The Dissertation Committee for Belinda Mora García
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

The Aeneid of Brazil: *Caramuru* (1781)

Committee:

Arturo Arias, Supervisor

Naomi Lindstrom

Sonia Roncador

Jossianna Arroyo

Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra

The Aeneid of Brazil: *Caramuru* (1781)

by

Belinda Mora García, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2012

Dedication

To my parents, Elma García Marentes and Armando Rafael Mora Ponce

Acknowledgements

This dissertation would not have materialized had it not been for the help and support of many people, far too many to name here. When I first decided to write about *Caramuru* for my master's thesis, I approached Professors Naomi Lindstrom and the late James Nicolopulos. They have both been fundamental in the writing of this dissertation, each in their own way. Professor Lindstrom kindly supervised my master's thesis, which involved much work on her part, patiently editing and graciously teaching me about academic writing. Professor Nicolopulos served on my PhD comprehensive exam committee, and taught me about reading texts from the perspective of classical imitation. Thus, the first chapter of this dissertation would not have been possible without his vast knowledge of the forms of Latin American colonial texts. I am also very grateful to Dr. Bruce Louden at the University of Texas at El Paso. I never would have been able to recognize the plot of the *Aeneid* in *Caramuru* had it not been for his excellent class on Greco-Roman literature, which I took in 1999. Thanks also to Dr. Louden for reading the first chapter. I am most grateful to Professor Ivan Teixeira of the University of São Paulo, who taught me about Colonial Brazilian Literature and closely read and commented several chapters of this dissertation. I am especially grateful to Professor Arturo Arias for taking on my dissertation when I was left without a supervisor. His input on Latin American postcolonial discourse has been most helpful. Professor Arias has brought this dissertation to its final stages, and for this I am eternally grateful. I also want to extend thanks to Professors Sonia Roncador, Jossianna Arroyo, and Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra for participating on my committee. Thank you Professor Arroyo for volunteering to take the place of Professor Nicolopulos, I am sure he thanks you too! Thanks also to Dr. Kelly McDonough for reading and giving me feedback on the final chapter of this dissertation.

I want to thank all my friends and family, especially Nancy LaGreca, Walter Leite, Flavia Leite, Megan Scarborough, Patricia Nuñez, Simali Suthar and my colleagues who have been constant sources of support and love throughout my many years of graduate school. Thanks to my parents for their unconditional love, and to all my aunts, uncles, and cousins, whom I love very much. God bless you all, always.

The Aeneid of Brazil: *Caramuru* (1781)

Belinda Mora García, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2012

Supervisor: Arturo Arias

This dissertation concerns the epic poem Caramuru (1781) by José de Santa Rita Durão. I propose both a post-nationalist or postcolonial reading of *Caramuru*, as well as a pre-nationalist or historical analysis. The first part of this dissertation focuses on the form itself, particularly the genre of epic poetry to which *Caramuru* belongs. The title of this dissertation references Virgil's *Aeneid*, while the comparisons between this and other epics focus on the conventions of epic poetry, placing *Caramuru* within the context of other epic poems. Traditionally, and even recently, *Caramuru* has consistently been compared to Luis de Camões' *Os Lusíadas*. I have tried to establish a closer connection with Virgil's *Aeneid*, rather than *Os Lusíadas*, as the model epic for *Caramuru*. Chapter One focuses on the topic of imitation, specifically the many similarities with the plot of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Chapter Two offers a historiographical approach to how the readings of colonial texts changed over time, including a historical background of *Caramuru*, which was written soon after the fall of the so-called enlightened despotism of Portugal under the Marques de Pombal. The second part of this dissertation is a close reading of the text itself, and focuses on the colonial discourse present in the poem. Chapter Three is an analysis of the religious discourse in *Caramuru*, which reflects the preoccupations of an Augustinian monk living in the Age of Enlightenment. Chapter Four concerns the representations of Amerindian resistance in the poem, particularly of two characters who belong to the insubordinate Caeté tribe. The last chapter focuses on the issue of gender and how women are represented in *Caramuru*. The main woman protagonist is a Tupinambá woman who becomes a prototype for Iracema, a well-known fictional character from nineteenth-century Brazil. Santa Rita Durão was born in Brazil but lived most of his adult life in Portugal, plus 15 years in Italy. He wrote that the motivation to write this poem was his 'love of homeland' or nationalist sentiment, even though the nation of Brazil was yet to exist at the time he wrote *Caramuru*.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

The Aeneid of Brazil

In 1841, Andres Bello published an article in which he stated that Alonso de Ercilla's *La Araucana* (1569, 1578, 1589) was the so-called *Aeneid* (29-19 BC) of Chile. Similarly, the title of this dissertation suggests that we might consider Santa Rita Durão's *Caramuru* (1781) the *Aeneid* of Brazil. Indeed, *Caramuru* illustrates familiar encounters between Amerindians and Europeans that we could imagine as a foundational epic poem for the Americas. While Andres Bello observed that Chile is the only modern country whose foundation was immortalized by an epic poem, a closer study of colonial Iberian poetry reveals other epics. There are at least three epic poems that narrate the foundations of what is today the nation of Brazil: José de Anchieta's *De Gestis Mendi de Sàa* (1563), Bento Teixeira'a *Prosopopéia* (1601), and Santa Rita Durão's *Caramuru*. All these poems in commemorate, in one way or another, the establishment of what would eventually become Brazil.

If we compare the plots of *La Araucana* as the *Aeneid* of Virgil we find that Bello's description was meant in a general sense, the *Aeneid* to serve as a metaphor of foundation story or epic. This comparison between the actual poems, the *Aeneid* and *La Araucana*, reveals that Bello was speaking in much broader terms, with little or no reference to the Latin concept of imitation. With the independence of Chile in 1810, the new nation needed a foundational myth. Like many other Latin American nations, the nineteenth-century was dedicated to nation-building. Given the recent independence from

Spain, one could imagine that if Bello had chosen to compare *La Araucana* to Spain's national epic the *Cantar de mío Cid* (1140) instead of the *Aeneid*, perhaps the nationalist fervor of nineteenth-century would have frowned upon this. Perhaps Bello deliberately chose the parallel between the *Aeneid* and *La Araucana* in order to give the founding myth more prestige, since the model epic was written in Latin, not Spanish. More likely is the possibility that Bello's newly adopted founding epic needed to project the nationalist sentiment of his era. Had he stated that "*La Araucana* is the *Cantar de mío Cid* of Chile" this spirit of nascent patriotism would be somewhat thwarted, since the ties to imperial Spain were still very recent.

One can only speculate how this comparison of *La Araucana* with the Spanish national epic would have been anathema to the time in which Andres Bello wrote this particular essay. Oddly, something very much like this has occurred with the criticism on *Caramuru*, an epic that is almost exclusively and exhaustively compared with the Portuguese national epic, *Os Lusíadas* (1572) by Luís Vaz de Camões. While some early critics argued for the roots of *indigenismo* in *Caramuru*, or a representation of embryonic local pride, more recent interpretations have interpreted it as a sort of colonialist sequel to *Os Lusíadas*, commemorating the broadening Portuguese imperialist expansion (Cunha 2006). I believe a shift in the focus from romanticism to a more classical approach on the aspects of Latin imitation in Durão's poem would reveal that, in some aspects, *Caramuru* is more of an *Aeneid* than an *Os Lusíadas* of the New World. Indeed, the model of *Os Lusíadas*, like so many other renaissance epics, is clearly Virgilian. And while Santa Rita Durão makes a direct reference to Camões in the preface to *Caramuru*, the fact remains

that the original model of both these epics is Virgil's *Aeneid*. *Caramuru* is the *Aeneid* of the New World because the plot is modeled on Virgil, not Camões.

Since Durão wrote *Caramuru* well before Brazil became an independent country in 1822, it is difficult to sustain the argument that he was trying to promote Brazilian nationalism. More recent critics of this nationalist argument point to the allusion to Camões in the preface, which some have taken as an indication that perhaps it was not meant to be interpreted as a founding myth of Brazil. Contemporary critics of *La Araucana* are faced with a similar dilemma: how to square the clearly Spanish imperialist subtext of the epic with an alleged celebration of Chilean nationhood in the Mapuche heroes. While criticism of the two epics has curiously followed a similar trajectory, a closer evaluation of the texts themselves reveals little resemblance between these two epics. *La Araucana* is a history set to verse of the conquest of the Mapuche tribe in the south of today's Chile. Meanwhile, *Caramuru* takes an episode from Sebastião de Rocha Pita's *Historia da America Portuguesa* (1730) that relates the story of the Portuguese explorer Diogo Álvares Correia and transforms him into an epic hero whose legendary narrative parallels Virgil's hero, Aeneas. While Andres Bello may have characterized *La Araucana* as the *Aeneid* of Chile in an expansive, nationalist sense, the rhetorical use of Latin imitation that Durão adhered to is not as easily found in *La Araucana* as it is in *Caramuru*. So perhaps it is *Caramuru*, and not *La Araucana*, that is the true *Aeneid* of the Americas. As we shall see in the first chapter, *Caramuru* follows the Virgilian character models and their events quite closely. By comparing it directly to its Virgilian model, I

hope to show how Santa Rita Durão implemented the rhetoric of classical *imitatio* in order to create the fictional plot of *Caramuru*.

While the topic of Portuguese faith and empire will be explored further in the second part of this dissertation, Chapter One reads *Caramuru* through the lens of classical imitation. The exemplary model for *Caramuru* is both *Os Lusíadas* and Virgil's *Aeneid*. Yet if one compares the plot structure and basic narrative of *Caramuru* and the *Aeneid*, Durão seems to rewrite the story of pious Aeneas into legend of the Portuguese explorer called Diogo Álvares Correia. Using imitation as the standard by which poems where written during the Renaissance, we can read *Caramuru* in the long tradition of poets that sought to imitate the classics. This first chapter takes as the main theoretical framework presented by James Nicolopulos in *The Poetics of Empire in the Indies: Prophecy and Imitation in* La Araucana *and* Os Lusíadas (2000). While I was not able to make my entire dissertation a study of imitation in *Caramuru*, I have tried to accomplish this in the first chapter. Recognizing the references to Virgil's *Aeneid* enriches one's reading of the epic, which like many others was written with classical works as models.

Chapter Two addresses the historical background of the poem, taking into consideration particularly the juxtaposition of the anti-Jesuit rhetoric of *O Uraguay* with the post-Pombal shift in hegemony back to the Nobles and the Church in what is commonly known as the *Viradeira* in Portuguese history. This chapter was inspired by Ivan Teixeira's work *Mecenato Pombalino e Poesia Neoclásica* (1999). The study of the political and cultural background of Basílio da Gama's epic poem helps put in perspective the notion that his poem was written with a nationalist or nativist intent.

While *O Uraguay* does incorporate several heroic scenes of Amerindians, the demonization of the Jesuits stands as the main ideological thrust of the text. The background and threat to the Church establishment brought on by the so-called "rogues" of the Enlightenment may be said to be the ideological dialogue that Santa Rita Durão felt he was engaged in. Also, in *Caramuru*, there is an attempt to clear the Jesuits of the bad image given to them in *O Uraguay*. Thus, this chapter highlights the cultural and political scenery of the time and place in which the epic was written, mainly eighteenth-century Europe.

Chapter Three focuses on the religious aspects of the arrival of the Portuguese in the Western Hemisphere. The justification of conquest in order to abolish the practice of cannibalism echoes the pretext for the conquest of Mexico where some tribes performed rituals of human sacrifice. In the meantime, New Christians in Iberia were being persecuted and some where even burned at the stake in *autos-da-fé* or acts of faith sponsored by the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. These autos-da-fé were as much human sacrifices as the Aztecs in Mexico. The theoretical basis for this chapter is Gayatri Spivak, who pointed out how the practice of sati in India was used by the British as justification for the civilizing mission. Through the institution of the Church, the Portuguese carried out their own brand of "civilizing mission" in Brazil. In *Caramuru*, the Amerindian called Gupeva is converted to Christianity, which changes the power dynamics of the group and puts Diogo in control of the Tupinambá tribe. His evangelization is of course backed by military power, namely his weaponry. Chapter

Three attempts to examine and analyze the Spiritual Conquest of Brazil as represented in *Caramuru*.

The fall of the indigenous populations in the early days of the conquest and their subsequent rise, often times through miscegenation, are the topics of the last two chapters of this dissertation. Chapter Four concerns two Amerindians who resisted Diogo's efforts at conquest and colonization. His main rival is Jararaca, the leader of the Caeté tribe. A portrait of cannibalism as resistance is given in the character of Bambu, another Caeté who refuses to be enslaved by the Portuguese. Like the Amerindians in *O Uraguay*, these two can be seen as prototypes for nineteenth-century literary representations of Amerindian warriors of the Romantic period such as those created by Antônio Gonçalves Dias (1823-1864) and José de Alencar (1829-1877). Likewise, Iracema can be read as an imitation or reproduction of Paraguaçu, the main topic of the last Chapter. Other women characters in *Caramuru* that are analyzed in Chapter Five include Moema (as Dido) and the Virgin Mary (as Venus). These last two chapters also address issues pertinent to Amerindian populations in Brazil, which today stands at less than one-percent of the total population (although recently more people of Amerindian descent are self-identifying as Amerindian). In the conclusion, I posit that the nationalist agenda of *mestiçagem* must be problematized in order to protect Amerindian groups that are struggling to maintain their autonomy. The theoretical basis for the last two chapters includes several Latin American thinkers on coloniality, such as Aníbal Quijano and Walter Mignolo. For the feminist perspective, I relied manly on Luce Irigaray and Paula Gunn Allen.

Although literary criticism on *Caramuru* is scarce, a critical study of this epic that has defined most interpretations of the poem was made in Antonio Candido's analysis in *Literatura e Sociedade* (1985). One of Candido's key observations about the poem is that Brazilian romanticism may have distorted it both ideologically and esthetically. He writes:

> Ante um poema que poderia ser tomado, tanto como celebração da colonização portuguesa, quanto como afirmação nativista das excelências e peculiaridades locais, [os precursores franceses e os primeiros românticos brasileiros] optaram pelo segundo aspecto, encarando a obra como epopéia indianista e brasileira (*Literatura e Sociedade* 171).
>
> Faced with a poem that could be interpreted as much as a celebration of the Portuguese colonization, as a nativist affirmation of the excellences and local peculiarities, [the French precursors and the first Brazilian romanticists] opted for the later, considering the work as an Amerindian and Brazilian epic. (my translation)

The point of departure for this dissertation then is to examine this epic poem without a nationalist agenda; that is, to read *Caramuru* from a broader perspective to include a contemporary postcolonial point of view. Both the content and the form will be considered. Thus, the first part of this dissertation highlights the rhetoric of imitation on which it is based (the form) and the unique historical time period in which it was written (the context). The second part of this dissertation focuses mainly on the colonial discourse present in the text, and offers postcolonial and feminist readings of selected

passages or episodes in the poem (the content). The following introduction gives a short synopsis of the poem, followed by a suggestion for a new paradigm with which to read *Caramuru*: removing the poem from its conventional Romantic criticism and restoring it to a long tradition of epic poetry of Western Civilization. Since *Caramuru* has never been translated into English, all translations of the poem are my own.

A BRIEF BACKGROUND AND SUMMARY OF *CARAMURU*

José de Santa Rita Durão was born in 1722 near the city of Mariana in the state of Minas Gerais, 100 years before the independence of Brazil. The poet studied in the college of the Jesuits until the age of nine, when he relocated to Lisbon in 1731. He entered the Augustinian order and then attended the University of Coimbra until 1745. For five years he served as Reader of Theology in Braga and then returned to Coimbra, where two years later he earned the title of doctor in theology. He was then transferred to the town of Leiria, where in 1759 he preached an anti-Jesuit sermon. Later that same year, he published a pastoral that was also critical of the Jesuit order, in order to gain the favor of the Count of Oeiras (the future Marquês de Pombal). He soon regretted his accusations against the Jesuits and left Portugal in 1761, eventually relocating to Rome. In 1763 he had an audience with Pope Clemente XIII, formally retracting the statements he had made in Leiria against the Jesuits (Viegas xiii). For almost twenty years, Durão lived in exile from Portugal. In 1777, Durão finally returned to Lisbon, where a few years later he dictated his epic poem to a copyist (a freed slave who had returned with him to

Lisbon). *Caramuru* was published in 1781, and the poet died three years later. He was buried in a church in the Alfama sector of Lisbon.

"It was love of my homeland which incited me to write this poem," wrote Santa Rita Durão in the preface to *Caramuru*. At such a statement, one may be prompted to ask: exactly where does a colonial subject's homeland reside? Although Durão was born in the colonies, he left for Portugal at the young age of nine and never returned. The location of a colonial subject's homeland highlights the possibility of misreading in texts that are interpreted through a nationalist paradigm like the one implicitly presupposed by the signifier *Colonial Brazilian Literature*. Of course, this term was applied retroactively; colonial subjects in America for the most part seem to have imagined themselves as an extension of their respective empires. Another term for the literature of this same time period may more accurately reflect the spirit in which it was written: *Portuguese-American Literature*. But accustomed as we are to categorize works of literature by their national origin (as if books, like people, were citizens of this or that country), some works of literature from the colonial period have often been misinterpreted as evidence of burgeoning nationalist sentiments. For example, this appears to be the case of Alonso de Ercilla's *La Araucana*, which has often been ascribed an indigenous or anti-imperialist reading. If we were to read *Caramuru* without considering its liminality in the space and time of nations, we might come to the conclusion that it belongs neither to Brazil nor Portugal and therefore unclassifiable within either the Brazilian or Portuguese nationalist paradigm. This means we would need a new paradigm that goes beyond the limits of nineteenth-century romanticism or twentieth-century nationalist socialism. In the case of

La Araucana, this mode of interpretation was put forth by James Nicolopulos in *The Poetics of Empire of the Indies* (2000) and is based on the classical notion of imitation. While Nicolopulos' study focuses on the sixteenth-century imperial rivalry of *Os Lusíadas* and *La Araucana*, we can still find evidence of imitation in late eighteenth-century texts like *Caramuru*. Thus instead of nationalism, we can read a literature according to precepts of imitation. This is what I have attempted to do in the first chapter; however, as we shall see in the second part of this dissertation, imitation does not explain everything.

The main plot of *Caramuru* draws on at least three historical sources: *Crônica da Companhia de Jesus no Estado do Brasil* (1663) by Simão de Vasconcelos, *Nova Lusitânia: historia da Guerra Brasilica* (1675) by Francisco de Brito Freire, and *História da América Portuguesa* (1730) by Sebastião da Rocha Pita. These titles are significant in themselves because none of them refer to their time period as we do, as Colonial Brazil. Brazil was seen as Portuguese-America, or New Lusitania, or even as a state within the greater Portuguese empire. As already mentioned above, the hero of the epic poem is loosely based on Diogo Álvares Correia, who was born in 1475 in Viana do Castelo, Portugal. This Portuguese sailor was allegedly shipwrecked off the coast of Bahia around 1510. He was given the Tupi name Caramuru, which in the Tupinambá language signifies a particular type of eel that hides among the rocks near the shore (Rocha Pita 43). The specific episode on which Durão would build his epic poem is recounted in the following passage of Rocha Pita's *Historia da América Portuguesa*:

> Como a nau conduzia para a Índia instrumentos militares, saíram entre os despojos muitos barris de pólvora, outros de munição, cunhetes de balas, e algumas espingardas; preparou-as Diogo Álvares, e fazendo tiros com elas, derrubou algumas aves: o fogo, o eco e a queda dos pássaros causou tal horror aos gentios, que fugindo uns, e ficando estúpidos outros, se renderam todos ao temor, tendo a Diogo Álvares por homem mais que humano, e o tratavam com grande veneração, vendo-o continuar com tanto acerto nas caças o emprego dos tiros, que ouviam sempre com terror. (Rocha Pita Livro 1, 95-101)
>
> Since the ship was taking military instruments to India, there were among the remains many barrels of gunpowder, munitions, bullets, and some muskets; Diogo Álvares prepared them, and shooting them brought down some birds. The fire, echo and falling of the birds caused such horror to the natives, that some ran away while others where dumbfounded, they surrendered to this fear, assuming Diogo was a supernatural being and venerated him, watching him successfully hunt with his shots, which terrified them. (my translation)

Soon after Diogo Álvares won the respect (or fear) of the local tribes, he married a Tupinambá woman called Paraguaçu. She traveled to France with Diogo, where Paraguaçu was baptized and took the Christian name Catarina from her godmother (the French queen Catarina de Médicis). The Tupinambá woman then married Diogo and took his last name in order to transform herself from Paraguaçu into Catarina Álvares (Rocha

Pita Livro 1, 100). The couple returned to Bahia and had many descendants, who became known as the Caramurus of Bahia.

The so-called Caramurus of Bahia, the purported descendants of Diogo and Catarina, were parodied in a poem attributed to Gregório de Matos in the seventeenth-century "Aos principais da Bahia chamados Caramurus" (Matos 640). It is worth referring to that poem here to get a sense of the legacy that was left by the historical marriage between Paraguaçu and Caramuru, the eponymous hero of Durão's epic poem:

> Há cousa como ver um Paiaiá[1]
>
> Mui prezado de ser Caramuru,[2]
>
> Descendente de sangue de Tatu,
>
> Cujo torpe idioma é cobé pá.[3]
>
> [...]
>
> Não sei, onde acabou, ou em que guerra,
>
> Só sei, que deste Adão de Massapé,
>
> Procedem os fidalgos desta terra. (Matos 1: 640-641)
>
> There's nothing like seeing an indigenous shaman
>
> So proud of his European stock
>
> Descendent of the bloodline of Tatu
>
> Whose awkward language is indigenous, yes.
>
> […]

[1] Paiaiá or pajé is an indigenous spiritual leader, a mix between a prophet and a shaman

[2] In this sense, Caramuru means having mixed blood, being of Amerindian and European descent

[3] Cobé means indigenous, descendant of indigenous, or indigenous language; pá is Tupi for "yes"

I don't know where he's ended up, or in which war

All I know is that from this Adam of Massapé,

Descended the aristocrats in this land. (my translation)

In these verses Gregorio de Matos satirizes the descendents of the original Caramuru, or Diogo Álvares Correia, who has become the metaphorical Adam of this sugar-cane producing land. The poem mocks these nobles who are proud of their white ancestry, yet whose language and culture are still Amerindian.

While historical texts record that around 1509 or 1510 Diogo Álvares Correia was shipwrecked off the coast of Bahia, the events that occurred after the alleged shipwreck would take on legendary proportions. This transformation of an otherwise ordinary shipwrecked sailor into an epic hero is in no small part due to Durão's epic poem. Since the publication of *Caramuru* in 1781 and up until this day, the story of Caramuru and Paraguaçu as it is recorded in the poem has, for better or worse, been treated mostly as historical fact. Although it is not my intent here to sort out the historical fiction, it will indeed be useful to sort out what Durão took from the history books and what he added from his own imagination, particularly when one considers that the version of the story presented in Durão's *Caramuru* has more in common with the plot of the *Aeneid* than it does with the actual historical discourse of Bahia.

A brief summary of the first few stanzas shows that *Caramuru* follows in the literary conventions of most epic poetry. The first stanza announces the proposition of the poem, which is to tell of the deeds of the man who purportedly discovered the cove which would become the foundation for the first capital city, Salvador da Bahia:

De Filho do Trovão denominado,

Que o peito domar soube à fera gente;

O valor cantarei na adversa sorte,

Pois só conheço herói quem nela é forte. (Canto I: 1)

Of Son of Thunder named,

Who knew how to tame a fierce people;

His bravery I shall sing in troubled times,

For I only know a hero who is therein strong. (my translation)

Diogo Álvares Correia is referred to as the archetypical "son of Thunder," the Portuguese hero who tamed the savages and showed bravery in the face of adversity.

This idea that there are fierce peoples in the lands outside of Portugal, and that these need to be tamed or civilized is not original to Santa Rita Durão. This discourse of a civilizing mission is taken directly from the imperialist project which the Portuguese had already cultivated for several centuries. Sir Cecil Maurice Bowra's *From Virgil to Milton* (1945) notes the central imperialist ideology of *Os Lusíadas*, a concept very similar to what we find in Santa Rita Durão's poem. Bowra writes that in Camões' one sees the Portuguese as "champions of civilization and Christianity against the corrupt forces of Islam and barbarism" (133). In *Os Lusíadas*, the *other* is the Muslim; meanwhile in *Caramuru*, the non-Christians are of course the Amerindians, who were in addition to being "pagans" also rumored to be cannibals. In fact, the practice of cannibalism is central to the othering of the Amerindian, and it is mentioned in the first stanzas of *Caramuru*: "Devora-se a infeliz, mísera gente" 'They devour themselves, these hepless,

wretched people' (I, 5.1). Cannibalism would thus provide the needed moral justification for the Crown to implant Christianity and Portuguese civilization in Brazil.

The second stanza of the poem comprises the invocation. The invocation is defined as "the traditional calling of, or to, the Muse, which is also the Muse's calling of the poet, at the beginning of an epic" (Mikics 159). In *Caramuru*, the poet makes clear his Christian ethos by not summoning a muse in the classical sense, but by addressing the "Santo Esplendor, que do grão Padre manas… Virgem bela… Mãe donzela," the source of all light that breaks the shadows of human illusions to make the work begin and end with Her; since after all, the work belongs to this "pure light" (Durão I, 2). The final Canto of *Caramuru* returns to this invocation of a Christian muse, namely the Virgin Mary, when she makes her miraculous appearance to Paraguaçu. This topic will be examined in more detail in Chapter Five.

Continuing in epic convention, stanzas three to eight comprise the dedication to Prince José (1761-88). Prince José is the grandson of King José I, who reigned during the so-called age of Pombal, from 1750 until 1777. King José I's daughter, Maria I, was the first regnant queen in Portuguese history (Disney 312). Prince José was the oldest son of Maria I and the hopeful future king of Portugal. However, Prince José would never rule since he died young, while his mother was still queen. The active reign of Maria I (from 1777 until 1792) is commonly known as the Marian *Viradeira*, a topic that will be discussed further in Chapter Two. Since Prince José was expected to take over the reign from his mother, Durão addresses him directly in the poem: "E vós, Príncipe excelso, do Céu dado / Para base imortal do luso trono" 'And you, excellent Prince, sent from

Heaven above / For the immortal pedestal of the Portuguese throne' (I, 3.1-2). In the last stanza of the dedication to Prince José, Durão illustrates how the people of Brazil expand the scepter's empire and how in the name of her majesty's throne, the Church is propagated.

> Dai, portanto, Senhor, potente impulso,
> Com que possa entoar sonoro o metro,
> Da brasílica gente o invicto impulso,
> Que aumenta tanto império ao vosso cetro:
> E enquanto o povo do Brasil convulso
> Em nova lira canto, em novo pletro,
> Fazei que fidelíssimo se veja
> O vosso trono em propagar-se a igreja. (Canto I: 7)
>
> Give me, therefore, o Lord, a powerful impulse
> With which I may chant a resonant meter
> Of the Brazilian people, the undefeated impulse
> That magnifies so much empire to your reign
> And while the restless Brazilian people
> In a new lyre I sing, in a new lyric
> Make it faithfully be seen
> Your throne in propagating the church.

The religious subtext of the poem is reflected in the stated mission to establish a Christian Kingdom of God in the name of Portugal, and thus here it is clearly alluded to in the

dedication. Meanwhile, the monarchy's role in propagating the Church in the overseas colonies is unequivocally stated in the above stanza.

Like the proposition, the dedication in *Caramuru* recalls the one in *Os Lusíadas* to King Sebastian of Portugal. But while Durão begins and ends his poem with the Virgin Mary, Camões long addresses to King Sebastian serve as bookends to the poem. For Camões, the King of Portugal is more than a national monarch since he rules a vast overseas empire (Bowra 132). In *Os Lusíadas*, King Sebastian is the great defender of European Christendom:

> Vós, tenro e novo ramo florescente
> De uma árvore, de Cristo mais amada
> Que nenhuma nascida no ocidente,
> Cesárea ou Cristianíssima chamada. (Camões I, 7, 1-4)
> You, tender and green sapling
> Of that tree more precious to Christ
> Than any other Western lineage,
> Whether in French or Roman line (White 4)

He is also a menace to the Moorish barbarians, who see in him their inevitable defeat:

> Em vós os olhos tem o Mouro frio,
> Em quem vê seu excício afigurado;
> Só com vos ver, o bárbaro Gentio
> Mostra o pescoço ao jugo já inclinado. (Camões I, 16, 1-4)
> On you the fearful Moor has his eyes

Fixed, knowing his fate prefigured;

At a glimpse of you, the unbroken

Indian offers his neck to the yoke; (White 6)

Just as Camões persuades King Sebastian to take the savages and his empire by the reins, so Durão urges Prince José to propagate the Church in Brazil and thereby expand the Portuguese empire to the West. The dedications in both *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru* alert the reader that both these poems will concern the overseas imperialist enterprises of the Portuguese in their expansion of Christendom.

Following the proposition, the invocation, and after the dedication comes the narrative, which begins in stanza nine of *Caramuru*. Durão describes the storm that caused the shipwreck of Diogo's ship and the first encounter of the Tupinambá and the Portuguese crew on the beach. The Tupinambá then make preparations for their alleged anthropophagous ritual in which they will consume the shipwrecked Portuguese sailors. In the meantime, Fernando (one of the captives) tells the tale of the prophetic statue on the Ilha do Corvo in the Azores, which foretells the Western direction of expansion that the Portuguese would come to take. Unlike the Portuguese journey east to India, the statue is pointing west, in the direction of Brazil. This reiterates what Durão wrote in his prologue: "Os sucessos do Brasil não mereciam menos um poema que os da Índia" 'the achievements of Brazil did not deserve less of a poem than those of India" (5). After the story of the prophetic statue, enemy tribes mount a chance attack on the Tupinambá. The attack inadvertently saves the Portuguese crew from being consumed in a cannibalistic ritual.

In Canto Two, Diogo takes advantage of the chaos and sneaks away in order to get his armor and musket. His suit of armor terrifies the Tupinambá. They are even more terrified when he shoots and kills a bird in mid-flight. With this act the Tupinambá give him the name *Filho do Trovão*, or Son of Thunder, in reference to the loud noise made by his weapon. At the end of Canto Two, Diogo meets Paraguaçu, who is supposed to marry Gupeva, a fellow Tupinambá. Both Cantos Two and Three relate Diogo's project to catechize the Amerindians. The evangelization of the Amerindians is the main argument of the first half of poem; and particularly in the last Canto, the poet praises the Jesuits for all their hard work. This has little to do with classical notions of imitation; however, if one substitutes the ancient Roman Empire of the *Aeneid* for the Holy Roman Empire of the Catholic Church in the Americas circa 1500, a parallel begins to arise.

In Canto Three, Paraguaçu—who had purportedly learned Portuguese from a previously shipwrecked sailor—translates the conversation between Gupeva and Diogo. In reality, most Jesuits learned the Tupi language in order to facilitate the evangelization of the Amerindians in Brazil. Durão's epic poem gives the impression that everyone spoke Portuguese; however, since he is writing about events almost 300 years after they had occurred, it seems that Portuguese is the lingua franca already in 1510. Like many other aspects of this epic poem, this requires a suspension of disbelief. In order to read the poem, we have to accept that all these Tupinambás and the Caetés speak perfect eighteenth-century Portuguese. But whether it is in the language of the Tupi or the Portuguese, the Amerindians are evangelized. By the end of Canto Three, Diogo has converted both Paraguaçu and Gupeva to Christianity.

Cantos Four and Five relate a war among the rival tribes in the bay area of Bahia. It recalls the war waged by the third Governor-General of Brazil, Mem de Sá, who ruled the new Portuguese colony in Bahia from 1553 to 1557. In Canto Four, the chief of the Caetés tribe, called Jararaca, declares war against the Tupinambá. Jararaca is furious because Paraguaçu's father has denied him his daughter's hand in marriage and has instead given her to Gupeva to marry. Jararaca makes alliances with other neighboring tribes and warns them that if they bow down to these foreigners as Gupeva has, they will lose their land and be enslaved by them. In Canto Five, Diogo kills Jararaca by shooting him in the head with his rifle. Ten messengers from the tribes in the backland arrive declaring the "Son of Thunder" a Prince; and they subject themselves and their tribes to the mysteriously powerful foreigner. One Amerindian called Bambu refuses to submit, preferring to die a slow and painful death before acquiescing to the enemy. These scenes will be examined further in Chapter Four.

In Canto Six, several indigenous leaders offer Diogo their daughters in an effort to form an alliance with the Son of Thunder. Diogo chooses Paraguaçu. Unlike the other indigenous women, Paraguaçu had fought bravely against the Caetés. She had also been catechized and was presumably as a result more submissive: "Amava nela o peito valeroso / E o gênio dócil, com que à fé consente" 'He loved her brave heart / and her gentle disposition, which faith concedes' (Durão VI, 6.5-6). These renditions of a religious and submissive Paraguaçu are questioned further in Chapter Five. A French ship and crew take Diogo and Paraguaçu to Europe with them. Several rival indigenous women swim out to sea after Diogo, who is sailing away on the ship. The most beautiful

of these is Moema, who miserably begs Diogo to strike her down with his magic thunder and then drowns. Moema recalls the tragic figure of Dido in the *Aeneid*. In the remainder of the Canto, Diogo tells the captain of the ship about the Portuguese discovery of Brazil, describing in detail the landscape of the newly "discovered" continent.

Canto Seven takes place in France, which is where Paraguaçu is baptized and takes the name of her godmother, Catarina de Médicis, wife of Henry II. Diogo describes the flora and fauna of Brazil to the King of France. Cantos Eight and Nine take place on the voyage back to Bahia. Catarina-Paraguaçu tells of the future of Brazil in an ecstatic vision of the French and Dutch invasions of Brazil. In Canto Ten, Catarina-Paraguaçu experiences a supernatural apparition of the Virgin Mary, who asks her to establish the first church in Bahia. The Portuguese-Tupinambá couple then transfers their hegemony over the land and people of Bahia to D. João III, who is represented in Brazil by the first governor, Tomé de Sousa. Thus ends the narrative of *Caramuru*.

CARAMURU AND THE EPIC TRADITION

Beginning with Dante, Virgil was the model par excellence of the Renaissance. In *Capítulos de Literatura Colonial* (1991), Sergio Buarque de Holanda writes:

> O próprio modelo da *Eneida*, que Santa Rita Durão tentou seguir até certo ponto na trama de seu poema, tanto quanto seguira, na forma, *Os Lusíadas*, não era muito menos vivo e actual no século XVIII do que o fora para os épicos quinhentistas. Entre os autores mais reputados da época, o favor de que continuavam a desfrutar os motivos virgilianos só

> tinha paralelo no culto universal aos preceitos e aos exemplos de Horacio. 111
>
> The very model of the *Aeneid*, which Santa Rita Durão tried to follow to a certain point in the plot of his poem—just as he followed, in the form, Os Lusíadas—was not less alive and current in the eighteenth-century than he was for the epics of the fifteenth-century. Among the most reputable authors of the era, the privileges that the Virgilian motifs continued to enjoy were only parallel to the universal cult of the precepts and concepts of Horace. (my translation)

Sergio Buarque de Holanda is the first critic I have found who notes these Virgilian roots of *Caramuru*. Meanwhile, other critics have continued focusing on the comparison with *Os Lusíadas* because, as Eneida Leal Cunha asserts in *Estampas do Imaginário* (2006), Durão expanded Camões's epic to give continuity to the elegy of the expansionist adventure of the Portuguese faith and empire (15). In a 2003 article "A retórica do sublime no *Caramuru*," Luciana Gama focused on the rhetorical use of the sublime in Durão's epic poem. And previously, the influence of *Os Lusíadas* had been thoroughly examined in Carlos de Assis Pereira's *Fontes do Caramuru de Santa Rita Durão* (1971). Yet traditionally, the poem's fundamental literary value has been based on what nineteenth-century critics would refer to as the beginnings of an alleged Brazilian nationalist sentiment, attributed to Durão and other poets of the pre-Romantic era.

As part of the objective to move the focus away from the nationalist reading, I would like to follow the lead of Sergio Buarque de Holanda and Carlos de Assis Pereira

by comparing *Caramuru* to other epics. These comparisons seek to remove *Caramuru* from the paradigm of Romantic criticism and place it in a tradition of epics that extend beyond *Os Lusíadas*. The following brief overview intends to set the stage for a reading that places *Caramuru* in dialogue with other epics, a reading that focuses more on its genre as an epic poem than on any real or imagined notion of nascent Brazilian nationalism. Furthermore, this comparison intends to set the stage for Chapter One, which focuses on the form of Durão's epic poem.

Primary epics, like the Homeric epics or the *Cantar de Mio Cid*, began as oral traditions and then were only later transcribed and written down. *Caramuru* is a secondary or literary epic, like the *Aeneid* or *Os Lusíadas*, epics originally composed in written form. Structurally, *Caramuru* is divided into ten Cantos, with a total of 834 stanzas in *ottava rima* and 6,672 verses in decasyllable. As mentioned above, critics have repeatedly noted that Durão's epic was modeled on *Os Lusíadas* and the structure, specifically, the 10 Cantos and *ottava rima*, does in fact recall the earlier Portuguese epic. Like many other epics of the renaissance, *Os Lusíadas* was itself modeled on Virgil's *Aeneid*, which, as is commonly known, sought to imitate the Homeric epics. While Luís de Camões remained, in a sense, truer to the Hellenic tradition by incorporating the gods of ancient Greece into his epic, Santa Rita Durão ignores these Hellenistic divinities entirely. Nevertheless, *Os Lusíadas* is a Christian epic, with the rivalry of the ancient gods as mere decoration, or more precisely, imitation of Homeric epics. Meanwhile, the divinities in *Caramuru* are entirely Judeo-Christian.

Since *Caramuru* could be categorized as being more Judeo-Christian than Greco-Roman, we might trace its origins back to the ancient Mesopotamian epics, namely *Inanna* and *Gilgamesh*.[4] These texts of Sumerian and Babylonian origin, which date from the second millennium BCE, share with other Western epics "a masculine perspective on leadership" (Gower 319). Early comparative studies between the Bible and Mesopotamian sources have found many common themes and motifs. Alexander Heidel's study of the historical relationship of Hebrew and Mesopotamian ideas is examined in both *The Babylonian Genesis* (1942) and *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels* (1946). Although Heidel seems to find more differences than similarities, the common stories point to the indebtedness of the Bible to these earlier Near Eastern civilizations. While Heidel seems preoccupied with rescuing the Bible from its pagan sources and emphasizing the differences, the parallels nevertheless highlight different approaches to what we can consider an ancient Semitic worldview. A more recent study which focuses on Hellenic roots in Mesopotamia is *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (1997) by Martin L. West, who writes: "Near Eastern influence [on early Greek culture] cannot be put down as a marginal phenomenon to be invoked occasionally in explanation of isolated peculiarities; it was pervasive at many levels and at most times" (59). Thus, both the Judeo-Christian and the Greco-Roman aspects of *Caramuru* may be traced back to Mesopotamia.

[4] These epics were unearthed in the nineteenth-century in the ruins of cuneiform tablets in city of Nippur, now in southeastern Iraq (Gower 301).

It is beyond the scope of this introduction to focus on literature that came before Virgil's *Aeneid*, an epic in which the Homeric scheme of masculine leadership culminates in the founding of the Roman Empire. Homer's are *primary* epics, composed orally first, then transcribed; while the *Aeneid* is the first great *literary* (or composed from the beginning in written form) epic of Western Civilization. The *Aeneid* is a deliberate attempt by Virgil, at the request of the Emperor Augustus, to glorify Rome by celebrating the mythical Trojan origin of its people and, particularly, the achievements and ideals of Rome under the first emperor. Of all the epics of antiquity, *Caramuru* most closely resembles the *Aeneid*, particularly the narrative. The heroes Diogo and Aeneas sail away from their original homelands, Portugal and Troy respectively, in order to establish new cities, Salvador and Rome, and both epic heroes do so by intermarrying with a native woman (Paraguaçu, Lavinia). One notable difference between the heroes of these two epics is that Aeneas is, like Jesus, both divine and human. Aeneas' mother is the goddess Venus and his father is the mortal Anchises. The goddess Venus reappears in *Os Lusíadas*, as protectress of the Portuguese. In *Caramuru*, Diogo also gets divine help in his voyage to the New World; however, the poet transforms Venus into the Virgin Mary. The mother of Jesus plays an important role in *Caramuru* by making an appearance and requesting to establish her Church in Bahia. This comparison between the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru* will be further explored in Chapter One.

The ties between ancient Rome and its province of Lusitania in Roman Hispania temporarily fell away with the decline of the Empire. In AD 312, the Roman emperor Constantine had a vision of Christ and converted to Christianity. Thus began a lengthy

transition in the religion of the former Roman Empire, meticulously described in Richard Fletcher's *The Barbarian Conversion: From Paganism to Christianity* (1977). In the Iberian Peninsula another transition would soon follow when the Umayyad invaded in 711 C.E. The arrival in Iberia of Tariq ibn Ziyad and his recent North African converts to Islam would mark an opening of what would be a very long parenthesis in Roman/Christian Iberia. The rule of Islam in Iberia culminated in the Caliphate of Cordoba, which lasted from 929 to 1031. The fall of the Caliphate led to a rapid decline of Islamic rule in Iberia and a resurgence of Christian autonomy. Portugal was born in 1129; and soon after, the Portuguese would expel the Moorish rulers by 1249. In Spain, Ferdinand and Isabel brought a final close to this Islamic parenthesis when Christian armies finally conquered the last Moorish kingdom of Granada in 1492.

The epic poem *Cantar de mío Cid* (c. 1140) immortalizes this historical transition of Islamic to Christian dominance in Iberia. The *Cid* is not a literary, but a primary epic that tells the story of Rodrigo Diaz de Vivar, or the Cid. It marks the beginnings of the Romance epic in Iberia. The Cid is a hero who, like the Portuguese Diogo Álvares Correia, is also loosely based on an historical figure. Although *Caramuru* was written several hundreds of years after the *Cid*, a significant parallel between the two texts is that both heroes take their name from the foreign language of the *other*: Caramuru and the Cid are both Christian heroes who are known by both their name in Romance (Rodrigo and Diogo) and by their name in Arabic and Tupi respectively. The Cid signifies Lord or Master in Arabic. Caramuru was the Tupi name given to Diogo Álvares meaning "dragão que sai do mar" or 'sea dragon' (Rocha Pita 40). The incorporation of the language of the

constitutive other, namely the non-Christian adversary, signifies that the hero is as well known by his friends as he is by his enemies.

The role of the *other* as being non-Christian is significant in both *Caramuru* and the *Cid* because it points to the religious fanaticism present in both of these epic poems. In Durão's epic, Diogo or Caramuru is called "Filho do Trovão" or 'The Son of Thunder,' which evokes the Christian's Reconquista of Iberia. There is a Biblical passage in which Jesus gives the apostles James and John the name of "Men of Thunder" (Today's English Version, Mark 3.17). It was a reference to their fiery character, which was illustrated when they called upon the destruction of a Samaritan village that refused to allow them passage on their way to Jerusalem (Luke 9.51-56). In the time of the Reconquista, before they went into battle, Christians would call on Saint James (Santiago Matamoros), while the Muslims would evoke their prophet. The apostles James and John were thus the prototypes for the Iberian Christian epic heroes like Rodrigo Diaz de Vivar and Diogo Álvares Correia who were archetypical "Men of Thunder." Both poems can also be read as Reconquista literature, since the momentum gained from the Iberian Reconquista was carried over to the Western Hemisphere. Thus, we see the continuance of the Iberian Crusaders into the New World.

Like Spain, the Portuguese also had to take back their lands from the Muslim invaders; however, in Portugal this was completed earlier, between the Battle of Ourique in 1139 and the liberation of Algarve in 1249. Needless to say, the Iberian roots of *Caramuru* are most often not associated with the *Cantar de mío Cid* but with the Portuguese national epic, *Os Lusíadas*. Camões composed his epic with the political

motive of legitimating Portuguese history and its expanding empire, from its linguistic origins in the Middle Ages to its mercantilist development during the Renaissance. *Os Lusíadas* commemorates Vasco da Gama's discovery of a sea route to India, whose historical voyage dates from 1497 to 1499. By narrative and through prophesy, Camões relates the history of the Portuguese Empire, "and in doing so creates a 'nationalist' epic in which the poet sees the Portuguese waging a holy war against paganism" (Cuddon 289). While Camões poem praises the Portuguese Reconquista to the east, Durão's poem remembers the Spiritual Conquest in the west. This holy war is the topic of Chapter Three.

Caramuru is likewise a story of the continued imperial expansion of Portugal. The points of convergence between *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru* go beyond the characteristics of form, which were methodically outlined by Carlos de Assis Pereira in *Fontes do Caramuru* (1971). As Eneida Leal Cunha has pointed out, the overlap in the two poems includes the greater narrative of Portuguese overseas expansion and imperialism. In the first line of the introduction to *Caramuru*, Durão acknowledges this by stating that the accomplishments of Brazil did not deserve less of a poem than those of India. Of course, by "those of India" Durão was referring to *Os Lusíadas*. In this sense, *Caramuru* continues in the spirit of Portuguese maritime exploration that dominates the plot of *Os Lusíadas*. Again, Camões accounts of Portuguese secular ventures in the East are completed by Durão's narrative of Portuguese colonization in the West. It is in this non-ambiguous sense of the greater Portuguese Empire, of their conquest and

colonization of Brazil, that one could interpret *Caramuru* as the New World sequel to the Old World Portuguese epic, *Os Lusíadas*.

As noted above, the classical epics like the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the particularly the *Aeneid* all influenced a plethora of neoclassical epics, such as *Os Lusíadas*, during the Renaissance. Among these is another Iberian epic and contemporary of *Os Lusíadas*, the epic poem referred to at the beginning of this introduction as the *Aeneid* of Chile. Alonso de Ercilla's poem of the Spanish conquest of the Mapuche was partly inspired by his travels with the Spanish Army to what is today Chile, which happened only a few years before he began to write *La Araucana*. However, as James Nicolopulos has argued in *The Poetics of Empire of the Indies* (2000), there is also a marked rivalry between the Spanish and Portuguese empires in the subtext of the poem. While Camões and Ercilla wrote poems commemorating contemporary events, Santa Rita Durão wrote his poem over 300 years after the fact, basing his story on reports of Portuguese explorers documented in the written histories of Brazil. Yet, Ercilla's poem is closer to Durão's, not in time, but in the similar theme of a New World epic that narrates the conquest of South America.

Although *Caramuru* was written two hundred years after *La Araucana*, the two epics share the same subject matter of Iberian exploits in the New World and the Amerindians who resisted. In "No espírito da épica: Formações e variações discursivas na América Hispânica e Portuguesa" Leopoldo Bernucci notes that Ercilla's familiarity with the debate between Bartolomé de las Casas and Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda would sensitize Ercilla to the rights of the indigenous natives (167). Two hundred years after Ercilla's epic, the ideological conflict of the sixteenth-century had waned because the

conquest of the New World had mostly been completed and the colonies had begun to repopulate themselves with the descendants of both the colonizers and the surviving colonized inhabitants. It is at this time of repopulation that Durão's poem is written, and thus narrates the demise of some tribes of Amerindians, while others intermarried with the colonizers and endured. Although the poets were writing in different centuries, both *La Araucana* and *Caramuru* recall the first instances of Iberian contact with the native inhabitants of South America.

In *The Epic of America: An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the* Rusticatio Mexicana (2006), Andrew Laird notes that it was Virgil who provided the fundamental model and enduring inspiration for Latin poetry in colonial Mexico (15). The *Rusticatio Mexicana* (1782) is a catalogue in Latin of the plants and wildlife of what is today Mexico and Guatemala, and is another example of imitation since it recalls Virgil's *Georgics*. Laird notes that the beginning of the eighteenth-century marked a "transition in literary taste and practice from Baroque Mannerism to Neoclassicism, as artificiality of style, allusiveness, and difficult conceits were supplanted by less ornate and more fluid forms of expression" (20). Laird cites the Latin epic narrative *Guadalupe* by José Antonio de Villerías y Roelas (1695-1728) as another example of this style. Although it was not published in the author's lifetime, Laird believes that it may have had an influence on later heroic poets, including Landívar (21). Like the *Guadalupe* and the *Rusticatio Mexicana*, *Caramuru* is also concerned with the topic of the New World as dominion of the Virgin Mary and it also catalogues the flora and fauna of the Western Hemisphere.

O Uraguay (1769) written by José Basílio da Gama and published only twelve years before *Caramuru*, is generally considered the contending narrative poem to Durão's epic. Both epics take place in Brazil but were published in Lisbon. As transcontinental colonial subjects, Basílio da Gama (MG, 1741 - Lisbon, 1795) and Santa Rita Durão (MG, 1722 – Lisbon 1784) were both born in Portuguese America, but they spent most of their lives and received higher education in the metropolis. Both entered religious orders; but while Durão did become an Augustinian monk, Basílio da Gama never took the vows to become a Jesuit. In spite of their common *mineiro* origins and almost parallel lives, these two epic poems that are closest to each other in time are structurally quite different from one another. Both epic poems reflect the eighteenth-century politics and poetics of their time; however, Basílio da Gama embraced the secular ideals of the Portuguese Enlightenment, while Durão was a defender of the Church and pre-Pombal order.

Basílio da Gama portrays the Portuguese Crown as saving the Amerindians from the power-hungry Jesuits and winning for them equal rights as Portuguese subjects under the enlightened despotism of the Marquês de Pombal (1699-1782). The Marquês de Pombal did in fact abolish Amerindian slavery in Brazil. He also expelled the Jesuits from Portugal and its territories in 1759. While Basílio da Gama wrote a poem praising the Marquês de Pombal and denigrating the Jesuits, Santa Rita Durão praised the Jesuit missionary effort. Both poets appear to have been equally bound and loyal to the Portuguese Crown, so it is difficult to interpret either poem as seeking Brazilian independence from Portugal. In both poems the Portuguese are paternalistically portrayed

as saving the Amerindians, although in Durão's poem it is not from the evil Jesuits, but from other Amerindian cannibalistic tribes such as the Caetés.

La Araucana, *O Uraguay*, and *Caramuru* all generally represent their respective Iberian Crowns against the Amerindians by the dictates of imitation. While none of these poets actually defended both sides, they all adopted a Virgilian stance to the opposition by portraying the Amerindians as worthy adversaries, an epic convention. Indeed, the Amerindians in all three of these epics would, like Virgil's Turnus, put up a noble fight for their lands. However, since gunpowder would inevitably win out over bows and arrows, the epic poems all end with the Iberian Empires overtaking the Amerindians.

CHAPTER ONE

A Virgilian Epic: Imitation in *Caramuru* (1781)

Italians and Trojans, Tupinambá and Portuguese, these are the dramatis personae in the two epics, the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru*, which this chapter intends to compare. The following quote from the last Book of the *Aeneid* wishes for an eternal pact between the two nations, Italians and Trojans. The key player here is Turnus, for all the fate of the future of Rome rests on whether or not Aeneas will be able to defeat him:

> cesserit Ausonio si fors uictoria Turno,
> conuenit Euandri uictos discedere ad urbem;
> cedet Iulus agris, nec post arma ulla rebelles
> Aeneadae referent ferroue haec regna lacessent.
> sin nostrum adnuerit nobis Victoria Martem
> (ut potius reor, et potius di numine firment),
> non ego nec Teucris Italos parere iubebo
> nec mihi regna peto: paribus se legibus ambae
> inuictaregentes aeterna in foedera mittant. (Virgil 12.183-191)
> If Turnus the Italian wins, we losers
> Must migrate to the city of Evander.
> Iulus will cede this land, Aeneas' people
> Won't bring another war against this city.
> If in this combat victory sides with me

(I think it will; may the gods' power confirm this),

I will not make the Trojans overlords

Or claim the throne. With neither race the loser,

We'll form a lasting bond, on equal terms. (trans. Sarah Ruden)

Santa Rita Durão's epic poem recalls a similar pact between the Portuguese and the Tupinambá Amerindians. The defeat of the epic hero's rival (Turnus, Jararaca) signals the victory for the future of a new homeland (Rome, Brazil). Subsequently, the bond between the two nations is sealed by the intermarriage of the native woman (Lavinia, Paraguaçu) to the foreigner (Aeneas, Diogo). This particular story of intermarriage is not an invention of Santa Rita Durão. It was a common occurrence throughout the Americas, where European explorers often took Amerindian women as wives or concubines, albeit often by force. Thus the Iberian project of *mestizaje* or mixing of the races is also present in the poem, as opposed to the anglo model of keeping the colonists separate from native peoples. The Iberian model was the one sanctioned by Pope with the Leyes Nuevas of 1541. The specific story of Paraguaçu and Diogo is but one of these many cases of mestizaje, and were well documented in histories of Colonial Brazil such as the one written by Sebastião da Rocha Pita in *História da América Portuguesa* (1930). Therefore, the story of Paraguaçu and Diogo is not an original creation in the mind of the poet in the same sense that Lavinia and Aeneas were for Virgil. But the merging of two cultures is something both poets sought to represent in their epics. Durão takes the basic story of Paraguaçu and Diogo and creates a similar plot structure to the *Aeneid*, Jararaca being the key invention necessary in order to imitate the significant role played by Turnus. It is my

belief that Santa Rita Durão sought to construct his narrative by deliberately imitating the characters found in Virgil's *Aeneid*. After a brief overview of the concept of imitation, this chapter will compare these epics in further detail.

Like *Caramuru*, Luis de Camões' *Os Lusíadas*, was also modeled on the *Aeneid*. In Carlos de Assis Pereira's *Fontes do Caramuru de Santa Rita Durão* (1971), the author draws a comparative study of these two Portuguese-language epics. Besides this genre of Virgilian-style epics written in Portuguese language, the two share very similar forms. Pereira meticulously traces the structural authority which the Portuguese national epic had on *Caramuru*. He cites the use of decasyllable (a line verse of ten syllables) as a key point of comparison between them (59). Furthermore, Pereira notes that both are written in *ottava rima*, an eight-line iambic stanza rhyming ABABABCC a style that was both well-known and widespread throughout renaissance Europe (67). In the fourteenth-century, Boccaccio helped to establish ottava rima as the main form for Italian narrative verse. In the fifteenth-century Matteo Maria Boiardo was the first to use it in an epic poem, *Orlando Innamorato* (1486). In the sixteenth-century, Ariosto used it for *Orlando Furioso* (1516) and Tasso for *Gerusalemme Liberata* (1575). Iberian poets, including both Camões and Ercilla, followed their example, while Sir Thomas Wyatt introduced the form into English verse (Cuddon 667). Pereira documents both the use of decasyllable and ottava rima in *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru*, finding many similarities in rhymes and several parallel verses.

Besides the use of decasyllable and ottava rima, Carlos de Assis Pereira notes the connection between the general form and structure of the two poems (73-75). Pereira

cites numerous examples of verses in *Caramuru* that echo *Os Lusíadas*. In reference to the Portuguese explorers, we find the following similar verses:

1) "Que os mares discorrendo Ocidentais" 'who spilling from the seas of the west' (Camões VIII, 53.6; trans. White) "Que as praias discorrendo do Ocidente" 'who, spilling from the beaches of the west' (Durão I, 1, 2).
2) "Por mares nunca de antes navegados / Passaram, ainda além da Taprobana" 'by oceans where none had ventured / voyaged to Taprobana and beyond' (Camões I, 1.3-4) "Se os mares nunca dantes navegados / Discorrestes por climas diferentes" 'if the oceans where none had ventured / traversed to different climates' (Durão III, 60, 1-2)
3) "As novas Ilhas vendo, e os novos ares" 'seeing the islands and latitudes' (Camões V, 4, 3) "Novas Ilhas buscando, e novos mares" 'searching for new islands and new seas' (Durão VI, 26, 1)

The following verses are in reference to the giant Adamastor (Camões) and Diogo and Paraguaçu (Durão) respectively:

4) "[…] mudo e quêdo / E junto de um penedo outro penedo." 'dumb and numb with shock / A rock on an escarpment, kissing rock!' (Camões V, 56, 7-8) "[...] mudo e quêdo / Qual junto de um penedo outro penedo." 'mute and still / like two petrified rocks' (Durão II, 1, 7-8)

The above examples are only a small sample of what Pereira calls "coincidências formais" or formal coincidences (75). Pereira also compares several similar scenes in the two epics, such as Inês de Castro in *Os Lusíadas* with the scene of Moema in *Caramuru*.

The theme of lost love is reflected in these two scenes, particularly how they both go pale from lovesickness and in the way the nymphs mourn the deaths of Inês and Moema (Pereira 80). As we shall see below, these episodes of ill-fated loves both recall the tragic death of Virgil's Dido in the *Aeneid*.

Because of these similarities in style and form, comparisons between *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru* abound. More recent comparisons between the two epic poems allude to the content rather than the form (or structure) of the poem. The content of these two poems is of course the Portuguese Empire's overseas exploration and expansion of the late fifteenth and early sixteenth-centuries. While Luis de Camões celebrates Vasco da Gama's legendary voyage to India, Santa Rita Durão commemorates the Portuguese settlement of Bahia, and by metonymy, of the Portuguese colony of Brazil. The content of the two poems resembles each other because they both address the historical events surrounding the Portuguese Empire during the age of overseas expansion. *Os Lusíadas* tells of an epic voyage to the Far East and takes events of the history of Portugal that already existed in the popular imagination, transforming them into a founding myth in narrative verse. Likewise, Durão invents a saga of the origins of Portuguese America in the Western hemisphere. Both *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru* weave into their stories the history of Portugal and Brazil respectively.

Thus, most Lusophone readers of *Caramuru* have heard more echoes of *Os Lusíadas* than of Virgil's *Aeneid*; and those who use Camões' epic as a "consecrated subtext" of *Caramuru* will therefore recall former ties to the Portuguese Empire. In order to try to sever the ties to Portugal, some postcolonial criticism of *Caramuru* has

interpreted the indigenous scenes as a sort of nascent nationalism, as we shall see in Chapter 2. Meanwhile, other critics have left this open to interpretation by allowing for an ambiguous reading (Candido 1965), or stressing the poems hybridity (Bosi 1970). Recently, in *Estampas do Imaginário* (2006), Eneida Leal Cunha begins her study on *Caramuru* by citing the often-quoted preface of the poem, where the poet himself makes reference to Camões' Portuguese epic. Cunha argues that *Caramuru* "retoma a epopéia camoniana menos para corrigí-la que do que para expandí-la" 'retakes *Os Lusíadas* more to expand on it than to correct it' (15)[5]. Reading *Caramuru* as blatant celebration of Portuguese colonization and imperialism turns the above-mentioned "nascent nationalism paradigm" upside-down. Nevertheless, the late eighteenth-century fomented both independence and loyalist movements. More shall be said on this in the following chapter.

Before examining the content of the poem, I would like to first examine the form. This chapter concerns itself with imitation, building on Pereira's thorough study of the similar forms in *Caramuru* and *Os Lusíadas*. *Caramuru* reveals a distinct Virgilian model, particularly when one remembers the fact that *Os Lusíadas*, like so many Renaissance epics, was itself modeled on the *Aeneid*. Nevertheless, the ties between empire and epic are present in both Portuguese epics, and this topic is explored further in the last section of this chapter. With the incorporation of such episodes as Moema (recalling Dido) and Jararaca (reproducing Turnus) a clear case can be made for Durão's

[5] This is in reference to Carlos de Assis Pereira, who argues that Durão improved upon Camões poem, by not falling into the same traps and staying true to the prescriptions of Vernei's poetics in *O Verdadeiro Método de Estudar*.

faithful imitation of the *Aeneid*. By making Brazil the "Rome of the New World" the margins of the Portuguese empire are transferred to the center.

TOWARD A THEORY OF IMITATION

Before delving into a comparison of the narrative structures in *Caramuru* and the *Aeneid*, it would be useful to review the poetics of imitation. The idea that a writer should learn everything he could from the masters who were his predecessors prevailed during the medieval and renaissance periods and continued into the eighteenth-century (Cuddon 445). Needless to say, for many centuries, and especially during Santa Rita Durão's time, imitation had been regarded as a wholly respectable practice. It only fell out of favor when the poetics of romanticism began to consider it to be out of step with the new spirit of originality, spontaneity and self-expression (Preminger 575). Therefore, it is important to consider the theory of imitation from the context of the eighteenth-century, when *Caramuru* was written, and how Santa Rita Durão would have incorporated this theoretical framework into his poem.

In the article "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance," G.W. Pigman writes: "From Petrach's sonnets to Milton's epics a major characteristic of Renaissance literature is the imitation of earlier texts" (1). During the Renaissance, writings on the theory and practice of imitation were vast and perplexing; suffice it to say here that "the theories of imitation help structure one's expectations to the types of relations between text and model" (Pigman 1-2). Seneca and other classics such as Aristotle had been rediscovered during the Renaissance, and were subsequently re-adapted for literary production from

then until the eighteenth-century. This is evident from Camões' *Os Lusíadas*, which is undoubtedly influenced by Greek and Roman models. Likewise, *Caramuru* also followed the precepts of imitation, a last nod to the classics before romanticism overturned what had been the standard since the early Renaissance.

Practically all of the important doctrines and metaphors of imitation appear in Seneca's *Espitulae morales* 84" (Pigman 10). In this letter to his friend Lucilius, Seneca is commenting that one should neither write nor read exclusively, but do both. And it is in this context that he illustrates the apian metaphor: "We ought, as they tell us, to imitate the bees, which rove abroad levying contributions from every flower fit for making honey, and then arrange their gleanings, distribute them among the combs, and, as Virgil says, 'the honey, drop by drop, pack close, and with sweet nectar brim each cell'" (Seneca 2: 27-28). Pigman notes that in Seneca the apian and digestive metaphors reinforce one another and are loosely analogous, and states that the digestive metaphor is always used to support transformative imitation (7). One sentence from Petrarch very easily sums up the transformative application of the apian metaphor: "Take care that what you have gathered does not long remain in its original form inside of you: the bees would not be glorious if they did not convert what they found into something different and something better" (Pigman 7). Thus, the poetics of imitation, while waning but still evident in the eighteenth-century, must be taken into consideration when one embarks on a study of poetry of this time period.

James Nicolopulos argues that the practice of classical *imitatio* is vital to the elaboration of the dynamics of authority in the learned epic poem. He writes: "By

engaging in the deliberate imitation of prestigious models, the poet invokes their potency and seeks to infuse his own work with their power" (4). Following the advice of Petrarch, most imitating poets seek to surpass or supplant the imitated text with their own versions of archetypical heroes and settings, in addition to appropriating the authority of the model text (4). The thin line dividing the art of imitation from the practice of merely copying an already well-established model is a topic worth considering here. Nicolopulos points to the term *dissimulation*, which covers all the strategies of borrowing or stealing, and then trying to disguise the debt or theft. This particular strategy is suggested in Pigman's notion of dissimulative imitation (45). The practice of dissimulation aims to avoid the predicament of "following so closely or in such a servile fashion as to cast doubt on one's own ability" (Nicolopulos 46). Furthermore, dissimulation also seeks to cover its tracks, or as Nicolopulos so clearly points out:

> The seemingly contradictory goals of, on the one hand, milking all the power and prestige of a consecrated subtext, and on the other, of avoiding the appearance of parasitical vampirism, creates one of the central driving tensions of imitative practice. One of the major carriage springs through which this tension is absorbed in an imitative text is the idea of dissimulation that will only be penetrated by the learned. (46)

Thus, the difference between the analogy of the bee taking it's nourishment from flowers and "parasitical vampirism" is significant, since the line between imitation and plagiarism is often thin.

The theory of imitation can be traced back to Aristotle's *Poetics*, where it is known by its Greek name, mimesis. In chapter four of the *Poetics*, "On the Origins and Development of Poetry," the motives for imitation are described as innate:

> The creation of poetry generally is due to two causes, both rooted in human nature. The instinct for imitation is inherent in man from his earliest days; he differs from other animals that he is the most imitative of creatures, and he learns his earliest lessons by imitation. Also in all of us is the instinct to enjoy works of imitation. (35)

Two general points can be made from this excerpt: that both imitation and the appreciation of works of imitation are rooted in human nature. And even learned behavior is rooted in imitation. Aristotle continues by expanding on the idea that we derive pleasure from recognizing likenesses. Nicolopulos differentiates between mimesis and imitation, referring to Latin imitation as *secondary mimesis*, since it signifies "the imitation of models produced by art rather than nature" (43). In the case of epic poetry, the notion that the most convincing reproductions of life and nature are achieved by following models of prestigious predecessors is implicitly in Aristotle's singling out of Homer as paradigm of epic poet (Nicolopulos 43). In essence, one can derive a more pleasurable reading experience if one is able to identify the references to the epics of antiquity. Certainly, readers during the renaissance were more aware of these notions than contemporary readers. By identifying echoes of Virgil and Camões in *Caramuru*, readers may gain a greater overall appreciation for the poem.

As we have seen with the initial apian metaphor, Petrarch cited Seneca, while Seneca quoted Virgil. But Virgil himself also partook of the practice of imitation in order to write his epic poem of the origins of Rome. It is well-known that the *Aeneid* takes as its own model the Homeric epics. The *Aeneid* is divided into twelve Books: the first six are meant to reflect the *Odyssey*, while the following six emulate the *Iliad*. The first half of the *Aeneid* tells of the epic voyage from Troy to Latium, and the second part relates the war against Turnus for Lavinia's hand in marriage. In a similar fashion, Santa Rita Durão placed the war against Jararaca over Paraguaçu in the first half of the epic, and the voyage to the Old World in the second half. As mentioned earlier, the heroes of both epics (Aeneas, Diogo) defeat their respective opponents (Turnus, Jaraca), marry the heroine (Lavinia, Paraguaçu), and thus found a new people or race. Taken together, the Portuguese epics *Os Lusíadas* and *Caramuru* recall the ancient Homeric epics: Camões' tale of the epic voyage to India brings to mind the *Odyssey* while Durão's epic of war and conquest in the so-called New World evokes the *Iliad*. The fact that both these epic poems narrate major events of the Portuguese Empire in the sixteenth-century makes a strong case for more similarities than differences.

In Durão's own time, ideas about imitation were still in circulation, although romanticism was on the rise, particularly in France. Two key texts for understanding the theory of poetry in eighteenth-century Portugal are Francisco Leitão Ferreira's *Nova Arte de Conceitos* (1718, 1721) and Francisco José Freire's *Arte Poetica ou Regras da Verdadeira Poesia* (1748). The essence of Leitão Ferreira's poetics comes from Emanuele Tesauro's *Il Cannochiale Aristotelico* (1670), who modeled his own text on

Baltasar Gracián's *Agudeza y arte de ingenio* (1648). In the following passage from *Nova Arte de Conceitos*, Leitão Ferreira defines imitation as:

> Definimos a Imitação com Rodulfo Goclênio: expressão parecida ao exemplar, de modo que o imitador há de não só imitar o caráter comum, mas também o particular do objeto que imita. Chamo caráter comum à idéia e semelhança genérica do exemplar; e caráter particular, à idéia e semelhança de estilo do Autor ou Artífice imitado. Quero, v.c. [por exemplo], imitar a Lusíada de Camões; não só devo imitar este exemplar no caráter da Poesia épica, universal a todos os Poemas heróicos, mas também no caráter do estilo de Camões, particular à sua locução; e fazendo-me assim bom imitador, sairá semelhante o meu ao seu Poema. Donde se colhe que em cada exemplar há dois caracteres, duas semelhanças e duas imitações de que o imitador há de formar duas idéias, as quais deve unir, exprimir e copiar na sua obra para se dizer perfeita imitação. (152-153).
>
> We define imitation with Rodulfo Goclênio: expression resembling the model, in the manner that the imitator should not only imitate the basic characteristics, but also the particular of the object that he imitates. I call the basic characteristic the idea and generic resemblance of the model; and particular characteristic the idea and resemblance to the style of the author or object imitated. For example, one wishes to imitate Camões *Os Lusíadas*; I should just imitate this model in the characteristic of epic

> poetry, universal to all heroic poems, but also in the features particular to the style of Camões, specifically his language; and thus I will be a good imitator and my poem will resemble his. Where he gets that in each model there are two characteristics, two likenesses, and two imitations from which the imitator will form two ideas, which he should unite, express and copy in his own work in order to call it perfect imitation. (my translation)

In Santa Rita Durão's case, the poet makes explicit reference to Camões in the preface of his work. However, the models he used to make his own epic did not end or begin with *Os Lusíadas*. As we shall see in the next section, there is plenty of evidence that certain narrative structures of his epic were based on Virgil's *Aeneid*.

Leitão Ferreira praises Luis de Camões, and says that he has exceeded Virgil in his use of imitation: "imitou a Virgilio com tal felicidad, que não so emparelhou com elle no espirito, mas excedeu-o no pensamento e aos outros [Tasso, etc.] na imitacão" 'he imitated Virgil with such success, that not only did he match him in spirit, but he exceeded him in thought and the others [Tasso, etc.] in imitation' (166-167). The standards set in Leitão Ferreira's *Nova Arte de Conceitos* praise Camões' fictional account of a historical event: of the epic voyage of the Portuguese. While Virgil's Trojan journey was entirely fictional, Camões based his epic on historical accounts of the voyage to India, such as *Diário de Navegação* by Álvaro Velho and the *Crônicas* by Fernão Lopes Castanheda. Thus, Leitão Ferreira says that Camões "desmostrou a verdade na imitacão" 'demonstrated the truth in his imitation' (166). By these same standards, one could argue that Santa Rita Durão was also a faithful imitator. The account of the

Portuguese explorer Diogo Álvares was, like Vasco da Gama's voyage, taken from history books. But Durão's imitation did not end with the retelling of history in verse, since he went beyond, creating entirely fictional characters like Moema and Jararaca who would recall Dido and Turnus. While other historical poems like *La Araucana* or *Os Lusíadas* reflected the tales of conquest and exploration, *Caramuru* came closer to the spirit of the *Aeneid*, bringing together two different peoples and reconciling them as one by means of marriage.

Other important aspects of imitation taken from Leitão Ferreira are the different notions of imitation at this time. As noted above, before the nineteenth-century there was little regard for originality of expression. In *Nova Arte de Conceitos*, Leitão Ferreira states: "mostraremos como sem incorrer no afrontoso titulo de ladrão, se pode merecer o glorioso character de imitador" 'we shall show how without incurring the insulting title of thief, one can merit the glorious character of imitator' (169). The distinction between thief and imitator is then explained in greater detail, and Leitão Ferreira writes that stealing from other's *oeuvre* is when someone takes all or part of another's, taking credit for it, only for the sake of self-promotion or fame that these works will bring (169). Another aspect of imitation that arises in *Nova Arte de Conceitos* is the above mentioned apian metaphor. Lesson Eight of Leitão Ferreira's poetics begins with a colorful description of the bee as symbol of the imitator, and then proposes some rules in order that the imitation will not appear to be theft (177-179). The poet, like a bee, visits many different flowers or works of art, taking from many sources in order to make his own creation. It is still an apt metaphor for how to model one's work on another in a way that

it is not considered stealing. This principle of imitation thus extends not only to poets but also to theorists, since the references to Seneca abound in the Renaissance poetics.

Although at this time there were different notions of intellectual property, still there was a conscious effort to distinguish between free and servile imitation. As Leitão Ferreira expressed in Lesson seven of *Nova Arte de Conceitos*: "chamo imitação livre, àquella em que o imitador independente de outro exemplar, imita a sua mesma idea, como invento propio" 'I call free imitation that one in which the imitator independently of the original, imitates the same idea as his own invention' (154). As an example of free imitation, Leitão Ferreira cites Homer. On the other hand, there is servile imitation:

> "Chamo porém imitação servil àquella em que o imitador dependente do exemplar aleyo, o vay fielmente seguindo, e copiando, sem já mais se apartar de suas linhas, nem desmentir hum passo de suas cores, como faz o aprendiz que copeia a pintura de seu mestre." (155)
>
> Conversely, I call servile imitation that one in which the imitator depends on the other's model, and copies it faithfully, without straying from the original, or changing the colors, as the apprentice copies the painting of his master. (my translation)

As an example of servile imitation, Leitão Ferreira cites Vasco Mousinho de Quevedo's *Afonso Africano: poema heroico da presa de Arzila e Tânger* (1611), who imitated the scene of Camões' giant called Adamastor. Leitão Ferreira writes that servile imitators are slaves to the original models, and describes three degrees of servile imitation. Nevertheless, the author affirms that imitation is both necessary and useful.

Another work on poetics is Francisco José Freire's *Arte Poetica ou Regras da Verdadeira Poesia* (1748), important not only because Santa Rita Durão probably also read it, but because it gives us an explicit definition of imitation and epic poetry in the eighteenth-century. Like Leitão Ferreira, Freire begins his poetics with notes on imitation. He compares it with painting, the imitation of an actual thing, or action, that the painter produces. While the painter uses his body's eyes to imitate the model, the poet uses his soul's eyes in order to reproduce the original (Freire 31). After these notes on imitation in Book I, which include the universal and the particular, the author discusses tragedy in Book II, and finally an analysis of epic poetry in Book III. Freire defines the epic as follows:

> A epopéia é a imitação de uma ação heróica, perfeita e de justa grandeza, feita em verso heróico por modo misto, de maneira que causa uma singular admiração e prazer e, ao mesmo tempo, excite os ânimos a amar as virtudes e as grandes empresas. (165)
>
> The epic is an imitation of a heroic action, perfect and of precise greatness, composed in heroic verse, in a mixed mode, in a manner that arouses a singular admiration and pleasure and, at the same time, inspires souls to love virtues and great endeavors. (my translation)

This imitation of a heroic action can be seen in Vasco da Gama's epic voyage to India and in Diogo Álvares Correia bringing Portuguese civilization to South America and establishing an alliance with the local Tupinambá tribe. As stated above, the models for these epics in Portuguese language were Homer and Virgil.

Lastly, and in order to give some definitive form to the theory of imitation and apply it here to the two texts in question, it would be relevant to briefly highlight Giorgio Pasquali's notion of "*arte allusiva*" translated into English by Charles Segal as "allusive artistry" or "art of allusion" (Conte 24). Conte specifies the practice of this art of allusion in Pasquali's famous article on *arte allusiva*, "Pagine stravaganti:"

> In reading cultured, learned poetry, I look for what I have for years stopped calling reminiscences, and now call allusions, and would call evocations, and in some cases quotations. The poet may not be aware of the reminiscences, and he may hope that his imitations escape his public's notice; but allusions do not produce the desired effect if the reader does not clearly remember the text to which they refer. (Trans. Charles Segal 24-25)

Although Conte highlights Pasquali's practice in order to differentiate his own, it is in this philological paradigm that the two texts will be examined here.[6] Yet, as we have seen above, it is necessary to acknowledge the fact that poets who practiced imitation were drawing on an already existing tradition. I would agree with Pasquali that a reader's appreciation for a poem can be deepened if the allusions to earlier poems are highlighted, even if this means a somewhat tedious comparison of parallel texts and similar plot structures. In the case of *Caramuru*, the study of the allusions to *Os Lusíadas* was adequately covered in Carlos de Assis Pereira's *Fontes do Caramuru de Santa Rita*

[6] It should be noted that Pasquali's *arte allusiva* was highly criticized: "to the detriment of philological studies, Benedetto Croce argued that Pasquali's juxtapositions of parallel passages and loci similes signaled 'death to poetry'" (Conte 24).

Durão. In the same line of Pereira's study, the following section highlights various evocations of Virgil's *Aeneid*. This practice of revealing the sources which the poets sought to emulate can only partially broaden a reader's understanding and appreciation of the text or poem. A comprehensive reading of a text should not be limited to the mere study of allusions and imitation. Once the form of the poem is established in imitation, one can move on to other types of readings, contemporary or historiagraphic.

THE *AENEID* AND *CARAMURU*

With Pasquali's notion of *arte allusiva* in mind, this section will compare passages in *Caramuru* that recall similar ones in the *Aeneid*. The opening lines, or proposition, of Virgil's *Aeneid* echo the Homeric epics, referring to a man, an exile, and wars:

> Arma uirumque cano, Troiae qui primus ab oris
> Italiam fato profugus Lauiniaque uenit
> litora, multum ille et terris iactatus et alto
> ui superum, saeuae memorem Iunonis ob iram,
> multa quoque et bello passus, dum conderet urbem
> inferretque deos Latio; genus unde Latinum
> Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae. (Virgil 1.1-7)
> Arms and a man I sing, the first from Troy,
> A fated exile to Lavinian shores
> In Italy. On land and sea, divine will—

And Juno's unforgetting rage—harassed him.

War racked him too, until he set his city

And gods in Latium. There his Latin race rose,

With Alban patriarchs, and Rome's high walls. (Ruden 1)

In *From Virgil to Milton* (1965), C. M Bowra notes that although Virgil recalls Homer by opening his poem with "Arms and a man I sing," there is a significant difference in the notion of heroic virtue and human nature. Homer focuses on individual characters and their destinies since Achilles fights mostly for himself. Meanwhile, Virgil concerns his poem not so much with the destiny of a man but with the fate of a nation, "not of Aeneas but Rome" (Bowra 35). The essential theme of the *Aeneid* is the fate of Rome, revealed in these mythical beginnings before Rome itself existed. Aeneas is an archetypical Roman who represents this fate of the future glory of Rome. Thus, argues Bowra, Virgil's ideal of heroism is quite different from Homer's because it depends much less on physical gifts than on moral strength and is displayed not merely in battle but in many aspects of life, "that a man's *virtus* is shown less in battle and physical danger than in the defeat of his own weaknesses" (84). Still, like all epic heroes, he must submit his desires in order to carry out the will of Fate. And Aeneas has a task of epic proportions on his shoulders. That is, to found the city that would become the center of a great empire, establish a new race, and bring Troy's defeated gods to Latium. He must accomplish all these things against the wishes of Juno, queen of the gods and his chief antagonist. Aeneas' great nemesis is in fact "Juno's relentless rage," which will at every turn try to stop him from fulfilling Fate.

Echoing the *Aeneid*, the proposition of *Caramuru* tells of a man fleeing the western coasts, another exile driven on by Fate and destined to reach Bahian shores and Brazilian soil. Like Aeneas, the Portuguese hero of *Caramuru* also withstands many losses in battle before founding Salvador, the first Brazilian capital. Another commonality with Aeneas is that Diogo will likewise bring his gods along with him to the new homeland, thereby transplanting the religion of Portugal to Brazil:

De um varão em mil casos agitado,
Que as praias discorrendo do Ocidente,
Descobriu o recôncavo afamado
Da capital brasílica potente;
De Filho do Trovão denominado,
Que o peito domar soube à fera gente;
O valor cantarei na adversa sorte,
Pois só conheço herói quem nela é forte.
Of a man in a thousand adventures stirred (Canto I: 1)
That the beaches along the Occident
Discovered the famed bay area
Of the mighty Brazilian capital
Named Son of Thunder
He knew how to tame the fierce peoples
His bravery I shall sing in troubled times
Since only heroes in such circumstances remain strong.

Diogo Álvares Correia is the Portuguese hero referred to here as the "son of Thunder," recalling the Biblical James and John, whom Jesus named 'Sons of Thunder' for their zealous enthusiasm in bringing Christianity to the people. Diogo is also the hero who "tamed the savages," and showed bravery in the face of great adversity. While Aeneas' suffering is due to "Juno's relentless rage," the hardships that Diogo must endure are not attributed to any gods of the classical era, yet divine providence still plays a significant role. Regardless of the supernatural or natural causes for the adversities both heroes must endure, they both succeed in founding a new race.

Following the precepts in Francisco José Freire's *Arte Poetica*, Durão doesn't indulge the whims of the gods of the ancient pantheon and writes a very Christian epic. This is a significant change from *Os Lusíadas*, where pagan gods intervened in the lives of the characters of this poem. In Chapter four, Book three of *Arte Poetica*, Freire writes that although Camões used these "false divinities" abundantly in his poem, they are to be understood as Gracez Ferreira understood them, as "planets and secondary causes" (183). But Freire goes further than Gracez to say that when these false deities are assigned attributes of the true God, the work lacks verisimilitude and is a waste of time, albeit an agreeable one (183).[7] Camões' epic is a closer emulation to Virgil's since the same pagan goddess who aided the Trojans likewise aids the Portuguese. In this sense, Camões'

[7] Eu bem sey, que he proprio da Epopeia o que he admiravel, e extraordinario; mas tambem sey, que por conta disto nao deve padecer o verosimil, como fica padecendo com a introduccao de divindades fabulosas, fugyrando nellas os attributos do verdadeiro Deos. Daqui vem, que alem do inverosimil, se nao instruem os costumes como deve ser porque os Poetas, que usao de similhante liberdade, nao fazem mais, que fazer perder o tempo, ainda que agradavelmente... (Freire 183)

appropriation of Venus to favor the Portuguese mirrors Virgil's use of the same goddess, who is the mother of the hero Aeneas. In Durão's epic, the role of Venus in *Os Lusíadas* is played by the Virgin Mary, the mother of Jesus. In essence, all three epics utilize a goddess figure that guides and is partial to the heroes of their respective epic poems.

The roles of the gods in these epics reflect the different purpose and outcome of each hero's epic journey. The transporting of the gods to new lands is a key part of both Aeneas' and Diogo's founding of a new people. In the *Aeneid* this task is mentioned in the first lines of the poem, and again in the first Book, when Juno asks Aeolus (Lord of the Winds) to sink their ships and overwhelm them. She says to him, "gens inimical mihi Tyrrhenum nauigat aequor / Ilium in Italiam portans uictosque penatis;" 'A race I hate sails the Tyrrhenian sea, / Bringing Troy's beaten gods to Italy' (Virgil 1.67-68, Ruden 3). Aeneas will, as Juno says, transport Troy to Italy, which includes bringing their gods to Latium. Likewise, Diogo will also transfer the religion of Portugal to Brazil, implanting Portuguese civilization and Catholicism in Bahia. While Vasco da Gama did not necessarily end up transporting Portugal to India, the same project of Christianizing the world, so central to *Os Lusíadas*, is continued in *Caramuru*. From the point of view of the sixteenth-century, India and Brazil were equally seen as colonial outposts of Portugal. Only with Durão's hindsight, writing in the eighteenth-century, could the success of the so-called civilizing project in the respective colonies be measured. Just as the gods of antiquity transferred over from Greece to Rome, so the religion of Portugal was transported to Brazil.

While Virgil utilizes a Trojan hero to found a new race in the west, Durão uses a Portuguese hero to do the same. Both heroes bring their gods along with them, which is a device for illustrating the *translatio studii et imperii*, the geographic movement or transference (usually westward) of culture or knowledge and of political power or legitimacy. In *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*, Ernst Robert Curtius explains that the renewal of the Empire by Charlemagne could be regarded as a transfer of the Roman *imperium* to another people (29). Furthermore, Curtius writes that the concept of *translatio* implies that the transference of dominion from one empire to another is the result of a sinful misuse of that dominion (29). But while Augustine saw the widely celebrated Roman virtues as faults, Dante connects the Rome of Virgil and Augustus with the Rome of Peter and his successors (Curtius 30). All of this to say that Santa Rita Durão also partook of the *translatio* tradition, by referencing Virgil's *Aeneid* in his own epic of the expansion of Roman *imperium* in Portuguese America.

Escaping from Troy after the war, Aeneas will establish Latium, described in the last verses of the proposition as the place where "his Latin race rose" (Ruden 1). Likewise in *Caramuru*, there is potential in these unknown lands of the New World to establish an even greater empire than Greece or Rome, as the following verses illustrate:

> Nele vereis nações desconhecidas,
> Que em meio dos sertões a fé não doma;
> E que puderam ser-vos convertidas
> Maior império que houve em Grécia ou Roma:
> Gentes vereis e terras escondidas,

Onde, se um raio de verdade assoma,

Amansando-as, tereis na turba imensa

Outro reino maior que a Europa extensa. (Canto I, 4)

In it you shall see unknown nations

That in the midst of the backlands faith does not tame

And that may be transformed

A greater empire than Greece or Rome

Unheard of people and lands you shall see

Where if a ray of truth shines

Domesticated, you shall have in this immense mob

Another kingdom greater than all of Europe.

Again, these references to Greece and Rome signal a *translatio studii et imperii* once these savage lands are tamed. The poet of *Caramuru* predicts that this new kingdom in the backlands shall be transformed into a larger civilization than anything seen before in Europe.

Continuing in the convention of the Virgilian epic, the invocation comes after the proposition. In the *Aeneid* the invocation is posed as an appeal to the Muse to reveal the reasons for Juno's rage:

Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso

quidue dolens regina deum tot uoluere casus

insignem pietate uirum, tot adire labores

impulerit. tantaene animis caelestibus irae? (Virgil 1.8-11)

Muse, tell me why. What stung the queen of heaven,

What insult to her power made her drive

This righteous hero through so many upsets

And hardships? Can divine hearts know such anger? (Ruden 1).

In *Caramuru*, the poet also invokes the muse not as a question, but by asking the "source of all light that breaks the shadows of human illusions" to make the work begin and end with the holy Majesty that emanates from the Great Father and the Virgin Mother:

Santo Esplendor, que do grão Padre manas

Ao seio intacto de uma Virgem bela;

Se da enchente de luzes soberanas

Tudo dispensas pela Mãe donzela,

Rompendo as sombras de ilusões humanas,

Tudo grão caso a pura luz revela;

Faze que em ti comece e em ti conclua

Esta grande obra, que por fim foi tua. (Canto I: II)

Holy splendor, that emanates from the Great Father

To the bosom of a beautiful Virgin

If from the flood of sovereign lights

You provide everything by the maiden Mother

Breaking the shadows of human illusions

All things great this pure light reveals;

Make it begin and conclude with you

This great work that which in the end was yours.

The invocation here is not to a pagan Muse, but to a splendorous light, which emanates from God the Father and works through the Virgin Mother. As noted above, unlike the *Aeneid*, Durão's epic is Judeo-Christian and in the religious sense resembles *Os Lusíadas*. Thus both *Caramuru* and *Os Lusíadas* can be considered Christian epics. However, Durão recognizes the deity of the Amerindians as Tupá, which he observes in a footnote as being comparable to the Judeo-Christian God (a topic I will explore further in chapter two). The gods mentioned in the *Aeneid* are rarely mentioned in *Caramuru*, unless one interprets the Virgin Mary as synchronization of the goddess Venus. In which case, one could make the argument that Durão translated Camões's Venus as Mary, the mother of Christ. Still, the fact that Durão invokes the divine light itself may echo general notions of deism which were in circulation during the Enlightenment.

After the proposition and the invocation, we continue with the narrative of the poem, which diverges somewhat here since *Caramuru* begins with the arrival or shipwreck of the Portuguese explorers in Bahia. Meanwhile, Aeneas will not actually reach his destination (Latium) until Book Seven, as did Vasco da Gama, who only arrives in India in Canto Seven of *Os Lusíadas*. Still, both the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru* begin with a storm. In Virgil's poem this storm forces the Trojans to take a detour and lands their ships on the coast of Libya. In Durão's poem the storm is what causes the actual shipwreck that leaves Diogo and several other Portuguese sailors at the mercy of cannibals. The topic of cannibalism is thus introduced at the very beginning of the narrative of *Caramuru*. As Eneida Leal Cunha and other critics before her have pointed

out, this image of anthropophagous Amerindians will provide the legitimization for a violent conquest. Cunha points to the violence of the civilization project being legitimized by images of barbarous and terrible people and the horrendous vice of cannibalism (16). In the case of the *Aeneid*, the Carthaginians and the Latins are also seen as somewhat less civilized than the Trojan hero of the epic. Dido, Turnus, and Lavinia's mother, Queen Amata, are all infected by Juno's rage. These characters will try to go against Fate and ultimately meet a tragic or violent death for opposing Aeneas' destiny. They are not cannibals but they too are, in a sense, uncivilized, victims of Juno's dark rage. Aeneas is pious, while his opponents are impertinent and mock the will of the gods. Therefore, in both the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru*, the heroes represent an ideal of human nature and heroic virtue. They are made more so by direct contrast of the other, and thus represent light; meanwhile the Amerindian cannibals, Dido, and the rest correspond to the darker side of human nature.

After the storm, the Portuguese crew is saved from the cannibalistic ritual when enemy tribes mount a surprise attack. It is at this point that Diogo befriends the Tupinambá tribe. The daughter of the Tupinambá chief is Paraguaçu, who is supposed to marry Gupeva, but instead will marry Diogo. Resembling Lavinia in the Aeneid, Paraguaçu has many suitors. Jararaca is the leader of the enemy Caetés tribe who desires to marry Paraguaçu, but was not accepted by her father. The parallel in this part of the narrative is the rivalry between Jararaca and Diogo over Paraguaçu. This is where the historical version of the story of Paraguaçu and Diogo ends, since Jararaca is an invention of Durão's imagination, an appropriation of the Virgilian Turnus. This plot structure in

Caramuru thus recalls the competition between Turnus and Aeneas over Lavinia, which begins in the second half of the *Aeneid*. Yet, a significant point of contrast between the two poems is the role played by the respective heroines. Lavinia's only purpose in the *Aeneid* is to serve as the object of the Trojan-Latin struggle. Meanwhile, Paraguaçu's character is very developed in the poem, almost on equal footing with the hero Diogo. She fights alongside Diogo in the battle against the rebellious Amerindians. This is a topic I will explore further in the last chapter of this dissertation. Notwithstanding the different nature of Lavinia and Paraguaçu, we shall see that Jararaca is closely modeled on Turnus.

Soon after the Trojans have arrived in Latium, the signs tell them that they have finally reached their destination. Upon recognition of the fulfillment of the prophecy that they would be so hungry they would eat their own platters, Aeneas cries out: "continuo 'salue fatis mihi debita tellus / uosque' ait 'o fidi Troiae saluete penates: / hic domus, haec patria est." (Virgil 7.120-122) 'And cried at once, "Hail, country pledged by fate! / Hail faithful guardian gods of Troy as well! / This is your home, your country.' (Ruden 147-148). A parallel can be drawn here with *Caramuru*, although not as explicitly in the way this scene marks the arrival of the Trojans to their destination. In Durão's epic, the heroes arrive at their destination and are soon to be devoured by cannibals. Although there was no prophecy that the Portuguese would be eaten alive by cannibals, still there is an analogy with the eating of something not usually eaten, which indicates that they have reached their destination. Recognizing the sign of their being so hungry they would eat their plates, Aeneas sends an envoy to King Latinus the following day in order to request

land on which to found their new city. Aeneas' messengers relay to him the following answer from King Latinus regarding his only daughter Lavinia:

> est mihi nata, uiro gentis quam iungere nostrae
> non patrio ex adyto sortes, non plurima caelo
> monstra sinunt; generos externis adfore ab oris,
> hoc Latio restare canunt, qui sanguine nostrum
> nomen in astra ferant. hunc illum poscere fata
> et roer et, si quid ueri mens augurat, opto.' (Virgil 7.268-273)
> I have a daughter whom an oracle
> And many heavenly signs forbid me giving
> To a man of our race: foreigners come to Latium
> Will be our sons through marriage, and the new clan
> Will reach the stars. I think—I hope—it's this man
> That Fate requires—if my foreboding's right." (Ruden 152)

In contrast to the demands of Fate, Juno sends one of the furies to infect Lavinia's mother, Queen Amata and Turnus with hate for the foreigners. This materializes as Queeen Amata vehemently opposes the marriage of her daughter to Aeneas; she instead wishes for her daughter to marry a Latin, specifically Turnus. Likewise, Turnus resents having to bow down to the Trojans and not being able to take over the kingdom by marriage to Lavinia.

The plot of *Caramuru* follows a similar drama between the Portuguese newcomers and the Amerindian natives. This is where Durão enhanced the skeleton story

of the romance between Paraguaçu and Diogo, which he took from history books and appropriated the Virgilian character of Turnus in his creation of Jararaca. Substituting Trojans and Latins, Durão posited the Portuguese hero together with the Tupinambá tribe against the Caetés tribe, which would be headed by Jararaca. Jararaca seeks out Paraguaçu's father in order to ask for her hand in marriage, but like Turnus, he is refused. Paraguaçu's father wishes for his daughter to marry Gupeva, leader of the Tupinambá. However, like Virgil's Lavinia, destiny has arranged for Paraguaçu to marry a foreigner. Reminiscent of Queen Amata and Turnus, Jararaca is outraged and wages a war against his rival suitor, vowing that Paraguaçu will be either dead, or his:

> Logo que por cem bocas vaga a fama
> Do esposo eleito a condição divulga,
> Irado o caeté , raivando brama;
> Arma todo o sertão, guerra promulga,
> Tudo acendendo em belicosa chama,
> Investir por surpresa astuto julga,
> Com que a causa da guerra se conclua,
> Ficando P'raguaçu ou morta, ou sua. (4, 10)
> After traveling through hundreds of mouths, the rumor
> Of the chosen husband spreads,
> The furious Caeté, rabidly roars;
> He arms all the backlands, promoting war
> Burning everything with bellicose flame

A surprise attack he astutely considers

With which the cause for war shall conclude

Either Paraguaçu dies, or is his.

No mention is made here of Juno or any other supernatural power sending her furies to infect the antagonists with hate. Yet rumor personified plays a similar role in *Caramuru* as it does in the *Aeneid*, tearing through the land and spreading hate for the foreigners. Like the Trojan War, this war will begin over a woman. In the war that ensues between the tribes allied to Jararaca and his Caetés, and, Diogo and the Tupinambá tribe on the other, Paraguaçu fights bravely by Diogo's side. As noted above, this is a notable contrast from the *Aeneid*, where Lavinia does not make any decision or in any way intervenes with the outcome of her fate. Yet in the end, it is not Paraguaçu or Gupeva who delivers the final blow to Jararaca. As in the *Aeneid*, the final and lethal blow to the hero's adversary must be dealt by the hero of the epic himself. Aeneas launches the fatal spear that would make Turnus surrender; similarly, Diogo delivers the fatal gunshot to Jararaca.

The *Iliad* concludes with the death of Hector; likewise, the *Aeneid* concludes with the death of Turnus, whose last words signal his defeat: "uicisti et uictum tendere palmas / Ausonii uidere; tua est Lauinia coniunx; / ulterius ne tende odiis." (Virgil 12.936-938) 'You've triumphed: the Italians see me asking / For mercy, and Lavinia is your wife. / Lay down your hatred' (Ruden 295). Aeneas is almost persuaded by his opponent's last words to spare his life until he sees the sword-belt of Pallas, whom Turnus had killed in battle. Filled with the wrath that made Achilles famous, Aeneas strikes the final blow to Turnus:

hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit

feruidus. ast illi soluontur frigore membra,

uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras. (Virgil 12.950-952).

Incensed, he thrust the sword through Turnus' chest.

His enemy's body soon grew cold and helpless,

While the indignant soul flew down to Hades. (Ruden 295)

Bowra's analysis of this final battle scene between Turnus and Aeneaus sheds much light on the differences in heroic type, particularly when comparing Aeneas to Homer's Achilles:

> Turnus is killed because he lives a life of war and inevitably resorts to war when his will is crossed. He represents that heroic world which contains in its ideals the seeds of its own destruction, and in him Virgil shows that he understood the heroic type and even admired it but knew that it was no longer what the world needed. (49)

Bowra clearly shows how Turnus, not Aeneas, is modeled on Achilles. Both Turnus and Achilles live for their own personal glory and honor. But the new model of hero, represented here by Aeneas, does not live for himself but for the fate of something greater than himself, namely Rome. Thus by making Aeneas slay Turnus, Virgil overthrows the old Homeric model of the ideal hero.

In the article, "The *Aeneid* as Foundational Story," Gary B. Miles differentiates between a foundation story and a creation story. The main difference is that the foundation story tells about the origins of a particular human community that is perceived

from the outset as one among several communities, while a creation story concerns itself with the origins of the entire human race (231). The story of Aeneas is thus the story of Rome, not all of humanity. Similarly, one could say that Camões' *Os Lusíadas* is the foundation story of the Portuguese people. Whether Santa Rita Durão wrote an epic to commemorate the origins of the Brazilian people is not the topic of this chapter; however, I mention Miles article because he argues that "the Aeneid takes us back to the moment when the formation of Roman identity began" (234). The formation of Roman identity begins when Troy falls, a circumstance that propels Aeneas to "abandon the traditional Greek ideal of heroism and seek a new destiny" (Miles 234). But the culmination of this "Roman moment" is found in the murder of Turnus, who represents the old Greek ideal of heroism. That the defeat of Turnus is central to the foundation of Rome echoes in Durão's appropriation of this old model of heroism when he creates Jararaca. Miles describes the defeat of Turnus as the moment "when the Trojans secured their position in Italy and thus set in motion the long process of imperial expansion that would come to embrace the entire world" (234). The moment when Diogo Álvares slays Jararaca recalls a similar securing of Portuguese hegemony in Bahia.

In *Caramuru*, the first half of the epic concludes where Virgil's epic comes to an end, in a battle between two heroic types that ultimately ends with the death of Jararaca. The lethal weapon is not a sword but Diogo's firearm, a musket or rifle: "Dispara o tiro e a bala lhe atravessa / de uma parte à outra parte da cabeça" 'He fires the shot and the bullet goes through / one side to the other of his head' (Canto V, 51). Just as Turnus' defeat signifies the death of specific heroic type and victory for the future Romans,

Jararaca's death confirms the demise of the Amerindian warrior and the triumph of the imminent Brazilian race. Ultimately, what leads to the defeat of the hero's adversary is not that he is, in the case of Jararaca a "barbarous savage" or in the case of Turnus "infected with Juno's rage." The fact is these two went against the will of Fate, or God. As Bowra explains, "in the last analysis Jupiter and the Fates are one; for what Jupiter wills is fate" (77):

> The Fate, which is called Zeus by Cleanthes, is Divine Providence, […] which directs events in the world and is now called Jupiter, now Fate, now the fates, now the will of the gods. This Providence, which rules the universe, is also its mind and its nature, the universal law and the creative force of all existence. […] When such a power decides that Rome shall rule the world it is not a personal whim, like the support which Homer's gods give to Troy but something deep in the nature of things, a natural inevitable process […]. *Any attempt to oppose it is not so much wrong as foolish for it cannot be frustrated*. (my emphasis 78)

Thus, as Bowra's analysis of Virgil's so-called universal mind indicates, the hero's adversaries are doomed to fail. As sympathetic a picture as Virgil paints of Turnus, and Durão likewise creates in Jararaca, they go against Fate. Of course, in hindsight, we know that the Portuguese will overrun the Amerindians. Just as when Virgil is writing his *Aeneid*, the hegemony of Rome is already a reality. Yet, *Caramuru* does not end with the death of Jararaca.

After the epic battle in *Caramuru*, when the Caetés and other rival tribes have been subdued to Diogo and his Tupinambá allies, Paraguaçu and Diogo make an overseas journey to France. It is in France where Paraguaçu will be baptized and the couple will be married. As they are getting ready to depart from Bahian shores on a French ship, several would-be wives of Diogo swim out behind the galley. The most famous of Paraguaçu's rivals is of course Moema. This episode of Moema's frantic attempt to defy destiny and make Diogo choose her instead of Paraguaçu is a clear imitation of Virgil's Dido. Dido kills herself with a Trojan sword in a desperate attempt to end the suffering of her tragic and unrequited love for Aeneas. The parallels between these two scenes of unrequited love are unmistakable. Dido's last words are:

> dixit: et os impressa toro, 'moriermur inultae,
> sed moriamur,' ait. 'sic, sic iuvatire sub umbras.
> hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto
> Dardanus, et nostrae secum ferat omina moris.' (Virgil 4.659-662)
>
> She kissed the bed. "I die without revenge—
> But let me die. I like this path to darkness.
> Let the cruel Trojan's eyes take in these flames.
> The omen of my death will go with him." (Ruden 89)

Both Dido and Moema self-destruct; ultimately killing themselves because of their obsession with the hero, which Fate denied them. Their last dying words are filled with hate and rage towards the object of their desire. Bowra compares Dido's actions with Turnus, since they both illustrate "the limitations and the dangers of the heroic outlook"

(55). Dido's stubbornness makes her act in defiance of her better nature and contributes to her downfall. She lives only for herself, for her own emotions and passions and pride, neglecting Carthage and her responsibility to her people. Her obsession with Aeneas dominates her being and engages her vanity, since nothing else matters to her (Bowra 56). Like Turnus, her heroic nature lives only for itself; and when it is frustrated and injured, it can only turn to destroy others and itself. Bowra writes: "Virgil seems to have felt that the heroic type, which he understood and in many ways admired, had this fatal fault, that, because it lives for its own glory and satisfaction, it is bound to cause destruction" (56). Bowra concludes that this old heroic type, based as it was on the Homeric paradigm, was inadequate both to him and to Augustan Rome. The reckless self-assertion seen in Achilles, Dido, and Turnus could no longer serve a civilization committed to the new Roman ideal.

In a similar manner as Dido, Moema also self-destructs when Diogo sails off to France without her. One of the most memorable scenes of *Caramuru* is when Moema swims out behind the galley as it departs. She desperately pleads with Diogo not to leave her behind:

> Bem puderas, cruel, ter sido esquivo,
> Quando eu a fé rendia ao teu engano;
> Nem me ofenderas a escutar-me altivo,
> Que é favor, dado a tempo, um desengano:
> Porem deixando o coração cativo
> Com fazer-te a meus rogos sempre humano,

Fugiste-me traidor, e desta sorte

Paga meu fino amor tão crua morte? (Canto VI, 39)

You could have, o cruel one, been aloof

When I gave up my faith to your betrayal

You arrogance won't even let you hear me

It is a favor, given to time, a disenchantment

And yet leaving the heart captive

For you to hear my pleads, always human

You run away from me, you traitor, and this is my fate

You repay my fine love with such a raw death?

After insulting Diogo and continuing on her tirade, the hero begins to ignore her and walk away from the edge of the galley. Moema then pleads with Diogo to strike her down with his magic thunder—the same one that killed Jararaca in the previous Canto—and begs for him to take her life: "Dispara sobre mim teu cruel raio" 'Fire your cruel lightening upon me' (192). With these last words she faints, sinks into the water, and drowns.

The parallel between Moema and Jararaca is close, as these last words spoken by Moema indicate. The fact that these two characters are not based on any of the history books that Durão credits for the story of Diogo and Paraguaçu is significant. It points to a clear appropriation of Virgilian models, whose new heroic ideal would replace the old Homeric types. The old heroic type, epitomized by Achilles' rage, would be incorporated into the Virgilian text as an example of the new hero's adversary. Virgil thus set the tone for a new Roman ideal, which the Augustan age of peace and order admired beyond all

others but which had meant nothing to Homer (Bowra 56). Like Dido and Turnus, Moema and Jararaca were also ruled by the same self-assertive spirit and cult of honor typical of the old heroic type that was the standard of the Homeric epics.

As we have seen, the plot structure of *Caramuru* is almost explicitly taken from Virgil's *Aeneid*. Moema recalls Dido, their unrequited love for the epic hero results in both of them ending their own lives. Turnus, suitor of Lavinia, is the major adversary of Aeneas, who ultimately takes his life in battle. Jararaca, suitor of Paraguaçu, is the major opponent of Diogo, who also kills his rival in battle. In essence, Santa Rita Durão took the simple story of Paraguaçu and Diogo—two historical figures whose life stories were recorded in the first histories of Portuguese America—and rewrote it by appropriating character types found in Virgil's *Aeneid*.

It seems appropriate to end this section by addressing how the poets concluded their respective epics. Of course, Virgil's epic concludes with the death of Turnus and the assured marriage of Aeneas and Lavinia in order to secure the future of the Roman Empire. Durão's *Caramuru* does not close with the death of Jararaca but with the arrival of the representatives of the Portuguese Crown in Bahia in 1549, symbolizing the continued expansion and the establishment of the Portuguese Empire in Brazil. A significant contrast between the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru* is the fact that the defeated people of Latium have Juno protecting their sovereignty:

> et nunc cedo equidem pugnasque exosa relinquo
> illud te, nulla fati quod lege tenetur,
> pro Latio obtestor, pro maiestate tuorum:

cum iam conubiis pacem felicibus, esto,

component, cum iam leges et foedera iungent,

ne uetus indigenas nomen mutare Latinos

neu Troas fieri iubeas Teucrosque uocari,

aut uocem mutare uiros aut uertere uestem.

sit Latium, sint Albani per saecula rges,

sit Romana potens Itala uirtute propago;

occidit occieritque sinas cum nomine Troia. (Virgil 12.818-841)

But I concede and leave the field, disgusted—

Begging one thing for Latium, for the greatness

Of your children, and no law of fate forbids it.

When they make peace with a propitious marriage—

Let them—and treaties and shared laws unite them,

Don't make the native Latin warriors change

Their ancient name to Teucrians. Don't impose

The clothes and speech of Troy. Let Latium be,

And grant it centuries of Alban kings,

And Roman stock strong with Italian courage

Troy fell. Now let her name lie fallen with her." (Ruden 291-292)

While Virgil's Trojans found a new homeland for themselves, Diogo Álvares subjugates the land in the service of his Portuguese overlords. This is particularly signified by the language of the epic. Had Durão's epic been written in Tupi then the parallel with the

Aeneid would be complete. Yet the language of Portuguese "Trojans" is eventually imposed upon the Amerindian "Latins."

The ties that bind *Caramuru* to the Portuguese Empire are particularly symbolized in the poem by the year in which it ends: 1549, the year the first governor to Brazil, Tomé de Sousa, and the first of many Jesuits, Manuel da Nóbrega, arrived in Bahia. These two events signal the transfer and establishment of the Portuguese Church and State to the so-called New World. And it is in this religious sense that *Caramuru* goes a step further than the *Aeneid* in order to include the baptism of Paraguaçu, so that she may marry Diogo within the prescripts of her newly adopted Catholic religion. After the elimination of rivals Jararaca and Moema, the couple sails to France where Paraguaçu receives the Catholic sacraments of baptism and marriage. With the religious conversion completed, Paraguaçu changes her name to Catarina Álvares. *Caramuru* thus goes beyond the marriage alliance between newcomer and native. The last stanza before the epilogue is telling of the unambiguous religious slant of the poem:

> Que o indígena seja ali empregado,
> E que à sombra das leis tranqüilo esteja;
> Que viva em liberdade conservado,
> Sem que oprimido dos colonos seja:
> Que às expensas do rei seja educado
> O neófito, que abraça a santa igreja,
> E que na santa empresa ao missionário
> Subministre subsídio o régio erário. (Canto X, 10.76)

That the indigenous people be there employed,

And that he be at peace in the shadow of the laws

That he live in conserved liberty

Without being oppressed by the colonists

That his education be financed by the Crown

The neophyte that embraces the holy Church

And that the holy enterprise of the missionary

Will be financed by the public treasury.

As mentioned above, it is significant that *Caramuru* ends with the Portuguese-Tupinambá couple Diogo and Catarina-Paraguaçu transferring their rule over the land and the people Bahia to the king of Portugal D. João III, who is represented by the first governor. As we shall see in the next chapter, the debate of Brazilian sovereignty and freedom from Portuguese political and cultural domination is reflected in Brazilian literary history.

EMPIRES AND EPICS

The comparison between the similar plots and character types of these two epic poems ends here, yet the poetics of empire, or what David Quint calls "the epic of winners and losers" remains to be considered. Quint categorizes both the *Aeneid* and *Os Lusíadas* as winners' epics, and opposes them to the *Pharsalia* and *La Araucana*, which he calls loser's epics. However, I would have to insist on the point made by Nicolopulos, who unlike Quint, compares precisely the similar points between *La Araucana* and *Os Lusíadas*, specifically the rivalry revealed in the prophetic scenes between the two

Iberian empires of the sixteenth-century, Spanish and Portuguese. This new poetics of empire in the Indies is revealed by Nicolopulos in the respective *mapaemundi* prophecies of these two epics:

> In fact, as Ercilla intended it to be, it is the presentation of the mapamundi in the second vision seen in the aleph, precisely as Camões has framed his geographical prophecy, that confirms beyond a doubt that Ercilla wrote his mapamundi in a direct spirit of rivalry with Camões. (xvi)

The reason for Quint's classifying Alonso de Ercilla's text as a loser's epic was formed by readers and critics of *La Araucana* who only point to Ercilla's defense of—or alleged identification with—the native Mapuche of Chile. While a strong case could be made for sympathy with the Amerindians in Book One, the same can't be said for Books Two or Three, whose verses reveal it to be more inline with the poetics of empire found in its Portuguese rival, the so-called epic of the winners, *Os Lusíadas*. Nicolopulos demonstrates that *La Araucana* is as tied to empire as *Os Lusíadas*.

With Quint's paradigm in mind, we might be tempted to ask if *Caramuru* is a winner's epic or a loser's epic. One could argue that the close comparisons between the *Aeneid* and *Caramuru* would point to it belonging to the first of Quint's two possible interpretations, that is, an epic of winners. This would mean that *Caramuru* is more in line with the *Aeneid* and *Os Lusíadas*. Yet, the same case that Quint made concerning *La Araucana* could be made for *Caramuru* since, like the Chilean epic, it portrays the Amerindians as worthy adversaries and shows sympathy for their cause. If *La Araucana* is loser's epic, then so is *Caramuru*. Nevertheless, as we shall see in the following

chapter, nineteenth and twentieth-century criticism of *Caramuru* reveal a similar misreading as that which has traditionally occurred with *La Araucana*. Much like Ercilla, Durão incorporated many images of brave Amerindian warriors, as we saw above with the portrayal of Jararaca. This alleged sympathy with the Amerindian adversaries might lead some to interpret *Caramuru* as critical of the Portuguese Empire, or as evidence of nascent Brazilian nationalism. Although both *La Araucana* and *Caramuru* have offered critics and readers more interpretations due to their heroic portrayals of Amerindian, the common denominator in all these learned imperialist epics is empire.

CHAPTER TWO

History and Poetry in Portuguese America

Em nenhuma outra região se mostra o céu mais sereno, nem madruga mais bela a aurora; o sol em nenhum outro hemisfério tem os raios tão dourados, nem os reflexos noturnos tão brilhantes; as estrelas são as mais benignas, e se mostram sempre alegres; os horizontes, ou nasça o sol, ou se sepulte, estão sempre claros; as águas, ou se tomem nas fontes pelos campos, ou dentro das povoações nos aquedutos, são as mais puras: é emfim o Brasil terreal paraíso descoberto....

Sebastião da Rocha Pita, *História da América Portuguesa,* 1730

In no other region is the sky more serene, nor morning a more beautiful dawn; in no other hemisphere are the rays of the sun more golden, nor the nocturnal reflections so bright; the stars are of the most benign, and they are always cheerful; the horizons, sunrise or sunset, are always clear; the waters, whether taken from rural fountains or in the aqueducts of the urban centers, are of the most pure: in essence, Brazil is earthly paradise discovered... (my translation)

One of the first histories of Brazil was Sebastião da Rocha Pita's *História da América Portuguesa* (1730). José Veríssimo writes about the influence this early history

of Portuguese America had on Santa Rita Durão's epic poem in *História da Literatura Brasileira* (1916). Although Durão mentions in his preface that he had read Rocha Pita's book, Veríssimo comments that this was hardly necessary, since Durão's poem attests and confirms that many of the passages, incidents, and digressions are in fact derived from *História da América Portuguesa*. Furthermore, Veríssimo writes that Rocha Pita's enthusiastic patriotism is the most important element that Durão took from his work:

> *Patriotismo, porém, que não era ainda brasileirismo estreme, senão um sentimento misto, comum a todos esses poetas, de lealdade Portuguese e de amor à terra natal, sentimento que se dividia entre a nação, que era Portugal, e a pátria, que era o Brasil.* (154)
>
> Patriotism that was not yet extreme *brazilanism* but a mixed feeling, common in all these poets, of loyalty to Portugal and love for their place of birth, a sentiment divided between a nation, that was Portugal, and the homeland, that was Brazil.

Indeed, Veríssimo argues that in no other poet of the so-called *plêiade mineira* (the group of poets from eighteenth-century Minas Gerais) was the nativism, which served as a prelude to nationalism and patriotism, manifested as clearly as in Santa Rita Durão. This chapter examines the origins of this eighteenth-century phenomenon of nativism by focusing on the time-space overlap between what was once the Portuguese Empire and what is today also known as Colonial Brazil. The first part of this chapter will emphasize specific points of convergence, particularly as they relate to the poetry of this time period; which, needless to say, began with the arrival of the Portuguese in what today is

Brazil. The second part of this chapter focuses on the historical events taking place during the late eighteenth-century, the time of Durão's *Caramuru* and the Portuguese *Viradeira*.

While the terms *Portuguese America* and *Colonial Brazil* are today often used interchangeably to refer to the time in between the Portuguese conquest and colonization in the Western Hemisphere and Brazilian Independence, this was not always the case. As the title of Rocha Pita's book suggests, Portuguese America was the term used perhaps until the mid-nineteenth century, when the idea of a Colonial period in Brazil emerged. This term "Colonial Brazil," and by extension the idea of a so-called *Colonial Brazilian Literature*, is mostly a product of the nineteenth-century nationalist rhetoric. The ideal of nationalism sought to mark a definitive line in space and time that signified the birth of the Brazilian Nation in 1822. In order to distinguish the writings that came before Brazil's independence and help create the newly formed nation of Brazil, the poetics of nineteenth-century romanticism set out to transform what was once the literature of Portuguese America into a new nationalist paradigm, hence the name *Colonial Brazilian Literature*.

In the article "Hermenêutica, retórica e poética nas letras da América Portuguesa" Ivan Teixeira traces the origins of the term "Colonial Brazilian Literature" and its relation to romanticist hermeneutics back to the nineteenth-century, to the time when one of the first literary histories of Brazil appeared. Jean Ferdinand Denis (Paris, 1798 – Paris, 1890) was a French anthropologist who lived in Brazil between 1816 and 1820. His literary history of Brazil, published in 1826, appeared as a supplement to a literary history

of Portugal. In this innovative essay, Denis argues that a new nation needs a history of its literature. He outlines what he refers to as "principle traits" which he found useful "in order to indicate the course that poetry should take in the new world" and "summarize the poetic characteristics of different peoples" (my translation, Teixeira, *Hermenêutica* 146). The idea that Brazilians are somehow different peoples, separate from the Portuguese, is here seen as a reflection of their newly independent nation. It is in this sense that Denis, a Frenchman, is one of the first inventors of Brazilian Literary history.

While the norm of reading real or imagined nationalist sentiments into the works of these eighteenth-century poets established itself for the first time in this essay by Jean Ferdinand Denis, the clearest examples of this alleged nascent nationalism are most apparent in the portraits of Amerindians as well as the obligatory New World settings. Denis refers to those Amerindians and landscapes which appear initially in the work of José Basílio da Gama's *O Uruguay* and soon after, in Santa Rita Durão's *Caramuru*. These two epic poems are thus interpreted as being a prelude to the nationalist inclination, a sentiment which would become commonly attributed to both eighteenth-century poets. The French anthropologist's essay points to the beginnings of a nineteenth-century worldview, a point of view which was often utilized in order to read literary works of eighteenth-century Portugal.

When reading these texts in hindsight, a nationalist view was superimposed on pre-nationalist literature of Portuguese America. Thus, even though not all literature that preceded independence can equally be considered as an example of a budding nationalist sentiment, a feeling that was assumed to have been emerging in Brazil well before 1822.

A clear example of the bias which favored those poets who wrote on New World themes such as scenery and indigenous peoples can be witnessed in the criticism of the lyrical poet Tomás Antonio Gonzaga (Porto 1744 – Mozambique 1810). Gonzaga was actually born in Portugal and died in exile in Mozambique, having lived in Brazil only intermittently. Most research indicates that the first part of Gonzaga's magnum opus *Marília de Dirceu* (1792) was written in Minas Gerais, and the second (1799) while in his prison cell in Rio. The third part (1812), which is only tenuously attributed to him, was written in Mozambique. So while most of *Marília de Dirceu* was written in Brazil, critics such as Jean Ferdinand Denis and the Portuguese author Almeida Garret (Porto, 1799 – Lisbon, 1854) lamented that his pastoral poems did not incorporate any local Brazilian flavor or sentiment (Teixeira, *Hermenêutica* 147). For example, Denis praised the epic poets Durão and Basílio da Gama for having incorporated Brazilian themes into their poems, but at the same time criticized Gonzaga's supposed "lack of inspiration in the majesty and splendor" of the Brazilian landscape. Like Denis, Almeida Garret uses similar arguments against Gonzaga for not having placed the eponymous Marília in a tropical backdrop of palm trees, and other such birds and plants of the tropics. Garret also laments the fact that Gonzaga did not seize the alleged nationalist sentiment that he and other future critics would read into the poems of Basílio da Gama and Santa Rita Durão. Only when viewed from the nineteenth-century paradigm of nation-building can one get the sense that Gonzaga's bucolic style does not contribute to the idea of a nascent Brazilian national identity, a characteristic that was unwittingly ascribed to other major poets of eighteenth-century Portuguese America.

Perhaps paradoxically (for these nineteenth-century critics of Gonzaga's lack of New World themes) was the fact that the reception of *Marília de Dirceu* was much wider than either of the Brazilian epic poets who had incorporated Brazilian landscapes and peoples. Notwithstanding the alleged lack of nationalist themes and settings, Gonzaga's *Marília* received more acclaim than either José Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay* (1769) or Santa Rita Durão's *Caramuru* (1781). It is telling that eighteenth-century readers held *Marília de Dirceu* in higher regard than either of these epic poems. Does this mean that contemporary readers did not care for local settings and indigenous characters? Or perhaps the eighteenth-century audience was not as nationalistic as nineteenth-century critics? Most likely, the lettered Brazilian elite followed similar reading habits as their Portuguese counterparts and thus, *Marília de Dirceu* held broader appeal. In the eighteenth-century, there seems to have not been a wide-spread preoccupation to define Brazil or imagine Brazilians as different from Portuguese.

This is where the term "Colonial Brazil" becomes problematic, when talking about the Colonial period of Brazilian history. As we see in the title of Rocha Pita's history, he used the term *América Portuguesa*, Portuguese America, not *Brasil Colônia*, or Colonial Brazil. In retrospect, it would thus seem that the eighteenth-century readers of "Portuguese America" seem to prefer Dirceu's work, while the nineteenth-century readers of "Colonial Brazil" preferred the epics. In light of the history and politics of eighteenth-century Portugal, it is reasonable to conclude that some poets of the so-called Colonial period, particularly the neoclassicist *Escola Mineira*, may not have actually harbored the pre-nationalist sentiments ascribed to them by nineteenth-century critics.

This means that for certain sectors of the Portuguese-speaking population *Portuguese America* was not a colony in the post-colonial sense of the term. Portuguese America was rather a newly acquired province, an extension of the same empire, which just happened to be overseas.

This brings us to the main argument of this chapter. We cannot simply ignore certain texts of the colonial era simply because they fail to fulfill the requirements established by a nineteenth-century nation-building paradigm, or even twentieth-century ideals of socialist nationalism. Instead of trying to impose a nationalist sentiment to a time when the nation-state still did not exist, we may have a richer reading experience if we study each text within the context of its own time and place. The political subtext of empire building, which is inevitably found in these early letters of Portuguese America, adds a historical dimension to these texts that makes them as relevant to the study of history as it is to poetry.

Before returning to the earliest texts of Portuguese American letters, before any real or imagined trace of Brazilian nationalist sentiment can be found or conjured, it would be useful to examine other critics in order to compare them with Ferdinand Denis and Almeida Garret. How different were later critics' assessment of the literature that was written before independence? Does it differ much from that of these two earlier French and Portuguese critics? Let's begin this analysis with Machado de Assis (1839-1908), who wrote about nationalist inclinations in Brazilian Literature before independence in a work entitled "Instinto de Nacionalidade" (1873). Machado de Assis refers to the doctrine that would privilege the Amerindian epic poems over Gonzaga's bucolic poems:

"uma opinão, que tenho por errônea: é a que só reconhece espírito nacional nas obras que tratam de assunto local, doutrina que, a ser exata, limitaria muito os cabedais da nossa literatura" 'an opinion, that I take as erroneous: is the one that only recognizes the national spirit in the works that have to do with local themes, a doctrine that, to be exact, would limit the wealth of our literature' (803). Indeed, if the same criteria for valuing literature were applied to Machado's works, the lack of Amerindian protagonists in his oeuvre would likewise categorize him more in line with Gonzaga than Basílio da Gama. The bias toward Brazilian themes and peoples is reflected in the abundance of literature in the nineteenth-century by authors such as Gonçalves Dias and José de Alencar, which delved and explored New World themes and native peoples.

Although Machado de Assis was cognizant of this doctrine concerning the bias of nationalist spirit in literary works, his comparison of the epic poets Basílio da Gama and Durão with Gonzaga point to a perceived hierarchy in the literature that nevertheless reinforces the opinion he tries to refute:

> …os nomes de Basílio da Gama e Durão são citados e amados, como precursores da poesia brasileira. A razão é que eles buscaram em roda de si os elementos de uma poesia nova, e deram os primeiros traços de nossa fisionomia literária, enquanto que outros, Gonzaga por exemplo, respirando aliás os ares da patria, não souberam desligar-se das faixas de Arcádia nem dos preceitos do tempo. Admira-se-lhes o talento, mas não se lhes perdoa o cajado e a pastora e nisto há mais erro que acerto. (802)

> ..the names Basílio da Gama and Durão are quoted and loved, as precursors of Brazilian poetry. The reason is that they looked around for elements of a new poetry, and they gave the first traces to our literary physiognomy, while others, Gonzaga for example, breathing as a matter of fact the airs of the fatherland, did not know how to disconnect from the Arcadian fashion nor from the precepts of time. Their talent is admirable, but their pastoral cane and shepherdess are unforgivable, and in this there is more error than accuracy. (my translation)

These contradictory statements by Machado de Assis point to a convergence between history and poetry, which could be made here connecting these three Arcadian poets. Basílio da Gama wrote about the war that was waged on the Guaraní Indians and their Jesuit overseers. Santa Rita Durão also chose a topic that he took from the above-mentioned *Historia da America Portuguesa desde o ano de seu descobrimento até 1724* (1730) by Sebastião de Rocha Pita, one of the first such histories of Portuguese America ever written. Since the epic poets Basílio da Gama and Santa Rita Durão chose historical themes as backdrops for their respective poems, they were consecrated into the newly invented category of *Colonial Brazilian* letters. Had Gonzaga chosen to write about a historical theme from Portuguese America, perhaps he too would have been assigned an alleged nationalist fervor, similar to that attributed to his fellow neoclassical poets of the eighteenth-century. Because Gonzaga's lyrical poetry did not call for an historical event in the conventional way required of epic poetry, his personal preference for lyric over epic poetry pressumed a lack of Brazilian nationalism.

The assumption that the epic poets were nationalists is problematic. We have so far seen how a pattern emerged in the early nineteenth-century that began interpreting texts according to a presumed nationalist sentiment; or, as in the case of Gonzaga, a lack thereof. This particular way of reading the texts of Portuguese America (as independent from Portugal) was, as we have seen, initially established by a French anthropologist, soon to be followed by the Portuguese author Almeida Garret. In Brazil, the nationalist sentiments that were read into the texts would be reinforced time and again throughout the nineteenth-century by many authors of Brazilian romanticism, including but not limited to Machado de Assis, who in spite of this, called for a change in themes. By the late nineteenth-century, Machado de Assis felt that the nationalist themes had been exhausted, and had culminated with the works of and Gonçalves Dias and José de Alencar, among others (803). The focus in Brazilian letters did eventually change directions, at least for the time being, as evidence of this temporary reprise from nationalist themes can be found in writers of the Parnassian and symbolist movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries.

José Veríssimo, mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, is another Brazilian critic who would (like Machado de Assis) write a history of Brazilian letters. Veríssimo's work fits in here since he begins his Brazilian literary history with Bento Teixeira's *Prosopopéia* (1601) and coincidentaly ends his *História da Literatura Brasileira* with the death of Machado de Assis in 1908. Veríssimo points to a defining moment in the last third of the eighteenth-century when Brazilian poets finally begin to produce poetry at a level comparable to that of Portugal:

> No momento assinalado, [no último terço do século XVIII] uma plêiade de poetas brasileiros entram a concorrer dignamente com os poetas portugueses contemporâneos, a fazerem-se bem aceitos da literatura mãe. Mais brasileiros que nunhuns outros até aí, por mais vivo sentimento da terra natal ou adotiva, ao qual já porventura podemos chamar de nacional, estabelecem esses poetas a transição da fase puramente portuguesa da nossa literatura para a sua fase brasileira. Esta, iniciada pelo romantismo ao cabo primeiro terço do seguinte século, terá nalguns deles os seus inconscientes precursores. (121-122)
>
> At the indicated moment, [in the last third of the eighteenth-century] a group of Brazilian poets begins to worthily compete with contemporary Portuguese poets, and would be well accepted into the mother literature. More Brazilians than any until then, despite any lively feeling for their native or adopted land, what we may now happily name as "national;" these poets established the transition from a purely Portuguese phase of our literature to its Brazilian phase. This one, launched by Romanticism during the first third of the following century, would contain in them some of their unconscious precursors. (my translation)

Veríssimo's statements seem to identify not as much with the new ideas of the Parnassian and symbolist movements of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries as with the themes that would emerge during the Semana de Arte Moderna in São Paulo, which marked the commemoration of the 100 years of Brazilian Independence in 1922.

This Brazilian Week of Modern Art launched a return to the nationalist themes of the nineteenth-century.

The Semana de Arte Moderna of 1922 marks the beginnings of what in Brazilian literature is known as Modernism. While Machado de Assis had successfully broken with the nationalist paradigm (as did other pre-modernist poets such as Olavo Bilac, Francisca Julia, and Augusto dos Anjos) the return to nationalist themes resurged within Brazilian Modernism. The landmark study of Brazilian literature of the twentieth-century would appear during the Third phase of Brazilian Modernism, when Antonio Candido published his seminal work of Brazilian literary history, *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* (1959). Candido innovates the nineteenth-century critics' view of Brazilian literature, building in particular on the one established by Silvio Romero's *História da Literatura Brasileira* (1888). Unlike José Veríssimo's *História da Literatura Brasileira*, which takes the year 1601 as the beginnings of Brazilian literature, Candido prefers Romero's chosen date of 1750 as the so-called "decisive moment" in which literary manifestations about Brazil began to reveal a nativist tendency, a literary embodiment of an assumed nationalist spirit. In reference to the year 1750, Silvio Romero writes: "É agora o *momento decisivo* de nossa história: é o ponto culminante; a fase da preparação do pensamento autonômico e da emancipação política" 'It is now *the decisive moment* of our history: the culminating point; the phase of preparation of autochthonous thinking and political emancipation' (my emphasis 404). Romero divided the literary history of Brazil into two distinct phases: he called the First Era or Period of Formation from 1500 to 1750, and the Second Era, or Period of Autonomous Development, he designated from 1750 to 1830. Likewise,

Candido begins his study of Brazilian literature in precisely the same year, 1750, since it was in the mid-eighteenth century when an alleged nationalist sentiment manifested itself in the neoclassical poets of the *mineiro* school. Thus, the nineteenth-century paradigm established by Silvio Romero's choice of the year 1750 and the term "decisive moment" continued well into the twentieth century with *Formação da Literatura Brasileira*.

Silvio Romero's designation of the First Era from 1500 to 1750 overlooks the early years of Portuguese-American letters. Likewise, Antonio Candido upholds the arbitrary year of 1750 as the "decisive moment" in which Brazilian literature begins to operate as a so-called system. Candido argues that this *system of literature* has certain common denominators that allow one to recognize dominant features of a phase. The common denominators, which make literature an organic aspect of civilization, are three: (1) the literary producers, (3) their receptors or audience and (3) a mechanism of transmission binding one work to another (Candido *Formação* 23). The existence of a group of *literary producers* should more or less be conscious of their role, while the receptors, which make up the different types of audiences, are necessary for the work to live. The transmission mechanism, that is, a language used to signify ideas and concepts, binds one work to another and these to the greater cultural milieu. The three elements make up a type of dialogue between literature and its social contours, and literature thus becomes a symbolic system that enables individuals to interpret their social reality:

> O conjunto dos três elementos dá lugar a um tipo de comunicação inter-humana, a literatura, que aparece sob este ângulo como sistema simbólico, por meio do qual as veleidades mais profundas do indivíduo se

> transformam em elementos de contacto entro os homens, e de interpretação das diferentes esferas da realidade. (Candido *Formação* 23)
>
> The combination of the three elements gives room to a type of inter-humane comunication: literature; that appears under this angle as a simbolic system, by which the most profound inclinations of the individual are transformed into elements in contact between men, and of interpretation of the diferent spheres of reality.

Thus, in *Formação da Literatura Brasileira*, Antonio Candido details this critical orientation which sees literature as a system. While Candido is writing two hundred years after Denis and Garret, when Brazil is no longer a monarchy but transitioning towards social-democracy, the search for what constitutes Brazilian literature continues.

Silvio Romero's thoughts on literature as a part of a greater, nation-building project are unequivocal. He wrote: "A história literária é uma das manifestações da história social; as letras não são um luxo, senão uma necessidade orgânica da vida das nações" 'Literary history is a manifestation of social history; literature is not a luxury but an organic necessity in the life of nations' (Romero 412). Similarly, Candido's system of literature brings forth another *decisive moment*, which is the formation of the continuity of literature, like a torch being passed by runners. It is a tradition, states Candido, without which there is no literature as a phenomenon of civilization:

> É uma tradição, no sentido complete do termo, isto é, transmissão de algo entre os homens, e o conjunto de elementos transmitidos, formando padrões que se impõem ao pensamento ou ao comportamento, e aos quais

> somos obrigados a nos referir, para aceitar ou rejeitar. Sem esta tradição não há literatura como fenômeno de civilização. (Candido *Formação* 24)
>
> It is a tradition in the complete sense of the term, that is, a transmission of something between men, and the whole of the transmitted elements forming patterns that impose themselves upon thought and behavior, and to which we are obliged to refer, in order to accept or reject. Without this tradition there is no literature as a phenomenon of civilization. (my translation)

Hence, Candido argues for the omission of the seventeenth-century poet Gregório de Matos (1636-1696) from Brazilian letters. He argues that Matos was only "rediscovered" in the nineteenth-century by Varnhagen, and that only after 1882 with the Vale Cabral edition of his work can the poet be rightly evaluated. Before this, Candido maintains that Gregório de Matos "did not exist in the literary sense" because he did not influence or contribute to the formation of the Brazilian literary system during the time in which he lived (Candido *Formação* 24). While the scope of Gregório de Matos during his time was limited to Bahia, his poems provide an invaluable socio-historical record of seventeenth-century life in Salvador. As we will see, a similar argument can be made for the sixteenth-century poet José de Anchieta.

Whereas Verissimo's history focused more on the individual writers, Antonio Candido focused on how the culture was articulated in certain *decisive moments* in which literary manifestations in Brazil acquired the organic characteristics of a system. The first decisive moment in which the literary manifestations in Brazil acquired the organic

characteristics of a system is marked by three main currents of eighteenth-century taste and thought: Neoclassicism, Enlightenment and Arcadia (Candido *Formação* 41). Hence, *Formação da Literatura Brasileira* begins with the Academies of the Seletos (1752) and of the Renascidos (1759), literary groups or academies formed by the elite in Brazil, as well as the early works of Claudio Manuel da Costa. Candido maintains that it is the neoclassicists who manifested a desire to create a separate literature in order to prove that Brazilians were as capable of producing the same caliber of literature as their European counterparts. Paradoxically, those poets who were allegedly most committed to Brazilian "themes and sentiments" are precisely those who lived most of lives in Portugal: Santa Rita Durão, Basílio da Gama, and Caldas Barbosa. Like Silvio Romero and other critics who came before him, Candido tends to read nativist tendencies into the works of certain neo-classical poets. According to this literary paradigm, the poets express a certain embodiment of a nationalist spirit *before* Brazil became an independent country.

Contrary to the view of the nation-building paradigm of literature written before Brazilian independence is the posthumous work of Sergio Buarque de Holanda, *Capítulos de Literatura Colonial* (written in the 1950s but not published until 1991). A case in point is the author of *O Uraguay*, José Basílio da Gama. More than expressing any sort of nativist or Brazilian nationalist sentiment, Basílio da Gama was in fact partaking in the politics and poetics of his day. In the case of *O Uraguay*, this would mean eighteenth-century Portugal, not Brazil. As Sergio Buarque de Holanda writes: "a obra de José Basílio da Gama inscreve-se de algum modo na copiosa literatura anti-jesuítica estimulada pela ação do marquês de Pombal" 'the work of José Basílio da Gama belongs

to a certain extent to the abundant anti-Jesuit literature stimulated by the deeds of the Marquês de Pombal' (115). Pombal was the enlightened despot of eighteenth-century Portugal who expelled the Jesuit order from Portugal and its territories in 1758. Another recent study of this same poet is by Ivan Teixeira, *Mecenato Pombalino e Poesia Neoclássica* (1999). Teixeira has shown how these same neoclassicist poets participated in the historical and political experience of eighteenth-century Portugal. Hence, Teixeira argues that it is not viable to interpret texts of the colonial period merely on the basis of these real or imagined nationalist sentiments, particularly because the tendency to interpret them as such is based exclusively on the fact that they happen to have included Brazilian themes and settings. Critics developed this habit of reading in nationalist sentiments to these texts in the nineteenth-century when nation building was the order of the day. Teixeira's primary example of this historical interpretation of colonial texts is Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay*. The poem was actually part of the Portuguese enlightened despot Marquês de Pombal's Maecenas. For years this epic poem was thought to be the prime example of pre-Independence Brazilian nationalist sentiment, yet as both Sergio Buarque de Holanda and Ivan Teixeira have shown, the strongest sentiment that *O Uraguay* displays is clearly the anti-Jesuitism that was a trademark of the politics in the time of the Marquês de Pombal.

Like Tomás Antonio Gonzaga's *Marília de Dirceu*, Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay* makes more sense in a Portuguese-centered socio-historical context. Although Basílio da Gama's inclusion of Amerindians in his poem is what prompted critics to ascribe Brazilian nationalist sentiment to the poet, the anti-Jesuit propaganda cannot be

overlooked. Indeed, in *Literatura e Sociedade* (1965) Antonio Candido defines *Caramuru* as "ambiguous" (165). This classification of *Caramuru* as ambiguous could perhaps also be said of the entire Colonial period in Brazilian letters. As we peel back the layers of the earliest texts, they reveal less real or imagined traces of Brazilian nationalism. The reaction to this has been to push the date for the origins of Brazilian literature from the arbitrary date of 1750 forward to 1822. However, to exclude all letters of Portuguese America from the literature of Brazil seems too drastic and shortsighted. Although they may be "tainted" with more enthusiasm for the Portuguese Empire than for Brazilian nationalism, I suggest we go back to the earliest texts of Portuguese American letters in order to gain some perspective on what led up to the *decisive moment* of 1750.

I am reexamining these texts based primarily on two factors: Portuguese language and location in what is today Brazil. The sixteenth-century marks the beginnings of Portuguese writings in the Western hemisphere. Texts written in Brazil or about Brazil began in the year 1500 with the letter of Pero Vaz de Caminha to the King of Portugal. Since this chapter focuses specifically on poetry, I will skip that important document and begin fifty years later, and a full two-hundred years before Silvio Romero's decisive moment of 1750. The second half of the sixteenth-century saw the first two poets of Portuguese America with José de Anchieta (1534-1597) and Bento Teixeira (1550-1600), the inaugurators of written poetry in Brazil. These two poets, one from the Canary Islands and the other a Portuguese, were representative of the politics and poetics of their time. This is apparent in their literary creations, which unambiguously reflect the hegemony of

their respective Iberian empires. Particularly in the political and religious aspects of European colonization of Brazil, their poetry reflects the cultural discourse of overseas Iberian expansion during the sixteenth-century.

The first poet of Portuguese language who lived in what is today the nation of Brazil is José de Anchieta. Originally from the Canary Islands, he studied at the University of Coimbra in Portugal. When he was 17 he joined the Jesuit order and at the age of 19 was shipped off to Portuguese America, along with the second governor-general of Brazil, Duarte da Costa, in 1553. Upon arriving in Bahia, he was promptly sent south to São Vicente where he inaugurated the first School of Latin in Brazil. Anchieta is perhaps most remembered for having written the first grammar of the indigenous Tupi language of Brazil. His knowledge of Tupi was mostly used in order to write *autos* or skits in the medieval tradition with the intent to facilitate the catechization of the Amerindians. Aside from being a Jesuit missionary, Anchieta was also a poet. His poems reflect his multilingual background, since they were written in all of the languages he knew: Portuguese, Spanish, Latin and Tupi. Anchieta would often combine verses in one language with verses in another language, so that the same poem could be written both in Latin and in Portuguese, for example. The fact that Anchieta wrote poetry in four different languages makes it difficult to categorize him strictly as a "Portuguese American" poet so perhaps it would be better just to classify him as a multilingual, Coimbra-educated poet who happened find himself in sixteenth-century Portuguese America.

It may come as no surprise that most of Anchieta's poems have religious themes. Perhaps Anchieta's greatest achievement was writing religious poetry in Tupi, a challenging task because he had to find terms in the language which more or less corresponded to the equivalent of Latin and romance religious concepts and terminology. Thus, the Judeo-Christian concept of God is translated as Tupá, the name the Amerindians used to signify God. In *Dialética da Colonização* (1992), Alfredo Bosi argues that these translations or new representations in Tupi were neither Christian theology nor Amerindian beliefs, but a third symbolic sphere made possible only by this unique colonial situation (60). Thus related terms took on variations of the key term Tupá, such as the Virgin Mary being translated as *Tupansy*, or "the mother of Tupá," and church as *Tupáóka*, or "the house of Tupá" (Bosi 65). Perhaps indigenous peoples may have not seen any need for Tupá to have a house, or a mother for that matter, but these newly created terms coined by Anchieta in the Tupi language created a new third space that could be characterized as uniquely Brazilian or hybrid. In this sense, the term "Brazilian" would signify a blending of the Tupi language with Portuguese concepts of God. Thus, these religious poems mark the beginnings of a new culture that had not existed previously.

Besides creating religious poetry in the Tupi language, it is my belief that if we wish to give Anchieta a proper place in the poetry of the sixteenth-century Portuguese American (i.e. Colonial Brazilian) letters, we need to read not just his religious poetry but also his little known epic poem. It is remarkable because it is the first epic poem of the Western Hemisphere. Anchieta's epic was edited in Coimbra in 1563, six years before

Alonso de Ercilla's first publication of *La Araucana*. It is written in neither Spanish nor Portuguese, but in Latin. Although this poem was only translated and published into Portuguese in 1958, it can still be read today alongside *La Araucana* as one of the inaugural poems not only of Brazil but of the so-called New World. It is mainly about the exploits of the third governor-general of Brazil, Mem de Sá. The political topic does not exempt it from the Jesuit missionary's religious worldview. The main theses or driving force of Anchieta's epic is the Counter-Reformation, presented in the text as praising the catechization of the Amerindians as well as the expulsion of the French Protestants (Teixeira, *Anchieta* 4). The fight that Mem de Sá embodies is that of the battle against the enemies of the Roman Catholic Church, namely the Amerindian pagans—or rather those who refused to convert—and the threat posed by French Protestants to the Catholic stronghold in Brazil.

Anchieta dedicated his epic poem to the third governor of Brazil and is entitled *De Gestis Mendi de Sàa* (1563). While Anchieta could have very easily written his epic in Portuguese, he chose to write this work in Latin. That the first epic poem of our hemisphere was written in Latin is not insignificant. More than the sign of a Spanish or Portuguese empire, Latin was the sign of the Catholic Church, the hegemonic institution of power and knowledge in colonial Latin America. Furthermore, in his dedication to Mem de Saa, Anchieta makes it clear that the third governor is the strong arm of the rein of God in the New World, which forced the Brazilians to forget their alleged "ferocious customs and bloodthirsty rituals" (Anchieta 87). The dedication ends with Anchieta assuring the governor that the glory of his accomplishments will live on and that in

heaven a throne awaits him in reward for clearing the way for the rein of Christ (Anchieta 89). Since the poem was only recently translated into Portuguese, it is clear not only from the choice of language but from the subject matter of the poem itself that this poem could not be interpreted as having the alleged nationalist sentiments of the epics written in the second half of the eighteenth-century. Moreover, the question of language brings us back to an observation made by José Veríssimo on colonial Brazilian literature:

> A língua literaria do Brasil ainda era então e seria por todo o período colonial, apenas talvez com menos arte e menos número, a mesma de Portugal. Não havia ainda tempo para que os cruzamentos e outras influências mesológicas houvessem modificado o falar brasileiro, e menos para que as modificaçoes porventura havidas passassem do falar corrente à língua dos escritores educados por portugueses e feitos só, ou muito principalmente, na leitura de livros portugueses ou latinos. (110)
>
> The literary language of Brazil still was and would be throughout the colonial period, barely perhaps with less art and in lesser quantity, the same as that of Portugal. There had not yet been enough time for mixing and for other misological influences to modify the spoken language of Brazil, and less for the modifications that may have already occurred [at that time] to transfer from the spoken to the written language of writers educated by Portuguese and formed only, or mainly, in the reading of Portuguese or Latin books. (my translation)

Yet, putting aside the fact that it is written in Latin, it is not so difficult to see the similarities between Anchieta's Latin epic and the Portuguese epics of Basílio da Gama and Santa Rita Durão.

The similarities between *De Gestis Mendi de Sàa* and *Caramuru* are worth noting here. While Anchieta's poem praises the feats of the third governor-general Mem de Sá, Durão's poem exalts an obscure Portuguese explorer, Diogo Álvares Correia. Anchieta's poem picks up where Durão's concludes, since *Caramuru* ends with the arrival of the first governor-general Tomé de Sousa. Along with the first governor came the first Jesuits, namely Manuel da Nóbrega, but also in a general sense all Jesuits, including Anchieta himself. In this sense *Caramuru* can be seen as a prequel to Anchieta's epic poem. The fact that both Anchieta and Durão serve in religious orders explains the religious subtext in both poems. Ultimately for them, the so-called discovery of Brazil was as much about bringing the Catholic faith to the New World as it was for the more secular preoccupations of the crown and colonists. Also, the parallel themes of Counter-Reformation are present in both texts. Anchieta's preoccupation with the expulsion French Protestants are echoed by Durão's inclusion in his poem of the expulsion of Dutch Protestants from Brazil. While in the sixteenth-century the Church was more closely tied with the State than in the time of Pombal, both *Caramuru* and *De Gestis Mendi de Sàa* reflect this union between the religious orders and the Crown of Portugal. This bond would continue into the seventeenth-century and would go unchallenged until the eighteenth-century, when ideas of the Enlightenment began to take hold in Portugal.

Ivan Teixeira demonstrates how Basílio da Gama was operating under the auspices of the Maecenas of the Marquês de Pombal. Teixeira also shows how *O Uraguay* reflects the poetics of a secular Portuguese state, *de facto* headed by Pombal. Basílio da Gama's epic reveals more about the power struggle between the Jesuits and the State than any nascent Brazilian identity or nationalism. Of course, the portrayal of the Amerindians is very sympathetic, but according to Basílio da Gama, they were merely pawns of the Jesuits' greedy hunger for absolute power and world domination. The benevolent Portuguese crown sought only to liberate these unfortunate Native Americans from the clutches of their ambitious Jesuit overlords. The archetypical savages of Anchieta's poem, those same Amerindians with "ferocious customs and bloodthirsty rituals," became innocent bystanders in a power struggle that is likewise evident in Basílio da Gama's poem. In *O Uraguay* the antagonists were now the likes of Anchieta himself, specifically, the religious order of the Society of Jesus. Less than ten years after the publication of *O Uraguay*, the Marquês de Pombal is no longer in power and Portugal finds itself dimming the lights of its Enlightenment and returning to its old monarchical hierarchy, which included a strong alliance with the Church. This return to the old order, to the pre-Pombal days, is known in Portuguese history as the *Viradeira*. It is the historical context in which Durão's *Caramuru* appears in 1781.

THE PORTUGUESE *VIRADEIRA* (1777-1808) AND *CARAMURU* (1781)

King José I of Portugal died on the 24 of February 1777. The following day, when the Marques de Pombal arrived at the antechamber, Cardinal da Cunha met him with the

words ‘Your Excellency has no longer anything to do here’ (Livermore 238). Thus began the so-called *Viradeira* or *Mariano* period, named after the reign of Dona Maria I from 1777-1816. The death of King José I brought an end to the Marques de Pombal’s political career. When the King died his daughter Dona Maria I became the first queen-regnant of Portugal. While the Marques de Pombal had tried to exclude her from assuming the regency, it was of no avail (Livermore 238-239). Márcia Maria Menendes Motta writes that “despite the myth of the *Viradeira*, the *Mariano* period clearly exhibits a level of continuity with regard to the Marques de Pombal’s policies; in most of her governmental acts, the Queen held to the principles supported by the *Pombaline* policy” (2). Yet two significant areas that D. Maria did reverse from her antecessor was the state’s antagonism toward the Church and the persecution of the high nobility. These two institutions, Church and Nobility, were allowed to return to their former positions of power and influence which they exercised in pre-Pombal times. Hence the name *Viradeira*: a return to the former organization of the state.

Indeed, most of the policies instituted by the Marques de Pombal actually continued into the *Mariano* period. But more importantly for the existence of *Caramuru* is the fact that Durão may never have returned to Portugal had the political climate not changed as it did. Having fled the reign of Pombal, perhaps Durão never would have written *Caramuru* had he stayed in Rome for the remainder of his life. As we know from his biographical information, Durão had been living in Rome for close to 15 years, when suddenly in 1777 he finally returned to Portugal. That the *Viradeira* is the political milieu in which *Caramuru* was written is important but perhaps not as important as the direct

political influence of the Marques de Pombal on *O Uraguay*. While Basílio da Gama's epic was inextricably tied to the enlightened despot's rule, a similar connection between *Caramuru* and the reign of Dona Maria I is not as direct. However, like all works of art, *Caramuru* is a product of its time.

Criticism on these two epic poems of pre-Independence Brazil reflects the difference between the two periods of Portuguese history: the enlightened despotism under the reign of Pombal and the subsequent *Viradeira*. While the political climate in Portugal is central to these epics, a real or imagined sense of Brazilian nationalism is more difficult to conjure. The reversal of Pombal's marginalization of the Church and the Nobility could be interpreted as retrograde since it went against the trend brought about by the Enlightenment. One could argue that Santa Rita Durão is merely absorbing and transmitting the cultural poetics of his day, a reflection of the reign of D. Maria I, and the *Viradeira* as a return to the pre-Pombal past. Yet, as Motta stated above, there was actually more continuity in the policies instated by Pombal. It may be that the myth of a regression to previous policies has been greatly exaggerated. Likewise, Livermore also states that there was not a "complete revulsion against the previous regime" and that "Maria possessed a strong sense of filial respect and hesitated to undo anything her father had done" (240). If the regression to previous policies implied by the term *Viradeira* is just a myth, then there should be some continuity reflected in the two epics. However, it seems possible that both *O Uraguay* and *Caramuru* may be read as products of the Portuguese version of the Enlightenment and the Counter-Enlightenment respectively.

It is difficult to ignore the two noteworthy aspects that did change under D. Maria's reign: namely, the reinstatement of the Church and the Nobility to their former positions of influence and power in society. Durão was not part of the Portuguese nobility and would not have benefited personally from this particular aspect of the Queen's mandates. But as an Augustinian monk, this poet of the *Mariano* period in Portuguese history has obvious ties to the Church and in this sense he benefited from the regime change that took place in 1777. D. Maria's turning over of the previous marginalization of the Church is more in line with the subtext of Durão's epic poem. In fact, this is reflected in the explicit praise of the Jesuit missionaries in *Caramuru*, whereas in *O Uraguay* there is a clear anti-Jesuit bias in the text. In essence, *O Uraguay* reflects the enlightened despotism of Pombal, while *Caramuru* reveals more sympathy with the *Mariano* period in Portuguese history.

In *Enemies of the Enlightenment: The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity* (2002), historian Darrin McMahon examines the Catholic element in the counter-discourse of the Enlightenment. These anti-*philosophes* or "enemies of the Enlightenment" included: "militant clergy, unenlightened aristocrats, traditionalist bourgeois, Sorbonne censors, and recalcitrant journalists" (McMahon 6). While voices among the anti-*philosophes* were varied, McMahon points out that reaction to the Enlightenment was spearheaded by the Catholic Church. In France, the counter-Enlightenment movement was almost entirely Catholic, and it tended to view the Enlightenment as a fundamentally Protestant emanation. Thus, McMahon argues, *Philosophie* can also be viewed as yet another deviation wrought by the Reformation; the

so-called "enemies of the Enlightenment" drew from the language and the legacy of the Counter-Reformation (45). Many enlightened leaders of Europe, among them Portugal under Pombal, pursued policies directly inimical to the interests of the Church, leading Catholic opponents of the Enlightenment to believe that "the state could be their worst enemy" (McMahon 49). This is most evident in the case of the expulsion of the Jesuits, an act condoned by European monarchs throughout Europe. Opponents of the *philosophes* warned that the triumph of *philosophie* or the ideals of the Enlightenment augured regicide, anarchy, and the annihilation of religion—a fear that was fulfilled by the French Revolution of 1789.

It is in this context of counter-discourse of the Enlightenment that the remainder of this chapter will examine selections from *Caramuru* that reflect this preoccupation with the ideas of the eighteenth-century public intellectuals or *philosophes*. Once again, if we compare the two Brazilian epics we note the secular tone of *O Uraguay* and the promotion of the values of the Enlightenment. Meanwhile, Durão's poem shows a marked religious worldview. Hence, if the *Viradeira* is to be tied in some way to *Caramuru* it would need to be in this religious aspect of the poem. The returning of power to the Church after Pombal's intents to desecularize society under his bourgeois reforms is reflected in several Cantos of *Caramuru*. For example, the devotion to the Virgin Mary in *Caramuru* is an easy case to make, since the poem is in fact dedicated to Durão's Catholic muse. Meanwhile, Basílio da Gama invokes a more classical, nameless muse in *O Uraguay*.

Besides the fact that the poem is dedicated to the Virgin Mary, Durão asks the Virgin mother to make the poem begin and conclude with her. In the final Canto of *Caramuru*, Durão has the Virgin make her appearance in the text. Paraguaçu—now Catarina—has a vision of the Virgin Mary while in a state of ecstasy. Yet Catarina-Paraguaçu does not immediately recognize her as the mother of Jesus. In fact, it is not until the crew has already arrived in Bahia and Diogo is going through the items of his previous shipwreck that he shows Catarina an image of her. Diogo calls his newly baptized wife to see the image of the Virgin Mary and Catarina-Paraguaçu is transported into the aforementioned state of ecstasy.

> Pôs-lhe os olhos a dama, e transportada:
> Esta é (disse), é esta a grã Senhora.
> Que vi no doce sonho arrebatada,
> Mais que o sol pura, mais gentil que a aurora:
> Eis aqui! Esta é a imagem venerada,
> Este era aquele roubo, entendo agora:
> Oh minha grande sorte! Oh imensa dita!
> Isto me quis dizer a Mãe bendita.
> .....
> Aqui vos venho achar Mãe piedosa,
> No meio (disse) desta gente infanda!
> Infanda como eu fui, se o vosso lume
> Não me emendara o bárbaro costume. (Canto X: XLIII-XLIV)

The maiden laid eyes on her, and transported [she says]:

This is she, this is the Great Lady,

that I saw in my entranced sleep

More pure than the sun, more gentle than the dawn

It is here! This is the venerated image,

This was the robbery, I understand now

Oh what fortune! Oh what good luck!

This is what the blessed Mother was trying to tell me

……..

Here I come to find you pious Mother

In the midst of all these dreadful peoples!

Dreadful as I was, had your light

Not corrected my barbarous ways.

From that day on, the Virgin Mother was named "Virgem Santíssima da Graça, Singular Protetora da Bahia" 'Holiest Virgin of Grace, Singular protectorate of Bahia' and indeed, a primitive church would be established in her name: the first church in Brazil to honor the Virgin Mary. Durão does not conclude his epic poem without having fulfilled his promise to begin and end his work with the Blessed Mother and Protector of Bahia.

Had the dedication and apparition been the only reference to religion in the text one could perhaps conclude from that Santa Rita Durão was simply a devotee of the Virgin Mary, and given that he was a monk this probably will come as no surprise.

Nevertheless, there are other instances in the poem that may lead one to infer that there is more to Durão's religious discourse than a devotion to the Virgin Mary.

The *Viradeira* saw the Church's reinstatement to its former power in society: a return to clericalism. The policy of supporting the power and influence of the clergy in political or secular matters runs counter to Enlightenment ideals. Thus a simplification of the political climate of late eighteenth-century Portugal would describe Pombal's enlightened despotism as anti-clericalist and the *Viradeira* as clericalist. This is clearly seen in the anti-Jesuitism propagated by the Marques de Pombal. However, it is well worth noting that Dona Maria did not reverse the charges brought against the Jesuits under the previous regime. The Jesuits had applied for restoration under Dona Maria, but Livermore states that she remained "faithful to her father's memory" and "refused to admit it [the restoration of the Jesuits] but gave them pensions" (242). In the end, the Jesuits would not recover the favor of Rome until 1814, and were only readmitted to Portugal in 1828 (Livermore 242). Dona Maria restored the former power of the Church but maintained the same policy towards the Jesuits.

Durão had at one point in his career been anti-Jesuit, but in Rome he retracted his statements against them, and the verses in *Caramuru* praising the Jesuit missionaries in Brazil are proof of this change of view. In the last Canto of *Caramuru*, Durão fully credits the Jesuits for their hard work of evangelizing the Amerindians, thereby making them allies of the Portuguese and facilitating the establishment of the Portuguese settlers in Brazil. The stanzas cited below pay tribute to the founder of the Jesuit order, Ignacio de Loyola:

De varões apostólicos um bando

Tem de inocentes o esquadrão disposto,

Que iam na santa fé disciplinando,

Todos assistem com modesto rosto:

O catecismo em cântico entoando,

No idioma brasílico composto

Do exército, que Inácio à Igreja alista,

Para empreender a bárbara conquista. (Canto X: LII)

Of apostolic men, a group

Of innocents who serve the squadron

Who went in the holy faith, teaching

All listening with modest faces

Chanting the catechism in song

In the Brazilian language

The army that Ignacio [de Loyola] enlists

In order to undertake the barbarous conquest.

In this first of three verses we note the clear reference to the Jesuits, referred to in the poem as Ignacio's army. The Jesuits were sent to Brazil to catechize the Amerindians and, as we will see in Chapter Three, had mixed results. Nevertheless the poet recognizes their efforts in the conquest and colonization of Brazil. Durão also notes the efforts of missionaries to learn Tupi, in order to catechize the natives in their own language; a feat made easier by Anchieta's pioneering study of Tupi grammar.

Sentiu da pátria o público proveito

O monarca piíssimo que impera;

E estes varões famosos tinha eleito

A instruir o Brasil na fé sincera:

Eles toda a conquista houveram feito,

E o imenso gentio à fé viera,

Se cuidasse fervente o santo zelo,

Sem humano interesse em convertê-lo. (Canto X: LIV)

Feeling the public benefit of the fatherland

The most pious monarch that reigns

And these famous men he had chosen

To instruct Brazil in genuine faith

They would have undertaken the entire conquest.

And the immense heathen to the faith would come

If he guarded vehemently the holy zeal

Without mundane interest in converting them.

Durão has a footnote explaining that the holy zeal referred to in this stanza pertains to those who brought the downfall of those Jesuit missions. In this case, we could imagine he is referring to Pombal, whose successful propaganda war against the Jesuits culminated in their expulsion from Portugal and its colonies. In the final pages of *Caramuru*, Durão extols the missionary work carried out by the Jesuits—specifically the

two first Jesuits in Brazil, Manuel de Nóbrega and José de Anchieta—who were instructed by the Portuguese Crown to bring the alleged "true faith" to the Amerindians.

The conclusion of *Caramuru* as a praise of the Jesuit missionaries is foreshadowed in the first Canto, where Durão places the story of the missionary prophet within the story of the shipwrecked Portuguese sailors. After Sancho is devoured in the first Canto, the remaining survivors of the shipwreck are taken prisoners for three months until they are ready to be sacrificed. As they await death, Fernando tells the tale of the prophetic statue located on the island of Corvo in the Azores. With lyre in hand, Fernando begins to sing of the lost Saint Auréu, who was mysteriously elevated by an angel and taken west, "adonde o sol já se escondia" 'to where the sun had already hid' (Durão 25). The angel shows the saint a dying heathen and asks him to hear his cries. Auréu accepts the call and takes the shining lighted path toward him. Although Auréu does not speak the same language as the heathen, he understands and makes himself understood to him. Auréu tells him: "Do grande Criador por mensageiro / A benção (diz) te of'reço, homem ditoso" 'Of the great Creator by messenger / A blessing (he says) I offer to you, fortunate man' (Durão 26). The story of Auréu therefore foreshadows the arrival of the Jesuit missionaries in the New World. Durão credits those brave souls who chose to follow a "divine calling" to evangelize the heathens by converting them to his religion. The allegory of the prophetic statue illustrates Durão's preoccupation with the clerical cause of his day.

Fernando's tale ends when both saint and baptized savage are transported to the highest peak on the Island of Corvo in the Azores, frozen in time as if pointing the way to

new lands. The prophetic statue can also be read as a cue to the Portuguese audience that God had called upon them to convert the world: "Destino foi do céu onipotente / A fim que sem receio, ou torpe medo / À piedosa empresa o povo corra" 'It was destiny from the omnipotent sky / In order that without hesitation, or vile fear / The people carry out a pious enterprise' (Durão 37). Thus, the statue attests to the messianic nature of the Portuguese Empire, whose conversion of the world was part of the goal to establish "O Reino de Deus por Portugal" 'The Kingdom of God for Portugal' (Hoornaert 40). The story of the missionary saint sent to the west to evangelize the native population of Brazil is a main theme of Durão's poem. It will recur when Diogo himself takes on the role of missionary catechist to convert Gupeva, the leader of the Tupinambá, and his future wife Paraguaçu. With Gupeva and Paraguaçu converted, the subjection and evangelization of the entire Tupinambá tribe is facilitated. Thus, Caramuru is written in praise of both the evangelizing Jesuits and the Portuguese colonists who likewise succeeded in bringing the Amerindians into the fold of the Catholic religion.

In addition to Durão's reverence for the Virgin Mary and his praise for Jesuit missionaries in Brazil, his footnotes in Canto Three deserve close attention. Compared with the previous Cantos examined above, this one stands out as seemingly sympathetic towards indigenous beliefs. Initially, this Canto appears to be an acknowledgement of the indigenous religion: with Paraguaçu serving as translator, Gupeva explains to Diogo the characteristics of the Tupinambá faith. In this recognition of the Amerindians' religion, Durão counters the established colonial discourse that they did not have Faith, Law, or King: "Não tem fé, nem Lei, nem Rei," an oft repeated claim first made by Pero de

Magalhães Gandavo in his *História da provincial de Santa Cruz* (1576). In the following footnote, Durão denounces those authors who would believe that the Amerindians had no beliefs or governing customs of their own:

> 2. Um Deus – É injúria que se faz por alguns autores aos brasilienses, supondo-os sem conhecimento de Deus, lei e rei. Eles têm a voz Tupá, com especial significação de um ente supremo, como sabemos dos missionários e dos peritos dos seus idiomas. (83)
>
> 2. A God - It is an insult what some writers claim of the Brazilians, assuming that they don't have any knowledge of God, law and king. They have the Word Tupá, which in particular signifies a supreme being, as we know from the missionaries and the experts of their language.

This particular footnote demonstrates how Durão is actually using the Amerindians' religion as a way of defending their belief in God. The fact that the indigenous people of Brazil believe in a supreme being serves to defend clerics like Durão against his enlightened anticlerical contemporaries, as we shall see in this next footnote:

> 4. Espírito imortal – Os bárbaros americanos têm distinta idéia da imortalidade da alma, do paraíso, do inferno, da lei, etc. Veja-se o Martinière, Osório de rebus Emmanuelis, e outros. Grande argumento contra os libertinos e materialistas. Pois quem lhes transfundiu estes conhecimentos, senão a antiga tradição dos tempos diluvianos, e a harmonia que estas tradições têm com a natureza. (86)

> 4. Immortal Spirit – The barbarous Americans have a distinct idea of the immortality of the soul, of paradise, of hell, of the law, etc. See Martinière, Osório de rebus Emmanuelis and others. [It is] a great argument against the libertines and materialists. Who then transmitted this knowledge if not the ancient tradition of the times of the flood, and the harmony that these traditions have with nature.

In this footnote Durão specifically mentions liberals and materialists of his day. That the Amerindians have a distinct idea of a soul, paradise, hell, and divine justice is proof for Durão that the materialists are wrong. The ancient tradition of the Amerindians and the harmony that they maintain with nature has provided them with knowledge of the divine law of God and of the immortality of the soul.

In case any of those aforementioned liberals and materialist opponents would read his poem, Durão establishes a dialogue with them in the first footnote of Canto Three. After describing the indigenous people's belief in evil spirits, Durão directly addresses and probes his anticlerical adversaries, asking where the Amerindians could have learned this and who could have inspired such sentiments:

1. É constante o conhecimento que têm os bárbaros da América dos espíritos infernais. De quem o aprenderam? Quem lhes inspirou estes sentimentos? *Respondam os materialistas e libertinos.* Como era possível que concordassem com as outras gentes estas nações ferinas e sem algum comércio. Como era factível que conservassem, depois de tantos séculos, tão clara noção de espíritos separados? (my emphasis, Durão 82)

1. The knowledge that the barbarians of America have of infernal spirits is well established. Who did they learn it from? Who inspired in them these sentiments? *Respond materialists and libertines*. How was it possible that they concur with other peoples these ferocious nations, without any type of commerce? How was it possible that they conserve, after so many centuries, such a clear notion of separate spirits?

Durão demands that materialists and liberals respond to the fact that even the so-called barbarians of America believed in spirits and further points out that these supposedly savage nations held such beliefs in the supernatural, in spite of their relative isolation.

In the last of the dialectical footnotes to be examined here, Durão seems to have found the most convincing argument yet. Upon becoming familiar with the Amerindians' belief in hell, Durão is certain that his anticlerical enemies will be bewildered and perhaps even convinced of a belief in the supernatural:

12. Crêem os brasilienses que no meio das montanhas que dividem o Brasil do Peru há vales profundíssimos, aonde são punidos os ímpios. Idéia expressa do inferno, em que concordam com todas as gentes, e dão

> claro sinal nesta persuasão de saberem-no por tradição original dos primeiros que povoaram a América. *Não pode haver argumento mais convincente para encher de confusão os deístas, libertinos e materialistas*. (my emphasis, Durão 91-92)
>
> 12. The Brazilian peoples believe that in the mountains that divide Brazil and Peru there are profound valleys where the infidels are punished. [This is an] explicit idea of a hell, which agrees with all peoples, and gives a clear sign that in this conviction that they know it by original traditions of the First peoples to populate America. *There is no argument more convincing to fill with confusion deists, libertines, and materialists*.

For Durão, the Amerindians' belief that hell lies between the mountains that divides Brazil and Peru demonstrates that the concept of divine punishment is presumably universal. It may seem odd that Durão doesn't recognize the indigenous beliefs as superstition; rather, he uses their religion to give credit to his own supernatural beliefs.

As one would expect, Durão's own bias towards Catholicism as the allegedly singular religion would not allow him to portray the indigenous faith as equal to his own. Ultimately, this discourse of the superiority of Catholicism provides further justification for the spiritual conquest carried out by the Portuguese clergy in the colonies. Since missionaries are, by the very nature of their work, in the business of "selling religious beliefs," respect for the conservation of traditional beliefs and practices was never a priority.

We have so far seen how Durão's poem reflects the political climate of the Portuguese *Viradeira*, specifically, in the return to clericalism. Unlike Basílio da Gama's poem, which invokes a secular muse, Durão invokes the Virgin Mary. And while *O Uruguay* is thoroughly anti-Jesuit, *Caramuru* sings praises of the Jesuit missionaries for their evangelization efforts in Brazil. A third religious aspect apparent in *Caramuru* is the dialogue that Durão establishes with the "deists, libertines and materialists" of his day, products of the Enlightenment and the newfound faith in western science. Therefore, we return to how the social and political background of the counter-Enlightenment influenced many verses in *Caramuru*; and we can argue Santa Rita Durão was not promoting Brazilian nationalism, but rather deeply involved in the debates and ideas of the European Enlightenment. Durão supports the belief in God by pointing to the Amerindian's belief in the hereafter and the supernatural. This manner in which he seeks to prove to the materialists that God or Tupá exists is noteworthy. By appropriating the name that the Tupinambá have assigned to God, the great Tupá is taken as evidence of universal belief in a Supreme Being. The argument that this belief in Tupá came naturally to such "primate peoples" as the Amerindians is somehow held as proof of the existence of God. Likewise, the beliefs in supernatural concepts like the soul and an afterlife are further arguments against libertines and deists. Whether or not these arguments ever convinced any of Durão's contemporaries is unclear. However, the interest that Durão takes in the religious beliefs of the Amerindians is a sign of religious, not nationalistic, fervor.

The next chapter illustrates how this religious zeal often translated into justification for the conquest of Brazil.

CHAPTER THREE

Holy Wars: The Spiritual Conquest in *Caramuru*

By echoing the colonial discourse established under the Regiment of King João III in 1548, which declared that the King's main purpose in colonizing Brazil was the conversion of its natives, *Caramuru* evokes the spiritual conquest of Brazil. Those appointed to carry out this massive undertaking were the Jesuits and other religious orders, with the collaboration of the military and the government. The events in the poem, particularly the first three Cantos, follow the history of the subjection and catechization of the Brazilian Amerindians. In the last Canto, Durão fully credits the Jesuits for the hard work of pacifying the native population of Brazil, thereby making them into allies of Portuguese and facilitating the establishment of the latter in Brazil. We can therefore read *Caramuru* as a reflection of imperialist Portugal's efforts to implement catechization as a civilizing mission, a concept first suggested by Caminha in his *Carta* to King Manoel I (1500), and later implemented by the Jesuit missionaries in Brazil.

Vasco da Gama's first successful voyage to India in 1499 was followed by a second expedition by Pedro Álvares Cabral in 1500. As the fleet sailed south along the western coast of Africa, the South Atlantic winds and currents pulled it west, and the fleet inadvertently landed on what is today the northeast coast of South America. The Portuguese explorers named this place *a Terra de Vera Cruz* or The Land of the True Cross. Cabral's thirteen-ship fleet ended up spending eight days near and around present-day Porto Seguro before getting back on track to India. Pero Vaz de Caminha, the fleet

scribe, recorded the Portuguese's first impressions of the peoples of the western hemisphere in his *Carta*. The following quote is taken from that historic letter, *Carta* –1° de maio de 1500:

> Parece-me gente de tal inocência que, se nós entendêssemos a sua fala e eles a nossa, seriam logo cristãos, visto que não têm nem entendem crença alguma, segundo as aparências. E portanto se os degredados que aqui hão de ficar aprenderem bem a sua fala e os entenderem, não duvido que eles, segundo a santa tenção de Vossa Alteza, se farão cristãos e hão de crer na nossa santa fé, à qual praza a Nosso Senhor que os traga, porque certamente esta gente é boa e de bela simplicidade. E imprimir-se-á facilmente neles qualquer cunho que lhe quiserem dar, uma vez que Nosso Senhor lhes deu bons corpos e bons rostos, como a homens bons. E o Ele nos para aqui trazer creio que não foi sem causa. E portanto Vossa Alteza, pois tanto deseja acrescentar a santa fé católica, deve cuidar da salvação deles. E prazerá a Deus que com pouco trabalho seja assim!
>
> They seem to me people of such innocence that if we were able to understand each other they would at once become Christians, because it appears they don't have or practice any belief. And therefore if the convicts and exiles that are to remain here would learn their language and understand them, I have no doubt that, in accordance with the holy intentions of Your Majesty, that they would immediately become Christians and would believe in our holy faith, to which it would please

> Our Lord if they did because indeed, these people are good and of beautiful simplicity. And they would quickly be molded into whatever form given to them, since Our Lord has given them good bodies and good faces, as he does to good men. The Lord has brought us here for a reason. Therefore Your Majesty, wishing to expand the holy catholic faith, should insure their salvation. And it shall please God that with little work it shall be granted. (my translation)

After the stopover in Brazil, Cabral's fleet continued on to its original destination in the East Indies. Only three ships survived that voyage to India and Cabral's journey of 1500 would be his last. Both Cabral and Caminha died in the wreck of the flagship. Yet Caminha's letter survived because it was sent back to Portugal while the rest of the expedition continued on to India. The letter to King Manoel I is significant because it is the first written document telling of the initial contact between Portuguese explorers and native peoples of the lands that would one day become Brazil.

How should one describe those historical events that resulted in the spiritual and armed conquest of the indigenous peoples of the western hemisphere? The choice of wording is crucial. In his book *Dialética da Colonização*, Alfredo Bosi notes that in 1556, after the Black Legend of Iberian colonization was widespread, Spain decreed that the words *conquest* and *conquistadors* were to be replaced by the terms *discovery* and *colonizers* respectively (12). How one imagines the arrival of Europeans in the so-called New World is reflected by the use of either *discovery* or *conquest*. For many native peoples of the Americas, the Europeans' new finding meant death or destruction or both,

brought by an onslaught of warfare and diseases. Survivors of the conquest fared little better, as many Amerindians were forced into slavery. In order to provide the Portuguese colonists with a pacified and readily available labor supply, the religious missions served as an intermediary between the colonizers and the colonized. On these missions, the Amerindians were forced to surrender their souls to the new Christian beliefs introduced to them by the missionaries. This religious conversion of the Amerindians would come to be known as the spiritual conquest.[8] The full title of Santa Rita Durão's epic poem reflects the eighteenth-century worldview of the Portuguese Empire: *Caramuru, Poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia* (1781). The title signals to the reader that this is the story of discovery, not conquest. This chapter will aim to read *Caramuru* not from the point of view of the Europeans' discovery, but rather as an account of the religious or spiritual conquest of the indigenous peoples of what is today Brazil. The first section will present the religious and colonial discourse on which the historical bias of *Caramuru* is founded and the second section is a literary analysis of the poem's continuation of this same religious discourse found in the poem itself.

FROM CAMINHA'S *CARTA* TO VIEIRA'S *SERMÕES* (1500-1700)

The above excerpt from Caminha's *Carta* describes the Amerindians as perfect candidates for the King's plans to expand the Catholic faith since, for the Portuguese, they seem not to have any beliefs at all. Caminha seems confident that the Amerindians'

[8]The term originally comes from Antonio Ruiz de Montoya's *Conquista Espiritual hecha por los religiosos de la compañía de Jesús [...]* published in Madrid in 1638-1639. Although it was first used in this case as a laudatory term, it has since taken on negative connotations.

apparent ingenuousness would make conversion an easy task. His immediate strategy for conversion is that the Portuguese exiles that were left behind in the land of the True Cross will learn their language and convert them to Christianity. Interestingly, this is exactly the case of Diogo-Caramuru, at least of Santa Rita's Durão's poetic persona. In *Caramuru*, it is in fact the shipwrecked Diogo Álvares who converts the natives to Christianity. Furthermore, Caminha's letter confidently implies that the Amerindians are good and simple people and that they will easily be converted to Christianity. In *Caramuru*, the conversions of Paraguaçu and Gupeva were effortless. Caminha optimistically states that it will please God that with "very little effort" the King will accomplish this task to convert the Amerindians. In *Caramuru*, this effort is of course thwarted by the war between the Caetés and the Tupinambá. In historical hindsight, not all tribes were as friendly as those encountered by Cabral and his men. In addition to fulfilling the epic dictates of a war, the tribes who resisted colonization were eventually defeated. The parallels between *Caramuru* and Caminha's letter are significant, since they seem to agree that the salvation of the Amerindian's souls was the reason for colonization.

Believing that the Lord or God had brought them to Brazil for a reason, Caminha's letter ended by stating that since His Majesty's wishes include expanding the Catholic Faith, he should look after their salvation. In his essay on "Portuguese Settlement, 1500-1580" H. B. Johnson writes that "the eight days that the fleet spent refreshing itself in Brazil provided a first brief encounter between two civilizations, one recently embarked upon aggressive imperialism, the other a stone-age culture, virtually outside of time, living in the innocence apparently of Eden" (5-6). Indeed, the impression

one gets from Caminha's letter is that the Brazilian Indians had not yet eaten from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. Like Adam and Eve before the fall, the native Brazilians that Cabral and his crew encountered wore no clothes and did not feel any apparent self-consciousness about their uncovered bodies. John Hemming likewise points out that "the thing that most intrigued Caminha and his companions was their first sight of naked people" (3). In his first sighting of eighteen or twenty men, Caminha remarks on their skin color and their lack of clothing: "eram pardos, todos nus, sem coisa alguma que cobrisse suas vergonhas" 'they were dark-skinned, all naked, without anything covering their shameful parts' (84). Caminha's descriptions of the native women further demonstrate the Portuguese astonishment at their modest nudity (86-87). Their bewilderment with the native's customs and norms suggests that Caminha's letter reveals as much if not more about Portuguese conventions than it does about the people they encountered along the way of Cabral's journey to India.

If the first sight of modest nakedness was what most captivated the attention of the Portuguese, their will to convert the native peoples to Catholicism is likewise noteworthy. What might have convinced Caminha of his imagined facile reception of the Amerindians to Catholicism was their reaction to Portuguese religious practices. They watched closely as two of the ship's carpenters built a large wooden cross (Hemming 2). Caminha describes the celebration of the first mass on an empty beach in Porto Seguro:

> Once the cross was made, Cabral had his men 'kneel down and kiss the cross so that [the Indians] might see our veneration for it. We did so, and motioned to them to do the same: they at once all went to kiss it.' When

> the cross was finally planted, the natives joined in the ceremony, kneeling for prayers and imitating the Portuguese when they rose for the sermon. 'And at the elevation of the Host, when we knelt, they placed themselves as we were with hands uplifted, and so quietly that I assure Your Highness that they gave us much edification.' (Hemming 2)

Caminha comments that the Amerindians were probably more thrilled by the iron tools used to make the cross than the cross itself. Hemming refers to this as "the intense thrill of Stone Age people at their first sight of the cutting power of metal" (2). Nevertheless, Caminha interprets the natives' seemingly impressionable behavior as an indicator of their willingness to accept Christian doctrine.

Not all subsequent chroniclers shared Caminha's optimism about ease with which the Amerindians would embrace Christianity. As we will see in *Caramuru*, the alleged ritual that would horrify the Europeans was only revealed to them on the first *official* expedition to Brazil, headed by Gonçalo Coelho in 1501.[9] Américo Vespúcio's "Lettera a Soderini" (1504) constitutes the first written description of cannibalism practiced by natives in the New World and in which the victim was a European (Bueno 42). Vespúcio's account tells of a group of indigenous women who approached one of Coelho's crewmen and began examining him with much curiosity until one of them hit him over the head, knocked him out, and dragged him away:

> Então as outras mulheres imediatamente o arrastaram pelos pés para o monte, ao mesmo tempo que os homens, que estavam escondidos, se

[9]Although Cabral's expedition is actually the first, since they landed by accident this second trip headed by Gonçalo Coelho is considered the first official expedition to Brazil.

> precipitavam para a praia armados de arcos, crivando-nos de setas, pondo em tal confusão a nossa gente, que estava com os batéis encalhados na areia, que ninguém acertava lançar mão das armas, devido às flechas que choviam sobre os barcos. Disparamos quatro tiros de bombarda, que não acertaram, mas cujo estrondo os fez fugir para o monte onde já estavam as mulheres despedaçando o cristão e, enquanto o assavam numa grande fogueira, mostravam-nos os seus membros decepados, devorando-os, enquanto os homens faziam sinais, dando a entender que tinham morto e devorado os outros dois cristãos. (qtd. in Bueno 42)
>
> Then the other women immediately dragged them by their feet up to the hill, at the same time that the men, who were hiding, hurried off to the beach armed with bows, bombarding us with arrows, so bewildering our people that I was with the boats, stranded in the sand, that no one was able to get a hold of the arms because of the arrows that rained on the boats. We fired four shots and missed, but whose loud noise made them run away to the hill where the women were tearing apart the poor Christian, while cooking him over an open fire, they showed us the disjointed body parts, devouring them, while the men made signals, showing they had killed and devoured the other two Christians. (my translation)

The two other Christians referred to at the end had been missing for five days. In total, three Europeans had all suffered the same fate of being quartered, roasted, and devoured by the Brazilian Indians.

By the mid sixteenth century, the allegedly "noble savages" in Caminha's letter were already rebelling against the Portuguese settlers. Perhaps the most noted victim of cannibalism was the first bishop of Brazil, Dom Pero Fernandes Sardinha. The Caetés devoured Sardinha after the ship he was on wrecked in the shallows between Bahia and Pernambuco. Along with Bishop Sardinha, the Caetés stripped, bound and sacrificed over a hundred whites in all, not counting slaves, who were aboard the same ship (Hemming 82). In response to this atrocity against the Church, the Pope excommunicated the Caetés tribe in perpetuity (Galeano 241). Meanwhile, the third royal governor of Brazil, Mem de Sá, proclaimed a so-called *Guerra Justa* or justified war against the Caetés and authorized permanent enslavement of any captured prisoners (Hemming 147). The Portuguese settler population soon regarded the proclamation as "an open hunting license against any Caetés" and began to enslave any Amerindians—hostile or friendly—on the pretext that they might be Caetés (Hemming 86, 147). Needless to say, the fate of the first Bishop of Brazil must have prompted many Portuguese to be skeptical about Caminha's claims that the Brazilian Amerindians would be easily converted to Christianity.

The Jesuit Manuel da Nóbrega (1519-1570) addressed the issue of the difficulties and possibilities of the conversion of the Native American population in his *Diálogo sobre a Conversão do Gentio* (1559). Nóbrega was the first Jesuit to establish schools in order to catechize free and enslaved Amerindians and teach the young Portuguese colonists. Nóbrega is often remembered for "his never-ending fight in favor of monogamy and against cannibalism and unlawful slavery" (Hulet 12). Written in the years following the deglutination of Bishop Sardinha in 1556, the *Diálogo* presents a

much more realistic view of the possibilities for conversion than does Caminha's *Carta*. While Caminha's *Carta* was ingenuously optimistic about this particular enterprise, he had spent only eight days among the Amerindians in 1500. Meanwhile, Father Nóbrega had arrived in Brazil in 1549 with the first governor, Tomé de Sousa, and lived in Brazil for eight years before writing his *Diálogo*.

The debate in Nóbrega's *Diálogo* is between two Jesuit missionaries in Brazil: the newly arrived Gonçalo Alvares and an older veteran, Mateus Nogueira. Being the newcomer, Gonçalo Alvares is discouraged since the Amerindians are not as easily converted as he would have imagined. He begins by calling the Amerindians "beasts," because their "heart is incapable of absorbing the things of God" and that to preach to them is to "preach to rocks in the desert" (my translation, Nóbrega 181). The veteran missionary Mateus Nogueira has more experience and a better assessment of the situation. He knows that "the theoretical rapidity with which one might suppose that the Indians would be converted to the new religion and be rid of their savage ways is not in fact a reality" (Hulet 13). At one point in the dialogue Gonçalo asks Mateus point blank if the Amerindians have souls like they do, to which Mateus responds that they certainly do:

> GA: Êstes têm alma como nós?
>
> MN: isso está claro, pois a alma tem três potências, entendimento, memória, vontade, que todos têm. (Nóbrega 201)
>
> GA: Do they have souls like us?

MN: This is clear, well the soul has three forces, understanding, memory and will, and they have them all. (my translation)

Mateus Nogueira concludes that in spite of all these difficulties, the Amerindians are men with souls and therefore conversion of these souls to Christianity is indeed a possibility.

Nóbrega's preoccupation with conversion does not simply have to do with his profession. The original intention of King João III in settling Brazil was officially declared in the 1548 Regiment of the first royal governor of Brazil, Tomé de Sousa. The royal instructions had come to Brazil in 1549 with the fleet that had carried Sousa, and the first Jesuit missionaries, led by Nóbrega. They were specifically instructed by the King to "bring about the conversion of its natives" (Hemming 147). The orders put forth by the King's Regiment of 1548 established the Jesuit missions as essential institution for conversion and legitimized the collaboration between the missionaries and the military. It is in this sense that Nóbrega's *Diálogo* sought to counter those critics and skeptics who believed the King's orders to convert the Amerindians as a problematic, if not an impossible, task.

Alfredo Bosi writes that Nóbrega's *Diálogo* is noteworthy because of the evenhandedness with which he presents both sides of the argument, that is the Amerindians willingness or not to convert: "é notável pelo equilíbrio com que o sensato jesuíta apresentava os aspectos 'negativos' e 'positivos' do índio, do ponto de vista da sua abertura à conversão" 'is notable because of the equilibrium that the sensible Jesuit presents the negative and positive aspects of the Amerindian, from the point of view of his conversion' (my translation 18). A more judicious assessment of the *Diálogo* is made

by the Jesuit historian Eduardo Hoornaert in *A Igreja no Brasil-colônia: 1550-1800* (1984). Hoornaert writes that Nóbrega's *Diálogo* defends the argument that the conversion of the Amerindians would be impossible unless the Portuguese could first subject them. Furthermore, Hoornaert argues that Nóbrega's treatise legitimizes the collaboration between the military and the missionaries:

> No primeiro tratado teológico escrito a partir da experiência missionária brasileira, o Dialogo [....] defendeu a tese segundo a qual a conversão do indígena só se tornará possível após a sujeição dele, desta forma a colaboração entre militares e missionários foi legitimada. (64)
>
> In the first theological treatise written from the Brazilian missionary experience, the Diologue […] defends the thesis according to which the conversion of the indigenous would only be possible after his subjugation, and thus the collaboration between military and the missionaries was legitimized. (my translation)

Evidently, Hoornaert takes a more critical stance than Bosi vis-à-vis Nóbrega's *Diálogo*, pointing to the subtext of the missionaries' collaboration with the military, which expedited the spiritual conquest or holy war in the conversion of the Amerindians.

The landscape of the colonial missionary church in Brazil would be incomplete without mentioning the Jesuit missionary Antônio Vieira (1608-1697). Hoornaert asserts that Vieira believed that the colonization of Brazil was a part of a grand global scheme whereby Portugal had been chosen by God to lead the evangelization of the planet and that, without colonization, this universal evangelization would be impossible (64-65).

Hoornaert, who is also a Jesuit, writes that the theme of "invincible ignorance" in Vieira's writings is theologically different from the thought of Bartolomé de las Casas, for whom the Amerindians are potential members of the so-called Mystical Body of Christ:

> Os indígenas são, para las Casas, potencialmente membros do Corpo Místico de Cristo, de forma que haja espaços de salvação fora dos quadros da cristiandade. Esta intuição de las Casas é absolutamente revolucionária para a época e de maneira nenhuma compartilhada por Vieira. É uma intuição mística, certamente nascida na meditação do rosto sofrido dos indígenas escravizdos e humilhados por trabalhos forçados. Ela leva las Casas a assumir posições políticas sempre mais afastadas dos projetos coloniais da época, o que não é de nenhuma forma o caso de Vieira, profundamente envolvido pelo entusiasmo do "Reino de Deus por Portugal." (42)
>
> The indigenous are, for Las Casas, potential members of the Mystical Body of Christ, in a way that there would be spaces for salvation outside the confines of Christianity. This intuition of Las Casas is absolutely revolutionary for its time and is in no way shared by Vieira. It is a mystical intuition, certainly born in the meditation of the suffering faces of the indigenous peoples who were enslaved and humiliated by forced labor. It causes Las Casas to take political positions in opposition to the colonial projects of the time, which is in no way the case of Vieira, who was

> profoundly consumed with the enthusiasm for the "Kingdom of God by Portugal." (my translation)

This idea—a "mystical intuition" as Hoornaert calls it—is what distinguishes Las Casas from Vieira. Hoornaert asserts that for Vieira, who is devoted in his own missionary ideology, the indigenous peoples of America have no value outside of the Christian system (43). This leads Hoornaert to conclude: "Temos que reconhecer que o Brasil não teve um 'Bartolomé de las Casas'" 'We need to recognize that Brazil never had a Bartolomé de las Casas' (43). Like Nóbrega, Vieira also carried out the orders of Portuguese King to catechize the Amerindians and incorporate them into colonial Brazilian society.

While Vieira's imperialistic beliefs and missionary zeal might be open to modern day criticism, other critics like Hemming have argued that no Portuguese or Brazilian figure of similar stature and energy was as concerned with the welfare of the American Indians during the three centuries of Portuguese colonial rule (144).[10] Whether or not Vieira was a true defender of the Amerindians, the success of his massive efforts to convert them to Christianity is dubious. Hemming writes that Vieira often praised the Amerindian intelligence but would become furious when they "rejected Christian teaching as incomprehensible, alien to their way of life, and irrelevant to their

[10] However concerned Vieira may have been with the Indians, his views on African slavery were not so sympathetic. His discourse on African slavery reflected his greater messianic vision of the Kingdom of God in the name of Portugal. He believed that, by baptizing African slaves, the Portuguese were actually saving them from eternal damnation in Africa, which he compared with Hell, and that by bringing them to Brazil, which he compared to purgatory, they could earn salvation by working dutifully on the master's plantation (Hoornaert 74-76).

environment (343). In a frustrated admission of failure, Vieira exploded in one sermon, complaining that highly educated Jesuits had to "adapt themselves to the most unintelligent and inarticulate people that nature ever created or aborted:"

> To men whose status as men was in doubt, so that the Popes had to define that they were rational and not brutes…[Our teachers] had to return a thousand and one times… to teach again what was taught and repeat what was already learned… We perform out missions in poverty and in the wilderness, amid the hardships and miseries of the most uncouth, poorest and most lowly people, the least human people that were ever born in the world! (qtd. in Hemming 344)

The Amerindians saw that, for all their sanctity, the missionaries could not stop the deadly epidemics, thus causing confusion and despair. Therefore, writes Hemming, "They clung stubbornly to their own tribal way of life and rejected a genuine conversion to Christianity" (344). The fact that many indigenous tribes continue to conserve their traditions intact to this day is a testament both to the tenacity of the Amerindian's culture and to the questionable success of the missionaries' efforts in evangelization.

Evangelization in the Americas was a widespread phenomenon. This particular aspect of Iberian colonialism is evident in many of the written documents of that time period, from Caminha's *Carta* up to Durão's *Caramuru*. If the New World epic ancestor to Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay* is Ercilla's *La Araucana*, one could very reasonably argue that Durão's own predecessor is Antonio Ruiz de Montoya's *Conquista Espiritual hecha por los religiosos de la Compañia de Jesus, en las provincias del Paraguay,*

Paraná, Uruguay y Tape (Madrid, 1639; Bilbao 1892). The Lima-born Jesuit wrote this testament of his religious order's evangelical exploits among the Amerindians. The conquistadors and the men of "sword and letters" (like Ercilla) could not take all of the credit for conquering the New World, so the Jesuit priest sees himself as "continuing the work of his ancestors […] in search of wild animals, of barbarous Indians, […] in order to round them up in the corral of the Holy Church and to the service of His Majesty" (Montoya 19-20). While Montoya's work is written in prose and *Caramuru* is poetry, the underlying them of conversion of the Amerindians to Christianity is the same.

It is in this vein of spiritual conquest of the New World that *Caramuru* will be read here, as the Augustinian Monk's own tribute to the Portuguese' religious conversion of the natives of Bahia de Todos os Santos in the early fifteenth century. As we saw in the previous Chapter, Durão wrote *Caramuru* partially in response to Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay*, specifically as a defense of the Jesuit missions and missionaries. While Basílio da Gama's anti-Jesuitism is evident throughout the poem, Durão praises the efforts of the early missionaries to Brazil. Canto Ten provides a clear example of this sympathy for the intrepid Jesuits who traveled to Brazil in the sixteenth century in order to evangelize the native population:

> São desta espécie os operários santos,
> Que com fadiga dura, intenção reta,
> Padecem pela fé trabalhos tantos,
> *O Nóbrega famoso, o claro Anchieta:*
> Por meio de perigos e de espantos,

Sem temer do gentio a cruel seta,

Todo o vasto sertão têm penetrado,

E a fé com mil trabalhos propagado. (Canto X: LV)

They are of this kind, the saintly workers

That with harsh fatigue, straight intentions

They endure with faith so much labor

The famous Nóbrega, the lucid Anchieta

Amongst dangers and frights

Without fearing the heathen's cruel arrow

Penetrating all the vast backlands

And propagating the faith with a thousand works. (my emphasis)

Of course, the Jesuits referred to here in *Caramuru* are distinct from those of *O Uraguay*. Nóbrega and Anchieta are not fictional characters like Padre Balda in *O Uraguay*. The Jesuit Padre Balda is unscrupulous and clearly the antagonist of the poem, which is all aimed at subverting the Jesuit order thereby confirming the anti-Jesuit politics of Pombal. Meanwhile, the antagonist in *Caramuru* is the Caeté Jararaca. We will see in the next section why it is significant that he is Caeté, and not Tupinambá.

Durão's poem is read in the following section as a continuation of the religious discourse first put fourth in Pero Vaz de Caminha's *Carta*. The discourse of evangelization of the Amerindians continues with Nóbrega's *Diálogo* and Antonio Ruiz de Montoya's *Conquista Espiritual hecha por los religiousos de la Compañia de Jesus*, among others. While the evangelizing force in Durão's *Caramuru* is Diogo Álvares, a

layperson not a Jesuit, the epic poem *Caramuru* is also a testament in praise of the efforts of Jesuit missionaries, such as Nóbrega and Anchieta, to bring the Christian faith to the New World.

RELIGIOUS AND COLONIAL DISCOURSE IN *CARAMURU*

One major pretext for the mission of conversion of the Brazilian Amerindians was to eliminate anthropophagy. In this sense, evangelization was the means of preventing the natives from practicing cannibalism. This preoccupation with the native Brazilians eating human flesh is evident from the very beginning of *Caramuru*. Almost as soon as the narrative begins, Durão relates a detailed account of the alleged anthropophagous practice among the natives. Diogo and six other crewmembers survive the shipwreck, but one sailor named Sancho is not so lucky. He washes ashore but dies from hitting his head against a sharp rock. At this point, Durão describes the natives' gluttonous consumption of Sancho:

> Correm depois de crê-lo ao pasto horrendo;
> E retalhado o corpo em mil pedaços,
> Vai cada um famélico trazendo,
> Qual um pé, qual a mão qual outro os braços:
> Outros na crua carne iam comendo,
> Tanto na infame gula eram devassos;
> Tais há que os assam nos ardentes fossos,
> Alguns torrando estão na chama os ossos. (Canto I: XVII)

They run after him after believing him horrible fodder

And cut up his body in a thousand pieces

Each one starving brings

A foot, a hand, another the arms

Others the raw meat were eating

Even in gluttonous infamy they were depraved

Some are even grilling them in an ardent pyre

While others are roasting the bones in the fire

Although he is appalled by what he calls a "horror of humanity," Durão recognizes that some ancient peoples of Europe practiced cannibalism and credits Christianity with its abolition (17-18). Durão therefore reasons that the spread of Christianity in Brazil will likewise eliminate cannibalism, and this argument will thereby legitimize the spiritual conquest of the Brazilian Amerindians.

A similar justification of the conquest was made by those who saw human sacrifices as an excuse to impose Christianity on the Aztecs of central Mexico. Aztecs would wage wars on neighboring tribes and take captives with the intention to sacrifice them in order that the sun would continue. Nevertheless, Medieval Iberian society practiced its own forms of human sacrifice in the *autos da fé* carried out by the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions. This putting to death of the other was customary by the Inquisition, yet unacceptable when it came to indigenous peoples of Mesoamerica. While there was nothing similar to cannibalism being practiced in Europe, the projection of evil onto the other was, and remains, common currency. Meanwhile, any pretext to justify the

imperial takeover of another land is given credence and often exaggerated in order to rationalize the imposition of one's culture over another. In Brazil, the taboo practice given this inflated importance was cannibalism.

While the first Canto establishes the main argument for the conversion, which is to eliminate the Amerindians' cannibalistic practices; in Canto Two, the Indians and the Portuguese debate the question of anthropophagy. Gupeva, the leader of the Tupinambá tribes, defends this practice:

> Pois se os bichos nos devem comer logo,
>
> (O bárbaro lhe opõe com desempeno)
>
> A nós faz-nos horror se eles nos comem,
>
> E é menos triste que nos trague um homem. (Canto II: XIX)
>
> Well if the insects are going to devouring us soon
>
> (the barbarian haughtily contests)
>
> We are horrified that they would eat our flesh
>
> It is better to be devoured by a man.

While this conversation or debate is entirely fictional, the poet seems to want to give voice to the Amerindians' more practical view of consuming another human being. By establishing a hierarchy of man over insects, Gupeva argues that they prefer to be eaten by their own. While it is not mentioned here in this epic poem, it is now common knowledge that it was an honor to be devoured by another tribe. This view was established particularly in the poetry of Gonçalves Dias, specifically in his indianist poem

I-Juca-Pirama (1851). The next chapter details this transformation of taboo into totem, which culminated in Oswald de Andrade's *Manifesto Antropófago* (1928).

In the next two stanzas, Diogo responds to Gupeva by stating his twofold argument against cannibalism. While the first stanza explains Diogo's theological principles, the second stanza presents his so-called natural reasons to reject anthropophagy:

> O corpo humano (disse o herói prudente)
> Como o brutal não é: desde que nasce,
> É morado do espírito eminente,
> Em que do grão Tupá se imita a face.
> Sepulta-se na terra, qual semente
> Que se não apodrece, não renasce.
> Tempo virá que, aos corpos reunida,
> Torne a nossa alma a respirar com vida. (Canto II: XX)
> The human body (says the prudent hero)
> Is different from the beasts: from the time he is born
> It is the house of the eminent spirit
> In which the face of the great Tupá is reflected
> It is buried in the earth, like a seed
> One day the bodies will be reunited
> When our souls will once again breathe with life.

Diogo's explanation of the human body housing the spirit and the belief in the resurrection of the dead is a fundamental tenet of Durão's own Catholic doctrine. If the body is not buried in the ground like a seed, what will be of it at the time of resurrection? Somehow this literal belief in the resurrection of the body becomes problematic if one is devoured by another human being. Yet it seems that Gupeva still has the upper hand in the argument thus far because as he stated if people do not eat the corpse, insects will do the job that humans don't. Either way, when one dies, one is going to become food for another. How will the body resurrect from the insides of vermin? Durão's religious argument is somewhat flawed assuming that a corpse would need to buried in order to be resurrected.

Since the religious argument for burial and being consumed by vermin rather than people is lacking, Diogo continues with the second half of his rationalization, this time from a more practical point of view:

> O lume da razão condena a empresa;
> Pois se o infando apetite o gosto adula,
> Para extingir a humana natureza,
> Sem mais contrários, bastaria a gula.
> Que se a malícia em vós ou se a rudeza
> O instinto universal de todo anula
> É contudo entre os mais cousa temida
> Que outrem, por vos comer, vos tire a vida. (Canto II: XXI)
> The light of reason condemns such a practice

Well if the abominable appetite acquires this taste

To extinguish the human race

Without any contrary, gluttony would do it

If it is malice in you or if it is ignorance

The universal instinct of everything annuls it

It is however the thing most feared

That another would kill you just to eat you.

This logical explanation expands on the rational argument stated above. Diogo reasons that if people began to acquire a taste for human flesh, then gluttons could extinguish the human race just to satisfy their appetites. Yet the argument that the indigenous people of South America practiced cannibalism as a means of dietary supplement is not well founded. In extreme cases of starvation many peoples have been forced to eat human flesh. One account that turns this entire argument of indigenous people's as cannibals on its head is the account of cannibalism practiced by the Spanish explorers in Álvar Nuñez Cabeza de Vaca's *Naufragios* (1542). More recently, the Uruguayan rugby team got in touch with its own anthropophagic roots when their plane crash landed in the Andes. However, it is generally understood that cannibalism practiced by the indigenous people of Brazil was a ritual, and that it was not intended to make regular meals of other human beings.

Diogo also affirms that there is no greater fear than of being killed in order to be eaten. In fact, fear is a common war tactic, and not only among indigenous tribes. Implanting fear into the other tribe with the threat of death by consummation or human

sacrifice was a strategic way to establish one tribe's dominance over another. Just as the Aztecs would often instill fear into their enemies when during the so-called *Guerras floridas* they would conquer neighboring tribes and take captives for human sacrifice. In Brazil, an early account of this tribal war practice was made by an early German explorer called Hans Staden. His account was originally published in 1557 as *Warhaftige Historia und beschreibung eyner Landtschafft der Wilden Nacketen, Grimmigen Menschfresser-Leuthen in der Newenwelt America gelegen* (*True Story and Description of a Country of Wild, Naked, Grim, Man-eating People in the New World, America*). In this report of his travels in the New World, Hans Staden describes his own alleged eye-witness account of the practice, the following is taken from a section of his account entitled "*Porque devoram os seus inimigos*" 'Why they devour their enemies':

> Fazem isto não para matar a fome, mas por hostilidade, por grande ódio, e quando na guerra escaramuçam uns com outros, gritam entre si, cheios de fúria: [...] tua carne hoje ainda, antes que o sol se deite, deve ser meu manjar. Isto tudo fazem por imensa hostilidade. (qtd. in Ribeiro, 170)
>
> They do this not to get rid of their hunger but because of hostility, a great hate, and when in a war they have a skirmish, they yell at each other, filled with fury: your flesh will yet today, before the sun sets, shall be my morsel. They do all this with immense hostility. (my translation)

Thus, Staden imagines that fear is the primary effect of the practice of cannibalism. Devouring the enemy becomes a symbolic element in psychological warfare, since the mere threat of it becomes enough to terrorize the opposition.

With the judgments regarding anthropophagy as justification for Christianization stated in the passages cited from *Caramuru*, I would like to point out a parallel between the arguments made against *sati* and *anthropophagy* from the point of view of the empire, or colonizers. In her widely-cited essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988) Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak shows how the British abolition of East Indian widow sacrifice or *sati* has been generally understood as a case of 'white men saving brown women from brown men' (93). What appears on the surface to be simply a patronizing attitude turns out to be a justification for imperialism. In reference to the British, who boasted of their absolute equity toward and noninterference with native custom/law, Spivak writes that "the protection of woman (today the 'third world woman') becomes a signifier for the establishment of a *good* society which must […] transgress mere legality, or equity of legal policy" (93-94). The fact that the British intervened by changing Hindu law in order to 'save the brown women' reflects a patronizing colonizer-knows-best attitude similar to the one Durão establishes in *Caramuru*.

This dilemma of modification of the laws of the colonized based on moral grounds is a legitimate question. Like cannibalism in Brazil, or human sacrifices in Mexico, the ritual sacrifice of widows or *sati* was reinterpreted as a crime by the British government, thereby justifying interference in Hindu laws and customs. Spivak provides another example of this imperialistic rationalization disguised behind a condescending attitude in Edward Thompson's essay "Suttee" (1928). This essay illustrates the British misunderstanding of *sati* as a form of punishment. What the British took to be "poor victimized women going to the slaughter is in fact an ideological battleground" (Spivak

96). Spivak describes *sati* as a way that the surviving members of the widow's husband's family prevented her from inheriting joint family property (96). Another account by an actual East Indian widow states another aspect of sati: "the British government put a ban on the custom of sati, but as a result of that several women who could have died a cruel but quick death when their husbands died now have to face an agonizingly slow death" (qtd. in Loomba 237). Like the British government, Thompson's essay appropriates the Hindu woman as his to save against the 'native system' by imposing his own upper-class Victorian's typical demands upon what he likes to call 'his woman' (Spivak 101). Spivak therefore calls Thompson's essay a "perfect specimen of true justification of *imperialism as a civilizing mission*" (101, my emphasis). Whether it was the British saving widows in India, or the Spaniards rescuing the Tlaxcaltecas from the abuses of the Aztec empire, or the Portuguese protecting themselves from being devoured by cannibals, or even the Americans liberating the Iraqi people, empires will find some pretext to justify their actions.

Once again, these justifications for imperialism may seem imposing; however, civilizations do not thrive in a vacuum. What may for some appear to be a "civilizing mission" for others is a natural course of cultures in contact. Thus, Britain's "civilizing mission" recalls Portugal's imperialist justification on religious terms, best summed up in Vieira's battle of cry of missionaries in Brazil calling for "*O Reino de Deus por Portugal*" 'The Kingdom of God by Portugal' (a phrase first attributed to Antônio Vieira, although the concept is evident from Pero Vaz de Caminha's letter). In the same manner as Edward Thompson's essay, Durão's *Caramuru* uses the practice of anthropophagy as

an excuse for the ensuing subjugation and evangelization of the Brazilian Indians. However, Durão's descriptions of the gluttonous Tupinambá devouring Sancho as if human beings were a staple of the Amerindians' diet, or simply another source of protein, is a gross misrepresentation of the complex ritual practiced by some tribes. The custom usually involved the sacrifice and consumption of courageous enemies in order to incorporate the best characteristics of the Other as their own.

In the essay "Let Us Devour Oswald de Andrade," João Cezar de Castro Rocha notes that Durão's point of view follows the general European position, which had condemned cannibalism as being no more than barbaric and had, therefore, justified colonization (7). Yet the anthropophagous ritual is the means whereby the native seeks to appropriate his enemy's bravery and value; therefore, the enemy must be worthy of being devoured (Rocha 8). José de Alencar succinctly described the meaning behind the indigenous ritual:

> The enemy's remains would be like the holy bread, which strengthened [the] male warrior; because women and young males were only given a small portion of the remains. This was not revenge, but rather a communion with flesh, through which the transfusion of heroism would take place. (qtd. in Rocha 8)

Hence, this ritual anthropophagy is not unlike Durão's own Catholic practice of Holy Communion. This practice, in which the priest literally, not metaphorically or symbolically, but according to Catholic creed, explicitly converts the bread and wine into the actual body and blood of Jesus Christ himself, and should be eaten only by Catholics

who are free from mortal sin. Jesus is thus the hero worthy of being devoured. The Catholic rite of Holy Communion appears to be a milder form of this same idea of "transfusion of heroism," although the body of Jesus which is consumed by Christians is only bread, while his blood is wine.

Once Durão has established anthropophagy as a justification for Portuguese colonization of Brazil in *Caramuru*, the conquest of the Amerindians can now take place. Since the native population outnumbered the Portuguese, especially in the early years of settlement, conquering the Amerindians one by one would be impossible. If the colonizers controlled the leaders, they could easily dominate their respective tribes. This fact is likewise reflected in *Caramuru,* as Diogo first subdues Gupeva, the leader of the Tupinambá, by converting him to his religion and in doing so, effectively controls the rest of the tribe, including his future wife, Paraguaçu.

Gupeva's conversion to Christianity takes place in Canto Two, which tells how the Portuguese—represented here by Diogo—used firearms in order to coerce the Amerindians to abandon their cannibalistic ways. Diogo goes into the grotto to retrieve the arms that had washed safely ashore. When dawn breaks, he comes out of the grotto and decides to startle the natives with his armor. Gupeva comes near him and, upon seeing Diogo dressed in metal with sword and musket, he thinks he is seeing an *anhagá* or devil. Although Diogo is now capable of attacking the Amerindians, he decides to "suspend Mars's furor" and instead hopes to tame them by inspiring a little fear in "the ingenuous natives" (Durão 51). In the language of the Tupí he learned over the course of three months observing and listening to their language, he tells them not to be afraid. He

assures them that his bellicose instruments cannot harm them as long as they do not eat human meat. Then, Diogo threatens to fire upon anyone who eats human flesh:

> A carne humana! (replicou Diogo,
>
> E como pode, explica em voz e aceno)
>
> Se vir que come algum botarei fogo,
>
> Farei que inunde em sangue esse terreno. (Canto II: XIX)
>
> Human flesh! (responds Diogo
>
> And as best he can explains with speech and gestures)
>
> If I see any of you eat another I shall throw fire
>
> I shall flood this land with blood.

This portrayal of the conversation that occurs between Diogo and Gupeva reflects the fate which befell those Brazilian Indians who refused to change their anthropophagic ways. The amount of bloodshed that ensued after the Caeté ritually devoured the first Bishop (fatefully named Sardinha) is a testament to the historical basis of this exchange between Diogo and Gupeva. In fact, it is the subject matter of the first epic poem of the Westernn Hemisphere, mentioned in the previous chapter, José de Anchieta's *De Gestis Mendi de Sàa* (1563). As was mentioned preciously, Mem de Sá, who was the third Governor-General of Brazil, serving from 1557 to 1572, brought about a campaign to eliminate the Caeté after they incorporated the heroic attributes of Bishop Sardinha into their tribe by eating him. The land then did become flooded with blood since Mem de Sá led the military effort to pacify those tribes who refused to submit to Portuguese rule. In

Caramuru, Diogo takes on this role of representing Mem de Sá by threatening to fire upon those who continue to practice cannibalism.

The conversation between Diogo and Gupeva continues as the night falls, when Gupeva and other Tupinambá follow Diogo into a cave where he has conveniently stored his belongings from the shipwreck. The poet compares Diogo with Prometheus as he lights a lantern, while the Amerindians watch in fascination and wonder how this man could make fire appear out of nothing but his own hands, without the use of firewood. When the light shines on the gunpowder, gold, and silver, the Tupinambá see everything but envy nothing. Then Gupeva picks up a painting of a beautiful woman. He is sure this must be Tupá's wife, if he had one. Gupeva asks Diogo if the painting represents Tupá's wife or mother, guessing that such a beautiful woman could only be the mother of God:

> Esta (pergunta o bárbaro) tão bela,
> Tão linda face, acaso representa
> Alguma formosíssima donzela,
> Que esposa o grão Tupá fazer intenta?
> Ou porventura que nascesse dela
> Esse, que sobre os céus no sol se assenta?
> Quem pode geração saber tão alta?
> Mas se há mãe que o gerasse, esta é sem falta. (Canto II: XXVIII)
>
> This one (asks the barbarian) so beautiful
> Such a lovely face, perhaps represents
> A beautiful maiden

What wife the great Tupá intends?

Or perhaps that she give birth

That one, which over the skies in the sun sits?

Who would be able to know such high birth?

But if there is a mother that would, it is her indeed.

Gupeva intuitively guesses that the image of the Virgin Mary must be divine, either the wife or mother of Tupá. Diogo then explains to Gupeva the mystery of the virgin birth, how she became the mother of Tupá when he decided to be born human:

Encantado está o pio lusitano

De ouvir em rude boca tal verdade;

E adorando o mistério soberano,

Mãe ter não pode (disse) a divindade.

Mas sendo Deus eterno, fez-se humano,

E sem lesão da própria virgindade

A donzela o gerou, que pisa a lua,

Digna mãe de Tupá, mãe minha e tua.(Canto II: XXIX)

Delighted is the pious Lusitanian

To hear such truths in ignorant mouth

And adoring the supreme mysterious

Mother the divine can not have

But God being eternal, made himself human

And without breaching her virginity

The maiden that steps on the moon gave birth

Worthy mother of Tupá, my mother and yours.

If in the previous verses Diogo took the role of Mem de Sá, now he is portraying Padre Anchieta or Nóbrega by evangelizing Gupeva. As mentioned in chapter two, Anchieta wrote the first grammar and study of the Tupí language and wrote religious poems in Tupí. His translations equate Tupá with God. The interchangeable use of the terms Tupá and Deus (God) in *Caramuru* may be read as an acknowledgement that both the Amerindians and the Portuguese share the same God.

The poet's acceptance and appreciation of the Tupí's belief in a Supreme Being is significant because in other parts of the Americas indigenous beliefs were often treated as heresy or even devil worship. In *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700* (2006), Jorge Cañizares-Esguerra explores the common theme that the devil was considered to be the ruler of the natives and was rampant in the New World (5). Like Spanish Catholics, the British Protestants also used similar religious discourses to explain and justify conquest and colonization: "a biblically sanctioned interpretation of expansion, part of a long-standing Christian tradition of holy violence aimed at demonic enemies within and without" (Cañizares-Esguerra 9). Another example of this complete disregard for Amerindian beliefs is extensively documented in *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in the Yucatan, 1517-1570* (1987) by Inga Clendinnen. Franciscan missionaries in the region tortured more than 4,500 Mayans with methods used by the Spanish Inquisition in order to purge them of their religious beliefs (Clendinnen 76). Fray Diego de Landa (1524-1579) led this Franciscan Inquisition, serving as Bishop of

Yucatán from 1571-1579, and even carried out an *Auto da Fe* in order to display the unchallengeable power of the church in the region. While the exchange in *Caramuru* is of course a poetic representation, it reflects the linguistic concepts first put forth by Anchieta. Had Anchieta decided to translate Tupá as "the devil" instead of God, the evangelization process in Brazil may have been more akin to the Yucatán. Durão accepts the existing translations of Tupá as God and continues the tradition of syncretizing the two cultures' religious worldviews.

The religious discourse in *Caramuru* thereby reflects the attempts made by Jesuits missionaries to Christianize the existing concepts of the divine already present in the Tupí language. The following verses recall Pero Vaz de Caminha's description of the first mass, described at the beginning of this chapter, as Diogo asks Gupeva to pray with him to ask their spiritual mother to defend them and to protect him and his tribe:

> Peçamos, pois que é mãe, que nos defenda;
> Que te dê para ouvir dócil orelha
> E contigo o teu povo recomenda:
> Dizendo o herói assim, devoto ajoelha.
> Gupeva o mesmo faz com fé estupenda;
> E pendente de Diogo, que o aconselha,
> Levanta as mãos, como ele levantava,
> E vendo-o lagrimar, também chorava. (Canto II: XXX)
> Let's ask her, since she is our mother, to defend us
> That she give you a docile ear with which to hear

And will intervene on behalf of you and your people:

Thus spoke the hero as he devotedly kneeled

Gupeva does the same with marvelous faith

And dependent on Diogo, who advises him

Lifts up his hands as he did

And seeing him weep, also cried.

Mimicking Diogo's actions as he offers prayers to the mother of Tupá, Gupeva's heartfelt devotion to the divine feminine is clear. That night, Gupeva raises his heart to her before falling asleep "e à mãe de Deus o coração levanta" 'and to the mother of God he raised his heart' (57). With this tearful prayer to the goddess, Gupeva's conversion is complete.

The religious conversion of Gupeva deserves careful consideration, since it is in fact a reflection of the fact that many Amerindians converted to Christianity. The poetic representation in *Caramuru* imagines a voluntary conversion, but this was not always the case. Even as the previous verses noted, firearms were in fact used to threaten those tribes who continued to practice cannibalism. While this was the original pretext, Mem de Sá's previously mentioned *Guerra Justa* soon became a license to enslave any Amerindians, not just Caetés. Yet even in the cases where conversion was voluntary, we may stop to consider what does it mean to take on the colonizer's religion? What could cause a people to give up their beliefs and exchange them for another's? Certainly, in the Iberian Peninsula, the forced conversion of many Jews and Muslims just as the Americas were being founded and settled had an influence on the cultural mindset of the time. As in New Spain, many New Christians came to Brazil in order to escape persecution or to arouse

less suspicion vis-à-vis the Inquisition. The Amerindians already had a concept of God, but as with Muslims and Jews, it was deemed necessary that they be evangelized and brought into the fold of Christianity, particularly the Catholic Church. In other words, the Spiritual Conquest was a continuation of the Reconquista-turned-Inquisition, which transferred over to Iberian America at the same time it was being colonized.

In *Caramuru*, Gupeva's conversion is a strategic move on the part of Diogo's incursion into the group. Since Diogo is outnumbered, Gupeva's religious transformation actually serves Diogo more than it does Gupeva. Now that he and Gupeva share the same spiritual mother, Diogo no longer has to worry that the Tupinambá will devour him. Nor does he have to walk around dressed in full armor, carrying his musket and sword for protection. The morning after his conversion, Gupeva gathers around him important members of his tribe and vouches for Diogo, telling them that their god Tupá has sent Diogo to them from across the ocean. It is also Tupá who allows him to turn his soft flesh into steel, and make fire appear from his hands. Gupeva announces that Diogo's purported magical powers will help them defeat their enemies in battle and they should celebrate the arrival of this Heaven-sent guest. Gupeva further orders his tribesmen to go on a hunt in order to prepare a banquet and feast on the abundant food of the Bahian land in Diogo's honor. With the religious conversion of Gupeva complete, Diogo's dynamic in the group changes: his precarious status as a *prisoner* who was about to be consumed by the Tupinambá transforms dramatically to that of an *honored guest*. In essence, the evangelization of Gupeva establishes Diogo's hegemony in the tribe.

In addition to the magical powers attributed to Diogo's suit of armor and the lighting of the lantern, the hunting trip further confirms Gupeva's theomorphic claims about Diogo. As the tribesmen go off on the hunt, they take with them their bows and arrows. Diogo accompanies the tribe, taking only his musket as a weapon. Never having heard gunfire, the Amerindians are terrified by the loud explosion when Diogo shoots and kills a bird in flight. Not understanding how Diogo has seemingly caused it to thunder, fear causes them to cry out to God in fright, shouting "Tupá, Caramuru" (62). With the fire of his rifle, Caramuru is now (mis) taken for a son of the god of Thunder, and a son of Tupá. Diogo's reaction to the Amerindians' mistaking him for a son of God is cunning. He does not deny it, but instead uses it to his benefit to bring the Tupinambá under his control by threatening to strike down anyone who disobeys Gupeva, now his spiritual brother and trusted ally:

> De Tupá sou (lhe disse) onipotente
> Humilde escravo e como vós me humilho;
> Mas do horrendo trovão, que arrojo ardente,
> Este raio vos mostra que eu sou filho.
> (Disse e outra vez dispara em continente)
> Do meio do relâmpago, em que brilho,
> Abrasarei qualquer, que ainda se atreva
> A negar a obediência ao grão Gupeva. (Canto II: LI)
> I am of the omnipotent Tupá (he tells him)
> A humble slave and like you, I humble myself

But the horrendous thunder that I ardently hurl

This ray demonstrates that I am a son

(He says and again once again fires)

In the midst of the flash of lightening, in which I shine

I shall burn anyone who still dares

To disobey the great Gupeva.

Diogo thus deceives the Tupinambá by telling them that his ray of thunder is proof that he is in fact the son of Tupá. The use of firearms against arrows, the killing a bird in midflight, all contribute to misconception that perhaps Diogo is somehow otherworldly. Yet, as we shall see in the next chapter, not all the Amerindians where taken in by his seemingly magical weapon.

Durão mentions in a footnote how the heroes of mythological times—for example, Hercules—are not unlike the first Portuguese explorers. He considers these explorers more worthy of being called heroes than Augustus, since unlike that "evil tyrant," the heroic Portuguese evangelized the natives, or as Durão so indelicately states, they "planted a human heart in these beasts" (64). Yet Diogo does come across as somewhat tyrannical since he threatens to fire upon anyone who disobeys Gupeva. It is significant that these two are now sharing command in the group; Gupeva's authority is now backed by Diogo's firearms. Gupeva attributes magical powers to Diogo's suit of armor and to his lantern, but the thunderous gunfire is still incomprehensible to him. Unlike Diogo's other mysterious abilities, this one paralyzes him with fear of the unknown. Gupeva now has Diogo's firearms at his disposal, yet the thunder caused by

the “metal pipe” frightens him. Diogo sees his friend’s terror and promises not to harm him; he will only strike against Gupeva’s enemies. In order to further calm his fears, Diogo unloads the musket and gives it to Gupeva saying that whoever is loyal shall be able to hold it without it exploding. Diogo then tells the terrified Tupinambá that even a child or the meekest one among them can “hold the thunder in his hands without it exploding,” but should anyone rise up against him, treason will be paid with the traitor’s head. Diogo threatens to fire upon anyone who betrays him:

> [...] se algum faltasse à fé devida,
> Sentirá da traição por pena amarga,
> Com próprio dano seu, com mortal risco,
> Relâmpago e trovão, fogo e corisco. (Canto II: LIV)
> If some is lacking the proper faith
> They shall feel the betrayal from the bitter penalty
> With danger to himself, with mortal risk
> Lightning and thunder, fire and flash

Since Diogo holds the gunpowder, he decides when the gun will go off, and thereby effectively establishes his authority as the alleged son of the Thunder.

As mentioned in the introduction, the declaration of Diogo as the Son of Thunder has a biblical reference to James and John, whom Jesus named “sons of Thunder” for their fervent religiosity. On one occasion they wanted to summon a fire from heaven to destroy the people of a Samaritan village who had refused to allow Jesus and His apostles to pass through on their way to Jerusalem. Thus, James and John are known as the “sons

of thunder" in reference to their bold and vehement personalities. The poet, being an Augustinian monk, must have made this reference to Diogo as a prototype of these violent disciples of Jesus. The use of firearms to assist in the evangelization of the Amerindians could certainly be a reference to the disciples' James and John zealousness.

In *Caramuru*, Diogo represents those "sons of thunder" who partook in the colonization of the New World, missionaries who would be instrumental in the Christianization of the American Indians. Yet the evangelization of the Amerindians would have been much more difficult to accomplish had the missionaries not had the military power to back up their project. It is worth noting that the third governor of Brazil, Mem de Sá, had the support of both Manuel da Nóbrega and José de Anchieta (the epic poem dedicated to him by the latter is an actual testament of that support). To fail to see the connection between the clerics and the soldiers is myopic. To make a modern day comparison, one is reminded of the tragic fate of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, Sérgio Vieira de Mello, who tried to separate his organization from the military prescence of the United States in Iraq. His decision to call off the US military barricade in front of the UN building in Bagdad allowed a car bomb to trespass, killing him along with 20 members of his staff in the Canal Hotel bombing of 2003. His effort to distance his humanitarian mission from the US military was futile, since seen from the other side, the UN and US were perceived as one and the same.

Gupeva's acceptance of the colonizer's goddess, or Tupá's mother, was the first step in his submission to Diogo. Now, with the threat of the wrath of the Son of Thunder, Gupeva has no choice but to surrender:

Porem guardai-vos vós, que só no peito,

Só na alma que tenhais tenção malina,

Vereis que trovão faz por meu respeito

E que vem no estampido a vossa ruína.

Treme Gupeva, ouvindo este conceito,

E humilde a fronte ao grão Diogo inclina,

Certo de não faltar na fé que rende,

Donde o raio e trovão crê que depende. (Canto II: LVI)

Yet guard yourselves, that only in your heart

Only in your soul you have malicious intent

You shall see that it thunders on my behalf

And that it comes banging your peoples ruin

Gupeva trembles, hearing this concept

And humble he bows his head to the great Diogo

To be sure he is not lacking in faith

To where the ray and thunder he believes emanates

This scene of Gupeva's surrender ends when he calls his tribe to witness the inviting of Diogo, not as an honored guest as he had before, but to live among them as their new permanent overlord. It foreshadows the coming of the first governor-general of Brazil, Tomé de Sousa (1515-1573), to whom Diogo succeeds his authority as sovereign of the Tupinambá. In the following scene Gupeva offers his lands and subjects himself and his tribe to Caramuru's rule:

Convoca entanto o principal temido

As esquadras da turba então dispersa

E o grão Caramuru pede rendido

Que eleja casa no país diversa:

E que a gruta deixando, suba unido

Onde em vasta cabana o povo versa;

Nem duvide que a gente fera e brava

O sirva humilde e se sujeite escrava. (Canto II: LVII)

He summons the most feared one

The throng of squadrons then dispersed

And defeated he asks the great Caramuru

To pick a house in their various lands

And leave the grotto, and join them

Where in a vast hut the people gather;

And not to doubt that these fierce and brave people

Will serve him humbly and subject themselves as slaves.

The reason Gupeva yields his authority to Diogo is because Caramuru seems to control the lightning and thunder. Not only does the rest of the tribe offer Diogo his choice of dwelling, but by surrendering themselves as humble slaves to the theomorphic foreigner, Caramuru's hegemony is established. And thus ends the armed conquest of the Tupinambá tribe.

Caramuru's acceptance into the Tupinambá tribe is what facilitated the transfer of power which would take place upon the arrival of the first governor-general of Brazil in 1549 in Salvador. This city would become the capital of the Portuguese empire in Brazil for 300 years. The ease with which the Portuguese Crown was able to establish itself in Bahia would have been impossible without the assistance of Portuguese explorers like Diogo Álvares who arrived well before Tomé de Sousa. Along with the first governor came the first Jesuits, who established missions on which they assimilated the Amerindians into Portuguese culture, particularly Christianity. In *Caramuru*, the evangelization of Gupeva is a poetic representation of the work of the missionaries to convert the Amerindians to Christianity. As in the poem, the Christianization of the Amerindians benefited the Portuguese by forging an alliance with otherwise hostile tribes. Ultimately, if the colonizer's religion did not pacify the Amerindians, firearms would.

The themes addressed in this chapter have been cannibalism, how it served as a justification for the conquest of the Amerindians in Brazil, and how religion and firearms were used to carry out this enterprise. Furthermore, Gupeva's conversion allows Diogo to dominate the Tupinambá. If we recall the text's explicit clericalism discussed in the previous chapter we can see that three main themes behind the religious and colonial discourse in *Caramuru* concern cannibalism, conquest, and clericalism. Sympathy with the clerical cause is evident throughout *Caramuru*: from the allegory of the prophetic statue in the first Canto, to the specific mention of the Jesuit missionaries who evangelized the so-called savages in the last Canto, Durão brings the clericalist discourse

full circle in the poem. In *Caramuru*, Durão represents the mostly Jesuit clergy who were involved in the evangelization of the Brazilian Indians as the unsung heroes of the Portuguese discovery of Bahia. In the poem, Diogo personifies the Jesuits since he is responsible for converting Gupeva, and thus allowing for the subsequent submission of the entire Tupinambá tribe. The fact that some Amerinidians practiced anthropophagy served as a major argument for justifying the armed and spiritual conquest of Brazil. Hoping to counter the anticlerical currents established under Pombal's administration and touted in Basílio da Gama's *O Uraguay*, *Caramuru* essentially seeks to defend the clergy by commemorating their evangelical endeavors in this epic poem about the spiritual and armed conquest of Brazil.

CHAPTER FOUR

Jararaca's Revenge: European Imperialism and Amerindian Resistance

In the previous chapters we saw how Gupeva and Paraguaçu ally themselves with Diogo and the Portuguese enterprise in Brazil. In this chapter I attempt to analyze those scenes in *Caramuru* that portray the struggle against Portuguese conquest and colonization. The threat of the practice of cannibalism was used to justify the conquest of the Amerindians, a historical fact reflected in both José de Anchieta's *De Gestis Mendi de Saa* as well as Santa Rita Durão's *Caramuru*. Again, cannibalism plays an important part in this resistance, as we will see in the exchange between Diogo and the Amerindian named Bambu. Yet the main opponent in *Caramuru* is of course Jararaca, who, as we saw in Chapter One, is modeled on Aeneas' rival Turnus, the King of the Rutuli. While Diogo's adversaries are intended to be portrayed as worthy, these portraits of Amerindian warriors will recall other such characters in literature, particularly the brave Galbarino of *La Araucana*. In this chapter I will analyze the scenes of resistance in Caramuru and explore the possibility that the Amerindian heroes Jararaca and Bambu were prototypes for nineteenth-century Brazilian Amerindianist literature and twentieth-century Modernismo in Brazil.

Amerindian characters in Brazilian literature began to appear as early as 1563, with the Latin epic of America, *De Gestis Mendi de Saa*. However, Brazilian *indianista* literature is generally thought to have begun with *O Uraguay* and *Caramuru*. These two

eighteenth-century epics are considered to be the inaugurators of Amerindianist literature in Brazil, as Eneida Leal Cunha affirms in *Estampas do Imaginário* (2006):

> Considerado pelo conjunto da historiografia literária brasileira como um dos inauguradores da linhagem indianista e reverenciado pelos românticos como inspiração ancestral, o *Caramuru* chegou a ser proposto pelo seu primeiro editor brasileiro, em 1878, como texto ideal a ser adotado nas escolas, em substituição aos clássicos portugueses (16).
>
> Considered by the whole of the Brazilian literary historiography as one of the inaugurators of the indianista lineage and reverenced by the romantics as ancestral inspiration, in 1878 the first Brazilian editor of Caramuru proposed that this would be the ideal text to be adopted in schools to substitute the Portuguese classics. (my translation)

At the end of the nineteenth-century, the suggestion that *Caramuru* should substitute *Os Lusíadas* because of some real or imagined Brazilian essence present in the former demonstrates the influence it had on the Romantic movement of the time. However, Leal Cunha's contemporary view of the epic is in disagreement with the first editor of *Caramuru*, the argument being that it does not present any sort of ideological break from *Os Lusíadas*. Leal Cunha sees *Caramuru* as an expansion of colonialist discourse: "O *Caramuru* retoma a epopéia camoniana menos para corrigi-la do que para expandi-la" 'Caramuru takes up Camões epic not to correct it but to expand it' (15). This shift in the reading of *Caramuru* from ancestral inspiration, which transpired in the late nineteenth-century was no longer so in the late twentieth, early twenty-first century. In 1878,

substituting *Os Lusíadas* for *Caramuru* may have been part of the process of decolonization. However, today *Caramuru* is read as colonialist validation.

While I would agree with Leal Cunha's point of view that *Caramuru* is a continuation of the colonialist discourse which in Portuguese letters began with *Os Lusíadas*, the beginnings of *indianista* letters in Brazil simply can't be ignored. The Amerindian heroes in both *O Uraguay* and *Caramuru* gave rise to a tradition that perhaps culminated in the nineteenth-century with monumental works such as Gonçalves Dias' *O Canto do Piaga* (1846) and *I-Juca-Pirama* (1851), as well as José de Alencar's *O Guarani* (1857) and *Iracema* (1865). In the twentieth century Oswald de Andrade continues the spirit of resistance from an Amerindian perspective in his poetry, as well as his *Manifesto Antropófago* (1928). While it is clear that Gonçalves Dias merits the title of indianist poet of Brazil, it is possible that his Amerindian heroes may have been loosely modeled on the seventeenth-century Amerindian protagonists created by José Basílio da Gama and Santa Rita Durão. And while the themes of conquest and colonization are common to the Amerindianist genre, the following verses from *O Canto do Piaga* recall similar scenes in *Caramuru*:

> Pelas ondas do mar sem limites
> Basta selva, sem folhas, e vem;
> Hartos troncos, robustos, gigantes;
> Vossas matas tais monstros contêm.
> Oh! quem foi das entranhas das águas,
> O marinho arcabouço arrancar?

Nossas terras demanda, fareja ...

Esse monstro. . . — o que vem cá buscar?

Não sabeis o que o monstro procura?

Não sabeis a que vem, o que quer?

Vem matar vossos bravos guerreiros,

Vem roubar-vos a filha, a mulher! (Canto 3: 1, 4-5)

In the waves of the limitless ocean

A vast forest of trees without leaves approaches

Endless tree trunks, enormous and robust

Your jungles these monsters contain.

Oh! Who from the entrails of these waters

The armored marine comes to reap?

Our lands he demands, tracking…

This monster… what does he seek here?

You don't know what the monster is seeking?

You don't know why he is here, what he wants?

He comes to kill your brave warriors,

He comes to rob you of your wife and children!

The above selection is a foreboding vision that the piaga or high priest (piajé) has as he is awakened from his sleep by a messenger warning him about the arrival of wooded monsters, or ships, which have come to take the Tupi's land. The reference is clearly of the Portuguese arrival to Brazil.

O Canto do Piaga brings to mind analogous scenes in *Caramuru* as Santa Rita Durão portrays the adversary tribes led by Jararaca. Particularly the following verses, in which *o piaga* is warned of the European's intent to enslave and eliminate the Amerindians:

> Vem trazer-vos algemas pesadas –
> Com que a tribu Tupi vai gemer;
> Hão de os velhos servirem de escravos
> Mesmo o Piaga inda escravo há de ser
> Fugireis procurando asilo,
> Triste asilo por ínvio sertão
> Anhangá de prazer há de rir-se
> Vendo os vossos quão poucos serão. (Canto 3: 7-8)
> He brings heavy handcuffs –
> With which the Tupi tribe will groan
> The old men will serve as slaves
> Even the Piaga a slave will become
> You will escape looking for refuge
> A sad refuge in the impervious backlands
> The Devil will laugh with pleasure
> Seeing how few of you remain.

While Jararaca was not a high priest but a warrior, his vision of life under Portuguese rule in *Caramuru* is strikingly similar to the one presented in *O Canto do Piaga*. Indeed, this

direct reference to the Tupi's foreboding future serving as slaves is likewise heralded by Jararaca in Canto Four of *Caramuru*:

Se o sacro ardor que ferve no meu peito,
Não me deixa enganar, vereis que um dia
(Vivendo esse impostor) por seu respeito
Se enchera de imboabas a Bahia:
Pagarão os tupis o insano feito;
E vereis entre a bélica porfia
Tomar-lhe esses estranhos já vizinhos,
Escravas as mulheres co'os filhinhos.
Vereis as nossas gentes desterradas
Entre os tigres viver no sertão fundo,
Cativa a plebe, as tabas arrombadas,
Levando para além do mar profundo
Nossos filhos e filhas desgraçadas;
Ou, quando as deixam cá no nosso mundo,
Poderemos sofrer, paiaiás bravos.
Ver filhos, mães e pais feitos escravos? (Canto IV: 34-35)

If the sacred passion that boils in my veins
Doesn't fool me, you will see that one day
(That impostor living) for his respect
Bahia will be filled with foreigners

The Tupinambá will pay their insane act

And you will see in the bellicose contention

These strangers-turned-neighbors will take from them

Their women and children as slaves.

You will see our people in exile

Living deep in the backlands, among the tigers

The people imprisoned, the tribes humiliated

Taking with them overseas

Our wretched sons and daughters

Or when they leave them here in our world

Can we withstand, oh brave nobles,

See our sons, mothers and fathers enslaved?

While it may be that the coincidental references to the Amerindians becoming enslaved by the Portuguese is based on a common history, the popularity of both *O Uraguay* and *Caramuru* during the nineteenth-century must have inspired Amerindianist poets like Gonçalves Dias. As we saw in Chapter Two, it was during the Brazilian Romantic movement that these two seventeenth-century epics were codified, among others, as the foundations of Brazilian literature. Yet what would make these two epics unique or different from other eighteenth-century writers are the Amerindian characters in their respective epics. Meanwhile, writers like Tomás Antônio Gonzaga certainly enjoyed more popularity and captured a wider contemporary audience than either Basílio da Gama or Santa Rita Durão combined, since pastoral themes were in vogue at that time

both in Europe and Colonial Brazil. However, for nineteenth-century readers and authors concerned with nation building, bucolic themes were no longer of use or interest. The aim of the Romantic literary movement was to establish a narrative worthy of the newly independent country of Brazil. And while other epic poems, such as Claudio Manuel da Costa's *Vila Rica* (1773) regarding the founding of Ouro Preto, or Bento Teixeira's *Prosopopéia* (1601) about the origins of Pernambuco, both share similar themes of Portuguese colonial establishment in Brazil, they were not sources of direct inspiration for nineteenth-century Amerindian heroic characters. Like *Caramuru*, these poems can also be read as colonialist justification. However, what sets *Caramuru* apart from these other epics are the representations of Amerindians as worthy adversaries. While Durão's epic contains the usual rhetoric of referring to the Amerindians as "savages" or "barbarians," two Amerindian characters in *Caramuru* stand out for their heroic qualities: Jararaca and Bambu.

In *Caramuru*, Cantos Three and Four occupy the space for a widespread indigenous rebellion, symbolized in the poem as hostilities between the defiant Caetés and their allies against Diogo and the now subdued Tupinambá tribe. Durão portrays the cause of the confrontation as a jealous rivalry over Paraguaçu, which echoes back to Helen and the Trojan War. As we shall see in the upcoming chapter, the Amerindian woman, or indeed women in general, are an allegory for the fertile land to be conquered. Thus, a war that may appear to be over a woman may actually be for the land and its resources. This particular war over Paraguaçu, while clearly modeled on the Trojan War,

could also be interpreted as a war for hegemony in Bahia (more will be said about this in the next chapter).

Canto Four opens with Jararaca observing Paraguaçu in a *locus amoenus*: "Dormindo está Paraguaçu formosa / Onde um claro ribeiro à sombra corre; / Lânguida está, como ela, a branca rosa," / 'Beautiful Paraguaçu is sleeping / Where a clear stream meets the shade / She is languid like a white rose' (119). Indeed, Paraguaçu in Tupi means "great sea or river," in this quote she is depicted as part of nature or the land which is at stake. Paraguaçu then wakes and runs away while Jararaca follows her to the safety of her parents' home, where he asks her father for her hand in marriage. But Paraguaçu declines Jararaca's proposal, and thus begins the war between the Caetés tribe and Diogo and his allies. If Paraguaçu is depersonalized as an individual, just representing the land, then nature personified has rejected Jararaca. Not surprisingly, Durão interprets this as being all part of a divine plan, as "the powerful heavens had destined her for more" (122). Of course, this thinly veiled religious discourse pretends to ally the will of God with nature. Paraguaçu's rejection infuriates Jararaca. He declares war on the Tupinambá tribe, vowing to fight until Paraguaçu is either his or dead.

This confrontation between Diogo and his allies on one side, and Jararaca with his supporters on the other, occupies the space of two Cantos. Although the war is significant in itself, the actual warfare episodes will not be analyzed here. What is important for the purposes of this chapter is the discourse of resistance which takes place before and after the actual battle. Jararaca's words are significant because they echo many of the same issues and conflicts that have been raised by anti-colonialists over the centuries and

around the globe. Even today, the struggle of indigenous peoples in Brazil continues. For example, the recent Belo Monte hydroelectric dam project in the Amazonian state of Pará is a continuation of Brazilians of European descent pushing Amerindians off their land in the name of progress. The proposed dam would be the third largest in the world after the Itaipu dam, on the border of Brazil and Paraguay, and the Three Gorges dam in China. Critics of the project such as the Movimento Gota d'Água point to the inefficiency of the proposed hydroelectric dam since it would only be in use for 4 months out of the year. It was originally designed under the Brazilian military dictatorship in the 1970s and thus carries with it the connotations of progress at any price, disregarding both human rights and environmental damages. Furthermore, it would flood tribal lands of the Juruna and Arara peoples and 400 square kilometers of standing forest (Amazon Watch). The flooding would also displace some residents of the nearby city of Altamira and directly affect 14 indigenous who depend on this part of the Xingu River for their livelihood. Fortunately a judge has temporarily halted the construction, but this demonstrates how even today these issues are pertinent to the region, 500 years after Diogo Álvares washed up on the shores of Bahia.

In *Caramuru*, this discourse of resistance to colonization and conquest is woven into the text in such a way that it balances out the predominant colonialist narrative of the poem. I have chosen to focus on these particular episodes in *Caramuru* because perhaps on some level, Durão was able to see the conquest not just from the perspective of the Portuguese, but also from the standpoint of the Amerindians. Perhaps the reason for this is because while many of his contemporaries in the state of Minas Gerais were conspiring

for independence, Durão also was aware of and supported this cause. Perhaps by putting this discourse of resistance in the mouths of these particular Amerindian characters, no suspicions would be raised about his loyalty to Portugal. The poet captured the spirit of independence by identifying with those Amerindians who hundreds of years before also had to confront the Portuguese and resist colonization.

In addition to empathizing with the Amerindian struggle for autonomy, Santa Rita Durão is obliged by epic convention to present the Amerindian rivals of the Portuguese as worthy adversaries, otherwise what would be the point of defeating a weak opposition? Before going to war, Jararaca gathers the tribes of Caetés and their allies in order to motivate them for battle. Jararaca's epic speech and his bravery in battle are therefore an excellent example of the conventional requirement of epic poems to portray the enemy as a worthy adversary. This rhetorical device actually elevates the hero of the epic even more because he defeats a mighty opponent. Had Jararaca been portrayed as cowardly, or as an easy conquest, Diogo would then undoubtedly lose some credibility in his superhuman endeavors as hero of an epic poem.

Nevertheless, following the conventions of imitation can only take us so far since in reality it was not an equal fight. Durão opportunely ignores the fact that the Amerindians were fighting only with bows and arrows, while the Portuguese had firearms. In the *Aeneid*, Turnus and Aeneas both fought with swords; technologically speaking, they were on the same playing field. The paradigm of imitation must also take into consideration that superior weaponry has had an influence in Western European world domination and colonization. In the poem, Caramuru is referred to as the Son of

Thunder; whereas thunder here signifies the noise made by Diogo's musket. Even today, not just in Brazil but across the globe, weapons continue to define worldwide hegemony. Nuclear weapons may have replaced muskets, but the effect is the same. Indeed, the war machine is alive and well 500 years after the conquistador's thunder arrived in the Americas. The domination achieved with superior arms is comparable to the present day violent confrontations between the landowners and the dispossessed, such as the 19 members of the Movimento Sem Terra who were gunned down and many others were wounded in the Eldorado dos Carajás massacre of 1996. The following year, Galdino Jesus dos Santos, an indigenous person from the state of Bahia was burned alive by five upper-middle class young men in Brasilia. Galdino, of the Pataxó tribe, had traveled to Brasil's capital on occasion of *Dia do Índio* (Indigenous Day) to meet with authorities about land disputes with local non-indigenous farmers. The murder of Galdino set off a wave of protests and invasions of farm land by indigenous peoples (Folha online). Contemporary events are the reason that these discourses of resistance to continued encrochment on Amerindian lands are important to us today.

Despite Jararaca's inferior weapons, the poet nevertheless manages to portray him as an opponent equal in bravery to Diogo. Part of the strategy to represent Jararaca as a worthy adversary is based on the content of Jararaca's speech, which demonstrates the Caetés bravery. The discourse of resistance also reveals a reasonable interpretation of history on the part of Durão, since he recognized that not all the conquered indigenous tribes were as compliant or complacent as the Tupinambá. While Durão could have dehumanized the Caetés as brutal savages, he portrays both Jararaca and Bambu as

articulate and visionary. Jararaca's monologue can be divided into three main parts. The first section sets the scene, so we get a feel of what it is like for a tribe that feels threatened by the arrival of this strange man who washed up on the shore one day, and is now leading a powerful rival tribe. The new technology, namely his weapon, has imbued him with seemingly magical powers. The second part of Jararaca's speech offers predictions of what life under the Portuguese colonizer would be like, particularly as they would live once having been enslaved by the Europeans. The third and last part is a discussion of the nature of the threat of Diogo's mysterious gunfire, a novelty for the Amerindians that is represented in the poem as "thunder." It is important to point out that Diogo himself never makes such an inspiring discourse. Perhaps it is because of his superior weaponry that he has no need to convince or inspire with his words since brute force requires little in the way of rhetorical arts besides threats.

In the first two stanzas of Jararaca's monologue, he assesses the situation in which the native tribes find themselves; that is, of the imminent danger posed by Diogo and the collaborating Tupinambá tribe. He begins by addressing the warriors as nobles or *paiaiás*, defined in a footnote as "nome honorífico em língua brasílica, equivalente a nobres ou senhores" 'honorific name in the Brazilian language, meaning nobles or gentlemen' (Durão 129). Jararaca tells the noble warriors that this is the day they owe it to future generations to demonstrate their bravery in battle, so that they might prevail over what is to come. Furthermore, he confirms the knowledge of Gupeva's de facto surrender to *imboaba*, or foreigner, "nome que dão aqueles bárbaros aos nossos europeus" 'the name they barbarians give to our Europeans' (Durão 131). This naming of "us" *paiaiás* versus

"them" *imboabas* draws a line separating the two sides since one cannot be expected to fight against someone you identify with or perceive to have common identity. Unlike Gupeva, Jararaca is not going to accept Diogo Álvares as "one of us" *paiaiás*. Diogo is the enemy, and thus he is assigned a different category of being, that of *imboaba*.

Gupeva's cowardice and amazement at the powers of the rifle have led him to proclaim this *imboaba* the Son of Thunder. Having surrendered his soul (by religious conversion), his tribe (by ceding hegemony in the group), Jararaca adds that the servile Gupeva has even relinquished his wife to the foreigner (131). Jararaca's adress to his fellow *paiaiás* begins here:

> Paiaiás generosos, hoje é o dia
> Que aos vindouros devemos mais honrado,
> Em que mostreis que a vossa valentia
> Não receia o trovão, subjuga o fado:
> Sabeis que de Gupeva a cobardia
> Por filho do trovão tem aclamado
> Um imboaba, que do mar viera,
> Por um pouco de fogo que acendera.
> Prostrado o vil aos pés desse estrangeiro,
> Rende as armas com fuga vergonhosa,
> E corre voz que o adora, lisonjeiro,
> E até lhe cede como o cetro a esposa:
> E que pode nascer do erro grosseiro,

Senão que em companhia numerosa

As nossas gentes o estrangeiro aterre,

E que a uns nos devore, outros desterre? (Canto IV: 32-33)

Generous nobles, today is the day

We owe it to our most honorable posterity

To demonstrate your bravery

Don't fear the thunder, overcome fate

You know that the cowardly Gupeva

Has proclaimed as son of thunder

A foreigner that came from the sea

Because of a little fire that he's lit.

The vile one is prostrated at the feet of this stranger

Surrendered to the arms with a shameful escape

And they say that he adores him, flatteringly

And he even yields with his scepter his wife

And what can come of this crude mistake

But in the numerous company

The stranger will terrorize our peoples

And some he will devour, and others he will banish.

Jararaca is clearly outraged at Gupeva's surrender. The *imboaba* weaponry was enough to scare Gupeva into submission and hand over his rule to Diogo. Because Caramuru killed a bird in midflight, lighting a metaphoric fire from his musket, the frightened Tupí

have decided to submit to the Son of Thunder. They have thus been terrorized into submission to their new overlord.

This first section ends with Jararaca asking the assembled noble warriors: what could be the result of Gupeva's tragic mistake? Surely, says Jararaca, the outcome will be that the foreigners will displace and devour the native tribes. In anthropophagic ritual, the vanquished are going to be devoured by the victors. The native population is going to be colonized by Diogo and his allies because of superior weaponry. Those who survive are going to be forced to give up their lands. Of course, the hindsight that Durão has writing in the eighteenth-century about events that took place in the sixteenth-century makes Jararaca's predictions on target. Just as the vision in *O Canto do Piaga* foretells of events which actually occurred in the past, here the poet writes of events yet to come, as if Jararaca could see into the future. This retrospective prophecy or foretelling after the fact, in Latin *vaticinium ex eventu*, is a technique often used by poets when they are writing about events incidents that took place in the past. The foreboding future that Jararaca accurately predicts appears in the poem in order to acknowledge the colonization which occurred subsequent to the arrival of the Portuguese in Brazil. These are the scenes in the poem that would inspire the creation of such *I-Juca-Piramas*, in Tupi "the ones who must die and are worthy to be killed." Jararaca is certainly an admirable *paiaiá*, and the words he speaks to the rebellious tribes before going into battle reflect his bravery as a warrior and a leader. He foresees the future under Portuguese subjugation and will fight to the end before submitting to these *imboabas*.

The second part of Jararaca's address continues to answer the question he raised at the end of the first part. He responds to his own question by foretelling a grim future for the native tribes of Bahia. This vision of the future life of the Amerindians was mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, comparing it to the similar foreboding prophecy in *O canto do Piaga*. Their land would become filled with many more *imboabas*, says Jararaca, who will cease to be foreigners and become their neighbors (Durão 132). He warns the gathered tribes that they will see their wives and children become slaves, and continues his unhappy predictions into the next stanza. Jararaca declares: our people will lose their land and the native tribes of Bahia will be pushed out to the fringes, to the sertão, where they will live among the beasts (Durão 132). With their people taken captive and their villages destroyed, the future of their tribes looks bleak. This middle part of Jararaca's speech ends by posing another question to his allies. He asks them if they will be able to withstand seeing their children, mothers and fathers—if they are not disgraced, stolen and taken abroad—turned into slaves.

Jararaca's "prophesy" about the enslavement of their people did come true. Likewise, Gonçalves Dias' piaga was warned what would happen to his people when the monstrous trees without leaves arrived on their shores. Again, the poets have the vantage point of writing several hundred years after the fact and can point to the enslavement of the Amerindians in retrospect. In the article, "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America" Anibal Quijano points to the main cause of the Amerindian genocide:

> The vast genocide of the Indians in the first decades of colonization was not caused principally by the violence of the conquest nor by the plagues

> the conquistadors brought, but took place because so many American Indians were used as disposable manual labor and forced to work until death. (186)

The history of this genocidal slavery is thus represented in both the poetic voices of the piaga and of Jararaca.

Jararaca's prediction of the fate of the Brazilian Amerindians, the same future predicted by the mysterious messenger in *O canto do Piaga*, is backed by historical evidence. In Brazil, the early colonists and settlers needed labor to fuel their economy. Before the introduction of African slaves this demand for labor was filled by capturing indigenous people. Even when African slaves began arriving in significant numbers, the Amerindian slaves were much more affordable. Hemming writes:

> As often throughout the colonial period, slavery was permitted for *indios de corda* – Indian prisoners of intertribal wars supposedly bound and ready for execution—and captives taken in 'just wars', which could now be waged on any tribe about which there was 'certain and infallible fear' that it might threaten Portuguese rule. Both these definitions were open to flagrant abuse. (Indians 179)

Slavery of Amerindians would only end in 1755 with the Law of Liberties which declared the Amerindians to be free citizens (Hemming 187). Thus for over 200 years, the Amerindians who did not die of European diseases were often subjected to hard labor.

The third and last part of Jararaca's address is a consideration of the nature of Diogo's gunfire. Jararaca begins by pointing out how the Amerindians fear of the so-

called *Filho do Trovão* is oppressive. What will happen if they do not stop the Portuguese's mysterious thunder now, asks Jararaca, would the globe then someday be filled with it? Jararaca says that it is one thing to be afraid, but quite another to die from fear of it, which is certainly worse than death itself. Consequently, Jararaca vows to confront Diogo face-to-face and discover whether his magical thunder is real or not. If it is false, he will reveal it; if it is not, then at least he will have died bravely. It would be foolish for the Caetés and their allies to give up the fight before even knowing the true cause of Diogo's gunfire, says Jararaca (Durão 133). In the final part of this monologue he deliberates upon the nature of Caramuru's thunder:

> Mas teme o seu trovão: e tanto oprime
> O medo àquele vil, que não pondera
> Que por esse trovão, que não reprime,
> Há de ver cheia de trovões a esfera?
> Que grande mal será, se o raio imprime?
> Se o mundo por um raio se perdera,
> Susto pudera ter, cobrar espanto:
> Porém morre de medo, que é outro tanto.
> Eu só, eu próprio, no geral desmaio,
> Ao relâmpago irei sem mais socorro;
> E quando ele dispare o falso raio,
> Ou descubro a impostura, ou, forte, morro:
> Será de nigromancia um torpe ensaio,

Com que o astuto pretende, ao que discorro,

Fazer que a nossa tropa desfaleça,

Antes que a causo do terror conheça. (Canto IV: 36-37)

But he fears his thunder, and he is so oppressed

By fear of that vile one, that he won't ponder

That for this thunder, that won't be stopped

Will he see the earth filled with thunder?

If the world were lost for a little thunder

He could be afraid, a little weary

But he dies of fear, which is a much more.

I myself, in the midst of this fear

Will go directly to the thunder without any help

And when he fires his false thunder

Either I discover the source of this deception, or I die valiantly

It would be a clumsy game of necromancy

Which this astute one professes and I disclaim

Causing our tribe to fall

Before even knowing the source of this terror.

The thunder here is of course the noise made when Diogo fires his musket, a mystery to the Amerindians since this European technology is a novelty for them. Jararaca's uncertainty about the divine or mortal nature of Caramuru's thunder points us to another question: what is the nature of our weapons? To what end were they created? And how

are they being used? Particularly in the case of colonialism, European and/or otherwise, are weapons used for self-defense or are they just the means for dominating other peoples?

Jararaca calls on the tribes to be fearless, to discover once and for all the nature of Caramuru's thunder. While the Tupinambá have formed an alliance with Diogo, albeit an alliance that they were forced to accept at gunpoint, Jararaca is the leader of the opposition who steps forward to resist the eminent *imboaba* occupation. Jararaca is willing to fight no matter the outcome, including death. These last verses of Jararaca's address are a culmination of the brave courage of this legendary Amerindian adversary:

> Que se for (que não creio) o estrondo infando
> Do sublime Tupá triste ameaça,
> Fará como costuma, trovejando,
> Que, matando um ou outro, a mais não passa:
> Se eu vir que o raio horrível vai vibrando,
> A um homem como eu, nada embaraça:
> Se for mortal quem causa tanto abalo,
> Por meio ao próprio raio irei mata-lo.
> Su, valentes; su, bravos companheiros!
> Tomai coragem! Que será no extremo?
> Embora seja um raio verdadeiro,
> Se não é Deus que o lança, eu não temo.
> Seja quem quer que for o autor primeiro,

Como não seja o Criador Supremo,

Não há forças criadas que nos domem:

Que sobre tudo o mais domina o homem. (Canto IV: 38-39)

If it be (and I don't think so) that the terrible noise

A distressing threat from the sublime Tupá

Thundering as he usually does

Killing one or two, nothing more

If I see that the horrible lightning goes on

Nothing hinders a man like me

If what causes so much tremble is mortal

By means of the very ray I shall kill him.

Oh valiant and brave friends!

Have courage! What will be in the end?

Even if it is a real ray

If it is not God who hurls it, I am not afraid.

Whoever it is that is the origin of this ray

If it isn't the Supreme Creator

There aren't any known forces that can tame us

Over which man does not already dominate.

The idea that somehow God is behind Diogo's weapon represents a religious justification for war, probably the oldest known rationalization for it: *Deus vult, Deus vult!* (God wills it). The poet has put God on the side of those that hold superior weapons because writing

300 years after the fact, the demise of the Caetés and other tribes who would revolt is evident. The references to God present in the field of battle recall many other epics, which fuse the supernatural element with the secular. In the *Aeneid* it is the Fates, and ultimately Jupiter, who decided the victory of Aeneas over Turnus. Likewise in *Os Lusíadas* the Christian God combined with the pagan goddess Venus assisting the Portuguese in their epic journey to India. In the *Cantar de mio Cid*, God is necessarily on the side of Rodrigo Díaz de Vivar. Thus, in the literary world of epics, if there is a war then God must necessarily be for or against one side or another.

The poet places Tupá behind Caramuru's thunder since he knows the Portuguese will ultimately prevail over the Caetés and their allies. However, divine intervention in matters of warfare points to more than just another instance of a retrospective prophesy. Particularly in the Iberian Peninsula, God or religion had been part of the ideology of war for almost a millennium. Since 711 A.D., when the Moors first entered the Peninsula there arose an almost immediate backlash. Pelayo or Palagius of Asturias (685-737) is generally credited with having initiated the Reconquista with his victory at the Battle of Covadonga sometime between 718 and 722. While the Portuguese Reconquista ended approximately 300 years before Spain's, there was still a lingering animosity towards non-Christians, particularly Jews and Muslims. The enmity towards the latter is particularly evident in *Os Lusiadas*, as Landeg White writes in the introduction to his English translation of the epic:

> The most troublesome aspect of *The Lusíadas* to the modern reader must surely be Camões treatment of Islam… Camões hostility is disturbing.

> Muslims are consistently presented as *astuto*, *falso*, *enganoso*, *malicioso*, *pérfido*, *sábio*, *sagaz*, *torpe*, and *gentes infernais*. The only *fiel* Muslim is Monsayeed from Morocco, who turns Christian after helping da Gama escape from Calicut. (xix)

Perhaps Durão sought to imitate Camões by positing the Amerindian characters in the way that Muslims were represented in *Os Lusíadas*. In both cases, the Other is not a Christian, therefore he is not trustworthy. Gupeva and Paraguaçu are like Monsayeed since they are the only characters in the epic who convert to Christianity. Amerindians in *Caramuru* are consistently referred to as savages and barbarians, yet there is something particularly heroic about Jararaca that makes him stand out as a larger-than-life antagonist.

Like the Amerindian warrior in Gonçalves Dias' *I-Juca Pirama*, Jararaca is unafraid of death and willing to die for his tribe. He is an articulate antagonist that bravely fights against Diogo and his allies. Jararaca's *raison d'être* is to fight. We know that he will not overcome in battle against the Portuguese, not because he is any less of a warrior, but because of weaponry that is technologically superior to his own. Jararaca's glory, which represents the greater indigenous resistance to Portuguese conquest and colonization, is undoubtedly immortalized in *Caramuru*. No other character in *Caramuru* is portrayed with as much vision and valor as Jararaca, indeed not even Diogo, who is supposed to be the hero of the poem.

To what end would have the poet engaged in this heroic representation of the Other? This is a question that is more familiar to readers of *O Uraguay* or *La Araucana*.

The Amerindian heroes of these two epics have sometimes been interpreted as sympathy with the resistance to Portuguese/Spanish colonization and conquest. In *The Poetics of Empire in the Indies*, James Nicolopulos gives us an overview of the differing interpretations of this debate concerning *La Araucana*. Perhaps paradoxically, the critic most versed in the art and practice of imitation is the one who argues for an existence of a certain level of sympathy with the Amerindian cause in Ercilla's epic. Nicolopulos writes that David Quint goes even further than Beatriz Pastor "in reading the construction of the Other through imitation in the *Araucana* as not only an attempt to represent the antagonist as worthy of a truly 'epic' struggle, but also as *an indicator of an active sympathy with that resistance* as well" (my emphasis 8). As we saw in Chapter Two, critics of *O Uruguay* have also debated the role of the heroic Amerindian. I think that for *Caramuru*, analogous arguments could be made, however we cannot cherry pick (as I have in this chapter) those scenes of heroic resistance and declare that the poet was actually sympathetic with the Amerindian resistance. Read out of context, Jararaca's visionary speech could be held up as evidence of a certain Amerindian consciousness or perspective of the conquest, a reading that was often ascribed to *O Uraguay*. Ultimately, each reader will draw their own conclusions about what the poet had in mind when painting such heroic portraits of the Amerindian antagonists; however, the scenes should be read in the context of the entire epic.

After Jararaca's visionary words, the tribes begin the attack, while Gupeva and Paraguaçu fight bravely at Diogo's side. The fighting continues through Cantos Four and Five until Diogo finally kills Jararaca by shooting him in the head with his magical

gunfire (168). As discussed in Chapter One, Jararaca's death recalls the death of Turnus at the hands of Aeneas. Like Turnus, Jararaca's rebellion must yield to the hand of Fate. Jararaca's death proves to the skeptical Amerindians that Diogo's thunder comes from Tupá, when in actuality the victory over the Amerindians was due to superior weaponry and almost a millennium of experience having battled against the previous (or other) Other: the Moors. Fortunately for the Christian crusaders, just as the Jews and Muslims were being expelled from Iberia, they found a new infidel to battle with in the Western Hemisphere. Crusaders would have gone out of business were in not for the Amerindians who refused to convert to Christianity. Jararaca is one such Amerindian who stood his ground and defended his land and his peoples, even as the weapons he did not fully understand would eventually claim his life and his cause.

After Diogo kills Jararaca in Canto Five, the remaining tribes of the sertão send messengers declaring that they all agree to yield to the Portuguese, "Confirmando com pactos verdadeiros / A inteira sujeição que ao Luso davam" 'Confirming with sincere pacts / Complete subjection to the Portuguese' (Durão 169). Jararaca is dead, thus the remaining rebellious tribes must submit. Furthermore, the acquiescent tribes declare Diogo to be Prince of the Sertão or Backlands, "Príncipe aclamam com festivo modo / O Filho do Trovão do sertão todo" (Durão 170). In *Caramuru*, Jararaca's death signifies the defeat of the defiant Amerindians, which led to their ensuing subjugation to the Portuguese. But there was one more defiant Amerindian that Diogo would encounter in the poem, the anthropophagous antagonist called Bambu.

OTHER REPRESENTATIONS OF RESISTANCE: CALIBAN IN *CARAMURU*

Had Durão simply copied Virgil, the resistance led by the Caetés in *Caramuru* would have ended as did the *Aeneid*, with the death of the worthy adversary (Turnus/Jararaca). But there is another episode of indigenous rebelliousness or heroism in *Caramuru*, which takes place immediately after the battle episodes of Cantos Four and Five. While the majority of the tribes do acquiesce to Diogo after Jararaca's death, one of the Caetés refuses, even in death, to submit. In this part of the chapter, I would like to present sketches of the voices of the Bambu, a Caliban-type character who represents the colonized Amerindian in *Caramuru*. Bambu's calibanesque resistance is echoed in Oswald de Andrade's twentieth-century poetic cannibalism as well as Aimé Césaire's *A Tempest* (1969). As with the portrayal of Jararaca, Bambu's discourse of defiance is not meant to imply that the poet was an anti-colonialist, rather it is another instance of portraying the Other as a worthy adversary.

The second instance of indigenous resistance in *Caramuru* involves a brief exchange between Diogo and a moribund Caeté named Bambu. Unlike Gupeva and Paraguaçu, who partake of the conquest of Bahia as they join forces with Diogo, both resistors discussed in this chapter die as a result of contact with the colonizer, a consequence of their refusal to surrender. As mentioned above, Durão's intentions behind writing these episodes of indigenous resistance in *Caramuru* could be interpreted as either sympathy with the native population of Bahia or as merely fulfilling the dictates of a balanced epic poem by providing the Portuguese with worthy adversaries. The objective of my analysis is not to discern the poet's intentions in writing these

representations of resistance to the Portuguese colonizing effort, but rather to present them as a counter-narrative to the portraits of acquiescence suggested by the colonialist discourse within *Caramuru* itself.

In the introduction to the Martins Fontes (2002) edition of *Caramuru*, Ronald Polito notes "o curioso caso de um selvagem com o corpo coberto de marimbondos, padecendo a morte para não se sujeitar a Diogo Álvares, como a maioria dos indígenas" 'the curious case of the savage covered with biting insects, enduring death in order not to subject himself to Diogo Álvares, like most of the indigenous peoples' (xxv). Polito's also echoes many critic's reference to the Moema episode, "[considerado por muitos] o ponto alto de todo o poema*"* '[considered by many] to be the highpoint of the poem (xxv). Polito's categorization of these two scenes as *curious* and as *the highpoint*, respectively, prompts the following questions: Why this insistence on the Moema episode as the best moment of the poem? And What is it about this scene of Bambu's anthropophagic resistance to Diogo that makes it so exceptional? Upon closer examination, the so-called curious or unusual "savage" referred to as Bambu may have more in common with the Moema episode than might initially appear. In both scenes an indigenous person readily lays down his or her life before the Portuguese colonizer. The Caetés' hatred of the Portuguese, like Moema's passionate love for Diogo, inevitably brings about their own demise. Moema drowns herself by jumping into the ocean, while Bambu dies a slow and agonizing death, also at the feet of the Portuguese colonizer. Although the underlying motives for these two deaths are not the same, they demonstrate the legendary thin line between love and hate. Moema's love of the colonizer ultimately

results in her death, which can be interpreted as the epic motif of the woman who is destined to die. She is Durão's Dido, or Inês de Castro, or Lindóia. Both Moema and Bambu die as a result of their passionate sentiments toward the colonizer: one from love, and the other from hate. The feminine portrayal of colonization will be examined further in the next chapter.

The Amerindian named Bambu is first mentioned in Canto Four, when Diogo cuts off the hands of two other noble Caetés and leaves Bambu seriously injured by splitting open his skull (Durão 141). The two stanzas below describe the episode in which Diogo once again encounters Bambu, this time on his deathbed:

> Estava o desditoso encadeado,
> E exposto a mil insetos que o mordiam;
> Nem se lhe via o corpo ensangüentado
> Que todos os marimbondos lhe cobriam:
> Corria o negro sangue derramado
> Das cruéis picaduras que lhe abriam;
> E ele, imóvel e tanto em tosco assento,
> Parecia insensível no tormento.
> Vendo Diogo o infeliz quanto padece
> No modo de penar mais desumano,
> Maior a tolerância lhe parece
> Do que possa caber num peito humano:
> E como autor do crime reconhece

Do cruel sogro o coração tirano,

Oferece a Bambu, que a morte ameaça,

Socorro amigo na cruel desgraça. (Canto V: 59-60)

The wretched one was chained

Exposed to a thousand wasps that where biting him

His body did not appear to be bleeding

Because of all the biting wasps that covered him

Shedding black blood that ran down

From the cruel bites, the open wounds

And he, immobile, so roughly seated

Seemingly insensible to the torment.

Diogo saw the ill-fated one, how much he endured

Suffering in a most inhumane way

With more tolerance, thought he,

Than any human being could withstand

And as the author of the crime recognizes

The cruel relative of a tyrannous heart

He offers Bambu, who's threatened with death,

A helping hand in his cruel disgrace.

In this scene, Diogo shows compassion for the moribund Amerindian, feeling concern for the pain and suffering of his enemy. Once again, Durão uses another rival in order to demonstrate the virtues of the Portuguese hero. Diogo recognizes that he is the one who

inflicted the mortal injury that left Bambu half-dead, and now being eaten alive by biting wasps. Now he heroically offers to help his defeated adversary. The poet depicts Diogo as capable of great compassion, demonstrating that the hero is able to empathize with his opponent.

Unlike the Jararaca episode, which is totally fictitious and modeled on the *Aeneid*, Durão explains in a footnote that an actual member of the Court of D. José I reported a case similar to the Bambu episode occurring in the state of Pará (172). It is a case of art imitating life. As in reality, in the epic the Portuguese colonizer comes face to face with the subaltern colonized, who is dying before his eyes. How to interpret these scenes? In the article "Peripheral Modernity and Differential *Mestizaje* in Latin America: Outside Subalternist Postcolonialism" Mario Roberto Morales argues that "concepts and models pertaining to a subalternist postcolonialism is not pertinent for the case of Latin America" (500). The reason he argues is that the reality of Latin American mestizajes does not permit binary oppositions between cultures, as it would in say South Asian or North African postcolonialist discourse. However, what to do with a text such as *Caramuru* where there are no mestizo characters? In dealing with the writing of the conquest itself, particularly those encounters that took place in the sixteenth-century, on which most of Latin America's foundational fictions are based, the mestizo imaginary is difficult to apply if not by force. Yet even in present-day Latin America, to apply the mestizo paradigm ignores the sectors of the population that are on the margins, particularly those Amerindian groups that maintain their identity as First Nations. Yet, after arguing for the

mestizo uniqueness of Latin America, Morales goes on to admit that not everybody falls into this rubric:

> The dominant Latin American subject is still located in the criollo elite. The culturally hegemonic subject is located within the Mestizo groups. And the subalternized subject dwells in the spaces of the communitarian indigenous peoples (especially in countries like Mexico, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, and Brazil). 500

Indeed, the cultural hegemony of Latin America is, or aims to be, mestizo. However this is a fairly recent development in the history of the Western Hemisphere.

In countries like Mexico, the criollo identity was only replaced by the mestizo in the twentieth-century, after the Mexican Revolution and the push for mestizo identity by intellectuals such as José Vasconcelos (among others), author of *La raza cósmica* (1925). Meanwhile in Brazil, a mestizo identity began to be cultivated in nineteenth-century romantic literature with authors such as José de Alencar and culminates in the Brazilian Modernist movement that began in 1922, but persists well into the late twentieth-century (as we shall see in the next chapter) with publications such as *Darcy Ribeiro's O povo brasileiro: a formação e o sentido do Brasil* (1995). Furthermore, what to say of countries that did not experience a Mexican Revolution or Brazilian Modernism that pushed the *mestizaje* paradigm to the forefront? In Peru, like in New Mexico, statues still stand commemorating Spanish Conquistadors. Although in protest, New Mexicans will often saw off the statues' feet, recalling those Spanish who cut off the hands and feet of rebellious Amerindians. The point is that in many parts of Latin America today, Mestizos

have often assumed an air of Criollo superiority reminiscent of the nineteenth-century, thereby merely replacing the previous dominant group with another (Monsiváis, Arias, Miller). The degrees of varying mestizo identity notwithstanding, how can we apply a late concept such as *mestizaje* to Colonial Latin American texts, where peninsular identity was often if not always culturally hegemonic? It is for this reason that I think we may apply contemporary South Asian and North African postcolonial paradigms to Latin America, because before the rise of *mestizaje* in the region, there existed a clearer picture of who was the colonized and who was the colonizer.

The image in *Caramuru* of the colonizer confronted with the subaltern colonized's languid body that is bleeding and covered entirely by wasps evokes a scene of inevitable defeat. Yet in spite of his wretched state in which his body is being returned to nature by means of insects, the dying Amerindian adamantly refuses the Portuguese's generous offer of help:

> Perdes comigo o tempo (disse o fero)
> Ao que vês, e ainda a mais vivo disposto;
> A liberdade, que me dás não quero,
> E da dor, que tolero, faço gosto:
> Assim vingar-me do inimigo espero. (Canto V: 61)
> You waste your time with me, says the savage
> I can withstand all this and more
> The freedom that you offer me, I do not want
> And with pleasure I tolerate the pain:

In this way I hope to avenge myself of the enemy.

Bambu's resistance recalls the spirit of many indigenous tribes who refused to submit to Portuguese colonization. Indeed, a quality that makes Bambu such a memorable, albeit minor character in *Caramuru* is his indomitable spirit. Like Jararaca, Bambu is also unafraid to die. But not even in death will Bambu submit to Diogo. Bambu rejects Diogo's offer of freedom, instead he takes pleasure in his pain in the hope that he is avenging his enemy. As we shall see in the upcoming stanzas, this is because he has devoured enough Portuguese that now his body is made up of his enemy.

We can place this revealing conversation between Diogo and Bambu in the context of what Albert Memmi writes about the unique situation of the colonized subject in *The Colonizer and the Colonized* (1965). He states that "regardless of how soon or how violently the colonized rejects his situation, he will one day begin to overthrow his unlivable existence with the whole force of his oppressed personality" (Memmi 120). Bambu's defiance is a declaration of insubordination to Diogo, a representation of the colonized who would rather die than submit to the colonizer. Memmi states that "being unable to change his condition in harmony and communion with the colonizer, [the colonized] tries to become free despite him, […] and he will revolt" (127). A similar personal uprising takes place in Bambu's response to Diogo's offer of freedom, an offer which he rejects because it would still involve surrendering his autonomy and subjecting himself to Portuguese rule.

Again, we return to those verses examined at the beginning of this chapter, to the theme of enslavement of the Amerindians. As in the *Canto do Piaga*, the vision warns the

piaga of impending doom that will befall the Amerindians with the arrival of the Portuguese. The piaga as seer of his tribe must warn the others of the imminent danger of becoming enslaved by those who crossed the ocean in wooden monsters (ships). Likewise in *Caramuru*, Bambu senses that it would be better to die than to be subjected to a life of slavery under the new overlords:

> Se o motivo, diz Diogo, porque temes,
> É porque escravo padecer receias,
> E tens por menos mal este, em que gemes,
> Do que uma vida em míseras cadeias:
> Depõe o susto, que sem causa tremes;
> Penhor te posso dar, porque onde creias,
> Depondo a obstinação do torpe medo,
> Que a vida e liberdade te concedo. (Canto V: 62)
> If the reason, says Diogo, that you are afraid
> Is because you fear becoming a slave,
> And think that your current misery is not as bad
> As a life of miserable chains
> Cast aside your fear, you tremble without cause
> I assure you, because where you believe
> Let go of this stubborn fear
> Life and liberty I will concede to you.

Bambu refuses to accept Diogo's offer of freedom under Portuguese rule because he foresees a life of being enslaved to the *imboaba*.

By instilling a vision of the future in the words of Bambu, the poet acknowledges that the Amerindian is in fact headed for slavery under Portuguese rule. During the sixteenth-century Amerindians were the primary source of labor on the sugar plantations, and would only be replaced by those who could eventually afford African slaves. But physical slavery is only part of the equation, the question of what would happen to the Amerindian's entire way of life remains. Anibal Quijano refers to this "colonization of culture" as a three-part process whereby Europeans expropriated certain aspects of the cultural knowledge of the colonized peoples in order to develop capitalism and profit, but at the same time repressed other areas of knowledge that were a threat to the Eurocentric worldview: "repression in this field was most violent, profound, and long-lasting among the Indians of Ibero-America, who were condemned to be an illiterate peasant subculture stripped of their objectified intellectual legacy" (189). Lastly, the Europeans required the colonized to learn the dominant culture in order to facilitate and extend their authority over them, "especially Judeo-Christian religiosity" (Quijano 189). So while Bambu was correct in his fear of becoming a slave to Diogo, the colonizer tries to spin this subjection by telling the colonized that under his enslavement he will attain "life and liberty." Because the Amerindians will be offered Christianity as a "reward" for their subjugation, they will be—in the minds of the missionaries—justly compensated!

Bambu's valiant defiance can be read as the refusal of the colonized Amerindian to submit, but it also has a telling cannibalistic reasoning behind it. He has no desire to

ease the suffering of his mutilated body because, as he assures Diogo, it is his way of taking revenge on his enemy. Again the theme of cannibalism returns and we see that, in this case, it is a form of resistance. How is this possible? Bambu's anthropophagic response illustrates this particular line of reason:

> Aqui da fronte o bárbaro desvia
> Dos insetos co'a mão a espessa banda;
> E a Diogo, que assim se condoía
> Um sorriso em resposta alegre manda.
> De que te admiras tu? Que serviria
> Dar ao vil corpo condição mais branda?
> Corpo meu não é já, se anda comigo,
> Ele é corpo em verdade do inimigo.
> O espírito, a razão, o pensamento
> Sou eu e nada mais; a carne imunda
> Forma-se cada dia do alimento,
> E faz nutrição, que se confunda:
> Vês tu a carne aqui, que mal sustento?
> Não a reputes minha: só se funda
> Na que tenho comido aos adversários;
> Donde minha não é, mas dos contrários.
> Da carne me pastei continuamente
> De seus filhos e pai; dela é composto

Este corpo, que animo de presente,

Por isso dos tormentos faço gosto.

E quando maior pena a carne sente,

Então mais me consolo, no soposto

De me ver no inimigo bem vingado,

Neste corpo, que é seu, tão maltratado. (Canto V: 63-65)

And now from his forehead, the barbarian repels

The thick swarm of insects with his hand;

And to Diogo, whose show of empathy,

He responds with a happy smile.

What are you so astonished? What good is it

To give the vile body a more gentle condition?

It is no longer my own body, if it is with me,

In reality it belongs to my enemy.

Spirit, reason, thought

Am I and nothing more; the unclean flesh

Is formed every day from food

And it nourishes, which is confusing:

Do you see my flesh here, which I barely sustain?

Don’t assume it is my own, it is made up of

My adversaries, which I have consumed;

It is not mine but belongs to those others.

I have continually eaten other's flesh

Essentially your children and father

Make up this body, which I presently animate

That is why I take pleasure in the torments.

And when the flesh feels greater suffering

I feel more consoled, in that

Witnessing my vengeance on the enemy

In this wretched body, which is yours.

Bambu relishes the pain and anguish his body is experiencing since he is, in a sense, torturing his enemies' bodies and hence taking revenge on Diogo. Because his essence is only "spirit, reason, and thought," his tangible self is not really his own, it belongs to his enemies. Bambu thus witnesses the suffering of a body that is his, but not his own.

In order to further analyze this scene of Bambu as heroic cannibal, I would like to compare him with other anthropophagic figures in Latin American literature, particularly the character taken from Shakesphere's last play, *The Tempest* (1612), which has often been reinterpreted as an allegory for colonialism. Caliban's first appearance in the context of Latin America appears in the book-length essay *Ariel* (1900) written by Uruguayan philosopher José Enrique Rodó (1872-1917). He also is the main character of the critical essay from 1971 entitled "Calibán, apuntes sobre la cultura en nuestra América" 'Caliban: Notes Towards a Discussion of Culture in our America; translated by Lynn Garafola, David Arthur McMurray, and Robert Márquez' written by Cuban poet, essayist, and literary critic Roberto Fernández Retamar. Besides essays, echoes of

Caliban can be heard in Oswald de Andrade, particularly his "Manifesto Antropófago" (1928), which constructs a similar analysis and presents the problem as a dilemma: Tupí or not Tupí? Although Oswald de Andrade is a poet, not a critic like Rodó and Retamar, his poetic vision is a platform on which we can also recognize the same line of anti-colonialist discourse. Another recent literary reference to Caliban is Aimé Césaire's (1913-2008) play entitled *A Tempest* [*une Tempête*] (1969), which is a postcolonial revision of Shakespeare's original. The character Bambu in *Caramuru* is much like Césaire's figure of Caliban, the colonized subaltern who refuses to be conquered and will never submit to colonization.

The Tempest is in fact an allusion to America, since it was written at the time of European exploration of the Western Hemisphere. The play is in this sense a reflection on the colonial enterprises of that time period, particularly as Europeans struggle to make sense of this "discovery" of the New World and its people. Fernández Retamar traces the influence upon Shakespeare's play of a 1603 translation of Michel de Montaigne's essay entitled "Of Cannibals" (1580) which gives an account of his encounter with Brazilian natives who were captured and brought back to the city of Rouen, in France. Yet another likely source for *The Tempest* could very well have been Richard Eden's account of Magellan's circumnavigation of the globe in *History of Travel* (1577), which records South American natives worshipping Setebos, Caliban's god in the play (Bevington xvii). Ultimately, the rumors of the cannibalistic rituals practiced by the natives of the New World are what Europeans, like Montaigne and Shakespeare, were addressing in their text. This sign of *otherness* of the Amerindians was thus represented in this taboo act of

consuming other human beings (and, as we saw in the previous chapter, cannibalism was a central argument in justification of the conquest in Brazil).

While Montaigne may have maintained a humanist and therefore positive, even "naturally virtuous" view of the Native Americans, Shakespeare's view was that of an "implacable realist," writes Fernández Retamar (11). Change the "n" with the "l" in *cannibal* and you have Shakespeare's *Calibann*, or Caliban. Caliban is depicted as the *Other* of the emerging bourgeois world, a non-Utopian view, where he is essential to the maintenance of the colonizer's *brave new world*. This Utopian vision is the only vision which, "can and must do without men of flesh and blood. After all, there is no such place" (Fernández Retamar 11). Fernández Retamar simply points to the playwright's realistic portrayal of Caliban and holds it up as a mirror to his people. He says: "Look, this is who we are. We are Caliban. We are the native peoples of the New World." Most notably however, he is in dialogue with Rodó and challenging the Uruguayan's identification with Ariel.

In Rodó's *Ariel*, it was the United States who was represented by Caliban, the cannibal who is contrary to Ariel. Rodó's concern is that Latin America, represented as the eponymous character in Shakespeare's play, would become materialistic like the United States as a consequence of neocolonialism. Rodó thought that Latin America would thus lose its alleged spiritual superiority if it gave up its identification with the spirit of Ariel for the neocolonialism of the materialistic and barbaric Caliban. This materialist Caliban does somewhat recall Bambu, since he believes that by consuming the flesh of the Portuguese he has transformed or incorporated this matter into his own. This

argument that one can appropriate the flesh of another is a materialistic world-view. However, Bambu does not dichotomize matter and spirit, since he still believes he is also spirit. Rodó's view is more black and white, projecting onto Caliban a purely materialist worldview and reserving the spiritual aspect for Ariel.

In contrast with Rodo's dichotomy of Ariel and Caliban, Fernández Retamar's essay written in the early 1970's takes a "consciously postcolonial attitude that refers not only to the long colonial period of the Spanish in Latin America but also the most recent period of North American neocolonialism" (Foster and Altamiranda x). For Fernandez Retamar, Latin America will now be represented as Caliban, the indigenous cannibal. It is important to highlight this emergent tide of North American neocolonialism and the accompanying revisionist view of the colonial period of Latin America. Although *Ariel* and *Caliban* present two different points of view in relation to the alleged neocolonial subject in Latin America, both are written within the context of perceived and de facto US colonialism in the region.

Fernández Retamar notes that Rodó wrote *Ariel* in response to the impending threat of neocolonialism, "a threat made real by the U.S. intervention in the Cuban War of Independence of 1898" (13). Rodó was familiar with a speech made by the Franco-Argentine writer Paul Groussac in Buenos Aires on May 2, 1898, in which Groussac characterizes the Yankee Spirit as possessing a formless and "Calibanesque" body. The identification of Caliban with the United States was thus proposed by Groussac and popularized by Rodó (Fernández Retamar 15). In presenting Latin America as Ariel, Rodó effectively polarizes the United States and Latin America in his essay. Fearing

neocolonial chains, Rodó warns his fellow Latin Americans of the imminent dangers of this potential superpower to the north. As the old Iberian empires no longer pose any real threat, Latin Americans are called to rally against a new interloper, this time their neighbor to the north.

Although Rodo's warning against the incipient neocolonial threat was justified by the fact that the United States did in fact take control of Cuba from 1902-1959, Fernández Retamar concludes that the identification of Caliban with the United States was off the mark, or "certainly a mistake" (15). He takes his cue from the Mexican intellectual and statesman José Vasconcelos (1882-1959), who disagreed with the equation of the United States with Caliban. Vasconcelos observed that "if the Yankees were only Caliban, they would not represent any great danger" (Fernández Retamar 15). Thus, for both Vasconcelos and Fernández Retamar the threat of neocolonialism comes from Próspero, not Caliban. Indeed, Próspero is the imperialist master in Shakespeare's play, while Caliban is the enslaved and powerless native. This is where Fernández Retamar and Rodó disconnect. As we recall, Rodó has identified Latin America with Ariel, and the United States with Caliban. For Fernández Retamar, Latin America is Caliban and the U.S. is Próspero. Ariel is not completely out of the picture, as we shall see, but he is superseded by Caliban. In relation to *Caramuru*, the analogy of neocolonialism represented by Próspero applies as well to the original colonialism of the Spanish and Portuguese in the region. As we saw in the excerpts from the text above, Diogo is seen as holding magical powers, a Próspero-like figure.

Throughout Fernández Retamar's essay, he identifies Latin America with Caliban, whom he recognizes as the voice of his own Cuban predecessor, José Martí (1853-1895). In answering the question "what relationship do we, the present inhabitants of this America […], have to the primitive inhabitants of this same America," Martí answers:

> We are descended from Valencian fathers and Canary Island mothers, and feel the enflamed blood of Tamanaco and Paramaconi coursing through our veins; we see the blood which fell amid the brambles of Mount Calvary as our own, along with that shed by the naked and heroic Caracas […] (qtd. in Fernández Retamar 29).

Our lack of familiarity with the names evoked by Martí, writes Fernández Retamar, is further proof that we are subject to a colonialist perspective on history, which has been imposed on us and is therefore a false consciousness (29). Martí's identification with Amerindian heroes is Fernández Retamar's evidence that he "feels Carib blood, *the blood of Caliban* coursing through his veins" (29). If Martí is one of the voices of Caliban, then Rodó and other intellectuals who have yet to recognize their own so-called Carib blood are identified with Ariel. The voice of the Amerindian is Caliban, while the lofty ideals of flighty intellectuals are Ariel. In response to Rodó's identification with Ariel, Fernández Retamar makes clear, "There is no real Ariel-Caliban polarity: both are slaves in the hands of Próspero, the foreign magician. But Caliban is the rude and unconquerable master of the island, while Ariel […] is the intellectual" (24). There is no real Ariel-

Caliban polarity because both are—in the scheme of *The Tempest*—opposite Próspero, the foreign colonizer.

Aimé Césaire's take on the play follows Fernández Retamar's line of thinking, although in *A Tempest* Caliban is a black slave, while Ariel is a mulatto slave. The colonial situation is for the most part the same, however unlike Shakepeare's Caliban, Césaire's Caliban is unrepentant and gives greater voice and agency to the colonized. Like Aimé Césaire, Oswald de Andrade is the poet in Brazil whose *Manifesto Antropófago* (1928) gives voice to a metaphorical Caliban. Oswald would be joined by other modernist Brazilian artists such as Tarsila do Amaral and Raul Bopp in a search for "an artistic expression which preserved the 'primitive' traces of Brazil but which at the same time, would start off an accelerated process of cultural modernization" (Castro Rocha 9). Oswald summarizes the conundrum of identity in the Americas, asking: "Tupi or not Tupi, that is the question" (*A Utopia Antropofágica* 47). Once again, the allusion is to Shakespeare, but this time it is taken from *Hamlet, Prince of Denmark* (1600) and not *The Tempest*. This play on Shakespeare's words is a consideration of where our consciousness as inhabitants of the Americas lies. For Oswald, the answer is clear since he, like Fernandez Retamar, identifies with the cannibal and Caliban respectively. Oswald de Andrade confronts the predicament of twentieth-century Brazilian identity, hence the name, "The *Cannibalist* Manifesto." Oswald declares that the cannibal is against the Jesuits (Vieira and Anchieta) as well as the Amerindian godsons of Catarina de Médicis, those that were baptized and assimilated the religion of the Portuguese interloper (*A Utopia Antropofágica* 48-51). In the last line of his brilliantly irreverent

Manifesto, Oswald dates it as "the year 374 of the deglutination of the Bishop Sardinha" (*A Utopia Antropofágica* 52). Oswald's choice of the year 374 instead of 1928 signals a notion of Brazilian *cannibalesque* time that begins not with the birth of Christ, but in the year 1554, when the Caetés devoured the Portuguese Bishop, aptly named Sardinha.

Just as Fernández Retamar built his critical views and opinions on the poetry of José Martí, we can construct our own critical analysis based on the poetics of Oswald de Andrade. His *Manifesto Antropófago* captures the voice of Caliban, the defiant cannibal. In *The Tempest*, when Caliban finally speaks in Act I, Scene II of the play, he curses his master Próspero, saying: "You taught me language, and my profit on't / Is I know how to curse. The red plague rid you / For learning me your language!" The source of the metaphor, the statements of the original Caliban, implicate that language is the tool with which to defy Próspero. Likewise, poets and critics like José Martí, Oswald de Andrade, Aimé Césaire, and Fernández Retamar would use their respective Iberian languages to deconstruct an analogous Iberian colonialist discourse. Thus Caliban's most potent weapon is not his practice of cannibalism, but his use of language as a means of resistance.

In *Caramuru*, we are to suspend disbelief that either Jararaca or Bambu actually speak Portuguese. It is more historically accurate to state that Diogo had to learn Tupí. Yet in Durão's text, the specific language is not as important as what is being said between the colonizer and the colonized. The poet has captured the spirit of rebellion of the heroic Amerindians who refused to submit to the Portuguese. Hundreds of years before critics like Fernández Retamar would even begin to intuit the spirit of Caliban,

misread by Rodó in *Ariel*, Santa Rita Durão portrayed it in his creation of characters like Jararaca and Bambu. Like Alonso de Ercilla, Santa Rita Durão intuits the heroicness of the Amerindian resistance. Both epic poets are able to portray them to us in a sympathetic manner, to the point that some critics have even questioned or doubted which side the poets were really on. Indeed, David Quint categorized *La Araucana* as an 'Epic of the Defeated' because of "the tilting of its sympathies to the Araucanian chiefs and their desperate struggle" (159). Read in the context of the entirety of their respective epics, I doubt that either Ercilla or Durão favored the Amerindians over their own Iberians. Yet their sympathetic portrayal of Amerindian heroes and warriors in their poems is difficult to ignore.

One might be tempted to argue that Durão's sensibility for the plight of the indigenous Brazilians is revealed in *Caramuru* in these two instances of resistance to Portuguese colonization as presented in this chapter. However, the similarities between Jararaca and Turnus demonstrate not sympathy but Durão's faithfulness to Virgil's *Aeneid*, having followed this model to the point that it might outweigh what some would consider any historical relevance of this *fictional* epic poem. The portrayal of Bambu, which interrupts the imitation of the Virgilian epic in order to recount an incident in recorded Brazilian history, posits a greater challenge for the reader. However, the poet's civilizing mission is revealed in the words of Diogo, who offers Christianity in exchange for slavery.

The descriptions of the two brave Caetés presented in this chapter coincide with the warfare between the Portuguese-led Tupinambás against the resistant tribes of the

sertão led by Jararaca. Durão's representation of these two intrepid Caetés poses an important counterpoint to the acquiescing portrayals of Gupeva and Paraguaçu that occupy the first few Cantos of *Caramuru*. While the notion of a worthy adversary is a common motif found in other epic poems, in which the hero's opponent is evenly matched in order to make the hero appear all the more valiant, Jararaca is represented as a highly articulate visionary who foresees the enslavement of the indigenous people of his land. Bambu is likewise portrayed as a cunning anthropophagous native who takes revenge on Diogo by informing him that he has eaten his people and is therefore relishing the physical pain being inflicted on his enemie's body. The defiant Amerindians have their own predecessors in other Latin American epics such as Galbarino, called "el indio valeroso" in *La Araucana* or Cepé in *O Uraguay*. The episodes of Amerindian resistance in *Caramuru* foreshadow nineteenth-century indianist literature and even some twentieth-century literature like Oswald de Andrade's *Cannibal Manifesto*. It is in the literary trope of the defiant Amerindian characterss—like Galbarino and Cepé– that the courageous Jararaca and the fearless Bambu can be read.

CHAPTER FIVE

Surviving the Genocide: Amerindian Women of the Conquest

> A instituição social que possibilitou a formação do povo brasileiro foi o cunhadismo, velho uso indígena de incorporar estranhos à sua comunidade. Consistia em lhes dar uma moça índia como esposa.
>
> The social institution that made possible the forming of the Brazilian people was *cunhadismo*, or "in-lawism," an old indigenous usage for incorporating outsiders into the community. It consisted of giving a man an Indian girl as his wife.
>
> *Darcy Ribeiro,* O povo brasileiro*, 1995*
>
> *(translation Gregory Rabassa)*

In the practice of *cunhadismo* the Amerindian woman is treated as object to be given away; this recalls Luce Irigaray's concept of exchange [échange]. In patriarchy as analyzed by Irigaray, only men are *subjects* of exchange; women are among the *objects* of exchange and are therefore a kind of 'commodity' (my emphasis, Whitford 16). Amerindian women's relations with European men recall many of the founding historical myths of the Americas, which have often been interpreted as love stories. Three of the better-known indigenous women who participated in the miscegenation or genesis of the Americas are Pocahontas in Virginia, La Malinche in Veracruz, and Paraguaçu in Bahia.

These women have become legendary historical and mythical icons in their own right; however, they also demonstrate what Ronald Hyam stated in *Empire and Sexuality* (1990): The expansion of Europe was not only a matter of 'Christianity and commerce,' it was also a matter of copulation and concubinage. Sexual opportunities were often seized with imperious confidence (2). These alliances, formed between the Amerindians and Europeans who came to be related to one another by marriage or exchange, were crucial in the establishment of permanent European colonies in the Western Hemisphere. Darcy Ribeiro has termed this phenomenon in Brazil as *cunhadismo*, the practice of giving away a woman to strangers in order to establish ties with them, much like the most important Amerindian woman protagonist in *Caramuru* who becomes the outsider's wife. Paraguaçu, like Diogo Álvares, is loosely based on a real person in Brazilian history (and is particularly well-known at least in Bahia, where there is a river named after her). Paraguaçu would become part of the narrative of the establishment of Portuguese hegemony in Bahia in the sixteenth-century. This chapter aims at a gendered analysis of *Caramuru* while examining the significance behind the representations of Amerindian women in Durão's poem.

IRACEMA AND OTHER ANAGRAMS FOR AMERICA

As we saw in the previous chapter, colonial representations of Amerindian men would establish literary prototypes of fierce and brave warriors that served as models for nineteenth-century Indianist authors. Meanwhile, the feminized versions of these literary Amerindian prototypes have often been portrayed within the framework of a

romanticized representation of Brazilian *mestiçagem*, or hybridity. In order to place the fictional Paraguaçu of *Caramuru* within the greater context of the literature of the conquest of Brazil, it will be useful to compare her with at least two other Amerindian women of Brazilian literature. The reason for this is that by placing Paraguaçu within the established narrative of women of the conquest we can begin to understand how the main woman protagonist of *Caramuru* fits into the greater narrative that became the foundational myth of Brazil. Then, we can come to a clearer understanding of how this literary persona is represented differently (or not) from these and other Amerindian women of the conquest.

The portrait of Basílio da Gama's defiant Lindóia in *O Uraguay* serves as a significant counterpoint to the acquiescent Paraguaçu in Durão's *Caramuru*. Lindóia is the wife of the Amerindian Cacambo who is captured and murdered by the Jesuits in a scheme to marry his wife to one of their close allies—the mestizo Baldetta, a bastard son of the Spanish Jesuit Father Balda. On the day the wedding is scheduled, Lindóia seeks out the village sorceress, who reveals to her the true cause of her husband's death. Instead of going to her wedding ceremony, Lindóia goes into the forest and commits suicide by allowing herself to be bitten by a lethally poisonous snake. One of the most memorable scenes in the poem is when her brother goes into the forest to look for her and finds her beside a tree, with a snake wrapped around her torso. With great skill Caitutu (Lindóia's brother) shoots an arrow at the snake and pins its head to the tree. He races to rescue the dying Lindóia, but it is too late. Like the character Bambu discussed in the previous chapter, Lindóia would rather die than submit to her Jesuit overlords. The relation

between Lindóia and Paraguaçu represent the Amerindian women's role in this dichotomy of surrender and resistance. Brazilian literature thus begins with two diametrical representations of indigenous women's response to Portuguese colonization. Basílio da Gama's Lindóia remains faithful to Cacambo, and even prefers to die before agreeing to marry Baldetta, while Durão's Paraguaçu helps establish Portuguese hegemony in Bahia.

In the nineteenth-century Iracema becomes the post-Independence version of Paraguaçu, the prototypical Amerindian woman of Brazil. Her story is also known as "the legend of Ceará," and is the plot of the eponymous novel *Iracema* (1865) by the Brazilian author José de Alencar (1829-1877). The fact that Iracema, and not Paraguaçu, is a common name for women in Brazil today demonstrates that *Iracema* is the Amerindian myth that Brazilians remember and cherish more as their own. It also reflects the fact that many Brazilians may have never read *Caramuru*, but *Iracema* is required reading in most secondary schools. Unlike the two colonial representations of Amerindian women in *O Uraguay* and *Caramuru*, *Iracema* was written during the full-fledged romantic nationalist movement of nineteenth-century Brazil. Just as Gonçalves Dias may have modeled some of his Amerindian characters on earlier epics, it is possible that José de Alencar created Iracema in the image of Paraguaçu since the story of Paraguaçu's surrender would be mirrored and further romanticized in the drama of *Iracema*. The plot of Alencar's romanticized version of the conquest reveals a somewhat passive and melancholy indigenous woman who dies of sorrow. Indeed, Iracema is portrayed as even more docile than Paraguaçu, particularly since she does not accompany her Portuguese lover to war to

fight alongside him as Paraguaçu does in Canto IV. Iracema is yet another indigenous woman who married a conqueror. The allegory of the indigenous woman as conquerable by male potency can thus be interpreted as a metonymy for the successful conquest of Brazil.

Thus, the eighteenth-century model for *Iracema* is not the defiant Lindóia, but the submissive Paraguaçu. Lindóia may be seen as a tragic figure in the mold of Antigone; whereas Paraguaçu survives, and will later marry and have many children. Lindóia died in the resistance, but Paraguaçu overcomes the conquest. Paraguaçu was able to incorporate the colonizer into her culture; and, as we will see in the excerpts from *Caramuru* below, she also assimilated to Portuguese culture. Assimilation in Brazil is generally seen in a positive light, as noted in Russell G. Hamilton's article "European Transplants, Amerindian in-Laws, African Settlers, Brazilian Creoles: A Unique Colonial and Postcolonial condition in Latin America" (2008). Hamilton writes:

> With regard to the sui generis character of Brazil's colonial and postcolonial condition, any number of Brazilian intellectuals who have written on and/or spoken out about such social and economic issues as class disparities and racial discrimination see assimilation, based on hybridity and creolization, as an essentially positive historical factor. (120)

In Brazil, assimilation is synonymous with *mestiçagem*. Resistance to multiculturalism—as it is manifested and practiced in the United States—comes from both the left and the right: the right fears that people of color will demand rights and privileges long denied to them, while the left mistrusts multiculturalism as importing "gringo" ideals and values

(Stam 15). Thus not many black intellectuals in Brazil critique or question the narrative of *mestiçagem*, those that do include, Abdias do Nascimento (Miller 98), Marcelo Paixão, Ney de Oliveira Santos, and Clóvis Moura (Fiola 6), among others. Meanwhile, mainstream authors like Jorge Amado champion and celebrate *mestiçagem* (Miller 99). It appears that while there are antiracist movements in Brazil, the official discourse still upholds assimilation through *mestiçagem* as the primary means of overcoming racism.

Paraguaçu may be an eighteenth-century version of Iracema; yet in *Caramuru*, the story ends before any children are born between Diogo and Paraguaçu. Yet the historical couple did in fact have many children, as Gregório de Matos' poem, seen in the introduction, "Aos principais da Bahia chamados Caramurus" suggests (Matos 640). Therefore, more important for the Brazilian narrative than the Amerindian women characters themselves is perhaps their offspring. In *Foundational Fictions* (1991), Doris Sommer writes that José de Alencar claimed that Brazilian society was special, "not because of heroic resistance but because of romantic surrender," and insisted that Brazil was founded "when whites and Indians fell into each other's arms and made mestizo babies" (150). In other words, Lindóia's "heroic resistance" is not what makes Brazil different, rather it is both Paraguaçu's and Iracema's "romantic surrender" that marks the Brazilian imaginary. While Alencar's writings on Brazilian *difference* may appear to be a mere reflection of nineteenth-century romanticism, his views (as highlighted here by Sommer) have continued well into the present. This may be due to the nature of the Portuguese Empire in Brazil, which actually transferred the capital of their empire to Rio de Janeiro in 1807, thereby mitigating the nineteenth-century violence experienced in

most of Hispanic and Anglo-America. Brazilians did not have to fight a war for independence, nor where they burdened by civil wars in the nineteenth-century.

In Brazilian literature, Alencar picks up the story where Santa Rita Durão left off, since Iracema symbolically gives birth to the first Brazilian. The son of Iracema and Martim is aptly named Moacir, which translates as "born of suffering" or "son of pain." The pain and suffering of the conquest of Brazil is reflected in the indigenous name of this first *mestiço*. This particular aspect of the Brazilian imaginary is evident in Darcy Ribeiro's *O povo brasileiro* (1995), a book that is considered "the culmination of the life's work of one of Brazil's leading twentieth-century intellectuals" (Lowe ix). As the quote at the beginning of this chapter suggests, Darcy Ribeiro argues that the role of *cunhadismo* was decisive in the formation of the Brazilian people:

> A função do cunhadismo na sua nova inserção civilizatória foi fazer surgir a numerosa camada de gente mestiça que efetivamente ocupou o Brasil. É crível até que a colonização pudesse ser feita através do desenvolvimento dessa prática. (82)
>
> The role of *cunhadismo* in the new civilizing establishment was bringing about the rise of a widespread class of people of mixed blood, who effectively occupied Brazil. It is quite possible that the colonization itself was brought about through the development of this practice. (translation Gregory Rabassa 50)

Thus, Darcy Ribeiro argues that the entire colonizing project was only made possible by the birth of these offspring of Portuguese colonizers and Amerindian women. In literary

terms, this would mean that character's such as Alencar's Moacir would occupy the land and further colonize Brazil. Yet as Moacir's name suggests, it was not an easy or painless process since the institution of *cunhadismo* was not as welcoming as the name suggest. Darcy Ribeiro further states that the offspring of Brazilian *cunhadismo* were generally rejected by both their mothers' and their fathers' people. While it is evident, because of the nature of the independence of Latin American countries in the nineteenth-century, that creoles were in fact rejected by their paternal side, the maternal or "second rejection" is less well-known. Yet according to Darcy Ribeiro, this double rejection forms the basis of Brazilian identity:

> A segunda rejeição era a do gentio materno. Na concepção dos índios, a mulher é um simples saco em que o macho deposita sua semente. Quem nasce é o filho do pai, e não da mãe, assim visto pelos índios. Não podendo identificar-se com uns nem com outros de seus ancestrais, que o rejeitavam, o mameluco caía numa terra de ninguém, a partir da qual constrói sua identidade de brasileiro. (108-109)
>
> The second rejection was that of their maternal people. The Indians' concept was that a woman is simply the sack into which the male deposits his seed. The one who is born is the child of the father and not of the mother, as the Indians see it. Unable to identify himself with either of his

> ancestral lines, which both rejected him, the mameluco[11] fell into a no-man's land out of which he shaped his identity as a Brazilian. (70)

This double dose of patriarchy, from both the Amerindians and the Portuguese, shaped the world into which the Brazilian mamelucos were born. By patriarchy, I refer to Luce Irigaray's definition as 'an exclusive respect for the genealogy of sons and fathers, and the competition between brothers' (Whitford 23). This certainly appears to be the case in the exchange of Amerindian women during colonial times, particularly in the case of *cunhadismo* as an indigenous institution. Ribeiro's hypothesis of the double rejection is likewise reflected in *Iracema*; although she is not entirely abandoned by her foreign love, she is forced to live alienated from her tribe and dies of sorrow soon after giving birth to Moacir.

The way that Amerindian women of the conquest survived was often by intermarrying with the colonizer. From the woman's point of view, it was a strategy for overcoming the genocide. Yet the same cannot be said for their offspring, who were in the unique situation of living between two worlds. Often they became extensions of the colonizer's people, albeit second-class Portuguese citizens, and thus aided their father's people by furthering the colonial enterprise. Robert Stam points out that "mamelucos were riven in their allegiances between their indigenous ancestors, whom they often despised, and the Europeans, who despised them; they were, in a sense, the first victims of the 'ideology of whitening'" (5). While there are no mestizo offspring in the epic of

[11] A *mameluco* is the term applied to those born of a European father and an Amerindian mother in Colonial Brazil.

Caramuru, except perhaps Santa Rita Durão himself, we may interpret the practice of *cunhadismo* in this context of the Amerindian wombs as Trojan Horses from which a new breed of colonizers emerged.

In *Colonialism/Postcolonialism* (1998) Ana Loomba asserts that, "from the beginning of the colonial period till its end (and beyond), female bodies symbolize the conquered land" (152). Considering the role of Amerindian women as mothers to native-born colonizers or *bandeirantes*,[12] I would change Loomba's assertion to more accurately reflect the fact that in the case of Brazil (and perhaps Latin America as a whole), female bodies did not merely symbolize the conquered land but were in fact an extension of it. As Octavio Paz writes in the essay "Los Hijos de la Malinche" in *El Laberinto de la soledad* (1950):

> Si la Chingada es una representación de la Madre violada, no me parece forzado asociarla a la Conquista, que fue también una violación, no solamente en el sentido histórico, sino en la carne misma de las indias. (224)
>
> If the Chingada is a representation of the violated Mother, it is appropriate to associate her with the Conquest, which was also a violation, not only in the historical sense but also in the very flesh of the Indian women. (translation Lysander Kemp 86)

[12] *Bandeirantes* were the people carried out slaving expeditions or *bandeiras* in the interior of Brazil during the sixteenth century. These expeditions were mostly led by Portuguese explorers accompanied by their *mameluco* servants and/or Amerindian allies.

It is significant that in a twist of the Mexican narrative, Alencar's Iracema is hardly raped but appears to be the one who seduces the Portuguese Martim. She gives him the *jurema* potion and initiates sexual relations while he is under the effects of the hallucinogen. Whether we interpret the narrative of miscegenation as a rape, or a seduction/love story, Iracema and Malinche are both significant because (like Paraguaçu in Bahia) they gave birth to the first offspring between Amerindians and Iberians. The sons of these Amerindian women often continued their father's conquest of land and women, as in the case of the *bandeirantes* in Brazil.

While Paz emphasized the rape of the Amerindian women, Ribeiro points to *cunhadismo* as the phenomenon which facilitated the conquest. These examples suggest a depersonalization of Amerindian women; they are mere objects of exchange, not people. Amerindian women thus become a part of the physical land, or as Ribeiro so crudely states, "um simples saco em que o macho deposita sua semente" 'simply the sack into which the man deposits his seed' (108). By giving away Amerindian women to Portuguese colonizers the native populations sealed their own disastrous fate. This is particularly so when the alliances with indigenous go-betweens such as Paraguaçu, Iracema, or Malinche allowed for an easier occupation of the land in question, whether in Mexico or Brazil. In Brazil, the historical Catarina-Paraguaçu Álvares played a key role in the establishment of a permanent Portuguese settlement in Bahia. By learning the Portuguese language, being baptized, and marrying a Portuguese colonizer, Paraguaçu's role in Durão's *Caramuru* epitomizes the surrender of the Amerindian woman. Durão's epic seeks to legitimize this occupation of land *and woman* by reframing it as the

establishment of a new Roman empire. This idea from Colonial Brazil still holds, as Darcy Ribeiro writes in the final chapter of *O Povo Brasileiro* aptly titled *O destino nacional* / The National Destiny: "Na verdade das coisas, o que somos é a nova Roma. Uma Roma tardia e tropical" (448) 'If truth be told, we are the new Rome—a tardy, tropical Rome' (trans. Greogory Rabassa 322). José de Alencar's novel is an intermediary between Colonial Brazil and Darcy Ribeiro's contemporary writings. Iracema creates a sappy romantic version of a very similar story, which more or less has been accepted as the grand narrative of the foundation of Brazil to this day.

Like Iracema, the story of Paraguaçu and Diogo romanticizes the conquest of the Americas, reducing it to a mere romance between willing Amerindian women and predatory European men. It rewrites the history of a genocidal occupation and transforms it into a trite love story, glossing over what came to be one of the first empires of global reach. Thus, the grand narrative referred to above in Sommer's quotation of Alencar, who claimed that the uniqueness of Brazilian society is based not on resistance but surrender, seems to have been already established in the eighteenth-century with *Caramuru*. Certainly, Alencar did not invent the idea of a romance between a European and Amerindian who establish a new line of *mestiço* or mixed-race peoples. Besides Diogo Álvares, there were other historical figures, such as Durate Coelho in Pernambuco, who may have also contributed to this narrative. Duarte Coelho formed an alliance with the Tupi-speaking Tobajara, an alliance sealed by the marriage of the donatory's brother-in-law Jerónimo de Albuquerque to a daughter of a Tobajara chief. Jerónimo de Albuquerque became known as the 'Adam of Pernambuco' because he and his

Amerindian wife had such a large family of *mamelucos* (Hemming 166). Meanwhile in São Paulo, João Ramalho also started his own line of *mamelucos* by various indigenous women. The myth of cultural harmony through romance may have been loosely based on history, yet both Santa Rita Durão's Paraguaçu and José de Alencar's Iracema transform these stories of peoples in contact/conflict by idealizing miscegenation through romantic narratives.

For the most part, the narrative of a romanticized foundational myth does not often get called into question because it is so ingrained in the imaginary of Brazil that it becomes rather difficult to deconstruct unless one thinks critically about the likelihood of such stories and what their impact means to us today. If we were to gloss over the realities of Portuguese men washing up on the shores of Bahia, while Portuguese women remained for the most part in Portugal, we might forget that these inter-racial marriages could not possibly have all been love stories. A more critical approach would more than likely reveal that they are closer to European male fantasies than to reality. Unfortunately, we do not have a written record of what the conquest of Bahia was like for the Amerindians. Historical texts are as biased as literary texts because they were written from the point of view of the Portuguese colonizers. Yet we can read what Amerindians have to say about the conquest today. North American Indian authors and critics such as Paula Gunn Allen have written extensively on Amerindian women of the conquest such as Pocahontas, among others. She does not see such women as traitors to their respective tribes; instead, she celebrates their ability to endure and even thrive in overwhelming circumstances. Indeed, she argues that the image of powerful Indian women as traitors is

"another chapter in the patriarchal folktale that begins with Eve causing Adam's fall from grace into divine disgrace" (Allen 203). Paraguaçu and Iracema should also be recognized and remembered not as traitors to their respective tribes, but as survivors of the conquest.

We turn now from historical and literary representations to a closer reading of Paraguaçu as portrayed in *Caramuru*. If Alencar's *Iracema* is somewhat based on Durão's Paraguaçu, then an analysis of this particular Amerindian woman in *Caramuru* may shed more light on this paradigm of Brazilian Amerindian women of the conquest. Another Amerindian woman in *Caramuru* is Moema, not based on a real person but rather, as we saw in the first chapter, a poetic imitation of Dido in Virgil's *Aeneid*. I have also included the Virgin Mary as part of this cast of women characters in *Caramuru*, particularly since her apparition to Paraguaçu plays a key role in the establishment of the first church in Bahia.

REPRESENTATIONS OF INDIGENOUS WOMEN IN *CARAMURU*

The following analysis of Amerindian women in *Caramuru* is concerned with the poet's representation of Paraguaçu and other women in the poem. As we saw in chapter three, Santa Rita Durão is particularly concerned with the significance of the Amerindian's conversion to Diogo's religion. Like Gupeva who accepts the colonizer's religion, the significance of Paraguaçu in *Caramuru* appears to be that she is the first Amerindian woman to be baptized and take a Christian name. This religious element of the conquest was not addressed in Alencar's *Iracema*, since Martim is more concerned

with war and miscegenation than evangelization. Paraguaçu's appearance in the poem follows a particularly gluttonous description of an anthropophagic ritual, thus Durão begins his description of Paraguaçu by emphasizing that she is different from the rest of the "nauseating natives" (75). The reason for her *difference*, as we shall see in this analysis, has to do with her conversion to Christianity. Once Diogo convinces the Tupinambá to follow his religion he expects them to give up their ritual practice of cannibalism. Paraguaçu accepts Diogo's religion early on, although she will not be officially baptized until they go to France. For the poet, Paraguçu becomes acceptable as a wife and can marry Diogo only after she is baptized.

The first appearance of Paraguaçu in Canto Two reflects the grand narrative of the Portuguese conquest of Brazil as a love story between the colonizer and the colonized. In the poem, Paraguaçu is supposed to marry Gupeva, but Durão assures the reader that no passion exists between the two: "Nem prenda lhe aceitou, porque o não ama" 'She didn't even accept gifts from him, because she loves him not' (Durão 76). Durão writes that the so-called barbarians know nothing about love: "Nada sabem de amor bárbaras gentes / Nem arde em peito rude a amante chama" 'The barbarous people know nothing about love / The lover's flame doesn't burn in primitive hearts' (Durão 76). This view that the Amerindians have no concept of love or passion contradicts other scenes throughout the poem, since Paraguaçu herself, Moema and Jararaca all demonstrate strong feelings akin to the "flame" that Durão claims they are lacking (this will be further analyzed later in the chapter). Gupeva does not lament Paraguaçu's rejection of the marriage plans proposed by her parents, nor does he resent her, but instead behaves with respect towards her,

"Gupeva, que não sente o seu despeito / Tratava-a sem amor, mas com respeito" 'Gupeva, who doesn't feel her spitefulness / Treated her with respect but without love' (Durão 76). Gupeva is thus more of a brother to Paraguaçu and he will also become like a brother to Diogo Álvares. This brotherly relation is important because in order for the Tupinambá to expand their power Paraguaçu must intermarry with another tribe, which points to the practice of *cunhadismo* in the poem. As noted by the poetic voice of Jararaca, Gupeva passively accepts this arrangement. When Paraguaçu chooses Diogo over Jararaca she has purposely chosen to ally her tribe to the Portuguese, not the Caetés.

Canto Four begins with a *locus amoenus* scene as Paraguaçu leisurely relaxes in what will soon become a battlefield. Antonio Candido refers to this *locus amoenus* episode in Canto Four of *Caramuru* as "one of the poem's happier moments" (*Na Sala* 14). An anomaly, he writes, since Candido sees the personality of Durão manifested throughout the tumultuous poem and attributes the poem's warfare and cultural imposition to the poet: "Durão é em grau surpreendente *um poeta de guerra e da imposição cultural*, e não ficaria deslocado em nosso tempo excepcionalmente bruto e agressivo" 'Durão is to a surprising degree *a poet of war and cultural imposition*, and would not in our own time be out of touch as exceptionally brute and aggressive' (my emphasis, *Na Sala* 7). The first part of this statement, that Durão is a poet of war, must be taken with some reservations. Durão is an epic poet, not a lyric poet, and an epic poem must conventionaly include a war. Therefore, Candido's assertion that Durão's personality mirrors the poem ignores the fact that the violent content in *Caramuru* is more of a reflection of the historical nature of the conquest of the Americas. Furthermore,

the bellicose Cantos were not based on a specific war in Brazilian history, but as mentioned in Chapter One, the scenes of warfare in *Caramuru* deliberately imitate those in Virgil's *Aeneid*. In other words, there is no way Durão could have left out these war scenes and still written a proper Virgilian epic. Attributing an aspect of the known history of European conquest in the New World—part of which includes a violent resistance to the overseas colonizer—to a poet's personality is somewhat misleading. Reflecting on what was not always a peaceful discovery but a violent conquest, Durão included this darker side of history in a few particular scenes in *Caramuru*.

While war may be attributed to epic poetry in general, not necessarily to Durão's personality, the second part of Candido's statement is closer to the mark and deserves further consideration. Durão is indeed a poet of cultural imposition; however, this reflects the fact that part of the entire colonial project of taking possession of the Americas was the imposition of one culture over another. As we saw in chapter one, Virgil's Lavinia was also destined to marry a foreigner. Thus, the poet's use of the woman as conquered land reflects this subtext of imperialist occupation, be it Roman, Portuguese, or otherwise. However, Durão's epic goes beyond Virgil's *Aeneid* in this aspect, because while Lavinia married a Trojan, her people were able to maintain their Latin language and culture: "Don't make the native Latin warriors change their ancient name to Teucrians [i.e. Trojans] / Don't impose the clothes and speech of Troy / Let Latium be …." (translation Ruden 292). In *Caramuru*, not only is the Amerindian woman a metaphor for (or extension of) the conquered land, she also must adopt the culture of the conqueror. The role of Santa Rita Durão's Amerindian women in *Caramuru*

demonstrates Luce Irigaray's contention that "woman constitutes the silent ground on which the patriarchal thinker erects his discursive constructs" (Moi 130). Cultural imperialism thus takes on a gendered dynamic as we shall see in the following selections from the text.

In life as in art, the relationship between Diogo and Paraguaçu will facilitate the establishment of Portuguese hegemony in Bahia. It begins with a love-at-first-sight encounter, contradicting the poet's previous claim that the Amerindians are incapable of feeling love.

> Mas desde o céu a santa inteligência
> Com doce inspiração mitiga a chama,
> Onde a amante paixão ceda à prudência
> E a razão pode mais que a ardente flama:
> Em Deus, na natureza e na consciência
> Conhece que quer mal quem assim ama,
> E que fora sacrilégio episódio
> Chamar à culpa amor, não chamar-lhe ódio. (Canto II: 83)
> Yet from heaven above, the holy intellect
> With sweet inspiration, tempers the flame
> Where the lover's passion cedes to prudence
> And reason overrules the ardent flame
> In God, in nature, and in conscience
> Knows that who loves like that, loves not

And it would be a sacrilegious incident

To place the blame on love instead of hate.

Whoever loves passionately at first sight, writes Durão, indulges in something more akin to hate than love (77). The reason for this is that attachment and aversion are really two sides of the same coin. What appears to be love (attachment) is actually hate (aversion) turned inside out. This concept is better illustrated when we look at two other characters in Caramuru who, unlike Paraguaçu, did not allow their reason to rise above these two poles of desire. Moema and Jararaca are seemingly madly in love with Diogo and Paraguaçu respectively. If we consider what Durão wrote about the prudence, their dramatic displays of affection may be interpreted as a thinly disguised love-hate relationship with/between the colonized and the colonizer. In Moema's case, her love for Diogo is her downfall (this will be discussed further below). For Jararaca, whose passion for Paraguaçu quickly turned to hate in the face of her rejection of his hand in marriage, the result is war. Ultimately, Moema's attachment and Jararaca's aversion to Diogo bring about their demise. Meanwhile, Paraguaçu does not engage in this illusion of love and hate, which is why she endures and thrives, and even lives to see the face of the goddess who appears to her at the end of the poem. Her use of reason makes her different from other Amerindian characters in the poem.

In addition to tempered love, language plays a key role in the relationship between Paragauçu and Diogo. Initially, Diogo had summoned Paraguaçu only because she knew Portuguese, which—according to the poem—she had acquired from a Portuguese slave in Taparica (Durão 75). However, as with all the other Amerindian

dialogues in the poem, the possibility that they all communicated in Portuguese is unlikely. Yet the poet feels he should provide a note about how the historical Paraguaçu learned Portuguese, and this brings up the topic of language. Earlier excursions had deliberately left behind *degredados* or exiles, in which case it is plausible that by the time of Diogo's arrival there were Amerindians who had already become familiar with the Portuguese language. The following excerpt from Pero Vaz de Caminha's *Carta* shows that Durão's statement about Paraguaçu having learned Portuguese is credible: "E portanto, se os degredados, que aqui hão de ficar aprenderem bem a sua fala e os entenderem…." 'Therefore, if the exiles that are to remain here learn their language and understand them…' (Ribeiro *A Fundação* 89). Although the *Carta* suggests it is the Portuguese exiles who will learn the Amerindian language, it is very likely that some might end up learning Portuguese. Either way, in the poem Durão claims that Paraguaçu was conveniently "sent to Diogo by Heaven" in order to facilitate communication with the Amerindians:

> No raio deste heróico pensamento
> Entanto Diogo refletiu consigo,
> Ser para a língua um cômodo instrumento
> Do Céu mandado, na donzela amigo:
> E por ser necessário ao santo intento,
> Estuda no remédio do perigo;
> Que pode ser? Sou fraco; ela é formosa…
> Eu livre… ela donzela… será esposa. (Canto II: 84)

In a ray of this heroic thinking

While Diogo ponders to himself

Being a convenient instrument of language

Sent from heaven above, in the maiden friend:

And since it is necessary on the holy intent

He studies the remedy of danger;

What can it be? I am weak, she is beautiful…

I am free… she is a maiden… she will be my wife.

Diogo's admission of weakness recognizes that at this point in the poem, before the war with the Caetés, he still does not have any power within the tribe. He barely escapes being eaten in the anthropophagous ritual, but now he sees the advantages of taking Paraguaçu as his wife. Her beauty is not only based on her dress and complexion but her influence in the group. Diogo recognizes that her language abilities will give him an upper hand in the power dynamics of the Tupinambá. While divine intervention is a common occurrence in epic poems, here it opportunely facilitates the colonizers' ability to communicate with the soon to be colonized Amerindians. Paraguaçu is reduced here to a mere instrument of language, one that is necessary for evangelization. Diogo concludes that she must be heaven sent, and thus decides to make her his wife.

Diogo's initial disadvantages are overcome by his marriage to Paraguaçu, his partner in language. Language is central to being, and in colonial subjects it forms a part of their identity in relation to the colonizer, as the following quote by Walter Mignolo explains:

> Science (knowledge and wisdom) cannot be detached from language; languages are not just 'cultural' phenomena in which people find their 'identity'; they are also the location where knowledge is inscribed. And, since languages are not something human beings have but rather something of what humans beings are, coloniality of power and of knowledge engendered the coloniality of being [colonialidad del ser].' (quoted in Maldonado-Torres 242)

Paraguaçu's ability to understand and speak Portuguese is not only central to her being, it benefits Diogo as well. Her knowledge of both languages, in addition to her allegedly light complexion and her dress, transform her into an instrument of colonization for Diogo.

Diogo is thus convinced that he should marry Paraguaçu. He proposes to her by literally offering her his hand as a gesture of matrimony. Paraguaçu says nothing, instead she agrees by smiling and giving him her hand (Durão 78). Speechless, the two stand facing one other. After the long, awkward silence the "prudent hero" decides that his love for Paraguaçu will remain innocent and fraternal until she has been baptized in the Catholic faith.[13] Although during their first meeting Diogo and Paraguaçu address each other as husband and wife, it actually serves as an engagement. Thus not only is a common language crucial in bringing them together but a common faith is necessary in order to bring this trans-Atlantic couple together.

[13] This recalls the dilemma of John Smith on his marriage to Pocahontas since only upon conversion is the Native American woman able to marry to the colonizer.

Paraguaçu's acquiescence to Diogo's professed love and marriage proposal is worth examining closely. In just one stanza, Paraguaçu accepts Diogo's terms: baptism and his church, and furthermore, pledges alliance to his people and to his god:

> Esposo (a bela diz), teu nome ignoro;
> Mas não teu coração, que no meu peito
> Desde o momento em que te vi, que o adoro:
> Não sei se era amor já, se era respeito;
> Mas sei do que então vi, do que hoje exploro,
> Que de dous corações um só foi feito.
> Quero o batismo teu, quero a tua igreja,
> *Meu povo seja o teu, teu Deus meu seja.* (Canto II: 90)
>
> Husband (says the beauty), your name I ignore;
> But not your heart, that is in mine
> Since the moment that I saw you, I adore it
> I don't know if was already love, or respect
> But I know that what I saw, what today I exploit
> That two hearts were made from only one.
> I want your baptism, I want your church
> *My people are yours, your God is mine.* (my emphasis)

The last line of this stanza is strikingly similar to the biblical Ruth when pledging her allegiance to her mother-in-law Naomi: "But Ruth answered, 'Don't ask me to leave you! Let me go with you. Wherever you go, I will go; wherever you live I will live. *Your*

people will be my people, and your God will be my God.'" (my emphasis, Bible, 1 Ruth 16). The story of the Biblical Ruth is one of conversion, since she is a Moabite woman who marries Mahlon, son of Naomi. When Mahlon dies, Naomi tells Ruth to return to her tribe and remarry but she refuses. This is the context in which she tells Naomi that her people and God are her own. She is celebrated in Judeo-Christian culture as an exemplary loyal convert. I believe that Durão, being a man of the cloth, could not have ended this particular stanza without intending it to be a reference to Ruth. Thus, in *Caramuru*, Paraguaçu represents the biblical Ruth.

Paraguaçu promises to remain constantly at Diogo's side, in sleep as well as in battle, and vows fidelity, whether Diogo be in prison or on a throne (Durão 76). Moreover, the poet portrays her as giving herself up completely to Diogo by submitting to him without any resistance at all:

> Ter-me-ás, caro, ter-me-ás sempre a teu lado;
> Vigia tua, se te ocupa o sono;
> Armada sairei, vendo-te armado;
> Tão fiel nas prisões como num trono:
> Outrem não temas, que me seja amado;
> Tu só serás, Senhor, tu só meu dono;
> Tanto lhe diz Diogo, e ambos juraram;
> E em fé de juramento, as mãos tocaram. (Canto II: 91)
> You shall have me, dear, you shall have me always at your side;
> Under your watch, if it occupies your sleep;

I shall go out armed, seeing you armed;

As faithful in the prisons as on a throne;

Don't fear another, who would be my love;

Only you will be my lord; I am belong to you alone;

Diogo says the same to her, and both swore,

And as a sign of their promise, held hands.

The above quote is the poet's imagination of an unlikely scenario, a highly romanticized view of the conquest. If Paraguaçu is to represent the conquered land, she gives herself over willingly and entirely. She accepts the terms of Diogo's marriage proposal, and eagerly hands herself over to him, his people, his church, and his God. If one pauses to think critically about the nature of the conquest of the Americas, this episode seems like a Christian missionary's fantasy.

Paraguaçu served as an intermediary between her tribe and Diogo. Furthermore, Paraguaçu's adoption of Diogo's religion and her declaration that her people now belong to him transform her into an instrument for further colonization and evangelization. Surviving the conquest came at a high price, but in the end her offspring endured and even thrived. In *Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism and Latin America* (2000), Anibal Quijano delineates the racialization process that arose in Ibero-America after the conquest. He notes that unlike the vast majority of Amerindians who were enslaved or confined to serfdom, the Indian nobility received special treatment owing to their roles as intermediaries with the dominant race (536). Quijano explains how the colonizer "forced the colonized to learn the dominant culture in a way that would be useful to the

reproduction of domination, whether in the field of technology and material activity or subjectivity, especially Judeo-Christian religiosity" (my emphasis 541). Reproducing the colonizer's dominance, Gupeva's and Paraguaçu's assimilation of Portuguese language and culture further facilitates the submission of the tribes of Bahia in the poem.

The poet's representation of Paraguaçu emphasizes her cultural assimilation, yet the poet's fantasy of conversion and evangelization continues beyond the nonphysical to include her physical appearance as well. In *Caramuru*, another characteristic that distinguishes Paraguaçu from her people is that she does not look like a typical indigenous woman, but rather is the color of "white snow" and has light eyes and pink tones. A white Paraguaçu requires a suspension of disbelief. Durão is not trying to portray a realistic portrait of her but conforming to the conventions of beauty typical of his neoclassic era, which again sought to imitate the classics:

> Paraguaçu gentil (tal nome teve)
>
> Bem diversa de gente tão nojosa,
>
> De cor tão alva como a branca neve,
>
> E donde não é neve, era de rosa:
>
> O nariz natural, boca mui breve,
>
> Olhos de bela luz, testa espaçosa;
>
> De algodão tudo o mais, com manto espesso,
>
> Quanto honesta encobriu, fez ver-lhe o preço. (Canto II: 78)
>
> Gentle Paraguaçu (this was her name)
>
> So different from the nauseating peoples

Of a color as clear as the dawn, white like snow

And where she wasn't snow, she was a rose

A natural nose, a brief mouth

A beautiful light in her eyes, a broad forehead

Cotton all the rest, with a thick cloak

Covering her decency, revealing her worth.

The description of Paraguaçu as a clothed, white European beauty confirms that the poet has once again imposed his own cultural norms onto another. Although this merely reflects the greater nature of the conquest and evangelization of most of the Americas, which involved destroying the native cultures and imposing European culture in the Western Hemisphere. For most of the colonial era and beyond, there was no respect shown for native cultural practices, or any efforts made to preserve them. This is most likely due to a crusading momentum gained from the Reconquista in Spain and Portugal that was carried over into the New World. The intolerance for Jews and Muslims in the Iberian Peninsula, and later for Protestants in Europe, manifested itself as a general suspicion or persecution of pagan or non-Christian peoples in general, and the Americas were no exception. For the purposes of Durão's epic poem, there is no way that Paraguaçu could have maintained her Amerindian beliefs and dress and still been an acceptable wife for Diogo. While her white skin may be considered as mere imitation of classical literature, her change in religion and clothing goes beyond questions of literary conventions. So while it seems that in many aspects *Caramuru* can indeed be read as an imitation of Virgil, the cultural imperialism that was central to Iberian colonization in the

Americas is likewise reflected throughout the poem. It is in this sense that the quality of imitation in the poem falters because the poet is perhaps more committed to Christianity than to true classical representations.

As we have seen so far, Paraguaçu's whiteness reflects European notions of Beauty. The implication that Paraguaçu's clothing is indicative of her worth is significant because it points to the evangelization process that was part of this entire imperialistic undertaking. While the representation of Paraguaçu as being light-skinned requires a willing suspension of disbelief (or at least an acknowledgment of the practice of imitation) her clothing reminds the reader of the necessity that the heroes' bride must adapt to Christian norms and culture. The poet imagines her willingness to cover her body in order to dress in the Portuguese way, a clear sign of submission and obedience to the conqueror. One doubts whether or not the real Paraguaçu would be so eager to dress like a modest Christian. As we saw in chapter three, in Pero Vaz de Caminha's letter, the earliest Portuguese explorers were shocked by the natives' lack of shame for their naked bodies. This opinion of the nakedness of the other reflects more on the Portuguese bias than it does on the Amerindians they were observing. Likewise, Santa Rita Durão's portrayal of Paraguaçu in *Caramuru* says more about the poet than it does about the historical Paraguaçu, or Amerindian women in general. Unease with the human body is usually culturally determined, particularly in the Abrahamic religions who all trace their mythical origins to Adam and Eve. Although these two walked around completely naked before they disobeyed God in the Book of Genesis, their shame was a consequence of having eaten fruit from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The poet has therefore

assimilated Paraguaçu into his own cultural bias by dressing her like a Christian woman and making her suddenly self-conscious of her naked body by covering it. Like God's punishment of Adam and Eve in Genesis, the poet has made Paraguaçu uncomfortable in her body and ashamed of her nakedness.

Portuguese notions of shamefulness and sinfulness of the body reflect medieval Christian values and standards, yet this idea of modesty was relative and foreign to the Amerindians, who were otherwise comfortable in their own bodies. The poetics of Oswald de Andrade show how absurd this must have seemed to the Amerindians. In his poem "Erro de Português," which initially connotes an idea of a grammatical error in Portuguese language, turns out to be a postcolonial criticism on Portuguese notions of modesty and dress. The first three lines comment on the imposition of Portuguese norms in Brazil: "Quando o português chegou / Debaixo duma bruta chuva / Vestiu o índio" 'When the Portuguese arrived / Under a brutal rain / He dressed the Amerindians' (224). While these first three lines are a poetic simplification of the actual events that unfolded with colonization and evangelization, the last three lines express a value judgment: "Que pena! Fosse uma manhã de sol / O índio tinha despido / O português" 'What a pity! If it were a sunny morning / the Amerindian would have undressed the Portuguese' (224). Oswald de Andrade imagines a different outcome to the events of history, determined in the poem by something as unpredictable as the weather on the day of the Portuguese arrival in Brazil. Commenting on this poem in reference to Pero Vaz de Caminha's letter, Oswald de Andrade notes the desire to "save" the Amerindians: "salvar queria dizer vestir, pôr sapatos e chapéu e, além de todo; obedecer ao conquistador branco" 'salvation

meant to dress, to put shoes and hat and, beyond all else, to obey the white conquistador (224). Applying Oswald's poetics of decolonization to *Caramuru*, we can question the shawl which covered Paraguaçu since this article of clothing was part of what made her acceptable to being a wife of a Portuguese (in addition to skin color and not partaking in cannibalism).

In *Caramuru*, we have seen Paraguaçu's transformation: her skin whitened, her body dressed, and her soul and people turned over to Diogo. This version of the story of Paraguaçu and Diogo epitomizes an ideal of romantic love as a venue for peaceful encounters of different cultures. As if this is not enough *licentia poetica* in *Caramuru*, not only does Paraguaçu want to marry Diogo, but many other Amerindian women also desire to marry the shipwrecked Portuguese: "Muitas outras donzelas brasilianas / A mão do claro Diogo pretendiam" 'Many other Brazilian maidens / sought out clear Diogo's hand' (Durão 179). The implications that the Portuguese colonizer is desirable to so many other Amerindian women (indeed, even to Paraguaçu) tie into Enrique Dussel's concept of the *ego conquiro*, as explained below by Nelson Maldonado-Torres:

> Enrique Dussel states that Hernán Cortés gave expression to an ideal of subjectivity that could be defined as the *ego conquiro*, which predates René Descartes's articulation of the *ego cogito*. This means that the significance of the Cartesian *cogito* for modern European identity has to be understood against the backdrop of an unquestioned ideal of self, expressed in the notion of the *ego conquiro*. The certainty of the self as a conqueror, of its task and missions, preceded Descartes certainty about the

> self as a thinking substance (res cogitans) and provided a way to interpret it. (Coloniality of Being 244-245)

Much like the attitude that presumed the U.S. armed forces would be welcomed in Iraq as liberators, the arrogance of the *ego conquiro* does not question the legitimacy of the greater imperial project. The unquestioned belief in the colonizing mission is evident throughout *Caramuru*, but particularly in relation to the imagined desirability of the colonizers as mates. Nevertheless, the poem hints at the practice of polygamy among some of the Amerindians in Brazil, which made having more than one wife a reality.

In *História das mulheres no Brasil* (1999), Ronal Raminelli writes the first chapter entitled "Eva Tupinambá," which acknowledges Amerindian women as the first mothers of Brazil. While Raminelli notes that most indigenous men had only one wife, polygamy was common among great warriors and chiefs (19). Evidence that some of the Portuguese colonizers were partaking in this native custom comes to us in the letters of Jesuits who were scandalized by the practice (Ribeiro *o povo* 84). Therefore, in addition to *cunhadismo*, the practice of polygamy also led to the explosion of *mamelucos* in Brazil. In São Paulo, João Ramalho was known for having hundreds of wives. Meanwhile in Bahia, as Ribeiro notes: "os recém-chegados acasalaram-se com as índias, tomando, como era uso na terra, tantas quantas pudessem, entrando a produzir mais mamelucos" '…the new arrivals mated with Indian women, taking on, as was the custom in the land, as many as they could, going on to produce more *mamelucos*' (*O povo* 89, trans. Rabassa 55). It is significant that in *Caramuru* Santa Rita Durão portrays Diogo Álvares as having only one wife, in order to make his hero not appear to have "gone native." The

Augustinian monk may have been as scandalized by the practice of polygamy as the Jesuit Nóbrega who wrote letters acknowledging and criticizing this practive. Perhaps Durão felt the need to edit out this not-so-minor detail, in order to keep with the Christian ideal. Yet it is well-known that the historical Caramuru, like João Ramalho, took many Amerindian wives.

In *Caramuru*, Paraguaçu's rival is Moema, who was also in love with Diogo. As discussed in the first chapter, Moema imitates Dido in the *Aeneid*. Like Jararaca, the poet had to also invent Moema in order to follow the plot of the *Aeneid*. And like the portrayal of Paraguaçu in the epic, Moema offers herself to Diogo and does not resist the colonizer. The scene of her drowning at sea takes place in Canto Six of *Caramuru*, when Amerindian men bring their daughters as possible marriage partners for Diogo in order to form an alliance with him (evidence of the practice of *cunhadismo* in the poem itself). Diogo refuses the other women, yet accepts their fathers and brothers as relatives so as not to offend them (Durão 180). He takes Paraguaçu as his only wife, with whom he will sail to Europe. As they are sailing away, several of Diogo's jealous would-be wives swim out to sea in an attempt to catch up to the ship. The beautiful yet scorned Moema swims ahead of the other women and speaks to Diogo as she holds onto the rudder of the ship; while Diogo, along with the rest of the crew, witness the entire spectacle from the deck (Durão 191). In the next four stanzas of the poem, Moema sings a passionate account of Diogo's alleged betrayal of her love. Moema's last words to Diogo are ones of hate; ironically, she calls him a barbarian as Diogo turns away:

> Bárbaro (a bela diz), tigre e não homem…

Porém o tigre por cruel que brame,

Acha forças amor que enfim o domem;

Só a ti não domou, por mais que eu te ame. (Canto VI, 38)

Barbarian (says the beautiful), tiger and not a man

But even as the tiger roars cruel

Finds love strengths that finally subdues them,

Only you it did not tame, no matter how much I love you.

It is a twist in the greater part of this narrative that here the Amerindian is the one who calls the Portuguese a barbarian, in fact a beast. She says that he is worse than a beast since at least a tiger would succumb to love, but not Diogo. She then begs him to put an end to her misery with a flash of his lightning: "(Disse, vendo-o fugir) ah não te escondas; / Dispara sobre mim teu cruel raio…/ E indo a dizer o mais, cai num desmaio" '(She says, seeing him escape) Oh don't hide / Shoot me with your cruel ray / And before she could say anything else, she fainted and fell (192). After recovering long enough to at last cry out "Ah Diogo cruel!" Moema sinks into the ocean and expires.[14]

These dramatic scenes prompt a critical reader to ask: first, what are the implications of a slew of indigenous women swimming out into the ocean after the foreign colonizer? And furthermore, what is the significance of Moema's jealous wrath and subsequent death/suicide? Firstly, it is unlikely that either of these questions should

[14] The artist João de Barros commemorated this most celebrated scene of *Caramuru* in his painting "A despedida de Moema" (1935). The painting portrays Moema as she desperately clutches the rudder of the galleon as it sails away to Europe with her unrequited love Diogo and his soon-to-be wife Paraguaçu.

be taken too literally but should instead be interpreted through the lens of imitation. The multiple women seem to be a hint at polygamy, a question which Santa Rita Durão avoided in order to make his hero more like the pious Aeneas, and Moema must have the wrath of Dido. I suggested in the previous chapter that Moema is the female counterpart to Jararaca. Thus, Diogo's adversaries include both men and women. Both Moema and Jararaca are rivals to the Diogo-Paraguaçu union. The key signifier for this Moema-Jararaca scheme is when Moema pleads with Diogo to fire a bullet and end her life. Her plea recalls the death of Jararaca at the hands of Diogo, who killed him by firing a shot to his head. So while Diogo abolishes his adversary Jararaca by gunfire, Paraguaçu's rival Moema is swallowed by the sea. Diogo thus defeats his enemies on both land and in the sea.

Brazilian literary critics such as Massaud Moisés, Afrânio Coutinho, and José Guilherme Merquior have unanimously proclaimed the death of Moema as the most aesthetically pleasing episode, at best; and at worst, the only redeeming feature of *Caramuru*. A notable exception to the standing opinion of the Moema scene being the highpoint of the poem is Antonio Candido's observation in his article "Na Sala de Aula." Candido examines other episodes, notably the *locus amoenus* at the beginning of Canto Four, but nowhere is Moema even mentioned. Moreover, in *Formação da Literatura Brasileira*, Candido parenthetically notes that the most beautiful part of the poem is the description of Brazil in Canto Seven, which Diogo relates to Henrique II of France (180). Yet aside from Candido, the notion that the Moema scene is the most beautiful scene in the book persists. In the introduction to the most recent edition of *Caramuru* (Martins

Fontes, 2000) Ronald Polito echoes the earlier critics by describing the Moema episode as "the highpoint of the entire poem" (xxv). A good question to ask is: why has Moema's death been singled out while all the other equally memorable episodes involving Paraguaçu go unnoticed? What is it about this dramatic scene, an indigenous woman who ends her life because she cannot have the love of the colonizer that makes her tragic death so impressive to critics?

I believe the answer to this question of the Moema scene in Caramuru has to do with imitation. The reference to Virgil's *Aeneid* is unmistakable. It is clear that these tragic deaths of the women who were scorned and left behind by the hero of the epic poem are no coincidence. Dido dies in the flames of her own funeral pyre while Moema drowns herself in the sea. It is significant that their deaths take place just as the respective heroes Aeneas and Diogo are sailing away in order to complete their destiny. A less imitative version of this favorite scene of Moema swimming out behind Caramuru's ship is offered in the recent film based on the poem *Caramuru: a invenção do Brasil* (2001) directed by Guel Arraes. Although it is beyond the scope of this chapter to compare the original epic to the film, this particular scene sheds much light on Brazil's perception of itself, as well as the transformations that have occurred in just over 200 years since the epic was published. Arraes' film reveals twentieth or even twenty-first century sensibilities, which often collide with the original eighteenth-century version. It is basically a parody of the original epic poem. In the film, Moema and Paraguaçu are sisters, not rivals. Unlike the epic poem, the film acknowledges the fact that polygamy was the custom of the Tupinambá, and Caramuru has to explain to Moema and Paraguaçu

how it is at odds with the Portuguese law of one wife only. The memorable scene of the ship sailing back for Europe is reinterpreted in the film: Diogo Alvarez is aboard the ship but it is Paraguaçu, not Moema, who initially dives into the water to swim after the ship. When Moema sees her sister dive into the water she jumps in after her, and it appears that it may actually be Moema's love for her sister, not Diogo, that makes her dive into the ocean. The scene in the film, although melodramatic, is much less so than the epic poem. There is no love-hate relationship between Moema and Caramuru in the movie. Most importantly, Moema does not drown in the attempt to swim after the ship. This particular scene in Arraes' film is an imitation of an imitation, yet another intertextual echo of Virgil's Dido.

After Moema's unsuccessful pursuit of the ship that leaves her literally drowning in her own sorrows, Diogo and Paraguaçu sail across the Atlantic Ocean to Europe. In Canto Seven, Paraguaçu and Diogo arrive in France where they are received by King Henry II and his wife Queen Catarina de Médicis. In France, Diogo and Paraguaçu are rumored to be the respective king and queen of Brazil (Durão 208). Diogo addresses the king and introduces Paraguaçu as princess and first mother of Brazil:

> E esta, que ao lado meu teu cetro beija,
> Princesa do Brasil, que um tempo fora,
> No seio da cristã piedosa igreja,
> Como mãe pia regenera agora.
> É bem que a mãe primeira o Brasil veja,
> Donde a gente nasceu, que lhe é senhora;

E quando a Lusitânia lhe é rainha,

Tome o Brasil a França por madrinha. (Canto VII: 13)

And this one, who at my side kisses you scepter

Princess of Brazil, that was at for a time on the outside,

In the bosom of the pious Christian church,

Now she is reborn a devout mother.

It is good that the first mother of Brazil sees,

Where we were born, which is her lady,

And when Lusitânia is her queen,

Brazil will take France as godmother. (my emphasis)

This view of Paraguaçu as first mother of Brazil anticipates the eighteenth-century ideas of nationhood, particularly romanticism as framed by José de Alencar's *Iracema*. However, unlike Iracema, Paraguaçu is Christianized. This clearly reflects Santa Rita Durão's preoccupation with evangelization of the indigenous peoples of Brazil. Just as France is taken as the godmother of Brazil, Catarina de Médicis is godmother to Paraguaçu at her baptism, which takes place three days later. Paraguaçu is baptized Catholic and takes the name of her godmother Catarina. This initiation ritual into the colonizer's religion is an attempt by Durão to portray the so-called mother of Brazil as eager to adopt Diogo's church and his God.

The transformation of Paraguaçu from a so-called pagan to a Catholic is reflected in her name, since she is now and henceforth referred to as Catarina Álvares. The name change is significant and reflects the colonizer's christening of the land. By renaming the

places with Christian or European names the landscape begins to be transformed into the colonizer's property. We can recall Ana Loomba's assertion noted at the beginning of this section about female bodies symbolizing the conquered land (152). Naming the land is synonymous with possession. This is why Brazil had originally received a Christian name, the Land of the True Cross or a Terra da Vera Cruz. Just as Paraguaçu is given a Christian name, so is her land. However, the Christianized name of the land now known as Brazil did not remain, the former Land of the True Cross is today known by its most prominent commercial product at that time, brazilwood.

Christian names, whether given to land or people, were an act of appropriation by Christian imperialism in the Americas. Yet it should not go unnoticed that Diogo Álvares is better known by his Tupi name Caramuru than by his European name. In fact, the title of Durão's poem hints at this reversal of identity on the part of this Portuguese. He is transformed into Tupi, just as Paraguaçu is Christianized. Yet the subtitle of the poem "poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia" 'epic poem of the discovery of Bahia,' particularly the insistence on this event being a "discovery," is from the point of view of the colonizer. Even today, the so-called discovery continues to be used to refer to the arrival of Europeans in the Americas. Yet we would never think of saying that anybody "discovered" the moon. People landed on the moon, and it was indeed a monumental event, but the astronauts did not discover it. However, the arrogance of imperialism insists in repeating to the present day that Iberians *discovered* the Americas. It would be more accurate to say that they Portuguese "landed" or "stopped over" in Brazil, particularly since they were en route to India.

On the journey back from Europe, Paraguaçu has a vision of the future history of Brazil, specifically the French and Dutch invasions in Rio and Pernambuco respectively. As was examined elsewhere, this technique of retrospective prophecies is quite common in epics. Yet one wonders: what is the significance of Paraguaçu having the vision and not Diogo, who is after all supposed to be the hero of the poem. I believe it is related to the final Canto, in which Paraguaçu's prophetic vision turns into an apparition of the Virgin Mary. Initially, Paraguaçu does not recognize her, but she is described as having serpents at her feet (Durão 298). Not only does she appear to Catarina, she speaks to her, asking the young princess of Bahia to restore her glorious image:

> Catarina (me diz), verás ditosa
> Outra vez do Brasil a terra amada;
> Faze que a imagem minha gloriosa
> Se restitua de vil mão roubada: (Canto X: 13)
> Catarina (she says to me), you shall see blessed
> Once again from Brazil the beloved land;
> Make my glorious image
> Be restored from the vile hand that stole it.

The permanent imprint of Mary's face into Catarina's consciousness follows this request, while Catarina and those gathered around listening to her prophecies are awed and confused by the apparition (Durão 298-299). Who was that mysterious woman? And who among them could have stolen her image? It would be curious to interpret that it was Diogo (and the Portuguese metonymically) who stole and appropriated the image of the

great goddess. However, this is not what the text says. The questions about the apparition are answered several stanzas later when Diogo discovers that inside the chapel on board Du Plessis's ship is a stolen icon of the Virgin Mary. Thus, the stolen image is actually just a stolen image aboard the Frenchman's ship.

In ancient Greco-Roman mythology the goddess had several forms: Athena, Aphrodite, Artemis and Hera (Minerva, Venus, Diana, and Juno). Of these, only Hera/Juno was specific to motherhood. With the advent of Christianity it seems that the other options of womanhood that were not associated with motherhood were erased, as the Virgin Mary took the place of Hera/Juno. Meanwhile the other two goddesses, Aphrodite/Venus and Athena/Minerva were either merged or blended into the one goddess, the mother of Jesus. We will recall that in the *Aeneid* Juno is antagonistic to Aeneas, while Venus is the hero's divine mother. In *Os Lusíadas* the Roman goddess Venus continues to favor the epic heroes, while Bacchus is the antagonistic god of the Portuguese. Yet, *Caramuru* breaks with Camões in order to put forth a purely Christian version of the goddess. And, once again, Christian dogma takes precedence over imitation in *Caramuru*. Furthermore, any concept or form of the goddess that the Amerindians had is likewise unacknowledged and forgotten. It seems that the poet uses poetry as an evangelizing tool, in order to promote his religion and erase any pre-Christian or Amerindian forms of the Goddess. His representation of a feminine divinity is limited to the mother of Jesus, who is not even given the status of goddess, but a mere vessel through which the monolithic patriarchal god manifests himself. Nevertheless, Durão wrote*****during the Inquisition.

An analysis of the significance of the Virgin Mary, mother of Jesus, comes to us from Luce Irigaray. Elizabeth Grosz gives us a pointed interpretation of the Christian mother-goddess as interpreted by Luce Irigaray in *Sexual Subversions: Three French Feminist* (1989). Grosz writes: "For Irigaray women need to find or formulate a God of their own, a God in their image: no longer mother of God, the vessel through which God is manifested, but a God who, with the masculine God can together occupy heaven…" (160). While the poet Virgil may have decided to portray Venus was the mother of Aeneas in the *Aeneid*, she was still a Goddess. In Christianity, God is limited to a masculine trinity, with emphasis on the duad between God the father and God the son. This ties into Luce Irigaray's concept of *indifférence*, which means sexual indifference is built into the greater patriarchal structure, "sexual difference is not recognized; women are not the other sex, but the other of the same, always defined in relation to men" (Whitford 17). Thus, the Virgin Mary remains outside the monotheistic view of God; and despite all the devotion given to her in Catholicism, she is not equal with God. This is why Irigaray calls on women to search for a God of their own, one who will not limit the feminine side of the divine to a mere vessel for man's self-representations and ideals.

When Diogo calls Paraguaçu to see the "divine mother" she immediately recognizes the "grã Senhora" (Durão 308). She embraces the image of the woman she saw in her vision and addresses her as the merciful Mother, surprised at how she came to find her here among the pagan Amerindians:

> Aqui vos venho achar, Mãe piedosa,
>
> No meio (disse) desta gente infanda!

Infanda como eu fui, se o vosso lume

Não me emendara o bárbaro costume. (Canto X: 44)

Here I come to find you, pious Mother,

In the midst of these dreadful peoples!

Dreadful as I was, had your light

Not mended the barbarous customs.

The idea that Paraguaçu "saw the light" that corrected her barbarous ways is part of the Christian narrative of salvation. This particular view of the wretched state of the natives before conversion is an imperialist view similar to the notion of the civilizing mission. Whereas today the rhetoric of interventionism has attached to it secular terms such as "freedom" and "democracy" or "nation building" the Iberian empires were carried out in the name of "religious salvation." The Jesuits and Franciscans that were in the business of allegedly saving souls seem to have believed that they were doing Amerindians a favor by evangelizing them. This means that their native cultures had to be devalued and despised, so that they could carry out their conversions to Christianity and establish their God's kingdom in this world, "o Reino de Deus por Portugal." In *Caramuru*, the appearance of the Virgin Mary to Paraguaçu facilitates the Spiritual Conquest, as she requests that they build a church in which to honor her (Durão 309). It is constructed in the name of the singular protector of Bahia: the Lady of Grace or *a Senhora da Graça*.

The appearance of the Virgin Mary asking a newly converted Amerindian to build her a church is a recurring theme in colonial America. In Mexico, she appeared at the site of Tonantzin and was possibly syncretized in order to win more Amerindian converts.

Like Juan Diego in Mexico, Paraguaçu sees the Virgin Mary and is obliged to grant her request of building a church in her honor. The significance of the Virgin Mary appearing to the newly colonized natives in *Caramuru* can be interpreted in many ways. It can be read as part of the greater spiritual conquest of the Americas, or it can be imagined as the native gods taking the form of the European divinities in order to smooth the progress of colonization. Often times, synchronizations occurred in order to maintain ancient religions and avoid the ever-looming inquisition.

The final pages of *Caramuru* tell of how Paraguaçu relinquishes her power as princess of Brazil to the first Portuguese governor of Bahia, Tomé de Sousa. This is perhaps the greatest legacy and the political subtext of the entire Caramuru-Paraguaçu phenomenon. In the poem, Durão reenacts this historical scene by having Paraguaçu and Diogo cede their power to Sousa. Paraguaçu says: "Cedendo ao trono luso a posse inteira / E eu do monarca na real pessoa / Cedo todo o direito e entrego a coroa" 'Surrendering to the Portuguese throne the entire possession / And I to the monarch in the royal person / Cede all the rights over to the crown' (Canto X: 69). Just as in the first encounter with Diogo in Canto Two, when Paraguaçu symbolically gives her people to him as a promise to be his wife, once again Paraguaçu relinquishes her power. As princess of Brazil she hands over any claims she had to power to the political colonizer, the first governor of Brazil, Tomé de Sousa. As if her words were not enough to show this, her actions reiterate this final scene of acquiescence: "…a dama generosa / Desce do trono e o esplêndido diadema / Entrega ao Sousa" '…the generous lady / Steps down from the throne and the splendid tiara / She gives to Sousa" (Canto X: 70). Durão's epic is an

example of what Paula Gunn Allen writes in *The Sacred Hoop*, that in the centuries since the first attempts at colonization, "the invaders have exerted every effort to remove Indian women from every position of authority" (3). By stepping down as princess of Bahia, Paraguaçu textually surrenders her land and her people to the Portuguese Crown.

In conclusion, the surrender of the Amerindian women of *Caramuru*, particularly Paraguçu, is noteworthy and telling. It appears that the only examples of resistance are by Amerindian men, the topic of the previous chapter. Whereas the Amerindian men are portrayed as fearless, particularly Jararaca, who seems even to surpass Diogo in heroicness, the women in the poem are portrayed as somewhat feeble. However, unlike Iracema, Paraguaçu does not wither and die; she survives. And unlike Lavinia, Paraguaçu even fights in battle alongside Diogo against Caetés and their allies (although it is Diogo who delivers the final blow). Yet her role in the surrender of her tribe portrays her, together with Gupeva, as accomplices of the conquest of Bahia. Once the armed conquest was achieved, the Portuguese strategy for colonization was twofold: evangelization and miscegenation. This fact is reflected in *Caramuru* since Catarina-Paraguaçu embodies both the spiritual conquest and the sexual subjugation of the land and its people. Paraguaçu surrenders her body and her people to Diogo the colonizer, just as she surrenders her land to Tomé de Sousa, the Portuguese governor. She is a forbearer of Iracema, particularly the notion of Brazil as product of miscegenation. Yet, by marrying the colonizer she manages to survive the genocide. She is the first mother of a new nation called Brazil.

CONCLUSION

Nationalist Discourse Revisited

In the introduction to this dissertation I proposed a non-nationalist reading of *Caramuru*. The title itself, the references to Virgil's *Aeneid*, and the comparisons between this and other epics in the introduction focused on the form itself, that is of epic poetry. Chapter One concerned the topic of imitation, specifically the many similarities with Virgil's *Aeneid* as opposed to Camões' *Os Lusíadas*, which has been the standard epic of comparison for *Caramuru*. Chapter Two was more of a historiographical approach on how the readings of colonial texts changed over time, also the historical background of the time and place in which *Caramuru* was written. The last three chapters dealt with the text itself. Chapter Three was an analysis of the religious discourse in the epic, specifically Gupeva's conversion and how this benefitted Diogo. Chapter Four concerned the representations of resistance in the poem, Jararaca's words as foreboding what would befall the Native Americans, and Bambu's cannibalistic resistance. The last chapter focused on the issue of gender and how Amerindian women and female deities are represented in *Caramuru*. The first part of this dissertation focused on the form of the poem and the cultural milieu of the late eighteenth-century. The second part focused on the text itself, offering postcolonial and feminist readings of certain episodes in the epic.

To conclude this dissertation, I would like to return to the prologue of the poem (reflexões prévias e argumento), which was first referred to in the introduction: "Os sucessos do Brasil não mereciam menos um poem que os da Índia. Incitou-me a escrever

este o amor da pátria" 'The events of Brazil did not deserve less of a poem than those of India. It was love of my homeland which incited me to write this one' (Durão 5). Santa Rita Durão was born in Brazil, but lived most of his adult life in Portugal, and 15 years in Italy. His 'love of homeland' is analogous to nationalist sentiment, even though the nation of Brazil was yet to exist at the time he wrote *Caramuru*. The question I would like to address now in these conclusions is how are we to think about nationalism today, in a post-nationalist world?

In 2000 I attended a lecture on Border Cultures by Carlos Monsiváis at the University of Texas at El Paso in which he half-jokingly declared the death of Mexican Nationalism. Monsiváis considered Mexican nationalism to be unobtainable, unrealistic, and even quite dangerous to the stability of the Mexican Nation. He said: "Nationalism is a foolish illusion; it is sentimental, *machista* and *guadalupano* and should therefore be rejected because it is useless and harmful." Furthermore, he argued that nationalism opposes modernization because it excludes women, homosexuals, non-Catholics and particularly the indigenous communities of Mexico. Monsiváis reminds us that the (Mexican) nation, like most of Latin America, has changed. With cultural nationalism exhausted, the idea of a singular *mexicanidad* in this post-nationalist era is obsolete; hence the term coined by Monsiváis: "*posMéxico*".

In *La Cultura Nacional: problema y posibilidad* (1981), Antonio Cornejo Polar presents a more nuanced critique of nationalism. He begins by criticizing Riva Agüero's vision of Peru as exclusively Hispanic, relegating the indigenous elements as something exotic, alien or foreign to the nation. Agüero imagined that the Amerindian foundation

would slowly disappear, and that the country would then be free of that burden, and would become the white country with which he dreamed (10). Cornejo Polar goes on to examine the counterpoint to this, what he calls "the ideology of mestizaje," or the unrealistic idea that Peru is 50% indigenous and 50% white (12-13). Of this ideology of mestizaje, Cornejo Polar writes: "mediante esta ideología lo que se postula frecuentemente es que bastaría la realización del mestizaje para que se resolvieran los problemas básicos del Perú y de su cultura" (14). Thus, the ideology of mestizaje tries to harmonize conflicting viewpoints, but it fails because reality proves otherwise. Cornejo Polar credits José Carlos Mariátegui as the first to question the legitimacy and the appropriateness of the concept of unity as requisite for analyzing the problems of national discourse. Mariátegui accepts a polycentric view of Peruvian literature: "existen varios sistemas literarios, cultos y populares, en español, quechua o en aymara, y evidentemente ninguno puede ser rechazado: todos son parte de la literatura nuestra, de la literatura peruana." (16). The problem, as seen by both Mariátegui and Cornejo Polar, lies in the myth of national unity. A national monoculture is problematic, even one that tries to syncretize all disparate elements, such as the ideology of mestizaje (17). Cornejo Polar calls for an acceptance of the plurality of cultures and literatures that constitute Peru, which means accepting the reality of contradicting and conflicting elements that make up the nation. As José María Arguedas wrote: "en el Perú, todo hombre no embrutecido por el egoísmo puede vivir, feliz, todas las patrias" (qtd. in Cornejo Polar 18). The key element here is nations in the plural form, a polycentric view of the nation.

In Brazil, where the nation was similarly imagined as a product of *mestiçagem*, there has also recently been a move to get away from monolithic ideas of what it means to be Brazilian. We can see this particularly in the use of the signifier 'Afro-Brazilian' and the recognition of the negritude movement in Brazil that recovers Black identity from the margins to its proper place in a country built by former slaves. An excellent example of this redeeming of Black consciousness is Abdias do Nascimento's *Brazil, Mixture of Massacre?: Essays in the Genocide of a Black People* (Trans. Elika Larkin Nascimento 1989). Nascimento argues against Gilberto Freyre's claims of a so-called "racial democracy" in Brazil. This ideology based on race mixture, or celebrated miscegenation, was the alleged singular proof of Brazilian antiracist efficacy for Freyre. But the "allure of the *mulata*" and *mestiçagem* in general are the results of Brazil's colonial legacy, while the violent and negative elements of miscegenation "have been left behind in the period of modernity and its consolidation of national identity" (Miller 98-99). Clóvis Moura considered the use of the first person plural *nós* or we in the narrative of *Casa Grande e Senzala* (1933) particularly offensive (Fiola 6). For Abdias do Nascimento, the claim of racial democracy has curbed the growth of African consciousness, watering it down as it were through the three "tions" of this doctrine: assimilation, acculturation and miscegenation. Racial discrimination in Brazil is described as "a mechanism to see that the Black man disappears through the ideology of whitening as the search for the ideal man" (Nascimento 18). Like the ideology of mestizaje in Peru, notions of racial democracy in Brazil sought to erase or dilute the Black elements of Brazilian culture.

Besides the substantive Afro-Brazilian sector of society, a smaller yet significant group remains: the present-day Amerindians of Brazil. Some sources put the population of the Brazilian Amerindians at around or less than one percent (Meade xiv). Meanwhile, 44 percent are of African descent and roughly half claim European ancestry. Thus the relative size of Amerindian population in Brazil is more comparable to that of the United States or the Caribbean, than to that of Mexico or Peru. Yet the same arguments against *mestizaje* as the hegemonic narrative of Amerindians in Mexico or Peru can likewise be made for Brazil. We can see that the reality of Amerindians independent of the *mestiçagem* paradigm exist, an example that comes to mind is in the film "Bye-Bye Brazil" (1980) directed by Carlos Diegues. The traveling caravan called Rolidei comes across a remote indigenous tribe on their way to Altamira (site of the proposed Belo Monte dam). Clearly their clothes and boom box mark their transculturation, however, this encounter between the Amerindians and the traveling musicians reveals where their true identity lies. The Amerindian chief's mother asks Dasdô if she is from Brazil. Confused, Dasdô asks "what do you mean?" Then the chief's father asks her about the welfare of the Brazilian president, to which Dasdô responds "sei lá" or who knows? It is clear that the Amerindians see the Brazilians as a separate tribe. Evidently, this remote tribe knows Brazil exists, but they do not identify as Brazilians. In their imagination, the chief of the Brazilian tribe is the president of Brazil. These representations of Amerindians in Brazil who are not part of the hegemonic cult of *mestiçagem* reveal an autonomous identity.

Attempts to forge a unified Brazilian identity from Romantic and historic notions of interracial unions did not begin with José de Alencar's *Iracema* (1865) or end with Gilberto Freyre's *Casa Grande e Senzala*. Darcy Ribeiro's *O povo brasileiro* continues Brazil's hegemonic narrative of *mestiçagem* as recently as 1995. *Caramuru* marks the literary beginnings of the founding myth of Brazil as a love story between an Amerindian woman and a Portuguese man. This myth assumed national proportions in the nineteenth-century, but has persisted even to the twenty-first century, as evidenced by the film referred to in Chapter Five, "Caramuru: a invenção do Brasil" (2001). In the documentary that accompany's this film, the narrator states that José de Alencar was the first Brazilian novelist to write scenes between Amerindians and Whites (although Basílio da Gama and Santa Rita were born in Brazil, apparently they are not considered Brazilian here).

In *Mestizo Nations: Culture, Race, and Conformity in Latin American Literature* (2002), Juan E. De Castro notes how the substitution of a love story for "the brutal historical fact of the genocide of the Amerindian" makes *Iracema* palpable to the country's multiethnic population and functions as a cohesive agent in the formation of Brazilian nationality (50). In comparison with some Spanish American versions of *mestizaje*, the presentation of Brazil as founded through a nonviolent conquest or love story marks a central difference in the discourse of Brazilian *mestiçagem*. Castro writes of Alencar presenting the conquest "as a moment of positive cultural and sexual encounter rather than as a period of conflict and extermination, even if it is possible to find traces of the genocide of the Brazilian Indians [in his texts]" (52). Since the same

myth was propagated in *Caramuru,* I believe a similar argument would also apply to *Iracema*'s predecessor.

Just as Juan E. De Castro's analysis of *Iracema* reveals the contradictions in Alencar's discourse of *mestiçagem*, so does Marilyn Grace Miller's analysis of Jorge Amado's *Tenda dos milagres* (1969) shed light on Brazilians faith in miscegenation as a cure for all political and social ills of multiracial and multiethnic societies (50). It is worth mentioning that in this novel by Jorge Amado, reference is made to *Caramuru*: "The mixture which began with the shipwrecked Caramuru had never stopped its swift and irresistible flow; it was the very foundation of Brazil" (Trans. Barbara Shelby 321). Previously, Caramuru would make an appearance in Mario de Andrade's *Macunaíma* (1928). And in the introduction to this dissertation, I quoted the poem attributed to Gregório de Matos regarding the Caramurus of Bahia. It seems that the memory of Caramuru in Bahia persists in the Brazilian imaginary. In fact, with the recent release of the film "Caramuru," this myth of Brazilian *mestiçagem* shows no signs of fading. What is it about Caramuru's story that has withstood centuries of political and societal changes? Miller and Robert Stam agree:

> This faith in miscegenation as the solution to the country's woes and enmities is itself a product of the colonialist ideology, so that the same narrative that would seek to criticize and challenge colonial values, to some extent, at least, reiterates them in a more contemporary setting, and *mestiçagem* proves to be once again complicit with *the homogenizing aims of the colonial project*. (my emphasis, Miller 114)

In the colonial era, the battle cry of the "the kingdom of God for Portugal" was commonplace, as suggested by António Vieira's sermon. In postcolonial Brazil, the missionary zeal to win souls for the Portuguese Empire has been transformed into nation-building project whose rhetoric is built on the gospel of miscegenation.

This homogenizing desire for unity may have its roots in the Iberian Peninsula, since Brazil, like most of the Latin America, was first settled by Spanish and Portuguese adventurers and missionaries. It seems clear that the religious zeal of the Reconquista was carried over into the Western Hemisphere where it manifested as evangelization of the Amerindians. And just as there would be no tolerance for non-Christians in Iberia, so in the Americas, the efforts to stomp out paganism would define the Colonial period. Once the nineteenth-century nation building projects were underway, nationalism replaced Christianity as the homogenizing force. This is evident in the changes that were made to the movie version of *Caramuru*. In the film, no mention is made of evangelization of the Amerindians or the Jesuits, and the Virgin Mary does not appear to Paraguaçu. Unlike the epic, the movie was completely secularized. What remains from a text that was saturated with religious discourse is the love story between Diogo and Paraguaçu. Like *Iracema* in the nineteenth-century, the film Caramuru reinforces the discourse of *mestiçagem* while glossing over the harsher realities of conquest and colonization. It still stands as a strategy for the nation-building project.

Perhaps the most telling part of this entire narrative is that the story of Caramuru took place in Salvador de Bahia, which now is the center of Afro-Brazilian culture. Amerindian peoples and cultures have been completely erased from most of the coastal

areas of Brazil. So when we set out to remember the first Amerindian encounters with the Portuguese, all we are left with is stories. Where are the descendants of the Amerindian tribes that use to live along the coast of Brazil? They have all but disappeared because of disease, enslavement, and intermarriage of surviving peoples. While the genocide of the Amerindian population was taking place, the Portuguese began importing African slaves in order to work in the sugar plantations. Meanwhile, Black Brazilians who refuse to submit to the gospel of *mestiçagem* are branded as racists (Miller 113). Negritude in Brazil is reminiscent of the quilombos of the past; it is a threat to the ideological hegemony established in "the myth of the good master" propagated by *Casa Grande e Senzala*. The refusal of Black intellectuals like Abdias do Nascimento to toe the line of Freyre and Jorge Amado reveals the cracks in the alleged "melting pot" that is Brazil.

Having reduced the coastal Amerindian populations to literature, the question we must now ask is: what will happen to the remaining Amerindians in Brazil? Felicio Pontes Jr., the Federal Prosecutor of Brazil in the state of Pará, said in an interview about Belo Monte, the proposed hydroelectric dam on the Xingu river: "Para um governante no século dezesseis dezessete era uma proeza dizer 'eu exterminei todos os indígenas do meu território' isso era algo que lhe fazia ser maior perante a comunidade internacional." 'For a ruler in the sixteenth seventeenth century it was a feat to say 'I exterminated all the indigenous peoples of my territory' that was something that made you appear greater before the international community.' Pontes Jr. goes on to say that today it is no longer acceptable for rulers to disrespect the minority rights in their country. This concern for what the international community thinks is important; however, it should be more

important to think about what your own country will say about you in the future. Your great-grandchildren will wonder what you did or failed to do in order to protect the original inhabitants of your country, not to mention your natural resources. The proposed Belo Monte dam is like the canary in the mine shaft, if it is built and the rights of the Amerindian populations living in the area are ignored, then something greater is amiss.

In retrospect, we can see that the genocide that occurred during the colonial period still has consequences that resonate today. In the article entitled "(Post)coloniality for Dummies: Latin American Perspectives on Modernity, Coloniality, and the Geopolitics of Knowledge" Santiago Castro-Gómez gives a concise overview of the so-called "Coloniality of Power" group (259). This group fits into the rubric of postcolonial studies, and includes but is not limited to Walter Mignolo, Aníbal Quijano, Enrique Dussel, Nelson Maldonado, and Santiago Castro-Gómez. In this article, Castro-Gómez traces the roots of Latin American reflections on coloniality beginning from Karl Marx and then to Edward Said; and from Said's *Orientalism* we come to Mignolo's *Occidentalism* (277). Like postcolonialism in the East, the concept of "coloniality" in the West is a system of cultural and symbolic domination or colonialism (colonial forms of power) that continue into the present, in spite of the independence of most Latin American countries in the first quarter of the nineteenth-century. The modes of domination first established by Europeans in Latin America, which subordinated certain racialized/ethnic groups, continue to exist even without the presence of European colonial administrations. According to Anibal Quijano, "coloniality of power" consists of colonizing the imaginary of the dominated peoples. The *encomienda* system was central

to this project, since its primary function was "to integrate the Indian to the cultural model of the dominant ethnic group" (Castro-Gómez 281). By unifying Quijano's and Mignolo's theses, Castro-Gómez concludes that "the imaginary of whiteness, produced by the discourse of racial purity, was an aspiration that all social sectors internalized in colonial society and that functioned as the axis around which the subjectivity of all social sectors was built" (282). Thus, although there are many parallels with postcolonialism in the East, coloniality in the Western Hemisphere has a unique history of coming from within the discourse of the West, particularly of the Spanish and Portuguese empires of the sixteenth and seventeenth-centuries.

The insistence on *mestiçagem* as the hegemonic narrative of Brazil should be carefully and cautiously measured. While it is true that there are many elements of hybridity in Brazilian culture, a less invasive expression of cultures in contact was brilliantly articulated in the poetic anthropophagy of Brazilian modernism. One absorbs elements of the other by symbolically devouring them, yet one's culture remains intact. It is telling that Brazilians will express this poetic anthropophagy for cultures outside of Brazil, yet the dominant narrative within the country is still based on miscegenation or *mestiçagem*. For the Amerindians who remain in Brazil, continued absorbance into the greater project of *mestiçagem* will erase their own culture, as happened along most of the coast of Brazil. While today it is almost impossible to isolate oneself in one's community, the consequences of continued pressure of minorities to integrate should also be judiciously considered. There is already among Amazonian indigenous peoples a process of recognition inscribed with the 1988 constitution that acknowledges their right to

pursue their traditional ways of life and possession of their lands (demarcated as Indigenous Territiories). Nevertheless, indigenous people in Brazil still face a number of external threats and challenges to their continued existence and cultural heritage.

Cultures will always be in contact; hence, to insist on a monoculture is not only dangerous but an exercise in futility. Looking back at the Iberian roots of Latin America, we can see that the insistence on Christianity as the only acceptable religion carried over in the Americas to the detriment of Amerindian populations who had nothing to do with the hundreds of years of religious conflicts in Iberia. The timing and overlap of events—such as the expulsion of the Jews in 1492 from Spain, and 1497 from Portugal, the establishment of the Spanish and Portuguese Inquisitions in the sixteenth-century, and the forced conversions of remaining Moriscos in 1609—all these incidents coincided with the formation of Brazil and Spanish America. It was not until 1824 that the first Brazilian constitution allowed for freedom of religious belief. With Christianity no longer compulsory as a unifying element, attention was then turned to the physical component: unity through racial mixing. The desire for unity remains, but this unity can never be imposed. The unity of humankind can only be perceived or intuited but never forced. Insanity has been defined as doing the same thing over and over again but expecting different results. As the inheritors of centuries of religious and ethnic conflicts in Iberia, we should know better than to insist on exterminating minority elements in our respective societies for some real or imaginary sense of unity based on the ideal of an "imagined community" that is the nation.

Today Brazilian Amerindian authors such as Eliane Potiguara, Daniel Munduruku, and Graça Graúna, among others, write and celebrate their own history; no longer having to rely on colonial subjects such as Santa Rita Durão or Basílio da Gama to speak for them. However, there remain many questions that have not been dealt with in this dissertation, particularly this question of indigenous agency. If indigenous agency is not taken seriously, the inherent asymmetry will lead to their eventual extinction as a community. Unfortunately, this seems to be the general expectation, which is not unfounded considering the history of extinction of many of the first nations of the Americas. Antonio Carlos de Souza Lima points out that intellectuals and politicians have not devoted much thinking to the problem of Indian political participation in Brazilian society, "due to a deeply held belief that the Indians must have spokesmen in order to mediate their access to fundamental rights, and that they are bound in any case to disappear, the only question being when" (255). Indeed, the pressures of globalization combined with Brazil's rise as a world power imply an invasion and ecological destruction of Brazilian lands. How can indigenous knowledge survive under these circumstances? Can indigenous peoples continue to exist if they are dispossessed of their land? If they are forced to migrate to the cities, what will become of their language and culture as they become assimilated into the national project? These and other questions remain central to our readings of Amerindian literature, whether written by their own voice, or represented through another's vision such as *Caramuru*.

Works Cited

Adorno, Rolena. *The Polemics of Possession in Spanish American Narrative*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.

Alden, Dauril, ed. *Colonial Roots of Modern Brazil*. Berekely: U of California P, 1973.

Alencar, José de. *Iracema*. 1865. Trans. Clifford E Landers. New York: Oxford UP, 2000.

Allen, Paula Gunn. *The Sacred Hoop: Recovering the Feminine in American Indian Traditions*. Boston: Beacon P, 1986.

Allums, Larry, and Louis Cowan, eds. *The Epic Cosmos*. Dallas: The Dallas Institute, 1992.

Anchieta, José de. *De Gestis Mendi de Saa*. Trans. Armando Cardoso. São Paulo: Edições Loyola, 1986.

---. *Poesias*. 1954. São Paulo: Editora U de São Paulo, 1989.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. New York: Verso, 1983.

Andrade, Mario de. *Macunaíma: o herói sem nenhum caráter*. 1928. Belo Horizonte: Editora Itatiaia, 1987.

Andrade, Oswald de. "Manifesto Antropófago." 1928. *A Utopia Antropofágica*. São Paulo: Editora Globo, 1990. 47-52.

---. *Pau-Brasil*. 1925. São Paulo: Editora Globo, 1990.

Arias, Arturo. "The Maya Movement: Postcolonialism and Cultural Agency." Moraña 519-38.

Aristotle. "On the Art of Poetry." Dorsh 31-75.

Arroyo, Leonardo. *A Carta de Pêro Vaz de Caminha*. São Paulo: Edições Melhoramentos, 1971.

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Emprie Writes Back: Theory and Practice in post-colonial literatures*. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Bailey, Cyril. *Religion in Virgil*. 1935. New York: Barnes and Noble (with permission of Oxford UP), 1969.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Hélène Iswolsky. Indianapolis: Indiana UP, 1984.

Barros, Diana Luz Pessoa de, ed. *Os discursos do descobrimento: 500 e mais anos de discursos*. São Paulo: Editora da U de São Paulo, 2000.

Basílio da Gama, José. *O Uraguay*. 1769. Trans. Sir Richard F. Burton. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1982.

Bello, Andrés. "La Araucana." *Anthology of Andrés Bello*. Comp. Pedro Grases. Trans. Barbara D. Huntley and Pilar Liria. Washington DC: General Secretariat OAS, 1981. 171-77.

Bernucci, Leopoldo. "No Espírito da Épica: Formações e Variações Discursivas na América Hispánica e Portuguesa." *Revista de Crítica Literaria Latinoamericana* 23.45 (1997): 167-75.

Bethell, Leslie, ed. *Colonial Brazil*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1987.

Beverly, John. *Subalternity and Representation: Arguments in Cultural Theory*. Durham: Duke UP, 1999.

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1994.

---, ed. *Nation and Narration*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

Good News Bible. Today's English Version. New York: American Bible Society, 1976.

Blank, Wayne. "Son of Thunder." 4 Dec. 2008. The Church of God Daily Bible Study. http://www.keyway.ca/htm2001/20010502.htm

Bosi, Alfredo. *Dialética da Colonização*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1992.

---. *História concisa da Literatura Brasileira*. São Paulo: Editora Cultrix, 1994.

Bowra, C. M. *From Virgil to Milton*. New York: Saint Martin's P, 1965.

Buarque de Holanda, Sérgio. *Capítulos de Literatura Colonial*. 1991. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 2000.

---. *Raízes do Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2005.

Bueno, Eduardo. *A Coroa, a cruz e a espada: lei, ordem e corrupção no Brasil Colônia, 1458-1558*. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva, 2006.

---. *Náufragos, Traficantes e Degredados: As Primeiras Expedições ao Brasil (1500-1531)*. Cascais: Pergaminho, 2001.

Caminha, Pero Vaz de. "Carta." Ribeiro and Neto 83-91.

Camões, Luís Vaz de. *Os Lusíadas*. Cotia SP: Ateliê Editorial, 1999.

---. *The Lusíads*. Trans. Landeg White. New York: Oxford UP, 2008.

Candido, Antonio. *Formação da Literatura Brasileira*. 2 vols. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 1975.

---. *Literatura e Sociedade*. São Paulo: Publifolia, 2000.

---. *Na Sala de Aula: Caderno de Análise Literária*. São Paulo: Ática, 1985.

Cañizares-Esguerra, Jorge. *How to Write the History of the New World*. Stanford:

Stanford UP, 2001.

---. "Postcolonialism *avant la lettre*? Travelers and Clerics in Eighteenth-Century Colonial Spanish America." Thurner 89-110.

---. *Puritan Conquistadors: Iberianizing the Atlantic, 1550-1700*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2006.

Canny, Nicholas and Anthony Pagden, eds. *Colonial Identity in the Atlantic World, 1500-1800*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1987.

Cantar de mío Cid. Madrid: Edimat Libros, 2006.

Cardoso, Ana Leal, and Carlos Magno Gomes. *Do imaginário às Representações na Literatura*. Aracaju: U Federal de Sergipe, 2007.

Castro, Juan E. De. *Mestizo Nations: Culture, Race, and Conformity in Latin American Literature*. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 2002.

Castro-Gómez, Santiago. "(Post)Coloniality For Dummies: Latin American Perspectives on Modernity, Coloniality, and the Geopolitics of Knowledge." Moraña 259-85.

Certeau. Michel de. *The Writing of History*. Trans. Tom Conley. New York: Columbia UP, 1988.

Césaire, Aimé. *Discourse on Colonialism*. Trans. Joan Pinkham. New York: Monthly Review P, 2000.

---. *Tempête*. Trans. Philip Crispin. London: Oberon Books, 2000.

Clausen, Wendell. *Virgil's Aeneid and the Tradition of Hellenistic Poetry*. Los Angeles: U of California P, 1987.

Clendinnen, Inga. *Ambivalent Conquests: Maya and Spaniard in Yucatán, 1517-1570.* 2nd

ed. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2003.

"clericalism." The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fourth Edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, 2004. 23 December 2007. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/clericalism>

Conte, Gian Biagio. *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Trans. Charles Segal. Ithaca, NY: Cornell UP, 1986.

Cornejo Polar, Antonio. *La Cultura Nacional: problema y posibilidad*. Lima: Lluvia editores, 1981.

---. *Sobre literatura y crítica latinoamericanas*. Caracas: U Central de Venezuela, 1982.

Corrêa, Leda Pires. "Léxico e imaginário do colonizador português." Cardoso 61-74.

Cuddon, J. A. *Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. 3rd ed. London: Penguin, 1992.

Cunha, Eneida Leal. *Estampas do Imaginário: Literatura, história e identidade cultural*. Belo Horizonte: Editora U Federal Minas Gerais, 2006.

Curtius, Ernst Robert. *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Trans. Willard R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.

DiNova, Joanne R. *Spiraling Webs of Relation: Toward an Indigenist Criticism*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Dirlik, Arif, Vinay Bahl, and Peter Gran, eds. *History after the Three Worlds: Post-Eurocentric Historiographies*. Boulder: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000.

Disney, A. R. *A History of Portugal and the Portuguese Empire*. 2 vols. New York: Cambridge UP, 2009.

Dorsch, T.S. *Classical Literary Criticism*. New York: Penguin, 1965.

Donavan, Kathleen M. *Feminist Readings of Native American Literature: Coming to Voice*. Tucson: U of Arizona P, 1998.

Durão, José de Santa Rita. *Caramuru: poema épico do descobrimento da Bahia*. 1781. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2000.

Eagleton, Terry, Fredric Jameson, and Edward Said. *Nationalism, Colonialism and Literature*. Minneapolis: U Minnesota P, 1990.

Fanon, Frantz. *The Wretched of the Earth*. Trans. Constance Farrington. New York: Grove P, 1963.

Fernández Retamar, Roberto. *Caliban and Other Essays*. Trans. Edward Baker. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1989.

Fletcher, Richard. *The Barbarian Conversion: From Paganism to Christianity*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1977.

Fiddian, Robin, ed. *Postcolonial Perspectives on the Cultures of Latin America and Lusophone Africa*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2000.

Fiola, Jan. "Race Relations in Brazil: A Reassessment of the Racial Democracy Thesis." *Program in Latin American Studies Occasional Papers Series U of Massachusetts at Amherst* 24 (1990).

Ferreira, Francisco Leitão. *Nova Arte de Conceitos*. Lisbon: Miguel Rodriguez, Mercador de Livros, 1718.

Ferreira, Tito Lívio. *Nóbrega e Anchieta em São Paulo de Piratininga*. São Paulo: Conselho Estadual de Cultura, 1970.

Fiddian, Robin, ed. *Postcolonial Perspectives on the Cultures of Latin America and Lusophone Africa*. Liverpool: Liverpool UP, 2000.

Foster, David William, and Daniel Altamirando, eds. *Theoretical Debates in Spanish American Literature*. New York: Garland, 1997.

Freire, Francisco José. *Arte Poetica ou Regras da Verdadeira Poesia*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Lisbon, 1759.

Gama, Luciana. "A retórica do sublime no *Caramuru*." *Revista USP* 57 (2003): 122-37.

Gower, Donna S. "*Inanna* and the Epic *Eros*." Allums and Cowan 299-330.

González Echevarría, Roberto. *Myth and Archive: A Theory of Latin American Narrative*. Durham: Duke UP, 1998.

González Stephan, Beatriz, and Lúcia Helena Costigan, eds. *Crítica y descolonización: el sujeto colonial en la cultura latinoamericana*. Caracas: Ediciones de la U Simon Bolivar and Ohio State U, 1992.

Gordon, Richard A. *Cannibalizing the Colony: Cinematic Adaptations of Colonial Literature in Mexico and Brazil*. West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue UP, 2009.

Green, Anna. *Cultural History*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Green, Thomas. *The Light in Troy*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1982.

Greenblatt, Stephen. *Marvelous Possessions: The Wonder of the New World*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991.

---. "Towards a Poetics of Culture." Veeser 1-14.

Grosz, Elizabeth. *Sexual Subversions: Three French Feminists*. Boston: Allen and Unwin, 1989.

Hamilton, Russell G. "European Transplants, Amerindian In-laws, African Settlers, Brazilian Creoles: A Unique Colonial and Postcolonial Condition in Latin America." Moraña 113-29.

Hansen, João Adolfo. *A Sátira e o Engenho: Gregorio de Matos e a Bahia Do Século XVII*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1989.

Harrison, Nicholas. *Postcolonial Criticism: History, Theory and the Work of Fiction*. Malden, MA: Polity, 2003

Heidel, Alexander. *The Babylonian Genesis*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1963.

---. *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1963.

Henry, Elisabeth. *The Vigor of Prophecy: A Study of Virgil's Aeneid*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois UP, 1977.

Hemming, John. "Indians and the frontier." Bethell 145-89.

---. *Red Gold: The Conquest of the Brazilian Indians*. London: Macmillan, 1978.

Hoornaert, Eduardo. *A Igreja no Brasil-colônia (1550-1800)*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1974.

---. *Guadalupe: Evangelización y dominación*. Lima: Centro de Esudios y Publicaciones, 1975.

Hulet, Claude L. *Brazilian Literature*. 3 vols. Washington DC: Georgetown UP, 1974.

Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith, eds. *Nationalism*. New York: Oxford UP, 1994.

Hyam, Ronald. *Empire and Sexuality*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2004.

Irigaray, Luce.*Conversations*. New York: Continuum, 2008.

---. *This Sex Which Is Not One*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

Johnson, H. B. "Portuguese Settlement, 1500-1580." Bethell 1-38.

Kallendorf, Craig. *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in Early Italian Renaissance*. London: UP of New England, 1989.

Karttunen, Frances. *Between Worlds: Interpreters, Guides and Survivors*. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1994.

Kelsey, Penelope Myrtle. *Tribal Theory in Native American Literature*. Lincoln:U of Nebraska P, 2008.

Laird, Andrew. *The Epic of America: An Introduction to Rafael Landívar and the Rusticatio Mexicana*. London: Duckworth, 2006

Lee, Wayne E., ed. *Empires and Indigenes: Intercultural Alliance, Imperial Expansion, and Warfare in the Early Modern World*. New York: NYUP, 2011.

Lima, Antonio Carlos de Souza. "On Indigenism and Nationality in Brazil." Urban 236-58.

Lindstrom, Naomi. *The Social Conscience of Latin American Writing*. Austin: U of Texas P, 1998.

Livermore, H. V. *A New History of Portugal*. London: Cambridge UP, 1969.

Machado de Assis, Joaquim Maria. "Notícia da atual literatura brasileira instinto de nacionalidade." 1873. *Obra Completa*. 3 vols. Rio de Janeiro: Aguilar, 1959.

Madsen, Deborah L., ed. *Native Authenticity: Transnational Perspectives on Native American Literary Studies*. Albany: State U of New York P, 2010.

Mallon, Florencia E. "The Promise and Dilemma of Subaltern Studies: Perspectives from

Latin American History." Dirlik 191-217.

Martindale Charles, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1997.

---. "Introduction: 'The Classic of all Europe.'" Martindale 1-18.

Matos, Gregório de. *Crônica do Viver Baiano Seiscentista*. 2 vols. Ed. James Amado. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Record, 1999.

McMahon, Darrin M. *Enemies of the Enlightenment: The French Counter-Enlightenment and the Making of Modernity*. New York: Oxford UP, 2002.

Meade, Teresa A. *A Brief History of Brazil*. New York: Facts on File, 2003.

Medina, José Toribio. "Mujeres de *La Araucana* de Ercilla" *Hispania* 11.1 (1928): 1-11.

Metcalf, Alida C. *Go-betweens and the Colonization of Brazil 1500-1600*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2005.

Memmi, Albert. *The Colonizer and the Colonized*. Trans. Howard Greenfeld. Boston: Beacon, 1965.

---. *Decolonization and the Decolonized*. Trans. Robert Bononno. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 2006.

Meuwese, Mark. "The Opportunities and Limits of Ethnic Soldiering: The Tupis and the Dutch-Portuguese Struggle for the Southern Atlantic, 1630-1657." Lee 193-220.

Miles, Gary B. "The Aeneid as Foundation Story." Perkell 231-50.

Miller, Marilyn Grace. *The Rise and Fall of the Cosmic Race: The Cult of Mestizaje in Latin America*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2004

Mikics, David. *A New Handbook of Literary Terms*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.

Mignolo, Walter D. *The Darker Side of the Renaissance*. 2nd ed. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 2003.

---. *Local Histories/Global Designs*. Princeton: UP, 2000.

Moi, Toril. *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Routledge, 2002.

Monsiváis, Carlos. "Border Cultures." University of Texas at El Paso. Spring 2000. Lecture.

Moraña, Mabel, Enrique Dussel, and Carlos A. Jáuregui, eds. *Coloniality at Large: Latin America and the Postcolonial Debate*. Durham: Duke UP, 2008.

Moura, Clóvis. *Dialética Radical do Brasil Negro*. São Paulo: Editora Anita Ltda. 1994.

Mouzinho de Quebedo, Vasco. *Afonso Africano*. 1786. *Internet Archive*. European Libraries. Google. September 28, 2009. http://www.archive.org/details/affonsoafricano00bragoog

Nascimento, Abdias do. *Brazil: Mixture or Massacre?* 2nd ed. Trans. Elisa Larkin Nascimento. Dover, MA: The Majority P, 1989.

---. "Celebração do dia do Índio." *Combate ao racismo: discursos e projetos*. 5 vols. Brasília: Câmara dos Deputados, Centro de Documentação e Informacão, Coordenacão de Publicações, 1983.

Nicolopulos, James. *The Poetics of Empire in the Indies: Prophecy and Imitation in La Araucana and Os Lusíadas.* University Park, PA: Penn State UP, 2000.

Nóbrega, Manuel da. *Diálogo sobre a conversão dos gentios*. 1559. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. De Ouro, 1968.

O'Keefe, Cyril B. *Contemporary Reactions to the Enlightenment (1728-1762)*. Genève: Slatkine, 1974.

Pagden, Anthony. *European Encounters with the New World: from Renaissance to Romanticism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1993.

---. *Lords of all the World: Ideologies of Empire in Spain, Britain and France c. 1500-c.1800*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1995.

Pastor Bodmer, Beatriz. *Discursos narrativos de la conquista: mitificación y emergencia.* 2nd ed. Hanover, N.H.: Ediciones del Norte, 1988.

Paz, Octavio. *El laberinto de la soledad*. 1950. 9th ed. Madrid: Cátedra, 2002

---. *The Labyrinth of Solitude*. Trans. Lysander Kemp, Yara Milos, and Rachel Phillips Belash. New York: Grove P, 1985.

Pereira, Carlos de Assis. *Fontes do Caramuru de Santa Rita Durão*. São Paulo: Pontifícia U Católica, 1971.

Perkell, Christine, ed. *Reading Vergil's Aeneid: An Interpretive Guide*. Norman, OK: U of Oklahoma P, 1999.

Pigman III, George W. "Versions of Imitation in the Renaissance." *Renaissance Quarterly* 33.1 (1980): 1-32.

Pizarro, Ana. *La Literatura latinoamericana como proceso*. Buenos Aires: Bibliotecas Universitarias y Centro Editor de América Latina, 1985.

Polito, Ronald. "Introdução." Durão xi-xxxviii.

Potiguara, Eliane. *Metade cara, metade mascara*. São Paulo: Global Editora, 2004.

Preminger, Alex, and T. V. F. Brogan, eds. *The New Princeton Encyclopedia of Poetry*

and Poetics. Princeton NJ: Princeton UP, 1993.

Priore, Mary del, and Carla Bassanezi, eds. *História das Mulheres no Brasil*. Sao Paulo: Editora Contexto, 1999.

Quijano, Aníbal. "Coloniality of Power, Eurocentrism, and Latin America." Moraña 181-224.

Quint, David. *Epic and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Rabello, Sylvio. *Itinerário de Sílvio Romero*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1967.

Raminelli, Ronald. "Eva Tupinambá." Priore 11-44.

Ribeiro, Darcy, and Carlos de Araújo Moreira Neto. *A Fundação do Brasil: Testemunhos 1500-1700*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1992.

Riberio, Darcy. *O povo brasileiro: A formação e o sentido do Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1995.

---. *The Brazilian People: The Formation and Meaning of Brazil*. Trans. Gregory Rabassa. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2000.

Robbins, Ruth. *Literary Feminisms*. New York: Palgrave, 2000.

Rocha, João Cezar de Castro. "Let Us Devour Oswald de Andrade." *Nuevo Texto Crítico* 12.23-24 (1999): 5-22.

Rocha Pita, Sebastião. *História da América portuguesa*. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia, 1976.

Romero, Sílvio. *História da Literatura Brasileira*. 5 vols. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria José Olympio Editora, 1980.

Russell-Wood, A. J. R. *The Portuguese Empire, 1415-1808*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1992.

Sadlier, Darlene J. *Brazil Imagined: 1500 to the Present*. Austin: U of Texas P, 2008.

Schwartz, Stuart B. "The Formation of a Colonial Identity in Brazil" Canny 15-50.

---. *Early Brazil: A Documentary Collection to 1700*. Trans. Clive Willis and Stuart B. Schwartz. New York: Cambridge UP, 2010.

Schweninger, Lee. "'Back when I used to be Indian:' Native American Authenticity and Postcolonial Discourse." Madsen 69-85.

Seneca. *Seneca's Letters to Lucilius*. 2 vols. Trans. E. Phillips Barker. London: Oxford UP, 1932.

Smith, Andrea. *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide*. Cambridge, MA: South End P, 2005

Smith, Anthony D. *National Identity*. Reno: U of Nevada P, 1991.

Sommer, Doris. *Foundational Fictions: The National Romances of Latin America*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1991.

Spivak, Gayatri C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" Williams and Chrisman 66-111.

---. *In Other Worlds: Essays in Cultural Politics*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

Stam, Robert. *Tropical Multiculturalism: A Comparative History of Race in Brazilian Cinema and Culture*. Durham, Duke UP, 1997.

Stegagno Picchio, Luciana. *Storia della letteratura brasiliana*. Torino: Einaudi, 1997.

Teixeira, Ivan. "Anchieta, Bento Teixeira e a demonização da América." *Estado de São Paulo*. 5 Nov. 2006. Print.

---. "Hermenêutica, retórica e poética nas letras da América Portuguesa." *Revista U de São Paulo* 57 (2003): 138-59.

---. *Mecenato Pombalino e Poesia Neoclássica.* São Paulo: Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo/U de São Paulo, 1999.

---. *Roteiro da Poesia Brasileira: Raízes*. São Paulo: Global Editora, 2008.

Thurner, Mark, and Andrés Guerrero, eds. *After Spanish Rule: Postcolonial Predicaments of the Americas*. Durham: Duke UP, 2003.

Townsend, Camilla. *Pocahontas and the Powhatan Dilemma: an American Portrait*. New York: Hill and Wang, 2004.

Turchi, Maria Zaira. "Imaginário e representação: entre o símbolo e a alegoria." Cardoso 15-30.

Urban, Greg, and Joel Scherzer, eds. *Nation-States and Indians in Latin America*. Austin: U of Texas Press, 1991.

Velie, Alan R., ed. *Native American Perspectives on Literature and History*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1995.

Veeser, Aram H., ed. *The New Historicism*. New York: Routledge, 1989.

Veríssimo, Erico. *Brazilian Literature: An Outline*. 1945. New York: Greenwood, 1969.

Veríssimo, José. *História da Literatura Brasileira de Bento Teixeira (1601) a Machado de Assis (1908)*. 1916. 7th ed. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1998.

Viegas, Arthur. *O Poeta Santa Rita Durão: Revelações historicas da sua vida e do seu seculo*. Brussels Paris: L'Edition D'Art Gaudio, 1914.

Virgil. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Robert Fagles. New York: Viking, 2006.

---. *The Aeneid*. Trans. Sarah Ruden. New Haven: Yale UP, 2008.

Wade, Peter. *Race and Ethnicity in Latin America*. Chicago: Pluto Press, 1997.

West, Martin L. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. New York: Clarendon P, 1997.

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form*: *Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1987.

---. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1978.

Whitford, Margaret, ed. *The Irigaray Reader*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1991.

Williams, Patrick, and Laura Chrisman, eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.