

Performing Between the Lines: (Neo-)Imperial Discourses in the Amazonian Theatre of Francisco Gomes de Amorim

Talía Guzmán-González

Abstract. This essay examines two plays by the dramatist Francisco Gomes de Amorim, best known for his voluminous biographical work of Almeida Garrett. Critically engaging the plays and the copious notes that accompany the main texts through post-colonial theorists, this study analyzes the complex situation of the playwright whose drama appears to give a forum to the subaltern of the Brazilian exotic, whereas the paratextual commentary portends the authorial voice of Neo-Imperialism. This stratified conflation performed by Amorim's "discourse of the in-between" brings to the forefront significant issues for the re-articulation of Self and Other through miscegenation, racial submission and inequality, while at the same time undertaking an attempt at realist drama and a larger project of socio-political and intellectual ambition.

The first travels to Asia, the African coast and, later, Brazil, initiated the contact between what José Augusto França calls "geografias extra-europeias" (qtd. in Buescu 179) and Portuguese reality, constituting a space of production where the self is configured in contrast to its exotic Other. During the Romantic period, Francisco Gomes de Amorim (1827-1891) staged the Brazilian exotic for a Portuguese audience in two of his plays: *Ódio de raça* (written and staged in 1854) and *O Cedro Vermelho* (written and staged in 1856). By articulating images of the exotic, these plays provoke and posit

challenging questions regarding the role of the intellectual in representing the Other as part of a larger project of creating a national image by recuperating a glorious, and Imperial, past.

Ódio de raça and *O Cedro Vermelho* take place in the Brazilian region of Pará along the Amazon River. After ten years in Brazil, Gomes de Amorim drew from his first-hand knowledge of the “exotic,” a unique life experience for a writer, to carve out a place in the Portuguese literary society. This project, though perhaps not promptly apparent in the body of the plays, reveals itself in the extensive notes that accompany them as the ambitious venture of a marginal voice seeking its place in the intellectual community of the time. The transit from text to notes defines the “in-between” that, borrowing from Homi Bhabha, establishes the discursive space where identities are “produced in the articulation of cultural difference” (1). I use the concept of the “in-between” as a means to understand the multi-layered structure of these texts where Gomes de Amorim asserts his authorship and his authority over the theme of representing the Brazilian exotic. Furthermore, identifying the ambivalences that arise between the plays and notes allows us to recognize that in the representation of the Other, and more specifically when addressing miscegenation, Gomes de Amorim articulates a discourse imbued with Neo-Imperial connotations.

It is my argument that in the transition—and transit—between these textual spaces the larger project of Gomes de Amorim surfaces: a project characterized by its Neo-Imperial tone and his ambition for literary recognition. I hope to illustrate how, in his project of representing Otherness, Gomes de Amorim takes the position of that suspiciously engaged Western intellectual against whom Gayatri Spivak warns us in her now classic essay “Can the Subaltern Speak?” (1988). In his position as “witness” of the Brazilian reality we can recognize the “mark of interest” (279) laying “in-between” Gomes de Amorim’s texts.

The challenge inherent in the figure of the intellectual posing as an impartial party enables us to grasp the complex nature of Gomes de Amorim’s writing. His self-fashioning as “aprendiz de selvagem” (375) deriving from his experience living *with* and *as* a native, doesn’t (necessarily) translate into a transparent identification of equality with them.¹ This *mis*identification is only evident in the paratexts that frame the play-text where dissimilarity between the subject and object actually takes place. Such *mis*identification is fundamental, given that these plays were actually performed in the Teatro D. Maria II in Lisbon in 1854 and 1856 respectively, before they were published

as texts. When read (and likewise staged) without the notes, the plays create the illusion of an unselfish undertaking on behalf of the Brazilian natives and slaves. In this sense, I propose that while *Ódio de Raça* and *O Cedro Vermelho*, as play-texts, perform the drama of the Other, their notes illustrate the performativity or performative logic of Imperialism.² The concept of performativity as the multiple repetitions of given social “texts” serves as a possible mode for analyzing how Imperial practices are established in the colonies. In the course of imposing Imperial costumes, politics, cultural practices and belief systems there is a process through which (the “proper”) repetition of these practices guarantees the prevailing performance of Empire. For instance, the “civilizing” process through which natives assume the image of the colonizer would be one of many examples of how successfully performing the “text” of the colonizer will grant the colonized participation in the new Imperial society. Similarly, Bhabha stresses the theatrical or performative quality of the constitution of the colonial subject and the colonial discourse. In his “anatomy of colonial discourse” Bhabha establishes that while fixity is an essential part of this discourse, repetition also plays a key role in the fixation of stereotypes: “the stereotype [...] is a form of knowledge and identification that vacillates between what is always “in place,” already known, and something that must be anxiously repeated” (66). If, on the one hand, these performances can be successful, as the case of the black slave José in *Ódio de raça*, they may also present a “threat” to the colonial order. We will see how Domingos in *Ódio de raça* and Brás in *O Cedro Vermelho* illustrate the unsuccessful performance of Empire along the lines of what Bhabha identifies as the mimicry performed by the colonial subject. This mimicry stands as a menace since it has a double vision “which in disclosing the ambivalence of colonial discourse also disrupts its authority” (88). Both characters offer a point of resistance to the domineering power of the white man; however, they are silenced at the end of the plays.

It is precisely in this space of the silent Other that we situate Brazilian natives and slaves represented by Gomes de Amorim. Although his performed/staged text might give the impression of an Other who speaks for his or herself, the notes lead us to conclude otherwise. The play thus serves as a *prætext* in two senses: as that which—spatially and temporally—precedes the texts (its notes in this case), and second, as a claim that establishes his authoritative discourse *in* the notes. It is in this “in-between” that we recognize Gomes de Amorim’s contribution to the Portuguese nationalistic discourse

put forth by the Romantics of the time.³ Gomes de Amorim followed his mentor and friend, Almeida Garrett—the (secular) “sacerdote’ da nação”—who sought to revive the Portuguese theatre as part of the “máquina nacionalizadora,” a revival that represented an exercise in national reaffirmation (Matos Oliveira 218).⁴ Such an authoritative stance underlines that which Ribeiro and Matos Oliveira accurately identify as the ambivalence present in the plays analyzed here; this ambivalence creates a two-dimensional discourse in the plays’ dialogues in which the reader (or the spectator) cannot distinguish what is serious from acting for entertainment’s sake (21).

I propose that this ambivalence surpasses the actual dialogues and is present in the interstices between text and paratext, that is, between the introduction, the plays per se, and the notes. This dichotomy obfuscates the project of representation diluting the social and political agenda in the more ambitious intellectual project of Gomes de Amorim. In the practice of representation, ambivalence often takes the form of what Ribeiro rightly considers as the tension between “assimilar ou rejeitar os hábitos da terra” (“Gente de todas as cores” 125). Throughout the notes to *Ódio de raça* we find multiple references to travel writers and artists who sought to represent the exotic America to European audiences through literature, art and science. The names of Alexandre Humboldt, Ferdinand Denis, Karl Friedrich von Martius and Jean-Baptiste Debret appear as European authorities on the project of signifying the Other since they, like Gomes de Amorim, can speak from experience. In the introduction to *Ódio de raça*, the writer states the role of the theatrical enterprise as a medium through which he can depict a “fiel pintura” (8) of the local costumes, a picture that he did not exaggerate since he copied “do natural” (9). Written for the publication of the play-text, the introduction has as a reference the *performed* text, that is, the play as already having been performed, and as a result, the text comes with the approval of an audience who was moved and impressed with the social drama in the play.

The plot of *Ódio de raça* is straightforward and simple, sacrificing the discussion of the complex problem of racial and social relations in Brazil to the aesthetic conventions of the period such as melodrama.⁵ This reliance on convention shows how, according to Ribeiro, the author participates in the literary practice of the period and the “uso do código romântico é resultado do diálogo de Gomes de Amorim com o seu tempo [...] porém, distancia o seu ponto de vista dos escritores portugueses (e também dos franceses) e aproxima-o dos autores brasileiros, tornando-o um caso único nas literat-

uras de língua portuguesa do século XIX" ("Gente de todas as cores" 161).⁶ The play takes place in the Brazilian region of Pará where the white "senhor de engenho," Roberto, lives with his daughter, Emília, the black slave José or Pai Cazuza and Marta, a Tapuio Indian.⁷ The mother figure is missing from this family picture and, since her death, Emília has been left to the care of Marta and Pai Cazuza, who holds for the *sinha moça* more than the loyalty of a slave. Manuel, the clerk, works for his uncle Roberto and represents a social class composed by newly arrived Portuguese men involved in local commerce. Domingos is the mulatto slave who sets the action of the play in motion and is, as we later find out, Roberto's son by one of his female black slaves. Domingos and Roberto's filial bond typifies the common colonial practice of the slave-owner fathering slaves without acknowledging them.

The relationships between the mulatto, the black (noble) slave and the white master(s) are telling of the social and racial hierarchy of the time period. They operate as metaphors to explore the pervasiveness of exoticizing and colonial discourse in this play. The mulatto embodies the prevalent anxiety regarding racial miscegenation. Depicted as evil, his hatred (*ódio de raça*) responds to the rejection and discrimination by both the black slaves and the white masters and to the impossibility to racially "fit" with others in the social landscape. Domingos' mixed race makes him a menace since he is that "difference that is almost total but not quite" (Bhabha 91). He is also a threat to Emília, the white woman (and half-sister) he desires and whom he insists on making his *mulher*. Of course, the possibility of miscegenation (and incest) is suspended, leaving Manuel as a suitor to marry Emília, thus maintaining the white patriarchal order. In a fascinating note, worthy of Gilberto Freyre, Gomes de Amorim exposes this anxiety about miscegenation:

A vida nos engenhos ou nas fazendas do Brasil põe a senhora moça em contacto continuado com os pretos. As paixões naquele país invadem mais cedo o peito humano, e quando a criança se faz mulher nem sempre encontra um *ente da sua cor a quem possa amar*. Juntem-se a estas *já fatais* circunstâncias a liberdade dos costumes, o calor do clima—que permite que os pretos andem quase nus diante das senhoras—e diga-se se é para admirar que se repitam ali muitas vezes amores como os de Oteló e Desdémona. (101, my emphasis)

This note expresses the anxiety of nineteenth-century scientific, historic, and literary discourses against the miscegenation of races, as exemplified by

thinkers such as the French historian Ferdinand Denis, one of Gomes de Amorim's contemporary intellectual references and interlocutors. In the case of Gomes de Amorim and Brazil, the discourse of racial "degeneration" through the process of miscegenation legitimizes the continued white domination of the land and its natives. Emília would never admit a relationship similar to that of the Shakespearean characters, and in all instances is asserting her authority over her subalterns. The presence of this white female character puts forth the "gender dynamics" that, according to Anne McClintock "were, from the outset, fundamental to the securing and maintenance of the Imperial enterprise" (7). Emília, as opposed to the black and Indian female slaves, is not a victim of such an enterprise, but rather a beneficiary, since by marrying her white Portuguese cousin the ownership of the land is secured and, symbolically, the marriage perpetuates Portuguese control over it. We can recognize in this possession what McClintock discusses as a "narrative of Imperial recuperation" and the restoration of white patriarchy (240). This identification/restoration is even more revealing when we consider that Domingos, as the son Roberto, is a potential (masculine) heir to the land. However, the revelation of Domingos' origin—the classic *anagnorisis*—posits the impossibility of a union between Emília and Domingos. Further impeding the possibility of any other (familial) relationship to develop, Domingos is killed by Manuel, a white Portuguese man.

Emília becomes the channel through which a neo-colonial social constitution is performed in this ex-colony. However, this is concealed in her (mis)characterization as the "anjo dos escravos" (73). When she asks for Pai Cazuzu's liberty, she does so knowing that, like many other freed slaves, he would *not* leave the fazenda. This paternalistic discourse maintained the power structure that organized the colonial and Imperial society where "the trope of the organic family" (McClintock 45) was key to the safeguarding of Imperial involvement. As an organizing strategy of power, the family trope is also present in *O Cedro Vermelho* where "domestication" of a native would grant him entry into the white family.

Lourenço or Cedro Vermelho, a juruna Indian, lives with a white family, though not as a slave. He maintains a double identity as a "civilized" Indian, as signified by the baptismal name given him by his white godmother and the epithet given him by his tribe for his courageous character. The white patriarchal figure, Duarte, represents the Brazilian *senhor de engenho* invested in the local economy, as well as the state authority as a "Coronel da Guarda

Nacional do Pará" (173). Francisco, a young Portuguese "Guarda-marinha da Armada Portuguesa" (173) stands for the ex-Imperial authority still present in the region and similar to Manuel in *Ódio de raça*, he is the potential suitor for Matilde, Duarte's Brazilian niece who is often characterized as a "selvagem" (185).⁸ João represents the black slaves and, in contrast with the noble character of the Indians, is depicted in a most demeaning fashion. The play takes place on the shores of Lake Carumu in Pará in 1837, two years after the Cabanagem War had broken out in the region.⁹ In fact, the treatment of this war and the participation in it of the *Tapuio* Brás, is telling of the play's position regarding manifestations of autonomy that would challenge white man's control over the land and local government.

O Cedro Vermelho is followed by extensive notes that expand the fictional world depicted in the play-text and in which the reader confronts an "advertência," where the author announces an adventurous voyage into the exotic: "viajaremos por mundos pouco conhecidos [...] Irei dizendo tudo que souber [e] chamarei a atenção para os quadros que me parecerem mais dignos de ser contemplados" (359, my emphasis). Thus, by establishing a value judgment in the narration and choosing what is worthy of being represented and annotated, the intellectual furthers his project of representing the Other. This is explicitly articulated in the second note where Gomes de Amorim calls attention to the inauthentic pictorial representations of the "florestas virgens" that circulated in Europe at the time (362). Gomes de Amorim uses his experience as a way to present his view as authentic, and thereby discredit any other representation: "Vou explicar-lhe a causa dessa semelhança, supondo que não a saiba melhor do que eu [...] Eu vivi muito tempo nas florestas, conheci-as na idade em que as imagens das coisas e das pessoas se gravam na alma para sempre" (362, my emphasis). Through the exercise of literature the author is capable of recuperating the past, and presenting the reader with an actual depiction of Brazilian reality. To construct a genuine story, the author supports his notes with even more notes, quotes, vignettes and anecdotes, creating a multi-layered discourse that frequently falls prey to its many contradictions, especially regarding the topic of miscegenation.

Contrary to Emília in *Ódio de raça*, Matilde desires the Indian Other, whose exceptional character embodies the honorable traits of the Indian idealized in Romanticism. Ribeiro's characterization of the Indian underlines those traits: "Cedro Vermelho trará todos os contornos da excepcionalidade da sua raça [...] quando olhada sobre o prisma romântico: conhecedor da

natureza, sagaz, forte e destro como nenhum outro, possui ainda a honra e o cavalheirismo, além de ser....sentimental!" ("Gente de todas as cores" 133). Thus, Cedro Vermelho is a suitable figure on whom Matilde can project her romantic ideals and desires. Act Two opens with a crucial monologue by Matilde questioning the possibility of love between the races: she sees her love for Lourenço as a contribution towards the "nivelamento das raças" that has little to do with the "convenções sociais" and more with an ideal of romantic love (233). However, for her feelings to materialize, Matilde would first need to *domesticate* him, thus proving that the "nivelamento das raças" has more to do with the prevalence, and predominance, of white and European values than with accepting the Other in a reciprocal relationship. In a key passage, Matilde confesses to Lourenço that to make her love a reality, she would need to transform him into a "civilized" man, illustrating the neo-colonial discourse present in the play:

Tu és baptizado. Deixa-me educar-te e instruir-te, converter em realidade o meu sonho, transformando-te no ente superior que idealizei. A minha missão é, talvez, providencial; mas temo que seja superior às minhas forças! Ajuda-me a desempenhá-la, tornando-te dócil. Quando o meu amor e os meus conselhos tiverem polido a tua inteligência e feito do herói selvagem um tipo completo de cavalaria, consentirá a branca em tomar-te por marido diante do seu Deus e dos parentes. (239)

Cedro Vermelho's domestication—that began through the act of baptism—involves the subjugation to power since, by adopting a European model of idealized masculinity or *cavalheirismo*, he would need to renounce his identity and correspond to the image of the colonizer. As McClintock points out, "[t]hrough the ritual of domesticity [...] colonized peoples were wrested from their putatively 'natural,' yet, ironically, 'unreasonable' state of 'savagery' and inducted through the domestic progress narrative into a hierarchical relation to white men" (34-35). In this sense, Cedro Vermelho can only be validated as a "reasonable" subject by the white woman and her family through domestication and this process follows the performative logic of Imperialism proposed above: to tutor Lourenço would be to *perform* the acts of civilization, and if he reproduces them correctly, he can be admitted into the white man's family. Nonetheless, Lourenço rejects Matilde's proposition of domestication and possible union by establishing the racial differences that sep-

arate them and recalling the promise he made to her mother that he would find her a “branco digno de tua escolha” (239). By rejecting Matilde’s affection, Cedro Vermelho is renouncing the possibility of miscegenation and advocating for the maintenance of racial “purity.” In light of the play’s stance on miscegenation we can interpret this gesture as a sign of the Indian’s “noble” character since, in keeping his promise, he is also maintaining the racial and social hierarchy.

The notes further the commentary regarding (and against) miscegenation and the ambivalence that characterizes the Neo-Imperial discourse presented by Gomes de Amorim. For instance, in note 104 Gomes de Amorim recounts a story of a black barber “de feições horríveis [que] cativou uma formosa branca e veio a casar com ela” but then goes on to justify these relationships as a result of the “climas quentes” and posits that they are not “natural” (417). On the other hand, in note 134, the author acknowledges the possibility—and the reality—of miscegenation, but fear of critical repercussion led him to tone down the Matilde character in the performed play in comparison to the Matilde from the play-text, consequently articulating a counter-argument to that which he intends to defend. If, as he argues, the success of the play represents the success of an “idéia viva” (note 134, 433), the ending of *O Cedro Vermelho* represents the exact opposite of what is defended in the notes: the right of people of different races to love each other. If the performed play ends with Matilde’s rejection of her romantic ideals and the death of Cedro Vermelho forecloses the possibility of a future union, where can we identify that “filosofia viva” favoring miscegenation articulated in the notes? The message is thus limited to a (potential) reading public that, in deciding to take on the enterprise of reading the extensive notes, will learn of the ambivalent political posture of the narrative voice regarding miscegenation and the Other.

What is pervasive, for the audience that sees the performance, is that the marriage arrangements in both plays are the logical solution to a white “female” problem which, as Gomes de Amorim mentioned in his notes, is summed up in the tragedy of white women not being able to find white men to marry while in the tropics/colonized world. In *Ódio de raça* and *O Cedro Vermelho*, the white female characters represent the axis around which anxieties of difference revolve since they are the locus where racial whiteness and its Other (could) converge. These exogamous plots represent a neo-colonial project involving a white male “savior” of (native) women, dominator of the land. According to Renata Wasserman, in the exogamous plot the European mastery is conditioned “upon

the embedding of the conqueror in the conquered and the blurring of a difference that affirms European identity and should continuously signal and validate conquest" (95). In marrying Emília and Matilde, both first generation Brazilians, Manuel and Francisco re-validate a new form of conquest and mark the continued domination of Portugal upon Brazil. In this sense, Emília and Matilde embody the allegorical conflation of women and land, where possessing the women stands for possession of the land.¹⁰

It is important to point out how the heroes' nemeses in both plays strongly denounce the politics of colonial domination and articulate a *post-colonial* discourse where they censure its condemnable practices. For instance, in *Ódio de raça*, Domingos strongly criticizes how the white men enslave the sons they have with their female slaves, seeking to (re)produce cheap labor to work the land: "Sou cabra porque tu me fizeste, porque vives com as tuas pretas para acrescentares o número dos teus escravos!" (82).¹¹ In the case of *O Cedro Vermelho* the criticism is voiced in a powerful passage by Brás, a Tapuio, whose crime was to participate in the Cabanagem War:

Com que direito entram [no mato] os que nasceram nas cidades? Quem os chama? Quem lhes pede a sua civilização, os seus costumes, os seus inventos e o seu governo tirânico? Querem instruir-nos e só nos ensinam a conhecer quanto somos infelizes! (279-80)

Both Domingos and Brás represent the racial and political future of Brazil, a future that did not favor the interests of the, mainly Portuguese, elite. The case of Domingos represents the possibility of racial integration while his death suggests the *impossibility* of a racially mixed country to prosper. In the case of Brás, his condemnation reveals the play's position against the political struggles of the Indians, black slaves and *mestiços*. If this war represents a rebellion by racial and social minorities, Brás' demonization due to his participation in the Cabanagem War shows the resistance of the elite (and in this case the intellectual) to a possible reconfiguration of social structure. By de-contextualizing the natives' revolt, the play speaks in favor of the sustained presence of a Neo-Imperial order.

The characterizations of Brás and Domingos as the antitheses of the heroes Manuel and even José in *Ódio de raça* and the Indian in *Cedro Vermelho*, are based on their resistance and political struggle against the Neo-Imperial power represented in the figure of the *senhor de engenho*. Contrary

to Lourenço and, to some extent, José, they do not represent the image of the noble savage idealized by Romantic writers of the Luso-Brazilian tradition in the nineteenth century. As aforementioned, Lourenço's honorable character lies in his potential for domestication, and his consequent acceptance by the white-European family. According to Wasserman, "the figure of the noble savage, regardless of its fidelity to the Rousseauan concept, could be used to paint an American native most agreeable to European fantasies of Eden recovered and golden age *reconstructed*" (97, my emphasis). I highlight the "reconstructive" potential of an Edenic paradise since that is exactly what Gomes de Amorim's plays did in 1854 and 1856. Not only did they represent a political and social project, they also fulfilled the desire of the Portuguese (and European) bourgeoisie to *see* the exotic, from the comfortable viewpoint of an Imperial theatre in Lisbon. Just as "Rousseau's concept of natural man [...] places people of the New World in the intellectual service of the European thought" (Wasserman 99), Gomes de Amorim's reconstruction of the noble savage articulates the intellectual's desire for appropriating the Other as a constitutive part in the re-articulation of the Self. Akin to how Garrett sought to revitalize the Portuguese theatre by recuperating historical themes, Gomes de Amorim's Amazonian theatre, to some extent, furthers that project of re-presenting Portugal's glorious Imperial past. Beyond the agenda of *staging* the Other, Gomes de Amorim endeavors to create a Portuguese identity as well.

As with the exogamous plots, the prevalence of the Portuguese element as possessor of the land, perpetuates the Imperial presence in the ex-colony. The performance of these plays under the rubric of a national project of re-building Portuguese theatre à la Garrett, somehow underscores Imperial sentiments rather than enforcing a validation of the Other. Similar to how travel literature offered a means for Europeans to understand not only the exotic Other in the world at large but, more importantly, the Self, Gomes de Amorim reveals a Neo-Imperial discourse that is only accessible between the lines/texts. Even though we cannot characterize his theatre as what Mary Louise Pratt calls "survival literature" (86), the articulating premises and consequences established by Pratt are not unrelated to Gomes de Amorim Brazilian plays. She defines "survival literature" as those "first person stories [...] popular since Europe's first wave of expansion in the late fifteenth century [which] continued to flourish in its own right in the eighteenth century, as it does today" (86). With its "lowbrow sensationalism," survival literature

caught the public's attention due to its presentation of a world where sex and slavery offered writers a source for their melodramatic stories. Similarly, Gomes de Amorim's plays make use of commonplace themes where miscegenation offers innumerable possibilities for dramatic developments. For instance, Gomes de Amorim can explore, even if briefly, the chance of a union between the Indian and Matilde, because in the end, and pleasing the Portuguese audience, he will recognize that this is not possible, thus maintaining the "correct" racial configuration. In this sense, "the context of survival literature was 'safe' for transgressive plots, since the very existence of a text presupposed the Imperially correct outcome: the survivor survived, and sought reintegration into the home society. The tale was always told from the viewpoint of the European who returned" (Pratt 87). Gomes de Amorim, just like the survivor sketched by Pratt, finds his reintegration into society as an intellectual who can speak with the authority that experience confers to him.

By accounting for the Neo-Imperialistic discourse present in his plays we can recognize that, as Spivak said, in the transparency of the intellectual lies the mark of interest (279). Gomes de Amorim was able to find a niche in the intellectual milieu of the time because of his Brazilian experience. He constructs an exotic subject modeled after the tastes and desires of the time (be they those of the Brazilian or Portuguese elites) and the extensive notes in both plays reflect an ambitious project of establishing his intellectual mastery. The political and social agenda in which the Other could find his voice, is diluted in this ambitious personal project. The ambivalences present in the dialectic between plays and notes, reveals the crisis of Self re-presentation. To ignore the presence of these discourses would be to ignore the successful performance of Empire.

Notes

¹ Gomes de Amorim recounts the time when he was invited to join a "caçada de gado bravo" which, as he states, "na minha qualidade de aprendiz de selvagem, não quis rejeitar" (375). All quotes by Gomes de Amorim are taken from the edition by Maria Aparecida Riberi and Francisco Matos Oliveira.

² My use of performativity or performative goes along the lines of how Judith Butler defines "performance" in relation to gender. I find that there is a link between what she identifies as the construction of gender through repetitious "acts" and what I am suggesting is the constitution of the colonial subject through the repetition of Imperial models. I find useful her definition of gender as an act: "As in other ritual social dramas, the action of gender requires a performance that is *repeated*. This repetition is at once a reenactment and reexperiencing of a

set of meanings already socially established; and it is the mundane and ritualized form of their legitimization" (Butler 140).

³ The second half of the nineteenth century in Portugal was marked by the keen interest of writers such as Alexandre Herculano and Almeida Garrett to participate in the articulation of a national discourse. Part of this project was a "reinvidicação de uma memória nacional e patriótica" (Pereira in Buescu 339). In *Ódio de raça* as well as in *O Cedro Vermelho*, we can recognize that the sentiment of a glorious Imperial past prevails in the form of a neo-colonization, thus feeding the national sentiment of regeneration and faith in the political (and also cultural) future of the country.

⁴ In the notes to *O Cedro Vermelho* Gomes de Amorim describes the, not-too-humble, role of the playwright as "o moralista, o filósofo, o modesto lavrador dos campos do progresso [...] mas fiel à sua consciência e ao seu dever de apóstolo, manda a sua idéia, viva [...] fecundar os espíritos mais rudes e incultos, destruir preconceitos, conquistar terreno para o futuro e alumiar o caminho da humanidade" (433).

⁵ In the theatre histories consulted for this study, Francisco Gomes de Amorim is rarely mentioned. Luiz Franciso Rebello briefly mentions how Gomes de Amorim, together with Camilo Castelo Branco, represent the melodramatic, artificial and "folhetinesco" of nineteenth-century Portuguese theatre.

⁶ Gomes de Amorim held Brazilian writers such as Machado de Assis, José Veríssimo, Luís Guimarães Porto-Alegre and especially, Gonçalves Dias in high esteem. Reciprocally, he received a favorable review by Machado de Assis for his collection of poems *Cantos matutinos*. (Costa Carvalho 288).

⁷ In note 32 to *O Cedro Vermelho*, Gomes de Amorim defines Tapuio according to the Tupi usage of the word: "Tapuio, em lingua tupi, quer dizer "bárbaro" [...] chama-se hoje tapuio ou tapuia, a todo o índio ou Índia que se ache em comunicação com os brancos" (114).

⁸ Other occurrences can be found on pages 186, 194, 209 and 210, for example.

⁹ The Cabanagem War took place in Pará from 1835-1840, and was waged "mostly, by blacks, mix-bloods, and Indians." Among their demands was the expulsion of the Portuguese from the region, holding them responsible for the misery in which they lived (Fausto 90).

¹⁰ For instance, in Luso-Brazilian literature this colonial trope was explored by José de Alencar in *Iracema* (1865), as well as in the metaphors of the land and the Indian as productive spaces in the *Carta de achamento* (1500) by Pero Vaz de Caminha.

¹¹ With the expression "sou cabra" Domingos is referring to being the son of the white master and his black slave.

Works Cited

- Amorim, Francisco Gomes de. *Teatro: Ódio de raça e O Cedro Vermelho*. Ed. Maria Aparecida Ribeiro and Fernando Matos Oliveira. Braga: Angelus Novus, 2000.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, 1994.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Carvalho, Costa. *Aprendiz de selvagem: o Brasil na vida e na obra de Francisco Gomes de Amorim*. Porto: Campo das Letras, 2000.
- Fausto, Boris. *A Concise History of Brazil*. New York: Cambridge UP, 1999.
- França, José Augusto. "Exotismo." *Dicionário do Romantismo literário português*. Coord. Helena Carvalho Buescu. Lisboa: Caminho, 1997. 179-82.

- McClintock, Anne. *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Pereira, J. Esteves. "Nacionalismo (e a teoria política)." *Dicionário do Romantismo literário português*. Coord. Helena Carvalho Buescu. Lisboa: Caminho, 1997. 339-40.
- Pratt, Mary Louise. *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. New York: Routledge, 2003.
- Rebello, Luiz Francisco. *História do teatro português*. Mem-Martins: Edições Europa-América, 1988.
- Ribeiro, Maria Aparecida and Fernando Matos Oliveira. "Do escravo branco a escritor Europeu." Introduction. *Teatro: Ódio de raça e O Cedro Vermelho*. By Francisco Gomes de Amorim. Ed. Maria Aparecida Ribeiro and Fernando Matos Oliveira. Braga: Angelus Novus, 2000.
- Ribeiro, Maria Aparecida. "Gente de todas as cores: Imagens do Brasil na obra de Francisco Gomes de Amorim." *Máthesis* 7 (1998): 105-26.
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Ed. Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg. Chicago: U of Illinois P, 1988. 271-313.
- Wasserman, Renata R. *Exotic Nations: Literature and Cultural Identity in the United States and Brazil, 1830-1930*. New York: Cornell UP, 1994.

Talía Guzmán-González is a PhD student in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at the University of Wisconsin-Madison and co-editorial assistant for the *Luso-Brazilian Review*. Her research focuses on the representation of the body and city in Brazilian theatre and literature. E-mail: tguzmangonza@wisc.edu