

## The Origins and Errors of Brazilian Cordiality<sup>1</sup>

João Cezar de Castro Rocha

Translated by Shoshanna Lurie

In 1936 two fundamental books on the history of Brazilian culture were issued. On the one hand, Sérgio Buarque de Holanda published *Raízes do Brasil* [*Roots of Brazil*], a work Antonio Candido considered an instant classic from the moment of its appearance.<sup>2</sup> On the other, Gilberto Freyre continued the study of the formation and decadence of the patriarchal family with *Sobrados e Mucambos* [*The Mansions and the Shanties*]. The coincidence of the dates of publication encourages a parallel study of the two texts. However, Brazilian critics tend to compare *Raízes do Brasil* and Gilberto Freyre's masterpiece *Casa-Grande & Senzala* [*The Masters and the Slaves*], which also received instant recognition. In this essay, I will call this consecrated reading into question. I believe that a richer comparison can be made between *Raízes do Brasil* and *Sobrados e Mucambos*. Since this is not the most common approach, I need to justify my proposal. First, it is worth recalling that *Raízes do Brasil* was the first volume in an important collection coordinated by Gilberto Freyre for the publisher José Olympio, "Coleção Documentos Brasileiros." Freyre also wrote the book's forward, though it concentrated primarily on outlining the aims of the collection. In fact, in the five pages of the Forward, duly titled "Documentos Brasileiros," only one paragraph is dedicated to Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, and instead of an analysis of the content of the book, Freyre stresses the intellectual qualities of its author.

*Raízes do Brasil* and *Sobrados e Mucambos* share a thematic affinity that is often overlooked. Gilberto Freyre's book contains the revealing subtitle: "Decadence of the Rural Patriarchy in Brazil." Thus, unlike (in) *Casa-Grande*

& *Senzala*, in which Freyre described the process of “formation of the Brazilian family under the regime of patriarchal economy” (as the subtitle informs), in *Sobrados e Mucambos* he narrated the progressive replacement of the codes of the rural world with the laws of the urban universe. In the author’s own expression, with the development of conditions of urbanization, especially during the course of the nineteenth century, the street began to assert its interests before the abuses of the *casa-grande*. The street progressively imposes its rights on the house, instead of simply accepting its will and whims. At the same time, the development of urbanization occurs parallel to the social ascension of the mulatto to such an extent that it seems fair to say that *Sobrados e Mucambos* is a book composed of two intimately related axes: the historical victory of the street over the house and the social success of *mestiçagem* (miscegenation). In other words, if in *Casa-Grande & Senzala* Freyre offered a vast panorama of the formation of Brazilian society under the influence of the rural patriarchy, in *Sobrados e Mucambos* the author studied the social accommodation that took place with the decay of that patriarchy.

Similarly, in *Raízes do Brasil*, Holanda studied the formation of Brazilian society and, above all, the disappearance of the patriarchal family. If the first chapters of his essay are dedicated to identifying the historical roots of that formation, the last two chapters seek to investigate the arrival of a new society, whose principal novelty was precisely overcoming the patriarchal family. This family was the result of Portuguese heritage and contained a pair of characteristics that became fundamental to the establishment of Brazilian society. The most important consisted of the patriarchal family members’ resistance to the laws of universal nature characteristic of the modern State. As this is the crucial point of Holanda’s argument, it is worth illustrating through the analysis of a key concept.

In Chapter V of *Raízes do Brasil*, entitled “The Cordial Man,” Holanda described the essay’s best-known concept—cordiality as a type of sociability developed within Brazilian historical conditions. In my proposed reading of *Raízes do Brasil* and *Sobrados e Mucambos*, the discussion of this concept is fundamental. I will attempt to demonstrate that in the last sixty years a curious hermeneutic was produced in Brazilian critical tradition: while critics attribute the concept to the work of Holanda, they tend to interpret it according to Freyre’s orientation. However, first I will briefly present the theory propounded by Holanda.

The patriarchal family views itself as self-sufficient. Its members limit the final destiny of deeds and intentions to the domestic circle. A vast network of friendships guarantees the broadening of the circle, given that it reinforces its power as well as affirms its functionality. Characteristic of the rural environment, this is a family whose relatives and immediate circle comprise their own universe, with their own rules and codes. Summing up, the patriarchal family often finds itself in historical conditions in which the defining features of modernity did not take root. For this reason, “it was not easy for those in charge of professional positions of responsibility, educated in this environment, to understand the distinction between the private and the public spheres.”<sup>3</sup> As a consequence, the modern ideal of abstraction—implied in the universal character of the rules of the public sphere, an extension of the necessarily impersonal principles that should govern the State, whose limited number of resources has ideally to serve the entire population—meets an almost insurmountable obstacle in the patriarchal order. In its extreme, this order can represent a serious impediment to the “modernization” of society, according to an European viewpoint.

The cordial man is the legitimate son of the patriarchal family and the study of the etymology of the concept is very useful for this discussion. “Cordial” is derived from *cor, cordis*: “heart” in Latin. Under the control of his feelings, the cordial man refuses the characteristics of the modernization of social life, since, living by impulse, he always takes into account the function of private interests. Among these are the affection devoted to his friends and the hate bestowed upon his enemies. Through the saying that is still commonly used to this day, Brazilians show themselves to be within this logic: “*For friends, everything; for enemies, the law.*” In a cordial society, universal principles cease to be a right and become an authentic punishment for those who don’t occupy the superior ranks of the multiple hierarchies that organize social exchanges, or for those who don’t have contacts in the centers of power.<sup>4</sup>

For this reason, the cordial man is unfamiliar with the moderation of general rules and nothing bothers him more than the search for the middle ground, since he bases his behavior on the interpretation of a complex series of hierarchies. A man of extremes, he hates *and* loves with the same intensity; he desires *and* refuses at the same time; he is greedy *and* generous in the same action—above all, when he operates with public funds that, after all, he understands as also being legitimately his. In addition, as the abstraction of

laws imposed by a distant State seems an unnecessary fiction to him, the cordial man can work as the Argentine of Jorge Luis Borges' essay: "The State is impersonal: the Argentine only conceives of personal relations. For this reason, stealing public funds is not a crime to him. I verify a fact; I neither justify nor excuse it."<sup>5</sup>

This is only one aspect of Holanda's analysis. Brasília Sallum's keen remark should not be forgotten: in *Raízes do Brasil*, "one wishes to identify which past was then being overcome and which embryonic future was contained in that historical present."<sup>6</sup> After establishing the formative elements of Brazilian society, Holanda concentrated his efforts on the radical change that urbanization would bring with its development. On the occasion of a debate with Cassiano Ricardo,<sup>7</sup> the underlying assumption of the essay was clarified: "the cordial man is probably destined to disappear, if he hasn't already completely disappeared."<sup>8</sup> Holanda was less interested in the concept of the "cordial man" than in understanding that cordial relations had no future in the absence of the defining conditions of the rural world. Thus, the growth of cities and the progressive displacement of the rural population to urban centers would lead to the virtual disappearance of cordiality, since it would lose the glue holding it in place: the patriarchal family. It is as if in *Raízes do Brasil*, with an extraordinary power to synthesize, Holanda simultaneously approached the formation of the patriarchal family—the topic of *Casa-Grande & Senzala*—and its disappearance, the topic of *Sobrados e Mucambos*. However, Holanda's imagination seems much more fascinated with the "new times" promised by the phenomenon of urbanization than with investigating the "rural heritage."<sup>9</sup> In Antonio Candido's formulation, "Holanda not only clarified our history, but he foresaw the immediate future."<sup>10</sup> I find the first justification for the approach I propose in this elective affinity.

The concept of the cordial man provides the second justification. In the two books published in 1936, the concept of cordiality performs an important function. Curiously, it has been generally neglected that the two books proposed very distinct meanings for the same concept—although Gilberto Freyre seemed to believe that his assimilation of the concept was faithful to the author of *Raízes do Brasil*. Later critical studies only consider the presence of the concept in Holanda's work. However, as I have already pointed out, their hermeneutic produces a very particular miscegenation, attributing the concept to Holanda, but interpreting it according to Gilberto

Freyre's conception. In order to achieve a more adequate understanding of what I suggest here, I must sketch an archeology of the concept.

In a letter to Alfonso Reyes in 1931, Ribeiro Couto called "cordial civilization the attitude of emotional tendencies born of the fusion of Iberian man with the new land and primitive races."<sup>11</sup> Of course, the baptism of the "cordial civilization" belongs to the poet. However, the idea according to which the originality of the Brazilian historical process should be sought in the productive encounter between the Portuguese, the Indigenous, and the African in the lands of the New World was formulated in a nineteenth-century text. In 1840, the "Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute," under the immediate protection of the emperor Pedro II, organized an international competition, offering an award for the scholar who would present the best plan to narrate national history.<sup>12</sup> Karl Friedrich von Martius won the prize with his monograph "How the History of Brazil Should Be Written."<sup>13</sup> Of what did his project consist? He who wished to guarantee a place for Brazil among Western nations should point out the true novelty represented by the history of this immense tropical country. According to Martius, an epic adventure occurred in Brazilian territory during the centuries of colonization, and the historian must explain the nature of that epic. Generous with the future researcher, the German scholar didn't refrain from revealing its nature. "For this reason, a crucial point for the reflexive historian to demonstrate is how the conditions for the perfection of the three human races that are located side by side in this country in a way unknown in Ancient History are established in the successive development of Brazil, and that they should reciprocally serve as a means and as an end."<sup>14</sup> The races can play a complementary role, but the direction of the process is reserved for the European race—for the Portuguese: "We will never be allowed to doubt that Providence's will destined this mixture to Brazil. Portuguese blood, in a powerful river, should absorb the small tributaries of the Native and African races."<sup>15</sup> In reality, the importance of Martius' essay for the constitution of Brazilian social thought still merits more in-depth research—and at this time it will suffice to point out the possibility.<sup>16</sup> For example, in his classic *Retrato do Brasil*, above all in the *post-scriptum*, Paulo Prado not only celebrated *mestiçagem*, but also mentioned the German's text on various occasions: "This was the brilliant vision that Martius had of our history, while he suggested the study of the three races for its full understanding."<sup>17</sup>

With some prudence, it is not difficult to recognize that this idea is closer

to Freyre's vision than to Holanda's conception. Basically, it attempts to identify the origin of Brazilian sociability in the phenomenon of *mestiçagem*. Isn't it true that Freyre structured the text of *Casa-Grande & Senzala* in a way that reminds one of Martius' suggestions? In individual chapters of his masterpiece, the Portuguese, the Native, and the African contributions to the constitution of Brazilian society are studied. In addition, the function of guiding thread in the process is attributed to the Portuguese. Ronaldo Vainfas has recently remarked the link between Martius' essay and Freyre's masterpiece, rereading the German's contribution as the first moment in which the cultural consequences of *mestiçagem* were explicitly acknowledged. Moreover, in Martius' project the "question of ethnic and cultural *mestiçagem* was already at stake."<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, it is important to recognize that in the 1970s José Honório Rodrigues had clearly stressed the role of Martius' essay in the tradition of Brazilian thought, and even its repercussion in *Casa-Grande & Senzala*, with due emphasis.<sup>19</sup> However, it is equally important and indispensable to highlight the fundamental difference between Martius and Freyre. The German understood the process as the historical and (above all) *racial* synthesis that defines *mestiçagem* as the Brazilian contribution to civilization. Conversely, the Brazilian was interested in studying the historical and (above all) *social* complex of the formation of the patriarchal family that is also based on *mestiçagem*, but understood mainly as a technique of shared living ("*convivência*"). In Martius' text, *mestiçagem* is above all a racial phenomenon, whereas in Freyre's it is mostly a cultural trait.

In *Sobrados e Mucambos*, *mestiçagem* and cordiality are clearly associated with one another: "congeniality à la *brasileira*...; the 'cordiality,' to which Ribeiro Couto and Holanda refer,<sup>20</sup> that congeniality and cordiality emerge mostly from the mulatto... The Comte de Gobineau himself, who always felt so uncomfortable among Pedro II's subjects, seeing them all as decadent as a result of *mestiçagem*, recognized the supreme cordial being in the Brazilian: *très poli, très accueillant, très aimable*."<sup>21</sup> Explicit in this paragraph is that Freyre considered cordiality from a dual perspective: on the one hand, as the result of the process of the formation of the society itself, that is, of *mestiçagem*; on the other, as an index of a specific practice of social relationships. In other words, cordiality was a "technique of courteousness" ("*técnica de bondade*"),<sup>22</sup> and as such constituted a typically Brazilian trait. This is what Cassiano Ricardo asserted in his polemic with Holanda about

the meaning of the concept. For the poet, “everything in Brazil was created this way, through mediation (...). When that balance between antagonisms Freyre spoke of is upset, mediation has its turn. In the balance of antagonisms, one antagonism feeds the other. In the mediation, antagonisms peacefully destroy each other.”<sup>23</sup> Because of this, the characterization of the cordial man as someone who lives between extremes seemed unacceptable to him. Thus, and in a straightforward way, cordiality is related to *mestiçagem*, since in both cases we would be faced with a form of balancing opposing poles until their conversion into a new median point. In the end, cordiality becomes a synonym of Brazilianness as soon as the originality of the Brazilian historical process is defined as the ability to develop a means of harmonious shared living in the cradle of differences. *Mestiçagem* would have done this in relation to the birth of the Brazilian people, while cordiality would have in regards to the establishment of Brazilian sociability.

The same concept in *Raízes do Brasil* has a very different intonation. First, it is worth recalling that, unlike Freyre’s position, Holanda opposed cordiality to politeness and included both love as well as hate among typically cordial reactions, as we saw earlier.<sup>24</sup> In other words, the Comte de Gobineau’s quotation, employed by Freyre as a confirmation of his understanding of Brazilian cordiality, would be considered an interpretive error by Holanda. Understanding the nature of the misunderstanding is the best way to clarify his conception. Though the expression has its origin in Ribeiro Couto, the theoretical inspiration came from another German author, Carl Schmitt. Holanda illustrated this in a note in the second edition of the book.<sup>25</sup> In Chapter 3 of *The Concept of the Political*, also in a note, Schmitt established the meaning of the defining terms in his understanding of the political,<sup>26</sup> in other words, the difference between friend and enemy, based on the separation between the public and private spheres. Holanda appropriated the concept faithfully: “Hatred can be as cordial as friendship, since both emerge from the *heart*, originate in the intimate, domestic, private, sphere... Hatred, being public and political, and not *cordial*, would more precisely be called hostility.”<sup>27</sup>

Holanda never associated the social phenomenon of cordiality with the historical process of *mestiçagem*. On the contrary, he identified its origin in the patriarchal family, in the “rural heritage,” whose patterns of sociability suppose the transposition of the private sphere onto the public. The cordial man must also be understood as a Weberian ideal type: he would be formed

within a social formation characterized by the hypertrophy of the private sphere and by the predominance of personal relations. That is, cordiality should not be understood as an exclusively *Brazilian* characteristic, but rather as a structural trait that develops in societies whose public space faces serious difficulties asserting its autonomy from the private sphere. The concept of cordiality can become an important analytical instrument for the analysis of any social group endowed with a high degree of self-centeredness and therefore somewhat resistant to external pressure.

I am suggesting that criticism has considered Holanda's notable sociological intuition only as an interpretation of the Brazilian social formation, without realizing its relevance for the theoretical debate.<sup>28</sup> Of course, the author of *Raízes do Brasil* sought to offer an interpretation of the country, as the title of the book itself suggests. However, have we sufficiently understood the breadth of his ideas? Let us read his words: "The idea of a type of immaterial and impersonal entity, floating above individuals and controlling their destinies is difficult for the people of Latin America to imagine. It is common to imagine that we have an appreciation of democratic and liberal principles when, in truth, we fight for one personalism against another."<sup>29</sup> Neither have we been able to identify the affinity between Holanda and Jorge Luis Borges: "The Argentine, unlike North Americans and almost all Europeans, doesn't identify with the State. This can be attributed to the circumstance that in this country governments tend to be terrible or to the general fact that the State is an inconceivable abstraction; that the Argentine is an individual, not a citizen, is certain."<sup>30</sup> And what can we say of the Peruvian sociologist Joaquín Capelo's perception in 1902, anticipating Holanda's observation? While he sought to justify the absence of political parties with a coherent political project in his country, he concluded: "In Perú... every party is personal; their only objective is the elevation of a determined person to power: the *caudillo* to profit and make a living based on each one of his allies."<sup>31</sup> Passages with similar content demonstrate the main divergence between Holanda's and Gilberto Freyre's uses of the concept of cordiality while they help to clarify the reason that the curious hermeneutic miscegenation mentioned earlier was produced in Brazil.

In *Sobrados e Mucambos*, most clearly in the last chapter of the book, cordiality appears as a homology for *mestiçagem* at the social level. In this sense, it is worth pointing out that the structural transformations described by Freyre, which had implications for the decay of the rural patriarchy, did



not threaten the permanence of cordial relations. On the contrary, the nineteenth century, according to Freyre, was also the moment of the ascension of the mulatto, the cordial man *par excellence*. In other words, in Freyre's interpretive framework, cordiality is confused with nationality: *the cordial man is the Brazilian himself*.

In *Raízes do Brasil* everything occurs in a very different way. Growing urbanization doesn't only threaten the survival of cordial relations, but condemns them to an inexorable disappearance. Thus, Holanda has no special appreciation of the figure of the cordial man, preferring to concentrate on the changes due to the phenomenon of urbanization. In other words, in Holanda's interpretive framework, cordiality isn't confused with nationality but emerges as a valuable tool for describing the historical constellation dominated by the patriarchal family: *the cordial man is but the symptom of rural heritage*.<sup>32</sup>

In spite of such discrepancies, a particular reading has managed to dominate the tradition of Brazilian intellectual thought. Usually, the concept of cordiality is solely attributed to Holanda's work, as if in the same 1936 Freyre had not proposed an alternative conception that in truth agreed much more with Ribeiro Couto's definition. In this sense, Cassiano Ricardo's quotation in which he mentioned Gilberto Freyre and his idea of "balancing antagonisms"—used by Freyre to define the social dynamic of the pair composed of *casa-grande* and *senzala*—is symptomatic.<sup>33</sup> This citation reveals that Freyre's conception has much more affinity with a certain image of Brazilian culture, whose vocation would be to mediate conflict and not to face it head on.<sup>34</sup>

Nevertheless, although the concept of cordiality is only attributed to Holanda, the more common understanding of the concept is psychological and associates cordiality with friendliness, congeniality, and emotional availability. In other words, the concept is attributed to Holanda, but the interpretation that triumphed was Freyre's understanding! How has this reading been possible, and how is it still common today? Another reading will illustrate this. Some critics have the habit of criticizing Holanda's concept as ideological because the cordial man is *also* violent, as if in the text of *Raízes do Brasil* there were some incompatibility between cordiality and violence. As we saw earlier, the opposite is true. The cordial man *also* has to be violent, since he lives at the mercy of feelings imposed on him by his heart. However, to accept this reasoning would be to abandon a fantasy: "Now, the cordial

enemy does not define the Brazilian. It is not having the capacity to be an enemy, cordial or otherwise. This absence of hate, of prejudice.”<sup>35</sup> With a very cordial irony (according to Ribeiro Couto, Gilberto Freyre and Cassiano Ricardo’s definition), the uncomfortable gaze that Holanda directed toward Brazilian history was not so much faced as mediated through the *topos* of our fundamental congeniality. Noble savages or cordial men, we will probably continue reading *Raízes do Brasil* with the concept of cordiality found in *Sobrados e Mucambos*, since this concept is more in tune with the tradition of Brazilian culture. And like the Argentine in Borges’ essay, we probably won’t see anything condemnable in this gesture.

Perhaps the authors’ different perspectives and above all, the interpretive mixture that emerged in relation to the concept of cordiality, help to illuminate the course of the editions of *Raízes do Brasil*. Holanda introduced a series of changes between the first and second editions, continuing to present them in the third edition.<sup>36</sup> These changes have two basic orientations. On the one hand, the author added some notes, with the objective of substantiating his arguments with new data. This was the historian who, upon rereading the essay from his youth, decided to provide it with a more academic tone. On the other hand, Holanda altered or simply eliminated passages in which he had highly praised Gilberto Freyre’s work.<sup>37</sup> This was the thinker who hoped to assert the originality of his ideas. To conclude this essay, I will limit myself to one example. In the first edition, the reader finds the following evaluation of *Casa-Grande & Senzala*: “a work that represents the most serious and complete study of the social formation of Brazil . . .”<sup>38</sup> In the second edition, published in 1947, the comment disappears—the long passage hailing Freyre is completely eliminated, as is the forward he wrote for the first edition of *Raízes do Brasil*. Doubtless, Holanda’s reaction was drastic. However, isn’t more than a generation of readers’ obstinate hermeneutic *mestiçagem* even more scandalous?

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Enrique Rodríguez Larreta, Guillermo Giucci, José Mario Pereira and Moema Vergara for their suggestions and especially for their criticism.

<sup>2</sup> Candido, “O Significado” XL. In this famous essay, Candido enumerated the three works that played a decisive role in his generation’s formation: *Casa-Grande & Senzala* (1933), by

Gilberto Freyre, *Raízes do Brasil* (1936), by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda and *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (1942), by Caio Prado Jr.

<sup>3</sup> Holanda 105.

<sup>4</sup> For an analysis of sayings and underlying social hierarchies, see Roberto DaMatta, *Carnavais, Malandros e Heróis. Para uma Sociologia do Dilema Brasileiro* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Guanabara, 1979).

<sup>5</sup> Borges 36.

<sup>6</sup> Sallum 238.

<sup>7</sup> With delectable irony, Dante Moreira Leite observed: "The concept of the cordial man provoked a curious, and cordial, debate between Sérgio Buarque de Holanda and the poet and essayist Cassiano Ricardo." Leite 290.

<sup>8</sup> Holanda 146

<sup>9</sup> Titles from the definitive edition of *Raízes do Brasil*. The opposition was even clearer in the first edition, since two chapters were titled "The Agrarian Past."

<sup>10</sup> Candido, "A Visão Política" 88.

<sup>11</sup> Couto 1987.

<sup>12</sup> The award was announced as follows: "A gold medal in the value of 200,000 réis to the person who presents the most correct Plan for how to write the ancient and modern History of Brazil, organized with a system in which its political, civil, ecclesiastical, and literary parts are included." *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* vol. II (1840): 628.

<sup>13</sup> The monograph was published in 1845 in the *Revista do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro*. A more recent edition is Martius 1982.

<sup>14</sup> Martius 89.

<sup>15</sup> Martius 88.

<sup>16</sup> See Martius' novel, *Frey Apollonio. Um Romance do Brasil* (written in 1831, first published in 1992), in which he fictionally anticipated some of the ideas about the (im)possibility of a Brazilian civilization.

<sup>17</sup> Prado 195. On another occasion, Paulo Prado defined Martius' text as a "masterful thesis" (186).

<sup>18</sup> Vainfas 8.

<sup>19</sup> Rodrigues 130-142. "Martius was the first to stress the importance of the contribution of the three races in Brazilian history. He was the first to say that it would be a mistake (...) to reject the contribution and the efforts of the Indigenous population and of imported Africans" (130). "Varnhagen's work method was almost exclusively carrying out material research of the facts Martius pointed out to be important and meaningful" (132). "And for the first time, Martius' old plan... was fully carried out. If Varnhagen followed the plan, he only did so in collecting material, but it was Freyre who brought together and related the facts with a general characterization of Brazilian society and the Brazilian family, demonstrating a great interpretive ability" (142).

Vainfas stresses the discontinuity between Martius' suggestion and the tradition of Brazilian historiography. According to Vainfas, Freyre is the first to unfold the consequences of Martius' essay.

<sup>20</sup> Freyre again mentioned Holanda as the necessary reference when employing the concept of cordiality: "The 'desire to establish intimacy,' which Sérgio Buarque de Holanda considers so characteristic of the Brazilian and with which he associates the characteristic of using diminutives which is so much ours—that serves, he says, to 'create familiarity with objects.'" Freyre 358.

<sup>21</sup> Freyre 356-57.

<sup>22</sup> Cassiano Ricardo employed this expression in his debate with Holanda. "That the Brazilian (when more polished) knows to take advantage of courteousness, and that technique can be called the 'technique of courteousness.'" Ricardo 22.

<sup>23</sup> Ricardo 31, 33.

<sup>24</sup> Faoro notes that "cordial doesn't mean agreeable, dull, but it also encompasses hatred" (62).

<sup>25</sup> Note 157, 106-107 of the edition used here.

<sup>26</sup> Schmitt 55, n. 5. There is an English edition: *The Concept of the Political*. Trans., introd., and notes by George Schwab; with comments on Schmitt's essay by Leo Strauss. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1976.

<sup>27</sup> Holanda 107.

<sup>28</sup> I have partly proposed this hypothesis in "Brasil" 17.

<sup>29</sup> Holanda 138.

<sup>30</sup> Borges 36.

<sup>31</sup> See Kristal 41.

<sup>32</sup> "Finally, I want to point out again that cordiality itself does not seem to me a definitive and exact virtue that must prevail without taking into account the changeable circumstances of our existence. I believe that, at least in the second edition of my book, I have clarified this. In truth, I associate cordiality with the particular conditions of our rural, colonial life that we are rapidly overcoming." Holanda 145.

<sup>33</sup> On the notion of "balancing antagonisms" in Gilberto Freyre's writing, see Araujo, *Guerra e Paz*.

<sup>34</sup> See Ricardo: "All Brazilian revolutions are ended in agreements, and the strictest punishment for our political crimes has never surpassed exile" (41). This was not the case of the dictatorship of Getúlio Vargas' "Estado Novo" (1937-1945) and of the military dictatorship begun in 1964, sadly renowned for their violent repression of political adversaries.

<sup>35</sup> Ricardo 43.

<sup>36</sup> See Rocha, *Literatura* 164-66, in which the changes that refer to the relationship between Holanda and Freyre are stressed.

<sup>37</sup> Though he introduced important changes, Freyre maintained the references to Holanda's work in later editions of *Sobrados e Mucambos*.

<sup>38</sup> Holanda 105, 1st ed.

## Works Cited

- Araujo, Ricardo Benzaquen de. *Guerra e Paz: Casa-Grande & Senzala e a Obra de Gilberto Freyre nos Anos 30*. São Paulo: 34 Letras, 1994.
- Borges, Jorge Luis. "Nuestro Pobre Individualismo." *Otras Inquisiciones. Obras Completas*, vol. II. 1952. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1989. 36-37.
- Candido, Antonio. "O Significado de *Raízes do Brasil*." *Raízes do Brasil*. Sérgio Buarque de Holanda. 1967; Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1989. xxxi-xl.
- . "A Visão Política de Sérgio Buarque de Holanda." *Sérgio Buarque de Holanda e o Brasil*. Ed. Antonio Candido. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo, 1998. 81-88.
- Couto, Ribeiro. "Carta a Alfonso Reyes." 1931. *Revista do Brasil* 3.6 (1987): 30-31.

- DaMatta, Roberto. *Carnavais, Malandros e Heróis. Para uma Sociologia do Dilema Brasileiro*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Guanabara, 1979.
- Faoro, Raymundo. "Sérgio Buarque de Holanda: Analista das Instituições Brasileiras." *Sérgio Buarque de Holanda e o Brasil*. Ed. Antonio Candido. São Paulo: Editora Fundação Perseu Abramo, 1998. 59-70.
- Freyre, Gilberto. *Sobrados e Mucambos. Decadência do Patriarcado Rural no Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1936.
- Holanda, Sérgio Buarque de, *Raízes do Brasil*. 1936. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1987.
- Kristal, Efraín. *Una Visión Urbana de los Andes. Génesis y Desarrollo del Indigenismo en el Perú*. 1988. Lima: Instituto de Apoyo Agrario, 1991.
- Leite, Dante Moreira. *O Caráter Nacional Brasileiro. História de uma Ideologia*. 1954. São Paulo: Livraria Pioneira Editora, 1969.
- Martius, Karl Friedrich von. "Como se Deve Escrever a História do Brasil," *O Estado de Direito entre os Autóctones do Brasil*. 1845. São Paulo / Belo Horizonte: Editora da USP / Livraria Editora Itatiaia, 1982. 85-107.
- . *Frey Apollonio. Um Romance do Brasil*. 1831. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1992.
- Prado, Paulo. *Retrato do Brasil. Ensaio sobre a Tristeza Brasileira*. 1928. Ed. Carlos Augusto Calil. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1998.
- Ricardo, Cassiano. "O Homem Cordial." *O Homem Cordial e outros Pequenos Estudos Brasileiros*. Rio de Janeiro: Ministério da Educação e Cultura, 1948. 5-46.
- Rocha, João Cezar de Castro. *Literatura e Cordialidade. O Público e o Privado na Cultura Brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ, 1998.
- . "Brasil Nenhum Existe," *Caderno Mais!, Folha de São Paulo*, 9 January 1999.
- Rodrigues, José Honório. *Teoria da História do Brasil. Introdução Metodológica*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1978.
- Sallum, Brasília. "Raízes do Brasil." *Introdução ao Brasil. Um Banquete no Trópico*. Ed. Lourenço Dantas Mota. São Paulo: Editora Senac, 1999. 237-256.
- Schmitt, Carl. *O Conceito do Político*. 1932. Rio de Janeiro: Vozes, 1992. *The Concept of the Political*. Trans., introd., and notes by George Schwab; with comments on Schmitt's essay by Leo Strauss. New Brunswick: Rutgers UP, 1976.
- Vainfas, Ronaldo. "Colonização, Miscigenação e Questão Racial: Notas sobre Equívocos e Tabus da Historiografia Brasileira." *Tempo* 8 (December 1999): 7-22.

*Gilberto Freyre*, 1950

Photograph

Courtesy of Topbooks Editora.

