth century."¹⁹⁸ And when the American diplomat John Barret (who had been ambassador to Argentina) visited Brazil, he wrote:

... before the end of the century Brazil will be one of the world's greatest producers of food. Moreover, [it] will then be populated by an active and industrious race with a productive energy similar to that of present-day United States but tempered' by a Latin sentiment which excludes the feverishness of our way of life but which will result in an equal material and intellectual civilization.¹⁹⁹

Brazil's material advance, then, combined with the prospect of an unlimited extraction of wealth from the Amazon rubber regions, gave rise to a mood of optimism which is also evident in the works of many intellectuals. Indeed, by 1900 Romero's "triple goals" of literary, scientific, and political independence seemed within reach.²⁰⁰

This mood of independence had its roots in the land, and it seemed as if after four hundred years Brazilians themselves were discovering – or re-discovering – Brazil, their infinite country; and the intellectuals were among the first to express this telluric nationalism. "In short," wrote Afonso Celso, "the subsoil, soil, air, jungles, water are all to be found in a Brazil full of life, and life is wealth. [Brazil] is not dependent on the rest of the world; it could, if it so desired, build ... the wall of China around its frontiers."²⁰¹

¹⁹⁷ *The Brazil of Today* (Nivelles, Belgium: Lanneau & Despret, n.d.), p. 7. This work is a translation of *O Brazil actual* (Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1904).

¹⁹⁸ Cândido Campos, *El Brasil en 1910* (Rio: Rodrigues & C., 1910), p. 5.

¹⁹⁹ Quoted in *ibid.*

²⁰⁰ *História da literatura*, I, 48.

²⁰¹ *Porque me ufano*, p. 61.

CONCLUSION

Brazilian society at the turn of the twentieth century was in a state of transition. Appraising it in 1912, the distinguished British traveler James Bryce noted that it might “not for some time to come succeed in reconciling the old and the new.” The aristocracy of rank, whose interests had been linked to the imperial court, was almost gone; but, Bryce observed, “the aristocracy of wealth is in control of public affairs [and], in most parts of the country, it stands far above the labouring population, with little of a middle class between them.”²⁰²

Within this aristocracy of wealth Brazil’s turn-of-the-century intellectuals formed an elite. A very small group in a country “where seven-eighths of the people [were] ignorant,”²⁰³ they remained largely elitist in their outlook. Their thought followed traditional lines. Borrowed indiscriminately from European models, it continued to reflect the persisting influence of *beletrismo* and *bachalerismo*. Just as Brazilians seemed “to suffer passively” the influence of French and British modes of dress, so the intellectuals continued to imitate European modes of thought without realizing, as Max Leclerc noted, how extraneous these were to the *realidade brasileira*.

However, Brazilian thought already had begun to develop when Leclerc visited Rio in 1890; by 1940, the change was so great that Stefan Zweig could write admiringly about a “Brazilian” culture, something which perhaps Leclerc never imagined would exist. The beginnings of this transformation can be traced to the 1860’s and the School of Recife, but it was not until the late 1890’s that the new ideas became widespread. Although these ideas were finally to flourish in the South-Center — especially in Rio and São Paulo —, it was immigrants from the North such as Sílvio Romero who would bring them to the Capital. By 1900, the new scientific attitude towards knowledge had produced a more modern and realistic interpretation of Brazil. As João Cruz Costa, who is usually discriminating in his praise, has written:

... no one can withhold his admiration for this man who, in the history of national ideas, marks a turning point for the Brazilian intellect. With Sílvio Romero, the ‘intellectual merchandise’ we imported is relegated to a secondary plane, and national problems, above all those related to the history of culture, become the preoccupation of our intellectuals. Sílvio Romero was the precursor of the effort to interpret Brazil that has gained ground since the publication of his first works in 1871.²⁰⁴

It was at the close of the nineteenth century that intellectuals as a group began to react against the superficiality of knowledge and the “unconscious imitation” of Europe,

²⁰² Bryce, *South America*, p. 414.

²⁰³ *Ibid.*, It should be noted that today Brazil’s intellectual community is still a “microscopic part” of Brazilian society and that about half of the population is illiterate.

²⁰⁴ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, p. 194.

which by 1900 had become more “comprehensive and deliberate.”²⁰⁵ One of the main reasons for this increased seriousness about both knowledge and Brazil was the growth of urban centers. For, the cities encouraged novelty, facilitated contact among intellectuals, and provided the individual with an autonomy of action and freedom of expression denied to the *homem rural*. In the city, the intellectuals ceased mirroring’ the values and attitudes of rural, nineteenth-century Brazil to become the masters of their own guild, as evidenced by their creation of numerous cultural institutions, independent of political or economic interest groups. Moreover, city life encouraged contact between various social groups, stimulating the intellectuals to try to educate the many Brazilians who had been denied any access to culture. That culture thereby achieved greater diffusion in the 1890’s is apparent from the increase in the number of newspapers, the publication of works on Brazilian history geared specifically to primary- and secondary-school students (such as the works of João Ribeiro) and the popularity of such didactic works as Nabuco’s *Minha formação*. Perhaps newspapers were the most successful instruments of breaking down both the isolation of the various regions within Brazil and the gap between the intellectual elite and the masses.²⁰⁶

Another reason for the flowering of a more “Brazilian” thought and literature during the 1896-1905 decade was the relative stability and peace that characterized the administrations of Campos Salles and Rodrigues Alves. The Federalist Revolution (1892-95) not only had “over-involved” the intellectual in politics, but also had “shocked” him into thinking about Brazil, since, like Canudos (1896-97), it disproved the idea of the “placidity” of Brazilian history. A bitter struggle, taking over 10,000 lives, it had revealed many of the shortcomings of Brazilian society, to which the intellectuals would address themselves during the period of “calm” that followed Prudente de Moraes’ administration.

This concerned awareness about Brazil was one of the dominant themes of thought at the turn of the twentieth century, which was to give it a yet fuller expression. Significantly, however, later thinkers would reflect the influence of Sílvio Romero, Capistrano de Abreu, Euclides da Cunha, and Graça Aranha, rather than Afonso Celso’s telluric nationalism. Today the Brazilian Academy of Letters is known as the “Casa de Machado de Assis” and Rui Barbosa and Joaquim Nabuco are as much a part of Brazil today as they were in 1900.

Epilogue: “O Modernismo”

This search for national identity, so much a part of turn-of-the-century thought, was to continue in the twentieth century, becoming a dominant theme of the movement known

²⁰⁵ Romero, *História da literatura*, I, 59.

²⁰⁶ Azevedo, *A cultura brasileira*, pp. 360-362

However, in contrast to Argentina during this period, Brazilian thought failed to record the impact of the waves of immigrants from Europe. In Brazilian thought there is very little of the “alluvial” quality that one finds in the history of ideas in Argentina. Some writers were, to be sure, concerned with the problems of immigration, such as Graça Aranha; but there was no “divorce between the masses and the minorities” which, as occurred in Argentina, could result in the split between “liberal conservatism” and “popular democracy.” See José Luis Romero, *Las ideas políticas en Argentina* (3rd ed.; México and Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica, 1959), Part III.

as “modernismo.” However, the optimism that prompted Afonso Celso to write about the “virtues of being a Brazilian” in 1900 proved chimerical. By 1909, Paulo Barreto was asking, “When will Brazilians discover Brazil?” and five years later Alberto Torres warned, “It is already tomorrow.”²⁰⁷ Brazil indeed had turned pessimist. To many intellectuals, the ideals of nineteenth-century liberal Brazil had been crushed with Rui Barbosa’ defeat in the presidential election of 1910. The war in Europe intensified their pessimism, and the mood of despair, reflected in the works of Olavo Bilac, Monteiro Lobato, and João do Rio (the pseudonym of Paulo Barreto), reached its peak in 1928 with Paulo Prado’s *Retrato do Brasil: ensaio sobre a tristeza brasileira*.

While Prado’s *Essay on Brazilian Sadness* exemplifies what Gilberto Freyre has called “an almost suicidal pessimism about Brazilian ethnic and social conditions,” Lobato’s *Urupês* (1919) and the works of Alberto Torres are “harbingers of the ... modern phase in Brazilian literature.”²⁰⁸ This modernista movement has been described by Cruz Costa as follows:

After the First World War, Brazilian thought became more independent. Ears hitherto closed to Brazilian stridency were now unstopped. Basing itself on a reality nearer at hand, the Brazilian intellect entered another phase of renewal. ‘Our books became increasingly redolent of the jungle, of wet earth, and of fresh sea breezes. Brazilian themes and the landscape that surrounds us were to give our literature a greater spontaneity,’ writes Tristão de Ataíde. ‘National inspiration will not lead us as high, but it will lead us, with greater security, toward a remote future of creativity and independence.’²⁰⁹

Likewise, according to Mario de Andrade, art and music became less academic and more experimental, less European and more national after World War I. Robert C. Smith holds that “Brazilian painting lacked a national spirit ... [and] indigenous figures ... [until] Cândido Portinari demonstrated that Brazilian painting, in spite of its exotic past and constant borrowings from foreign sources, can be both monumental and original.”²¹⁰ In spite of the National Institute of Music (founded in Rio de Janeiro in 1848), the achievements of Carlos Gomes (1836-96), and the “new directions” initiated by such composers as Leopoldo Miguéz (1850-902), Henrique Oswald (1854-1931), and Alberto Nepomuceno (1864-1920), it was only after World War I that Brazilian music acquired a more “national emotion” which would find its highest expression in the works of Heitor Villa-Lobos.²¹¹

The beginnings of Brazilian Modernism usually have been traced to São Paulo’s

²⁰⁷ João do Rio [Paulo Barreto], *Cinematographo: chronicas cariocas* (Pôrto: Livraria Chardron, 1909, pp. 275-283, and Alberto Torres, *O problema nacional brasileiro* (3rd ed.; São Paulo: Companhia Editôra Nacional, 1938) p. 124.

²⁰⁸ Freyre,

²⁰⁹ Cruz Costa, *History of Ideas*, pp. 275-276.

²¹⁰ Robert C. Smith, “Brazilian Art,” *Concerning Latin American Culture*, ed. Charles C. Griffin (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1940), pp. 194 and 196. See also, Mário de Andrade, “Art,” *Brazil*, ed. Hill, p. 191.

²¹¹ Luis Heitor Corrêa, “Music,” *Brazil*, ed. Hill, especially p. 200. See also; Mário de Andrade, *Pequena história da música* (5th ed.; São Paulo: Libreria Martins Edit., 1958).

Semana de Arte Moderna in 1922. In fact, the Modern Art Week frequently has been used to symbolize Modernism's denunciation of the "fetish of European influence" and the "traditionalism of Brazilian arts and letters."²¹² Manuel Bandeira, himself a member of the modernista school of poets, pointed to 1922 as the beginning of the movement in poetry.²¹³

However, like all cultural movements, Modernism did not originate at one particular moment or with any particular individual or work. To the present generation of literary historians — individuals who no longer identify personally with the Modern Art Week — the importance of 1922 has diminished. For example, Alceu Amoroso Lima has described the first two decades of this century as "Pre-Modernism," which he characterizes as a "nationalist" and eclectic" movement; the former because of an "accentuated Positivism" and the latter because it was a period dominated not by one literary style but by a mixture of Symbolism, Realism, and Parnassianism. Similarly, in a study published last year, Wilson Martins describes Modernism as a movement spanning the years from 1916 to 1945 with the Modern Art Week as but another step in its evolution.²¹⁴

Increasingly, Modernism has been viewed as a movement broader than a revolution in the plastic and literary arts. Considered as a reaction against European models and Brazilian traditionalism, it found expression in the efforts of many intellectuals to discover the *realidade brasileira*, to replace the nineteenth-century Romantic view of Brazil with a more realistic appraisal based on scientific observation, and to express their thought in an authentically Brazilian idiom. Seen in this way, Modernism was more than just a literary or artistic movement. It embraced a majority of the intellectuals who were responding to social, economic and political change within Brazil and to the influence of modern social science research. Thus, it is possible to associate Gilberto Freyre, Arthur Ramos, and later Oracy Nogueira, Florestan Fernandes, Dary Ribeiro and other social scientists with the men generally called modernistas such as Mário de Andrade, Manuel Bandeira, Ronald de Carvalho, Oswald de Andrade and later José Américo, Jorge Amado, Heitor Villa-Lobos, and other writers and artists.

Taken as a group, the intellectuals of the turn of the twentieth century were the precursors of Modernism. To be sure, their view of Brazil was still largely traditional, but their intellectual pursuits and literary life now appear to have been more like those of their twentieth-century successors than of their predecessors in the nineteenth century. As Werneck Sodr e has observed, they already had begun "to lay the foundations of a genuine intellectual liberation."²¹⁵ Indeed, the intellectuals themselves were aware of this: "Brazil's present-day literature," wrote Jos e Ver ssimo in 1912, "is already an expression of a thought and feeling which can no longer be confused with that of Portugal."²¹⁶

Samuel Putnam holds that, "The modern or contemporary era of Brazilian literature

²¹² Charles Wagley, *An Introduction to Brazil* (New York: Columbia Univ. Press, 1963), p. 270.

²¹³ Manuel Bandeira, *Apresenta o da poesia brasileira* (3rd ed. rev.; Rio: Casa do Estudante do Brasil, 1957), pp. 126-127.

²¹⁴ Alceu Amoroso Lima, *Quadro sint tico*, p. 61, and Wilson Martins, *O modernismo* (S o Paulo: Edit. Cultrix, 1965).

²¹⁵ Quoted by Cruz Costa, "Evoluci n de la intelectualidad brasile a," p. 256.

²¹⁶ Ver ssimo, *Hist ria da literatura*, p. 1.

is really to be dated from the year in which both da Cunha's *Os sertões* and Graça Aranha's *Chanaan* were published." However, just as the literary movement which was highlighted by these two works was "to achieve a broader and deeper expression of in the social literature of the 1930's,"²¹⁷ so the pattern of intellectual life which began to emerge around 1900 was to reach a fuller expression in the Vargas era.

In the same period, the intellectual began to foster a general diffusion of culture, marked by the establishment of new libraries (state and national) and the local printing of inexpensive editions such as the *Brasiliana* series (published by the Companhia Editôra Nacional of São Paulo) and the *Documentos Brasileiros* collection (published by the Livraria José Olympio in Rio). By the late 1940's Brazil would begin to acquire the "reading habit," according to Richard M. Morse.²¹⁸

At this time, too, Francisco da Silva Campos began to reorganize the educational system, thus realizing one of José Veríssimo's life-long dreams. In 1931 the Ministry of Education and Health was created, and by 1933 Brazil had its first faculty of philosophy. The university system was also expanded by the introduction of new disciplines, including history.²¹⁹

Most important of all, perhaps, the 1930's witnessed the "professionalization" of Brazil's intellectuals. As Stefan Zweig noted in 1940: "For centuries there was no proper soil for an indigenous literature and poetry to blossom from: the necessary echo of a native audience did not exist. For Brazilians to write verse and prose has meant almost up to our time a materially hopeless and really heroic sacrifice to the poetical ideal."²²⁰

The 1930's, then, mark the beginning of a new era in Brazilian intellectual history, an era in which the intellectuals are no longer speaking in a vacuum, an era in which the instruments of culture — newspapers, books and schools — have become more readily accessible to a larger portion of society. The efforts of Sílvio Romero, João Capistrano de Abreu, José Veríssimo, and Euclides da Cunha had begun to blossom.

²¹⁷ Putnam, "Literature," pp. 208 and 220.

²¹⁸ "Literary Life in Brazil: A Letter from São Paulo," *The New York Times Book Review*, May 16, 1948, p. 20.

²¹⁹ See, for example, Ferreira Reis *et al.*, *O ensino da história no Brasil, passim*, and Américo Jacobina Lacombe, "Fontes para o estudo da História do Brasil," *Revista de História de América*, No. 43 (jun., 1957), 31-49, especially p. 48.

²²⁰ Zweig, *Brazil*, p. 156.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliographies

- Borba de Moraes, Rubens, and William Berrien. *Manual bibliográfico de estudos brasileiros*. Rio: Gráfica Editôra Souza, 1949.
- Carpeaux, Otto Maria. *Pequena bibliografia crítica da literatura brasileira*. 3rd ed. rev. Rio: Editôra Letras e Artes, 1964.
- Ford, Jeremiah D. M., Arthur F. Whitten, and Maxwell I. Raphael. *A Tentative Bibliography of Brazilian Belles Lettres*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1931.
- Goldsmith, Peter H. *A Brief Bibliography of Books in English, Spanish and Portuguese, relating to the republics commonly called Latin America, with comments*. New York: Macmillan, 1915.
- Handbook of Latin American Studies*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936-51; Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1958.
- Humphreys, R. A. *Latin American History: A Guide to the Literature in English*. London, Toronto, and New York: Oxford University Press, 1958.
- Topete, J. M. *A Working Bibliography of Brazilian Literature*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1957.

Primary sources

- Abreu, João Capistrano de. *Caminhos antigos e povoamento do Brasil*. Rio: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, Briguiet, 1930.
- _____. *Capítulos de história colonial (1500-1800)*. 4th ed. Rio: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, Briguiet, 1954.
- The best edition because, unlike the 2nd (1928) and 3rd (1934), it is faithful to the 1st (1907) which was revised by the author. It contains excellent notes by José Honório Rodrigues.
- _____. *Correspondência de Capistrano de Abreu*. 3 vols. Rio: Ministério de Educação e Cultura, 1954-56.
- _____. *O descobrimento do Brasil e seu desenvolvimento no-século XVI*. Rio: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, 1929.
- _____. *Ensaio e estudos (crítica e história)*. 3 vols. Rio: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, Briguiet, 1931 (1ª série), 1932 (2ª série), and 1938 (3ª série).
- _____. "Necrologio de Francisco Adolpho de Varnhagen, Visconde de Pôrto-Seguro," *Jornal do Comércio*, dezembro 16-20, 1878. Appended to Varnhagen. *História geral do Brasil*. 3rd ed. 4 vols. São Paulo: Weiszlog Irmãos, n.d. Vol. I, pp. 502-

508.

- _____. *rã-txa hu-ni-ku ì: a língua dos Caxinauás do Rio Ibuáço*. 2nd ed. Rio: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, Briguiet, 1941.
- Arinos, Afonso. *Pelo sertão*. 4th ed. Rio: Briguiet, 1936.
- Azevedo, Aluísio. *O cortiço*. São Paulo: Martins Editôra, 1962.
- Barbosa, Rui. *Cartas de Inglaterra*. 2nd ed., São Paulo: Saraiva, 1929.
- Barreto, Paulo. *Cinematographo: chronicas cariocas*. Pôrto: Chardron, 1909.
- _____. *O momento literário*. Rio: Garnier, n.d.
- _____. *Psychologia urbana*. Rio: Garnier, n.d.
- Bilac, Olavo. *Poesias*. Rio: F. Alves & Cia., 1916.
- Bomfim, José do Manoel. *A América latina: males de origem; estudo de parasitismo social*. Rio: Garnier, 1903.
- _____. *Brasil na America*. Rio: F. Alves, 1929.
- Carvalho, Alfredo de. fHoras de leitura. Recife: M. Nogueira de Sousa, Edit., 1907. (Originally published in the *Jornal do Recife*, 1897-1906).
- Carvalho, Vicente de. *Poemas e canções*. São Paulo: Editôra Nacional, 1944.
- Celso, Afonso. "Discurso de abertura e encerramento do Primeiro Congresso de História Nacional, setembro 1914," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro (Boletim)*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1929.
- _____. *Porque me ufano do meu paiz*. 2nd ed. Rio: Laemmert & C., 1901.
- Coelho Netto, Henrique. *O sertão*. Rio: Leuzinger, 1896.
- Correia, Raimundo. *Poesias*. 2nd ed. Lisboa: Parceria Antônio Maria Pereira, 1906.
- Cruz e Souza, João da. *Obra completa*. Rio: Edit. José Aguilar, 1961.
- Cunha, Euclides da. *Contrastes e confrontos*. 6th ed. Pôrto: Livraria Chardron, 1923. (Collection of articles written for various newspapers, 1901-04).
- _____. "Da Independencia á Republica," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Vols. 113-114, Tomo LXIX, Part II (1908), 5-71. (Written in May, 1901, and published in the *Estado do São Paulo* as "O Brazil no seculo XIX").
- _____. *A margem da história*. Pôrto: Lelo, 1917.
- _____. *Rebellion in the Backlands (Os sertões)*. Translated with an introduction and notes by Samuel Putnam. (Phoenix Books.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1944.
- Direction Générale de Statistique. *Annuaire Statistique du Brésil. 1^{ere} Année (1908-12)*. Vol. I: *Territoire et Population*. Brésil: Imprimerie de la Statistique, 1916.
- Graça Aranha, José Pereira de. *Canaã*. 11th ed. rev. Rio: Briguiet, 1959.

- _____. *Machado de Assis e Joaquim Nabuco: comentarios e notas à correspondencia entre estes dois escritores*. 2nd ed. rev. Rio: Briguiet, 1942
- Lisbôa, Senador Coelho. *Problemas urgentes: oligarchias, seccas do norte e clericalismo*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1909.
- Machado de Assis, Joaquim Maria. *Obra completa*. 3 vols. Rio: Edit. José Aguilar, 1962.
- Mendonça, Lúcio de. *Caricaturas instantâneas*. Rio: Editôra S. A., "A Noite," 1939. (originally published in the *Gazeta de Notícias*, 1896).
- Murtinho, Joaquim. "Política brasileira: introdução ao relatório," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Vol. 219 (avril-junio, 1953), 239-265.
- Nabuco, Joaquim. *Um estadista do império*. Rio: Garnier, n.d.
- _____. "Lessons and Prophecies of the Third Pan-American Conference," Remarks at the Liberal Club of Buffalo, New York (February 20, 1907).
- _____. *Minha formação*. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1957.
- _____. "Scientific Possibilities in Brazil," Remarks at Washington University's Annual Dinner (February 16, 1907).
- Oliveira, Alberto de. *Poesias*. Rio: Garnier, 1912.
- Oliveira Lima, Manoel de. *América Latina e America Inglesa*. Rio: Garnier, n.d.
- _____. *Aspectos da história e da cultura do Brasil*. Lisboa: A. M. Teixeira & Cia., 1923.
- _____. *Dom João VI no Brasil*. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1945.
- _____. *Formação histórica da nacionalidade brasileira*. Prefaced by Gilberto Freyre. Rio: Edit. Leitura, 1944.
- Pompéia, Raul de Avila. *O Ateneu: crônica de saudades*. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1963.
- Prado, Eduardo. *A ilusão americana*. Rio: n.p., 1953.
- Revista da Academia Brasileira de Letras*. I, No. 1. (July, 1910).
- Ribeiro, João. *Cartas devolvidas*. 2nd ed. Rio: Livraria São José, 1960.
- _____. *O elemento negro*. Rio: Record, n.d.
- _____. *Floresta de exemplos*. 2nd ed. Rio: Livraria São José, 1959.
- _____. *História do Brasil*. 3rd ed. rev. Rio: F. Alves & Cia., 1959.
- _____. *A língua nacional*. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Companhia Edit. Nacional, 1933.
- Romero, Sílvio. *A America latina*. Pôrto: Chardron de Lello Edit., 1906.
An analysis of Bomfim's book.
- _____. *Evolução da litteratura brasileira (vista synthetica)*. Rio: Campanha, 1905.
- _____. *História da literatura brasileira*. 6th ed. 5 vols. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1960.

- _____. *Machado de Assis*. 2nd ed. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1936.
- _____. *Outros estudos de litteratura contemporanea*. Lisboa: "A Editôra," 1906.
- Torres, Alberto. *O problema nacional brasileiro*. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Edit. Nacional, 1938.
- Verlssimo, José. *Cenas da vida amazônica*. 3rd ed. Rio: Simões Edit., 1957.
- _____. *A educaçã nacional*. 2nd ed. rev. Rio: F. Alves & Cia., 1906.
- _____. *História da literatura brasileira*. 2nd ed. Rio: F. Alves & Cia., 1929.

Secondary sources: books

- Andrade, Mário de. "Art," in Lawrence F. Hill (ed.). *Brazil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947.
- _____. *Música do Brasil*. Curitiba: Editôra Guaíra Lta. 1941.
- _____. *Pequena história da música*. 5th ed. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editôra, 1958.
- Azevedo, Fernando de. *A cultura brasileira: introdução ao estudo da cultura no Brasil*. 4th ed. (Vol. 13 of "Obras Completas"). São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1964.
- This work is the best and most ambitious study of culture in Brazil, stressing the development of education. Also available in English: *Brazilian Culture*. Translated by William Rex Crawford. New York: Macmillan, 1950.
- Bandeira, Manuel. *Apresentação da poesia brasileira*. 3rd ed. rev. Rio: Edit. Casa do Estudante, 1957.
- Barbosa, Francisco de Assis. *A vida de Lima Barreto (1881-1922)*. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1952.
- Bello, José Maria. *História da República*. 4th ed. Rio: Simões Edit., 1959.
- One of the best works on the period is now available in an updated, English edition: *A History of Modern Brazil, 1889-1964*. Translated by James L. Taylor with a new concluding chapter by Rollie E. Poppino. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1966.
- _____. *Inteligência do Brasil*. 2nd ed. São Paulo: Companhia Edit. Nacional, 1935.
- Bernstein, Harry. *Modern and Contemporary Latin America*. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1952.
- Chapter 20 ("The Republic, 1890-1920,") is a useful synthesis.
- Berrien, William. "Some Considerations Regarding Contemporary Latin American Music," in Charles C. Griffin (ed.). *Concerning Latin American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- Brandão, Octavio. *O niilista Machado de Assis*. Rio: Simões Edit., 1958.
- Broca, Brito. *A vida literária no Brasil: 1900*. 2nd ed. rev. José Olympio Edit., 1960.
- A departure from traditional cultural history, it is an excellent study of intellectual life during the belle époque.

- Bryce, James. *South America: Observations and Impressions*. New York: Macmillan, 1912.
- Burns, E. Bradford. *The Unwritten Alliance: Rio-Branco and Brazilian-American Relations*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1966.
- Calmon, Pedro. *História do Brasil*. 2nd ed. 7 vols. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1963.
Volume VI is on the Republic.
- Calógeras, João Pandiá. *A History of Brazil*. Translated and edited by Percy Alvin Martin. New York: Russell & Russell, 1963.
- Campos, Cândido. *El Brasil en 1910*. Rio: Rodrigues & Cia., 1910.
- Carvalho Neves, Edgard de. *Afirmção de Euclides da Cunha*. São Paulo: Edit. Paulo de Azevedo Ltda., 1960.
- Castro Rebello, E. de. *Capistrano de Abreu e a síntese histórica*. Rio: Livraria São José, 1956.
- Coelho Netto, Paulo. *Bibliografia de Coelho Netto*. Rio: Edit. Borsoi, 1956.
- Corrêa de Azevedo, Luiz Heitor. "Music," in Lawrence F. Hill (ed.). *Brazil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947.
- Coutinho, Afrânio. *Euclides, Capistrano e Araripe*. Rio: Ministério de Educação e Cultura, 1959.
- Crawford, W. Rex. *A Century of Latin-American Thought*. Rev. ed., New York: Praeger, 1961.
Chapter VII ("Three Brazilian Thinkers") provides a useful summary of the ideas of da Cunha, Bomfim, and Freyre.
- Cruz Costa, João. *A History of Ideas in Brazil: The Development of Philosophy in Brazil and the Evolution of National History*. Translated by Suzette Macedo. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1964.
A pioneer effort, it is probably the best work of its kind. Part II is on the nineteenth century.
- Denis, Pierre. *Brazil*. Translated by Bernard Maill. Rev. ed. London: T. Fisher Unwin Ltd., 1911.
- Dias, Arthur. *The Brazil of Today*. Nivelles, Belgium: Lanneau & Despret, n.d.
A translation of *O Brazil Actual*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1904.
- Ferreira Reis, Artur César, et al. *O ensino da história no Brasil*. México, D.F.: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1953.
- Fleiss, Max. *L'Institute Historique et Géographique du Brésil*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1938.
- Freitas, Newton. *Alôs afro-brasileiros*. Buenos Aires: Emece Edit., 1942.
- Freyre, Gilberto. *Actualidade de Euclides da Cunha*. Rio: Casa do Estudante, 1941.
- _____. *The Mansions and the Shanties*. Translated by Harriet de Onis and with an in-

- roduction by Frank Tannenbaum. New York: Knopf, 1963.
- _____. *New World in the Tropics*. (1st Vintage edition.) New York: Random House, 1963.
- _____. *Ordem e progresso*. 2 vols. Rio: José Olympio Edit., 1959.
- Furtado, Celso. *The Economic Growth of Brazil*. Translated by Ricardo W. de Aguiar and Eric Charles Drysdale. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1963.
- Hambloch, Ernest. *His Majesty, The President of Brazil: A Study of Constitutional Brazil*. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., 1936.
- Haring, C. H. *Empire in Brazil*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1958.
- Lacombe, Américo Jaconina. *Brasil: período nacional*. México, D.F.: Instituto Panamericano de Geografía e Historia, 1956.
- Leão, Mucio. *João Ribeiro*. Rio: Livraria São José, 1962.
A sympathetic biography.
- Leclerc, Max. *Cartas do Brasil*. Translated, preface, and notes by Sérgio Milliet. São Paulo: Edit. Nacional, 1942.
- Lima, Alceu Amoroso. *Quadro sintético da literatura brasileira*. 2nd ed. rev. Rio: Agir, 1959.
- Lins e Silva, Augusto. *Atualidade de Nina Rodrigues*. Rio: Edit. Leitura, 1945.
- Lobo, Hélio. *O Pan-Americanismo e o Brasil*. São Paulo: Edit. Nacional, 1939.
- Magalhães Júnior, R. *Rui: o homem e o mito*. Rio: Edit. Civilização Brasileira, 1964.
- Marchant, Alexander. "The Unity of Brazilian History," in T. Lynn Smith and Alexander Marchant. *Brazil: Portrait of Half a Continent*. New York: Dryden Press, 1951.
- Mendonça, Renato de. "El Brasil en la América Latina," *Jornadas*. No. 13. México, D. F.: El Colegio de México, n.d.
- Mercadente, Paulo. *A consciência conservadora no Brasil*. Rio: Edit. Saga, 1965.
- Morazé, Charles. *Les trois âges du Brésil: essai de politique*. (Cahiers de la Fondation Nationale des Sciences Politiques, No. 51.) Paris: Librairie Armand Colin, 1954.
- Morse, Richard M. *From Community to Metropolis: A Biography of São Paulo, Brazil*. Gainesville: University of Florida Press, 1958.
- Matos, Pedro Gomes de. *Capistrano de Abreu: vida e obra do grande historiador*. Fortaleza: Batista Fontenele, 1953.
- Nabuco, Carolina. *A vida de Joaquim Nabuco*. São Paulo: Edit. Nacional, 1928.
- Normano, João F. *Brazil: A Study of Economic Types*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1935.

- Pagano, Sebastião. *Eduardo Prado e sua época*. São Paulo: Edit. “O Cetro,” n.d.
- Pereira, Baptista. *Rui Barbosa: catálogo das suas obras*. Rio: special edition, 1929.
- Pinto do Carmo, J. A. *Bibliografia de Capistrano de Abreu*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1943.
- Prado, Paulo. *Retrato do Brasil: ensaio sôbre a tristeza brasileira*. 4th ed. Rio: Briguiet, 1931.
- Prado Júnior, Caio. *História econômica do Brasil*. São Paulo: Edit. Brasiliense, 1945.
- Putnam, Samuel. “‘Brazil’s Greatest Book’: A Translator’s Introduction,” in *Rebellion in the Backlands*, pp. iii-xviii.
- _____. “Literature” in Lawrence F. Hill (ed.). *Brazil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1947.
- _____. *Marvelous Journey: A Survey of Four Centuries of Brazilian Writing*. New York: Knopf, 1948.
- Rabello, Sylvio. *Farias Brito ou uma aventura do espirito*. Rio: José Olympio, 1941.
- Ribeiro, Joaquim. *Rui Barbosa e João Ribeiro*. Rio: Ministério de Educação e Cultura, 1958.
- Rodrigues, José Honório. *Aspirações nacionais: interpretação histórico-política*. São Paulo: Edit. Fulgor, 1963.
- _____. *Conciliação e reforma no Brasil: um desafio histórico-cultural*. Rio: Edit. Civilização ‘Brasileira, 1965.
- The author attempts to show that Brazilian history is both placid and bloody.
- Sayers, Raymond S. *The Negro in Brazilian Literature*. New York: Hispanic Institute, 1956.
- Smith, Robert C. “Brazilian Art,” in Charles C. Griffin (ed.) *Concerning Latin American Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1940.
- Smith, T. Lynn. *Brazil: People and Institutions*. Rev.ed. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University, 1963.
- Sousa Andrade, Olímpio. *História e interpretação de “Os sertões”*. São Paulo: Edart, 1960.
- Stein, Stanley. “Latin American Historiography: Status and Research Opportunities,” in Charles Wagley (ed.). *Social Science Research on Latin America*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1964.
- Torres-Río seco, Arturo. *The Epic of Latin American Literature*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1961.
- Chapter 6 is an adequate summary of Brazilian literature.
- Vianna, Hélio. *Capistrano de Abreu: ensaio biobibliográfico*. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1955.

Vianna, Oliveira. *O ocaso do imperio*. São Paulo: Weiszflog, 1925.

Wyeth, George. "Brazil: Trends in Industrial Development," in S. Kuznets *et al. Economic Growth: Brazil, India, Japan*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 1955.

Zweig, Stefan. *Brazil: Land of the Future*. Translated by Andrew St. James. New York: The Viking Press, 1941.

Secondary sources: articles

Barouchet, Lidia. "La literatura brasileña y el movimiento modernista," *Cuadernos Americanos*, VIII, No.6 (nov.-dic., 1949), 260-267.

Barros Paiva, Tancredo de. "Bibliografia Capistraneana," *Anais do Museu Paulista*, IV (1931), 481-512.

Calógeras Pandiá, João. Lecture on Capistrano de Abreu (Sept. 13, 1927), *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Tomo 101, Vol. 155 (1927), 342-56.

The author was one of Capistrano de Abreu's students and closest friends.

Carpio, Campio. "Inmensidad humana de la literatura brasileña," *Abside* (México), X, No. 11 (abril-jun., 1940), 211-220.

Cavalheiro, Edgard. "Notas sôbre a evolução do romantismo no Brasil," *Revista Brasiliense*, V (maio-jun., 1959), 33-52.

Corrêa, Virgílio. "Auto-retrato capistraneano," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Vol. 227 (1955), 323-360.

_____. "Desenvolvimento dos estudos históricos no Brasil," *Revista de Historia de América* (México), 27 (jun., 1949), 45-58.

Coutinho, Afrânio. "Existe uma literatura brasileira?" *Provincia de São Pedro* (Pôrto Alegre), 6 (set., 1946), 74-77.

Cruz Costa, João. "Evolución de la imtelectualidad brasilena en la primera fase del siglo XX," *Cuadernos Americanos*, XXI, No.3 (mayo-jun., 1962), 255-262.

_____. "O positivismo no Brasil," *Revista Brasiliense*, V (maio-jun., 1956), 12-21.

Dantas, Paulo. "'Os sertões' como tema literário," *Revista Brasiliense*, V (maio-jun., 1956), 86-105.

Dias, Everardo. "O socialismo no Brasil," *Revista Brasiliense*, V. (maio-jun., 1956), 53-61.

Freyre, Gilberto. "Relación de la literature moderna del Brasil con los problemas sociales brasileños," *Cuadernos Americanos*, IV, No. 3 (mayo-jun., 1945), 114-133.

Chapter from *Brazil: An Interpretation*. New York: Knopf, 1945. This work was later revised and republished as *New World in the Tropics*.

Freiro, Eduardo. Review of Brito Broca's *A vida literária no Brasil: 1900*. *Kriterion* (Belo Horizonte), X, Nos. 39-40 (jan.-jun., 1957), 253-256.

Ganzert, F. W. "The Baron do Rio Branco, Joaquim Nabuco, and the Growth of Brazilian-

- American Friendship, 1900-1910," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXII (1942), 432-451.
- Jornal de Letras* (Rio). "1900-1950: meio século de literature e arte do Brasil," III, No. 19 (jan., 1951).
- Martin, Percy Alvin. "Causes of the Collapse of the Brazilian Empire," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, IV (1921), 4-48.
- Martins, Luiz. "O patriarca e o bacharel," *Revista do Arquivo Municipal* (São Paulo) Ano VII, LXXXIII (maio-jun., 1942), 7-36.
- Martins, Wilson. "Vida literária e literatura," *Anhembi* (São Paulo), Ano VII, XXV, No. 75 (fev., 1957), 571-575.
- Martius, Karl Frederick Philipp von. "Como se deve escrever a história do Brazil," *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, VI, No. 24 (jan., 1845), 381-403.
- Mendonça, Renato de. "Los tres más grandes prosistas del Brasil: José de Alencar, Machado de Assis y Euclides da Cunha," *Cuadernos Americanos*, III, No. 5 (sept.-oct., 1944), 154-171.
- Morse, Richard M. "São Paulo in the Nineteenth Century: Economic Roots of the Metropolis," *Inter-American Economic Affairs*, V, No. 3 (winter, 1951), 24-37.
- _____. "São Paulo Since Independence: A Cultural Interpretation," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIV (1954), 419-444.
- _____. "Some Themes of Brazilian History," *South Atlantic Quarterly*, LXI (1962), 159-182.
- Poppino, Rollie E. "A Century of the Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XXXIII (1953), 307-323.
- Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*. Vol. 204, (julho-set., 1949).
This volume contains articles on Joaquim Nabuco.
- _____. Vol. 205 (out.-dez., 1949).
This volume contains articles on Rui Barbosa.
- _____. Vol. 221 (out.-dez., 1953).
This volume contains articles on João Capistrano de Abreu.
- Rodrigues, José Honório. "Capistrano de Abreu e a historiografia brasileira," *Correspondência de Capistrano de Abreu*. Vol. I. Introduction.
This essay appeared in the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*, Vol. 221 (out.-dez., 1953), 120-138.
- Silva Pinheiro, Péricles da. "O republicamismo de Joaquim Nabuco," *Revista do Arquivo Municipal* (São Paulo), Ano XVIII, CXLVIII (jun., 1952), 51-108.
- Stein, Stanley. "The Historiography of Brazil, 1808-1889," *Hispanic American Historical Review*, XL (1960), 234-278.

Zemella, Mafalda P. "Capistrano de Abreu: o historiador e o homem," *Revista de História* (São Paulo), Ano V, 8, No. 17 (jan.-mar., 1954), 3-16.

Unpublished materials

Conrad, Robert E. "The Negro in Brazilian Thought in Colony, Empire and Republic." Unpublished Master's Essay, Department of History, Columbia University, 1964.

Ianni, Octavio. "Os estudos sobre relações raciais no Brasil." Paper read before the Conference on Race and Class in Latin America During the National Period, New York City, December 16-18, 1965.

Skidmore, Thomas E. "'Uma imensa carta sem endereço': Brazil's Search for National Identity in the Old Republic." Paper read before the Sixth Luso-Brazilian Colloquium, Cambridge, Mass., and New York City, September 7-13, 1966.

Unavailable works

Araújo, Oscar. *L'Idée republicaine au Brésil*. Paris: Perrin, 1893.

Ferreira, Tito Livio. "A nova divisão da história do Brasil," *Revista da Universidade Católica de São Paulo*, No. 32. (dez., 1959), 481-497.

Freyre, Gilberto. "O período republicano," *Estado de São Paulo*, September 30, 1943.

García Merou, Martín. *El Brasil intelectual*. Buenos Aires: Félix Lajouane Edit., 1900.

Lima, Hermes. "O positivismo e a República," *Revista do Brasil*, II, No. 17 (nov., 1939).

Livro do centenário. 3 vols. Rio: Imprensa Nacional, 1900-02.

Many of the contributions to this work have been published elsewhere.

Mendonça, Lucio de. *Horas do bom tempo*. 1901.

Prado, Eduardo. *A bandeira nacional*.

_____. "Fastos da ditadura militar no Brasil," *Revista do Portugal* (dez., 1889-jun., 1890).

This work was republished in São Paulo in 1902.