

5. Aesthetic Formalization of Brazilian Formation

Antonio Candido (1918-) published the two volumes of *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* (Formation of Brazilian Literature, henceforth FLB) in 1959.¹⁶³ The centrality of the concept of "formation" can be seen in the title and already in the first paragraph of the preface to the first edition (written in 1957), when he says that Brazilian literature "is recent, [it was] generated within the Portuguese [literature] and depended upon the influence of two or three others to get constituted. Hence, its *formation* has particular characteristics" (FLB1, p.9, italics added). Because of these characteristics, according to Antonio Candido, Brazilian literature cannot be studied as the others, that is, "majorly in a historical perspective"; it requires the kind of study he proposes, one that "seeks to define at the same time the value and the function of the works" (FLB1, p.9) in its formative process.

This peculiarity of Brazilian literature is soon identified as inferiority in comparison to other literatures. To FLB, "[t]here are literatures that a man does not need to leave, in order to receive culture and to enrich sensibility; others, that can only occupy a parcel of his life as a reader, otherwise his horizon can be irretrievably restricted by them" (FLB1, p.9). In the first case, Antonio includes the French, the Italian, the English, the German people, "and even a Russian and a Spanish" (FLB1, p.9). Nevertheless, "[i]f this is unthinkable in the case of a Portuguese, what to say about a Brazilian? *Our literature is a secondary branch of the Portuguese, which is, in turn, a secondary bush in the garden of the Muses...*" (FLB1, p.9, italics added). As a consequence, it is the fate of Brazilians to depend upon external experiences, since "[c]ompared to the great ones, our literature is poor and weak. But it is this literature, and not any other one, that expresses us" (FLB1, p.10).

All that in the very first two pages of the text: the centrality of the concept of "formation" is signaled; the peculiarity of Brazilian literature is stated; the

¹⁶³ In 2014, the 15th edition of FLB came out. FLB1 will refer to the first volume, while FLB2, to the second. The text was "prepared and written between 1945 and 1951... put aside for some years and resumed in 1955, for a finished revision in 1956, concerning the first volume, and 1957, concerning the second" (FLB1, p.10).

comparative evaluation of Brazilian literature is mobilized; and a hierarchy is constructed between "great" literatures, Portuguese literature and, at the bottom, Brazilian literature.¹⁶⁴

In 1962, Antonio Candido added a preface to the second edition, exposing the assumptions guiding his interpretation of the value and function of the works and his periodization. First, literature, "to be completely configured as an articulated system, depends upon the existence of a dynamic interaction of the triangle 'author-work-audience' and upon a certain continuity of the tradition"; second, "there is a strict solidarity between the two [periods] that I have studied (Arcadism and Romanticism)", since their radically different aesthetic attitudes do not preclude their approximation in terms of historical vocation; third, the perspective advanced by FLB requires "a method that is historical and aesthetical at the same time, showing, for example, *how certain elements of the national formation (historical-social datum) lead the writer to choose and to treat in a specific way some literary themes (aesthetic datum)*"; fourth, Arcadism represents the period that "definitely planted Western literature in Brazil, due to the universal standards that guided it and that enabled the articulation of our literary activity with the system that express the civilization to which we belong, and within which we have slowly developed our originality"; finally, fifth, Brazilian literature, to Antonio Candido, is "eminently interested", that is, "devoted... to the construction of a valid culture in the country", which configures a literature that, "as in the other Latin American countries, is marked by this commitment to the national life as a whole, a condition that does not exist in the countries of old culture", where the sense of belonging to the nation while making literature is not present (FLB1, pp.16-8, italics added). In 1981, in the preface to the sixth edition, Antonio reiterates that FLB "is not a juxtaposition of essays, but an attempt at correlating parts according to assumptions and hypotheses developed in order to reach the coherence of the whole" (Candido, 2000 [1981], p.19).¹⁶⁵

¹⁶⁴ As my focus here is FLB, I should note that the comparative dimension I will discuss below does not take into account the comparative efforts Antonio has advanced in many of his other texts.

¹⁶⁵ Paulo Arantes (1997, pp.19-22) narrates the way Antonio Candido told, in the celebration of 30 years of FLB in 1989, the thinking and the pragmatic processes that led him to the "fundamental theoretical idea of the book, the 'Literary System'" (Arantes, 1997, p.20). Antonio himself alludes, in the preface to the first edition, to the modification made in the first plan of the text (see FLB1, p.13). In an interview from 1996, he said that "the book should have been entitled: *Arcadism and Romanticism - decisive moments in the formation of the Brazilian literary system*" (apud Waizbort, 2007, p.91, n.14).

To anticipate things a little bit, let me pose the central problem to FLB as follows. The unceasing concern of this text is with the relation between literature and society, avoiding two extremes: the one that conceives the former as a product of the latter and the one that conceives the latter detached from the former. Moreover, Antonio assumes a certain originality of Brazilian literature that is intrinsically linked to the peculiarity of Brazilian nation itself in relation to "Western civilization". "We" are from the "West", but not in the same way "they", from the "old West", are. This resonates in the way Brazilian writers incorporate external factors and external influences into their texts. In that sense, the formation of Brazilian literature is a process that experiences at least two external dimensions: one from "our national formation", that is, from "Brazilian society"; and another one from "Western civilization", to which "we belong". These external dimensions are crucial to the process, which consists in the aesthetic formalization of the national formation. This general proposition on how I will interpret Antonio's interpretation of Brazil gives a sense of how he uses the concept of "formation" in FLB. I will explore that now.

In the introduction, Antonio Candido states that FLB "seeks to study the *formation* of Brazilian literature as a synthesis of universalistic and particularistic tendencies" (FLB1, p.25, italics added). The study of this process stipulates "decisive moments" marking the periodization of a "history of Brazilians in their desire to have a literature" (FLB1, p.27).¹⁶⁶ The criterion to define them as decisive is intimately associated to the use of the concept of formation; in his words, "[i]n order to understand in what sense the word formation is taken and why the moments studied are qualified as *decisive*, it is convenient to begin by differentiating *literary manifestations* from *literature per se*" (FLB1, p.25, italics in the original). In this sense, the status of "literature" is conditioned by the achievement of the above-mentioned systemic condition, without which one has only literary manifestations. The system is constituted by a tradition "in the full sense of the term, that is,

¹⁶⁶ The first volume is dedicated to the period 1750-1836 (Arcadism) and the second, to 1836-1880 (Romanticism). The quotation above comes from 1932 Julien Benda's book *Esquisse d'une histoire des Français dans leur volonté d'être une nation*. It is telling that, in translating the title of Julien's text, Antonio Candido has made a modification: in the original, the French desire, or willingness, is "to be a nation", while in FLB the Brazilian desire is "to have a literature". I will discuss below that "to be a nation" and "to have a literature" is not exactly the same thing to Antonio Candido. I should also remind that my discussion here is focused on FLB, so that I will resort to few other texts from Antonio only in so far as they can elucidate my interpretation of this text.

transmission of something between men (*sic*)" (FLB1, p.26), this something becoming a mandatory reference that people need to take into account, "either to reject or to accept" (FLB1, p.26).

The desire to have a literature is inseparable from "'the attainment of consciousness' from the authors regarding their role" and the "intention, more or less deliberate, of writing to their land, even when they were not describing it" (FLB1, p.28). It is a "disposition of the spirit" (FLB1, p.28) that constitutes "an artistic nationalism" (FLB1, p.29) deriving from historical conditions. This nationalism comes almost as an

imposition in the moments in which the State is *formed* and acquires physiognomy among peoples previously devoid of autonomy and unity. It appears in the contemporary world as an element of self-consciousness, in old and new peoples that acquire both [unity and autonomy] or in those that suddenly penetrate in the cycle of Western civilization, espousing its *forms* of political organization (FLB1, p.29, italics added).

From the above, it becomes clear that multiple formations are at stake in Antonio Candido's use of the concept: the formation of Brazilian literature, the formation of the nation, the formation of the state, the formation of (self-)consciousness.¹⁶⁷ It does not mean, however, that all of them share the same formative pace, reaching the same stage at the same time, as I will discuss below.

The interpretation of a text, according to Antonio Candido, requires the consideration of social and psychological aspects, that is to say, extra-literary elements integrated into the text. There is always a certain realism at stake. Hence, the interpretation of the formation of Brazilian literature cannot be detached from the extra-linguistic reality, the text being a transfiguration of external factors into internal ones - or, the aesthetic formalization of the national formation. That is the reason why, "along the formal considerations", FLB "freely deploys the techniques of social and psychological interpretation, when they are considered necessary to the understanding of the work" (FLB1, pp.38-9).

¹⁶⁷ Octavio Ianni touches upon that when he says that, in FLB, "the formation of Brazilian literature, as a system in movement, reveals itself to be also a reflection on the sociocultural formation of Brazil" (Ianni, 2004b, p.180).

The two periods studied in FLB are aesthetically different, but share the same historical vocation, constitutive of the process of attaining consciousness.¹⁶⁸ Arcadism expresses the "consciousness of integration: of adjustment to a natural, social and literary order, deriving from that the aesthetics of imitation" (FLB1, p.55); it is a search for an "Aristotelian *mimesis*" (FLB1, p.47) through which "art is guided by reason", which, in turn, aims at "apprehending the immanent form, that is, an ideal truth" (FLB1, p.69). This general definition of Arcadism does not fully correspond to the specific contours Enlightenment has taken in Brazil. The problems related to the XVIII century are

considerably different in Portugal and in Brazil, when compared to the countries that are the models, France and England. Our Age of Enlightenment was pious, scholastic, inquisitional; but it was manifest in the conceptions and in the reformist effort of certain intellectuals and administrators, framed by the [Marquês de] Pombal's relatively enlightened despotism.¹⁶⁹ Whatever the judgment on Pombal, his action was decisive and beneficial to Brazil, fomenting evolved mental attitudes that would increase the desire to know; the adoption of new points of view in literature and in science; a certain reaction against clergy's intellectual tyranny; and, finally, nativism (FLB1, pp.71-2).

Even if different than, and inferior to, what took place in the models, the French and the English, our Age of Enlightenment was at least positive to the country, following Antonio Candido. When Dom João VI arrived in Brazil, in 1808,

¹⁶⁸ The aesthetic differences are summarized by Antonio Candido in terms of the way each deals with words and nature: "we could say that in literature there are three possible aesthetic attitudes. Either the word is considered something bigger than nature, capable of superimposing upon the latter its own forms; or it is considered smaller than nature, incapable of expressing it, approaching it through fragmentary attempts; or, finally, the word is considered equivalent to nature, capable of creating a world of ideal forms that express in an objective manner the world of natural forms. The first case is the Baroque; the second, Romanticism; the third, Classicism" (FLB1, p.60). Arcadism, to FLB, comprises Classicism and Enlightenment (see FLB1, p.75). It is not my focus here to discuss the aesthetic differences distinguishing the literary periods studied in FLB from each other; instead, I aim at interpreting how the periodization itself is mobilized regarding the relation between literature and society in the multiple formations expresses in the text.

¹⁶⁹ Sebastião José de Carvalho e Melo (1699-1782), Marquis of Pombal, became minister of the State of Portugal in 1750, occupying this position until 1777. In 1759, he decided to expel the Jesuits.

Enlightenment definitively arrived here, however modestly, conducting a process that would lead to the Independence in 1822 (see FLB1, p.73). Interpreting the "Enlightened poetry", Antonio stipulates the existence of a "clear script", composed of "the praise of the strong government that promotes civilization; the preeminence of peace in relation to war; the necessity of civilizing Brazil through an adequate administration; the desire that the sovereign comes to take notice of our reality; the ambition that we can be governed by Brazilians that understand the original characters of the country, marked by the fusion of races and the acclimation of the European culture" (FLB1, p.117). The transference of the Royal Family in 1808 is considered by him "from many aspects, the most important event in our intellectual and political history" (FLB1, p.235), since it represented one of the main factors that provoked among Brazilian intellectuals the "conscious will of having a national literature" (FLB1, p.236).

In addition to that, Antonio Candido recalls that many Brazilians went to Europe in order to study, favoring "a certain progressist mentality" and the consciousness required to the formulation of a "Brazilian position, determined by more profound contradictions between the colonial economy and the Portuguese policy" (FLB1, p.244).¹⁷⁰ One of these Brazilians, Hipólito da Costa, became the editor of *Correio Braziliense* (1808-1822), a publication containing political and economic commentaries, and technical and scientific information. To Antonio, "[f]rom the refuge in London", Hipólito

educated Brazilian elites according to principles of the Enlightened liberalism; moderated, but firm. His long and fruitful overseas message was the presence of Europe in the best sense, symbolizing the profound dynamics of the period we are studying: placed in the centers of the matrix civilization, a Brazilian, beyond the ocean, interpreted Brazil

¹⁷⁰ Elsewhere, Antonio Candido, discussing the "increasing concern with the overcoming of the colonial status", says that since the second half of the XVIII century, a certain "enlightened conception of the intelligence" in Brazil enabled the "rapid emergence of the national consciousness" after the transference of the Royal family, "providing the basis to the mental development of the independent nation" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.107). This text was first published in 1961. The year of "1965" refers here and elsewhere to the date the book *Literature and Society* (a collection of studies) was first published.

following its terms, thinking our reality as an extension of an order defined by reason (FLB1, p.259).¹⁷¹

Hence, the integration promoted since Arcadism corresponds to the incorporation of Brazilian literature into "Western culture" (see FLB1, p.75). Nevertheless, as I have already said, this Enlightening progress has had a Luso-Brazilian version, where the reform or the rupture has not been complete, and, as a consequence, "tradition finds favorable conditions to survive [in the Luso-Brazilian literature]" (FLB1, p.184). Moreover, the formation of this intellectual life, fostering what I would call a "Brazilian Westernization", widened, in Antonio's words, "the gap between mass and elite", taking into account the "profound ignorance of the people" in Brazil (see FLB1, p.241). In a section of chapter VII (volume 1), called "our *aufklärung*", Antonio Candido stresses that Enlightenment happened in Brazil within "narrow limits and with all its obstacles" (FLB1, p.244). Romanticism, in Brazil, has also been full of "particularities" when compared to "the European movements" (FLB2, p.13): it is, at once, "national and universal", in a way that "external suggestions operated in the service of the stylization of local tendencies" (FLB2, p.14), an "affirmation of the proper against the improper" (FLB2, p.15).¹⁷²

Romanticism, in Brazil, was an episode in the formation of the national consciousness. On the one hand, the Romantic movement has changed the literary configurations - "Classicism ended up being identified to the Colony; Romanticism, to Independence" - and, with it, "our literature could *conform to the present*" (FLB2, p.9, italics added). On the other hand, both Romanticism and Arcadism are inscribed in the same movement "of accomplishment of the intellectual and artistic life in this part of America, resuming the process of incorporation into the Western civilization" (FLB1, p.309), or "into the European tradition patterns" (FLB2, p.9). In FLB's words, there are four topics that conduct the "*formation* of Brazilian literature as a system between 1750 and 1880, in intimate correlation with the elaboration of a national consciousness: the knowledge of the local reality; the valorization of aboriginal populations; the desire to contribute to the progress of the

¹⁷¹ In the original, "Enlightened" was in italics.

¹⁷² In the original, "proper" and "improper" are in bold.

country; the incorporation into the European patterns" (FLB1, p.75, italics added).¹⁷³

In this scenario, Romanticism was a change within the same trajectory, the same formative process; the combination of nationalism and Romanticism in Brazil was at the core of the attempt to "create a new expression to a new country" (FLB2, p.112).¹⁷⁴ Later in the text, Antonio reinforces that "the *formation* of our literature only gains meaning when it is seen in the entirety of the two solidary movements" (FLB2, p.328, italics added), all that inseparable from "what took place in our cultural matrices. From this comes the importance of the critique as attainment of consciousness... Ultimately, therefore, a question of models to be followed" (FLB2, p.328). Leopoldo Waizbort (2007) affirms that the synthetic movement operating through these decisive movements configures "a whole", but does not seek "the completeness"; or, it is a "totality that is not completeness" (see Waizbort, 2007, for example pp.91-2, p.102, p.105).¹⁷⁵

Within the narrow limits of "our *aufklärung*", a new stratum was created. The doubt Antonio Candido expresses in relation to the possibility of calling this new stratum "bourgeoisie" is related to his interpretation of the peculiarity of "our *aufklärung*". In his words:

¹⁷³ By now, it should already be clear that by "European patterns", FLB understands the "great European countries of the Western civilization", mainly England and France. According to Antonio Candido, "it even seems possible to state that, in Brazil, the infamous classic bauble was an excellent and fruitful factor of cultural integration, tightening with the culture of the West our communion of hybrid colonials [*coloniais mestiçados*], thrown in the adventure of shaping [*plasmar*] in the tropics a society in an European form" (FLB1, p.77). Interpreting one of the mid-XVIII century Brazilian thinkers, Antonio identifies in his work "one of the driving ideas of all the Brazilian writers since then and throughout the XIX century: the desire to show that we, Brazilians, men of an uncivilized [*inculta*] land, were also capable of doing like the Europeans" (FLB1, p.92).

¹⁷⁴ In another text, Antonio Candido says that, "in the first quarter of the XIX century, conditions were delineated to define both the audience [*público*] and the social role of the writer in close connection with nationalism" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.80).

¹⁷⁵ In a text written in 1950, Antonio Candido stipulates these "decisive moments" in a different way. To him, "[i]n Brazilian literature, there are two decisive moments that change the course and vitalize all the intelligence: Romanticism, in the XIX century (1836-1870) and Modernism, still called this way, in the current [XX] century (1922-1945). Both represent culminant phases of literary particularism in the dialectics of the local and the cosmopolitan; both are inspired, however, from the European example" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.112). One will note that, in this periodization, Romanticism ends 10 years earlier than the period stipulated in the second volume of FLB (1836-1880). In a text first published in 1968, Antonio is focused on the historical, and not the aesthetical, aspects, of the "function of literature in the process of national formation in Brazil" (Candido, 1989 [1968], p.180); concluding the text, he says that, "since Machado de Assis until our days, passing through the great axis of the 1922 modernists", Brazilian literature has begun to produce the works that are at the same time "the most characteristic and the most important ones" (Candido, 1989 [1968], p.180).

the burgeoning of the bourgeois (if we can call this way the new stratum formed in the cities, both from the immigration of farmers, and from the upward mobility of merchants and the development of bureaucracy)... has created, however, new problems in the adjustment of conduct. And, in defining a class that was more educated [*culta*], lively [*irrequieta*] and curious (contrary to the rude purblindness of the rural elites), [the burgeoning of the bourgeoisie] determined the objective and subjective conditions to the development of the analysis and the confrontation of the individual with society (FLB2, p.112-3).¹⁷⁶

As I have stated, Antonio Candido is identifying a movement of multiple formations: the formation of Brazilian literature since at least Arcadism; the formation of the nation; the formation of the state mainly after the transference of the Royal Family to Brazil; and the formation of national consciousness, deepened since Romanticism. These multiple formations can be seen in his interpretation of the relation between unity and diversity in Brazil. The following words express the main aspect I am constructing in my interpretation of FLB. Let me first quote them.

The political unity, preserved sometimes by almost miraculous circumstances, can make us forget the diversity that drove the *formation* and development of our culture. Colonization has been processed in separated cores, almost isolated from each other: the economic development and the social evolution were, in this way, considerably heterogeneous, taking into account the different regions (FLB2, p.298, italics added).

In this sense, regionalism acquires in Brazil a crucial relevance. If, in the "Western evolved literatures", it is "almost always a byproduct without bigger consequences", here, where the country "each time still touches and trembles with the surprises of

176 In the original, "elites" is in bold.

its own body, [regionalism] was and is an instrument of discovery" (FLB2, p.213).¹⁷⁷

From the above, it seems plausible to claim that the interpretation of the formation of Brazilian literature in FLB is inseparable from the way Antonio Candido interprets other formations. Before going directly to the point, let me recall two things. Firstly, I have pointed out in the beginning of the text that Antonio states that the formation of Brazilian literature is a process linked to two external dimensions, one from "our national formation" (that is to say, from "Brazilian society"), and another one from "Western civilization" (to which Brazil belongs and into which the formation of Brazilian literature aims at incorporating the country). Secondly, the study of this formative process stipulates a periodization constitutive of the "history of Brazilians in their desire to have a literature" (FLB1, p.27); it is now already clear that this is a history of how the Brazilian "elite" acquired "national consciousness".

That said, I will now go back to the quotation above. There, one sees that a link is proposed between the formation of the state ("political unity"), the formation of the nation ("regionally heterogeneous economic and social development"), the formation of Brazilian literature ("our culture") and the formation of national consciousness (intensified during Romanticism and its association with nationalism in the development of "our culture"). Throughout FLB, this multiple formative process operates at the center of the aesthetic formalization of the national formation and is depicted in a progressist way, pointing towards the coming of Machado de Assis (or, more precisely, towards what his genius expresses).¹⁷⁸

The figure of Machado works in the text as the summit of what I have previously called "Brazilian Westernization". In him, "two general processes of our literature assemble for a moment: the research of spiritual values, in a universal level, and the knowledge of local men and local society" (FLB2, p.114). Machado

177 Agreeing with other interpreters of Brazil, Antonio Candido says that, in America, there were "many Portuguese colonies", and not a single or homogenous "Brazil Colony". Moreover, quoting another thinker, he adds that "our literature" happens "in function of these so-called 'islands of culture more or less autonomous and differentiated', each one characterized by its particular genius loci [the spirit of the place]". Northeast represents, to FLB, the corroboration of this idea, since it stands out in Brazilian geography, history and culture with an impressive autonomy and distinctness" (all citations come from FBL2, p.298).

¹⁷⁸ Or, as Leopoldo Waizbort puts, FLB's narrative "has Machado de Assis as the focal point, a literary event that comes after the first romantics; his appearance required a rotation in the perspective to understand national literary history" (Waizbort, 2007, p.126).

was a genius, according to Antonio, because "he presupposes the existence of predecessors", applying "his genius towards the assimilation, the deepening and the fecundation of what was correct in the previous experiences" (FLB2, p.117), becoming, as a consequence, "the most Brazilian writer that has ever existed, and certainly the greater" (FLB2, p.118).¹⁷⁹ As Antonio states in another text, written in 1950, Machado is an example of perfection "in terms of work and of literary personality", since he "represents moments of an ideal balance between both tendencies [localism and cosmopolitanism]" (Candido, 1980 [1965], pp.110-1).¹⁸⁰ One should not presume, however, that Machado expresses a stage in which Brazilian literature reaches the same level as literature in "evolved countries"; its place in the garden of Muses is still relegated.¹⁸¹ Nevertheless, the formation of Brazilian literature follows, in the long run, a "progressist integration of literary and spiritual experiences, through the tension between the local reality... and the forms inherited from the European tradition" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.110).

The periodization FLB proposes organizes Brazilian history in a specific way, centered upon its vocation to form a literature whose thinkers, in turn, has the self-ascribed patriotic task of forming a nation.¹⁸² Machado is the most Brazilian among Brazilian writers because he has reached the most sophisticated stage in the formation of Brazilian literature. Moreover, he is so great, following Antonio Candido, because he is also the most sophisticated in bringing to the fore in his texts the contradictions of Brazilian society.¹⁸³ His higher level, literarily speaking, is linked to his capacity to express Brazil's contradictions, socially speaking. Taking about José de Alencar, "the most notable" of the writers in the Romantic tradition

¹⁷⁹ Later in the text, Antonio depicts Machado as a "genius continuer, not an isolated figure without a literary genealogy in Brazil" (FLB2, p.219). In another text, Antonio says that it is only in the third quarter of the XIX century that one can consider "our literature *formed* as an organic system that works and that is capable of providing a place to a regular literary life, serving as a support to works at once universal and local" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.90, italics added).

¹⁸⁰ In the same paragraph I have quoted, Antonio adds Gonçalves Dias, Joaquim Nabuco and Mário de Andrade as other examples of the same kind of perfection.

¹⁸¹ In a text first published in 1970, Antonio Candido extends this metaphor, saying that "our Latin-American literatures, as well as the North American ones, are basically bushes of the metropolitan ones. And, if we distance ourselves from resignations of the national proud, we will see that, despite the autonomy they have been gaining, they are still in part reflective" (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.151).

¹⁸² In another text, Antonio Candido states that Brazilian literature, in the XIX century, was taken "as something to be created voluntarily, in order to express the national sensibility, manifesting itself as an act of Brazilianness [*brasilidade*]" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.80).

¹⁸³ In 1968, Antonio reinforced Machado as "the most Brazilian" of writers, but this time he ascribes this expression to Roger Bastide, who supposedly used to say that to his students at the University of São Paulo. The justification remains the same: Machado "gave his country universality, by exploring, in our context, essential themes" (Candido, 1970 [1968], p.21).

in Brazil (the tradition Machado knew how to assess and how to continue in a genius way), Antonio says that "[a]s in every novelist of a certain relevance, there is in Alencar an implicit sociologist. In most of his books, the narrative movement gains power due to the problems of inequality [*desnivelamento*] in the social positions that will affect the very affectivity of the characters" (FLB2, p.225). The greater the literature, the greater its capacity to express a profound interpretation of society.

Let me give a quick break here, in order to summarize very briefly the uses of "formation" in FLB. In general lines, I think it is plausible to identify five traces of these uses: (1) the interpretation is focused on the relation between literature and society, or, more precisely, between literature and nation; (2) the formed Brazilian literature coexists - intimately - with the not-yet-completely-formed nation; (3) this incompletely formed nation is constituted by regional heterogeneity, due to different patterns of internal development, that begins to be internalized in literary works, as soon as the latter reach a systemic condition of their formative stage; (4) Brazilian literature, as well as Brazilian society, are interpreted from an external parameter that places "European model countries" at the top and Brazilian literature as "secondary"; finally, (5) this comparison and its related secondary condition mark the specificity of the formation of Brazilian literature and society.

The five traces constituting the uses of "formation" in FLB's interpretation of Brazil also raise the problem of the relation between, on the one hand, (social and literary) history and, on the other hand, the act of interpretation. As Antonio Candido himself stresses, "[i]n describing the sentiments and ideas of a particular literary period, we often formulate a point of view that *exists in us*, following the perspective of our epoch, before existing in the individuals that integrated [the period]" (FLB2, p.319, italics added). It seems plausible to say that the point of view that "exists in Antonio Candido" works in tandem with a wider problem. Hence, I propose now a step further in my interpretation of FLB, exposing it as an act situated in disciplinary and political problematizations.

First of all, I want to note that there are at least two simultaneous projections of the notion of "progress" at play in FLB. On the one hand, Antonio interprets the progress in the formation of Brazilian literature, a process that reached its higher level - literature as a system - with Machado, fulfilling in a certain way the desire of Brazilians to have a literature. On the other hand, this higher literary level is reached when Brazilian social contradictions are exposed, that is, when the

inequalities of Brazilian national formation are internalized in the literary text. To be precise at this point, it is worth noting a twofold internalization: the internalization in the text of the external (contextual, social) conditions; and the internalization, in terms of appropriation, of external (for the most part European) influences in the way Brazilian literature is formed. This twofold internalization brings to light the second projection of the notion of progress that FLB expresses, since it is accompanied by Antonio's judgment that Brazilian nation has not progressed at the same pace as Brazilian literature. All that comes again at the end of the FLB, when Antonio Candido reaffirms that Romanticism was crucial in the achievement of the status of literature in Brazil (that is, a systemic condition surpassing mere literary manifestations):

[n]ational literature appears, then, as expression of the secular dialectics synthesizing in original and adequate *forms* the position of the European spirit in face of the American reality... It is a question of describing and analyzing the various aspects of a society, in time and in space, expressing its struggle for national self-definition as civilized people, linked to the cycle of Western culture (FLB2, pp.366-7)

In this sense, Antonio's criterion to consider Machado the way he does comes from his interpretation that he was able to carry on and improve a certain historical vocation in Brazilian literature and, therefore, to formalize in his texts, better than any predecessor, the contradictions of Brazilian nation.

These projections of progress configure a certain teleology that Leopoldo defines as something "inscribed in the one who narrates, and not in the historical process" (Waizbort, 2007, p.127); the "historical narrative is far from naive, since it constructs, in the same movement, the narrator's perspective and the process he wants to narrate" (Waizbort, 2007, p.128). I agree with Leopoldo, in what regards his argument that FLB narrative comprises past, present and future and is concentrated in a moment (Romanticism) that works as an interregnum between "literary manifestations", that had come before, and "literary system", that would be consolidated afterwards; in this vein, the narrative operates both in a retrospective and in a prospective way to give sense of the totality. I think, however, that it is more precise to say that this teleology - part of the projections of progress

I have discussed above - resists any simple placement *either* in the subject who narrates the formative process *or* in history itself. One should recall that Antonio Candido said that "the point of view exists in us... before existing in the individuals" integrating the period. This logical precedence does not mean an unrestricted freedom to arrange history, since this arrangement is conditioned both by the epoch in which the subject who narrates/projects is situated and by the historical process she or he narrates. Hence, in my view, there is an undecidable line that *separates and unites* at once the progress Antonio Candido identifies in the development of the historical vocation inscribed in the formative process of Brazilian literature *and* the unequal progress he sees in Brazilian society. The latter can only be grasped from the former. That is to say, the unequal social progress, assumed as an extra-literary reality, is expected to be internalized in Brazilian literature, at least in the best among the literary texts approached. It seems plausible to say, therefore, that, throughout FLB, there is a certain previous conception of society establishing an intimate - but by no means determinant or unidirectional - relation with the judgment of each text interpreted.¹⁸⁴

Here, however, I touch upon one of the main contributions Antonio Candido has provided since his very first texts. As I said above, it is not the scope of this text to discuss that in detail. Nevertheless, it is important to state clearly the way I am interpreting this "previous conception of society" ascribed to FLB. Antonio has constantly reinforced his position in relation to two extreme interpretations: one considering that the value and the meaning of a text depended upon its capacity to expose some aspect of reality; and the other one considering that the context has only secondary relevance in relation to the formal operations advanced in the text.

¹⁸⁴ In a text included in *Literature and Society*, Antonio Candido develops a distinction between "primitive" and "civilized" people and societies: "[s]chematically, we would say that, ultimately, the erudite forms of literature dispense with the sociological point of view, but by no means it dispenses with the aesthetic analysis, while the oral forms of literature dispense with the aesthetic analysis, but by no means it dispenses with the sociological point of view" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.51). I mention that not in order to expose the distinction Antonio works with, but to point out that he sees variations of "behaviors, solutions, creations" that distinguish "the primitive" from "the civilized" (see Candido, 1980 [1965], ch.III). In the chapter just mentioned, he aims at avoiding the "anthropocentric fallacy", which consists in either seeing the "primitive" as radically different from the "civilized" or in mechanically reducing him [*sic*] to "our image" (presumably, the image of the "civilized"). To him, "man's [*sic*] mentality is basically the same", the differences between "primitive" and "civilized" deriving from social and cultural conditions (Candido, 1980 [1965], pp.43-4). I am suggesting that this is another aspect of a previous conception of society (and, in this case, of the human being) Antonio endorses in some of his texts and that requires further problematization. As this is not directly relevant to my interpretation of FLB here, I will leave that discussion for another opportunity.

In a text first published in 1965, Antonio said that he has reached the conclusion that "the aesthetic analysis precedes considerations of another order" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.3) and that the "*external* (in this case, the social) matters neither as a cause nor as meaning, but as an element that performs a certain role in the constitution of the structure, becoming, then, *internal*" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.4, italics in the original).¹⁸⁵ This precedence of the aesthetics is associated with a "basic truth, that is, that the logical and empirical precedence belongs to the whole, despite being apprehended through a constant reference to the function of the parts" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.8).¹⁸⁶

The attention devoted to the aesthetic move of internalization is inseparable from the affirmation that *there is* an internal *and* an external, but that their relation is not dichotomous, but of interpenetration. The point, to Antonio, is not exactly to challenge the distinction, but to distinguish various ways through it can be dealt with. In other words, sociology or history are not wrong when they assume a social reality outside the text - this is legitimate. *There is an outside-text*. So, what characterizes literary critique apart from other forms of dealing with social reality (sociology, history) is that social factors and psychological elements are taken in terms of the role they perform in the formation of the structure of the text.¹⁸⁷

No doubt this is a theoretical question (the relation between text and context) that has long been debated in Brazil and elsewhere.¹⁸⁸ But it is also more than that. Antonio's position is also placed in a very specific intellectual debate in Brazil. In one of the texts I have already mentioned, he says: "it is necessary to establish a *distinction of disciplines*, recalling that the *external* treatment of *external* factors can be legitimate when it is a matter of sociology of literature, since this one does not propose the question of the value of the work, and can be interested exactly in

¹⁸⁵ This text was first published in 1965 in *Literature and Society*, a collection of "studies" that "seeks to focus on various levels of the correlation between literature and society", as stated in the preface to the third edition, written in 1972. The quotation on the relation between the internal and the external is in the first of these studies, originated from a communication Antonio gave in 1961.

¹⁸⁶ As I have already mentioned, in the preface to the sixth edition of FLB, written in 1981, Antonio reinforces that the text at hand "is an attempt at correlating parts according to assumptions and hypotheses developed in order to reach the coherence of the whole" (Candido, 2000 [1981], p.19).

¹⁸⁷ I have already mentioned how FLB states the importance of social and psychological factors (see FLB1, pp.38-9).

¹⁸⁸ I must warn, however, that it is not my purpose to discuss Antonio Candido's conception of the relation between text and context. The contribution Antonio provided to this discussion is vast and of an immense value, and I will deal with that in the future, proposing a dialogue between Antonio Candido, Quentin Skinner and Jacques Derrida. Here, however, going into this topic would side-track this text.

everything that is [social] conditioning" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.4).¹⁸⁹ Therefore, he adds, this sociology is a "discipline of a scientific nature, without the aesthetic orientation necessarily assumed by critique" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.4). If we go back for a moment to FLB, we will see that Antonio defined "the critic" as the one who "largely uses intuition, accepting and seeking to express the suggestions brought by the reading. From these suggestions will come the judgment, that is not pure and simple judgment, but evaluation - recognition and definition of value" (FLB1, p.34). Luiz Carlos Jackson (2009) elucidates that FLB carries a covert dialogue with the academic environment of that time, especially with the state of affairs of sociology in the state of São Paulo and its reaction in face of the essayist texts of the first half of the XX century; this sociology was privileging the debate around economic development, relegating the discussion about culture, the core of FLB.¹⁹⁰

The kind of critique Antonio wants at once to save and to consolidate constitutes, in fact, the "terrain of literary critique" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.5), different from "sociology"; or, more precisely, the terrain where "the *external* becomes *internal* and critique ceases to be sociological to become only critique" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.7, italics in the original).¹⁹¹ As Leopoldo Waizbort (2007) stresses, there is an institutional dimension at stake: "critique and literary history search for their place, which is given neither by aesthetics not by sociology, but in their integration"; it is a project to "define the place of the critic - who is a university professor - and its thinking" (Waizbort, 2007, p.103). Antonio Candido, Leopoldo

¹⁸⁹ I have added italics in "distinction of disciplines". As Renato Lessa reminds, the differentiation of disciplines is linked to the goal of "profissionalization" of the production of knowledge, as well as to the goal of distinguishing the "scientific" production of knowledge from other forms (see Lessa, 2011).

¹⁹⁰ The essayist character and the dialogue with the academic environment have been recently reinforced (see Jackson, 2009, p.271; Cordeiro, 2011, p.116; Alambert, 2012, pp.80-7; and Aguiar, 2014, pp.278-80). Examples of some essays often raised in this academic environment are *Raízes do Brasil* (Roots of Brazil), Sérgio Buarque de Holanda; *Casa Grande & Senzala* (Big House & Slave Quarters), Gilberto Freyre; *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (Formation of Contemporary Brazil), Caio Prado Jr.; to name but a few of the most oft-cited. It is also important to have in mind Antonio's close personal and intellectual relations with thinkers associated to the 1922 Modern Art Week, such as Mário de Andrade and Oswald de Andrade.

¹⁹¹ Commenting this passage, Luiz Costa Lima (1991 [1990]) mentions that this is a "considerable refinement", but not a "rupture" in relation to FLB (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.153). Leopoldo Waizbort (2007) mentions this passage as part of Antonio's wider effort to circumscribe a domain of knowledge to "literary critique" and argues that the synthesis that is practiced in FLB is theorized in the text in which this passage is found (see Waizbort, 2007, pp.108-11). To Antonio, "modern critique has overcome not the sociological orientation, always possible and legitimate, but the critical sociologism, the devouring tendency of explaining everything through social factors" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.7).

notes, works towards the institutionalization in the university of the literary studies in a moment in which disciplinary differentiation seeks to stipulate an autonomous and specialized domain for literary critique, operating through that integration and dedicated to the study of literary works (see Waizbort, 2007, pp.106-9).

Antonio Candido reminds that "[t]here was a time... in which the critic ceded his place to the sociologist, the politician, the physician, the psychoanalyst. Today, the danger comes from the opposite side; from the excessive ambitions of formalism" (FLB1, p.35); that said, the "formalist imperialism would mean, in a wide perspective, the danger of backsliding" (FLB1, p.35). In a 1957 conference (the same year the preface to the first edition of FLB was written), Antonio opposed himself against the "imperialist intentions" of "sociologists, psychologists and others" that think they can "explain the totality of the artistic phenomenon only with the resources of their disciplines" (Candido, 1980 [1965], pp.17-8). Sociology, to him, is nothing more than an "auxiliary discipline"; when it comes to the "literary or artistic phenomenon", sociology can be "ineffective", "useful" or "indispensable", depending on which phenomenon of this kind one wants to deal with (see Candido, 1980 [1965], p.18).

This intervention in the disciplinary debate becomes even more significant if one recalls that Antonio Candido was one of the main figures in the consolidation of sociology as a discipline in Brazil. In 1956, he wrote a text entitled "Sociology in Brazil", that would be published in 1959 (therefore virtually simultaneously to FLB) in the same volume of the encyclopedia where Florestan Fernandes published a text called "Sociology", both invited by Fernando de Azevedo, then Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of São Paulo (USP) (see Candido, 2006 [1959], p.271, p.285).¹⁹² In this text, dedicated to the interpretation of the formation of sociology in Brazil, Antonio Candido affirms that

the relatively recent burgeoning of a scientific sociology has taken place to the extent that the social studies have been able here to overcome the literary mentality to which they had been so far indissolubly linked. Literature has been among us, for a longer time than in other countries, a kind of matrix, of shared ground, that has fomented the studies on society,

¹⁹² Fernando had been president of the Brazilian Society of Sociology from 1935 to 1954 and one of the protagonists in the foundation of USP in the 1930s (see Piletti, 1994).

providing them with visibility in a culture intellectually little differentiated (Candido, 2006 [1959], p.291).

In the following paragraph, Antonio adds that "[t]he current restriction of the literary sovereignty indicates a delimitation of spheres that is the true sign of cultural maturity and that guarantees the autonomy of each of the human sciences" (Candido, 2006 [1959], p.292).

Antonio Candido has become Fernando's assistant of sociology in 1942 and remained professor of sociology until 1958 (the year exactly between the writing of the preface to the first edition of FLB in 1957 and its publication in 1959), when he began to be exclusively dedicated to literature (Abdala Júnior, 1999, p.359).¹⁹³ Leopoldo Waizbort (2007) recalls that Antonio distances himself from sociology to the extent that the latter becomes increasingly scientific. In other words, Antonio's definition of "critique" is intrinsically related to the position he adopts to a certain kind of sociology: "[h]is work is, or ceases to be, sociology only in relation to a certain sociology, which means that the domains gain identity only in contrast to each other, through processes of mutual self-identifications and self-differentiations" (Waizbort, 2007, p.115).¹⁹⁴ Paulo Arantes (1997) reinforces, and widens, that aspect when he says that FLB expresses a "series of measures destined, first of all, to widen the current notion of Critique", an effort that is also part of the "organization of the culture in a dependent country" (Arantes, 1997, pp.34-5).¹⁹⁵ In

¹⁹³ "Exclusively" here should call the attention to the fact that Antonio had already been dedicating himself to literature since the 1940s (for a more detailed account of Antonio's literary activity in the 1940s, see, for instance, Waizbort, 2007; and Ramassote, 2010, 2011). In 1954, his PhD dissertation was in sociology; in 1958, Antonio left the position in sociology at the University of São Paulo (USP) to become professor of Brazilian literature at another university in the state of São Paulo (now UNESP); in 1961, he went back to USP, to become professor of literary theory and comparative literature (these information are taken from Abdala Júnior, 1999, p.359; Waizbort, 2002, p.183; Jackson, 2009, p.270; Ramassote, 2010; and Aguiar, 2014, p.279). Antonio Candido was ahead of a collective institutional research program on literary critique, supervising students such as Roberto Schwarz, Walnice Nogueira Galvão and Davi Arrigucci Júnior (see Jackson, 2009, p.276; Ramassote, pp.125-8; and Aguiar, 2014, p.280). Narrating the days he was Antonio's student, Fernando Henrique Cardoso (2013 [1992]) recalls that he used to teach sociology wearing a white coat, typical among sociology professors at USP (see Cardoso, 2013 [1992], p.152).

¹⁹⁴ Below, Leopoldo points out that Antonio's choice for a restrictive conception of sociology is "symptomatic", since "it was only in relation to this conception that he could differentiate himself and guarantee, this way, its place" (Waizbort, 2007, p.115).

¹⁹⁵ Paulo's position is the following: "the meaning of *Formation* [FLB], exemplarily established by Antonio Candido, is specified, in the first place, in a series of measures destined, first of all, to widen the current notion of Critique. More precisely, whoever has the elements to enumerate and coordinate a significant set of these measures will be able to finally retrace the formation of *Formation* [FLB], and everything else that follows from that on the level of the organization of the

other words, the anti-imperialist position endorsed by Antonio Candido is a disciplinary position.

Self-identifications, self-differentiations in a dependent country. This calls for another dimension of this position. In 1970, Antonio Candido published what would become one of his most cited texts, *Dialética da Malandragem* (Dialectics of *Malandragem*). Interpreting a Brazilian novel from 1854,¹⁹⁶ Antonio says that, in "documentary" terms, the novel is "restricted", since "it ignores the ruling strata, on the one hand, and the lower ones, on the other hand. But perhaps the problem should be proposed in other terms, without wanting to see fiction as a duplication"; as he defines it, literary analysis is interested in knowing, in this case, which function is exerted by the historically localized social reality in the constitution of the structure of the work - that is, a phenomenon that one could call formalization or structural reduction of external factors" (Candido, 1978 [1970], pp.326-7). This quotation reinforces that literary critique (or analysis) must be capable of grasping the internalization of a certain social reality into the text. It is also clear that the social reality the novel formalizes is, according to Antonio, a partial one - it is a "restricted documentary" -, leaving aside other external factors - for example, the ruling and the lower strata of society. This negligence is not a problem in itself, since the quality of a text, in Antonio's perspective, is not given by the "duplication of social reality". But, then, it remains open how one should judge this quality. Following the quotation above, Antonio says that the novel he is interpreting is constituted by "discontinuous, but discernible, axes, arranged in such a way that their effectiveness varies: (1) the facts narrated, involving the characters; (2) the practices and customs described; (3) the judgmental observations from the narrator and from certain characters. When the author organizes them in an integrated mode, the result *is satisfactory and we can feel reality...*" (Candido, 1978 [1970], p.327, italics added). In sum, on the hand, the reality internalized is always partial; on the other hand, the partial reality that is, indeed, internalized should be "felt" for the text to be "satisfactory". In other words, it is not the same reality all over again that

culture in a dependent country" (Arantes, 1997, pp.34-5). Paulo stresses in his text the wider, cultural aspect of what I am suggesting here to be Antonio's "disciplinary" position. Below, I will raise a "political" dimension of FLB. Names apart, the most important thing to retain is that FLB expresses how the "disciplinary", the "cultural" and the "political" dimensions are inseparable.

¹⁹⁶ The novel is called *Memórias de Um Sargento de Milícias* [Memoirs of a Police Sergeant], by Manuel Antônio de Almeida. I will get back very briefly to *Dialética da Malandragem* later.

Antonio Candido brings to his work as a literary critic, but it is the case that the text analyzed should make some extra-textual reality appear (or be felt).¹⁹⁷

Near the end of his interpretation of the novel, Antonio Candido proposes "*a parallel that perhaps can help us*" between "the historical *formation* of the United States" and the Brazilian one (see Candido, 1978 [1970], pp.340-2, italics added). He points out that, in the United States, since the beginning, religious and civil law has produced rigid groups and individuals. This rigidity has provided them with "force of identity and resistance" but has also "dehumanized their relations". In Brazil, "groups and individuals have never met such forms; they have never had the obsession of order, except as an abstract principle, or of freedom, except as whimsy"; in Brazil, the "clashes between norm and behavior" have been "softened", causing the "conflicts of consciousness" to be "less dramatic" (all these quotations are in Candido, 1978 [1970], p.340). The novel expresses, to Antonio, a "corrosive tolerance, *very much Brazilian*, that presupposes a valid reality beyond, but also beneath the norm and the law" (Candido, 1978 [1970], p.341, italics added).

I mentioned this text because it exposes exactly the point I am insisting on in order to interpret the uses of "formation" in FLB. Firstly, the "parallel" Antonio mobilizes is another instance of the comparison he proposes between Brazil and other countries. In FLB, Brazilian literature is a "secondary branch of the Portuguese, which is, in turn, a secondary bush in the garden of the Muses"; in the last text I cited, however, there is no such a hierarchy between Brazil and the United States. In both cases, the mobilizing comparison seems to be more than a "help"; it is an external parameter constitutive of the interpretation of Brazilian formation. Perhaps the "United States" and the "European model countries" work as *external* influences Antonio *internalizes* in his definition of "Brazil". But there is another nuance here: the "United States" does not work in a hierarchical comparison, as the "European countries" do; this means that the notion of progress is more vividly projected just in the second of these comparisons, enabling Antonio to evaluate "our literature" and "our nation" as less developed than "theirs" (the "European" ones).¹⁹⁸

¹⁹⁷ In the same paragraph, Antonio Candido says that when the integration mentioned above is "less happy", "the practices and customs appear as *document*, ready to the files of the folklorists, curious and practitioners of *petite histoire*" (Candido, 1978 [1970], p.327, italics in the original).

¹⁹⁸ Luiz Costa Lima (1991 [1990]) alludes to two important things that the statement of the secondary condition of Brazilian literature brings. On the one hand, it resists the position of those that, "inadvertently or because of the adherence to the national-popular, aim at knowing literature and becoming its specialists and scholars, being interested only in national authors"; on the other hand,

Moreover, the "very much Brazilian" in the quotation above indicates that Antonio has a previous conception of society when he interprets the novel. The same happens in FLB, in what regards the relation between the formation of Brazilian literature and the formation of Brazilian nation. When Antonio insists on "formalization", it is important to have in mind the conception of movement, of interpenetration between context and text, expressed in this notion as well as in the notion of "internalization". Let me recall that one of the assumptions exposed in FLB is that Brazilian literature is "eminently interested", that is, "devoted... to the construction of a valid culture in the country"; this interest constitutes a literature that, "as in the other Latin American countries, is marked by this commitment to the national life as a whole, a condition that does not exist in the countries of old culture" (FLB1, pp.16-8), where the sense of belonging to the nation is not present as a commitment in the act of making literature. In 1950, Antonio Candido had already stated that "[d]ifferent from what takes place in other countries, literature has been here, more than philosophy and human sciences, the central phenomenon of the spiritual life" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.130). This crucial role performed by literature in Brazil consists in the already-mentioned formation of national consciousness and in the research of "Brazilian life and problems" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.132). In addition to that, literature has compensated the "weakness" Antonio observes in the "*formation* of the scientific and technical spirit" in Brazil (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.132, italics added).¹⁹⁹

I have proposed to interpret FLB through an undecidable line at once separating and uniting the progress Antonio Candido identifies in the formation of Brazilian literature and the inequalities he sees in Brazilian society. I have also stressed that, in FLB, Machado de Assis is considered the literary thinker who has most notably expressed Brazilian social contradictions. In 1968, Antonio Candido concludes another text with the suggestion that, in Machado, we should look for the "fictional situations he invented", including those that manifest "the essential conflicts of men with themselves, with other men, with classes and groups"

this statement also "reflects a feeling that was very common at least until de 1960s in the *intelligentsia* of young peoples" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.155)

¹⁹⁹ Still in another text, first published in 1968, Antonio reinstates that "[i]n Latin American countries, literature has always been something profoundly devoted to the construction and the acquisition of a national consciousness, so that the historico-sociological point of view is indispensable to study it" (Candido, 1989 [1968], p.180)

(Candido, 1970 [1968], p.32).²⁰⁰ The point is that, if one follows the track Antonio Candido proposes, one can only see in Machado all that sophistication if, and only if, a literary critique of his texts is advanced, and not from any other kind of interpretation, however valid and legitimate it may be, since it is this critique that is able to grasp these fictional situations, therefore the internalization of social contradictions.

In a text first published in 1970, Antonio Candido goes straight to the point:

[a] fundamental stage in the overcoming of dependence is the capacity to produce works of first order [*obras de primeira ordem*], influenced not by immediate external models, but by previous national examples. This means the establishment of what could be called, somehow mechanically, internal causality, which even makes more fruitful the borrowings from other cultures (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.153).²⁰¹

This condition of "dependence" derives from "the backwardness and the lack of economic development" (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.156), that is, a condition of underdevelopment. In FLB, Antonio states that regionalism, in countries such as Brazil, becomes an instrument of discovery. In the text I have just mentioned, he reiterates that: regionalism "was and is a stimulating force in literature", turning the attention to "remote regions" where one finds "groups marked by underdevelopment" (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.158).²⁰²

From the above, it is possible to conclude that, first, in what regards Brazilian literature, social context has remained indispensable - "every novelist of a certain relevance is also an implicit sociologist", as Antonio states in FLB -; second, that the literary account of social reality in Brazil gains an intrinsically national character, since the formation of Brazilian literature is a process of attaining national consciousness; and, third, that this bond between literature and

²⁰⁰ In the original, "fictional situations" is in italics.

²⁰¹ In this same text, Antonio mentions Machado again, stating that his "originality... could have opened new routes at the end of the XIX century to the source-countries. But he has lost himself in the sand of an unknown language, in a country then completely without relevance" (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.153).

²⁰² In this text, Antonio Candido identifies a peculiarity in Brazil, since here the "best products of Brazilian fiction have always been *urban*", including Machado, until nearly the second quarter of the XX century (Candido, 1989 [1970], p.161).

politics can only be grasped through a literary critique, and not through a purely sociological point of view. This literary critique is an intellectual exercise itself participant in the process of attaining national consciousness. Paulo Arantes (1997) goes directly to the point here. In FLB, "no doubt Antonio Candido seemed to align himself... to this collective ambition of national construction"; at the same time, Antonio did not need to associate "the critical judgment about that evolutionary line [of literature] to the historical success of the social expectations that have always accompanied the classical anatomies of the Brazilian *malformation*" (Arantes, 1997, p.13, italics added). Things are not completely dissociated, either. As I have argued, the progress of Brazilian literature enhances its capacity to expose social contradictions; or, as Paulo puts, the social bond of Brazilian literature is "tighten by the progressive articulation of the system" (Arantes, 1997, p.14).

I have claimed above that the internalization of external (European) influences and the internalization of external (socially and locally real) factors are linked to Antonio's double projection of the notion of progress. The achievement of a systemic condition of the literary life in Brazil, that is to say, the *formation* of Brazilian literature, required the capacity to balance localism and cosmopolitanism in the literary production; this balance, in turn, exposes the contradictions in the *malformation* of Brazilian society.²⁰³ This specific bond between literature and society - formation and malformation - can only be identified through the kind of literary critique Antonio Candido himself proposes. Machado exemplifies the highest level of the literary formalization of Brazilian malformation; Antonio provides the literary critique without which this move cannot be grasped. The "underdeveloped" condition and the "malformation" of the nation in Brazil constitute Antonio's previous conception of society I have been pointing out here. A conception he wants to see both partially aesthetically internalized in the texts he interprets and socially superseded in a progressist historical development. It seems plausible to say that, in FLB, "Europe" (more precisely, the model countries, France and England) has reached a stage of its progress - in literature and in society - that Brazil has not yet been able to achieve. Our literary bush is still secondary; our society is still underdeveloped.

²⁰³ In Marcos Rogério Cordeiro's words, in FLB, "universalism gradually reveals, in itself, characteristics of the opposite tendency, problematizing national conditions [*dados*], while localism gives rise to images and ideas of a general and universal character" (Cordeiro, 2011, p.118).

Here I reach a crucial aspect to my interpretation of FLB. As Paulo Arantes (1997) reminds, Antonio Candido has been interpreted sometimes as nationalist, sometimes as Eurocentric.²⁰⁴ In order to avoid extending too much this discussion, I will build my interpretation relying very briefly on two already-mentioned texts from Paulo Arantes and Luiz Costa Lima and on a short text written by Alfredo Bosi.²⁰⁵

Alfredo Bosi (1978 [1977]) affirms that FLB expresses an "anti-nativist" position, since, to Antonio, Brazilian literature appears there "fundamentally as a branch of the Portuguese [literature]" (Bosi, 1978 [1977], p.xv).²⁰⁶ And this perspective, following Alfredo, would have impacted upon Antonio's notion of "national consciousness". Although long, the extract below will serve as my support to what comes next when I will deal with Paulo Arantes and Luiz Costa Lima. Let's follow Alfredo's words first:

In relation to "national consciousness", it would have taken place [according to Antonio Candido] a transplant of the "cultured Western mentality and norms" [he is quoting FLB here] to Brazilian life, which is plausible, in case we think of "national consciousness" as a consciousness that *a part of the hegemonic classes has of the historical process...*

The history of Brazilian literature would have been a history of more or less blissful integrations of our reality to the European cultured patterns... *it is only when the colonized internalizes and remakes the cultural pressures of the colonizer that he has the conditions to compose a new work, matching the civilization that has determined him*

²⁰⁴ It is tempting to resort to other texts from Antonio, including some of those I have already cited here, in order to advance this point little further. Nevertheless, as my point here is not to discuss Antonio Candido's entire work, my subsequent interpretation of his position remains exclusively concerned with FLB. This is also the reason why I will not discuss Antonio's intense political engagement, including in political parties, except when this is relevant to the interpretation of FLB I am proposing here.

²⁰⁵ Alfredo's text is a preface to Carlos Guilherme Mota's text *Ideologia da Cultura Brasileira* (1933-1974) [Ideology of Brazilian Culture] (1933-1974). The preface was written in 1977.

²⁰⁶ As I hope it is already clear by now, it is not my purpose to discuss the critical engagements FLB has provoked, except on the very specific points in which they help me to make clearer my interpretation here. That is the reason why I will rely on Paulo's, Luiz's and Alfredo's texts, three of the more prolific interpreters of Brazil, in a very focused way.

Hence, there is an *axiological coherence* in the beautiful, rich and complex trajectory of Antonio Candido... [whose] theoretical matrix [is] the *conception of culture as an instrument of modernization*, of matching Brazil with the irradiating centers of Western civilization. The value to be reached here is the *cultural overcoming of underdevelopment*... It is a neo-Enlightened conception whose limit is the idea that *modernization works as a democratization factor*. Progress would come from the free, but meticulous, exercise of a culture without boundaries, without nationalist colors, neither folklorizing shadows.

As an ideal, this project seems to me to *find its privileged place in the University* and in literary productions strongly personalized. But out of this condition, that is, *within a society of unbalanced classes, such as the Brazilian, the ruling codes*, that govern the mass industry and the universal language of power *mistranslate, or do not translate, the popular daily life* (Bosi, 1978 [1977], p.xv, italics and bold added).

From the parts in italics above (I will leave the part in bold untouched for a moment), a series of aspects come to the fore. Firstly, Alfredo attaches the use of "national consciousness" by FLB to a *classist* conception; secondly, this conception is inseparable from a specific *axiological* position; thirdly, this position is characterized by an *neo-enlightened modernizer* perspective; fourthly, this perspective has its hegemonic condition not only within a certain class, but also in a *University and disciplinary* project, which is the project of the University of São Paulo (USP); finally, fifthly, this classist condition is linked to a cultural point of view that *excludes or at least marginalizes* popular culture, therefore most of the (unequal) society that constitutes Brazilian (mal)formation. In other words, Antonio's interpretation of Brazil, following Alfredo, would express a modernizing political position which is also a disciplinary position (linked to a University

project) that silences most Brazilians, since they are not part of the hegemonic class from which and to which Antonio speaks.

Alfredo Bosi's interpretation was interpreted by Paulo Arantes (1997). First of all, Paulo reminds that Alfredo's use of "neo-enlightened" to characterize Antonio's position was a profound critique; by then, "within the leading sectors of the leftist thinking, Enlightenment had become the preferred target of criticism... This is the angle from which Alfredo Bosi attacks, in this case, the university culture of São Paulo" (Arantes, 1997, p.49). To resist this hegemonic intellectual culture, Alfredo, in Paulo's words, "opposed a new 'gesture towards the people' to the cosmopolitanism" Candido (and the University of São Paulo) expressed (Arantes, 1997, p.50). In sum, to Paulo, Alfredo Bosi endorsed a national-popular project against a cosmopolitan (universalist) project that Antonio had supposedly (and collectively) put forward.

Nevertheless, to Paulo Arantes, FLB's concern with the "incorporation into the West" is not a purely cosmopolitan position that ultimately capitulates to an external cultural imposition. To focus on the cosmopolitan dimension of Antonio's interpretation is to lose from sight the other face of the formative process, that is, "the ambiguity of that instrument of cultural imposition" through which "the imposed pattern becomes critical ferment" (Arantes, 1997, p.54). In sum, following Paulo, FLB does not express a cosmopolitan position, but a balance between cosmopolitanism and localism, the same balance Antonio looks for in a "formed" literature. The problem with Alfredo Bosi's national-popular project, then, was that he had saw in FLB only "capitulation" through a "cosmopolitan stylization of the colonizer's point of view" in what was, instead, an appropriation of external influences that enabled the exposition of national contradictions.

Now, let me recall the part in bold in the long quotation from Alfredo Bosi's text. There, one reads that "it is only when the colonized internalizes and remakes the cultural pressures of the colonizer that he has the conditions to compose a new work, matching the level of the civilization that has determined him" (Bosi, 1977 [1978], p.xv). To Paulo Arantes (1997), what is lacking in Alfredo's interpretation, based as it is on a unidirectional determination that identified in Antonio Candido, is a certain "sense of the opposites" that Antonio has used in his "interpretation of our mental evolution" (Arantes, 1997, p.55). To put it differently, from FLB's perspective, "once adjusted, the cultured pattern imposed has become an expression

of the contradictions of the incipient social order", thereby carrying a "realist vocation" in the formation of Brazilian literature (Arantes, 1997, p.55).

Hence, Paulo's position is that FLB is double-faced. On the one hand, it conveys a positive image of Enlightenment. Suffice to recall that "our *aufklärung*", however timid and limited, is there considered at least beneficial to the progress of Brazilian literature (remind FLB1, pp.71-3; see also Arantes, 1997, p.56). On the other hand, this positive image has not been defended as a straightforward cosmopolitan position. Paulo Arantes (1997) concludes his engagement with Alfredo Bosi saying that, ultimately, what his national-popular project - his projection of progress - wants is not so far from what FLB expresses. It was only obliterated by his one-faced interpretation of the text.

Luiz Costa Lima (1991 [1990]) addresses the axiological problem in FLB from a different perspective.²⁰⁷ According to him, when FLB states that "our literature is a secondary bush", it takes for granted "the scale of values that oriented the critical activity" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.155).²⁰⁸ The point is that, by obliterating his values and assuming a supposedly neutral position in the act of interpretation, Antonio Candido preserves "an a-historical conception of form" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.154). Deriving from that, the task of the literary critique would be to expose the internalization of the external that the literary work operates.²⁰⁹ The question posed by Luiz Costa Lima addresses exactly this apparent neutrality of critique: "what makes *unquestionable* the affirmation that Brazilian literature is secondary, if not the unquestionability of the scale of values that oriented the critical activity?" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.155, italics in the original). Facing this situation, Luiz wants to expose the obliterated values at work in FLB.

Before continuing with Luiz, it is crucial to have in mind that Antonio Candido begins FLB stating that Brazilian literature, because of its incipient condition and because it is originally dependent upon external literatures, cannot be studied "majorly in a historical perspective", requiring a study that "seeks to define

²⁰⁷ Luiz Costa Lima (1991 [1990]) and Leopoldo Waizbort (2002; 2007, part II) discuss the concept of "literary history" in FLB, tracing it back to the XIX century, especially to the German thought.

²⁰⁸ It is worth reminding that Antonio Candido states in a note of the introduction to FLB that "[t]he reading of this 'Introduction' is dispensable to those that have no interest in questions of critical orientation" (FLB1, p.25) and, in the preface to the second edition, he complains about the excessive importance the "Introduction" had in its reception (FLB1, pp.15-19). It is in this preface that Antonio exposes the assumptions that guided his interpretation of the works included in FLB.

²⁰⁹ Or, in one of Antonio's formulations, how "the *external* becomes *internal*" (Candido, 1980 [1965], p.7, italics in the original).

at the same time the value and the function of the works" (FLB1, p.9) in the formative process. Well, the reader of the text soon realizes that this function is related to the attainment of the systemic character and of the national consciousness without which a proper "literature" is not formed.

Now, going back to Luiz's text, it is argued that FLB "suppresses the complexity of its formulations, in order to make clearer its service towards the guideline opened by the romantics" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.159). To recall, this guideline is constituted by the possibility of making "external suggestions" operate "in the service of the stylization of local tendencies" (FLB1, p.14). Luiz points out the FLB "praises" Romanticism for its attention towards the "national", but "criticizes it for not having escaped from the European attraction" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.158). To put it differently, even if the romantics have not entirely performed the function of constituting a coherent system, they have importantly opened this possibility. The missing step refers to the escape from "Europe" (that Machado would later accomplish, as I have said above). FLB's perspective is based, therefore, on the privilege it ascribes to an interpretation "that highlights a literary production and circulation that favors the national cohesion" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.162). Hence, to Luiz there is a "convergence [in FLB] between the primacy of the nation and a certain analysis of the social" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.162).²¹⁰ In other words, the accomplishment of the formative process of Brazilian literature comes when the systemic character encounters the nation.²¹¹

²¹⁰ Commenting on Luiz's text, Leopoldo Waizbord (2007) stresses that it expresses the notion that FLB seeks "the totality that is not completeness" and that the axiological dimension at stake brings to light Antonio's position as the narrator (Waizbord, 2007, pp.131-2). Moreover, Benjamin Abdala Júnior (1999) recalls that the publication of FLB takes place in a period in which nationalism was strongly placed in the agenda (Abdala Júnior, 1999, p.361). In this aspect, one can recall the national-developmental program of president Juscelino Kubitschek (1956-1961) and, from another angle, Alfredo Bosi's critique of Antonio. Also, during the 1960s and 1970s, controversies on the study of Brazilian literature and on literary critique were deeply marked in the academic environment by an opposition between thinkers endorsing Marx-inspired-sociological approaches to literature (predominantly positioned at USP) and those more dedicated to textual analysis inspired, for instance, by "structuralism", "phenomenology", "post-structuralism" (predominantly in Rio de Janeiro). Beyond an intellectual dispute, this opposition brought to the table the relation between literature and society during dictatorship in Brazil. In sum, there is a complex intertwining of political and intellectual dimensions inscribed in what I am discussing here (see, for instance, Lima, 2003).

²¹¹ This encounter does not mean, as I hope to have already made clear by now, that the "nation" is "formed" as Brazilian literature is. Sérgio Alcides (2011) notes that it is the adjective "Brazilian" that qualifies the noun "literature" as an "organic system" (see Alcides, 2011, p.144). Perhaps it would be more precise to say that the formative status as "literature" is achieved when the "national" character is reached, at the same time that this "national" character is reached when the status as "literature" is achieved. It is in this sense that an encounter takes place.

The brief engagements with Alfredo Bosi's, Paulo Arantes' and Luiz Costa Lima's texts are important to me here because they not only express the disciplinary dimension of FLB, but, most importantly, they bring to the fore interpretations of the political position exposed in FLB. But, first, let me remind that I have proposed to interpret FLB through the multiple formations comprising the formation of the state (the achievement of political unity, "preserved sometimes by almost miraculous circumstances"), the formation of the nation (regionally diverse and heterogeneous), the formation of Brazilian literature (intrinsic to "our culture") and the formation of national consciousness (deepened during Romanticism and its association with nationalism). I have also argued that there is an undecidable line in-between the progress Antonio Candido identifies in the formative process of Brazilian literature and the unequal progress he sees in Brazilian society.

When seen through this undecidable line and these multiple formations, the engagements above gain a different perspective. The literary hierarchy in FLB placing "model countries" at the top, Portugal in the middle and Brazil (together with the other Latin American countries) at the bottom is accompanied by the interpretation of the formative process of Brazilian literature as one of a progressive "incorporation into Western civilization". It seems to me that, in this sense, Antonio Candido can be interpreted as aesthetically cosmopolitan, in that some "European literatures" remain throughout FLB an external parameter from which he judges the achievements of Brazilian literature. External in two senses: they come from "Europe" *and* they remain unquestioned (that is, as a taken-for-granted or exogenous parameter).

It does not derive from this aesthetically cosmopolitan position, however, that the national progress Antonio wants to see in Brazil is a reproduction of the historical formation of those "European societies". The localism, in FLB, is expressed not only in the "local contradictions" Brazilian literature exposes at its best, but also in the potentially different civilization that can be built in Brazil through the internalization of external suggestions. In other words, FLB does not express the ambition towards a universal modernization, but the possibility of critically constructing a different nation - incorporated into the "West", but not equal to the "European model countries". In this sense, it is plausible to say that the axiological assumption of national cohesion does not lead to a politically cosmopolitan position. Moreover, the balance between contraries that Antonio

Candido takes as the parameter of judgment in the his act of interpretation constitutes the bond between his disciplinary, his aesthetic and his political positions, as well as between a nationalist and a cosmopolitan position. In other words, the multiple formative process exposed in FLB problematizes both sides of this balance, and this problematization is also not opened to an easy solution. For neither of the sides.

Although it is not my scope to discuss the convergences and divergences among interpreters of FLB, I should clarify at least one aspect that could be brought from my engagements above. A brief digression will help me here. In Leopoldo Waizbort's words, Antonio recognizes that, "despite the *formation* of the literary system, society as a whole - and in which that system exists - has not concluded that *modern* project. These is a mismatch between the adulthood [or maturity] of national literature and national adulthood [or maturity] per se" (Waizbort, 2007, p.145).²¹² This mismatch is the recognition, from Antonio, that there is an "anachronism of various layers of the historical time, due to which literature has *formed* without the *formation* of the nation" (Waizbort, 2007, p.163, italics added).²¹³ Marcos Rogério Cordeiro (2011) highlights that the interpretation of the literary works in the decisive moments studied in FLB works as intermediaries through which Antonio reaches the "historical problematization" (see Cordeiro, 2011, p.122). According to Marcos, "acclimation" is not an "outcome, but a process" and the ruptures marking the process always pose the problem again, in a

²¹² I have added italics to "formation".

²¹³ In a text first published in 1968, Antonio refers to FLB in the following way: "[n]evertheless (as I have tried to show in another book on the subject), this aesthetic rupture between both periods [Arcadism and Romanticism] does not mean an historical rupture, since Romanticism remained oriented by the same tendency, that is, the double process of integration and differentiation, of incorporation into the general (in this case, the mentality and the norms of Europe) in order to obtain the expression of the particular, that is, the new aspects that were being raised in the maturing process of the country. This circumstance gives continuity and unity to our literature as element of *formation* of national consciousness from the XVI century, or at least the XVII century, until the XIX century. At this moment, both literature and the ruling classes consciousness (to which it corresponded), as well as society, can already be considered mature and consolidated, due to the fact that they were capable of formulating their problems and trying to solve them" (Candido, 1989 [1968]. p.179, italics added). Leopoldo notes that, in this passage, literature and society seem to be at the same formative stage, which is not what is articulated in other texts, including FLB. To him, this expresses the difficulty of finding a more precise formulation of the problem in Antonio's work (see Waizbort, 2007, p.165-6, n.217). The mismatch of the multiple formations is plausible, however, as an interpretation of FLB, which is my focus here. If I mention Leopoldo's observation of the ambiguity throughout Antonio Candido's texts, it is just to point out the wider problem in which this discussion is situated, that is to say, the multiple positions expressed in the interpretations of Brazil, in face of the hierarchy and inequality not only within the combined development of national literatures, but also within the combined development of national societies.

modified form, requiring "new forms of solution"; hence, "[a]cclimation is a historical desideratum, also felt in other spheres of social life, that triggers changes and creates the necessity of the aesthetic update of the form, also creating conditions for the development of a bigger process, incorporating the previous one, that is, the *accumulation*" (Cordeiro, 2011, p.123, italics in the original). Marcos Rogério Cordeiro (2011) opposes, then, Paulo Arantes' and Leopoldo Waizbord's interpretations (among others), on the one hand, to Luiz Costa Lima's interpretation (among others), on the other hand, agreeing with the first group, since, to him, it is "the social history, taken in its wide and concrete sense, that prefigures the method from which literature is exposed and interpreted" (Cordeiro, 2011, p.116). In sum, to Marcos, Antonio's interpretation of the process of acclimation and accumulation contains "no axiological judgment, as some critics [Luiz Costa Lima among them] proclaim, but, indeed, an aesthetical judgment" (Cordeiro, 2011, p.127) on the form of the objects analyzed, that is, literary works and society.

In my view, there is no simple opposition between the precedence of social history (literary works and society interpreted), on the one hand, and an axiological precedence, on the other hand. Let me recall that Antonio Candido says, near the end of FLB, that the description of "sentiments and ideas" of a literary period is intimately linked to the formulation of "a point of view that *exists in us*, following the perspective of our epoch, before existing in the individuals" included in the period (FLB2, p.319, italics added). This "existential" point of view is a starting point in the interpretation of how a literary text internalizes external ("European") influences and external (social) contradictions. As I have argued, the multiple formations in FLB expose an undecidable line separating and uniting literature and society.

Following this line, when, for instance, Paulo Arantes says that Antonio takes part in the "collective ambition of national construction" (Arantes, 1997, p.13) by calling attention to the social bond of Brazilian literature in a dependent country, and when Luiz Costa Lima argues that Antonio's position advances an axiological judgment that privileges an interpretation "that highlights a literary production and circulation that favors the national cohesion" (Lima, 1991 [1990], p.162), it is possible to take both interpreters as shedding light on different dimensions of the uses of "formation" at stake in FLB. For my purpose here, it is less relevant whether they agree with each other or not; instead, I have relied on their texts because they

have helped me to expose the multiple formations and the undecidable line separating and uniting literature and society in FLB.

With that in mind, let me go back once more to Machado's placement in FLB. As Paulo Arantes (1997) puts, "the main *formative* measure [*providência formativa*] taken by Machado de Assis...was at once *comparative*... and *cumulative*", in a such a way that "the dilemmas of the double allegiance with which almost every Brazilian writer has struggled" could have been coped with (Arantes, 1997, p.32).²¹⁴ But these dilemmas have also been Antonio's in his search for the balance between cosmopolitanism and localism both - and at once - in the literary works he interprets and in the kind of literary critique he develops to this interpretation. In other words, Machado and Antonio were *neither* updated up to the point of losing from sight the local condition, therefore becoming a "fake European", *nor* attached to the local reality up to the point of turning his back to the world of his times (see Arantes, 1997, p.32).²¹⁵ The undecidable line also operates *separating and uniting* Machado and Antonio.

Antonio Candido's interpretation of the formation of Brazilian literature is a political and a disciplinary positioning. Machado is the most Brazilian to Antonio due to the fact that he interprets Brazilian society in a similar form than Antonio does; at the same time, Machado becomes such a figure because Antonio Candido, as a literary critic, is able to grasp in his text the internalization of external factors (and external influences) that would otherwise be at least in part lost, in case another kind of interpretation was advanced. It comes as no surprise, then, that FLB goes back once more to Machado before finishing:

"there is no doubt that a literature, mainly an incipient one, should feed itself majorly from the subjects offered to it by the region; but let us not establish doctrines that are so absolute that end up impoverishing it [the literature]. What we need to require from the writer, first and foremost, is a certain intimate sentiment that turns him into a man of his

²¹⁴ Italics added to "formative". For more on this "double allegiance", see Arantes (1992, especially pp.14-20).

²¹⁵ Leopoldo Waizbort (2007) highlights that both Antonio and Machado occupy "the same position, the one of self-reflection" (Waizbort, 2007, pp.141-2), which is linked to the balance between localism and cosmopolitanism. But, Leopoldo reminds, if Machado is the place of "completeness of the formative stage, [Antonio] is the place of the autonomization of critique and of literary history in relation to literature" (Waizbort, 2007, p.144) - and in relation to sociology and history.

time and of his country, even when dealing with subjects remote in time and in space". This is the "other independence", one that "has no September 7th, neither Ipiranga chant"; one that "will not be made in one day, but slowly, so that it can be more lasting; one that will not be the work of one or two generations; many will work towards it until it gets totally realized" (FLB2, pp.367-8).²¹⁶

This other independence, therefore, is much more than the political independence achieved in September 07th, 1822. It is one in which, if achieved, Brazilians will not only have a literature, which they have already got, but also a completely independent nation, which they have not yet accomplished. After the quotation above comes FLB's last paragraph, where Antonio defines the words above (Machado's text) as the "point of maturity of the romantic critique... adequate, therefore, to finish this book, that sought exactly to describe the process through which Brazilians attained consciousness of their spiritual and social existence through literature" (FLB2, p.368).

In the beginning of the text, Antonio Candido had modified Julien Benda's text title, replacing the "desire to be a nation" by "the desire to have a literature". In the end, it seems that FLB gives the full sense of this replacement. In Brazil, the formation of literature was not accompanied at the same pace by the formation of the nation. Brazilians already have a literature, and, by this literature, Brazilians have been able to provide an aesthetic formalization of the national malformation.

²¹⁶ The quotations reproduced by Antonio Candido are from Machado's text *Instinto de Nacionalidade* [Instinct of Nationality], from 1873.