

Quincas Borba in *A Estação*

Marcus Vinicius Nogueira Soares

Translated by Rebecca J. Atencio

Abstract. This essay proposes a study of the novel *Quincas Borba* by taking into account the uniqueness related to the conditions derived from its serialized publication in *A Estação* between the years of 1886 and 1891. It is argued that such a circumstance implies specific patterns of readership usually overlooked by literary criticism.

On 15 June 1886, the periodical *A Estação: Jornal Ilustrado para a Família* began serializing the novel *Quincas Borba*. At first it may seem surprising to know that this biweekly digest, issued by the distinguished Lombaerts publishing house, was dedicated to matters of fashion, with illustrations and advertisements showing readers how to imitate the latest Parisian styles. What is even more surprising to learn is the fact that Machado de Assis not only wrote the novel in question, he was also a diligent collaborator in the magazine from its inception in 1879. In addition to *Quincas Borba*, which alone suffices as testimony to the importance of this partnership, I recall two other texts, “O alienista” and *Casa Velha*.¹ The list would be longer if I included his short stories, even if I limited myself only to those that later appeared in *Papéis avulsos* and *Histórias sem datas*. Further, as Marlyse Meyer points out, Machado de Assis’ participation can be traced back to the transformation of the French magazine *La saison*, published in Brazil beginning in 1872, into *A Estação*, as it would be called after 1879. The new format included a literary section most likely directed by the author of *Dom Casmurro* himself, not to mention his role in elaborating texts that were not strictly literary in nature, such as editorials and so forth (Meyer 76).

Without a doubt, Machado de Assis' constant presence in a fashion publication can cause some surprise when we consider that the writer in question is the revolutionary author of the *Memórias póstumas de Brás Cubas*, although his activity in *A Estação* predates the publication of that title. This is all the more true taking into account that the result of his cooperation corresponds to a work such as *Quincas Borba*. Perhaps no reader will be surprised to discover in the same magazine the ornate texts of Olavo Bilac, Raimundo Correa, Alberto de Oliveira, Artur Azevedo, Lúcio de Mendonça, and Luiz Murat, among other highly-respected representatives of the Parnassian school, authors who would later share with Machado the title of founding members of the Brazilian Academy of Letters.²

It could be argued, moreover, that the cause for our surprise is merely the fact that we are dealing with a fashion publication. Yet ever since *A mão e a luva* Machado had been publishing his novels, including *Brás Cubas*, in periodicals, and therefore it should not seem at all unusual for him to do so once again. This argument does not present problems when we think of *A mão e a luva*, *Helena*, and *Iaiá Garcia*, novels with narrative structures that are conducive to publication in serialized chapters, but the same cannot be said of *Brás Cubas*. The latter is a different case entirely because the *Revista brasileira* in which it appeared was an eminently literary publication that printed the latest critical and historiographical writings of the time. Thus, a narrative experiment such as Machado de Assis' 1880 novel was not at all out of place in its pages.

Considering the five Machadian novels that first publicly appeared in periodicals, I can reduce the arguments and counterarguments above to a single formulation: if, on the one hand, *Quincas Borba* does not share the same narrative pattern as the three novels that immediately preceded *Brás Cubas*, then, on the other hand, by closely following the experiments inaugurated by the latter, the story of Rubião finds itself dislocated inside a vehicle that is *a priori* inadequate to this type of experimentation. This inadequacy becomes even more obvious if we compare *A Estação* with the newspapers in which Machado published his novels between 1874 and 1878, *O globo* and *O cruzeiro*.³ This rapid formulation seems to fully justify the effect of surprise caused by the incongruence of what can be considered the "right" text in the "wrong" place, although the strength of this argument is based on the omission of the following question: under what conditions of publication and reception does this supposed incongruence produce the effect of surprise?

Quincas Borba: The Appendix

As everything seems to indicate, the reaction of surprise can be attributed to trends in critical reception established in the twentieth century, in which the appreciation of Machado's work is associated almost exclusively with the reading of his texts in book form. One of the most characteristic modes of publishing literary texts in the nineteenth century, the periodical (where innumerable authors, from Joaquim Manuel de Macedo to José de Alencar, were consecrated even before Machado), does not appear to figure as one of the aspects highlighted in the critical approach to his work, except when the analytical focus is on his strictly journalistic production, the *crônica*. It is as if Machado acted in fields that were absolutely distinct and separate from each other, to the extent that the exercise of one career could be detrimental to the other, as suggested by José Veríssimo: "He was never a journalist, except in passing and without sacrificing his literary personality..." (154).

Under this prism, the research begun in 1958, sponsored by the Comissão Machado de Assis (Machado de Assis Commission) to elaborate critical editions of a large portion of his work, opened new interpretative possibilities.⁴ Aside from its task of establishing reliable texts, which in itself attests to the importance of the enterprise, the Commission also made some previously unpublished materials accessible for the first time, in particular a volume in the form of an appendix with the entire text of *Quincas Borba* as it appeared in the pages of *A Estação* between the years 1886 and 1891. Despite the importance of this volume, the repercussion was not immediate. In 1986, John Gledson emphasized the significant differences between the serialized and book versions when he wrote: "[it is] surprising that there is no reliable, systematic description of the alterations made by Machado" (69). So as not to say that the Commission's research went completely unnoticed, Gledson mentions two essays based on the appendix edition of *Quincas Borba*: Augusto Meyer's from 1964, and John Kinnear's from 1976.

Years later, in 1993, the scholar Marlyse Meyer became interested in the different versions of *Quincas Borba*, and not because of the appendix—according to Meyer, she learned of its existence from Gledson's text only after having begun her own research. Upon coming across *A Estação* in the course of a project on nineteenth-century feminine periodicals, Meyer delved into reading the biweekly magazine published by Lombaerts with the purpose of

satisfying my curiosity: what tidbits did such an obviously feminine magazine offer to feed the imagination of its "gentle readers?" The answer was unexpected.

These were delicacies of the highest order, since, from the first number, I discovered that their assiduous producer was none other than Machado de Assis. (73)

Her surprise led her on a different path than what she had originally intended. Meyer's astonishment only increased with each new discovery of Machado's presence in *A Estação*: "and, on 15 June 1886, what EMOTION! All the more so because I was caught completely unaware when I came across Chapters I and II of *Quincas Borba*" (95).

My interest in the testimony of a researcher of Meyer's stature clearly has nothing to do with the fact that she was initially unaware that *Quincas Borba* had first been published in *A Estação*. In my view, her research seeks to fill the void left by the brief critical fortune of the appendix, a void that reflects the relative lack of attention paid to the publication conditions surrounding the first printing of *Quincas Borba*. In this sense, what seems fundamental in Meyer's text is how the previously unknown fact of the novel's debut in *A Estação* does not become merely a piece of information that disappears once it has been mentioned, no longer figuring as a constitutive element of the comparative research of the different versions. Instead, its continued relevance leads Meyer to formulate the following question: "what part did the magazine itself play in Machado's imaginary construction, given the peculiarities of magazine publishing in which the composition and writing of the text are serialized and thus fragmented?" (74).

In what follows, I will try to answer that question.

Quincas Borba* in *A Estação

Quincas Borba was published between the dates of 15 June 1886 and 15 September 1891, meaning that its text was printed in a total of 93 numbers of *A Estação*. Between these two dates, one hundred and twenty sections were issued and thus the novel was absent from thirty-two of them.⁵ The chapters appeared in the literary section, sharing space with poems by the previously mentioned Parnassian writers as well as with the short stories of Artur Azevedo and I. S.,⁶ to mention only a few of the most consistent contributors. There were also book reviews and *crônicas*, along with the prominently-placed "Croniqueta" section signed by "Eloy, the hero," a pseudonym that Meyer attributes to Artur Azevedo. At times, the Machadian text occupied three columns, with eight chapters printed in a single edition, such as on 31 August 1891. On other occasions, as it appeared in an illustrated periodical,

it competed for space with large gravures that fragmented it and pushed it to the edges of the page, making it almost imperceptible to readers.

As previously mentioned, *Quincas Borba* was not the first fictional work by Machado to appear in *A Estação*. It followed by three and a half months the last chapter of *Casa Velha* (concluded on 28 February 1886), a text that took Machado more than a year to complete, given that its first chapter came out on 15 January 1885. Of the longer texts, “O alienista,” published between 15 October 1881 and 15 March 1882, is also worthy of note.

Of all the aspects pointed out here, the one that most attracts our attention is the length of time it took for Machado to finish *Quincas Borba*, a period of five years and three months. Such a long duration would be desirable for a serialized story from the perspective of editorial strategy, the purpose of which is to increasingly pique the interest of readers and encourage them to renew their subscriptions; the text could, depending on its popularity, even bring in new subscriptions. On the other hand, in a periodical with a biweekly distribution, such a stratagem could backfire; if it failed to hold the reader’s attention, a long narrative could cause readers to lose interest and stop following the story, or even to cancel their subscription altogether.

To what, then, can we attribute the five years and three months that it took Machado to complete *Quincas Borba*?

In a recent essay, Leopoldo de Oliveira proposes that Machado de Assis underwent a “creative crisis” in the novel genre between the appearances of *Memórias póstumas de Brás Cubas* and *Quincas Borba* (Oliveira 43–44). This crisis would have stemmed from the author’s attempt to avoid simply repeating in the latter the formal innovations established in the former without, however, completely omitting them either. This argument is based on the long period of time that separates the two novels and on the different durations of the serial publication of each: nine months in 1880 for the first; five years and three months for the second.

In fact, between *Resurreição* and *Memórias*, Machado had been publishing on a regular basis a new novel approximately every two years. After that he did not maintain the same regularity and oscillated between an interval of four or five years, even taking eight years to complete *Dom Casmurro*, which came out in 1899.⁷ Could it be that Machado faced yet another creative impasse, this time as a result of Rubião’s story, and out of which Bentinho’s account was the formal result? It is not my intention to pursue this question here, as it exceeds the scope of the present essay. I will limit myself to observ-

ing, without specific reference to *Quincas Borba*, that the increase in the temporal lapse between the novels published after 1880 could have other causes.

As for the duration of publication, a brief comparison of the two novels can be elucidative. As is well known, *Memórias póstumas de Brás Cubas* appeared in the *Revista brasileira* between 15 March and 15 December 1880. Of the nineteen sections published during this period, the text was absent on only two occasions, 15 June and 15 November. The space occupied by the text in terms of page numbers is also worthy of note: between page nine—which occurred only once, on 15 May 1880—and page nineteen.

Turning to *Quincas Borba*, the material conditions of publication are obviously quite different. Even if we discount all the times when the chapters did not appear in *A Estação*, the novel would not have reached its conclusion in less than three years and ten months. A simple observation appears to justify this unusual length: the place reserved for the serial in the literary section hardly takes up three pages, and even then those pages are not always filled by text alone, but often share space with gravures. The reduced size of the allotted space is even more obvious when we take into account that until the first major interruption in publication, between 31 May and 31 October 1888, the novel was only absent five times: 31 May and 31 October, 1887; 15 March, 30 April, and 15 May 1888.⁸

In terms of the narrative sequence, the interruption occurs in chapter XCVII when Rubião, during a visit to the Palhas' home—to pay his respects following the death of D. Maria Augusta—feeds the suspicion of Sofia's possible adultery after learning about the story of Harmonia Street—recounted by the coachman three chapters before. After almost two years of uninterrupted publication, the novel had not even reached its halfway point, even though this length of time is already approximately double that taken to publish *Memórias* in the *Revista brasileira*. If I add to the comparison another text, *Casa Velha* (which, as we have seen, was prolonged for more than a year in the pages of *A Estação*, despite being shorter than the narrative of Brás Cubas), then we can clearly see that Machado had a very limited amount of space at his disposal in which to incorporate his texts.

To summarize, the hypothesis of a "creative crisis" measured by the five year, three month duration of the novel is not supported by what we know about the material conditions of the novel's publication.

Something similar is found in John Gledson's reading. Basing his interpretation of Machadian realism in *Quincas Borba* on a comparison of the two

versions, Gledson attempts to show that Machado's intent was to "fictionally reproduce the political crisis" (69) of the late 1860s, a decade characterized by having precipitated the fall of the monarchy and of which the War of Paraguay (1864-1870) and the "Lei do Ventre Livre" ("Law of the Free Womb," 1871) are the most obvious symptoms. The decisive point on which he constructs his analysis pertains to the second and final major interruption of the novel, between 31 July and 30 November 1889, when Machado would have presumably "reached the point of concluding publication" (74). Based on this, Gledson states that the process of writing *Quincas Borba* can be divided into three stages: before and after July of 1889 and the final version of the book in 1891. In other words, during the first stage of writing his text Machado could not find the realist tweak necessary to fictionalize the crisis, something which was only possible after November. This change occurs as a result of the adaptation of the political situation, which until July seemed anachronistic in relation to the historical period, and the transformation of Rubião into a representative of that period:

By identifying Rubião with the Empire and its contradictory impulses of conservatism and progress [...] Machado situates his character's schizophrenia within the most suitable social context of the moment (that is, for 1868-71). (109)

Though it is not my purpose to question the validity of Gledson's realist conjectures, I believe that identifying some of the problems arising from his approach, which is characterized by a search within the text for clues to the author's project of revealing the "true nature of society" (75), can be beneficial with respect to those aspects of particular interest to my own study. Let us consider a brief example before continuing.

Observing the addition made by Machado in chapter XXI of the book's first edition (XXIV in *A Estação*), in which the first encounter between Rubião and the Palhas in the train in Vassouras is narrated, Gledson not only calls attention to the fact that this passage corroborates the historical adaptation mentioned above (mainly in that which has to do with slavery), he also highlights a small detail related to the couple's motivation for taking the trip: "Palha, who arrived from Vassouras, *where, doubtless, he had not been on vacation*, obviously has an interest in the continuation of slavery" (93-94, my emphasis). Although he admits that Machado himself does not mention the purpose of the excursion in the text, the essayist believes that the suggestion

of a trip for pleasure rather than business, as indicated by the subtle presence of “baskets and packages with souvenirs” (Assis, *Quincas* 133), is a technique used to “deceive the reader: much later, we learn that ‘Sofia is his companion on these [business] travels’” (93). Gledson’s certainty on this point gives rise to a question: does the passing reference to the souvenirs necessarily rule out the possibility of a business trip? Not at all, because even if the excursion were of a commercial nature, that would not preclude the couple from bringing home the souvenirs mentioned. In this sense, far from trying to deceive the reader, the presence of this apparently superfluous detail seems to me to be more linked to the function of producing, within the atmosphere of realism, what Barthes calls the “reality effect,” in which the represented element is “the category of ‘the real’ (and not its contingent contents)” (Barthes 148).

If we return to Gledson’s reading of the 1889 interruption, which is the key element of his interpretation, we can clearly see the difficulties that this method presents when applied to a serialized text. It is curious that he states, as I have previously quoted, that Machado had reached the point of concluding publication. At no time during my own consultations of *A Estação* did I observe the presence of any text or note that justified such an interpretation; the text is suspended in July and reappears in November without any explanation whatsoever. Moreover, the pause in 1889 was neither the first nor even the longest: three and a half months as opposed to four and a half months in 1888. But for Gledson what reinforces the greater importance of the second suspension is the fact that the novel recommences with number CVI instead of following the logical sequence with chapter CXXII, thus making the “serialized novel incomprehensible to the reader” (74). Nevertheless, as Meyer points out, “the reader of the serialized novel, much like the soap opera aficionado, probably does not pay much attention to chapter numbers; what really matters is the continuation of the story” (100). This assumption seems very probable with respect to *Quincas Borba*, given that similar errors can be found practically from the beginning—the first of which occurred on 15 November 1886.

Considering the diversity of texts with which the account of Rubião’s misfortunes shared the pages of the literary section (including, obviously, the gravures), and the resulting variation in the quantity of space occupied by its chapters, it is practically impossible to establish the production and publication dynamic followed by Machado. With a book, the text becomes materially accessible to the reader as a readymade object. By contrast, the author publishing his text in a magazine or a newspaper faces potential distractions

throughout the writing process, from personal problems to technical difficulties in publication. These distractions can often interfere with the text's legibility and, in extreme cases, preclude its full realization.⁹ Returning to the previous quote from Meyer, we can add that the inconsistencies pertaining to the characteristic demands of magazine publishing encompass not only that which is an integral part of the author's "imaginary construction," but also that which refers to the material conditions of reading the text.

In this sense, any comparison of the different versions of *Quincas Borba* (or at least one that does not aim to establish a text that is faithful to authorial intention) should take into account the inconsistencies that characterize texts published in periodicals. Great care must be taken, therefore, when it comes to a publication such as the appendix containing the initial version of *Quincas Borba*: the simple transcription of the text in *A Estação* into book format implies a change in the material aspects of its inscription, since "the 'same' text, fixed in terms of word content, is not the 'same' if the mode of transmission to readers, listeners, or spectators changes" (Chartier 123).

Thus, considering these differences, it is possible to suppose that a reader in the 1880s was not surprised to find his beloved "Machadinho" in the pages of *A Estação*.¹⁰

Outline Of The Chapters In *A Estação: Jornal Ilustrado Para A Família*

Year/Month	Chapters	Observations
1886		
JUNE		
15	I and II	
30	III–V	
JULY		
15	VI– IX	
31	X–XIV	
AUGUST		
15	XIV (cont.)–XVIII	
31	XIX–XXII	
SEPTEMBER		
15	XXII (cont.)–XXV	
30	XXVI–XXVIII	
OCTOBER		
15	XXVIII (cont.) and XXIX	
31	XXX–XXXII	

Year/Month	Chapters	Observations
NOVEMBER		
15	XXXI–XXXV	Numbering error; subsequent chapters also reflect this error.
31	XXXVI–XXXVIII	
DECEMBER		
15	XXXIX–XLI	
31	XLI (cont.) and XLII	
1887		
JANUARY		
15	–	The collection in the National Library does not have a Literary Section for this day.
31	XLVIII–I.	
FEBRUARY		
15	L	
28	L (cont.)– LIII	
MARCH		
15	LIV– LVII	Numbering error; subsequent chapters also reflect this error.
31	LVI (cont.) and LVII	
APRIL		
15	LXII (?)	Chapters LVIII–LXI have not been recovered. The chapter from this day did not appear in full, but, considering the continuity with the following chapter, it is possible to call it Chapter LXII.
30	LXIII and LXIV	
MAY		
15	LXIV (cont.) and LXV	The Literary Section is incomplete, but it is probable that the novel did not appear on this day.
31	–	
JUNE		
15	LXVI – LXVIII	
30	LXVIII (cont.)	
JULY		
15	LXIX	
31	LXIX (cont.)– LXXI	
AUGUST		
15	LXXII– LXXV	
31	LXXV (cont.)	
SEPTEMBER		
15	LXXV (cont.)– LXXVII	
30	LXXVIII and LXXIX	

Year/Month	Chapters	Observations
OCTOBER		
15	LXXIX (cont.) and LXXX	The Literary Section is incomplete, but it is probable that the novel did not appear on this day.
31	–	
NOVEMBER		
15	LXXX (cont.)	
30	LXXX (cont.) and LXXXI	
DECEMBER		
15	LXXXII	
31	LXXXII (cont.) and LXXXIII	
1888		
JANUARY		
15	LXXXIII (cont.)	
31	LXXXIV– LXXXVI	
FEBRUARY		
15	LXXXVII	
29	LXXXVIII and LXXXIX	
MARCH		
15	–	The novel did not appear.
31	XC	
APRIL		
15	XCI–XCIII	The novel did not appear.
30	–	
MAY		
15	–	The novel did not appear. Last chapters before the four and a half month interruption.
31	XCIV–XCVII	
OCTOBER		
31	XCVI–XCVIII	Publication recommences. Numbering error: it should begin with XCVIII and end with C. Subsequent chapters also reflect this error.
NOVEMBER		
15	XCIX– CIII	
30	CIV– CVII	
DECEMBER		
15	CVIII– CXI	
31	CXII– CXV	
1889		
JANUARY		
15	–	The novel did not appear.
31	CXII and CXIII	

Year/Month	Chapters	Observations
FEBRUARY		
15	–	The novel did not appear.
28	CXII	
MARCH		
15	CXIII	
31	CXIV	
APRIL		
15	CXV– CXVIII	
30	–	
The novel did not appear.		
MAY		
15	–	The National Library does not have the Literary Section, but from what follows on 6/15 it is probable that the novel did not appear on this day. Idem.
31	–	
JUNE		
15	CXVII (cont.) – CXIX	
30	CXIX (cont.)	
JULY		
15	–	The novel did not appear. Last chapters before the three and a half month interruption.
31	CXX– CXXII	
NOVEMBER		
30	CVI– CIX	Publication recommences.
DECEMBER		
15	CX– CXIII	
31	CXIV and CXV	
1890		
JANUARY		
15	–	
31	CXVI– CXVIII CXVIII (cont.)	
FEBRUARY		
15	CXVIII (cont.) and CXX	
28	CXXI – CXXV	
MARCH		
15	CXXXVII – CXXXI	Numbering error: it should be CXXVI.
CXXVI. 31	CXXXII – CXXXVI	
APRIL		
15	CXXXVII and CXXXVIII	
30	–	
The novel did not appear.		
MAY		
15	CXXXIX – CXLI	
31	CXLII – CXLV	

Year/Month	Chapters	Observations
JUNE		
15	CXLVI – CXLVIII	
30	–	The novel did not appear.
JULY		
15	CXLVI – CXLIX	Repeats the numbering from 6/15.
31	CXLIX (cont.) – CLIV	
AUGUST		
15	CLII and CLIII	
31	CLII (cont.)	Numbering error.
SEPTEMBER		
15	–	The novel did not appear.
30	CLII (cont.) – CLVI	
OCTOBER		
15	CLV – CLVII	
31	–	The novel did not appear.
NOVEMBER		
15	CLVI – CLVIII	
30	CLIX – CLXI	
DECEMBER		
15	CLXI – CLXIV	
31	–	The novel did not appear.
1891		
JANUARY		
15	CLXV – CLXVII	
31	CLXVIII – CLXX	
FEBRUARY		
15	CLXXI	
28	CLXXII and CLXXIII	
MARCH		
15	CLXXII – CLXXV	
31	CLXXVI – CLXXXI	
APRIL		
15	CLXXXI – CLXXXII	
30	CLXXXIII – CLXXXIV	
MAY		
15	CLXXXV – CLXXXVII	
31	–	The novel did not appear.
JUNE		
15	CLXXXVIII – CLXXXIX	
30	CXC – CXCV	
AUGUST		
15	–	The novel did not appear.
31	CXCII – CXCIX	Numbering error.
SEPTEMBER		
15	CC – CCII	

Notes

¹ Here I follow John Gledson's suggestion that *Casa Velha* is a novel, not a short story.

² It is also worth mentioning other collaborators in *A Estação* who were not members of the Academy: Luiz Delfino, Júlia Lopes de Almeida, Moraes Silva, and Pardal Mallet. The latter, having died three years before the Academy's founding, was chosen by Pedro Rabelo as the patron of seat number 30 (Mallet 12).

³ In *O globo*; *A mão e a luva* (26 Sept. 1874 to 3 Nov. 1874); and *Helena* (6 Aug. 1876 to 11 Sept. 1876); in *O cruzeiro*; *Iaiá Garcia* (1 Jan. 1878 to 2 Mar. 1878).

⁴ The "Comissão de Machado de Assis" was created by the Ministry of Education and Culture in 1958 and was composed by Austregésilo de Ataíde, José Renato Santos Pereira, Antônio Cândido de Melo e Sousa, Antônio Houaiss, Antônio Chediak, Augusto Meyer, Aurléio Buarque de Holanda Ferreira, Barreto Filho, Brito Broca, Celso Ferreira da Cunha, Ciro dos Anjos, Eugênio Gomes, J. Galante de Sousa, José Simeão Leal, Lúcia Miguel Pereira, Marco Aurélio de Moura Matos, Mário Gonçalves de Matos e Peregrino Júnior. The Machado de Assis Commission was responsible for the preparation of critical editions of Machado works, which were published by Instituto Nacional do Livro and Civilização Brasileira.

⁵ In order to facilitate the visualization of the publication dates, I have included an outline of the chapters in *A Estação* at the end of this essay.

⁶ Unfortunately, I have been unable to identify the author.

⁷ The dates are as follows: *Quincas Borba* (1891), *Dom Casmurro* (1899), *Esau e Jacó* (1904), and *Memorial de Aires* (1908).

⁸ I base the reference to these two dates in 1887 on the chapter plots, since the National Library does not have the complete supplements from those days. See chapter outline at the end of this essay. See also Ana Cláudia Suriani da Silva's essay in this volume. In her research, she has found some of the so-called "missing chapters."

⁹ As an example, the publication of José de Alencar's *A Viúvinha* in the *Diário do Rio de Janeiro* was interrupted in 1857 when the author's brother allowed one of the chapters to appear prematurely in the *crônicas* section. Later, in 1860, the entire novel was published in book form (Alencar lxxviii).

¹⁰ Machadinho ("little Machado") is the nickname used by *A Estação* on 30 September 1880, n° 18, upon announcing the debut of *Memórias póstumas de Brás Cubas*.

Works Cited

- Alencar, José de. "Como e Porque sou Romancista." *Romances Ilustrados de José de Alencar*. Vol. 1. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1967.
- Assis, Machado de. *Quincas Borba*. Rio de Janeiro: INL, 1969.
- . *Quincas Borba: Apêndice*. 2nd ed. Rio de Janeiro; Brasília: Civilização Brasileira/INL, 1977.
- Barthes, Roland. "The Reality Effect." Trans. Richard Howard. *The Rustle of Language*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1989. 141–48.
- Chartier, Roger. "Leituras e Leitores 'Populares' da Renascença ao Período Clássico." *História da Leitura no Mundo Ocidental*. Eds. Guglielmo Cavallo and Roger Chartier. São Paulo: Ática, 1999.

- Gledson, John. "Quincas Borba." *Machado de Assis: Ficção e História*. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra, 1986.
- Kinnear, John. "Machado de Assis: To Believe or Not to Believe." *Modern Language Review* 71 (1976).
- Mallet, Pardal. *Hóspede*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Três, 1974.
- Meyer, Augusto. "Quincas Borba em variantes." *A chave e a máscara*. Rio de Janeiro: O Cruzeiro, 1964.
- Meyer, Marlyse. "Estações." *Caminhos do Imaginário no Brasil*. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2001.
- Oliveira, Leopoldo O. C. de. "As Metamorfoses na Estrutura Narrativa entre as Versões A e B." *Ler e Reescrever Quincas Borba*. Ed. Ivo Barbieri. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2003.
- Verissimo, José. "O Sr. Machado de Assis." Ed. Ubiratan Machado. *Machado de Assis: Roteiro da Consagração*. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 2003.

Periodical Consulted

A Estação: Jornal Ilustrado para a Família. [Rio de Janeiro].

Marcus Vinícius Soares is Associate Professor of Brazilian Literature at the Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro. He is the author of several articles published in journals in Brazil and in the United States. Currently, he is finishing a book manuscript on Manuel Antonio de Almeida's novel *Memórias de um sargento de milícias*. E-mail: soaresmarcus@hotmail.com