

# INTERNATIONALIZING BRAZILIAN LITERATURE

*Diane E. Marting*  
*University of Mississippi*

*THIRD WORLD LITERARY FORTUNES: BRAZILIAN CULTURE AND ITS INTERNATIONAL RECEPTION.* By Piers Armstrong. (Lewisburg, PA: Bucknell University; London: Associated University Presses, 1999. Pp. 262. \$41.50 cloth.)

*THE MUFFLED CRIES: THE WRITER AND LITERATURE IN AUTHORITARIAN BRAZIL, 1964–1985.* By Nancy Baden. (Maryland and Oxford: The University Press of America, 1999. Pp. 239. \$34.50 paper.)

*SOB O SIGNO DA NOVA ORDEM: INTELECTUAIS AUTORITÁRIOS NO BRASIL E NA ARGENTINA (1914–1945).* By José Luis Bendicho Beired. (Série Teses. São Paulo, Brazil: Edições Loyola, 1999. Pp. 295. N.p.)

*MACHADO DE ASSIS: REFLECTIONS ON A BRAZILIAN MASTER WRITER.* Edited by Richard Graham. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999. Pp. 134. \$11.95 paper.)

*THE SPACE IN-BETWEEN: ESSAYS ON LATIN AMERICAN CULTURE.* By Silviano Santiago. Edited by Ana Lúcia Gazzola, with an introduction by Ana Lúcia Gazzola and Wander Melo Miranda. Translated by Tom Burns, Ana Lúcia Gazzola, and Gareth Williams. (Post-Contemporary Interventions. Latin America in Translation/En Traducción/Em Tradução. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2001. Pp. 188. \$19.95 paper.)

Brazilian literature, like all culture, has been and is being globalized, though perhaps not so much as Spanish American literature. Major works from the Brazilian literary canon and a few uncanonized contemporary writers are published in translation in many of the world's languages. One reason this internationalization is occurring in Brazil is that today's book publishers are often multinational corporations; another is that distances around the globe have disappeared as obstacles to rapid communication between writers, translators, and editors. Furthermore, whether a sleeping economic giant or political newsmaker, Brazil commands strategic importance worldwide and draws

international tourists. The internationalization of Brazilian literature plays itself out in the details of where, how, and why Brazilian literature is read outside Brazil. Although always uneven and unjust (i.e., some deserving writers seem doomed to remain unknown), this internationalization is dynamic and increasing. It behooves us to understand how (if) this process is reflected in literary criticism and theory. In the books reviewed here, the job of contextualizing and explaining to the reader automatically involves reaching beyond national borders to hypothesize or analyze analogues to Brazilian literature.

These five books exemplify to a greater or lesser degree this comparative momentum. Most central to the issue of Brazil's cultural globalization are *Third World Literary Fortunes: Brazilian Culture and its Literary Reception*, Machado de Assis: *Reflections on a Brazilian Master Writer*, and individual essays in *The Space In-Between: Essays on Latin American Culture* in which international reception is an explicit theme. The two others, Nancy Baden's *The Muffled Cries: The Writer and Literature in Authoritarian Brazil, 1964–1985* and José Luis Bendicho Beired's *Sob o signo da nova ordem: Intelectuais autoritários no Brasil e na Argentina (1914–1945)*, are comparative in the way in which they discuss politics and its infinite interrelationships with literature, but they do not thematize the problem to any great extent. Baden, for instance, compares Brazilian writers' experiences with censorship to those of Argentine and European writers, while Beired organizes his tome around a comparison between Brazil and Argentina in the period between the two world wars, thus exposing intellectual similarities and even at times communications between nationalist conservatives.

As a translation, *The Space In-Between* embodies the phenomenon of Brazilian works crossing borders. Another in Duke University's excellent series of Latin America in Translation, it provides English-language readers with eleven essays by Silviano Santiago from the 1970s and 1980s. The subtitle, "Essays on Latin American Culture," alerts us to the regional (inter-national) purport rather than national interest of this writing. These essays first appeared in Brazilian journals or in one of his books: *Nas malhas da letra* (1989), *Uma literatura nos trópicos* (1978), or *Vale quanto pesa: Ensaio sobre questões político-culturais* (1982). Santiago's essays debate issues as disparate as Umberto Eco, Eça de Queiroz, modernism, mass culture, censorship, verisimilitude, the postmodern narrator, and internationalist thinking by nineteenth-century intellectuals. A comparatist educated at the Sorbonne who has taught in the United States, Santiago knowingly and incisively brings theoretical issues to bear on French, U.S., and Brazilian literatures and cultures.

The title essay, "Latin American Discourse: The Space In-Between," begins with Michel Foucault's admonition in *The Archeology of Knowledge* against filling in the gaps of reality with abstract thought:

Before all else, negative work. One must free oneself from a whole array of notions connected to the idea of continuity. . . . For example, the notion of influence provides a magical rather than a substantive foundation to acts of transmission and communication. (24)

The application of Foucault's discursive rule leads to Santiago's original formulation of the condition of Latin American discourse as a blank space used by American non-Europeans and non-indigenous peoples: 'the space in-between', which the introduction by Ana Lúcia Gazzola and Wander Melo Miranda eloquently summarizes in this way:

The ideological fallacy in which notions like source and influence are often clothed is dismantled, and the value of the (peripheral) copy with respect to the (hegemonic) model is recovered. Their relation comes to be seen no longer as the dead-end of dependency and the impossibility of Latin American cultural identity, but as a process of differentiated repetition in which the insertion of the native culture into the universal totality is sought. By the overturning of values such as backwardness and originality, what is affirmed is the value of the text of the colonized culture as the space in-between, which retroactively affects the text of the dominant culture, thus creating the possibility for a creative evaluation of the universality of the texts of the metropolis. (3)

The American text is a supplement: it is that difference from European discourse in the rewriting of European themes by Americans.

Better known in the United States than Santiago's concept of the "space in-between" is Néstor García Canclini's theory of hybridity. In my opinion, Canclini does not offer a huge advance over Santiago's idea; both accomplish the task of theorizing positive value for a non-dominant culture's discourse, texts, and artifacts. On the other hand, Canclini's proposal is more easily generalized and applied to other contexts than is Santiago's idea. In its very formulation, 'hybridity' denies privileges of origin or foundational status to European production, as does the 'space in-between', but in my view the spatial figure in the latter seems less active, less imbued with agency, than Canclini's affirmation that cultures are always mixtures, whether dominant or not, whether they admit to being mixtures or not, and that mixtures are good. Santiago's 'space in-between' may be more easily made operative in in-depth analyses of cultural phenomena, such as in psychoanalytical approaches to culture, whereas Canclini explicitly theorizes about the surface of border cultures.

For instance, Santiago emphasizes the erasure of the colonial historical record: "Through the constant destruction of original traces, together with the forgetting of the origin, the phenomenon of duplication establishes itself as the only valid rule of civilization" (29). Santiago's phrasing permits the recognition of the appearance of blank space, of a lack of an original Brazilian component to world culture, yet he shows that what appears empty never truly is:

Somewhere between sacrifice and playfulness, prison and transgression, submission to the code and aggression, obedience and rebellion, assimilation and expression—there, in this apparently empty space, its temple and its clandestinity, is where the anthropophagous ritual of Latin American discourse is constructed. (38)

The metaphor of cannibalism for the particular Latin American contribution to world culture comes from Oswald de Andrade's avant-garde manifesto during the heyday of Brazilian modernism. Purposefully and irreverently, Andrade and Santiago biologize the action of mixing the European and the American in Latin American cultural production. While this organic metaphor may seem a disadvantage or defect to some, those who think this way should remember that a hybrid is also a living thing, and hybridity, also a biologism. In fact, Canclini adds the knotty problem of "naturalness" by using a plant image, whereas Santiago's figurative language comes from a human activity, albeit the extraordinary one of humans eating humans. Perhaps this difference in the imagery of the theories can be attributed to the fact that Canclini takes aim primarily at the idea of authenticity, which has denied strikingly hybrid cultures or market-driven, mass-produced objects an appreciative audience. In contrast, Santiago wants to prove groundless and blind the accusation of lack of originality in American cultures by valorizing the 'duplicate with a difference', the supplemental discourse, over one that hides its origins in other cultures/works (and thus appears original).

It should also be remembered that although Santiago's chapter-length essay develops ideas previously expressed in his (very negative) review of Umberto Eco's *Travels in Hyperreality: Essays* and other texts, and thus may be seen as part of a body of writing, nevertheless "the space in-between" has not seen book-length development. So perhaps a full comparison to *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity*<sup>1</sup> would not be fair; it may be enough to say that Santiago's early essays on Brazilian literature in the context of American and Latin American cultures have been pivotal, widely read, and widely cited. In terms of the internationalization of Brazilian culture, they are fundamental. I begin with Santiago's essays, since they seem to be approaching the status of classics if this sample of new books is any indication. All the books I review here except Beired's rely on or quote from Santiago's publications significantly.

The first essay in Santiago's collection, "Why and For What Purpose does the European Travel?," treats the collision of two cultures. How can they see one another? How did the Portuguese or the Spanish see

1. Néstor García Canclini, *Hybrid Cultures: Strategies for Entering and Leaving Modernity* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1989, 1995).

the original inhabitants of the New World? Santiago begins with comments on Luís de Camões's implication in *Os Lusíadas*<sup>2</sup> that 'the European' travels "because he is insensitive to the problems of his own people, because he does not have a high sense of justice. (In the contemporary world, the same conclusion would be valid in reference to the Americans and Soviets.)" (13). The European travels because he does not want to work; the ethics of adventure justified the European's traveling at the same time it excused his (not usually hers) blindness to social problems at home. The traveler's greed merely substitutes the venue and participants of the homeland for those of the faraway land, but does not change his greed's moral meaning. The European traveler casts his eye on America to assess exploitable resources and little else.

Not all Santiago's essays directly theorize international relations, however historical, intellectual, or otherwise. Some analyze Brazil exclusively, but even these pay attention to possible analogues elsewhere. In his admittedly sketchy "Repression and Censorship in the Field of the Arts during the 1970s," Santiago protests (perhaps too loudly) that government censorship does not achieve its avowed purpose of preventing the production of works which it finds objectionable. For all the right reasons, he asserts that the number of works appearing that a regime might wish to ban does not diminish in times of censorship. Indeed, Santiago rather harshly declares: "Repression and censorship can, at the most, feed a certain latent laziness in every human being, [and] can only justify rationally the idleness that often impels the artist to think today and create only tomorrow" (113). While Santiago eloquently decries the suffering of the artist during times of censorship, he argues that censorship does not hurt the art or the artist as its producer. Rather it affects, first, the artist in his or her person and family, and second, the larger society that has less varied reading material and, as a result, a stunted or slanted view of itself and others. I am not certain that pro-censorship forces will be swayed by Santiago's argument that they are guaranteed failure, because for such conservatives the point may be that the effort to eliminate undesirable works before they are consumed is what matters, and not the attack on the producers of them or some sort of overall evaluation of the success of censorship. Furthermore, in the process of arguing in this manner Santiago sounds as if only the most hardworking of souls, or the most foolhardy, can overcome the natural inclination not to write, whereas a government threat would not keep such a person from writing. I am not so sure that bravery in the face of government censorship is truly required in order for a

2. Luís de Camões, *Os Lusíadas* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1981); *Os Lusíadas: Lectura, prefacio e notas de Alvarao Júlio da Costa Pimpão*; apresentação Aníbal Pinto de Castro, 3rd ed. (Lisbon: Misterio da Educação, Instituto Camões, 1992).

writer to continue to be defined as one. I wish ethics were criteria, but I fear it is not.

Baden was less sure that government censorship in Brazil has failed as miserably as Santiago would have it, and so she sets out to test the hypothesis. She began her research as an open-ended survey, asking such things as “did censorship cause you to change or modify your manner of writing?” and “what influences did it have on your literary production?” Her 1983 fieldwork included giving a research questionnaire to thirty-one elite writers of books; she does not evaluate journalism, popular or mass media, or literature.<sup>3</sup> She followed the survey with an interview in some cases. The late date of Baden’s survey,<sup>4</sup> after the dictatorship had ended, means that the softening of the censor’s role up to the 1979 *abertura* (opening) to democracy may have had an effect on the responses she received. The writers she interviewed were the ‘usual suspects’ from courses in Brazilian literature, with few surprises. To her credit, the list includes a variety of ideological stands vis-à-vis the regime. Baden’s conclusions support the theory that censorship was uneven, that it manifested itself disparately across time, and that in literature it most affected theater. The novels and poems that we critics adore (and whose authors Baden interviewed) were little changed and rarely censored, probably because even in the most generous of opinions, they have too small a reading public for the government to be very active in suppressing them. Part of Santiago’s thesis was technically confirmed.

Baden found that the sheer number of Brazilian presses (compared to the tiny number of government readers looking for subversive material) made the government unable to censor books as it would have wished, or in a consistent fashion. The censors tended to rely on a book or play’s title in the decision to ban or not. The result was odd choices for censored and non-censored works. Yet this lack of predictability also caused fear among intellectuals, writers, journalists, and their publishers. As Santiago wrote, “Censorship ends up by getting to, in a drastic

3. The writers are: Adonias Filho, James Amado, Jorge Amado, Ivan Angelo, João Antônio, Ignácio de Loyola Brandão, Antônio Callado, Carlos Heitor Cony, Edilberto Coutinho, Roberto Drummond, Bernardo Elis, Ruy Espinheira Filho, Tânia Jamaro Faillarce, Rubem Fonseca, Oswaldo França Júnior, Heloísa Buarque de Hollanda, Lêdo Ivo, Roniwalter Jatobá, Wilson Lins, José Louzeiro, Fábio Lucas, Rubem Mauro Machado, Júlio César Monteiro Martins, Ariovaldo Matos, Roberto Reis, Affonso Romano de Sant’Anna, Silviano Santiago, Lygia Fagundes Telles, Antônio Torres, Edla Van Steen, and José J. Veiga.

4. “It was evident in 1983 when I [Baden] did a lot of the fieldwork that the role of censorship was not exactly as I had envisioned it when I began to collect data. It was also clear that some individuals were already beginning to forget some details and that several of the younger authors simply had not experienced the sixties” (x).

manner, the human person of the artist, the physical being—and not the work” (112). Since the producers of literature did not receive a clear message as to what they could and could not do, Baden argues, censorship failed. Another characteristic of Brazilian censorship between 1964 and 1985 was the choice of inner exile over outright emigration, when artists faced the possibility of being censored or worse—imprisoned or tortured—for having defied the government in print. Finally, Baden writes that “the most direct effect of the regime’s ‘suffocation’ can be seen in the young poets” (63). She briefly examines Charles Perrone’s study of *poesia marginal* and gives a brief history of this iconoclastic writing that circumvented publishers via the mimeograph and other forms of self-publishing, for example.

Basing her discussion upon Randal Johnson’s and Flora Süssekind’s research, Baden further notes that in the state’s efforts to control writers, it employed both the stick and the carrot in the form of prizes, subventions, and indirect initiatives. This manipulation by the Brazilian state is confirmed in *Sob o signo da nova ordem*. Beired’s study of authoritarian intellectuals between the World Wars concludes that unlike conservative nationalist intellectuals in Argentina, those in Brazil were likely to benefit from the apparatus of the state after the decade of 1910 and especially after the 1930 Revolution.<sup>5</sup> Baden discusses the co-optation of writers by FUNARTE (Fundação Nacional das Artes) and INL (Instituto Nacional do Livro) but, not surprisingly, few writers admit to her in interviews or by questionnaire that receiving government help or recognition changed their opinions of the regime. In fact authors perceived that both receiving coveted awards and being censored were means to selling more books and becoming better known by the public, once the tight fist had loosened its grip. But even during the worst years of censorship,

literature and other kinds of art works provided an arena for political debate when other institutional channels for the expression of dissent, such as political parties, the Congress, the Courts, the university and the news media were closed down and controlled. (fn. 7)

In *Third World Literary Fortunes*, Piers Armstrong compares Brazil not just to Argentina but to all of Spanish America. Few Latin Americanists really study both Brazil and Spanish America; not even Santiago truly engages Spanish America. In speaking of Lima Barreto,

5. “No Brasil, os intelectuais autoritários ou participaram do aparelho de Estado ou receberam sua benevolência” (276). “A Revolução de 1930 contribui para . . . desenvolver a competição entre os intelectuais pela disputa do poder político e simbólico” (278). Beired is reviewed less extensively here merely because the topics are less amenable to my theme and less close to my disciplinary training, but I recommend it highly. Its tight argument and wealth of information guarantee that it will be reviewed elsewhere.

Machado de Assis, and Aluísio Azevedo, Armstrong asserts provocatively that “their ethical perspective borders on amorality, setting them apart from their Spanish American peers, and suggesting a deep assimilation of late-nineteenth-century French cynicism” (174). Armstrong argues for a separate historical trajectory from Spanish America for Brazil’s literary reception during the twentieth century. This is an interesting hypothesis, but by lumping together all the varied Spanish American cultural scenes and areas of production, Armstrong errs in the other direction. He is unfair to Spanish America by not recognizing its heterogeneity. Armstrong argues effectively for the impossibility of categorizing Brazilian literary production under a single rubric due to its diversity, but he still claims that in terms of reception one can categorize all of Spanish American boom literature, for example, as political and ethical. Yet if one considers any single country of Spanish America—be it Argentina, Bolivia, or Colombia—at the time of the boom when Armstrong claims Spanish America was united in its production and thus more easily consumable by other culture, that single Spanish American country (like Brazil) will not conform to the boom paradigm either. It is easy to agree with Armstrong when he says that there were many historical events that have drawn the Spanish-speaking world together, like the Spanish Civil War and the Cuban Revolution, but these events affected the arts and artists in each nation differently. No national literature fits the paradigm of the region’s international presence in the boom, not Brazil and not Venezuela, especially because it was a phenomenon of a few mega-selling writers. One might concede as acceptable Armstrong’s distorting shorthand for Spanish America because some of Brazil’s regions may be as large as some Spanish American countries, given the former’s size. But perhaps it is best understood as a self-defense reaction to the common refusal among scholars of Spanish America to recognize Brazil adequately.

When Armstrong provides evidence, he appears to agree that the boom really includes just a few prose authors and not a continent-wide homogeneous block of novelistic production. There is an interesting section in *Third World Literary Fortunes* (146–56) that counts entries in the *MLA Bibliography* and *Dissertation Abstracts International* to compare the scholarly reception of the boom writers to that of a couple of Brazil’s canonical figures of the same period. The numbers argue that Brazilian literature is understudied in the United States, and that when it is studied the publication tends to be written in Portuguese, except when it is about Jorge Amado, where English criticism predominates (the Spanish American boom writers also tend to be written about in English in these two sources). Another interesting point: whether writing about João Guimarães Rosa, Machado de Assis, Drummond de Andrade, or Mário de Andrade, criticism about Brazilian literature is more likely to



discuss themes of national identity, literary theory, or technique, than is criticism about the Spanish American boom. This is true except for Amado, again the exception to Brazilian practice, who is studied less in terms of technique and more in terms of sexuality and other social themes, as are the boom writers. Finally, Armstrong notices that Amado is the only Brazilian author who has sustained the publishing of translations by commercial publishers like the boom writers; other Brazilians have been presented to foreign audiences by small presses or university presses, either exclusively or after an initial commercial publication.

Although Armstrong interprets Guimarães Rosa, Machado, de Andrade, Drummond de Andrade, and Amado in some detail, the strength of *Third World Literary Fortunes* lies in his defense of Amado as a serious writer, in part, based on these numerical comparisons. As the only boom writer from Brazil, Armstrong uses the Bahian's extraordinary international reception as a spring board to plunge into an extended examination of the reasons for his popularity outside Brazil and lack of critical success within it:

Amado's appeal cannot simply be explained in terms of its subject matter, but must be understood as a successful technique in literary terms. . . . The presence of the popular element masks the fact that the real stylistic forte of Amado is derived largely through a continuity with traditional, popular Western narratological models and a sensibility to the artistry of popular culture. (104)

Furthermore, "What seems lacking in almost all criticism of Amado is the capacity to drop ideological agendas and consider the work hermeneutically in terms of a steady organic development fired by an original cultural and creative perspective" (140). Amado gains Armstrong's sympathy because the novelist is attacked by feminists (94), and he states that after *Gabriela*, Amado "remains a *machista* but ceases to be male-centric" (97). In an extended discussion of the popular and exotic images of Brazil, from inside and out, Armstrong concludes that "Amado's tropical marriage of Brazilian and Marxist theory is really an extraordinary act of subversion in relation to both conservative authoritarianism and Soviet orthodoxy" (96), whereas he is usually seen as a populist who is not particularly subversive or threatening to the regime. Armstrong's sixty-page discussion of "Socioanthropology and Popular Culture," traces a genealogy of certain regions in Brazil: the industrial South, the cultural capital of Rio de Janeiro, the traditional heartland in the *sertão*, and Amado's preference for Bahia. At his most convincing, Armstrong provides reasons from popular culture and from exported consumable culture for what we all knew at the outset: Amado is read around the world, whereas Machado de Assis struggles for international recognition.

Armstrong lauds the fact that “There is a continuity, then, between the nationalist essentialism of early modernism, subsequently discarded by the *geração de '45* but sustained by Amado, and social science discourse” (159).<sup>6</sup> Amado is closest to Gabriel García Márquez and magical realism, according to Armstrong:

the Brazilian’s theory has at least two characteristics in common with Spanish American literary intellectuals, and one fundamental difference. The shared elements are the paradoxical union of an essentialist vision of the privileged region—whether Bahia and Brazil or Spanish and Latin America—and an orthodox Leftist politics. . . . Still, the essentialism of Amado and of the Brazilian socioanthropological tradition post-Freyre is distinct from the “essentialism” of the Spanish American Boom novel. “Amado is not a formal innovator.” (234)

Armstrong argues against most critical opinion when he rescues Amado, since the critical majority agrees with Santiago when he argues that “The Latin American writer demonstrates that we should free ourselves from the image of a smiling carnival and fiesta-filled holiday haven for cultural tourism” (38), and not glorify them in novels. Unfortunately, swimming against the current of contemporary thinking is not Armstrong’s main problem, since one can argue cogently for popular culture and images. No, *Third World Literary Fortunes* suffers most from rough transitions and an organization that leads to repetitions.

The essays in *Machado de Assis*, edited by Richard Graham, originated in a 1995 conference at the University of Texas at Austin. These four papers “give the reader some notions of differing approaches [to Machado] now current,” according to Graham (ix). Most interesting to me is that Daphne Patai’s polemical “Machado in English,” would have such an important place in a selection of so few papers from the “multinational and interdisciplinary conference” (ix). On the one hand, internationalization comes to the fore in this collection by dedicating a quarter of the book to English translations; on the other hand, discovering the cutting and changing that Machado has endured in the name of translation confirms that anyone who can read Portuguese should steer clear of Machado in English. Patai excoriates past translators for their traditional ways, and translation theorists for their egotism in placing translations above original texts. Yet it does seem possible to be more faithful in translations and to valorize the creation of translators without the excesses she points out.

In “*Dom Casmurro*: Realism and Intentionalism Revisited,” the volume’s lead essay, John Gledson seeks to defend his thesis in *The*

6. “The term ‘essentialism’ is here used to mean the attempt to encapsulate the identity of a vast social or cultural mass, or historical experience, in a synthesized description” (159).

*Deceptive Realism of Machado de Assis: a Dissenting Interpretation of Dom Casmurro* (Liverpool, Great Britain: F Cairns, 1984) and indicates some directions Machado studies might take in the future. Gledson places himself in a group (with Santiago) of those who have been attacked by younger critics, and ultimately casts doubt on newer approaches to Machado: "I am far from denying the possible usefulness of, for instance, the varying strands of Marxism, of feminism, or of Derridean deconstruction, so long as they are coherently argued and sustained. But I have my doubts" (18). Gledson concludes that such theories, which I would argue are part and parcel of any internationalization of Machado studies, come too soon because the "spade-work" (historical and textual research) has not yet decided questions of irony and intention. But biographical and historical questions cannot be answered without ideological values; they are not and cannot be objective. Hence, feminist or deconstructionist interpretations are legitimate at any stage of research, if they are legitimate at all (and I believe they are).

The two other articles divide along the lines set out in Santiago's essay, "The Rhetoric of Verisimilitude" (1978). In "Dom Casmurro: Simulacrum and Allegory," João Adolfo Hansen considers Santiago's essay an improvement over many previous treatments of this novel, because it "moved away from the empiricist substantialism" and the question of Capitu's guilt. Hansen believes that "after Silviano Santiago's article, Capitu left the dock, but was replaced by her accuser, Dom Casmurro, and his creation, Bento Santiago" (41). He finds an emptying out of substance and a filling with authoritarian memory, such that *Dom Casmurro* becomes an allegory of the times of colonial thought and allegorical critique. On the other hand, Sidney Chalhoub in "Dependents Play Chess: Political Dialogues in Machado de Assis" argues that Machado is showing Dom Casmurro's thinking about class, and about dependents, and commenting on them:

Once the holders of seignorial prerogatives begin to doubt the authenticity of the moves and attitudes of subordinate people—seeing them as capable of representation, of dramatization—they tend to adopt the view that dependents are always and universally false and mischievous. Dom Casmurro is an allegory of the experience of defeat for the defenders of a certain understanding of class politics and domination. (76)

Hence, "the masters' way" forces the reader to conclude that "Capitu seduced Escobar" (83). Hence, Hansen's and Chalhoub's divergence on the issue of whether one should decide Capitu's guilt obtains, despite their similar analysis of Machado's political commentary and ironic stance toward his society.

This excellent collection contributes greatly to Machado's international reception, ever lagging behind that of Amado. As I finish this review (September 2003), I notice that the MLA has begun a new series

of histories entitled "World Literatures Reimagined."<sup>7</sup> Brazilian literature could greatly benefit by a balanced English volume reimagining it internationally in a creative and thorough way. It can only be hoped that scholars in several languages are writing national literary histories in world contexts and that the publication of histories like these will appear in Spanish, French, Chinese, and Swahili.

7. "Written by specialists but addressed to a wide audience, books in the series consider particular literatures in an international context. The scope of the books includes the emergent literatures of the developing world; the less-taught literatures of central and eastern Europe and the Americas; and the literary traditions and languages of Asia, Africa and the Middle East" (*MLA Newsletter*, Fall 2003, 14).