Uniwersytet Wrocławski

Wydział Neofilologii

Instytut Filologii Romańskiej

Eliasz Chmiel

Collective Subjectivity of Literary Characters: A Theoretical-Methodological Framework with a Case Study of Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*

Doctoral dissertation written under the supervision of

dr hab. Marcin Kurek, prof. UWr

Uniwersytet Wrocławski

Wydział Neofilologii

Instytut Filologii Romańskiej

Eliasz Chmiel

Subiektywność kolektywna postaci literackich: model teoretyczno-metodologiczny wraz ze studium przypadku *Zamarłego morza* Jorgego Amado

Praca doktorska napisana pod kierunkiem

dr. hab. Marcina Kurka, prof. UWr

Acknowledgements

I want to thank the Polish National Agency of Academic Exchange for the STER program grant, which enabled me to conduct a part of my research in Brazil, at Universidade Federal de Pernambuco (Recife) and Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado (Salvador).

I am particularly grateful to Marcin Kurek for supervising the development not only of this dissertation but also of my Master's thesis, and for his generous mentorship over the past decade. He consistently trusted my ideas, encouraged my intellectual autonomy, and offered the thoughtful guidance of a more experienced scholar, while always remaining open to my own vision.

I also thank Teun A. van Dijk, Nico Carpentier, Justyna Deszcz-Tryhubczak, Francisco José de Jesus Topa, Eduardo Cesar Maia Ferreira Filho, Márcia Rios da Silva, Gildeci de Oliveira Leite, and Iida Pöllänen for their valuable academic guidance, and Uniwersytet Wrocławski, Universidade Federal de Pernambuco, Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, and Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto for institutional support.

Although this dissertation is written in English, I have chosen to express my gratitude also in the native languages of those to whom I am more personally indebted so that these words of thanks may reach them in the most direct and heartfelt way possible.

Dziękuję moim Rodzicom, Barbarze i Grzegorzowi Chmielom, za zaszczepienie mi ciekawości świata, radości z czytania, pilności w nauce i innych ważnych dla mnie sferach, a także za bezlik poświęceń, jakie wiązały się z pełnieniem Waszej roli. Dziękuję za Waszą miłość, przyjaźń, wsparcie i za całe dobro, którego ujęcie wymagałoby osobnej rozprawy.

Nie sposób podziękować za wszystko również mojemu bratu, Oskarowi Chmielowi. W szczególności dziękuję jednak za wielokrotne przetarcie naszych wspólnych szlaków, za wskazywanie nowych możliwości i przygód: za internat w Lotniku, gdzie wszystko się zaczęło; za długie, inspirujące dyskusje; za to, że zawsze mogę liczyć na mądre słowo od najinteligentniejszej osoby, jaką dane mi było poznać. „Brothers gonna work it out"!

Agradeço à minha esposa, Gabriela Maíra Mendes Ribeiro, graças a quem pude conhecer as maravilhas do Brasil e da sua literatura, entre tantas outras. Obrigado, Zinha,

pela delícia dessa última década que tivemos a sorte de compartilhar; pelas aprendizagens que adquirimos juntos; pela sua compreensão e disposição de passar anos na Polônia, longe dos seus próximos, para que eu pudesse me dedicar a essa pesquisa; pela leitura e seu valioso parecer sobre o Capítulo 3. Obrigado, ainda, por ter me presenteado com uma família nova — a do Maranhão e a de Minas Gerais. Não poderia deixar de mencionar, em especial, os meus sogros, Irenilde de Fátima Mendes Ribeiro e Jaci Ferreira Ribeiro: agradeço por terem me acolhido no seu lar com tanto carinho e amizade.

Dziękuję Tomaszowi Hładczukowi, Wojciechowi Stolarczykowi, Mateuszowi Okalowi, Mateuszowi Krupowiczowi, Marcie Majerowskiej, Januszowi Niekraszowi, Pawłowi Skupińskiemu, Jakubowi Walickiemu oraz Marcinowi Pawłowskiemu za niemalże braterskie, siostrzane wsparcie, tysiące inspirujących rozmów i Wasz nieoceniony wkład w powstanie tej rozprawy.

Agradeço aos amigos do Brasil que foram e continuam sendo ótimos professores da língua portuguesa, da cultura brasileira e da arte do encontro, especialmente a Lucas Caetano, Vinicius de Almeida, Sofia Clark, Isabela Gonçalves, Ramon Silva Chaves, Gustavo Luiz Gava, Marcelo Mendes e Bárbara Rocha.

Finally, I am deeply grateful to the professors and teachers who taught me at Instytut Filologii Romańskiej Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, Faculdade de Letras da Universidade do Porto, Facultad de Filología, Traducción y Comunicación de Universitat de València, IV Liceum Ogólnokształcące w Zielonej Górze, Samorządowe Gimnazjum w Kożuchowie, and Szkoła Podstawowa nr 1 w Kożuchowie—many of whom made a lasting difference in my life. *Dziękuję*, *gracias*, *merci*, *obrigado*.

Contents

Introduction

The idea for this research emerged following a reading of Alejo Carpentier's *The Kingdom of This World* and Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*. In both novels, I observed a phenomenon that affects fundamental aspects of their storyworlds in a variety of ways and intersects with a range of narratological issues, including unreliable narration, focalization, collective narrative agents, viewpoint, perspective, voice, speech categories, consciousness representation, ideology, discursive struggles, or characterization. I intuitively referred to this phenomenon as "collective subjectivity" (CS)—a term that proved not only fitting, but also already in use. Subsequent research into its usage across English, Spanish, Portuguese, Polish, and French revealed that, although the concept has been employed as an analytical tool by other scholars, its applications are largely confined to the field of psychosociology, with only a very limited presence in literary studies.

The concept of collective subjectivity of literary characters appears in two of Mario Vargas Llosa's essays (1997, 63; 2000, 35). He employs it as a key to the analysis of the narrator's point of view in Alejo Carpentier's *The Kingdom of This World* (which happens to be one of the novels that served as a starting point for my own reflection). In the book, the narrator adopts the perspective of a collectivity of Haitian Vodou practitioners, who believe in François Macandal's magical powers. In the scene of Macandal's execution (Carpentier 1989, 36–38), the narrator relates, unquestioningly, the revolutionary leader's transformation into a mosquito, which lets him liberate himself, although he was actually executed (both in the novel and in the real-world history). As the Nobel Prize-winning novelist explains, by adopting the perspective of Mackandal's followers, the narrator carries out "the displacement towards that *collective subjectivity*"[1] [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Vargas Llosa 2000, 35), thereby producing a point of view (in terms of "level of reality"), which Vargas Llosa describes as an "incredible technical achievement" (2002, 84–85).

Similarly, in *Sea of Death*, the characters—although they are actually looking at Lívia, a human protagonist—collectively believe that they are seeing the sea goddess

[1] In original: "el desplazamiento hacia aquella subjetividad colectiva".

Iemanjá. This perception renders the "miracle" possible, not as an objective event, but as a result of the collective subjectivity through which it is experienced. The narrator does not question the "miracle." He conveys the perspective of the "sea people." Thus, the theme, style, and level of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate the novel, and the plane of reality on which the story takes place, are so harmonized that the reader can have a sensation of deep immersion in the narrated reality. It is important to note here, however, that a collective subjectivity does not necessarily have to be characterized by marvelousness, spirituality, or faith-based thinking (as in Mario Vargas Llosa's conception). "Subjective" does not mean "untrue." It can simply be different from the hegemonic "objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61) or from any other subjectivity.

Apart from Vargas Llosa, also science fiction writer and critic Gérard Klein (2011), inspired by the literary work of H.P. Lovecraft, has partially discerned the potential of the concept for the study of narrative fiction. Nevertheless, even though their contributions are very valuable, they are neither academic nor exhaustive. It is to address this gap that the present study not only theorizes the concept in a more systematic manner but also develops an analysis methodology, conducts a model analysis of Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*, and assesses the concept's applicability within the field of literary studies and, more broadly, narratology.

Although the phenomenon of collective subjectivity of literary characters is present in numerous works by Jorge Amado, to test the applicability of the proposed theoretical-methodological framework, this study focuses primarily on *Sea of Death* (*Mar Morto*), a Brazilian novel (1936) that offers exceptionally fertile ground for examining collective subjectivity. The work was selected due to its pronounced focus on collectivity, its sociological perspective, its engagement with the representation of a marginalized social group and its counter-hegemonic perspective, and the fact that it was written in a period of an intense ideological polarization, of intense disputes regarding the Brazilian identity (Candido 1984), and, therefore, of intense discursive struggles, which constitute an important aspect of collective subjectivity. Moreover, *Sea of Death* features a richly constructed collective protagonist, whose subjectivity is conveyed through a wide range of narrative strategies, making it an exemplary case for model analysis. Nevertheless, occasional references to other works will support and enrich my argumentation. Lastly, although I analyzed the original

versions of the novels rather than their translations, I also provide English translations of selected passages to maintain the clarity of the discussion.

It is important to emphasize, however, that the primary objective of this dissertation has been the development of the theoretical-methodological framework itself.[2] The analysis of *Sea of Death* has served primarily as a test case—intended to assess whether the proposed framework functions effectively in practice and whether the concept of collective subjectivity can serve as a valuable and universal analytical tool. The research findings it has yielded demonstrate that the framework is well-suited for the analysis of *Sea of Death* and that, in principle, its applicability is universal, extending not only beyond this particular novel but also beyond the work of Jorge Amado and Brazilian literature more broadly. My study confirms that the use of the concept as an analytical tool can shed new light on our understanding of literary works (especially those with a collective protagonist), particularly regarding such issues as focalization, perspective, viewpoint, voice, ideology, unreliable narration, speech categories, collective narrative agents, consciousness representation, discursive struggles, or characterization. In addition, my framework enables us to: 1) describe precisely the particularities of the ideological profile of a fictional collectivity and the narrator's/implied author's attitude towards it; 2) relate this profile to the context systematically.

In this dissertation, I will answer the following research questions: What is the collective subjectivity of literary characters? How should one analyze it? In what ways can it affect a novel's narrative elements? Does it have considerable potential to increase our understanding of the process of the discursive legitimation (or delegitimation) of the "other" through literature? How is the collective subjectivity of literary characters constructed in *Sea of Death*? What was its role in the discursive struggles of the Getúlio Vargas Era (1930–1945) in Brazil? Furthermore, by way of conclusion, I will assess how the use of the concept can be profitable for narrative scholars.

[2] I would like to acknowledge that an earlier version of the theoretical-methodological framework developed in this dissertation was partially presented in my article "Collective Subjectivity of Literary Characters as Exemplified by Jorge Amado's Marginalized Figures" (Chmiel 2023), published in *O Eixo e a Roda: Revista de Literatura Brasileira*. While the article introduces some of the key concepts explored here, it remains limited in scope due to space constraints and therefore offers a less comprehensive study. Several passages from that publication—revised and expanded—have been incorporated into this dissertation.

Since analyzing a fictional collective subjectivity requires interdisciplinary, custom-made theoretical-methodological framework, I have elaborated it, correspondingly with the needs of my study, on the basis of the principles of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory (2001 [1985]), Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (Carpentier, De Cleen 2007; Carpentier, Spinoy 2008; Carpentier 2010; 2017), the psychosociological framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019), and narratological findings regarding Possible Worlds Theory (Pavel 1986; Doležel 1988; 1998; Ryan 1991) and fictional minds (Palmer 2004; 2010).

Regarding Possible Worlds Theory and fictional minds, since the object of my research is the CS of literary characters, it was crucial to define the notion of *character* first. At this point, it became necessary to draw on Alan Palmer's—important yet underexplored within narratology—theoretical framework (2004; 2010). He drew on one of Uri Margolin's (1989) definitions, according to which a fictional character is a non-actual individual, a hypothetical being "designated by means of referring expressions," who is understood as a "member of some non-actual state of affairs or possible world" (1989, 4). Such an approach is relevant for my theoretical framework, mainly because of the possibility of ascribing mental properties to fictional characters. Furthermore, although Palmer acknowledges the importance of the issues of ideology in the context of fictional minds, he notes that such concerns lie "well beyond the scope of [his] book" (2010, 48). My study, at least in part, also addresses this research gap.

The psycho-sociological framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis, in turn, provided an essential conceptual basis for developing an approach tailored to fictional contexts. My definition of the CS concept constitutes an adaptation of Fernando Fabris' (2012, 32–33) psycho-sociological definition to the field of literary studies. This adaptation was necessary because, although fictional collective subjectivities share several analogies with their real-world counterparts, they are ontologically distinct. Nevertheless, insights from psycho-sociological research offer valuable points of reference that enrich the literary application of the concept.

Furthermore, I have chosen Discourse Theory and Discourse-Theoretical Analysis because they allow for an examination of how the features of the collective subjectivity correlate with aspects of social, historical, political, economic, cultural, and daily life

processes. This approach (alarmingly absent in literary studies) enables the interpretation of data in relation to context and the comparison of different discourses, and, where applicable, facilitates understanding of the points at which they enter into antagonistic opposition.

This dissertation is divided into three main chapters, each of which serves a distinct function in the development of my argument and the presentation of my theoretical and analytical contributions. Chapter One reviews the state of research. It is structured around four main areas: 1) existing uses of the concept of collective subjectivity in literary studies and psychosociology; 2) theoretical tools from narratology—especially Possible Worlds Theory, Alan Palmer's fictional minds framework, and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory; 3) Jorge Amado's work; and 4) Vargas-era hegemonic discourse. In addition, the chapter offers a more detailed discussion on the theoretical gaps the dissertation addresses.

Chapter Two defines the collective subjectivity of literary characters and synthesizes contributions from narratology, psychosociology, and Discourse Theory to propose a coherent framework for its identification and systematic analysis. First, it discusses the most relevant aspects of the Possible Worlds Theory, Alan Palmer's fictional minds framework, Uri Margolin's concept of collective narrative agents, the real-world collective subjectivity analysis framework, and Discourse Theory. Subsequently, it reflects on what kind of literary works are suitable for analysis, on the compatibility of the theoretical and methodological perspectives I present in this chapter, on how they can be synthesized, and how the product of such a synthesis can be applied in practice.

Chapter Three applies the proposed framework to a model analysis of Jorge Amado's novel. First, it offers a justification for the selection of *Sea of Death*. Then, it outlines briefly Brazil's pre-republican history and, with more detail, the history of Brazilian social thought of the 19th and 20th-century leading intellectuals. I examine the relation between their ideas and the factual social reality in order to analyze the hegemonic discourse that was in force both in the years more immediately preceding and throughout the period in which Jorge Amado wrote *Sea of Death*. Afterward, the chapter discusses a counter-hegemonic discourse articulated by the social novels from the Nordeste region that were written by the representatives of the Brazilian modernism's second phase (1930–1945), of the so-called "Generation of '30" (Jorge Amado was one of its most important exponents—next to

Graciliano Ramos, Rachel de Queiroz, and José Lins do Rego). In the chapter, I also discuss Jorge Amado's work and offer a concise overview of the most relevant aspects of Candomblé religion, since a proper understanding of the themes explored in *Sea of Death* requires some knowledge on this matter. Lastly, I conduct a practical analysis of the novel itself.

The dissertation closes with a reflection on the study's analytical, methodological, and theoretical contributions, identifying avenues for future research and potential applications of the proposed framework in broader narratological contexts.

Finally, the theorization of collective subjectivity proposed in this study may be regarded as a typological contribution to the study of fictional minds. While the proliferation of new terms and concepts in literary theory is sometimes criticized as unnecessary or excessive, introducing new analytical categories can be both legitimate and necessary when they designate phenomena that existing frameworks fail to capture with precision. As Brian McHale—a leading narrative scholar—observes, "we should not underestimate the usefulness of 'mere' typology. Before a phenomenon can be explained it must first exist for those who would explain it, which means that it must be constituted as a category with boundaries and a name" (1981, 185).

1. State of research

1.1 Other collective subjectivity concept uses

While the analyses of such writers and literature theoreticians as Mario Vargas Llosa (1997; 2000) and Gérard Klein (2011) constitute an important point of reference for determining what we already know and what should be established in this matter, the psycho-sociological findings regarding the real-world collective subjectivities provide valuable observations that may serve as inspiration to fill the research gaps in literary studies. An examination of other CS concept uses should shed more light upon the purpose of reconceptualizing it and upon its history in the context of literary studies.

1.1.1 Mario Vargas Llosa's *subjetividad colectiva*

Those who do not believe in saints cannot be cured by the miracles of saints.

— Alejo Carpentier, *The Kingdom of This World*

According to the results of my study, the first use of the concept of collective subjectivity as a tool for literary analysis can be found in Mario Vargas Llosa's *Cartas a un joven novelista* (1997, 63)[3]. It is a book in which the Nobel Prize-winning novelist teaches aspiring writers about the inner workings of fiction. In the chapter dedicated to the "levels of reality," the author describes the same phenomenon I have observed in Carpentier's *The Kingdom of This World* and Amado's *Sea of Death* (and afterwards, in other narrative art works as well).

For him, it is closely related to the notion of point of view. As he explains:

> the point of view in terms of level of reality is the relationship between the level, or plane, of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate the novel and the plane of reality on

[3] In the English version of the book, *Letters to a Young Novelist* (2002), "*subjetividad colectiva"* (literally: "collective subjectivity") has been translated from Spanish, by Natasha Wimmer, as "subjective group consciousness" (85).

> which the story takes place. As with space and time, the planes occupied by the narrator and by the story may coincide or they may be different, and it is their relationship that determines the kind of fiction that is produced (2002, 73–74).

Interestingly, after that, Mario Vargas Llosa (2002, 84–86) examines the level of reality that predominates in *The Kingdom of This World*. In his view, although Alejo Carpentier's novel should be situated in the fantastic, not the realist camp, it cannot be indisputably classified as such. The story contains events that are not conceivable in our world, but at the same time, it has much in common with the real-life, historical events in Haiti. Moreover, it does not break with reality in an evident, explicit way:

> Carpentier's novel is grounded in a plane of unreality associated with myth or legend; in this plane, "real" historical acts or characters undergo an "unreal" transformation when acted upon by faith or beliefs that give the fantastic text a kind of objective legitimacy. Myths explicate reality in terms of particular religious or philosophical convictions; all myths possess, besides their imaginary or fantastic element, an objective historical context. This determines their place in a subjective group consciousness [*una subjetividad colectiva*, in original version of the text (Vargas Llosa 1997, 63)] that pretends to impose (and often succeeds in imposing) itself on reality […]. The incredible technical achievement of *The Kingdom of This World* is the point of view in terms of level of reality that Carpentier creates. The story often unfolds on a mythical or legendary plane—the first level of fantastic literature or the last of realism—and is narrated by an impersonal narrator who, though he doesn't establish himself entirely on that same level, comes very close to it, brushing up against it, so that the distance he maintains from his material is small enough to almost make us live inside the myths and legends of his story and yet unequivocal enough to make us realize that what we are being told is not objective reality but rather a reality undone by the credulity of a town that has not given up magic, witchcraft, or irrational practices, although on the outside it seems to have embraced the rationalism of the colonizers from whom it is emancipated (2002, 84–85).

Subsequently, Mario Vargas Llosa (2000) elaborated on this idea, by dedicating a whole essay, "¿Lo real maravilloso o artimañas literarias?" ["The marvelous real or literary

trickeries?"; transl.—E. Ch.], to the analysis of this phenomenon. In the essay, he explains how the Haitian Vodou religion's principles affect the level of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate (interestingly, in Jorge Amado's novels, this level of reality is often affected by the principles of Candomblé, an Afro-Brazilian religion, which shares its origins with the Haitian Vodou). He provides a very illustrative example from the novel, in which the narrator adopts the perspective of a collectivity of Vodou practitioners, whose collective subjectivity is characterized by their belief in François Macandal's magical powers. In the scene of Macandal's execution (Carpentier 1989, 36–38), the narrator relates, unquestioningly, the revolutionary leader's transformation into a mosquito, which lets him liberate himself, although he was actually (both in the novel and in the real-world history) executed. As Vargas Llosa explains, by adopting the perspective of Mackandal's followers, the narrator begins "the displacement towards that *collective subjectivity*"[4] [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Vargas Llosa, 2000, 35). This is how it is reflected in the scene in question:

> What did the whites know of Negro matters? In his cycle of metamorphoses, Macandal had often entered the mysterious world of the insects […]. He had been fly, centipede, moth, ant, tarantula, ladybug, even a glow-worm with phosphorescent green lights. When the moment came, the bonds of the Mandingue, no longer possessing a body to bind, would trace the shape of a man in the air for a second before they slipped down the post. And Macandal, transformed into a buzzing mosquito, would light on the very tricorne of the commander of the troops to laugh at the dismay of the whites. This was what their masters did not know; for that reason they had squandered so much money putting on this useless show, which would prove how completely helpless they were against a man chrismed by the great Loas. […] The bonds fell off and the body of the Negro rose in the air, flying overhead, until it plunged into the black waves of the sea of slaves. A single cry filled the square: 'Macandal saved!' (Carpentier 1989, 36–37).

It is important to notice that Alejo Carpentier himself explored and exposed this collective subjectivity purposefully, and that it constituted a crucial element of the novel that

[4] In original: "el desplazamiento hacia aquella subjetividad colectiva".

is considered the first marvelous-realist literary work. Although without using exactly this term, he commented it in his foundational prologue to *The Kingdom of This World*:

> After feeling the in no way false enchantment of this Haitian earth, […] I was moved to compare this marvelous reality I'd just been living with the exhaustingly vain attempts to arouse the marvelous that characterize certain European literatures of these last thirty years. […] the marvelous begins to be marvelous in an unequivocal way when it arises from an unexpected alteration of reality (a miracle), from a privileged revelation of reality, from an illumination that is either unusual or singularly favorable to the unnoticed riches of reality, from an amplification of the scale and categories of reality perceived with particular intensity by means of an exaltation of the spirit that leads it to a kind of "limit-state." In the first place, the sensation of the marvelous presupposes a faith. Those who do not believe in saints cannot be cured by the miracles of saints […]. All of that became particularly evident to me during my stay in Haiti, where I found myself in daily contact with something we could call *the real marvelous* [emphasis in original]. I was treading earth where thousands of men eager for liberty believed in Mackandal's lycanthropic powers, to the point that their *collective faith* [emphasis added] produced a miracle the day of his execution. […] I also realized that the presence and authority of the real marvelous was not a privilege unique to Haiti but the patrimony of all the Americas, where, for example, a census of cosmogonies is still to be established. […] The text that follows […] responds to this order of concerns. […] It allows the marvelous to flow freely from a reality followed strictly in all its details (Carpentier 1993, *Prologue*).

As we can observe, Alejo Carpentier points out only the "collective faith" as a factor that determined the perception and actions of the characters. Mario Vargas Llosa, in turn, mentions faith, beliefs, credulity, and irrationality. Even though their analyses are very valuable, they are neither academic nor exhaustive. They have not proposed any theoretical explanation of what the collective subjectivity of literary characters is and how it can affect the narrative elements (not only the narrator's point of view). Moreover, they have not proposed any methodology for analyzing it systematically, and they have not contemplated the fact that it does not have to be necessarily irrational to constitute an interesting object of study (which is perfectly understandable, considering the non-academic character of their texts).

1.1.2 Gérard Klein's *subjectivité collective*

The potential of using the concept of CS in literary studies has also been noticed by the French essayist and science fiction writer Gérard Klein (2011 [1986]) and, subsequently, by a group of scholars (Bellagamba, Picholle, Tron 2012) inspired by Klein's essay *Trames & Moirés: à la recherche d'autres sujets, les subjectivités collectives*.

Although—similarly to Mario Varas Llosa's "letter" and article—the text does not have an academic character, the metaphorical reflections of a practitioner (inspired by psychoanalysis and the literary work of H.P. Lovecraft) present some valuable observations.

As Simon Bréan explains, Klein's concept of collective subjectivity refers to

> *products, of variable size and coherence, of all the processes of intersubjectivity […]. It applies both to the social groups, united by common representations and convergent interests, and to the individuals, considered nodes* of *intersection of constantly evolving representations. [The collective subjectivities] constitute, in a way, the passive support of exchanges between subjects and represent everything that escapes the will* (Bréan 2012, 34) [transl.—E. Ch.].[5]

Regarding the phenomenon's relation with literature, in turn, Klein claims that the collective subjectivity analysis that he proposes

> does not reveal the hidden meaning of the artwork, but it uses the artwork to make visible, through this object, an aspect of the social process that would have remained silent without it.

[5] In original: "produits, de taille et de cohérence variables, de tous les processus d'intersubjectivité […]. Il s'applique aussi bien aux groupes sociaux, unis par des représentations communes et des centres d'intérêts convergents, qu'aux individus, considérés comme des nœuds d'entrecroisement de représentations en perpétuelle évolution. [Les subjectivités collectives] constituent en quelque sorte le support passif des échanges entre sujets et représentent tout ce qui échappe à la volonté."

> It uses the artwork as a prism that decomposes light and invites us to look not at the prism but the spectrum (Klein 2011, 20–21) [transl.—E. Ch.].[6]

His idea is that the subjectivity of an individual is also conditioned by the social factors that are independent of him and, for this reason, an artwork of some writer can tell us—indirectly, unintentionally—a lot about his social group. It is revealed in what he writes, because his subjectivity is conditioned by a larger subjectivity, a collective subjectivity. In other words, Klein suggests that an author's work is not merely an individual creation but is deeply embedded in the collective experiences shared by the group to which the author belongs. He argues that literature, rather than expressing a solitary mind, reflects a collective subjectivity.

As such, CS does not necessarily have to be characterized by marvelousness or faith-based thinking (as in Mario Vargas Llosa's conception). "Subjective" does not mean "untrue." It can simply be different from other subjectivities.

Klein and his successors noticeably focused only on the social, extrafictional level (on the collective subjectivity of the writer's social group). They have not reflected on the literary characters' CS and its importance on the storyworld level. Moreover, they have not elaborated any methodology for analyzing collective subjectivity, on any level. Finally, Klein himself stated that he had not defined a fully operative concept and that he had only indicated to the researchers "the direction in which to look" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Bellagamba, Picholle, Tron 15). Although his successors presented some interesting observations, they did not define a fully operative concept either.

1.1.3 Fernando Fabris' *subjetividad colectiva*

The concept's theorization is much more robust in the psycho-sociological field. Although the real-world collective subjectivity analysis is very different, it can serve as a

[6] In original: "ne restitue pas la signification cachée de l'œuvre, mais elle utilise l'œuvre pour faire apercevoir à travers cet objet un aspect du processus social qui, sans elle, serait demeuré muet. Elle se sert de l'œuvre comme d'un prisme qui décompose la lumière, et elle invite à regarder non pas le prisme, mais le spectre."

source of valuable inspiration for theorizing the concept in the narratological context and elaborating an analysis methodology.

According to Fernando Fabris' findings, which draw mainly on the work of Enrique Pichon-Rivière (1975), the concept accounts for the common denominators of the subjective structure of the members of a particular social group. Collective subjectivity encompasses the common denominator of their way of thinking, feeling, and acting, and is determined by socio-historical processes, everyday life, identification with social ideals, collective memory and projects, beliefs, positive or negative social experiences, and the group's acceptation or repudiation of public figures, among others (Fabris 2012, 32–33).

The concept does not stand for any abstract totality. A CS does not denote an "Us." As Fabris explains:

> The existence of the common denominators that let us define it, does not presuppose any reduction of the infinite variety of the individual or group subjectivities that constitute it […]. The collective subjectivity is an open system, a dynamic totality which is relative to other dynamic totalities and implies not equilibrium, but equilibrations and reequilibrations (Fabris 2012, 34, transl.—E. Ch.)[7]

In *Subjetividad colectiva y realidad social. Una metodología de análisis* (2019), Fernando Fabris, Silvia Puccini, and Mario Cambiaso elaborated a very complete and convincing framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis. This framework can be adapted to the needs of narratology and thus let us analyze the narratives systematically, with a coherent conceptual framework and defined ways of collecting, organizing, contextualizing, and interpreting the data.

1.1.4 Conclusions

The concept of collective subjectivity has been explored in both psycho-sociological and literary analysis. Despite previous efforts by Mario Vargas Llosa, Gérard Klein, and Klein's successors to address aspects of CS within literature, their contributions, while valuable, remain incomplete and non-systematic. Vargas Llosa's exploration of collective

[7] In original: "La existencia de denominadores comunes que permiten definirla, no supone una reducción de la variedad infinita de subjetividades individuales o grupales que la conforman […]. La subjetividad colectiva es un sistema abierto, una totalidad dinámica relativa a otras totalidades dinámicas e implica no tanto equilibrio como equilibraciones y reequilibraciones."

subjectivity primarily focuses on the narrative perspective influenced by cultural and religious beliefs, whereas Klein emphasizes the influence of an author's social context on their work, without providing a theoretical or methodological framework.

Fernando Fabris, Silvia Puccini, and Mario Cambiaso offer a more robust theorization and methodological approach within the psycho-sociological field. Their work—which delineates collective subjectivity as the common denominator in the subjective structure of the members of a social group—provides a valuable theoretical foundation and a systematic method that can be adapted to literary studies. Thus, it lets us analyze narratives systematically, with a coherent conceptual framework and defined ways of collecting, organizing, contextualizing, and interpreting the data.

Such adaptation addresses the research gaps that can be deduced from Mario Vargas Llosa's and Klein's texts, as well as from Carpentier's *The Kingdom of This World* and Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*.

1.2 Narratology

The concept of collective subjectivity is clearly related to such narratological issues as perspective, viewpoint, focalization, voice, speech categories, ideology, narrative empathy, collective narrative agents, unreliable narration, consciousness representation, and characterization.

These categories have already been deeply explored by several foundational academics, whose work has significantly contributed to the field (Vladimir Propp, Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal, Wayne C. Booth, David Herman, Lubomir Doležel or Marie-Laure Ryan, among others). Their legacy has been systematized in the publication *The Living Handbook of Narratology* (Hühn, Pier, Schmid, Schönert), which its authors called "living" because of its dynamic nature.

LHN is based on the *Handbook of Narratology* (Hühn, Pier, Schmid, Schönert 2009). Apart from mirroring the content of the latest print version in an open-source online publication, its authors wanted the *LHN* to be an instrument for producing updated versions of the print ones. Thanks to its continuous updates and quality control conducted by leading

narrative scholars, it became one of the most often cited narratological resources. As such, it has served as an important reference point for my study.

However, in the field of narratology, there are also research streams, that are not part of well-established findings and approaches (especially in the context of literary studies), such as Alan Palmer's (2004) fictional minds approach and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's (2001 [1985]) Discourse Theory. Since they can shed new light on the previously mentioned narratological issues (which correlate with the concept of collective subjectivity), they are of vital importance for my study.

1.2.1 Alan Palmer's fictional minds

In his book, *Fictional Minds*, Alan Palmer (2004) suggests that the reader understands novels mainly by following the functioning of the minds of their characters. He demonstrates that, despite the importance of this aspect of the reading process, traditional narratology had not elaborated any complete theory of fictional minds. Palmer addresses this issue with an innovative, interdisciplinary project, which makes use not only of the narrative theory, but also "real-mind" disciplines such as psychology, cognitive science, philosophy, or psycholinguistics.

In his theoretical framework, he draws on one of Uri Margolin's (1989) definitions, according to which a fictional character is a "non-actual being who exists in a possible world and who can be ascribed physical, social, and mental properties" (Palmer 2004, 38). Such a definition relies on Possible Worlds Theory, which has been introduced into narratology by Lubomír Doležel (1998), Thomas Pavel (1986), and Marie-Laure Ryan (1991). As Doležel states, from "the viewpoint of the reader, the fictional text can be characterized as a set of instructions according to which the fictional world is to be recovered and reassembled" (1988, 489). Hence, storyworlds are possible worlds constructed by language, and the characters, in turn, are non-actual individuals who "inhabit" them. In other words, fictional minds refer to the mental constructs of characters within a narrative, encompassing their perception, cognition, dispositions, feelings, beliefs, and emotions as portrayed through the text.

Such an approach is relevant for my theoretical framework, especially because of the possibility of ascribing mental properties to fictional characters, which results in an illusion of fictional minds.

Importantly, Palmer explains that he decided to name his book *Fictional Minds*, instead *The Presentation of Consciousness in the Novel*, for example, to indicate that fictional minds should be considered a new subject area within narratology, and not just a single study. Although Palmer's findings provoked both admiration and criticism of certain aspects of his work, they did manage to draw attention to the fact that fictional minds are indeed an important subject area within narrative theory and should be explored in a greater degree. It has reflected in the publication of a whole volume of *Style* journal—vol. 45, no. 2, 2011—dedicated exclusively to the discussion on Alan Palmer's theory and also in *The Living Handbook of Narratology* (Jannidis), in which we can read that

> Until recently, there was nothing like a coherent field of research for the concept of character, but only a loose set of notions related to it (…). The situation has changed over the past ten or fifteen years thanks to a series of monographs on character by Culpeper (2001), Eder (2008), Jannidis (2004), Koch (1992), Palmer (2004), and Schneider (2001).

It is noteworthy that one of the main criticisms was aimed at his concept of social mind, which might be confused with the one of collective subjectivity. Palmer's idea of a "collective mind"—which refers to a group-based thinking, feeling, and acting—has been convincingly criticized by Patrick Colm Hogan (2011) and Manfred Jahn (2011). CS, however, does not presuppose any "collective mind" or "intermental thought." Once again, it solely encompasses the *common denominator* of the way of thinking, feeling, and acting of the members of a collectivity. In addition, analyzing a collective subjectivity does not imply *knowing* what a character thinks—Palmer's approach has also been criticized by Manfred Jahn (2011) and Emma Kafalenos (2011), precisely for this reason. In my view, these differences make the collective subjectivity idea less disputable. Moreover, they also shift the analytical focus to different issues from the storyworlds we study.

The most important issue is the ideological one. Thanks to the Discourse-Theoretical methodology, the results of a CS analysis enable us to describe very precisely and systematically the particularities of the ideological profile of a collectivity. For Palmer, who admits the importance of the issues of ideology in the context of fictional minds, they are "well beyond the scope of [his] book" (2010, 48).

1.2.2 Discourse-Theoretical Analysis

The last pillars of my theoretical and methodological framework for analyzing a fictional collective subjectivity are Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's (2001 [1985]) Discourse Theory and the Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (Carpentier, De Cleen 2007; Carpentier, Spinoy 2008; Carpentier 2010; 2017).

Thanks to them, the results of a CS analysis enable us to describe very precisely and systematically the particularities of the ideological profile of a collectivity (as well as its other, non-ideological aspects) and to answer in detail such questions as: "what different understandings of reality are at stake, where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another?" and to show "how each discourse constitutes knowledge and reality, identities and social relations" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 51).

Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory (DT) can be used in such analysis, thanks to Carpentier and De Cleen (2007), who rearticulated it as an analytical framework, mainly by using its concepts as sensitizing concepts (Blumer, 1969), i.e. concepts which suggest what to look for and where to look, which provide starting points for building an analysis. Their Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (DTA) "conceptual toolbox" consists of the following sensitizing concepts: discourse, discursive field, articulation, nodal point, floating signifier, dynamics of fixity and unfixity, chain/logic of equivalence (or difference), conflict, antagonism, hegemony, new objectivity, myth, social imaginary, and contingency, among others.

Noteworthily, since DTA has a process-oriented focus, which prevents one from reducing the tensions and contradictions surfacing in the image of subjects to incidental inconsistencies (Van linthout 2008, 344–351), this approach can contribute to a broader understanding not only of the result, but also of the complex process of the discursive

legitimation (or delegitimation) of subjects through literary narratives. The emphasis is on *how* the narratives mean, rather than on *what* they mean.

While the application of Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory (DT) is common in political studies and occasional in media studies, "it is virtually nonexistent in the realm of literary and art studies" (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 18). After Carpentier and Spinoy convincingly explained the importance and appropriateness of filling this research gap (2008, 1–21)—which was confirmed in the following chapters of their book by the results of four literary analyses[8]—the situation hardly changed: so far, I have found only two articles that attempted to fractionally fill the gap. Their authors confirm the persistence of this situation (Mehrmotlagh, Beyad 2018a, 140; 2018b, 4).

Thus, such undertakings would be part of an interdisciplinary research stream that applies DT in its analyses of culture and media, but still somewhat neglects the narrative arts, despite its awareness of the necessity of filling this gap (cf. *Communication and Discourse Theory: Collected Works of the Brussels Discourse Theory Group*, edited by Nico Carpentier, Benjamin De Cleen, and Leen Van Brussel, in 2019).

1.2.3 Conclusions

The concept of collective subjectivity intersects with various narratological issues, including perspective, viewpoint, focalization, voice, speech categories, ideology, narrative empathy, collective narrative agents, unreliable narration, consciousness representation, and characterization: categories that have been thoroughly explored by such narratologists as Vladimir Propp, Gérard Genette, Mieke Bal, Wayne C. Booth, David Herman, Lubomir Doležel or Marie-Laure Ryan, among others.

Nevertheless, to fully understand certain aspects of collective subjectivities, it is also necessary to make use of approaches that are not part of well-established (in the context of

[8] The four examples of DTA application in literary studies include: 1) an analysis of John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* and its agonistic relation with the authoritarian order of its time (Sim 2008); 2) a study of the counter-hegemonic potential of Franz Kafka's and Thomas Mann's literature (Bru 2008); 3) an analysis of Nazi efforts to incorporate Flemish literature into their hegemonic project (Spinoy 2008); 4) a reflection on how literary history could be rewritten from the perspective of DTA (Van Linthout 2008). As we can observe, all of them have focused only on the extrafictional level, and not on fictional discourses and discursive struggles *within* a storyworld.

literary studies) findings or frameworks: Alan Palmer's (2004) fictional minds approach and Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's (2001 [1985]) Discourse Theory.

Concerning the fictional minds—which turned out to be an important, yet underexplored subject area within narrative theory—my study brings a less disputable, in my opinion, alternative to Palmer's "collective mind," which has been convincingly criticized by Patrick Colm Hogan (2011) and Manfred Jahn (2011). It also enables us to describe very precisely and systematically the particularities of the ideological profile of a collectivity, which, for Palmer, who admits the importance of the issues of ideology in the context of fictional minds, was "well beyond the scope of [his] book" (2010, 48).

Regarding Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory, in turn—rearticulated as Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (DTA), that provides a robust methodological framework for analyzing the ideological dimensions of collective subjectivities—my study addresses a gap in an interdisciplinary research stream, which applies DT in its analyses of culture and media (Carpentier, De Cleen, Van Brussel 2019), but rather neglects the narrative arts (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 1–21).

1.3 Jorge Amado's work

Jorge Amado is considered by many as "the most read or best-known writer in Brazil and the best-known Brazilian writer to the rest of the world" (Silva 2018, 199). According to data from Jorge Amado's House Foundation official website (Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, "Jorge Amado. Biografia"), his books were translated into 49 languages, adapted into countless films, theatrical works, and TV programs. In 2019, Goldstein (20) estimated that, until 1997, around thirty million copies of Amado's books were sold in Brazil, and between nine and twenty million abroad.

Due to this popularity (which will be explored in greater detail in Chapter 3.2.2), the bibliography on Jorge Amado and his work consists of hundreds of publications (or even thousands, if we count the journalistic ones). In the CAPES' (Brazilian Federal Agency for Support and Evaluation of Graduate Education) Catalogue of Theses and Dissertations, I have found 44 PhD dissertations and almost one hundred master's theses on this subject—not only from the fields of Literary Studies, but also History, Geography, Law and

Education (the catalogue does not include papers written abroad, in other languages). Many of them, together with numerous articles, monographs, edited volumes, conference proceedings, and journalistic materials, can be consulted at Jorge Amado's House Foundation, in Salvador (Bahia), where I have conducted a part of my research.

These works cover a large variety of subjects: author's life and his political engagement (e.g. *Jorge Amado: entre engajamento e a militância comunista (1929–1956)*, by Matheus de Mesquita e Pontes, or *História e memória da trajetória político-intelectual de Jorge Amado*, by Carolina Fernandes Calixto), socio-historical context (e.g. *De Honório a Archanjo: Jorge Amado, questão racial e formação nacional*, by Carla de Fátima Cordeiro), Brazilian and international reception (e.g. *Jorge Amado: The International Projection of the Brazilian Writer* and *O rumor das cartas: um estudo da recepção de Jorge Amado*, by Márcia Rios da Silva), cultural identities (e.g. *Tradição, tradução, hibridismo e resistência da identidade afro-brasileira na literatura amadiana*, by Aline Santos de Brito Nascimento), memory (e.g. *Memória e recepção em "Terras do Sem Fim", de Jorge Amado*, by José Otávio Monteiro Badaró Santos), issues raised by Translation Studies (e.g. *Pilar do comunismo ou um escritor exótico? Estudo descritivo das traduções polonesas da obra de Jorge Amado*, by Jarosław Jacek Jeździkowski), by Discourse Studies (e.g. *Processos de subjetivação no discurso religioso de matriz africana em textos de Jorge Amado*, by Mariângela Castejon), Literary History (e.g. *A tradição do romance picaresco e a obra de Jorge Amado*, by Denise Dias), Comparative Literature Studies (e.g. *Representações da infância ultrajada e da criança-herói: uma leitura de Charles Dickens e Jorge Amado*, by Luis de Melo Diniz), and by Food Studies (e.g. *(Re)leituras gastronômicas: o não-dito da comida em "Dona Flor e Seus Dois Maridos" e "Gabriela, Cravo e Canela"*, by Anna Carolina Deodato da Silva), among many others.

It is worth noting that, currently, one of the most valuable and dynamic platforms for exchanging ideas on Amadian literature is the online, international event Webinário Estudos Amadianos, which also publishes voluminous and diverse conference proceedings after each edition (e.g., *III Webinário Estudos Amadianos: 110 anos de nascimento de Jorge Amado*, edited by Gildeci de Oliveira Leite, Filismina Fernandes Saraiva, Thiago Martins Caldas Prado).

Most of the literature on Jorge Amado is written in Portuguese language, but there are also such books as *Jorge Amado: New Critical Essays*, edited by Earl Fitz, Keith Brower, and Enrique Vidal Martinez (Routledge, 2013), *Jorge Amado: lectures et dialogues autour d'une oeuvre*, edited by Rita Olivieri Godet and Jacqueline Penjon (Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2005) or *Jorge Amado. Relectura en su centenario*, edited by Ascensión Rivas Hernández (Universidad de Salamanca, 2013).

Particularly relevant for my research were the publications that analyze Amado's novels with heightened attention to the sociohistorical context (e.g. *Jorge Amado: romance em tempo de utopia*, by Eduardo de Assis Duarte, or *As cores da revolução: a literatura de Jorge Amado nos anos 30*, by Luiz Gustavo Freitas Rossi) and to their relation with other novels and ideas from the same period (e.g. *Uma História do Romance de 30*, by Luís Bueno), as well as the papers concerning specifically Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death* (e.g., "A study of intertextuality and mythology in Jorge Amado's *Mar Morto*," by Ebenezer Adedeji Omoteso, "Uma releitura de *Mar Morto*," by Luís Bueno, "Amado Axé de *Mar Morto*," by Gildeci de Oliveira Leite, or "A recriação do mito de Iemanjá e Orungã: uma leitura do romance *Mar Morto*, de Jorge Amado," by José Benedito dos Santos). The present state of research on these subjects turned out to be very complete, which enabled me to conduct my study with all the necessary data.

Regarding my contribution to Amadian Studies, in turn, it will consist of an interpretational work that has been carried out through the lens of an unprecedented framework and, as a result, has pointed out an important element of multiple Amadian storyworlds (the collective subjectivity of marginalized characters) and its considerable impact on them.

1.4 Vargas-era hegemonic discourse

Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death* (1936) was published in the so-called Getúlio Vargas Era (1930–1945[9]), a watershed period of Brazilian history. Since one of the main objects of my study is the relation between the collective subjectivity of Jorge Amado's marginalized

[9] Six years after this period, Getúlio Vargas was elected by direct vote and served as President of the Republic from 1951 until 1954, when he took his own life.

characters and the hegemonic discourse of Vargas-era Brazil, I have also explored the literature on this particular context.

Paradoxically, the hegemonic discourse of the Vargas Era cannot be identified with the Vargas regime's discourse (the reasons for that are explored in Chapter 3.2). It should instead be identified with a discourse whose origins date back to the colonial period, with what Mariusz Malinowski names "the brigantine cultural heritage" (2011, 134–160).

Hence, it has been necessary to study not only the Vargas-era sociohistorical context but also the previous history of Brazil. The subject has been partially covered in the publications I have mentioned in the previous section, from the Literary Studies field, but I have consulted specific sources as well, from the field of Social Sciences. Also in this case, the present state of research turned out to be very complete and enabled me to describe the hegemonic discourse of Vargas-era Brazil with all the necessary data and interpretations.

I have studied works on concrete historical events (*História do Brasil*, by Boris Fausto, *Brazylia: republika. Dzieje Brazylii w latach 1889–2010*, by Mariusz Malinowski, or *A History of Brazil*, by Joseph Smith and Francisco Vinhosa), but also on the history of ideas (e.g. *W poszukiwaniu brazylijskości. Główne nurty brazylijskiej myśli społecznej w XX wieku*, by Mariusz Malinowski), relations between the state and culture (e.g. *Culture Wars in Brazil: the First Vargas Regime*, by Daryle Williams), oppression of the marginalized by the state and the symbolic elites (e.g. *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945*, by Jerry Dávila, or *Antiracist Discourse in Brazil: From Abolition to Affirmative Action*, by Teun A. Van Dijk), and other works on a variety of topics such as Vargas' nation-making efforts, regime's social control, Brazilian Integralism, nationalism intensification or "racial whitening ideology" (for example, *Vargas and Brazil: New Perspectives*, by Jens R. Hentschke, *Father of the Poor?: Vargas and His Era*, by Robert M. Levine, or *Rasa, etniczność i religia w brazylijskim procesie narodotwórczym*, by Tadeusz Paleczny).

2. What is the collective subjectivity of literary characters? How should one analyze it?

2.1 Literary characters

Since the object of my research is the CS of literary characters, it is crucial to define the notion of *character* first. At this point, it becomes necessary to make use of Alan Palmer's (2004; 2010) theoretical framework. He drew on one of Uri Margolin's (1989) definitions, according to which a fictional character is a "non-actual being who exists in a possible world and who can be ascribed physical, social, and mental properties" (Palmer 2004, 38). Such a definition relies on Possible Worlds Theory, which needs to be presented before we explore the subject of fictional minds.

2.1.1 Possible Worlds Theory

The idea of possible worlds was developed in the latter half of the 20th century, within analytical philosophy, mainly by Saul Kripke (1980) and David Lewis (1973), to address issues in modal logic, a type of logic used to represent statements about necessity and possibility. It understands the reality as the totality of what can be imagined rather than just what physically exists, a totality composed of a multitude of separate worlds (with the central element of this system being the "actual," "real" world, in opposition to "non-actual" possible worlds), and it explores different ways reality could be. It assumes that any world that adheres to the principles of non-contradiction and the excluded middle qualifies as a possible world, and it defines necessity as something true in all possible worlds, possibility as true in at least one possible world, and impossibility as something untrue in any world.

In poststructuralist narratology, the concept has been adopted by such scholars as Thomas Pavel (*Fictional Worlds*, 1986), Marie-Laure Ryan (*Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*, 1991), and Lubomir Doležel (*Heterocosmica*, 1998) to describe the storyworlds, i.e. possible worlds created within literature, produced by language through a performative power that originates from cultural conventions (when a third-person

narrator utters a statement regarding a character, for instance, it is a performative utterance, which means that it brings into existence what it says by the act of saying it)[10]. As Doležel states, from "the viewpoint of the reader, the fictional text can be characterized as a set of instructions according to which the fictional world is to be recovered and reassembled" (1988, 489).

Noteworthily, the storyworlds are ontologically incomplete; they have ontological gaps or, as Roman Ingarden named them, "spots of indeterminacy" (1973, 246)—no narrative artwork can determine every detail of its whole storyworld. Marie-Laure Ryan, however, argues that what enables the readers to access fictional worlds and to create the implicit texture that fills these gaps is what she names the principle of minimal departure (1991): while we read a text and reconstruct a storyworld from it, we assume that the storyworld is like our own until the text tells us otherwise (for example, if the text mentions a little boy, the reader will first imagine a child with two legs, two arms, and one head, unless the text specifies that the boy has two heads, five legs and six arms).

In a later phase of development, the concept of possible worlds moves away from its roots in logic and analytic philosophy, expanding to encompass the imaginary, the mental, the potential, and the virtual (Ryan, "Possible Worlds"). Alan Palmer's study of fictional minds—which proposes that "the most important sets of instructions that allow the reader to reconstruct the fictional world, are those that govern the reader's understanding of the workings of characters' minds" (2004, 34)—is part of this research stream.

2.1.2 Fictional minds

Uri Margolin, a prominent theorist of fictional characters, explains that the individuals whose experience is the primary concern of narrative fiction, depending on the theoretical framework being applied, can be understood as:

[10] Typically, the information that the reader receives from a third-person narrator is reliable: Wayne C. Booth's unreliable narrator (1961) relates mostly to first-person narrators. As Edward Morgan Forster put it, "People in a novel can be understood completely […]. And this is why they often seem more definite than characters in history, or even our own friends; we have been told all about them that can be told; even if they are imperfect or unreal they do not contain any secrets, whereas our friends do" (1927, 46–47).

a) referents of linguistic expressions (proper names, pronouns, deictics, and definite descriptions). "The central questions concerning literary character under this interpretation are strictly intratextual, involving the identification of discourse topics, the varieties of referring expressions and their interrelations" (1989, 2–3);
b) aggregates of properties established by the text, "macrosign[s] or semantic complex[es], composed of a cluster of smaller units (*sèmes*) unified by a proper name" (1989, 3–4);
c) bearers of general ideas (characters as allegories). Their "attributes are viewed as vehicles to express ideas. By the same token, interrelations among individuals in a narrative will represent interrelations among ideas and attitudes" (1990, 454);
d) entities performing actantial roles (hero, antagonist, helper, desired object, etc.); The actants are "defined by means of a narrative syntax, according to the kind of slot [they fill] in elementary modalized action propositions and their sequences" (1989, 4);
e) non-actual individuals, hypothetical beings "designated by means of referring expressions," who are understood as "members of some non-actual state of affairs or possible world" (1989, 4)—a notion which "is arguably the closest to our cultural intuition, flexible and open-ended, and at the same time, theoretically well-grounded" (1989, 10).

The conception of non-actual individuals is different from the others because, in contrast to structuralism, it does not perceive characters as solely semiotic constructs (Ryan, "Possible Worlds"). Instead, it sees them as imaginary, life-like individuals "endowed with inner states, knowledge, and belief sets, memories, attitudes and intentions—that is, a consciousness, interiority and personhood" (Margolin 1990, 455).

As Ryan ("Possible Worlds") accurately observes,

> each of these conceptions accounts for different aspects of fictional characters—presentation, identification, thematic function, function within the plot, and ontological status—but it is only the fifth that explains their ability to arouse emotions in the reader, an aspect of narrative that is currently generating considerable interest.

Palmer emphasizes that readers play a significant role in constructing fictional minds. The reader's imagination fills in gaps in the narrative, contributing to the vividness of

characters' psychological processes. This idea is critical in understanding how fictional minds are collaboratively created by both the text and the reader.

At this point, it becomes clear that Palmer has drawn on the Reader Response Theory findings, which concentrate on the readers' role and on how they experience a literary work. It sees the reader as an agent, who confers "real existence" to the text and gives it meaning through interpretation and, by this act, unfolds the work's inherently dynamic character, as Wolfgang Iser—the founder of the Constance School of Reception Aesthetics (together with Hans Robert Jauss)—argues in *The Act of Reading* (1978).

What also inspired Palmer, was Iser's thesis that the text directs and pre-structures the creation of meaning by progressively furnishing elements of what will ultimately form the artwork, while leaving gaps between them—or "spots of indeterminacy" (Ingarden 1973, 246)—for the reader to fill in, thereby completing the work. As Palmer himself explains, regarding the process of characterization[11]:

> As only a certain number of the words on the pages of the text can refer to a particular character, it is part of the competence of the reader to construct, both from this written text and from the unwritten implications that comprise the gaps within the written text, a continuing consciousness for that character. Having accomplished that initial and basic task, the reader then has to interpret all the available evidence (2004, 41).

In 1989, Margolin called attention to the fact that, up until that time, the idea of character as a hypothetical being had been treated as less important, as some kind of "*postscriptum*" to the fundamental theories. Regarding developing this approach, he stated the "task is before us" (1989, 23). In 2004, in turn, Alan Palmer (43) attempted to "make a contribution to the response that is still required to Margolin's challenge." Also my research, in part, can be considered as such an attempt.

To conclude this initial contextualization—and shift the focus to the concept of fictional minds itself—I will refer to Ryan's summary:

[11] In narratology, characterization is the process of ascribing properties to characters both in a direct way, when the narrator ascribes a trait explicitly to a character, or indirectly, when the characterization requires inferences drawn from the text, which are based partly on the reader's world knowledge. For a wider explanation about the characterization, see Jannidis.

> In recent years, the conception of characters as non-actual individuals has led to new approaches to the representation of minds. Studies of fictional minds used to be concerned with explicit forms of representation, such as stream of consciousness or free indirect discourse (Cohn 1978). These studies are based on the assumption that we can know the mind of fictional characters much better than the mind of real people, because thought is something contained within the head. Omniscient narrators can penetrate into the mind of characters, while we cannot do so with actual individuals. Invoking what is known in cognitive psychology as "theory of mind" or "mental simulation," Palmer (2004) has denied the view that it takes some form of psycho-narration to enable readers to know the thoughts of fictional characters (Ryan, "Possible Worlds").

Palmer's concept of fictional minds refers to the mental functioning of characters—understood as non-actual individuals (Margolin 1989, 4)—in narrative fiction, as constructed by both the narrator and the reader. In Palmer's view, the term *mind* encompasses more aspects of the inner life than such terms as *consciousness* or *thought*: it embraces not only perception and cognition, but also dispositions, feelings, beliefs, and emotions. Fictional minds are understood holistically, taking into account the character's actions, mental processes, and how these are inferred by the reader from the text. Palmer stresses that these minds are socially situated and often involve what psychologists name *intermental thought*, highlighting the collective and public aspects of mental life in fiction.

The author of *Fictional Minds* discusses the narrative conventions (53–86), which give readers access to diverse mental events and aspects of a character's mind:

1) The narrative convention of *direct thought*—also known as *private speech*, *quoted monologue*, *interior monologue*, or *stream of consciousness*—allows the narrator to reproduce the exact thoughts of a character, as if it was their transcription (e.g., "She thought, Who is he?"). Over time, it evolved into *free direct thought*, where quotation marks and tags (like "she thought") are omitted (a style popularized by modernist writers such as Virginia Woolf and James Joyce).
2) *Thought report*—also known as *internal analysis*, *psychonarration*, *narratorial analysis*, *submerged speech*, *omniscient description*, and *narratized speech*—is

similar to indirect speech: the narrator conveys a character's thoughts indirectly, within the flow of the narrative. Instead of presenting them as direct quotations, the narrator summarizes or paraphrases them. (e.g., "She wondered who he was."). In the context of fictional minds, it is a very important, versatile technique that serves various purposes. For example:

a) Presentation of mental events. This mode is particularly suitable for the presentation of such mental events as inner speech, perception, emotions, sensations, attention, visual images, or mood;
b) Presentation of such latent states of mind as attitudes, beliefs, skills, knowledge, judgments, character traits, evaluations, tendencies of thought, intellect, memory, imagination, volition, and desires;
c) Depiction of mental action, of a causal network behind actions (according to Palmer, thought report is the most effective mode for the ascription of specific intentions, motives, or reasons for action).
d) Presentation of personality and character. E.g., "She always analyzed every decision carefully, weighing the consequences before acting" (provides the basis for anticipating the future course of the story);
e) Summary. Through the thought report mode, it is possible to summarize a mental process that lasted for a long period, by using a "telescopic perspective" or "panoramic view" (for example, "Over the next few weeks, he gradually came to accept his new reality"). Dorrit Cohn (1978, 35) identifies three rhythms of time condensation: durative, which refers to ongoing events (e.g., "continued," "still"); iterative, which indicates recurring events (e.g., "very often," "occasionally"); and mutative, which indicates changes over time. Importantly, since states of mind like dispositions and beliefs necessarily exist over time, for their presentation, the summary becomes the norm.
f) Depiction of background information. This wide category includes such elements as: negative knowledge (what the narrator knows, but the character does not), physical context (sentences that consist of thought report and, at the

same time, of the storyworld's physical description), or presupposition (that part of a sentence, which is a given, which goes without saying).

g) Presentation of intermental thinking, which refers to shared or collective mental processes that occur between individuals rather than within a single person. It highlights the idea that much of human thought is social and public, shaped through interactions with others. This concept contrasts with traditional views of consciousness that focus solely on individual, internal thoughts. Intermental thinking is demonstrated through group dynamics, conversations, and social situations, where the minds of different characters work together or influence each other. If a group of detectives is working together to solve a case, for example, throughout their discussions, they share insights, piece together clues, and challenge each other's ideas. As they talk, their collective understanding of the case evolves, and none of them could have reached the conclusion alone.

h) Expression of consensus, of a shared view held by a specific social group. According to Chatman (1978, 207), this kind of thought report contains "the suggestion of a kind of 'in'-group psychology." It should not be associated uniquely with an individual character, since it is rather an expression of a "communal point of view," as Leech and Short suggest (1981, 349–350), or of a "common view," as Bakhtin names it (1981, 301–302). In Jorge Amado's *Captains of the Sands,* for instance, we read that

> Omolu had sent the black pox to the upper city, the city of the rich. Omolu didn't know about vaccines, Omolu was a goddess from the jungles of Africa, what could she know of vaccines and scientific things? But since smallpox had already been turned loose (and the black pox was terrible), Omolu had to let it go down to the city of the poor. […] But since Omolu felt sorry for her poor little children, she reduced the strength of the black pox, turned it into milk pox (Amado 2013 [1937], 126).

In this case, the narrator focalizes[12] a collectivity of Candomblé practitioners who believed that it was Omolu, revered in Candomblé as a divinity of illness and cure[13], who unleashed the epidemic as revenge against the rich.

3) *Free indirect thought* gives us access to characters' minds, by merging their language and subjectivity, as in *direct thought*, and the narrator's presentation, as in *thought report*; by merging the narrator's and character's voices. It allows the reader to access a character's thoughts while retaining some narrative distance. In the following example, we can see how the character's language and subjectivity have been presented, but in the past tense and third person: "She would be damned if she'd go on living like this." This method is more subtle, and it often shifts fluidly between the narrator's and the character's perspectives. *Free indirect discourse* (which refers to speech, thought, and perception) is also known *as narrated monologue*, *free indirect style*, *substitutionary speech*, *dual voice*, *represented speech and thought*, *narrated speech*, *simple indirect thought*, *immediate speech*, or *narrated thought*.

Furthermore, Palmer suggests that, while analyzing a fictional mind, it is relevant to pay special attention to such aspects of mind presentation as characters' dispositions, background suppositions, emotions, and actions.

The notion of dispositions (Palmer 2004, 108–112) refers to the enduring mental traits or tendencies that shape a character's behavior and reactions over time. Dispositions are distinct from immediate thoughts or emotions, as they represent a character's long-term patterns of thinking, feeling, or acting. They can be considered stable aspects of a character's personality that influence how they interact with others and respond to situations.

To explain it, Palmer provides an example (2004, 43): "As usual in these circumstances, he became angry and defensive." This type of statement frequently appears in narratives and plays a key role in shaping the story's progression. It describes a moment of immediate consciousness (the feeling of anger) in the context of the disposition that the character has

[12] For an explanation about the focalization, see Niederhoff.

[13] There is an inaccuracy in the English translation: Omolu is a male Orisha, which is also reflected in the original, Portuguese version: *Omolu tinha mandado a bexiga negra para a Cidade Alta, para a cidade dos ricos. Omolu não sabia da vacina, Omolu era um deus das florestas da África, que podia saber de vacinas e coisas científicas? Mas como a bexiga já estava solta (e era a terrível bexiga negra), Omolu teve que deixar que ela descesse para a cidade dos pobres. […] Mas como Omolu tinha pena dos seus filhinhos pobres, tirou a força da bexiga negra, virou em alastrim* (Amado 1937, 187).

toward anger. Moreover, the disposition is, to a certain extent, the very cause of the narrated event (together with the situational factors). By interpreting such events of consciousness presentation within the context of dispositions, the readers construct a cohesive sense of the fictional minds.

Another idea that is important for the understanding of fictional minds is Searle's (1992, 196) notion of the *background*. It consists of the mental capacities, ways of behaving, practical knowledge, learned behaviors, or dispositions—among others—that guide our actions, perceptions, and thoughts without us consciously realizing them. The *background suppositions* are basic, taken-for-granted suppositions about the world that shape how we behave and interact, but they are not typically framed as beliefs or consciously held ideas. For instance, an individual may consciously hold a belief about the potential benefits of a policy, but the supposition that objects are solid cannot be treated similarly, as a belief, since it is inherently assumed. This unspoken supposition operates at a deeper level, influencing behavior and interaction with the world without the need for conscious reflection. In the context of fiction, readers construct coherent fictional minds also from episodes that reveal characters' background suppositions.

Regarding the emotions, in turn, Palmer claims that their manifestation is "one of the more obvious ways in which our thought can become public" (2004, 115), also in the case of literary characters. They can be inferred through characters' behavior, dialogue, and interactions with others. As Doležel put it, they are "often accompanied by spontaneous physiological events. […] When the events are observable (blushing, sparkling eyes, gestures) or audible (laughing, crying, exclamation of pain, tone of voice), they become signs (indices) of emotions" (1998, 68). Importantly, in the context of fictional minds, the emotions are "powerful motivational factors" (Doležel 1998, 65), which frequently play vital role in many of the characters' decision-making processes.

Lastly, also the characters' actions can be very revealing, in terms of the mind presentation since, as Clark and Chalmers (1998, 10) propose, sometimes it is impossible to disconnect physical actions from the underlying mental processes that drive them—the mental structure that drives action encompasses memories, motives and reasons, as well as decisions and intentions, among others. Palmer refers to this phenomenon as the *thought-action continuum* (2004, 212–214).

In Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*, for example, during a heavy storm, Guma, the protagonist, "is looking for a small inlet where he can anchor the sloop" (135). Although "There aren't many at that mouth of the river" (135), and although his life is at risk, he does not choose to anchor in the place he finds, because of the specter of the former plantation owner, which Guma believes haunts the place. In this case, the narrator *shows* the reader—instead of *telling* him—what kind of background suppositions the protagonist has and to what extent they affect him.

However, it is the reader who needs to ascribe consciousness to observable actions. The intentions, purposes, motives, or reasons driving an action might be directly stated by the narrator, implicit but recognizable for the reader, or hidden. The essence of Palmer's approach is a detailed examination of the "structure of mental events that lies behind the decisions that lead to actions and, specifically, of how this is presented in the discourse by the narrator" (2004, 122).

Sometimes, the characters attribute mental states to themselves through what Palmer calls *first-person ascription* (2004, 124). This often occurs in first-person narratives, where the character directly expresses their own thoughts and feelings, allowing the reader to see how they understand and interpret their own mental state. In such cases, the character reflects on their motives, decisions, or emotions, which can offer a deeper understanding of their personality and thought processes.

Unlike *third-person ascription* by a third-person narrator's performative utterances (which bring into existence what they say by the act of saying it), first-person ascriptions are not always reliable. Characters may have limited self-awareness, be influenced by bias, or even intentionally mislead themselves or others (as in the unreliable narration [Booth 1961] case, in which the narrator's/character's perspective might provide a false or incomplete account of events, motivations, emotions, etc.). First-person ascriptions reveal the character's subjective view of their mental state, but this does not ensure their accuracy or truthfulness. Therefore, readers must often assess the reliability of these self-ascriptions by considering other narrative cues, behaviors, or the context (similarly, in dialogues or monologues, characters' spoken words reveal much about their mental states, but they rarely present a complete picture). The third-person ascription, however, can be more objective,

especially in the cases of third-person narrators who have unlimited access to the characters' minds.

Lastly, the author of *Fictional Minds* advocates for a holistic approach where all the above-presented approaches are combined. It is in this way that the readers construct a continuing consciousness of a character from the text, "join up the dots" to construct "a consciousness that continues in the spaces between the various mentions of that character" (Palmer 2004, 176).

In the chapter on "The Fictional Mind in Action" (205–239)—as well as in his following book, *Social Minds in the Novel* (2010)—Alan Palmer presents a practical application of his conceptual framework for the analysis of fictional minds. In my study, however, the methodology—although it draws significantly on Palmer's framework—needs to have its particularities, not only because its object is a specific aspect of mind, but also because of its focus on collectivities.

2.1.3 Collective narrative agents

For a collective subjectivity to exist, a *collective narrative agent* (Margolin 2000) is necessary. Uri Margolin defines CNA as "a group of two or more individuals represented as a singular higher order entity or agent, a collective individual so to speak, with global properties or actions" (2000, 592).

The number of works in which it occurs is considerably limited, since, as Margolin accurately observes: "The vast majority of Western literary narratives consist centrally of the stories of one individual in isolation or of a limited number of interacting individuals […] and when [collective agents] do occur, they usually occupy a background or secondary role" (2000, 592). Nevertheless, it is not the case in

> a good number of narratives, from short stories to novels, whose main protagonist is a collectivity of some kind, ranging in size from a couple [as in Perec's *Les choses*], through a small group of children, technicians, or guests at a birthday party [Silvain's *Les éoliennes*] to a large group of deportees to a deportation camp [Borowski's *This Way for the Gas, Ladies*

> *and Gentlemen*], to whole generations of Africans [Armah's *Two Thousand Seasons*], and finally to a large portion of humanity, namely, women [Wittig's *Les Guérillères*]. In these narratives, [… w]hile specific individuals do occur in all of them, they are now the ones who play the minor, often purely illustrative role, while the story as a whole is primarily the group's story (Margolin 2000, 592).

The novels in which the collective narrative agents occupy the central role—as is the case of *Sea of Death*—can be considered *collective narratives* (CN) (Margolin 2000, 593).

For a CNA to exist, in turn, three conditions must be met, according to Margolin (2000, 593–594):

1) In various narrative propositions, whether explicitly or not, the argument position is occupied by an expression that designates a collectivity (e.g. "the girls," "a hundred women," "the team," "us," "they," "all soldiers," etc.).
2) In these specific propositions, the predicate position is occupied by predicates that apply to the whole collectivity, as one entity, and not to all its members separately or by predicates that designate collective actions that can be carried out only by a group as a single unit, and not by many subactions of the individuals that compose the group (e.g. "be numerous," "increase in number," "gather," "endure for generations," "march in unison," etc.).
3) The collectivity that occupies the argument position—as a whole, as a single entity—is ascribed a variety of thematic roles throughout the actions that are narrated (agent, experiencer, or patient).

There are also other stylistic features (Margolin 2000, 595–596) that may reveal the narrative's focus on a collectivity, such as:

1) Titles in the plural that:
   a) refer to the CNA explicitly, like *Les Guérillères* by Monique Wittig or *Captains of the Sands* (by Jorge Amado),

b) refer to the CNA ambiguously: *Barren Lives* by Graciliano Ramos or *Gado Humano* ("Human Cattle," transl.—E. Ch.) by Nestor Duarte,
c) refer to things that can be associated with the collective hero: Jorge Amado's *Sweat* (which refers to the working poor) or *Cacau* ("Cocoa," transl.—E. Ch., refers to cocoa plantation laborers);

2) Recurrent enumerations of proper names or activities in the plural;
3) A particular order for introducing characters (in the plural first). Individual characters appear later, only as components of their collectivities. For example: "child thieves […] the sinister adventures of the "captains of the sands" […] city infested by children who live by stealing […] they […] juvenile delinquents […] Dressed in rags, dirty, half-starved, aggressive, cursing, and smoking cigarette butts, they were, in truth, the masters of the city, the ones who knew it completely, the ones who loved it completely, its poets" (*Captains of the Sands*, Amado 2013 [1937]). Only in subsequent chapters are *some* of the group members presented individually.
4) Viewing individual group members' actions, interactions, and characteristics through a collective perspective. The individuals are framed primarily as group members, rather as social selves than as independent, private selves.

Importantly, Margolin (2000, 597–598) warns that claims about a collectivity may not apply to each or any of its individual members. For instance, "They worked hard" does not necessarily imply that "X, a member of the group, worked hard." Multiple individuals can jointly accept a decision, opinion, or objective as a shared group stance without each person necessarily holding it as their personal view. While groups depend on individual members for their existence, they possess attributes that operate at the group, holistic level.

2.2 Collective subjectivity

2.2.1 Real-world collective subjectivity analysis framework

Another pillar of my framework for the fictional collective subjectivity analysis is the psycho-sociological framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis proposed by Fernando Fabris, Silvia Puccini and Mario Cambiaso in their *Subjetividad colectiva y realidad social. Una metodología de análisis* (2019).

First, it is important to note that, although the fictional CS has several analogies with the real-world CS, they are ontologically different. Therefore, it has been necessary to implement specific adaptations to the context of literary studies. I will describe them throughout my explanation of Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso's ideas.

The authors of the book draw on many different thinkers and scholars (such as Henri Lefebvre, Karl Marx, Lucien Goldmann, Sigmund Freud, George H. Mead, Melanie Klein, Jean-Paul Sartre, José Maurício Domingues or David Harvey), but mainly on the work of Enrique Pichon-Rivière (1975).

According to their preface, one of the most important contributions of Pichon-Rivière's work was proposing to analyze the subject in the context of everyday life and the socio-historical process. This fundamental achievement originated the development of a psychology that focused on the relationship between the social process and subjectivity.

Regarding the collective subjectivity, Fernando Fabris (2012, 32–33) defines it as a concept that accounts for the common denominators of the subjective structure of the members of a particular social group (in the case of my study, it is a social group of literary characters). CS encompasses the common denominator of their ways of thinking, feeling, and acting (which are analyzable, in the context of literary studies, thanks to Alan Palmer's framework), and is determined by socio-historical processes, everyday life, identification with social ideals, collective memory and projects, beliefs, positive or negative social experiences, and the group's acceptation or repudiation of public figures, among other factors.

In an attempt to outline the boundaries of the concept, Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso (2019, ch. 2, *Subjetividad colectiva* section) explain that collective subjectivity does not refer to the great ideas, nor discourses, ideologies, nor to public opinion, although it interpenetrates with all of them. It is related to social and political consciousness, though not limited to them. It refers to a historical time, which is longer than a conjuncture and shorter

than an era. Collective subjectivity is less fluctuating than social sentiment, moods, or public opinion, but less persistent than a zeitgeist. CS is composed of subjectivities of people who are very different from one another, yet share at least a social space and a historical time (those who are part of the same social space and historical time always share some common denominators, even if they do not like having something in common with people they perceive as different or even antagonistic). The concept, however, does not stand for any abstract totality. A CS does not denote an "Us." As Fabris (2012, 34) explains:

> The existence of the common denominators that let us define it does not presuppose any reduction of the infinite variety of the individual or group subjectivities that constitute it. […] Collective subjectivity is an open system, a dynamic totality relative to other dynamic totalities and implies not equilibrium but equilibrations and reequilibrations. Conflict, contradiction, diversity, and diversification are central to it.[14] [transl.—E. Ch.]

Furthermore, the authors of *Subjetividad colectiva y realidad social* criticize (ch. 2, *Perspectiva teórica* section) deterministic views of history, which treat it as an autonomous force, independent of individual will, and emphasize that the subjects—individuals and groups—act and interact, playing an active role in shaping history. This leads to the concept of collective subjectivity, which highlights the strategic role of human action in history, where individual and social behaviors are meaningful responses to circumstances. Nevertheless, the authors stress that acknowledging human agency does not downplay the influence of objective historical, economic, and social conditions. Subjects both shape and are shaped by history. Therefore, collective subjectivity must be understood within the broader social, institutional, and historical contexts. The analysis of collective subjectivity and social phenomena must take into account both everyday life and sociohistorical processes.

[14] In original: "La existencia de denominadores comunes que permiten definirla, no supone una reducción de la variedad infinita de subjetividades individuales o grupales que la conforman. […] La subjetividad colectiva es un sistema abierto, una totalidad dinámica relativa a otras totalidades dinámicas e implica no tanto equilibrio como equilibraciones y reequilibraciones. Es central en ella el conflicto, la contradicción, la diversidad y la diversificación."

What makes an analysis with such focus (as well as an analysis of narratives with the focus on the elements listed in Fabris' definition of collective subjectivity) possible is the notion of *psychosocial emergents* (Fabris, Puccini 2010), which are "traces" of subjectivities. These "traces" are events which—due to their emergence in the context of everyday life—allow us to capture and understand subjectivities. These psychosocial emergents are meaningful marks that are relevant from a cultural point of view, and have the function of revealing CS. As Enrique Pichon-Rivière (1966, 65) put it: "Everyday events, with their mundane or routine nature, appear to the social researcher as full of meaning, as emergent from a reality that uses them as signs to manifest itself."[15]

The psychosocial emergents can be located at the intersection of the everyday and the historical, or in the terms of Ágnes Heller (1985, 42), between the everyday and the non-everyday (since they do not necessarily refer to a social urgency or emergency, they can even remain unnoticed). The decoding of psychosocial emergents allows the researcher to move from recording the immediate experiences and conditions of daily life to analyzing the social process, everyday life, and collective subjectivity, because they condense within themselves a multiplicity of personal and social meanings (Fabris 2012, 37–38).

Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso (ch. 2, *Los emergentes* section) provide such examples of psychosocial emergents as the widespread road blockades in Argentina during the 1990s, the response of TV viewers to the soap opera *Resistiré* in 2003, or the support for subway workers' struggles by the middle-class sectors of Buenos Aires in 2005.

The psychosociologists who analyze collective subjectivities need to collect or produce their data first. To this end, apart from registering such events as mentioned above, they conduct interviews, surveys, creative research workshops, etc. Then, the product of such work is considered a sample, which contains a sequence of thematic emergents expressed by various "spokespersons." Afterward, they attempt to interpret these emergents and ascribe a meaning to them.

In my study, I have adapted the concept of psychosocial emergents to the needs of narratology and have found them, analogically, within the storyworld of Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*. I understand them as events of a general type—the so called "event I," which refers

[15] In original: "Los acontecimientos de la vida cotidiana, con su carácter intrascendente o rutinario, aparecen ante los ojos del investigador social como indicios plenos de significado, emergentes de una realidad que los utiliza como signos para manifestarse."

to any change of state, *implicitly or explicitly* represented in a text (see Hühn)—which also fulfill the criteria of the above-mentioned definition of psychosocial emergents, and thus also reveal the *meaning* of their respective *signifiers* in the characters' understanding, in the characters' *web of meanings* (I use the concepts of *meaning*, *signifier*, and *web of meanings* in accordance with their definition within Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory, which is discussed in the next section). Additionally, it is important to note that one emergent can reveal the meaning of more than one signifier, as we will see in Chapter 3.3.

In an analysis of a literary work, there is no need to produce the data, because the sample has already been "gathered"—by the narrative's author (since we do not intend to analyze a real-world collective subjectivity, but a fictional creation, we can treat the literary narratives as sequences of emergents, and the characters as the "spokespersons"). After such adaptation, in the narratological context, I prefer to refer to the psychosocial emergents as *subjectiveme indicators*.

A subjectiveme indicator can, for example, be the fact that: 1) the Haitian slaves believed that Macandal transformed himself into a mosquito during his execution (Carpentier, *The Kingdom of This World*); 2) the "sea people" believed they saw the goddess Iemanjá (Amado, *Sea of Death*); 3) the Candomblé practitioners believed that it was Omolu, revered in Candomblé as a divinity of illness and cure, who unleashed the epidemic as revenge against the rich (Amado, *Captains of the Sands*); 4) a homeless, delinquent orphan considered the famous bandit Lampião as a hero when he was informed that Lampião had murdered many soldiers and plundered a town hall (Amado, *Captains of the Sands*); 5) the favela residents preferred to consult a Candomblé healer rather than a doctor (Amado, *Jubiabá*); 6) a poor researcher, marginalized in the academic environment because of his race and interests, studied the Brazilian cultural richness in poor districts, the temples of Afro-Brazilian religions, popular fairs and brothels (Amado, *Tent of Miracles*). It is important to note here that a collective subjectivity of literary characters does not necessarily have to be characterized by marvelousness or faith-based thinking (as in the first three examples). "Subjective" does not mean "untrue." It can simply be different from the hegemonic "objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61) or from any other subjectivity, as in examples 5) and 6), in which we can see, for instance, that, in the character's understanding, the "folk culture" signifier has a different meaning from the one that is ascribed to it by the

racist, Eurocentric, and elitist hegemonic discourse of the Getúlio Vargas Era in Brazil (moreover, such an understanding of the signifier in question conditions the characters' actions). Subjectiveme indicators of this kind tell us a great deal about the characters' subjectivity. The "miracle" of seeing the goddess, for example, is "possible" because of the beliefs, cultural capital, and subjectivity of those who experience it.

Since the subjectiveme indicators we localize can be numerous and diverse, it is necessary to organize them by categories and subcategories, which will be determined by the most relevant *nodal points* (although the concept is explained in the next section, to ensure clarity, it is important to note here that it refers to the signifiers that determine the meaning of other signifiers by organizing around themselves a system of interdependent meanings—in the case of *Sea of Death*, for example, these would be "Afro-Brazilian culture," "the elite," "morality," and the "State," among many others, because subjectiveme indicators in Amado's novel reveal how the characters understand these concepts—or *signifiers*, in Discourse Theory terms—and the meaning that they ascribe to them determines the meaning of other concepts, lower-level signifiers: the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian culture" nodal point, for instance, determines the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian music" signifier, which in turn determines the meaning of "samba," and so on). For the purpose of organizing subjectiveme indicators by categories and subcategories, I recommend creating a spreadsheet database (apart from facilitating work with the data, it also gives us valuable possibilities of visualizing it).[16]

After organizing subjectiveme indicators by categories and subcategories, it is necessary to analyze them for the purpose of revealing their meaning and of elaborating generalizations, with the care and prudence required by all kinds of research. In some cases, the distance between the data and the interpretation will be minimal or none. In others, the generalization will be a product of more significant interpretative efforts.

The distance between the data and the interpretation will depend considerably on the way the subjectiveme indicators are represented. In most cases, it will be relatively short when the characters' subjectivity is revealed directly, through quotation (*direct speech* and

[16] I have created my spreadsheet database by exporting my e-book reader clippings to an .xlsx file, which contained a list of the excerpts I had highlighted, with such additional data as their respective novel title, author, page, and my notes. Then, I have added several columns that were to be filled by myself (e.g. "nodal point," "lower-level signifier," or "meaning").

direct thought modes), or indirectly, when the narrator paraphrases the characters' speech or thought (*indirect speech* and *thought report*). The distance between the data and the interpretation can get more significant, though, in the case of characterization through *free indirect discourse* (which refers to speech, thought, and perception) [17] and through characters' actions, because the meaning of such subjectiveme indicators depends to a certain degree on the reader's interpretation (which does not mean that there are infinite possibilities of defining it: as Umberto Eco proposed in his *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* [1993, 52], based on Popper's idea of falsifiability, while definitive proof of an interpretation may be impossible, criteria can be established to reject incorrect interpretations[18]).

Furthermore, our generalizations are more well-grounded when they are based rather on subjectiveme indicators which reveal the subjectivity of a collectivity (e.g., when the narrator focalizes a group, as in the excerpt from *The Kingdom of This World*). However, on many occasions, we will have to elaborate them on the basis of those that reveal the subjectivity of many "spokespersons" individually. We can consider a character as a spokesperson, a representative of a collectivity, only if their subjective structure (in Fabris' terms)—or web of meanings (in DTA terms)—shares a considerably wide common denominator with other characters and, thus, is a part of a collective subjectivity. For the best results, we should combine the two approaches whenever possible.

Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso (2019, ch. 1, *Objeto y objetivo*, and *Dimensiones* sections) also elaborated several examples of analyses, which have oriented my project, and a long list of guiding questions. In the context of a narratological analysis, the most important ones are the following:

[17] For a wider explanation about the modes of direct speech, direct thought, indirect speech, thought report and free indirect discourse, see McHale ("Speech Representation").

[18] Henryk Markiewicz (1996) suggests that a literary interpretation is incorrect when it contradicts explicit information in the text, when it introduces external elements not implied by the text, it is based on linguistic misunderstandings or misinterpretations of the text, it disregards the internal or relevant external context of the text, when it extrapolates a local meaning to the entire text without justification, it overemphasizes marginal details, it ignores the genre conventions of the work, it arbitrarily applies external explanations or cultural concepts, it unjustifiably attributes figurative meanings to the text, when it simplifies or misinterprets symbolic meanings that are inherently complex or multifaceted. Hence, the literary works should be analyzed on the levels of 1) text (which involves focusing on the meanings of words, phrases, and sentences, ensuring that interpretations align with the literal text), 2) higher meaning structures (analyzing characters, objects, events, and relationships within the work's represented world, ensuring that interpretations fit the broader narrative and thematic structures), and 3) typifying and figurative references (examining allegorical or symbolic meanings—interpretations should respect the work's cultural context and figurative intentions).

1) What are the most relevant psychosocial emergents (subjectiveme indicators) and what do they mean?
2) What are the features of the collective subjectivity in question?
3) With which features of the social, historical, political, economic, cultural, and daily life process do the features of the collective subjectivity correlate?

The relationship between the socio-historical process, praxis of everyday life and the collective subjectivities can be explored through such research questions as (since a literary scholar does not have a possibility to interview the subjects, like the psychosociologists do, it will not always be possible to find an answer to each question, but they can still guide us regarding what should we look for in the texts):

1) What are, in the subjects' perception, the most significant events of their past and present?
2) How do they periodize their past? What events mark a before and after?
3) What were the most important situations and conflicts for them?
4) What perceptions and representations of the here and now do the subjects have?
5) With which other times do they compare their present?
6) What emotions do they experience in everyday life?
7) What social ideals and values do they accept or reject?
8) Which public figures, institutions, organizations, or social movements are valued by them? Which are rejected?
9) Who do they feel supported by in everyday life?
10) What image do they have of their personal and social future?
11) How do they believe social problems and conflicts can be resolved?
12) How do they define the moment in history they are a part of?
13) How much freedom or constraint do they feel in social life?
14) How much protagonism do they consider themselves to have as members of a community?
15) How much satisfaction with their own life do they feel?

While answering such questions to psychosociologists, the interviewees recount their experiences, reflecting on what they live through, revealing their perceptions and perspectives on social and subjective life, their emotions, worldview, vision of the future, and

memory. In many literary works, however, the characters also "do" it (as non-actual beings), without being interviewed. Similarly, while psychosociologists need to organize creative research workshops—during which subjects playfully participate in the creation of symbolic, theatrical representations, and during which are registered not only subjects' verbal answers but also their behaviors, acting, and interacting—the literary scholars can find analogous data in the narratives which describe the characters' doings.

Moreover, although I have certain concerns regarding the accuracy of Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso's framework (due to the complexity and elusiveness of human subjectivity), they are significantly less relevant in the case of fictional collective subjectivity analysis, in my opinion, due to the performative nature of the third-person narrator's utterances, which bring into existence what they say by the act of saying it and thus, provide a significant degree of reliability.

Another concern I have, regarding the presented approach, is that Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso go as far as to analyze the collective subjectivity of an entire country. Certainly, it is probable that in 2017 there were certain common denominators in the subjective structure of the Argentinian society, but when the object of our study is the CS of an entire country, the common denominators must necessarily be very limited and general, due to the heterogeneity that is inevitable among members of such a large group. The same would be true in the case of fictional groups analysis.

In my view, narrowing the scope of research to a more specific social group or to a smaller segment of a society, could yield less general results, which would be even more interesting if we compared two (or more) different collective subjectivities that coexist in one (fictional) space and time: for example, a subjectivity of a marginalized group and subjectivity of a dominant group; Or a subjectivity of a marginalized group and a hegemonic "objectivity" (which also is a kind of a collective subjectivity). Therefore, in my study, I have analyzed a CS of subjects who share not only space and time, but also certain social conditions.

Lastly, attention should be drawn to the third guiding question provided by the authors of *Subjetividad colectiva y realidad social* (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019), which asks: With which features of the social, historical, political, economic, cultural, and daily life process do the features of the collective subjectivity correlate? To answer it, i.e. to interpret

the data in relation to the context, to compare different webs of meanings, and—if that is the case—understand where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another, I propose making use of Discourse-Theoretical Analysis, a solution which is also in conformity with Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso's recommendations: "The historical, social, geographical, cultural, political, and economic dimensions also form part of the multidimensional object we focus on […]. To address these dimensions, we review contributions from sociology, history, anthropology, public opinion studies, discourse studies"[19] (2019, ch. 1, *El horizonte* section).

2.2.2 Discourse-Theoretical Analysis

2.2.2.1 Introduction: the context of Discourse Studies, social constructionism, and poststructuralism

In the last two decades, the term "discourse" has gained significant popularity, frequently appearing in academic texts and discussions. However, it is often used without a clear definition, leading to ambiguity in its meaning. Sometimes it is used vaguely, while at other times it carries specific meanings that vary across different contexts. Generally, the term "discourse" refers to the view that language is structured in accordance with different patterns that individuals' utterances follow while they participate in various areas of social life (e.g., "medical discourse" or "political discourse"). "Discourse analysis" is the examination of these patterns.

Nevertheless, such a simplified definition does not clarify what discourses actually are, how they operate, or how to study them. To address these questions, more advanced theories and methods are necessary. Opportunely, the field of Discourse Studies is formed by many interdisciplinary approaches that can be applied to explore a wide range of social domains. However, there is no uniform agreement on what exactly discourses are or in what

[19] In original: "Las dimensiones históricas, sociales, geográficas, culturales, políticas y económicas constituyen también parte del objeto multidimensional que focalizamos […]. Para dar cuenta de estas dimensiones revisamos los aportes de la sociología, la historia, la antropología, los estudios de opinión pública, los análisis del discurso".

way they should be analyzed. Various perspectives propose different—sometimes competing—interpretations. Nonetheless, Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips, in their *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method* (2002, 1), propose a preliminary definition of discourse which is roughly universal: "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)."

Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's (2001 [1985]) Discourse Theory is in accordance with other approaches (such as Critical Discourse Analysis or Discursive Psychology) in their common starting point that "our ways of talking do not neutrally reflect our world, identities and social relations but, rather, play an active role in creating and changing them" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 1).

They also share the goal of conducting *critical* research, which involves analyzing power relations within society and developing normative perspectives that allow for a critique of these relations, focusing on opportunities for social change. As Teun van Dijk accurately observes, the critical approach "characterizes scholars rather than their methods," since they

> are sociopolitically committed to social equality and justice. They are specifically interested in the discursive (re)production of power abuse and the resistance against such domination. Their goals, theories, methods and data and other scholarly practices are chosen as academic contributions to such resistance (Van Dijk 2015, 63).

For a discourse analyst, the goal of research is not to look "behind" the discourse to uncover what people truly mean or to reveal some hidden reality. The fundamental assumption is that reality cannot be accessed outside of discourse, making discourse itself the primary focus of analysis. When analyzing discourses that are familiar, it can be especially challenging to view them as socially constructed systems of meaning that could be different. Since analysts often belong to the culture they study, they tend to share many of its common-sense or taken-for-granted understandings. The challenge lies in the fact that these very understandings are what need to be examined: the analysis aims to explore how certain

statements become considered as true or "naturalized," while others do not. In the case of my study, however, I work with discourses from the past, which have already been "denaturalized" to a large degree, apart from the fact that I do not originally belong to the culture I study and that my intention is to adhere to the rule that "it is the stringent application of theory and method that legitimises scientifically produced knowledge," since "It is by seeing the world through a particular theory that we can distance ourselves from some of our taken-for-granted understandings and subject our material to other questions than we would be able to do from an everyday perspective" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 22–23).

Moreover, Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips (2002, 3–4) warn us that, while discourse analysis can be used across various research areas, it is not suitable for any theoretical framework. It should not be treated as a standalone analysis method disconnected from its methodological and theoretical foundations. Each approach represents a comprehensive framework, not merely a data analysis technique. Each framework includes:

1. Philosophical premises about the role of language regarding the social construction of reality,
2. Theoretical models,
3. Methodological guidelines,
4. Specific analytical techniques.

In discourse analysis, theory and method are interconnected, and researchers must embrace the fundamental philosophical assumptions to effectively employ discourse analysis. Nevertheless, Marianne Jørgensen and Louise Phillips emphasize that, although the components of the framework should be cohesive, researchers can create their own framework by integrating elements from various discourse analytical approaches and, when relevant, non-discourse analytical approaches (as in the case of my study):

> Such multiperspectival work is not only permissible but positively valued in most forms of discourse analysis. The view is that different perspectives provide different forms of knowledge about a phenomenon so that, together, they produce a broader understanding. Multiperspectival work is distinguished from an eclecticism based on a mishmash of disparate approaches without serious assessment of their relations with each other. Multiperspectivalism requires that one weighs the approaches up against each other,

> identifying what kind of (local) knowledge each approach can supply and modifying the approaches in the light of these considerations (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 4).[20]

Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory (DT) is rooted in social constructionism, which serves as an umbrella term for various emerging theories about society and culture (while discourse analysis is just one of many approaches within social constructionism, it is among the most commonly used). According to Burr (1995, 2–5), it is difficult to provide a description that would cover all—very diverse—social constructionist approaches, but they all share the following premises:

1. A critical approach to taken-for-granted knowledge: we should not view our knowledge of the world as objective truth. Reality is accessible to us only through categories, meaning that our understanding of the world is not a direct reflection of an external reality. Instead, it is shaped by how we categorize the world, or, in discourse analysis terms, it is a product of discourse.
2. Historical and cultural specificity: we are shaped by history and culture, and our understanding of the world is the result of interactions between people that are rooted in specific historical contexts.
3. Connection between social processes and knowledge: our understanding of the world is shaped and sustained through social processes; we create shared truths and engage in competition over what is considered false or true.
4. Connection between social action and knowledge: in each worldview, certain actions seem natural, while others are unthinkable. Varying social interpretations of the world result in different actions. Hence, the social construction of truth and knowledge has social repercussions.

These fundamental principles of social constructionism are grounded in French poststructuralist theory, which rejects universalizing and totalizing theories like psychoanalysis or traditional Marxism. Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's post-Marxist

[20] An assessment of the relations between the approaches I have chosen for my framework can be found in section 2.2.3.

DT, in turn, is one of the "purest" poststructuralist theories in the field of Discourse Studies. It departs from the poststructuralist belief that

> discourse constructs the social world in meaning, and that, owing to the fundamental instability of language, meaning can never be permanently fixed. No discourse is a closed entity: it is, rather, constantly being transformed through contact with other discourses. So a keyword of the theory is *discursive struggle* [emphasis in original]. Different discourses – each of them representing particular ways of talking about and understanding the social world – are engaged in a constant struggle with one other to achieve hegemony, that is, to fix the meanings of language in their own way. Hegemony, then, can provisionally be understood as the dominance of one particular perspective (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 6–7).

Such an approach contrasts considerably with Norman Fairclough's fashionable Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), for example, which also emphasizes discourse's active role in shaping the social world, but for Fairclough, discourse is merely one aspect among many in each social practice. His differentiation between discursive and non-discursive practices is a vestige of traditional Marxism in CDA, making Fairclough's theory less poststructuralist than DT (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 7).

Furthermore, DT—similarly to all other approaches from Discourse Studies—adopted the conviction of structuralist and poststructuralist linguistic philosophers that our understanding of reality is always mediated by language. Through language, we produce representations of reality that are not simply reflections of an existing reality but also play a role in shaping that reality. This does not imply that reality does not exist. Meanings, representations, or physical objects do exist, but for Laclau and Mouffe, who—in contrast to Foucauldian kinds of approaches—reject the distinction between discursive and non-discursive practices, they only gain meaning through discourse:

> every object is constituted as an object of discourse, insofar as no object is given outside every discursive condition of emergence. […] An earthquake or the falling of a brick is an event that certainly exists, in the sense that it occurs here and now, independently of my will.

> But whether their specificity as objects is constructed in terms of 'natural phenomena' or 'expressions of the wrath of God', depends upon the structuring of a discursive field (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 107–108).[21]

Thus, language is not simply a channel for conveying information about reality. Instead, it functions as a "machine" that actively produces and shapes the social reality. Such understanding arises from the structuralist linguistic theories that emerged after Ferdinand de Saussure expressed his groundbreaking ideas.

Saussure (1960) proposed that signs are composed of two elements: the form (*signifiant*) and the content (*signifié*). Moreover, he claimed that the relationship between them is arbitrary. The meanings we associate with words do not naturally belong to them but are the result of social conventions that link specific meanings to particular sounds. For instance, there is no inherent connection between the sound or written word "dog" and the image of a dog that comes to mind when we hear it. Our understanding of the word "dog" as referring to a barking, four-legged animal is based on a social convention. Saussure emphasized that the meaning of a sign is determined by its relationship to other signs. The word "dog" differs from "cat" or "mouse," and it is through such distinctions that the meaning of "dog" emerges in this network (or *structure*) of signs.

Poststructuralism builds upon structuralist theory but introduces significant modifications. While it retains the structuralist idea that signs gain their meanings through their relationships within a network of signs rather than through their connection to reality, poststructuralism rejects the structuralist notion of language as a stable, fixed structure.

For Saussure, language is comparable to a fishing net, in which each sign occupies a specific position as one of the numerous knots. Structuralist theory largely assumes that signs are locked into fixed relationships with one another, with each sign having a defined place in the net and a fixed meaning. Poststructuralists have criticized this view, rejecting the idea that signs hold rigid positions. In poststructuralist thought, while signs still derive meaning through their differences from other signs, the signs they differ from can change depending

[21] Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 9), in turn, provide an example of a flood, which can be interpreted as a natural phenomenon caused by an unusually heavy rain, by the El Niño phenomenon, or by the 'greenhouse effect,' while others can see it as an effect of political mismanagement, or as a manifestation of God's will, a presage of Armageddon.

on the context. Therefore, words cannot be tied to definitive meaning(s). For poststructuralists, structures do exist, but they are always temporary and not necessarily consistent. These structures are fluid, allowing the meanings of signs to change.

Furthermore, it is also important to note that some of the most important influences for Discourse Theory—as for all other discourse analysis approaches—were the contributions of Michel Foucault, whose work shared many characteristics with poststructuralist thought (although he did not identify himself as a poststructuralist). He has been essential in shaping discourse analysis, both through his theoretical ideas and empirical studies. In nearly every discourse analytical framework, Foucault is a key reference point—his work is frequently cited, discussed, or adapted.

Most modern discourse analytical approaches are influenced by Foucault's idea of discourses as systems of statements that shape how we understand and define reality. They also expand on his notion that truth is largely shaped through discourse and understand the subjects as created in discourses (Laclau and Mouffe agree with Foucault, who, influenced by Louis Althusser, suggests that "discourse is not the majestically unfolding manifestation of a thinking, knowing, speaking subject" [Foucault 1972, 55]—the individuals do not express themselves through language, but it is the language that "expresses the culture" through them).

However, as Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 13) accurately observe, while various discourse analysis approaches are deeply influenced by Foucault's concepts, some of them also reject certain aspects of his theory. For example, most modern frameworks, including DT, differ from his tendency to identify a single dominant knowledge regime in each historical period—they envision a more complex and contested picture, where multiple discourses coexist or compete for the authority to define truth.

2.2.2.2 Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory

After this initial contextualization, the focus needs to be shifted to Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory itself. In their main study, *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics* (2001 [1985]), they propose an understanding of the concept of discourse that is considerably different than in other

approaches. Its specificity can be explained by using, as a starting point, Teun Van Dijk's (1997, 3) definition of discourse as "talk and text in context," and distinguishing between micro and macro-approaches toward both text and context. DT is macro-textual and macro-contextual, which means that it uses:

1) a broad definition of text, greatly in congruence with Barthes (1973), perceiving texts as materializations of meanings or ideologies (discourse is seen as discourse-as-representation or discourse-as-ideology, and not discourse-as-language, as in micro-textual approaches; it is a "big D" Discourse [Gee 1990], which refers to "saying (writing)-doing-being-valuing-believing combinations" and not merely to "connected stretches of language that make sense, like conversations, stories, reports, arguments, essays," as "little d" discourse [Gee 1990, 142]).
2) a broad definition of context: while micro-contextual approaches focus on specific social settings, like a conversation or a political campaign speech, macro-contextual approaches focus on much broader analysis—for example, on how democratic discourse was articulated within Polish social reality (which does not imply, however, a total disregard of relevant micro-contexts).

Thus, DT—with its broad and abstract understanding of discourse—pays less attention to more localized settings (in contrast to frameworks that originate from the field of linguistics and that focus mostly on detailed empirical examination of spoken, written, or audio-visual materials, as Conversation Analysis, for example). DT is mainly concerned with the "circulation, reproduction, and contestation of discourses as-structures-of-meaning, not with language-in-use per se" (Carpentier, De Cleen, Van Brussel 9–10). As Laclau put it: "by discourse we do not mean a combination of speech and writing, but rather that speech and writing are themselves but internal components of discursive totalities" (1990, 100).

Furthermore, as observed before, DT "rejects the distinction between discursive and non-discursive practices" (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 107), and uses a concept of discourse, which "includes within itself the linguistic and the non-linguistic [to] emphasize the fact that every social configuration is *meaningful*" (Laclau 1990, 100; emphasis in original). For instance,

> If I kick a spherical object in the street or if I kick a ball in a football match, the physical fact is the same, but its meaning is different. The object is a football only to the extent that it establishes a system of relations with other objects, and these relations are not given by the mere referential materiality of the objects, but are, rather, socially constructed. This systematic set of relationships is what we call discourse. […] the discursive character of an object does not, by any means, imply putting its existence into question. […] A stone exists independently of any system of social relations, but it is, for instance, either a projectile or an object of aesthetic contemplation only within a specific discursive configuration. A diamond in the market or at the bottom of a mine is the same physical object; but, again, it is only a commodity within a determinate system of social relations (Laclau 1990, 100–101).

Thus, for example, the fact that in Amado's *Tent of Miracles* the police plundered the temples of Afro-Brazilian religions repeatedly (and with impunity) reflects, to a certain degree, the meaning that is ascribed to "Afro-Brazilian religions" signifier within Amado's storyworld by the hegemonic discourse (it is important, however, to remember that it is unacceptable to formulate generalizations, regarding the meaning of signifiers, by taking into consideration only individual, isolated facts, and not a wider context). Much like how signs in language are defined through their differences from each other, social actions gain meaning through their relationships with other actions. All social practices either reproduce or alter common ascriptions of meanings (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 113).

Additionally, for Laclau and Mouffe, the discourse is a temporary closure: it fixes meaning in a particular way, but it can never be ultimately fixed, since a concrete fixation of the meaning of a sign is contingent—possible but not necessary. The core idea of DT is that no social phenomenon can ever be total or finished, that meaning cannot be irreversibly fixed, which leads to ongoing social conflicts over how societies and identities are defined, generating various social consequences. The goal of discourse analysis is to trace the processes through which we struggle over how meanings of signs are established, and the processes through which certain fixations of meaning become so normalized that they are perceived as natural.

To achieve this goal, one needs to be familiar with how these processes occur from a theoretical perspective. To begin with the basics, Laclau and Mouffe explain their concept of articulation (which refers to individual acts of meaning production): "we will call

articulation any practice establishing a relation among elements such that their identity is modified as a result of the articulatory practice. The structured totality resulting from the articulatory practice, we will call *discourse* [emphasis in original]" (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 105). This "structured totality" is suitable with the fishing net metaphor I have mentioned before, since it is a web of meanings, in which each sign occupies a specific position as one of the numerous "knots." A discourse—"a structure in which meaning is constantly negotiated and constructed" (Laclau 1988, 254)—is established (*articulated*) through a partial fixation of meanings around *nodal points* (112), which are privileged signs, points of reference, a center that determines the meaning of other signs by organizing around themselves a system of interdependent meanings (e.g., if the nodal point of a discourse is "nation," its meaning might determine the meaning of such signs as "patriotism," "national security," "national culture," "immigrant," "multiculturalism," etc.). All the signs that are partially fixed in a discourse, through their relations to other signs (like in a fishing net[22]), are named *moments*.

A discourse is articulated through the exclusion of meanings that the signs might have carried, of any alternative ways they could have been connected (from other discourses, for example). In this sense, discourses limit the range of potential meanings. They attempt to halt the shifting of relationships between the signs to establish a cohesive structure of meaning (although it can never be totally, permanently fixed). Laclau and Mouffe refer to everything that a discourse excludes, everything outside the discourse, as the *field of discursivity*. Since a discourse is always formed in relation to this outside, it remains vulnerable to its influence. In other words, it can be challenged by alternative ways of fixing signs' meaning.

And since the meaning of the signs is also determined by their relationship with other signs, a change of one meaning implies a change in the meanings of various other signs. For example, "Brazil" meant something different for the dictator Getúlio Vargas and for the outlaws called *cangaceiros*, and, as a result, we can observe parallel divergences in their understanding of such concepts as nation, national culture, patriotism, etc.

At this point arises the need to present the notion of *discursive struggles*. Discourses compete to define signs in their own ways. The signs that various discourses compete to

[22] Discourse can be viewed as a type of structure in the Saussurian sense, however, unlike in Saussurian thought, where structure is seen as a permanently closed system encompassing all signs, Laclau and Mouffe argue that discourse can never achieve this total closure. There are always alternative potential meanings that, when articulated, may reshape the structure of the discourse. Therefore, discourse represents a temporary closure: it establishes meaning in a certain way, but this fixation is not permanent and can be redefined.

define are called *floating signifiers*. While nodal points can also be floating signifiers, the term "nodal point" specifically describes a point of stabilization *within* a particular discourse; In contrast, floating signifier "belongs to the ongoing struggle between different discourses to fix the meaning of important signs" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 28–29). After pinpointing the signs that function as nodal points, we can examine what meaning is ascribed to them by other discourses. By analyzing the differing interpretations given to these floating signifiers, we can attempt to identify the struggles over meaning.

As Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe (2001) explain, discursive struggles occur between antagonistic discourses that try to dominate (*hegemonize*) a discursive field. This domination is achieved by consolidating a web of meanings (a discourse) through imposing specific meanings on specific signs (the meaning of the "Brazilianness" signifier, for example, depends on a specific discourse and is subject to a constant negotiation, due to the fact that it is impossible to avoid the permanent struggle for domination in a discursive field). When a discourse achieves *hegemony*, its practices rise to the level of common sense. Their political and contingent provenance is forgotten; they become natural and self-evident to society. Such discourses constitute, in Laclau's terms, a "new objectivity" (1990, 34, 35, 61). Phillips and Jørgensen (36) provide a very illustrative example: "we are so used to the understanding and treatment of children as a group with distinctive characteristics that we treat the discourse about children as natural. But just a few hundred years ago, children were, to a much greater degree, seen and treated as 'small adults'" (since our view of children has been constituted through struggles over meaning that were forgotten a long time ago, we may term this view and the discourse that grounds it as "objective").

As can be inferred from the above, the concept of hegemony refers to "the situation that arises when nodal points (and the discourses they belong to) (begin to) obtain social dominance" (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 9). It has been borrowed from Antonio Gramsci (1999, 261), who analyzed how the bourgeoisie establishes and sustains its dominance and defined hegemony as a notion that refers to "the formation of consent rather than to the (exclusive) domination of the other, without however excluding a certain form of pressure and repression" (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 9).

Gramsci argued that the bourgeoisie maintained dominance not only through violence, political influence, and economic pressure but also by their ideology: by

developing a hegemonic culture, the bourgeoisie promoted its own norms and values until they were accepted as universal common sense. Consequently, the working class came to identify their own interests with those of the bourgeoisie, supporting the existing order rather than challenging it. In other words, since workers' perceptions were molded by the ideology of the bourgeoisie, they were unable to recognize their actual interests, which led them to experience what is known as "false consciousness."

At this point, I need to clarify that, regarding the concept of ideology, Laclau and Mouffe adopted Foucault's position: they have no need for it, in their theory it is practically empty (while many definitions of ideology imply that it is possible to access the "absolute truth" when we liberate ourselves from ideology, from a "false consciousness," for Foucault, truth is created in discourse, and it is impossible to get behind the discourse to access an "absolute truth"). However, I did mention before that the results of a collective subjectivity analysis can enable us to describe systematically the particularities of the *ideological* profile of a collectivity. In my study, I do not understand ideology as a "false consciousness,"[23] with its negative connotation, but rather as Teun van Dijk (2011, 379–383) defined it, in a more general way, that includes different types of ideology (also those of resistance), i.e. as socially relevant belief systems, that "are not individual, personal beliefs, but social beliefs shared by members of social groups" (382). Moreover, as Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy state: "Laclau and Mouffe's definition of discourse can be termed […] discourse-as-ideology (in the neutral meaning of ideology), as their approach is more macrotextual and macrocontextual" (2008, 5). Thus, when I state that the results of a collective subjectivity analysis can enable us to describe the particularities of the ideological profile of a collectivity, I mean that these results enable us to describe what meanings are ascribed to signifiers that constitute a particular web of meanings, signifiers that make up an ideology, i.e. to describe how characters understand particular concepts and how these concepts are related with each other in characters' understanding.

Furthermore, Laclau and Mouffe's post-Marxist approach redefines Gramsci's concept of hegemony by overriding his Marxist essentialism and his conviction that it is the economy that divides society into groups: for them, no objective laws inherently divide

[23] For Ernesto Laclau (1990: 89–92), this "false consciousness" would be objectivity (in the sense I have presented earlier—a hegemonic "objectivity" that "masks" its political and contingent nature).

society into specific groups (classes)—in DT, social groups are always formed through political, discursive processes.

They also proposed a different conceptual framework for understanding hegemony. For Laclau and Mouffe, hegemonic projects are ultimately focused on establishing and stabilizing *nodal points* (through *articulation*) that can serve as the foundation for a social order. We constantly construct society and act as though it is a complete, unified whole, speaking of it as a totality. When we use terms like "the people" or "the country," we try to outline this totality. However, it remains imaginary. For instance, when left-wing politicians say they will "do the best for the country," and right-wing politicians say the same, they probably envision a different "country" and have distinct plans. Such terms work as *floating signifiers*, since their meaning varies depending on who uses them. For Laclau, floating signifiers that represent a totality are tools for the construction of hegemonies, for "forming a new objectivity," since they constitute "a principle of reading of a given situation" (Laclau 1990, 61). He calls them *myths*. One of the goals of discourse analysis is to identify and examine societal myths that appear as objective reality, to understand why certain myths are accepted as objective truth while others are not, to understand how these floating signifiers are filled with different meanings by different social groups, each aiming to establish its own vision as dominant.

The aim of hegemonic projects is to convert myths into a *social imaginary*, which, according to Laclau, is a cognitive horizon, an "absolute limit which structures a field of intelligibility," "the condition of possibility of the emergence of any object" (Laclau 1990, 64). A dominant social imaginary "pushes other discourses beyond the horizon, threatening them with oblivion" (Carpentier, De Cleen, Van Brussel 2019, 8). It is important, however, to remember that since the discourse is a temporary closure (it fixes meaning in a particular way, but it can never be ultimately fixed), the hegemony can never be total and "there is always room for *struggles* over what the structure should look like, what discourses should prevail, and how meaning should be ascribed to the individual signs [emphasis in original]" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 40).

Other important concepts for understanding what hegemony consists of are *antagonisms* and *chains of equivalence*. Antagonisms arise where discourses collide, when distinct identities are in mutual opposition, each excluding the other. They have both positive

and negative aspects: struggling social groups seek to destabilize the identity of the other, but simultaneously, that other is essential for stabilizing their own identity, which is constituted, among other things, by a "common enemy." Antagonisms are constructed discursively through the *logic of equivalence*, through the creation of chains of equivalence, in which identities that are different from each other are united in a common project to oppose negative identities. In other words, the logic of equivalence links together different identities into a single discourse (the hegemonic one, for example) without completely eliminating their differences, "through a partial surrender of particularity, stressing what all particularities have, equivalentially, in common" (Laclau 2005, 78). Ernesto Laclau (1988, 256) illustrates this with the following example: "if I say that, from the point of view of the interests of the working class, liberals, conservatives, and radicals are all the same, I have transformed three elements that were different into substitutes within a chain of equivalence." The creation of such chains of equivalence is crucial for the success of a hegemonic project.

Logic of difference, in turn, weakens the antagonisms, disrupts chains of equivalence and integrates the disarticulated identities into a different discursive order. As Laclau put it: logic of difference consists in the "assertion of a particularity […] whose only links to other particularities are of a differential nature ([…] no positive terms, only differences)" (2005, 78). An example of the logic of difference in action can be the LGBTQ movements, which, by emphasizing the differences among various sexual orientations and gender identities, disrupt the heteronormative discourse.

2.2.2.3 Methodological guidelines

Although Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe, similarly to Derrida and Foucault, advocated for recognizing the uniqueness of each deconstruction (Derrida 1967) and for the necessity of adopting customized methods to each empirical study (Laclau 1990, 208–209), they received certain criticisms regarding the fact that they have not provided any specific methodological guidelines. In 1998, for instance, David Howarth, for whom such an approach appeared detrimental to methodological clarity (1998, 288), suggested that:

> Laclau and Mouffe need to lay down, however minimally, a set of methodological guidelines for practitioners, as well as a set of questions and hypotheses (à la Lakatos) for clarification and development. Thus far, the only clear methodological rule consists in a "non-rule": rules can never be simply applied to cases, but have to be articulated in the research process. […] The lack of adequate responses to the epistemological and methodological questions pose significant problems for researchers working within discourse theory (Howarth 1998, 291).

Jacob Torfing, in turn, writes in his *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek* (1999), that

> Although the concepts and arguments of the new theories of discourse are developed in specific analytical contexts, they are pitched at a highly abstract level. That is to say, because discourse theory has a metatheoretical character, it is often difficult to apply it in an unmediated way in concrete empirical studies. Discourse theory provides us with a basic understanding of the key aspects of discursive world formation, but has no ambition of furnishing a detailed and fully operationalized framework for the study of all kinds of social, cultural and political relations. I would thus warn against attempts to apply discourse theory directly and instrumentally in empirical studies (Torfing 1999: 291).

In 2002, also Jørgensen and Phillips state that "Laclau and Mouffe's discourse theory, however, is short on specific methodological guidelines and illustrative examples" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 8) and that

> Laclau and Mouffe do not do much detailed analysis of empirical material themselves. And when they do identify specific discourses, they are interested in these as abstract phenomena rather than as resources that people draw upon and transform in the practices of everyday life […]. But that does not mean that Laclau and Mouffe's theory or their concepts cannot be used in detailed empirical analyses. It just takes a little imagination (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 49).

Significant progress has been made in the methodological advancement of Laclau and Mouffe's approach. Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, 49–57), for instance, recapitulate some of DT concepts they consider useful as tools for empirical analysis (the ones I have presented in this section), present how they can be used in practice, and suggest how to start an analysis (by identifying the most relevant nodal points, floating signifiers, myths and examining their relations with other signs) and what steps should follow (an examination of chains of equivalence, antagonisms, etc., with a focus on both linguistic and non-linguistic practices). Moreover, they suggest that the theoretical notion that discourses are inherently unstable and open to challenge can be translated into methodological guidelines for localizing conflict lines, for examining "What different understandings of reality are at stake, where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another?" (51). However, they warn us that

> Treating the delimitation of discourses as an analytical exercise entails understanding discourses as objects that the researcher constructs rather than as objects that exist in a delimited form in reality, ready to be identified and mapped. But this does not mean that anything at all can be called a discourse. Researchers have to establish in their reports that the delimitation they have made is reasonable (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 144).

Additionally, they provide other guiding questions, that can be answered with the help of the conceptual tools that they recapitulate and that I have presented in this section, e.g.: "how each discourse constitutes knowledge and reality, identities and social relations; where discourses function unobtrusively side by side, and where there are open antagonisms" (51).

Alternative reflections and observations regarding methodological procedures for DT can be found in such studies as Glynos and Howarth (2007), Angermuller (2014), or Marttila (2015). For my research, however, the most relevant approach has been developed by the Brussels Discourse Theory Group (communication and media studies scholars affiliated to the Free University of Brussels—the Vrije Universiteit Brussel), which developed an

approach named Discourse-Theoretical Analysis, or DTA (Carpentier, De Cleen 2007; Carpentier, Spinoy 2008; Carpentier 2010; 2017).

In a 2007 article, its two members (Carpentier and De Cleen) attempted to integrate DT into media and communication studies—fields where it had previously been mostly absent—by demonstrating the theory's empirical applicability beyond political studies and by refining discourse-theoretical methodology.

They seem to have adopted the guidelines proposed by Jørgensen and Phillips (2002) in their integrity, but they also proposed that aligning Discourse Theory with key principles of qualitative research allows DT to function as an analytical framework. According to them, this is accomplished by using DT concepts as *sensitizing concepts* (Blumer 1969), which guide researchers on "what to look for and where to look" (Ritzer 1992, 365). These concepts (discourse, hegemony, articulation, nodal point, floating signifier, myth, social imaginary, chain of equivalence, antagonism, etc.) are meant to support rather than constrain the analysis, remaining as background guidance for the analyst. They assist in interpreting specific social contexts without limiting the scope of the analysis. Due to the unique nature of each research project, sensitizing concepts from outside DT are essential for providing a theoretical foundation. These additional theoretical ideas create another layer of sensitizing concepts, which are highly customized to the particular needs of each project (Carpentier, De Cleen 2007, 273; Carpentier 2017, 278).

To prevent a paradigmatic and ontological schism between external and internal sensitizing concepts, it is essential to adapt these external theoretical frameworks to align with Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory. Through these reinterpretations, non-discourse-theoretical frameworks are transformed into versions that are compatible with DT's ontological and paradigmatic principles (Carpentier, De Cleen, Van Brussel 2019, 13).

Also, Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy suggest that "Foucault's archeo-genealogical method and Derrida's deconstruction can be used as methodological points of departure, although also other methodologies, including […] those that can be borrowed from the social sciences, can be put to good use" (2008, 16). Their book *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis*: *Media, Arts and Literature* illustrates how it can be done with concrete empirical studies rather than detailed general instructions. What is important for my research, nevertheless, is the fact that they provide examples of cultural analysis, including literature,

and they demonstrate, unprecedentedly, the applicability of DTA to this kind of study (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 1–4; 16–21). The four examples of DTA application in literary studies include: 1) an analysis of John Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* and its agonistic relation with the authoritarian order of its time (Sim 2008); 2) a study of the counter-hegemonic potential of Franz Kafka's and Thomas Mann's literature (Bru 2008); 3) an analysis of Nazi efforts to incorporate Flemish literature into their hegemonic project (Spinoy 2008); 4) a reflection on how literary history could be rewritten from the perspective of DTA (Van linthout 2008). As we can observe, all of them—although methodologically inspiring—have focused only on the extrafictional level, and not on the discursive struggles *within* a storyworld.

Finally, since I propose that, to fully understand certain cases of collective subjectivities of fictional characters, it is necessary to analyze them in opposition to hegemonic "objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61), it is also relevant to mention here Martin Nonhoff's *Hegemony Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Research Practice* (2019), which "seeks to close Laclau's and Mouffe's 'methodology gap' to hegemony analysis" and "aims to turn the theory of hegemony into a more suitable instrument for empirical discourse analysis" (Nonhoff 2019, 64). In my opinion, his findings are not indispensable for a methodology aimed at analyzing fictional collective subjectivities (because original DT and DTA fully cover its needs—adding more elements would unnecessarily complicate it). However, they may still offer valuable insights into this matter.

2.2.3 Fictional collective subjectivity analysis framework

At this point, I have already presented all the perspectives that make up my theoretical and methodological framework for analyzing fictional collective subjectivities: Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory (2001 [1985]), Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (Carpentier, De Cleen 2007; Carpentier, Spinoy 2008; Carpentier 2010; 2017), the psychosociological framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019), and narratological findings regarding Possible Worlds Theory (Pavel 1986; Doležel 1988; 1998; Ryan 1991) and fictional minds (Palmer 2004; 2010). Hence, this section will reflect on the compatibility of these

perspectives, on how they can be synthesized, and on how the product of such a synthesis can be applied in practice. First, however, it is relevant to reflect on what kind of literary works[24] are suitable for such an analysis.

2.2.3.1 What kind of literary works are suitable for analysis?

For a fictional collective subjectivity to exist, a collective narrative agent (Margolin 2000) is necessary, as it has been discussed in Chapter 2.1.3 (since a collective subjectivity can constitute a crucial aspect of a collective narrative agent, researchers who study CNAs—whether in practice or theory—might also consider studying CSs). It does not mean, nonetheless, that all the literary works with a CNA are a fitting object for such a kind of study.

It is also necessary for the narratives to contain a considerable amount of subjectiveme indicators, which, as I have explained in Chapter 2.2.1, are events which allow us to capture and understand subjectivities, meaningful marks that have the function of revealing collective subjectivities, that reveal the meaning of their respective signifiers in the characters' web of meanings, in the characters' understanding. It is also preferable (though not indispensable) that a part of these subjectiveme indicators is of the kind that reveals the subjectivity of a whole collectivity (e.g. when the narrator focalizes a group, as in the excerpt from *The Kingdom of This World*), rather than just that of individual members of the group. In other words, we need evidence that there is a collective subjectivity represented in the text, that the characters' subjective structures (in Fabris' terms)—or their individual webs of meanings (in DT terms)—share a considerably wide common denominator.

It is important to stress here, however, that even if a narrative lacks subjectiveme indicators that reveal the subjectivity of a whole collectivity, it does not necessarily mean that collective subjectivity does not occur in it. As Uri Margolin observed in his article "Telling in the Plural: From Grammar to Ideology,"

[24] Although an analysis of non-literary works exceeds the scope of my research, other narrative art works, such as cinematographic ones, also seem a relevant object of study. In the *Vikings* series (2013–2020), for example, it may be interesting to analyze the Vikings' collective subjectivity in terms of the discursive struggles between the "pagans" and the representatives of the Christian world.

> The basic tension underlying the portrayal of group states or actions stems from the logical impossibility of describing things on a holistic and individual level at the same time, even though both levels exist concurrently and are irreducible to each other. There is no doubt that group phenomena cannot exist without lower-level individual ones […], and that differences on the lower level must lead to differences on the higher one. On the other hand, one can describe group phenomena without reference to individual ones, and the same upper-level phenomena can often be realized through different lower-level ones. […W]riters are consequently obliged to decide how much of the one dimension they should sacrifice for the sake of the other, how much to describe in group-as-a-whole terms, and how much in individuals-as-members-of-a-group terms. One artistic pole would be reductionism: treating plural states or actions (group properties) as a pure sum of individual ones, thereby losing the macro dimension altogether, ignoring the novelty of the collective level, and disregarding the fact that collective properties and configurations, not only individual ones, can play a role in determining the course of events. The opposite pole consists of dualism: concentrating exclusively on the macro level, treating the collective states or actions as independent, and not mentioning the individual elements that underlie them (Margolin 2000, 600).

For this reason, I propose to combine the approaches, i.e., to consider all types of subjectiveme indicators—the ones that reveal subjectivity of individual characters and the ones that reveal the subjectivity of a collective narrative agent.

Curiously, even certain narratives with a non-human CNA (animals, plants, objects, deities, etc.) seem to be a suitable object of study, because non-human CNAs tend to be anthropomorphized and thus they acquire human-like properties, including subjectivity, and can "leave," throughout the narrative, "traces" of their subjectivities, i.e. subjectiveme indicators (as in *Warriors*, by Erin Hunter, which tells the story of a collectivity of feral cats, who have their own rules, beliefs, values, notions of good and bad, which contrast with human, anthropocentric ones). Alan Palmer (2004) even goes as far as to argue that

> narrative fiction is, in essence, the presentation of fictional mental functioning. […] If I am right, then it follows that the study of the novel is the study of fictional mental functioning and also that the task of theorists is to make explicit the various means by which this phenomenon is studied and analyzed (Palmer 2004, 5).

One last thing to keep in mind, regarding the subjectiveme indicators (SI), is that the strength of our evidence depends considerably on the way the SIs are represented. The occurrence of a collective subjectivity in a narrative is less disputable when it is confirmed through SIs that reveal it directly, through quotation (direct speech and direct thought modes), or indirectly, when the narrator paraphrases the characters' speech or thought (indirect speech and thought report). In turn, in the case of characterization through free indirect discourse (which refers to speech, thought, and perception) and through characters' actions, the occurrence of a CS is somewhat less evident, since the meaning of such subjectiveme indicators depends to a certain degree on the reader's or analyst's interpretation. In my opinion, however, they can still be considered as valuable evidence, because the possibilities of interpreting them are limited, as Umberto Eco demonstrated it in his *Interpretation and Overinterpretation* [1993, 52], drawing on Popper's idea of falsifiability (while definitive proof of an interpretation may be impossible, criteria can be established to reject incorrect interpretations).

Apart from subjectiveme indicators, a collective subjectivity can also be represented through the narrator's performative utterances regarding a character or regarding a whole collectivity. Unlike subjectiveme indicators, these utterances do not reveal characters' properties through specific events, through their actions, thoughts, or speech, but through the narrator's direct statements about their subjectivity, bringing into existence what these statements say by the act of saying it. Hence, the occurrence of such utterances is another criterion for evaluating whether or not a literary work is suitable for such an analysis (obviously, this strategy of capturing collective subjectivities does not originate from the psycho-sociological framework for real-world CS analysis, since in the real world, there is no narrator that would bring things into existence by the act of saying them).

Furthermore, the literary works in which we can find a collective subjectivity of literary characters may constitute an even more interesting object of study, if the collective subjectivity in question can be analyzed in relation to another CS that coexists in the same (fictional) space and time: for example, a subjectivity of a marginalized group and subjectivity of a dominant group; Or a subjectivity of a marginalized group and a hegemonic

"objectivity" (which also is a kind of collective subjectivity). The results of such an analysis enable us to answer in detail such questions as: "what different understandings of reality are at stake, where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another?" and to show "how each discourse constitutes knowledge and reality, identities and social relations" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 51) within a particular stoyworld.

Such focus, nevertheless, does not have to be primary. Fictional collective subjectivities can also be studied, for example, in order to better understand certain cases of unreliable narration (Booth 1961), in which the narrator might provide a false or incomplete account of events, motivations, emotions, etc. The narration in the magical realism, for instance, is "often characterised as 'childlike' or 'naive'" due to the fact that the magical events "are narrated in great realistic detail but without the narrator registering surprise or commenting on their strangeness" (Faris 2005). My approach can enable us to explain, in detail, why some narrations are not "childlike" or "naive," but culturally (or discursively) conditioned, for example, as in the case of *The Kingdom of This World* or Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death* (although, for Faris, magical realism "Initially flourish[ed] primarily in Latin America, in such texts as Alejo Carpentier's *The Kingdom of this World*" [2005, 281], it is necessary to consider the distinction between magical realism and the marvelous real[25]). It is important, however, to remember that a CS does not necessarily have to be characterized by marvelousness, credulity, or faith-based thinking to constitute an interesting object of study.

2.2.3.2 Synthesis of theoretical and methodological perspectives

As I have previously indicated, this section will reflect on the compatibility of the theoretical and methodological perspectives I have introduced in this chapter, on how they can be synthesized, and on how the product of such a synthesis can be applied in practice.

Regarding the Discourse-Theoretical Analysis, as I have explained earlier, although the components of the framework should be cohesive, researchers can create their own framework by integrating elements from various discourse analytical approaches and, when relevant, non-discourse analytical approaches (as in the case of my study). According to Jørgensen and Phillips, multiperspectivalism "is not only permissible but positively valued in

[25] See Chiampi 1983 (21–46).

most forms of discourse analysis," since "different perspectives provide different forms of knowledge about a phenomenon" (2002, 4). To avoid an "eclecticism based on a mishmash of disparate approaches," they recommend "identifying what kind of (local) knowledge each approach can supply and modifying the approaches" (2002, 4) correspondingly with the needs of each study. Also according to Carpentier, De Cleen, and Van Brussel, non-discourse-theoretical frameworks and their sensitizing concepts can be adapted to align with Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory, transformed into versions that are compatible with the ontological and paradigmatic principles of DT (2019, 13).

My definition of the concept of collective subjectivity, on the other hand, is an adaptation of Fernando Fabris' (2012, 32–33) psycho-sociological definition to the context of literary studies. Such an adaptation, which can be found in section 2.2.1, was necessary due to the fact that, although the fictional CS has several analogies with the real-world CS, they are ontologically different from each other.

Collective subjectivity of literary characters is a concept that accounts for the common denominators of the subjective structure of the members of a group of literary characters (understood as non-actual individuals, hypothetical beings, in line with Uri Margolin's [1989] definition, which relies on Possible Worlds Theory). CS encompasses the common denominator of their ways of thinking, feeling, and acting (which are analyzable thanks to Alan Palmer's fictional minds framework), and is determined by socio-historical processes, everyday life, identification with social ideals, collective memory and projects, beliefs, positive or negative social experiences, and the group's acceptation or repudiation of public figures, among other factors that occur within storyworlds.

Similarly to real-world collective subjectivities (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019, ch. 2, *Subjetividad colectiva* section), fictional *CSs do not refer to discourses*, although *they interpenetrate with them*. While discourses occur at the level of a (fictional) social space, subjectivities occur at the level of individual (fictional) minds. Both real-world collective subjectivity analysts and Discourse Theory authors, as presented earlier, agree that subjectivities not only shape but also are shaped by discourses. It is an interplay of particular *structures* of meanings, each one occurring at its own level and affecting the other.

Due to their analogies, they can both be analyzed and described in an analogous way: as webs of meanings (it is important, however, to keep in mind that delimiting CSs and

discourses in this way requires understanding them as objects constructed by the analyst, since they do not exist in such a delimited form—the delimitation should be reasonable, evidence-driven). For instance, in Jorge Amado's *Captains of the Sands*, a collectivity of Candomblé practitioners believed that it was Omolu who unleashed the smallpox epidemic as a revenge against the rich, because, in their web of meanings, the meaning of "Omolu" signifier is "a real being that has agency in the real world and the power of bringing diseases upon humans," among its many other meanings, and the meaning of "the rich" signifier is "reprehensible people"[26], among its many other meanings. Such an understanding is in contrast with the meaning that was ascribed to them within the web of meanings of the hegemonic discourse, similarly to the meaning of many other signifiers—or "knots"—that make up the web of meanings of this particular collective subjectivity. Additionally, such meanings, which stem from a particular subjectivity level, when *articulated*, begin to operate on another level, on the level of discursive struggles, whether they reproduce or alter common ascriptions of meanings. In other words, discourses are "structured totalit[ies] resulting from the articulatory practice" (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 105), while subjectivities serve as reservoirs of meaning, from which these practices draw.

Furthermore, collective subjectivities do not presuppose any "collective mind." Once again, they solely encompass the *common denominators* of the subjective structure of the members of a group. In the case of the collectivity of Candomblé practitioners from *Captains of the Sands*, for example, their CS encompasses their understanding of such signifiers as "Omolu" or "the rich" (and many others), because in Jorge Amado's novel they ascribe the same meaning to them and act accordingly, but they might have a divergent understanding of other signifiers. Similarly to discourses (understood by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in a poststructuralist way), CSs are dynamic *structures*. They constitute "an open system, a dynamic totality which is relative to other dynamic totalities and implies not equilibrium, but equilibrations and reequilibrations" (Fabris 2012, 34). The meaning of signifiers that make up these webs of meanings can never be permanently fixed (although in literary works they tend to be relatively static). Hence, in my view, the CS concept is compatible with Laclau and Mouffe's poststructuralist perspective (for poststructuralists, structures do exist, but they are

[26] Jorge Amado's work received much criticism for its reductionism, Manichaeism, for excessively stereotypical representations.

always temporary and not necessarily consistent—these structures are fluid, allowing the meanings of signs to change). Moreover, in the light of the above, it becomes even more evident that delimited CSs (in the form of a web of meanings) are objects constructed by the analyst; that they do not exist in such a delimited form (just as discourses do not).

The concept of collective subjectivity also seems compatible with Discourse Theory's social constructionist perspective, since it shares its fundamental premises (Burr 1995, 2–5). The real-world collective subjectivity theorists also agree that subjectivities not only shape but also are shaped by discourses, history, social processes, and culture. They criticize (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019, ch. 2, *Perspectiva teórica* section) deterministic views of history, which treat it as an autonomous force, independent of individual will, and emphasize that the subjects—individuals and groups—act and interact, playing an active role in shaping history. They emphasize the strategic role of human action in history, where individual and social behaviors are *meaningful* responses to circumstances. Nonetheless, they stress that acknowledging human agency does not downplay the influence of objective historical, economic, and social conditions. They state that collective subjectivity must be analyzed within the broader social, institutional, and historical contexts (importantly, *they recommend discourse analysis* for this task [ch. 6, *Cómo analizar los datos* section], among other approaches)—such an approach confirms compatibility with Discourse Theory's macro-contextual focus. Moreover, it is precisely based on the social constructionist premise that varying social interpretations of the world result in different social repercussions that Fabris and Puccini (2010) could form the idea of psychosocial emergents, which are "traces" of subjectivities, events that allow us to capture and understand subjectivities (the concept that I reconceptualized as subjectiveme indicators to adapt it to the context of narratology).

Regarding psychosocial emergents, Fabris, Puccini, and Cambiaso, similarly to Laclau and Mouffe, do not make the distinction between discursive and non-discursive practices. For them, subjectivity can be revealed both through language and actions, through linguistic and non-linguistic psychosocial emergents. As Fabris states (2012, 37–38), the decoding of psychosocial emergents allows the researcher to move from recording the immediate experiences and conditions of daily life to analyzing collective subjectivities, because they condense within themselves a multiplicity of personal and social *meanings*.

Besides, such an approach confirms compatibility with Discourse Theory's macro-textual focus (with its broad definition of text, greatly in congruence with Barthes [1973]).

Conceptualized in the same way, subjectiveme indicators are compatible not only with the DTA framework, but with Alan Palmer's fictional minds approach as well, because, apart from language, also characters' actions can reveal what meaning is ascribed to particular signifiers in their web of meanings, since, as Clark and Chalmers (1998, 10) propose, sometimes it is impossible to disconnect physical actions from the underlying mental processes that drive them—the mental structure that drives action encompasses memories, motives and reasons, as well as decisions and intentions, among others. Palmer refers to this phenomenon as the thought-action continuum (2004, 212–214).

Additionally, if these linguistic and non-linguistic subjectiveme indicators are public, socially visible, if they affect the storyworld's discursive field in any degree (if it is not an unaccompanied self-talk, for instance), they can be equated with the DTA concept of articulations, because in such cases, they function as acts of meaning production (either reproducing—i.e. consolidating—or altering meanings of particular signifiers).

Regarding the compatibility between Discourse-Theoretical Analysis and Literary Studies in general, Carpentier and Spinoy (2008, 1–21), in their introduction to *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis*: *Media, Arts and Literature* ("From the Political to the Cultural"), present a very persuasive argumentation, in which they defend such interdisciplinary research practices. They state that, while the application of Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory is common in political studies and occasional in media studies, it "remains surprisingly absent from the fields of Literary Criticism and Cultural Studies" (3): DT research agenda "rarely included more culturally inspired analyses" (2), which they consider "somewhat odd" (2), since culture—defined as "an assemblage of imaginings and *meanings* [emphasis added] that may be consonant, disjunctive, overlapping, contentious, continuous or discontinuous" (Lewis 2002, 12)—has an evident connection with DT's focus on signification (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 2).

Also, apart from the fact that Laclau—who has held visiting professor positions at several departments and centers dedicated to comparative literature (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 21)—and Mouffe frequently emphasized that Discourse Theory should be viewed as a toolbox, applicable across various domains (3), they also demonstrated

> a genuine and profound interest in the role and history of (high) culture, as is for instance illustrated by Laclau's discussion of Thomas Mann (Laclau, [Zac] 1994) and by his quoting of the medieval German mystic author Meister Eckehart and the British poet Browning (Laclau, 2002). Similarly, Mouffe (2001, 2007) has published and lectured on the relationship between politics and the arts (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 2).

Additionally, other influential approaches closely tied to DT, such as the Foucauldian and Derridean strands of poststructuralism, have made substantial contributions to modern cultural analysis. In a similar vein, also other approaches to discourse analysis have firmly established themselves within cultural studies, as demonstrated by the extensive body of literature (see Carpentier, De Cleen 2007).

The main thesis of Carpentier and Spinoy's book is that

> The discourse-theoretical toolbox (or treasure chest) makes available a large number of analytical tools that can enrich contemporary cultural analysis. More specifically, DTAs in the study of media, literature, and other artistic disciplines allow for a dry-eyed, sobered-up continuation of earlier poststructuralist and deconstructionist research. […] Bringing these analytical tools into new areas will automatically involve their rearticulation. […] Rigid intellectual and theoretical protectionism would [be] detrimental to this endeavor. The interpretatory openness […] not only improves […] analytical quality, but also cross-fertilizes discourse theory itself (2008, 4).

Although Carpentier and Spinoy provide examples of studies that convincingly prove their point, these papers have focused only on the extrafictional level, and not on the discursive struggles *within* a storyworld, as my study does. In my view, using a real-world-oriented framework to analyze a fictional world is relevant, since we assume, in accordance with Possible Worlds Theory, that it has analogous properties. Moreover, Laclau and Mouffe argue that social reality is constructed through discourses, where meaning is contingent and shaped by power relations. In the same way, literary storyworlds are

constructed spaces, where discourses are strategically created by the author to reflect, critique, or explore various forms of reality (a prominent example of this is George Orwell's *1984*). I believe that fictional discourses in literary texts function similarly to social discourses in that they shape and define the identities, relationships, and conflicts within the storyworld (as in *1984*, for instance). I also hold the view that Laclau and Mouffe's understanding of how social reality is constructed suggests that both fictional worlds and the real world are ontologically similar in terms of narrativity, because both in fictional worlds and the real world, social reality is constructed through discourse, which is inherently narrative in nature. Just as authors create storyworlds by arranging events, characters, and discourses, social actors construct their understanding of the real world through narratives shaped by discursive practices (e.g., cultural, political, and historical narratives). In this sense, both realms rely on narrativity to make sense of their respective realities. In addition, both in fictional and real worlds, meaning is not fixed. It is contingent and subject to interpretation. In literature, this is evident in the way readers interpret narratives, while in the real world, social meanings are continually rearticulated and contested through discursive practices. This shared reliance on the fluidity of meaning suggests an ontological similarity in how both worlds are understood (the notion that discourse shapes our lived reality does not suggest that social phenomena are devoid of material characteristics or that a physical world independent of discourse does not exist—as explained earlier, Laclau and Mouffe's point is that meaning of these phenomena arises through discourses, and this attribution of meaning actively participates in the formation of both objects and subjects).

At this point, it becomes necessary to recapitulate how the product of such a synthesis of methodological and theoretical perspectives can be applied in practice. To analyze fictional collective subjectivities with the use of my framework, I propose to start by identifying a suitable object of study: a literary work that fulfills the criteria established in section 2.2.3.1 (with a collective narrative agent, with a considerable amount of subjectiveme indicators, etc.).

Afterwards, it is necessary to identify subjectiveme indicators in the text (together with the narrator's performative utterances that reveal—or bring into existence—the particularities of characters' subjectivity through direct statements on this matter, in case such utterances do occur in the narrative). As I have explained in the chapter about Alan

Palmer's framework (2.1.2), while we look for SIs, we need to pay special attention to the narrative conventions that give readers access to diverse mental events and aspects of a character's mind (such as the direct thought, free direct thought, thought report, or free indirect thought) and to such aspects of mind presentation as characters' dispositions, background suppositions, emotions, speech, and actions.

Since our data can be numerous and diverse, I suggest organizing it by categories, which will be determined by the most relevant *nodal points* (signifiers that determine the meaning of other signifiers by organizing around themselves a system of interdependent meanings) and by subcategories, which will be determined by lower-level signifiers (in a spreadsheet database, for example). For this purpose, we need to establish which signifier's meaning is revealed through each subjectiveme indicator (it is necessary to keep in mind that each SI can reveal the meaning of more than one signifier). At the end of this task, we obtain an initial idea regarding the key components of the web of meanings that constitutes the collective subjectivity in question—for instance, we find out that the events represented in the literary work we study reveal how the characters understand such concepts as, for example, "Brazilianness," "Afro-Brazilian culture," "Omolu," "the State," or "communism."

To conduct such an analysis, in some cases, it might be necessary to have a deep knowledge of the literary work's real-world context. Storyworlds are autonomous possible worlds, which do not necessarily depend on the real world to be reassembled from the text by the reader, but they do depend to certain degree on the real world, which completes them, since storyworlds are ontologically incomplete, they have ontological gaps or, as Roman Ingarden named them, "spots of indeterminacy" (1973, 246)—no narrative art work can determine every detail of its whole storyworld. Marie-Laure Ryan, however, argues that what enables the readers to access fictional worlds and to create the implicit texture that fills these gaps is what she names the principle of minimal departure (1991): while we read a text and reconstruct a storyworld from it, we assume that the storyworld is like our own until the text tells us otherwise (for instance, if the text mentions a little boy, the reader will first imagine a child with two legs, two arms, and one head, unless the text specifies that the boy has two heads, five legs and six arms). Thus, the discursive struggles within Amado's storyworlds, for example, for an "ideal reader" (see Prince), are actually a reflection of those in the real world (this is a result of the Amadian fiction's documentary character, typical of the social

novel, and of the fact that, while reading a text and reconstructing a storyworld from it, readers assume that the storyworld is like their own until the text tells them otherwise, as the principle of minimal departure assumes). To fully understand these discursive struggles, to fill certain ontological gaps, certain spots of indeterminacy, knowledge of the real-world context is necessary because it allows the researcher to identify the most relevant nodal points, among other things. Moreover, as Markiewicz emphasizes, an interpretation is incorrect when "characters or environments in realist works are assessed in an ahistorical manner, divergent from the norms accepted within the cultural context to which those characters belong" [transl.—E. Ch.] (1996, 63).

To identify the most relevant nodal points, it is also profitable to consider Teun Van Dijk's (2011) guiding questions related to the schematic categories of the structure of ideologies: identity (Who are we? Who belong to us? Where do we come from?); activities (What do we usually do? What is our task?); goals (What do we want to obtain?); norms and values (What is good/bad, permitted/prohibited for us?); group relations (Who are our allies and opponents?); resources (What is the basis of our power, or our lack of power?).

Once the nodal points and relevant lower-level signifiers are identified, it is necessary to analyze what meaning is ascribed to them by the characters in question (accordingly to the instructions from Chapter 2.2.1). The nature of this task is, to a certain degree, interpretative. As Palmer emphasizes, readers ("interpreters") play a significant role in constructing fictional mind: it is the reader who needs to ascribe consciousness to observable actions—the intentions, purposes, motives, or reasons driving an action might be directly stated by the narrator, implicit but recognizable for the reader, or hidden. The essence of Palmer's approach is a detailed examination of the "structure of mental events that lies behind the decisions that lead to actions and, specifically, of how this is presented in the discourse by the narrator" (2004, 122). In addition, the reader's imagination fills in gaps in the narrative, contributing to the vividness of characters' psychological processes. This idea is critical in understanding how *fictional minds are collaboratively created by both the text and the reader*. Palmer—who has drawn on the findings of the Reader Response Theory—sees the reader as an agent who confers "real existence" to the text and gives it meaning through interpretation and, by this act, unfolds the work's inherently dynamic character. He agrees with Iser's (1978) thesis that *the text directs and pre-structures the creation of meaning* by

progressively furnishing elements of what will ultimately form the artwork, while leaving gaps between them for the reader to fill in, thereby completing the work:

> As only a certain number of the words on the pages of the text can refer to a particular character, it is part of the competence of the reader to construct, both from this written text and from the unwritten implications that comprise the gaps within the written text, a continuing consciousness for that character (Palmer 2004, 41).

After our interpretative efforts, it becomes clear whether a collective subjectivity occurs, if there is a common denominator regarding the way the characters understand particular concepts. If it is the case, it becomes possible to describe such a CS and its characteristics. If the results are satisfactory, the analysis could even be concluded at this stage, but, in my opinion, it is relevant to do additional work, since only the first two out of three main guiding questions are answered (1. What are the most pertinent subjectiveme indicators and what do they mean? 2. What are the features of the collective subjectivity in question? 3. With which features of the social, historical, political, economic, cultural, and daily life process do the features of the collective subjectivity correlate?).

To answer the third question, we can start by examining what meanings are ascribed to our key nodal points by other collectivities that coexist within the storyworld under analysis (also in this case a knowledge of the literary work's real-world context might be necessary, especially in the case of social novels, due to the storyworld's potential dependence on the real world). If these meanings differ, it indicates that these nodal points function as floating signifiers, and we can attempt to identify the struggles over their meaning.

It is also relevant to verify if these floating signifiers function as societal *myths* or if they have been converted into a *social imaginary*—apart from examining their relations with other signs—to find out whether they function as tools for the construction (or perpetuation) of a hegemony. If there is an *antagonism*, it is worth to study how it is constructed discursively (e.g. if there is *logic of equivalence* or *logic of difference* at work) and "what

different understandings of reality are at stake, where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 51).

Since each study is unique and requires adopting customized methods, it is not possible to describe here precise and universal methodological guidelines for answering the third guiding question. Nevertheless, we have at our disposal all the sensitizing concepts (discourse, hegemony, articulation, nodal point, floating signifier, myth, social imaginary, chain of equivalence, antagonism, etc.), which guide us on "what to look for and where to look" (Ritzer 1992, 365). Moreover, as I have mentioned previously, also Martin Nonhoff's *Hegemony Analysis: Theory, Methodology and Research Practice* (2019), which "seeks to close Laclau's and Mouffe's 'methodology gap' to hegemony analysis" and "aims to turn the theory of hegemony into a more suitable instrument for empirical discourse analysis" (Nonhoff 2019, 64), can offer valuable insights into this matter (although, in my opinion, his findings are not indispensable for a methodology aimed at analyzing fictional collective subjectivities, because original DT and DTA fully cover its needs).

Finally, I would like to address one last methodological question: it is also relevant to analyze whether a collective subjectivity or its representatives are legitimized or delegitimized by the narrator(s) (or by the implied author [see Schmid], in particular cases). The outcome, which may significantly affect the ideological overtone of the narrative, is determined mainly by the following factors:

1) the narrator's explicit disapprovals or approvals (in accordance with their value system, for example);
2) the narrator's identification with the collectivity (which may imply adopting its perspective);
3) the degree of exposure (the attention given to the CS, also in comparison with other subjectivities);
4) the proportion of the events which legitimize the CS, or its representatives, to those that delegitimize them (the implied author's presence and their ideologically biased selectivity may be particularly perceptible in this aspect);
5) the storyworld's social reality and the collectivity's situation within it;
6) negative or positive representation of other subjectivities;

7) ascription of structural roles (e.g., hero, helper, villain) to the CS representatives and their potential antagonists.

3. Model analysis: collective subjectivity in Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*

3.1 Justification for the selection of *Sea of Death*

The primary object of this study is Jorge Amado's *Mar Morto* (*Sea of Death*), a 1936 novel that provides an exceptionally fertile ground for the application of the theoretical-methodological framework developed here. This work was selected due to several factors: its focus on collectivity and sociological perspective; its rich presence of subjectiveme indicators (both individual and collective); its intention to represent a marginalized social group and its counter-hegemonic perspective; the coexistence of distinct collective subjectivities (the "sea people" and the "land people"); and the fact that it was written in a period of an intense ideological polarization, of intense disputes regarding the Brazilian identity (Candido 1984), and, therefore, of intense discursive struggles (as it will be explained in more detail in the following sections).

Sea of Death offers a rare and complex depiction of a collective protagonist whose subjectivity is expressed not only through direct speech and thought reports but also through the narrator's performative utterances, free indirect discourse, and through the characters' actions (carried out both individually and collectively). This multifaceted representation provides particularly strong evidence for studying collective subjectivity within a fictional world, making the novel an ideal case for a model analysis.

Initially, a broader corpus had been considered, encompassing Jorge Amado's *Cacau* (1933), *Suor* ("Sweat," 1934), *Jubiabá* (1935), and *Capitães da Areia* ("Captains of the Sand," 1937). They also fulfill the theoretical requirements established for the study of collective subjectivity and could, therefore, serve as fruitful objects of analysis within the proposed framework.[27] However, to ensure a more coherent, in-depth, and detailed analysis, I have decided to focus on *Mar Morto* alone. This decision allowed me to concentrate more effectively on the development of my theoretical-methodological framework, as well as to

[27] There are other social novels from the Nordeste region—written in the Getúlio Vargas Era (1930–1945) by the most prominent representatives of the so-called "Generation of '30"—that seem to be a suitable object of study. For instance: 1) *O Quinze* (1930), Rachel de Queiroz; 2) *São Bernardo* (1934), Graciliano Ramos; 3) *Vidas Secas* (1938), Graciliano Ramos; 4) *Pedra Bonita* (1938), José Lins do Rego; 5) *Fogo Morto* (1943), José Lins do Rego; 6) *Terras do Sem-Fim* (1943), Jorge Amado; 7) *São Jorge dos Ilhéus* (1944), Jorge Amado.

explore the representations of collective subjectivity and discursive strategies in a more comprehensive and nuanced way, without fragmenting the study across multiple storyworlds. Nevertheless, occasional references will be made to other works in order to support and enrich my argumentation.

3.2 Getúlio Vargas Era and Jorge Amado

To conduct this analysis, it has been necessary to acquire a deep knowledge of the Amadian work's real-world context. As I have mentioned before, I recognize that storyworlds are autonomous possible worlds, which do not necessarily depend on the real world to be reassembled from the text by the reader, but they do depend to certain degree on the real world, which completes them, since storyworlds are ontologically incomplete, they have ontological gaps—no narrative art work can determine every detail of its whole storyworld. Marie-Laure Ryan, however, argues that what enables the readers to access fictional worlds and to create the implicit texture that fills these gaps is what she names the principle of minimal departure (1991): while we read a text and reconstruct a storyworld from it, we assume that the storyworld is like our own until the text tells us otherwise. Thus, the discursive struggles within Amado's storyworlds, for an "ideal reader" (see Prince), as we will see further on, are actually a reflection of those in the real world (this is a result of the Amadian fiction's documentary character, typical of the social novel, and a result of the fact that, while reading a text and reconstructing a storyworld from it, readers assume that the storyworld is like their own until the text tells them otherwise, as the principle of minimal departure assumes). To fully understand these discursive struggles, to fill certain ontological gaps, knowledge of the real-world context is necessary, because it allows the researcher to identify the most relevant nodal points, among other things.

Nevertheless, it is necessary to clarify that I agree with Iser's (1978) thesis that *it is the text that directs and pre-structures the creation of meaning* by progressively furnishing elements of what will ultimately form the artwork (while leaving gaps between them for the reader to fill in). For this reason, I recognize that the storyworlds, even in the case of social or historical novels (despite their documentary character), can differ from the real-world state of affairs or its history, that they can have their particularities. Hence, *the evidence from the*

storyworld under analysis is to be treated with priority: the ways in which Amado's narratives reconstruct the real-world discourses should also be closely studied; the texts cannot be interpreted only through the prism of their context, with a disregard for their fictional autonomy and internal dynamics. In other words, what is explicitly stated in the text should be treated as more solid evidence for an interpretation than what is a product of filling the ontological gaps, even if it is incompatible with the real-world state of affairs or history.

3.2.1 Real-world hegemonic discourse

In Brazil, the 1930s began with a revolution, a *coup d'état*, and a very intense ideological polarization (Candido 1984). In the young republic, one of the principal axes of this polarization was constituted by the differences in the understanding of the national identity (hereafter, "Brazilianness"). The hegemonic vision of Brazilianness, on the other hand, was decisive in determining who the victims of social marginalization would be.

Until the 1930s, the hegemonic discourse mainly defended conservative norms and values. It justified the current, oppressive order, which, practically, had not changed (from the perspective of the marginalized people) for centuries (Pesavento 1996). In colonial times, both Indigenous and black people were considered inferior and were exploited by the white[28] elites (Paleczny 2004, 12–51). Brazil's declaration of independence (1822), the proclamation of the republic in place of the monarchy (1889), and even the abolition of slavery (1888), did not bring any significant improvement for them (Malinowski 2013, 24–45). In the first three decades of the republic, the government did not make any serious efforts to mitigate the inequalities between the elites and the lower classes, because the latter were not considered a legitimate part of the Brazilian nation (Malinowski 2013, 47–120) by the symbolic elites (i.e. by the "groups and organizations that directly or indirectly control public discourse" and "who have privileged access to the influential public discourses in politics, the media, education and business corporations" [Van Dijk 2015, 70, 76]).

The situation changed to a certain degree in the 1930s, after Getúlio Vargas (1882–1954) took power. Vargas diagnosed in Brazil a lack of national interest and national

[28] Given the inconsistencies across style manuals, I have chosen to use lowercase (*black*, *white*) when these terms function as adjectives, and uppercase when used as nouns referring to social identities. *Indigenous*, however, is capitalized in all instances, in line with current academic conventions.

identity, a dispersion of internal forces that was generating instability. His purpose was to unify the Brazilians around elements of identity that would reinforce their patriotism and the government's position. Hence, he included black people and other members of the lower classes in his new nation-building project (partially inspired by Gilberto Freyre's groundbreaking *Casa-Grande & Senzala* [*The Masters and the Slaves*]). He was trying to create his image as the "Father of the Poor" by implementing, for example, unprecedented worker empowerment programs. However, in most cases, his new labor laws were neither respected by the employers nor enforced by the State. Vargas' dictatorship was still very oppressive towards the marginalized, although in a less explicit way (Malinowski 2013, 121–180). Nonetheless, it is not relevant to describe, at this point, all the nuances of his very multifaceted political activity, since, paradoxically, the hegemonic discourse of the Vargas Era cannot be identified with the Vargas regime's discourse.

The Vargas Era begins in 1930. Yet, Vargas implemented the most significant and groundbreaking changes only after 1937, after his self-coup that established the so-called *Estado Novo* (lit. "New State"), an 8-year-long dictatorship. By then, Jorge Amado had already published six novels: *The Country of Carnival* (1931), *Cacau* (1933), *Sweat* (1934), *Jubiabá* (1935), *Sea of Death* (1936), *Captains of the Sands* (1937)[29]. The hegemonic discourse that Amado's novels contested was not the Vargas government's discourse. The reason for this is that this hegemonic discourse was not a result of seven years of discursive practices. Vargas's regime did not construct a new common sense, a "new objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61), in such a short time. Its discourse did have many characteristics in common with the hegemonic one (precisely because it was embedded in the hegemonic common sense). Still, it was only one of the actors struggling for hegemony in the Brazilian discursive field of that period. Though certainly the strongest, it was still only one of these actors.

The hegemonic discourse of the Vargas Era should instead be identified with a discourse whose origins date back to the colonial period, with what Mariusz Malinowski

[29] In 1929, Jorge Amado (under a pseudonym—Y. Karl), together with Dias da Costa and Edison Carneiro, wrote also *Lenita* (known as well as *El-Rey*)—a novel that was published in installments in *O Jornal*. Later, however, the writer considered the work immature and of little literary value, to the point of disregarding it as part of his literary legacy. In *Navegação de cabotagem* ("Coasting"), his memoir, Amado writes that *Lenita* is "such a bad novel that it required three authors," "a poorly written book by three teenagers" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Amado 1992, 48).

names “the brigantine cultural heritage” (2011, 134–160). The Brigantine Dynasty ruled in Brazil from 1640 till 1889. However, according to Malinowski (2011, 134–160), for the Brazilian lower classes, the first decades of the republic were a complete continuation of colonial times, because the symbolic elites fully adopted the brigantine *raison d’état*. They treated the people instrumentally and subordinated the national interest to the Brazilian aristocracy and the conservative politicians. Pseudoscientific racial theories, which proposed that Western European culture was the acme of human sociocultural evolution, were widely accepted and contributed to the popularization of the “racial whitening ideology,” which was supposed to be a solution for the so-called “Negro problem.” The objective of the official historiography of the period was to consolidate the domination of the oppressors, to neutralize the aspirations of the oppressed, and to reject their culture, since they were considered the ones to blame for Brazil’s backwardness (Williams 2001, 106). To describe “the brigantine cultural heritage” in detail, however, it is necessary first to outline Brazil’s earlier history.

3.2.1.1 Introduction: Brazil’s pre-republican history

Before 1500, before the Portuguese invasion, the territory that makes up modern-day Brazil was inhabited by a variety of tribes (mainly from the Tupi–Guarani language family, but also by the Yanomami, Aimoré, or Pataxó, among many others—according to the census conducted in 2010 by the Brazilian Institute of Geography and Statistics [Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, “Censo Demográfico 2010”], currently, there are 274 indigenous languages in Brazil, spoken by 305 different ethnic groups). Studies conducted by anthropologists, historians, and geographers have revealed a rich and extensive history of indigenous cultures in the region, spanning up to 13,000 years. These cultures changed significantly over time and exhibited considerable regional diversity (Roosevelt, Navarro 2021, 8).

Describing the customs and social structures of these ethnic groups is challenging because, apart from serious cultural differences and data shortages, significant prejudice against Brazilian Indigenous peoples—both historically and today—complicates it. Such

prejudice is evident, to varying degrees, in the accounts of travelers, chroniclers, and religious figures, particularly Jesuit writers (Fausto 2006, 38).

However, Mariusz Malinowski (2013, 17), Joseph Smith and Francisco Vinhosa (2013, 31) claim that the *initial* relations between the Portuguese and the Indigenous were *generally* pacific—peaceful relations were beneficial for the Portuguese for practical reasons, since they needed local guides and barter trade partners. Between 1500 and 1535, the primary economic activity of the Portuguese was extracting brazilwood, mainly through buying it from the Indigenous peoples for cloth scraps, small tools, and trinkets—objects of minimal value to the Portuguese (besides, the fact that the name of the country in question comes from the name of the commodity also reflects, to certain degree, how instrumentally the Portuguese treated their colony).

Afterward, nonetheless, the Portuguese shifted from maintaining temporary trading outposts to establishing lasting settlements, initiating the process of seizing Indigenous territories. As sugarcane agriculture expanded during the latter part of the 16th century, the demand for field workers escalated (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 31–32). As Malinowski states, "The Portuguese aversion to physical labor and the pursuit of maximum profits increasingly created a demand for manpower that could no longer be satisfied even within the framework of highly exploitative trade relationships" [transl.—E. Ch.] (2013, 17–19). Thus, the Portuguese enforced a system of obligatory labor on the Indigenous population that was effectively equivalent to enslavement.

Plantation owners defended their use of force and coercion by claiming that Indigenous people were savages, uncivilized, and could be treated no differently than beasts of burden. On the other hand, according to Smith and Vinhosa (2013, 32), certain members of Brazil's religious orders, particularly the Jesuits, upheld an opposing perspective, advocating that Indigenous peoples were fully human and entitled to their natural rights. The need for a clear policy toward them became urgent.

In 1537, Pope Paul II declared that Indigenous peoples were capable of receiving the Christian faith and prohibited their enslavement except in cases deemed a "just war." This, however, was open to interpretation and resulted in numerous abuses—conflicts with Indigenous groups were a common occurrence throughout the 16th and 17th centuries (Malinowski 2013, 19). Slavery was also allowed when Indigenous people were considered

rebellious, resisted conversion to Christianity, or were captured after attempting to run away. In practice, the laws were interpreted in a way that allowed plantation owners to acquire the manpower they needed (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 32).

The introduction of stricter laws in 1595 and 1609, aimed at protecting the Indigenous population from exploitation, showed some concern for their situation (the availability of healthy Indigenous laborers, due to the demographic disaster caused by the Portuguese, was gradually decreasing). However, this also signaled that the shortage of the Indigenous workforce was becoming less critical, largely due to the increasing importation of African slaves, who were seen as more reliable and effective workers (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 32).

The Indigenous people who remained in the coastal areas were compelled to submit to Portuguese control and exploitation. Religious orders provided some protection by establishing settlements for Indigenous people, but they focused primarily on converting them to Catholicism and, in their efforts to enforce European values, work habits, and discipline, they imposed coercive measures and social control that showed no respect for Indigenous cultures and traditions (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 33). They even questioned the humanity of the native populations, based on a belief in their cultural and moral inferiority. Father Manuel da Nóbrega, for example, claimed that "Indians are dogs who kill and eat one another. And in their vices and dealings with one another, they are pigs" (Fausto 2006, 49–50). Moreover, many plantation owners and settlers had long resented the Jesuits for their significant wealth and their role in advocating for Indigenous rights. In 1759, this resentment culminated in the seizure of their property and their expulsion from Brazil (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 15).

Overall, as Boris Fausto states:

> The arrival of the Portuguese was a veritable catastrophe for the Indians. […] This is not to say that Indians did not ferociously resist the colonists, especially when the latter made attempts to enslave them. The Indians who gave in, or who were conquered, experienced cultural violence, epidemics, and death. […] the word "catastrophe" is the most appropriate for describing the fate of the Amerindian population. Millions of Indians lived in Brazil at the time of conquest, and only some 270,000 are with us today (Fausto 2006, 40–41).

The severe decline of the Indigenous population contrasted with the consistent increase in the number of enslaved black Africans, brought to the country against their will. Portuguese merchants had engaged in the African slave trade since the mid-15th century. While the expense of transporting enslaved individuals initially made this labor source costly, plantation owners believed that a single African worker had the labor capacity of three or four Indigenous workers. Africans also displayed higher resistance to illnesses that were devastating native populations. Furthermore, enslaving Africans generated fewer ethical and theological controversies compared to the enslavement of Indigenous people. Jesuit theologian Luis de Molina, for instance, in 1592, argued that enslaving Africans was justified by natural law and Roman law, citing its long history, its roots in the classical world (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 33–34). Even religious organizations, such as the Benedictines, became significant slave owners on a large scale, justifying their actions by arguing that by bringing enslaved individuals to a Christian environment, they were offering them the chance to be civilized and saved through exposure to true religion. Additionally, black people were deemed racially inferior. During the 19th century, widely accepted pseudoscientific theories further bolstered racism. Measurements of skull shapes, brain weights, and other supposed biological factors were used to "prove" that black individuals were less intelligent, emotionally unstable, and biologically predisposed to subjection. In stark contrast to the treatment of Indigenous people, who were theoretically protected by laws against enslavement—albeit laws that were rarely enforced and riddled with exceptions—black slaves were granted no legal rights. Under the law, they were regarded as things rather than human beings (Fausto 2006, 52–53).

Historians typically classify African peoples into two major ethnic categories: the "Sudanese," associated with the Egyptian Sudan, western Africa, and regions along the northern Gulf of Guinea; and the "Bantus," linked to equatorial and tropical areas such as parts of the Gulf of Guinea, the Congo, Mozambique, and Angola. Enslaved individuals from numerous ethnic backgrounds within these groups were transported to Brazil. Among the "Sudanese" were the Yorubas, Haussas, Tapas, and Iwes, for example, while the "Bantus" included Angolas, Monjolos, Bengalas, and Mozambicans, among others. An estimated four million enslaved individuals arrived at Brazilian ports between 1550 and 1855 (Fausto 2006,

51). It is important, however, to note that the calculations vary considerably and also that the mortality rate of black people, during transport from Africa, was very high (Malinowski 2013, 20).

The African population not only became the primary labor force but also represented the majority of the colonial population. As a result, slavery emerged as the defining characteristic of colonial Brazilian society. For white colonists, it was regarded as a crucial, if not irreplaceable, foundation for the colony's economic development and their personal wealth (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 34).

They invariably subjected their workers to harsh and unhealthy conditions in which mistreatment and cruelty were common. The absence of health care greatly contributed to high infant mortality rates and shortened adult lifespans. On average, male field laborers brought from Africa survived only about seven years after their arrival. Sugar plantations anticipated annual losses of five to ten percent of their enslaved workforce due to overwork or poor health. Planters, nevertheless, accepted these high mortality rates, as the transatlantic slave trade ensured a steady influx of replacement labor (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 34).

Enslaved individuals were regarded as personal property, bought and sold at their oppressors' discretion. They were subjected to economic exploitation and rigid discipline, often enforced through violence. Central squares in towns and villages frequently had a *pelourinho*, a stone post used for public floggings of slaves and criminals, symbolizing both white dominance and cruelty. Like colonized Indigenous people, enslaved Africans were compelled to endure lives of labor. Throughout much of the colonial era, the majority were engaged in agricultural work, particularly in the sugar plantations of the Northeast, which depended heavily on physical toil. During the eighteenth-century mining boom, many were sent to Minas Gerais to work in gold and diamond extraction. A smaller number served as domestic workers in their oppressor's households or as servants in urban areas. Although formal marriage among slaves was rarely allowed, many created family units. However, these families were often torn apart when enslaved men were sold and relocated, leaving women to care for the children or other dependents. This dynamic contributed to the matriarchal structure typical of enslaved families (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 34–35).

The mistreatment of enslaved individuals often led to resistance, which could take various forms, including assaults or even the killing of the oppressors. Such actions were met

with severe retaliation and punishment from white society. Slave revolts did happen, but typically, they were swiftly suppressed (several factors hindered the possibility of collective rebellion, including the fact that, unlike the Indigenous peoples, black individuals were forcibly removed from their homelands, arbitrarily separated from one another, and transported to unfamiliar territories). Resistance more commonly appeared in subtle, less direct forms such as pretending to be ill, refusing to cooperate, damaging equipment, or, in extreme cases, choosing suicide. Escaping was another form of disobedience. The presence of a free black population sometimes made recapturing escapees challenging. Some runaways formed or joined organized settlements called *quilombos* (or *mocambos*), where they sustained themselves through small-scale farming. The most renowned *quilombo* was Quilombo dos Palmares, in Alagoas, which once housed 20,000 residents. Military forces launched multiple attacks on this *quilombo*, ultimately destroying it, after almost a century, in 1695 (Fausto 2006, 52; Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 35).

During the colonial era, Brazil's population, apart from a small elite of affluent landowners, sugar plantation owners, and merchants, largely lived in poverty and endured difficult living conditions. Both free individuals and enslaved people faced consistent economic exploitation, social inequality, and violence, whether institutional or non-institutional. In rural areas, life was dominated by relentless physical labor and subsistence farming. For the minority residing in urban centers, employment opportunities and conditions were only marginally less harsh (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 36–37).

The early development of Brazilian culture faced significant difficulties. Among the colonizers, there was a lack of educated people, and the dispersed aristocracy, spread across an immense area, did not foster any significant intellectual exchange. Public education and cultural initiatives received minimal attention. The Jesuits were the only group with a defined cultural agenda, which was intrinsically linked to their evangelization efforts. They nearly monopolized Brazilian education, with a curriculum heavily influenced by their theology (Malinowski 2013, 23).

In fact, the Crown actively worked to suppress intellectual progress in Brazil. Although books and pamphlets could be brought in from Portugal, they were strictly controlled through censorship. The colony was prohibited from having its own printing press, and when one was established in Rio de Janeiro in 1749, it was promptly seized.

Despite numerous petitions, the monarchy consistently denied requests to create a university in Brazil. Consequently, Brazilian-born white people who aspired to higher education were forced to study in Europe, leading the local elite to absorb Portuguese cultural values and culture (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 37).

The Crown was in charge of securing Portuguese control over the colony, managing its administration, implementing settlement policies, addressing fundamental issues like labor supply, and defining the nature of the relationship between Lisbon and the colony, but it was the Catholic church—the administrator of the official state religion—that was "in charge of the souls." With Catholicism being mandatory for all members of Brazilian society, the church played a crucial role in instilling obedience. However, its role extended beyond this. The church was deeply integrated into every stage of life, marking pivotal moments such as birth, marriage, and death. Belonging to a community, leading a respectable life, and ensuring a sinless departure from this world depended on rituals exclusively conducted by the church: baptism, confirmation, marriage, confession, last rites at the time of death, and burial in a cemetery (Fausto 2006, 60).

Furthermore, in the colony's social hierarchy, "purity of blood" served as a basis for segregation, at least until 1773. Those considered to have "impure blood" included New Christians, free black individuals, and, to some degree, Indigenous people and individuals of mixed racial backgrounds. The racial criterion excluded many from certain professions, noble titles, and membership in elite brotherhoods. Also religious differences, closely tied to the concept of "purity of blood," created a layer of social division. Portuguese settlers in Brazil were Catholic, by definition, but some were less Catholic than others: New Christians were often suspected by Old Christians of secretly practicing Judaism. This suspicion led to widespread discrimination against New Christians, some of whom were arrested or killed by the Inquisition. The 1773 charter abolished the distinction between New and Old Christians, but prejudice persisted well beyond that date. While this form of discrimination targeted individuals, a deeper division existed between those considered persons and non-persons—specifically, the divide between free individuals and slaves (legally, slaves were regarded as objects). The distinction between freedom and enslavement was closely tied to ethnicity and skin color, with the enslaved population primarily composed of black and Indigenous people, as well as those of mixed ancestry (Fausto 2006, 65–72).

The Crown sought to implement a slightly less discriminatory approach towards the Indigenous. For instance, a decree in 1755 encouraged intermarriage between Indigenous and white people, stating such unions were acceptable. The decree even stipulated that the offspring of these marriages should be prioritized for "jobs and honors" and prohibited the use of terms like *caboclo* or other potentially derogatory names. In one instance, however, the viceroy of Brazil removed an Indigenous militia chief from his position for marrying a black woman, because he "displayed sentiments so low as to marry a black woman, staining his blood with this union and making himself unworthy of the office of militia chief" (Fausto 2006, 68).

Social distinctions existed even within the enslaved population, often based on skin color. Lighter-skinned people were favored for roles such as domestic servants, artisans, or overseers, while those with darker skin were typically assigned the most grueling and physically demanding tasks (Fausto 2006, 69).

As Boris Fausto states (2009, 69), slavery was a foundational institution in Brazil, influencing every aspect of society and shaping the behavior and mindset of its people. The ambition to own slaves and the pursuit of acquiring them were shared across social classes, from the elite ruling class to humble urban artisans. There were mine and plantation owners who had hundreds of slaves, small-scale farmers with a few, or urban households with just one. At least until the arrival of large numbers of European workers in southern and central Brazil, manual labor was widely despised as "something just for Blacks." The racial prejudice against black people extended beyond the period of slavery and continues in different forms to this day.

The late 18th century witnessed significant changes across the Western world, occurring both in the realm of ideas and in practice. The absolute monarchies of Europe, collectively known as the *ancien régime*, entered a phase of decline and upheaval. These governments, tied to specific ideologies and traditions, faced growing challenges. Enlightened philosophy and liberal economic theories, originating from French intellectuals and British economists, began to gain influence and spread widely. The new ideas had been taking shape since the beginning of the century, or even earlier, and became known by the term "Enlightened thought." Enlightenment thinkers, such as Voltaire, Montesquieu, Rousseau, or Diderot shared a common principle: the primacy of reason. According to them,

reason leads to knowledge beneficial to humanity and enables the discovery of the natural laws that govern society. The role of rulers, they argued, is to strive for the well-being of the people by respecting natural laws and the inherent rights of individuals. Failure to fulfill these basic duties grants the governed the right to rebellion. Enlightened ideas gave rise, in the sociopolitical sphere, to liberal thought in its various shades. A shared foundation among the different currents of liberalism lies in the belief that human history progresses toward the improvement of both the individual and society, guided by principles established through reason. Happiness—a new concept in the 18th century—was considered the ultimate goal of each individual, and the greatest happiness for the greatest number of people was deemed the true purpose of society. This ideal was to be achieved through individual freedom, fostering conditions for the full development of each person's abilities and for their active participation in political life: liberal doctrine advocates for the right of individuals to representation, asserting that sovereignty—understood as the right to organize the nation based on a Constitution—resides in them, not in the power of kings (Fausto 2013, 106–107).

Key events marked this period of transformation. In 1776, the American colonies declared independence from Britain, and starting in 1789, the French Revolution dismantled the *ancien régime* in France. These events had widespread consequences, often involving violent conflict across Europe. Simultaneously, England experienced a quieter yet equally revolutionary shift: the Industrial Revolution. Innovations such as new energy sources, mechanization—particularly in textiles—advancements in farming, and dominance over global trade propelled Britain to become the preeminent power of the era (Fausto 2013, 108).

In their pursuit of expanding markets, the British began enforcing free trade policies. In Spanish and Portuguese America, the British steadily undermined the colonial systems, leveraging trade agreements, smuggling operations, and partnerships with local merchants to achieve their goals. The colonial world was also influenced by a significant shift toward the restriction or abolition of slavery, spearheaded by major powers like Britain and France. Revolutionary France declared the abolition of slavery in its colonies in 1794 (after the Haitian Revolution conducted by self-liberated slaves), followed by Britain's abolition of the slave trade in 1807 (it is important to note that Napoleon reversed the French decree in 1802). These international developments had a notable impact on the relationship between the Portuguese crown and Brazil. By the mid-18th century, Portugal had fallen behind the major

European powers, becoming heavily dependent on Britain. In return for this dependency, Britain offered protection against France and Spain. Despite this, the Portuguese monarchy sought to preserve its colonial system and curtail Britain's growing influence in Brazil (Fausto 2006, 108–109).

At the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, Brazil witnessed various conspiracies against Portuguese rule and efforts toward independence. Rather than being national revolutions, they were regional uprisings. This regional focus was a defining characteristic of events such as the Inconfidência Mineira in 1789, the slave rebellion "Tailors' Conspiracy" in 1798, or the Revolution of 1817 in Pernambuco. These movements were not motivated by exactly the same set of beliefs, although the "French ideas" and the American revolution's liberalism constituted an important source of inspiration. Naturally, the elitist rebels worked hard to suppress these ideas and were extremely skeptical about abolishing slavery, since it clashed with their interests. Meanwhile, for the poor, the notion of independence was closely tied to egalitarianism and social change (Fausto 2006, 113–114).

At the beginning of the 19th century, Napoleon's ongoing conflict with Britain eventually affected the Portuguese crown. With almost all of Western Europe under his control, Napoleon established a commercial blockade to isolate Britain from the continent. Portugal remained a gap in this blockade that Napoleon needed to close. In November 1807, French troops advanced from Spain into Portugal and moved toward Lisbon. Prince Dom João VI—who was governing Portugal as regent, due to the fact that his mother, Dona Maria, had been declared insane—when faced with the French invasion, he quickly decided to move the entire royal court to Brazil. An estimated 10,000 to 15,000 people boarded twenty-six Portuguese ships bound for Brazil, accompanied by a British naval escort. This mass relocation included the entire administrative structure of the kingdom: ministers, advisors, Treasury officials, Supreme Court judges, military officers, and high-ranking clergy. They also transported the government archives, royal treasury, a printing press, and various libraries. From the moment the royal family arrived in Brazil, there was a drastic turnaround in the relationship between the metropolis and the Colony (Fausto 2006, 121).

From the very beginning, Dom João VI (from the Brigantine dynasty) sought to achieve economic independence for the colony from its metropolis, which at that time was under French control. In December 1815, he reaffirmed Brazil's growing influence and

prominence by issuing a decree that transformed it from a subordinate colonial "state" (*estado*) into a "kingdom" (*reino*) (maintaining a personal union with Portugal). This effectively placed Brazil and Portugal on an equal footing. While Dom João personally enjoyed life in the tropics, there was significant tension between the Portuguese and the Brazilians. The top political, military, administrative, and judicial posts remained tightly controlled by the Portuguese nobles and officials who had accompanied the prince regent from Lisbon. While some noble titles and honors were granted to local landowners and civil servants, no Brazilian-born individual attained the position of government minister or gained entry into the Council of State, the prestigious advisory group that counseled the king on matters of governance (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 40).

When Dom João VI decided in 1821 to return to Lisbon—now liberated from Napoleon—he left his son, Pedro, in Brazil. Pedro played a key role in dismantling the country's political subordination to the Portuguese crown. In December 1821, when the Portuguese Cortes summoned the regent to come back, Pedro was asked to remain in Brazil. On January 9, 1822, he announced his final decision, a moment remembered in national history as "I Shall Stay Day" (*Dia do fico*). The Cortes attempted to overturn the June decision to convene the Brazilian Constituent Assembly, but once this information reached Pedro, on September 7, 1822, he declared Brazil's independence from Portugal—an event known as the "Cry of Ipiranga" (*O grito do Ypiranga*), commemorated today as the country's Independence Day—and by December, he had crowned himself Emperor Pedro I. In 1824, a constitution was announced (the document included in its definition of the Brazilian people only the minority of white and racially mixed individuals who were granted certain access to the political sphere due to their privileged social and financial status [Fausto 2006, 149–152]), and after Brazil paid compensations, in 1825, Lisbon recognized the independence of its former colony (Malinowski 2013, 24).

It is worth noting that whereas the Spanish colonies endured fifteen years of civil war between 1810 and 1825 to achieve independence, Brazil won its independence without bloodshed, within roughly one year. On the other hand, many elements of the internal colonial structure were preserved: slavery still thriving, an economy based on the interests of large landowners, social hierarchy that did not acknowledge the importance or rights of the

common people, the political dominance of sugar elites, and high birth status and wealth as the tickets to entering parliament (Malinowski 2013, 25).

Dom Pedro's dramatic exclamation "independence or death" was never intended as a call for the Brazilian people to take up arms and overthrow Portuguese domination. In reality, Dom Pedro was reaffirming his commitment to remain in Brazil and continue governing it as he already had. In other words, it emphasized continuity rather than heralding a genuine revolution. Unlike the newly independent nations of Spanish America, Brazil did not become a republic; instead, it emerged as a monarchy and an empire. There was never any serious consideration given to forming a republic, as the Brazilian elite associated such a system with social disorder and political instability. The ruling class was satisfied that the government and economy kept working just as they had before (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 43). In fact, in the first decade after independence, the slave trade in Brazil intensified. Official records indicate that an average of 32,770 enslaved individuals entered Brazil annually between 1811 and 1820, while this figure rose to 43,140 per year between 1821 and 1830 (Fausto 2006, 192).

The second half of the 1820s showed that attaining political autonomy would be more difficult than independence enthusiasts had predicted. Continuous tensions arose between the parliamentary majority of Brazilians and the emperor's Portuguese circle. As a result, in 1831, leaving his five-year-old son in Brazil, Pedro I abdicated and went to Portugal. Power was taken over by the Regency Council. Already in the 1830s, the political scene's division became formalized. First, the Liberal Party was formed, representing the interests of the emerging bourgeoisie. The Conservative Party, on the other hand, represented the interests of the emerging class of coffee magnates (Malinowski 2013, 25). It is important to note here that the poor majority and the enslaved did not have any political representation.

Following independence, the Brazilian government found itself in a challenging position: Brazil relied on Britain, which was pressing for the abolition of the slave trade, but except for a few dissenting voices, almost everyone—from large plantation owners to slave merchants, and even the majority of the free population—believed that immediately ending the slave trade would cause severe crisis (Fausto 2006, 192).

In 1826, Britain forced Brazil to sign a treaty stipulating that, three years after its ratification, any slave trafficking into Brazil would be deemed illegal. The treaty also granted Britain the right to inspect ships on the open seas if they were suspected of transporting

slaves. Ratified in March 1827, this agreement was set to become effective by March 1830. To support the treaty, a law passed on November 7, 1831, imposed harsh penalties on slave traffickers and granted freedom to any slave arriving in Brazil after that date. This law was approved at a time when the influx of slaves had briefly slowed. However, when the flow of enslaved people surged again, its provisions were essentially disregarded. At that point, slave traders were not yet despised by the ruling classes. In fact, they benefited from certain reforms enacted during the Regency. The few individuals who were brought to trial for slave trading were absolved by the local juries, controlled by wealthy landowners. The 1831 law came to be seen as something enacted merely to appease the British, giving rise to the Brazilian expression "*para inglês ver*," meaning something done only for show, without real substance (Fausto 2006, 192–194). The enforcement of the law "was so lax that the annual inflow of slaves more than doubled after a decade" (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 58).

The continuity of colonial structures started to crack, to a certain degree, after the coronation of Pedro II (1841). During the 1840s, attitudes towards the slave trade shifted markedly. New arrivals from Africa were increasingly viewed as fueling the spread of slave unrest and uprisings in the Northeast—such as the 1835 Malê revolt—a source of grave concern for the landowning elite throughout the 1830s and 1840s. Moreover, the society began to associate the emergence of deadly cholera and yellow fever epidemics with the continuing importation of enslaved individuals. In addition, renewed British diplomatic and naval efforts intensified, eventually leading to British warships encroaching upon Brazilian territorial waters to capture slave ships. This pressure resulted in the 1850 enactment of the Eusébio de Queiroz Law, which prohibited slave imports into Brazil and included the necessary provisions to ensure its effective enforcement (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 58).

Although the 1850 legislation only targeted the slave trade, it significantly raised the spirits of Brazil's antislavery advocates. Immediate abolition was still considered too extreme, but support was steadily growing for a plan to end slavery gradually within a set timeframe. The moral arguments condemning slavery as cruel and corrupt were reinforced by events in the United States, where the Civil War led to its abolition. This development left Brazil with the stigma of being the world's largest slaveholding nation. Increasingly, Brazilians came to view slavery not only as a source of deep national embarrassment but also

as a key reason for the country's military and economic backwardness (in comparison with Europe and the United States) (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 58).

Although Dom Pedro publicly declared his support for ending slavery in 1867, he offered little active leadership to achieve this goal. He preferred a gradual approach and hoped that the Law of the Free Womb (*Lei do Ventre Livre*), passed in September 1871, would settle the issue. Under this law, all children born to enslaved mothers after its enactment would be born free. The slave-owner would house these children until they turned eight, at which point the owner could accept government compensation and free them, or refuse compensation and keep them working until they were twenty-one. Additionally, slave-owners had to allow any enslaved person to purchase their own freedom at the current market value. Thus, the 1871 law ensured that the *status quo* would remain in place for at least twenty-one more years. Although it produced few immediate practical changes, it established a final deadline beyond which slavery could not continue indefinitely. The political debate then shifted to whether that timeframe should be shortened. Throughout the 1880s, the discussion intensified: Conservatives still endorsed a gradual approach, while Liberals pressed for a quicker end. Abolitionists argued that, theoretically, existing slaves could remain in bondage for life, extending slavery for at least another sixty to seventy years. As time passed, however, the situation changed. The number of enslaved people declined due to manumissions and growing recognition that slavery was both morally reprehensible and economically inefficient compared to paid, "free" labor. In 1884, the provinces of Amazonas and Ceará freed their slaves, and in 1885, the Saraiva-Cotegipe Law liberated all slaves over the age of sixty. Abolitionists went further, urging slaves to run away. This led not just to individual escapes but to the abandonment of entire plantations (especially in São Paulo). In 1888, while Dom Pedro was in Europe, Princess Regent Dona Isabel signed the "Golden Law" (*Lei Áurea*), which, in theory, granted immediate and unconditional freedom to Brazil's enslaved population (although the vast majority of enslaved individuals had already been freed and it was clear that slavery could no longer be sustained in Brazil) (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 59–60).

No assistance was offered to help freed slaves: for the newly freed individuals—without formal education, savings, or land to cultivate—the legal status of freedom, in a still very racist society, provided little advantage (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 76).

During a period of rapid growth in the number of European settlers, the masses of freed slaves had very limited prospects. Some stayed where they were—at the mercy of their former oppressors. Others banded together and wandered through the interior, looking for a land to cultivate or for other opportunities. Abolition was one of the most important steps in breaking with the colonial past, carrying enormous symbolic as well as legal significance, but in practice, the fate of the previously enslaved people hardly changed at all (Malinowski 2013, 32).

Nevertheless, there were other changes on the way: one year after the abolition of slavery, in 1889, the Brigantine Dynasty's monarchy was overthrown through a *coup d'état*. Where slaves chose to stay and continue working, they had to be paid. The elites' dissatisfaction was turning into criticism of the authorities. Pedro II was losing support from all sides (Malinowski 2013, 32). Already before the abolition, there were certain tensions between the Crown and the church; more significant, however, was the rise of a dissatisfied, increasingly professionalized army. By the 1880s, key players—army officers, urban intellectuals (republicans and positivists), and coffee entrepreneurs—coalesced against the weakened monarchy. The emperor's poor health, uncertainty over succession, and the growth of new political ideas created fertile ground for change. In November 1889, the army's action, backed by the coffee bourgeoisie's support, toppled the empire (Fausto 2006, 227–236).

3.2.1.2 The Old Republic and Vargas Era (1889–1945)

The above introduction outlines, to a considerable degree, the shape and the content of the hegemonic web of meanings in question. Based on the presented history and the description of the brigantine cultural heritage, it is already possible to presume that Vargas Era hegemonic discourse was racist, elitist, exclusive, etc., and that this was translated into the meanings that were ascribed to such nodal points as Afro-Brazilian culture, Brazilianness, miscegenation, slavery, morality, or social justice. Before reaching any conclusions, however, it is necessary to conduct a more systematic analysis—with the use of the Discourse-Theoretical Analysis framework—of the hegemonic discourse that was in force both in the years more immediately preceding and throughout the period in which Jorge

Amado wrote *Sea of Death*. Therefore, I will begin this section with an analysis of the social thought of 19th and 20th-century leading intellectuals and, afterward, I will study the relation between their ideas and the factual social reality.

3.2.1.2.1 Brazilian social thought

Gilberto Freyre (1900–1987), considered one of the most important Brazilian sociologists, argues that

> the formation of Brazilian society […] has been in reality a process of balancing antagonisms. Economic and cultural antagonisms. Antagonisms between European culture and native culture. Between the African and the native. Between an agrarian and a pastoral economy, between that of the agrarian and that of the mining regions. Between Catholic and heretic. Jesuit and *fazendeiro*. The *bandeirante* and the plantation-owner. The Paulista and the [Portuguese]. […] The landed proprietor and the pariah. The university graduate and the illiterate. But predominant over all these antagonisms was the more general and the deeper one: that between master and slave (Freyre 1986 [1933], 79–80).

Mariusz Malinowski, however, in his *W poszukiwaniu brazylijskości. Główne nurty brazylijskiej myśli społecznej w XX wieku* („In Search of Brazilianness. Leading Trends in Brazilian Social Thought in the Twentieth Century"), claims that these antagonisms have never disappeared: "Quite the opposite—they still endure; some in a modified form, others almost exactly as they were a century ago" (Malinowski 2011, 12).

As I have mentioned before, in the young Brazilian republic, one of the principal axes of ideological polarization was constituted by the differences in the understanding of the national identity. As Malinowski observes (2011, 21–49), the concept of "national identity"—although very present in many discussions—refers to a phenomenon that is very difficult to capture. "Identity," in general, "tends to mean too much (when understood in a strong sense), too little (when understood in a weak sense), or nothing at all (because of its sheer ambiguity)" (Brubaker, Cooper 2000, 1), due to a widespread theoretical and methodological confusion. "National identity," in turn, poses even more advanced difficulties: not only because of even more complicated theoretical and methodological

problems related to its collective, supra-individual nature (and therefore abstract, ideologically constructed, variable character), but also because of the complexity of the concept of "nation."

Malinowski (2011, 46) states that it is difficult to find a definition of a nation that would be accepted by the majority of sociologists, historians, or anthropologists. Moreover, there are those who claim that nations come into existence spontaneously and those who claim that they are products of nation-building projects conducted by leaders, rulers, elites, intellectuals, educators, media, etc. The case of Brazil, however, is especially challenging.

Is it at all possible to define or describe the collective identity of different—predominantly conflicted—peoples who share a territory, if this territory has been filled with "traditions and values imported through waves of migration[30] that repeatedly reshaped the whole group's cultural and ethnic profile?"—asks Malinowski (2011, 47) [transl.—E. Ch.]. Many Brazilian thinkers tried to find the "formula" of Brazilianness. They interpreted history, traced the roots of national culture, and reflected both on the causes and consequences of the paradoxes within local society. Yet their ideas moved beyond purely academic discourse, becoming constitutive elements of the Brazilian mentality. Meanwhile, as new ideas emerged, the very notion of a Braziliannes became increasingly problematic (Malinowski 2011, 53–54).

From the earliest days of the republic, no shared vision existed for a cultural-symbolic framework that most people could embrace as a model of national community. What the metropolis provided failed to match local circumstances, and a genuinely local culture had not yet taken shape. As a result, Brazilians, as a society, were in a continual process of defining themselves—or rather, attempting to do so. Their entire history was marked by strong divisions, with clashing interests deeply embedded in the nation's core, preventing the emergence of a single common ground or of any general agreement on foundational values. Rather than moving toward cultural uniformity, Brazil evolved as a country of increasingly pronounced differences (Malinowski 2011, 65–66). "Brazilianness," therefore, can be considered as a floating signifier, since the meaning of this nodal point varied depending on

[30] In 19th and 20th century, Brazil received also many inmigrants from various European and Asian countries—in the most intense period, from 1889 to 1930, almost 3 million people (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 120), as we will see further on.

who was using it, and as a myth, since it represented a totality and "a principle of reading of a given situation" (Laclau 1990, 61).

The concept of Brazilian identity has historically been tied to understanding the nation's past. Leading 20th-century thinkers approached this through various interpretations, though all recognized *Capítulos de história colonial* ("Colonial History Chapters"), by Capistrano de Abreu (1907), as a foundational, absolutely canonical text. This work became an essential reference in Brazilian historiography, marking a significant shift in the historical discourse. Understanding its impact is key to grasping Brazil's intellectual efforts to define its identity (Malinowski 2011, 67).

The formal study of history in Brazil began with the monarchy's establishment, marked by Emperor Pedro I's commission to José da Silva Lisboa to document the nation's history (prior works were fragmentary and lacked critical rigor). A turning point came with the creation of the Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute (Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro) in 1838, which institutionalized historical studies and emphasized a systematic approach to understanding Brazil's past. The IHGB sought to produce a history textbook that promoted patriotism, grounded in source-based research and intellectual dialogue. Hence, in 1840, it organized a competition for the best work outlining the framework for writing a comprehensive history of Brazil (Malinowski 2011, 69).

The competition was won by Karl Friedrich Phillip von Martius, whose article *Como se deve escrever a história do Brasil* (1845; "How Should the History of Brazil Be Written") became a key text during the imperial era, outlining the foundations of an appropriate approach to Brazilian history for many historians. Von Martius argued that anyone documenting Brazil's past must consider the interaction of the three races that shaped its development, while also assigning predefined roles to each race: "The Portuguese blood, like a mighty river, should absorb the small tributaries of the Indian and Ethiopian races" (Von Martius 1956 [1845], 443). For him, a historian's work was an expression of patriotism, which, in his understanding, was a synonym of conservatism and devotion to the monarchy (Malinowski 2011, 69–70). Moreover, the fact that his article won an important, official competition of a public institution and that his guidelines and views were adopted by many historians suggests (especially in the light of the previously presented historical events) that, within the hegemonic discourse of that period: 1) the meaning of such signifiers as "the

Indigenous" or "the Black" was, indeed, negative (they were perceived as inferior, less important, culturally less relevant); 2) the "patriotism" signifier did not refer to loving the country as an inclusive whole, but rather to serving the monarchy and conservative ideals, which aimed at sustaining the current, oppressive social order.

An example of a historian inspired by von Martius' guidelines and views was Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen. In his *História Geral do Brasil* (1854–57; "General History of Brazil"), he describes the historical events with the faith in the Crown's primacy and infallibility, he regards the Indigenous as inferior beings explicitly, he dismisses the Indigenous people's legitimacy in resisting Portuguese colonial rule, endorses the practice of slavery, relegates the populace to a marginal role, portrays the Portuguese as the decisive driving force behind Brazilian social processes, glorifies the conquerors, ignores the defeated, and none of the contemporary historians questions the validity of his narrative (Malinowski 2011, 71–72, 82).

As Malinowski observes:

> Although it is impossible to generalize the entirety of 19th-century historical production in Brazil […], virtually all authors aligned the methodology of their work with a specific ideology—namely, conservatism. As a result, there was a tendency to evaluate all of history through the lens of its alignment with the prevailing political order, with many works being directly dedicated to the emperor himself. […] Researchers in their works assumed Eurocentrism as an obvious perspective (evaluating events from a Portuguese point of view) or subordinated the meaning of history to the current interests of the empire [transl.—E. Ch.] (Malinowski 2011, 72–73, 80).

The work of Capistrano de Abreu (1853–1927), however, could be considered a significant deviation from the *prevalent* historiographical norms. In *Capítulos de história colonial* (1907), he emphasized the description of everyday life, living conditions, and the customs of ordinary people. Additionally, he portrayed Brazilians as inheritors of certain Indigenous traits—a perspective that was *highly unpopular* during that period (especially among intellectual elites) and was considered *provocative*. Another "provocative" aspect of *Capítulos de história colonial* was the chapter on "Exotic Factors," in which the historian identified Europeans and Africans, rather than Indigenous people (as was commonly thought

at the time), as the "exotic factors." In this chapter, Capistrano de Abreu questioned Portugal's "competence" in global conquest by highlighting the country's modest resources. For him, the role of the "pure-blooded" Portuguese was significant only at the moment of "discovering" Brazil, as he believed the subsequent history was shaped by the mixed population. However, regarding the Afro-Brazilian population, the author addressed it even more superficially than the Indigenous one, dedicating only three paragraphs to it in the entire book (Malinowski 2011, 84–86), even though they constituted a large part of the general population (around 56 percent, according to the 1890 census [Smith and Vinhosa [2013, 73]).

According to Malinowski, Capistrano de Abreu—with his *new*, less Eurocentric perspectives—was a *pioneer* of a breakthrough; before him, "*Nobody* questioned whether [Brazil] could be anything other than what was defined by the *raison d'état* of the empire. […] The decisive voice in everything belonged to only a handful of elites. The concept of the people's interest was a pure abstraction to them" [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (apart from historiography, such state of affairs reflected as well in Brazil's intellectual life in general, in its cultural models, and education system) (Malinowski 2011, 93–94). Moreover, Capistrano de Abreu "explained to the Brazilians their real history and origin, by introducing a clear dividing line between the *uncontested until then* Portuguese perception of Brazil and the Brazil as an effect of the heroic effort of the real inhabitants of that land," he "*revealed* to the Brazilians their most valuable treasure," and his interpretation of history became a "*starting point* for the future generations of intellectuals interested in searching the sense of Brazilianness," since he "pointed out many aspects of local history that *nobody* noticed before him" [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Malinowski 2011, 95–96).

In the previous paragraphs, I added emphasis to certain words to accentuate the groundbreaking nature of Capistrano de Abreu's work. It was considered provocative, controversial, or radical precisely because it diverged from the hegemonic discourse in its understanding of such signifiers (nodal points) as "the people," "Portugal," "colonization," "the Indigenous," "conservatism," "Europe," "elites," etc. This, in turn, suggests—especially in the light of the previously discussed historical facts—that, within the hegemonic web of meanings, "the people" designated a social class of minimal importance, which can be neglected; "Portugal" and "Europe" connoted prestige, competence, superiority, and

civilization; "conservatism" was considered the most valid political attitude; "the Indigenous" signifier referred to inferior, less important, culturally less relevant people; "colonization" was a synonym of bringing civilization and did not necessarily connote violence, abuse, injustice, etc. Additionally, such understanding of these nodal points—i.e., signifiers that determine the meaning of other signifiers by organizing around themselves a system of interdependent meanings—was translated into the meanings that were ascribed to lower-level signifiers.

Finally, it is also symptomatic that even Capistrano de Abreu, a more progressive thinker, understates the importance of the Afro-Brazilian contribution in the Brazilian society, which was in line with the hegemonic understanding of such nodal points as "the Black" or "Afro-Brazilian culture"—after all, although he managed to challenge certain aspects of the hegemonic discourse, his ideas were being conceived within that particular social imaginary, which, according to Laclau, is a cognitive horizon, an "absolute limit which structures a field of intelligibility," "the condition of possibility of the emergence of any object" (1990, 64).

Another intellectual who left a very significant mark on Brazilian social thought was Euclides da Cunha (1866–1909). Before the publication of his magnum opus, *Os Sertões* (1902; published in English in 1957 as "Rebellion in the Backlands"), racial matters were not a source of major controversy in Brazil. For the elites, the rural populations of the interior symbolized embarrassing underdevelopment. The "whitening ideology"—which aimed at diminishing the African element in Brazilian society, primarily through the promotion of mass immigration from Europe[31]—was widely accepted as a practical means of advancing national development. It was only with the publication of *Os Sertões* that a significant shift occurred in the understanding of the ethnic roots of Brazilians. The book also presented a conceptual alternative to the dominant perspective on the purpose and ultimate shape of "Brazilian civilization." The Canudos war (1896–1897), detailed within its pages, became a focal point, highlighting Brazil's contradictions and paradoxes (Malinowski 2011, 100).

Da Cunha's thought was shaped by the dominant intellectual trends of his era, particularly positivism and deterministic theories. He opposed the monarchy, and his interests were aligned with republicanism. When Brazil became a republic, however, his

[31] This subject will be discussed further in the next section.

expectations were disappointed, due to the flagrant continuity of the old, monarchic structures and practices. After his expedition to Canudos (as a war correspondent), he completely abandoned any remaining belief in the righteousness of the Brazilian republic's policies (Malinowski 2011, 103–104).

The majority of intellectuals and politicians of that era had knowledge limited to urban environments or, at best, to coastal regions dominated by sugar plantations. Their understanding of the nation, built on this limited perspective, was inaccurate and incomplete. Da Cunha's experience as a war reporter in the remote "backlands" (*sertão*) revealed to him a new, previously unfamiliar reality—one that challenged both the authority of the republican government and the commonly accepted perspective on the Brazilian nation. His book served as a warning to the country's elites, who, fixated on foreign models, remained oblivious to their own country's reality. Malinowski claims that, "If it were not for *Os Sertões*, history textbooks would most likely still classify [the Canudos war] in line with the *unanimous* and biased spirit of *all* contemporary press reports" [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (2011, 104–105).

The War of Canudos illustrates very well the harsh and often cruel attitude of the Brazilian elite toward the rural poor (as well as the meaning of "the poor" and "the people" signifiers within the hegemonic discourse's web of meanings). In those times of intensifying economic crisis, in a region which suffered from severe droughts, thousands of peasants (who were later joined by former slaves), seeking refuge from oppression and poverty, ignored by the government, established a large settlement in Canudos, located in the remote "backlands" of the Northeast, under the leadership of Antônio Conselheiro (1830–1897)—a wandering preacher, who gave them hope for overcoming their misery and who criticized the new government. In spite of that, the press, leading politicians, and government officials from Rio de Janeiro and Bahia showed no interest in understanding the extreme economic and social conditions that drove the peasants to this act of resistance. Instead, their defiance against local police was viewed and portrayed solely as a deliberate challenge to the rule of law. For propaganda purposes, Canudos was falsely labeled as a hub of dangerous outlaws and religious fanatics who operated outside legal and societal norms and aimed, in a supposed "monarchist conspiracy," at overthrowing the republic and restoring the monarchy. In Rio de Janeiro, crowds demonstrated in the streets demanding the immediate elimination

of anti-republican sabotage. Convinced that order needed to be restored at all costs, the Brazilian elite sanctioned the deployment of federal military forces, equipped with artillery, to crush the community. The soldiers were instructed not only to suppress the rebellion but, if necessary, to exterminate the community. After more than three months of siege, Canudos fell on October 5, 1897, following a brutal show of overwhelming force. The settlement was completely destroyed, and the vast majority of its at least 15,000 residents—men, women, and children—were massacred (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 94, 124–125).

Euclides da Cunha refutes the government's version of events (widely accepted by the press and by the public opinion), questions the dominant perspective that dehumanized the inhabitants of *sertão* as primitive and amoral, and accuses the republic of the crime committed—with the consent of the Catholic church—against its own nation, of treating its own citizens as enemies, instead of treating them as co-creators of Brazilian society. In *Os Sertões*, he presents a complex critique of the dominant narrative on "civilization" and "barbarism," offering a profound reevaluation of national identity that challenges the country's dominant values, particularly its racial hierarchies and modernization ideals. He juxtaposes two geographic and social worlds: the coastal regions influenced by European culture and the *sertão*, perceived as backward due to harsh environmental conditions that isolated it from the influences of the coast. However, da Cunha's interpretation transcends simplistic binaries, portraying the *sertão* not as inherently inferior but as a space of resilience and authenticity. Initially influenced by prevailing racist and positivist ideas, da Cunha later deconstructs these paradigms. He begins by criticizing miscegenation (*mestiçagem*) as a degenerative process, but gradually recognizes it as central to Brazil's identity (he evaluates positively the miscegenation of Europeans and the Indigenous, but still has a strong prejudice towards the Africans). His early deterministic perspective blamed the interior's climate for producing psychological instability, impulsivity, and violence in its inhabitants. Yet, through the figure of the *sertanejo* (a mixed-race inhabitant of the *sertão*, in da Cunha's narrative), the writer discovers a heroic symbol of national potential. Far from degraded, the *sertanejo* embodies resilience, self-reliance, and cultural authenticity, qualities forged through isolation and struggle against nature. Da Cunha rejects the elites' Eurocentric modernization projects, which he saw as poorly adapted to Brazil's local conditions and dismissive of its socio-racial complexities. For him, true progress required an understanding of the interior's

realities and the integration of its people into a unified national project. The *sertanejo*, rather than the Europeanized coastal elite, emerges as the essence of Brazilian identity, rooted in the land and shaped by a unique cultural evolution. This vision contradicts the common portrayal (conducted by politicians, writers, artists, or journalists) of the interior as a space of barbarism and elevates its inhabitants above the moral and cultural failings of the so-called civilized coast. *Os Sertões* reframes the Canudos War as a symbol of the republic's moral and political failure. Initially supportive of the state's narrative, da Cunha later exposes it as a façade for military brutality and social injustice. He portrays the Canudos defenders not as rebels but as victims of systemic oppression, their annihilation revealing the republic's betrayal of its democratic ideals. By documenting these events, da Cunha not only criticizes the elites' superficial modernity but also advocates for an inclusive national identity that embraces Brazil's racial and cultural diversity (Malinowski 2011, 111–120).

In later works, such as his writings on the Amazon rubber boom, da Cunha extends his criticism to the elite's exploitation of laborers, in conditions analogous to slavery, and the short-sighted policies of the republic that treated the poor like slaves or objects. He denounces the government's instrumentalization of people, who were displaced by droughts in the northeastern region, for economic gain, further emphasizing the need for ethical governance and a reevaluation of Brazil's development trajectory. Ultimately, da Cunha's legacy lies in his ability to confront dominant narratives and propose a more nuanced understanding of Brazil. He was the first in Brazil's history to point out, in a political discourse, the significance of the interior's cultural and social significance, advocating for a more inclusive national identity that reconciles its geographic, racial, and historical divides (before the publication of *Os Sertões*, the only intellectual who analyzed the function of races in the Brazilian society was Sílvio Romero—one of the main defenders of the "whitening ideology" and Gobineau's thought, which inspired the pseudoscientific racist theories) (Malinowski 2011, 120–128).

Similarly to Capistrano de Abreu, Euclides da Cunha, in spite of his more progressive intellectual profile, adhered to widely accepted pseudoscientific theories that promoted the idea of white racial superiority (although he managed to challenge certain aspects of the hegemonic discourse, his ideas were being conceived within that particular social imaginary). Among Brazil's other two main racial groups, he attributed far more significance

to Indigenous peoples. He regarded them as the mythical hosts of the land, who contributed significantly to the effort of conquering the challenging interior. The Africans, in turn, were considered by him as an external, imported workforce, as inherently subjugated, as the weakest element of the local society. The fact that his ideas (especially those on miscegenation) were considered new, exceptional, groundbreaking (Malinowski 2011, 100–128), suggests that within the hegemonic discourse the meaning of such signifiers as "the Indigenous," or "Africans" referred to inferior, less important, culturally less relevant people, and that such understanding was translated into the meanings that were ascribed to the lower-level signifiers that were connected to these nodal points.

Moreover, the way the Canudos war was handled by the symbolic elites (the government, intellectuals, press, Catholic church, army, etc.) suggests—especially in the light of the previously discussed historical facts—that, within the hegemonic web of meanings, "the poor" designated primitive, amoral people, of minimal importance, which can be neglected, publicly dehumanized, instrumentalized, or even massacred, if necessary (since they were not effectively included in the concept of Brazilian nation or national interest).

The first Brazilian thinker to decisively reject the idea of racial superiority of European colonizers over black and Indigenous people was Manoel Bomfim (1868–1932). In works like *América Latina. Males de origem* (1905) and *O Brasil na América* (1929), he criticized pseudoscientific racism (which, in Brazil, was regarded as, at best, questionable only by a small minority) and opposed Latin American intellectuals who supported it. He argued that it was used to justify the exploitation of lower social classes by the white elites under the guise of "science" and that it undermined the idea of society as an inclusive community, relegating the majority of its population to the margins. In his view, pseudoscientific racism served the privileged classes—whose interest lay in instilling a sense of civilizational inferiority in the dominated people and keeping them in that state for as long as possible—to suppress any manifestations of the Brazilian people's culture.

However, it does not mean that Bomfim considered the Afro-Brazilians as important contributors to Brazilian culture—he attributed greater significance to the Portuguese-Indigenous miscegenation (not because he considered them an inferior race, but because, in his view, they were forced into a passive role) (Malinowski 2011, 137–142, 159).

The meaning of signifiers that refer to ethnicities and their respective cultures, within the hegemonic discourse in question, becomes more evident in the light of the fact that

> Such a *radical* challenge to the previously *unquestioned* racial hierarchy in Brazilian society was *unacceptable* to the country's political and intellectual elites. Bomfim's stance provoked *enormous controversy* and even unrestrained attacks, particularly from proponents of the whitening ideology. The resulting conflict between Bomfim and Sílvio Romero escalated into *one of the most famous disputes in the history of Brazilian intellectual circles*, even devolving into mutual personal attacks. […] What irritated Romero the most was the *iconoclastic* vision of society that challenged the very essence of the whitening ideology […] and rejected the racial superiority of Europeans. […] Bomfim attributed the causes of Latin America's illnesses not to the degenerative influence of inferior races, as Europeans claimed, but rather to the parasitism of colonial metropolises […]—an assertion that was *extraordinarily bold* for its time [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Malinowski 2011, 142–143, 146).

I added emphasis to certain words from the above quotation to accentuate the groundbreaking nature of Manoel Bomfim's ideas. They were considered radical, unacceptable, controversial, or iconoclastic precisely because they diverged from the hegemonic discourse, from the societal myths that appeared as objective reality, converted into a social imaginary, into a Laclauian "cognitive horizon" (it is important, however, to remember that since the discourse is a temporary closure, the hegemony can never be total and, for this reason, a divergent thought, such as Bomfim's, can emerge).

In the face of the very persistent rigidity of the social imaginary of his time, Manoel Bomfim, who initially believed in the transformative potential of education, in the second half of the 1920s, completely lost his hopes for a structurally implemented social change and for a change in the mindset of the symbolic elites. He was seen as some kind of a lone "knight-errant," almost completely isolated in his struggle, facing a profound hostility of the conservative elites, also because of his supposedly communist inspirations. In the book he published in 1931, *O Brasil nação. Realidade da soberania brasileira*, he expressed his conviction that it was necessary to destroy the existing order through a revolution, although he was aware that it would not be possible, because of the widely diffused brigantine conservative legacy (the Revolution of 1930 that initiated the Vargas Era was completely unrelated to the ideas he promoted—the framework of the political, cultural, and social legacy that was contrary to popular interests remained unchanged; even the supposedly

progressive politicians were deeply ingrained with brigantine conservatism). For Bomfim, it was obvious that the elites were invested in keeping the nation in ignorance: in 1903, for instance, the elites allocated 85% of the federal budget to state administration and the military, while spending just over 1% on education (the republican government made no effort to eliminate illiteracy, as those who were illiterate were barred from voting and, therefore, excluded from democratic participation; power remained in the hands of the educated, who were elected by other educated citizens, leaving politicians with no incentive to address the needs of a population that was not part of the electorate) (Malinowski 2011, 149–157). The 1891 Constitution proclaimed citizens' equality under the law, yet, in practice, full citizenship was reserved for educated white men whose economic and social standing depended on their political affiliation, literacy, ownership of private property, etc. The rest of society was largely branded with the degrading label of *os bestializados* (the "bestialized") and treated accordingly by the police (Williams 2001, 3).

Although Malinowski (2011) presents the above examples of 19th and 20th-century thinkers whose thought could not be identified completely with the brigantine cultural heritage, he emphasizes clearly that their projects were "bordering on utopia" (186) and that they were only individual exceptions, that "throughout the whole 20th century, Brazil suffered the brigantine waking nightmare with an unchanging policy of oppression by the victors over the defeated, increasing divisions, exclusion, hidden racism, educational backwardness, and advancing pathologies."[32] [transl.—E. Ch.] (2011, 160).

Furthermore, he asks:

> if the aforementioned intellectuals were in the minority and, as they themselves believed, opposed the false vision of the nation and the state propagated by the majority—where was this majority? If they were indeed going so strongly against the current and their thought was so exceptional, then where was the so-called mainstream? If the most important thinkers of the early 20th century so commonly opposed the established reality, then what were the ideas that co-created this reality? If the political culture of that time supposedly recreated outdated structures and patterns of social relations, what exactly were its assumptions? Who were the ideologists of the Old Republic? [transl.—E. Ch.] (Malinowski 2011, 186–187).

[32] In fact, we can observe the vestiges of the brigantine cultural heritage in Brazil even nowadays (see Teun Van Dijk's *Antiracist Discourse in Brazil*—Chapters 5 and 6): e.g., in some of the practices of the ex-president (2019–2022) Jair Bolsonaro.

Subsequently, he answers these questions and suggests that an example of a mainstream thinker, whose ideas were coincident with the zeitgeist, was the conservative and openly racist intellectual Oliveira Viana (1883–1951):

> The new regime proclaimed in 1889 proudly carried the banner of progress, but in reality, it was merely a veil hiding the tissue of local political relations, which was most resistant to any changes: *conservatism*. In the 19th century, its advocates played a *key role* in the intellectual life of the country. One could mention, for example, the opinion-shaping power of Varnhagen's works, the works of Eduardo Prado, or Sílvio Romero. [… In 1920,] a book entitled *Populações meridionais do Brasil* was published by the then little-known publicist Oliveira Viana. […] It became an almost *immediate bestseller* and made the author an *undisputed star* of intellectual life in Brazil. Oliveira Viana was to enjoy the status of one of *the most influential and prestigious thinkers* for the next *two decades* [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Malinowski 2011, 187–188).

Oliveira Viana's biography seems to confirm the general acceptance of his ideas. After the big success of his book, in 1926, he was appointed as the director of the Rio de Janeiro Development Institute (Instituto de Fomento do Rio de Janeiro). Between 1932 and 1940, he worked as a legal advisor in the Ministry of Labor, Industry, and Commerce (Ministério do Trabalho, Indústria e Comércio). In Vargas's subsequent governments, he served as an influential political figure. He is also considered one of the main architects of the *entire labor and social legislation* introduced in Brazil during the 1930s, and in 1940, he was appointed as Minister of the Federal Court of Accounts (Tribunal de Contas da União). Moreover, he was accepted as a member of the Historic and Geographic Institute (Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro), International Institute of Anthropology, Portuguese Academy of History (Academia Portuguesa da História), among other institutions, and in 1937, he was elected a member of the Brazilian Academy of Literature (Academia Brasileira de Letras), which holds significant authority over Brazilian Portuguese (its members, referred to as "immortals," are selected from Brazilian citizens who have published works of acknowledged literary merit; membership as an "immortal" is a lifelong honor). For many thinkers of that period, addressing Oliveira Viana's ideas was almost obligatory (for over three decades). They were valued especially by the "integralists," i.e. by the members of a

large fascist movement led by Plínio Salgado, who included Olivieira Viana's texts in the "Integralist Library," in 1933. When Olivieira Viana died in 1951, he left behind an enormous private archive, which was nearly immediately taken over as a valuable state property; his residence was transformed into a museum, and in 1956, into the Oliveira Viana Foundation (Fundação Oliveira Viana). Additionally, besides the fact that Viana's name was inseparably linked to Vargas's dictatorship, his ideas were also frequently utilized by leading politicians and ideologists of the military dictatorship (1964–1984) (Malinowski 2011, 188–191, 218).

For these reasons—and because of Malinowski's suggestions regarding the mainstream character of Oliveira Viana's ideas—I believe that an analysis of his thought can provide us with a more accurate idea of the meaning that the hegemonic discourse attributed to such signifiers as: Brazilianness, Brazil's history, Colonial period, slavery, abolition of slavery, Brazilian elite, Europe, Portugal, latifundia, race, Aryanism, whitening ideology, European immigration, white people, black people, the Indigenous, miscegenation, civilization, barbarity, republicanism, conservatism, or authoritarianism.

Oliveira Viana's perspective on race was clearly shaped by European authors linked to pseudoscientific racism, such as Arthur de Gobineau. He adhered to a common stance among Brazilian intellectuals, rejecting studies that lacked connections to the theoretical foundations of European science. Across all his books, he consistently argued that the essence of Brazilianness was fundamentally defined by Brazil's racial hierarchy and by its agrarian roots (in contrast to the increasing industrialization). He regarded latifundia as the most effective system for land management and use. In his view, Brazil's true history was shaped by the aristocracy. When reflecting on his country's achievements, Oliveira Viana focused on narrating the legacy of this privileged elite (Malinowski 2011, 192–199).

He believed that the foundations for shaping the Brazilian nation in accordance with its true nature were rooted in the imperial era. In Oliveira Viana's view, the abolition of slavery—which he considered as a huge error—and the establishment of the republic interrupted the nation's formation. He regarded the republic as an unnatural and inherently unstable creation (Malinowski 2011, 202).

Oliveira Viana, with his "quasi-mystical Aryanism" (Freyre 1986, 220), was undoubtedly one of the leading advocates of the "white Portuguese" as the cornerstone of

Brazil's historical development. He formulated one of the most structured theories of "whitening," drawing on Vacher de Lapouge's interpretation of "Aryanism." Lapouge's cephalic index, which classified races based on skull proportions, posited the Aryan type as the "whitest" and, therefore, the most advanced. Oliveira Viana believed that Aryanization (the process of whitening) was the sole path to progress and civilization. In his view, white Brazilians, especially the rural aristocracy, embodied the highest level of social development and moral virtues, representing a "pure" group and serving as the guarantors of stability and order. For him, a racially mixed population was a highly diverse group and, as a result, inherently chaotic and disorganized. He argued that since their ancestry included not only white but also Indigenous or black people, they were submissive, passive, and civilizationally backward. Moreover, he dismissed both Indigenous and black people as barbarian and insignificant in the formation of Brazilianness, even attributing the country's civilizational stagnation to them. In addition, in Oliveira Viana's perspective, black individuals were an indispensable part of the slavery system due to their supposedly innate passivity, weakness, and submissiveness—traits he believed not only ensured the efficient operation of the slave labor system but also facilitated rapid miscegenation, leading to the inevitable degradation of the white race. As a result, the author considered black people a much greater threat to Aryan Brazil than Indigenous people (Malinowski 2011, 203–205).

For these reasons, Oliveira Viana viewed miscegenation as the primary curse of Brazil, one that needed to be addressed through the whitening of society. The white elites, he argued, had to undertake a civilizing mission, transforming miscegenation into a tool for progress, replacing the barbarism and deficiencies of the Indigenous and black people with the culture and strength of white people. These were not empty words—efforts to whiten Brazilian society with a massive European immigration were already underway at the time (as will be discussed afterward). However, the abolition, according to Oliveira Viana, disrupted the process of whitening, since enslaved black individuals lived shorter lives and had fewer children, while in freedom, the opposite occurred. For the Brazilian thinker, under the control of their oppressors, they at least served as a workforce with practical utility, but after the introduction of republican freedom, former slaves were no longer necessary and constituted a "societal pollution," an undesirable obstacle for the whitening of the society—especially those, who were, as he phrased it, "entirely incapable of being tamed and

civilized" (Viana, 2000 [1920], 1006). Moreover, he emphasized that the "Aryanization" of society should become Brazil's most important political goal and that the settlement of southern Brazil by European colonists was the foundation of a future, genuine nation. To achieve the goal, the ideology of the authorities should be conservatism, and the method of governance—authoritarianism rooted in the ideals of elitism and the cult of state interest, where responsibility for the state would rest with the dominant class and a strong, charismatic leader (Malinowski 2011, 206–211).

Brazilian social thought began to take a different direction—at a considerably slow pace—with the publication of Gilberto Freyre's (1900–1987) groundbreaking *Casa-Grande & Senzala* ("The Masters and the Slaves: a Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization"), in 1933. To a certain degree, the author stood in opposition to the hegemonic discourse of his time. Articulating a different meaning of the "miscegenation" signifier, "he was creating a Brazil that *no one* had described before" [transl.—E. Ch.; emphasis added] (Malinowski 2011, 286).

Freyre managed to see beyond the Laclauian "cognitive horizon" of his time by adopting a different perspective: he sought the meaning of Brazilianness through a detailed reconstruction of everyday life and the authentic experiences of ordinary people. As a result, he highlighted the positive effects of local miscegenation, which he saw as the foundation of Brazil's unique racial and cultural identity, characterized by its richness and diversity. He challenged the traditional understanding of the roles of various races in Brazilian history. While it is true that it is possible to point out other thinkers, who recognized the societal contributions of Indigenous and African peoples and their descendants before Gilberto Freyre, the author of *Casa-Grande & Senzala* was the *first* to present a comprehensive empirical analysis to support this idea and to make this topic the central focus of his work. For Freyre, Brazil was not weakened or harmed by the contrasts and contradictions within its society. On the contrary, these contrasts provided the foundation for the nation's development, enabling it to evolve into a society where opposing elements complemented each other, fostering the creation of a unique cultural landscape. He criticized Brazilian politicians and intellectuals who advocated for erasing differences as a condition for national progress, maintaining that these differences were what truly defined and shaped Brazil's identity. By rejecting the tendency of scholars to discriminate non-white races and to

overlook their contributions, Freyre developed an interpretation that granted both Indigenous peoples and the black population a cultural status *never before* attributed to these groups: he recognized them as equal co-creators of Brazilian culture, highlighting their immense contributions to Brazilian society (Malinowski 2011, 290–295).

Freyre's originality stemmed largely from his emphasis on black people as co-creators of national culture, a group that had been almost entirely overlooked, even though Indigenous peoples had received certain attention. This perspective was highly *controversial*, as it brought to light uncomfortable truths about the white aristocracy—truths that were evident yet deeply shameful. By underscoring the significant contributions of black people, Freyre challenged social taboos. He also redefined the narrative on the interactions between the three races. Departing from the prevailing view of constant violent conflict, Freyre argued that such tensions were confined to the early phases of the colonization. Over time, European violence gave way to the practice of miscegenation. Although the structures of domination and subjugation persisted, the close physical interaction between the races softened these structures with the unifying effects of miscegenation. Freyre suggested that white people related to black people with more tenderness and "brotherhood" than cruelty, presenting the relationship between the races as a harmonious, symbiotic coexistence (Malinowski 2011, 295–296).

In his extremely romanticized view, during the era of slavery, the misery of black people was alleviated, at least in part, by a sense of belonging to the master's household and having a roof over their heads. Under conditions of freedom, they were "deprived" even of that. In this new reality, they felt uprooted, and from that point onward, their lives were marked by constant uncertainty. Because of the disruption of this supposed balance between the two sides, previously enslaved people became more nonconformist, which led to acts of defiance and rebellion. Freyre believed (or wanted to believe) that, despite the vast inequality on which it was based, patriarchalism in its original form was, at its core, conflict-free. In his opinion, the abolition brought an end to this "idyll," and most of the Afro-Brazilians strongly missed the old "order." His concept of "racial democracy," in turn, emphasized the idea of mutual benefits between the dominant and the dominated groups: according to the author, the enslaved accepted their role not only because they did not have any alternative, but also because they appreciated the benefits of the circumstances that linked them to a higher-status

social group, since as a result of miscegenation, in Freyre's view, the descendants of such informal unions enjoyed, at least in part, the benefits associated with an ancestry that was not of the lowest (African) status (Malinowski 2011, 301–313).

Thus, paradoxically, one of the most progressive writers of that time, who challenged the hegemonic discourse significantly, at the same time turned out to be extremely conservative and very coincident with the hegemonic discourse (after all, although he managed to challenge it, his ideas were being conceived within that particular social imaginary, which, according to Laclau (1990, 64), is a cognitive horizon, an "absolute limit which structures a field of intelligibility," "the condition of possibility of the emergence of any object").

Although the author was considered by many the first intellectual who questioned the marginalization of the Afro-Brazilian culture and proposed including it as an essential part of the Brazilian identity, he proposed, at the same time, an extremely romanticized vision of the colonial past, in which black people lived in nearly perfect harmony with the Portuguese colonizers. Moreover, as Malinowski states (2011, 281), his analysis did not serve as an attempt to criticize the colonial cultural heritage or highlight the shortcomings of the dominant, conservative line of national historiography. Ironically, his innovative approach, with its similarities to Oliveira Viana's thought, became one of the key symbols of Brazilian conservatism.

Gilberto Freyre was convinced that completely rejecting tradition and the old order, thereby disrupting continuity, would have disastrous consequences for Brazil as a nation. In his view, the core of Brazilian identity was rooted in preserving continuity rather than embracing abrupt changes. He was determined to demonstrate that Brazil could not afford to fully break away from its colonial legacy. Additionally, he argued that a republican system of government—which he considered responsible for deterioration of fundamental Brazilian cultural values and social patterns—was incompatible with the nature of Brazilian society and that the colonial era should not be regarded as synonymous with backwardness but rather as the cradle of national culture, since for him, despite all the attention he devoted to the Indigenous and black populations, Brazil was mainly a product of Portuguese culture and of the contributions of the Lusitanian conquerors, colonizers, and elites. Moreover, Freyre's conservatism was evident not only in his written works but also in his biography (especially

in his relations with the Portuguese dictator, António de Oliveira Salazar, who used Freyre's idea of "lusotropicalism" as official ideology of his regime, due to the fact that it portrayed the Portuguese as global pioneers of effective conquest and harmonious domination and thus, could serve as an argument to convince the world of the harmlessness of the Portuguese colonial presence in Africa [Charchalis 2019, 52–80]) (Malinowski 2011, 304–317).

In his book, Mariusz Malinowski (2011) also analyzes the social thought of other important intellectuals—such as Alberto Torres, Paulo Prado, Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, or Darcy Ribeiro—but I have decided not to discuss their thought here, as they either reiterate findings I have already discussed or extend beyond the time frame of my study.

3.2.1.2.2 "Culture wars"

Daryle Williams (2001), a political historian of culture, in his book (*Culture Wars in Brazil: the First Vargas Regime, 1930–1945*), uses the metaphor of war to refer to "contentious politicking over the administration, content, and meaning of a national culture (…). In these culture wars, bureaucrats, artists, intellectuals, critics, and everyday citizens competed against one another and the state for control of *brasilidade*, an intangible but highly coveted sense of Brazilianness" (xvii). According to Williams (2001), these wars "fueled the double process of state building and canon formation that defined Brazilian political culture and cultural policies" and—mainly due to the efforts of the state that tried to become patron, regulator, and censor of Brazilian culture—"were powerful enough to influence national and international imaginaries of Brazilianness well beyond the fall of the Estado Novo dictatorship" (xvii).

Williams' scope is limited to the Getúlio Vargas Era, but—as it has been demonstrated in the previous section—the roots of these "cultural wars" reach back to a more distant past. Hence, to study the relation between the previously discussed social thought and the factual social reality, before analyzing the particularities of the Getúlio Vargas Era, I need to address in more detail the mass European immigration and the "whitening ideology."

The way this immigration was handled (in line with the "whitening ideology") suggests—especially in the light of the previously discussed historical facts and Brazilian

social thought—that, within the hegemonic web of meanings, "Europe" and "white race" signifiers were "synonyms" of civilization, superiority, prestige, and progress, while "Africa" and "black race" signifiers were "antonyms" of these qualities (barbarity, inferiority, insignificance, backwardness).

As Smith and Vinhosa (2013, 123) explain, Brazilian elite often harbored feelings of cultural and racial inferiority compared to Europe, leading them to adopt European customs in behavior, architecture, or fashion. They also embraced contemporary racial theories promoting Aryan supremacy, which supported the idea of "whitening" (*branqueamento*) the national population. While European immigration was mainly encouraged to secure cheap labor (after the abolition of slavery), it also aimed to increase the proportion of "white" Brazilians. Conversely, Asians and Africans were subjected to discriminatory attitudes, since they were seen as racially "degenerative" and as an obstacle to modernization. This "white immigration policy" significantly altered Brazil's demographics: the white population rose from nearly 44% in 1890 to 63% by 1940. The elite's focus on racial "regeneration" or "eugenics" reflected a growing popularity of the ideas of "white superiority" and "black inferiority" (such beliefs can be exemplified by Manoel de Oliveira Lima, a founding member of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, who blamed the Northeast's economic and cultural stagnation on the "almost complete absence of European elements"[33]). Despite the abolition of slavery in 1888, no policies were enacted to improve the socio-economic conditions of former slaves. Employment opportunities in professional and clerical roles often imposed a racial barrier, and senior positions in government, the Church, and the military were predominantly reserved for white people. Additionally, Brazil's international image was a priority for Foreign Minister Barão do Rio Branco, who mandated that Brazilian diplomats in Europe should be "tall, well-groomed, and personally attractive," with wives who were "white or near-white in appearance."[34]

Fausto (2006, 205–221), in turn, asks why no initiative was undertaken to transform slaves into free laborers (instead of prioritizing European immigration) and, furthermore, why were measures not implemented to encourage migration of Brazilians from the

[33] Qutoted in: Levine, Robert M. *Pernambuco in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978, p. 11.
[34] Qutoted in: Freyre, Giberto. *Order and Progress: Brazil from Monarchy to Republic*. New York: Knopf, 1970, p. 202.

economically disadvantaged regions of the Northeast to the south? Among many factors and reasons he mentions, he states that racism had won the governors' minds. Inspired by the works of thinkers like Arthur de Gobineau, the rulers viewed slaves and former slaves as inherently inferior, and this perception extended to individuals of mixed race. The prevailing belief was that Brazil's only path to progress lay in rapidly embracing Europeanization. Thus, in 1871, to encourage immigration, plans were made to subsidize travel costs, marking the start of state-supported immigration to São Paulo (the support varied, but it could cover, for example, an eight-day stay in a government facility and transportation to the plantations), where Europeans could find stable jobs way more easily than former slaves, who were confined to temporary, poorly compensated employment. The preference of employers for immigrant labor in the most economically vibrant regions, combined with the limited opportunities for freed slaves elsewhere, placed Afro-Brazilians at a severe social disadvantage. In areas with significant immigration, black individuals were often viewed as inferior beings, valued only in subordinate roles and perceived as inherently dangerous. They were stereotyped as lazy and predisposed to criminal behavior. Noteworthily, while the purpose of immigration in São Paulo was to provide labor, in the South, it centered on populating the region with European farmers, who benefited from colonization programs that offered them free or subsidized land (while Afro-Brazilians did not have such an opportunity). Alberto Torres (1865–1917)—one of the leading intellectuals of that time—commented it with the following observation: "It reaches scandalous proportions, for example, the zeal with which our governments have dedicated themselves to establishing and settling foreign colonists, providing them with properties and tools for work, while leaving many millions of our compatriots in idleness" [transl.—E. Ch.] (1938, 323). Between 1827 and 1930, Brazil received about 3.8 million foreign immigrants (approximately 2.74 million from 1887 to 1914).

Malinowski, in his *Brazylia: Republika* (2013, 60–62), informs as well that the promotion of immigration was made official even by the 1891 Constitution (article 35) and that measures to restrict "undesirable immigration" were taken quite swiftly: decree number 528, issued in June 1890, barred individuals from Africa and Asia from entering the country unless granted special approval by Congress. The largest immigrant groups included Italians,

Portuguese, Spanish, Germans, and Poles, although the list of represented nationalities extends far beyond these.

Fausto (2006, 275–279), for instance, states that European immigration to Brazil became significantly limited around 1914 due to the outbreak of World War I. As a result, Brazil faced labor shortages in regions dependent on immigrant workers, particularly in the coffee plantations of São Paulo. To address this, Brazil began turning to other sources of immigrant labor, including Japan (Japanese immigration to Brazil had already started in 1908, but the flow of Japanese immigrants increased significantly during and after World War I as Japan became a key partner in supplying labor). Other significant minority communities consisted of Jews, Syrians, and Lebanese.

In such a diverse country (which did not achieve its independence through armed struggle and great sacrifices, as was the case with many other Latin American nations, but instead gained its independence as a result of high-level negotiations), national identity cannot be taken for granted. At the beginning of the Vargas Era, a significant portion of the Indigenous peoples had been affected by traumatic experiences related to the social life in Brazil, lived in isolation from the other inhabitants of the country and did not participate in broader social life; Similarly, Afro-Brazilians, who also had been affected by traumatic experiences from the social life in Brazil, were still strongly marginalized and excluded from the social life; the immigrants from Europe and Asia tended to live in communities of their compatriots, or even in "mono-national" cities, where they could preserve the traditions from their motherland (without the necessity of assimilating Brazilian customs), where they had schools offering instruction in their native languages, local press written in those languages, or religious temples conducting ceremonies in their mother tongues. The idea of a national interest that could unify all the inhabitants of Brazil, understood as juridically equal members of one nation, did not exist (Malinowski 2013, 147–155; 2011, 176–178, 196).

Under such circumstances, it is likely that many individuals in these groups did not harbor deeply patriotic feelings, did not feel a sense of solidarity with other Brazilians, or even did not consider themselves Brazilians. Curiously, to address this issue, Mário de Andrade, one of the most acclaimed writers of Brazil, wrote *Macunaíma: The Hero Without Any Character* (2023 [1928]). Macunaíma—a chaotic fusion of multiple cultural influences, which, over time, evolved into a symbol of Brazilianness—embodied the notion that Brazil

lacked a unified national identity. Initially depicted as a black Indigenous man, Macunaíma later undergoes a metamorphosis, changing into a white man.

Getúlio Vargas diagnosed this lack of national identity and unity in interests, as well as a dispersion of internal forces that generated insecurity. His goal was to achieve unification around identity elements that would strengthen Brazilians' patriotism and the position of the government, grounded mostly in the values of conservative order, European tradition, and Catholic religion. It was a long process that extended beyond the period in which Jorge Amado wrote *Sea of Death*. Nevertheless, I will include it, in part, in my analysis, as the Vargas regime either revised or reinforced the ideas and values from the period of my interest (there is a relation of continuity between them). In turn, regarding the changes that were implemented within the period I studied, it is important to remember that a hegemonic discourse cannot be transformed overnight through a handful of decrees. As I have observed previously, the discourse of the Vargas regime did not instantaneously construct a new common sense, a "new objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61). It was merely one of the forces competing for hegemony in Brazil's discursive field at the time. While undeniably the most powerful, it was still only one among them.

During the 1930s, many Brazilians believed that immigrants adhered too fervently to the traditions of their ancestors, which contributed to the rising popularity of nationalist slogans advocating for a strong and clearly defined state. Vargas firmly supported this stance. The idea, promoted by numerous intellectuals, of developing a cohesive Brazilian culture to replace the blend of foreign influences during the Estado Novo era eventually became a legally sanctioned directive. Vargas sought to ensure that the presence of immigrants disrupted the formation of a unified Brazilian national identity as little as possible. Expressions of cultural distinctiveness among immigrants and their descendants were widely criticized, their schools, where instruction was conducted in foreign languages, were condemned, and numerous "mono-national" settlements were regarded as significant obstacles to the creation of a strong and unified Brazil. In response, Vargas issued a series of decrees aimed at preventing foreigners from accumulating land, restricting the type and scope of their organizational activities by bureaucratizing the legalization process and banning any form of political engagement, and accelerating cultural assimilation by eliminating education and press in foreign languages as well as forbidding the study of

foreign languages for children under the age of 14. The Immigration Code, enacted in May 1938, further reinforced these measures by banning the entry of Jews, Roma, and Japanese immigrants and prohibiting newly arrived foreigners from settling in cities, leaving agricultural immigration as the only unrestricted option. Immigration quotas were also introduced, imposing an annual cap of 2% of the existing population of a given nationality and regulating a maximum threshold of 25% for people of the same origin residing in a single locality. Vargas also redefined Brazilian citizenship laws. All individuals born in Brazil were automatically granted citizenship, while the rest of the population was categorized as passport immigrants, a designation that prevented them from forming organizations or participating in political life. Additionally, preaching in foreign languages was declared illegal. The nationalization campaign under Vargas brought, among many other things, reduction of fascist influences in Italian and German diasporas or, as a long-term effect, consolidation of the cultural foundations of Brazilian identity (which came at a price of numerous abuses towards all foreign-origin groups, such as, for example, shutting down of immigrant-run schools without providing any replacement) (Malinowski 2013, 149–152).

Furthermore, Vargas' regime fully incorporated cultural programming into the language and operations of federal authority, establishing Brazilian culture as a responsibility of the state. A newly created category of civil servants—federal culture managers—devoted considerable effort to fostering, expanding, and formalizing cultural activities that were considered representative of the national identity. This systematic approach to cultural administration and nation building—"sometimes paternalist, typically authoritarian, and invariably nationalist" (Williams 2001, 52)—led to the creation or expansion of nearly twenty federal institutions dedicated to the visual and performing arts, literature, historical preservation, museums, and civic culture. The institutionalization of cultural oversight and sponsorship was accompanied by significant federal spending. Beyond financial and administrative investments in the cultural sector, the federal government also channeled substantial symbolic capital into the support and promotion of the nation's cultural heritage. Additionally, the regime's cultural policies included the functioning of mechanisms, which aimed at reducing the impact of its critics: censorship, political repression, social control, cultural authoritarianism—in Williams' words, a "brutal thought police" (2001, 14). In 1942, leftist U.S. publisher Samuel Putnam condemned the Brazilian

government's persecution of intellectuals, highlighting the cases of novelists Jorge Amado and Graciliano Ramos, both of whom faced state repression. Putnam, reporting what would have certainly been censored in Brazil, cited a 1941 speech given by Amado while in exile in Argentina, in which the Bahian writer denounced the Vargas regime for its authoritarian cultural policies, including thought control and suppression of dissent. At the same time, the state that persecuted left-wing intellectuals as threats to Brazilian culture actively promoted conservative artists such as Oswaldo Teixeira (Williams 2001, 14–15).

An editorial from the July 1938 issue of *Revista do Serviço Público* encapsulated the functional, ideological, and historical role of federal cultural administration during the Estado Novo:

> The era has ended in which state intervention into a nation's culture was believed to amount to nothing. A false and empty liberalism once denounced any State initiative as an invasion into territory which should be exclusively reserved for free intellectual initiative. […] Only an imbecile would now be capable of defending this position, which is unsustainable in today's world. Those nations that do not demonstrate active consciousness of their unique characteristics will find it difficult to survive this tempestuous era in which we live. No aspect of national life can be left at the margins of state action, as the State is the sole entity capable of imprinting upon each citizen a truly nationalist mark. Cultural development merits the highest level of attention from those in power, as it is the linchpin to real and lasting national progress (RSP 1938, 3–4) [Quoted in English in Williams 2001, 69].

As I have demonstrated before, throughout Brazil's history, up to that point, the state had been almost entirely synonymous with a narrow elite, while the Brazilian people were either ignored or marginalized. According to Malinowski (2013, 173–174), Vargas was likely the first president to recognize that Brazil could never achieve modernity without fostering a cultural framework that united all citizens and it was this realization that drove the nationalization campaign, which aimed to eradicate cultural, linguistic, ethnic, and regional divisions while promoting a standardized set of values, traditions, and national symbols. This movement coincided with an emerging interest in the black population.

A key influence in this shift was Gilberto Freyre's book *The Masters and the Slaves* (1986 [1933]), which sought to highlight the contributions of black Brazilians to the country's cultural development (however, although Freyre focused extensively on the

Indigenous and black populations, in his view, Brazil was fundamentally shaped by Portuguese culture). Especially impactful and attractive to the white elite—as well as aligned with the Estado Novo's nationalist ideology—was Freyre's idea that Brazil was a "racial democracy," in which European, African, and Indigenous influences blended to form a singular nation, in which racial interactions were harmonious and all citizens enjoyed equality (in this regard, Brazil was seen as exceptional on a global scale and was often favorably compared to the United States, where legal segregation persisted in the southern regions up until 1954, although institutionalized efforts to "whiten" Brazilian population's racial composition persisted until 1960). Accusations of racial discrimination were dismissed by the Brazilian elite, who argued that black Brazilians had not made use of the opportunities available for economic progress and social mobility (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 183–184).

The regime's cultural policies, such as the promotion of samba as a national symbol, reflected Freyre's notion of embracing cultural hybridity. Although Getúlio Vargas included Afro-Brazilians and their cultures in his nation-building project, his regime, while adopting the rhetoric of racial harmony, was not free from racist policies and practices. The idea of Brazil as a racial democracy was useful to Vargas' government in constructing a nationalist identity that downplayed racial tensions, but in practice, the Estado Novo implemented discriminatory, exclusionary, and assimilationist policies, particularly against non-white groups.

An example of such policies can be those related to samba. The rapid expansion of media communications was a defining aspect of Getúlio Vargas' era. The rise of radio broadcasting gained significant momentum with the creation of a national radio network in the 1930s, which greatly contributed to its influence and popularity. The actual reach of radio audiences extended even further through the use of loudspeakers, which transmitted broadcasts to rural areas and favelas, ensuring access not only to those without personal receivers. The radio, however—technology capable of extending across vast geographic regions, overcoming significant socioeconomic disparities, and entering private spaces (including those inhabited by illiterate adults) that had previously been beyond strong government reach—was regulated and controlled by the regime. To oversee and direct media output, the state established the Department of Press and Propaganda (*Departamento de Imprensa e Propaganda*—DIP). The government often utilized direct communication

methods to disseminate its messages. During the Estado Novo, *A Hora do Brasil* (The Brazil Hour) was aired nightly, reinforcing state narratives about patriotism. Also the music that was most frequently enjoyed by the Brazilians was a source of serious concern for cultural officials at the Department of Press and Propaganda (Williams 2001, 85; Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 182). At the beginning of the 20th century, samba was considered an "inferior, primitive, and lascivious" (Azevedo 2018, 49) form of music. Initially repressed by the police, samba was later embraced by Rio de Janeiro's middle class as an exotic musical expression. Having achieved commercial success since 1917, samba reached its height during the Radio Era of the 1930s (Santos, Rocha 2017, 102), but as the decade progressed, its creators "were increasingly co-opted and censored by the political regime" (Shaw 1998, 152).

Samba (as well as other musical styles that emerged from the bohemian underground and impoverished favelas of Rio de Janeiro—areas predominantly inhabited by Afro-Brazilians) was a particular source of concern for state cultural authorities, because at stake was the dominance of a musical form that was increasingly linked to national identity, yet still carried strong associations with marginality. Determined to reshape samba—which was often criticized for its celebration of the *malandro* (rogue) and its sensual, pulsating rhythms—officials sought to turn it into a vehicle for promoting moral rectitude, patriotism, and hard work. In 1941, Martins Castelo, a semi-regular radio critic for the DIP, reinforced this directive by advocating for the prohibition of songs that used slang deemed corrosive to the national language or glorified *malandragem* (roguery). In practice, however, the DIP took a more pragmatic approach, recognizing samba's potential as a tool for promoting social and moral improvement. Álvaro Salgado, a music critic affiliated with the DIP, likened the treatment of samba to the way society handled street children—rather than eliminating them, they required proper education, according to him. Following this logic, samba, maxixe, embolada, marchinha, and frevo were framed as musical traditions in need of reform rather than suppression. Studies on popular music have shown that the DIP actively encouraged well-known musicians and lyricists to compose samba lyrics that celebrated the Estado Novo and exalted Vargas' leadership. Once broadcast on the radio, these hyper-patriotic songs helped cement the regime's goals of national renewal and moral uplift. Titles like *Salve 19 de Abril!* ("Long Live April 19!"—Vargas' birthday), *Glórias do Brasil!* ("Glories of Brazil!"),

and *É Negócio Casar* ("It's Time to Get Married") left little doubt about the ideological intent behind these state-sponsored sambas. Yet, despite these efforts, the Vargas regime failed to fully co-opt samba as it had hoped. As both a musical genre and a social symbol, samba remained a space for resistance to state intervention in cultural production. Instead of abandoning themes of bohemian life and *malandragem*, *sambistas* continued to celebrate them in their compositions. On the streets, state-imposed regulations were largely ignored, and official samba lyrics were often altered with alternative verses that glorified *malandragem* and other expressions of social defiance (Williams 2001, 85–87).

The Vargas regime's approach to samba becomes evident especially when examining the case of Carnival. The government provided organizational and financial support for the event—an initiative that played a crucial role in elevating both samba and Rio's Carnival to the status of internationally recognized symbols of Brazil. However, in return, samba schools were required to register with federal authorities and adhere to state-imposed censorship (it also became mandatory to incorporate national themes into the samba-enredo parades) (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 183).

During the Vargas Era, not only samba but also another element of Afro-Brazilian culture was elevated, as part of Vargas' nation-building project, to the status of an important symbol of Brazilianness, which later gained international recognition: the martial art of capoeira.

Capoeira has been a part of Afro-Brazilian traditions for centuries, though its exact origins remain uncertain. The earliest recorded reference to the practice appears in a judicial document from 1789 (ANRJ, Tribunal de Relação, codex 24, book 10, July 25, 1789), where it was labeled *Capoeiragem* and described as "the gravest of crimes." The document states that Manoel Cardoso Fontes acquired a young enslaved youth named Adão,

> who grew into a robust type, a hard worker who was obedient to his master, serving him in the household chores. Manoel resolved to take advantage of him by renting him out to third parties as a laborer for public works, as a porter, or for any other physical labor. In this way Adão became a good source of income for his master. With the passage of time, the timid slave, who before had always lived humbly, became more self-confident and independent and began to arrive home much later than the end of his day's work. After Manoel questioned

> Adão about his change in conduct, the *senhor* found his excuses to be most inconsistent. Eventually what Manoel had long feared happened: Adão did not return home. Manoel thought that certainly he had escaped to some *quilombo* in the suburbs of the city.
>
> To his surprise, he was to encounter Adão behind the bars of the district prison. He had been arrested along with other disorderly people who had practiced [the *jogo de*] *capoeira*. On the day of Adão's arrest a fight had occurred between capoeiras, and one of them had been murdered. According to the law of the kingdom, the gravest of crimes was the practice of *capoeiragem*, and even more so when it resulted in death. In the course of the proceedings it was established that Adão was innocent regarding the murder charge, but his status as a *capoeira* was confirmed. As punishment he was to receive five hundred "lashes" and "two years in public works." His *senhor*, after Adão had served some months of service and had received his punishment on the whipping post, petitioned the king, in the name of Christ's mercy, to wave the rest of the penalty, arguing that he was a poor man and dependent on the income that his slave brought him. He promised to take care that Adão would no longer return to fraternize with *capoeiras* or become one of them. Manoel's request was granted by the tribunal [Quoted in English in Desch-Obi 2008, 156–157].

Newspaper records from the 19th century report the indignation of the "respectable families," who felt threatened by the *capoeiras* (Lott 2018, 454). In 1890, a law (Chapter XIII, "On Vagrants and Capoeiras," of the Penal Code) was enacted explicitly banning the practice of capoeira, leading to intensified and more systematic police repression. Due to relentless persecution, capoeira was nearly eradicated in Rio de Janeiro and Recife by the early decades of the twentieth century. However, in Bahia, it managed to persist (Lewis 1992, 50).

As John Lowell Lewis (1992, 59–60) explains, at the turn of the 1920s and 1930s, Mestre Bimba (Manoel dos Reis Machado, 1899–1974) established the first formal school dedicated to teaching capoeira, modifying the traditional form by incorporating elements of jiu-jitsu and gymnastics. Since capoeira was still illegal at the time, he named his new style *Luta Regional Baiana* to avoid persecution. His academy was particularly notable for its effort to attract students from Bahia's middle and upper classes, as Bimba sought to reshape capoeira's image and distance it from its historical association with the *malandro* stereotype. To achieve this, he introduced an intensive capoeira course, which included a diploma and required a significant tuition fee, successfully drawing in university students, future

professionals, and upwardly mobile, lighter-skinned young men. Although capoeira did not receive official government recognition until 1937, this period marked the beginning of its institutionalization as a sport. The integration of capoeira into formal institutions contributed to its revival but also led to major transformations. The shift in the social background of practitioners influenced changes not only of capoeira's legal status, but also changes in the style of play, eventually leading to the emergence of two distinct forms of capoeira: the innovative Capoeira Regional, developed by Mestre Bimba, and the more traditional Capoeira Angola, preserved by Mestre Pastinha, who sought to maintain its older techniques and philosophy. In 1953, after witnessing a demonstration by Bimba's academy, Getúlio Vargas declared capoeira to be "the only truly national sport" (only after it was partially "de-Africanized" and after it was subjected to certain bureaucratization and control of the state).

Vargas skillfully leveraged sports and popular culture as a means of rallying public approval, mitigating political unrest, and uniting different peoples under one Brazilian flag. A prime example was soccer, which had already emerged as Brazil's most popular sport by the early 20th century. In the 1930s, the establishment of professional leagues helped cement the nation's reputation as a powerhouse in the game. Government involvement was key in financially supporting a national team and securing Brazil as the host for the 1950 World Cup, an event held at the newly built Maracanã Stadium, which stood as the world's largest at the time. Although the tournament ended in a defeat to Uruguay, soccer remained central to Brazilian identity and global recognition. The nation claimed its first international titles in 1958 (Sweden) and 1962 (Chile), with stars like Pelé (Edson Arantes do Nascimento) becoming global icons. By associating themselves with the success of the national squad, subsequent Brazilian governments sought to instill patriotism, reinforce national unity and pride, and enhance their own political standing through the widespread influence of the sport (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 182–183).

When Vargas staged his coup in 1930, heritage preservation had no legal framework. However, within seven years, his administration issued a decree-law that introduced one of the most progressive heritage protection codes of its time. By the end of the Estado Novo, national legislation safeguarded a carefully curated selection of cultural treasures, collectively recognized as Brazil's national historical and artistic patrimony. Nearly half of

all sites and artifacts recorded in Brazil's official heritage registry, the *Livros do Tombo,* were cataloged before 1945. The Vargas government actively promoted its image as a protector of these structures and artifacts, of "the identity documents of the Brazilian nation" (Williams 2001, 90–91).

According to Daryle Williams (2001, 92–95), the selection of Ouro Preto as the country's primary tourist destination reflects the Brazilian government's efforts to construct a national identity rooted in both historical significance and architectural heritage. The city was the site of the Inconfidência Mineira (1789), a separatist movement against Portuguese rule, led by Tiradentes, who was later elevated to the status of a martyr of Brazilian independence and a precursor to the Republic. The designation of Ouro Preto as a national monument served a dual purpose: reinforcing a distinct Brazilian national identity while simultaneously positioning the country within the broader framework of European cultural heritage. The baroque churches and colonial architecture, which were relatively uncommon on a national scale in Brazil, provided historical depth to the national narrative—they articulated "a national identity with an ancient pedigree stretching back into time immemorial" (Williams 2001, 95). For the ruling elites of the period, associating Brazil's heritage with European civilization functioned as a marker of cultural legitimacy and progress. Vargas approved this rationale by issuing an executive decree (12 July 1933), which played a crucial role in shaping the imaginary of a national community known as Brazil, establishing the country's first "national" monument despite its vast territorial scale and significant regional and ethnic diversity. Despite the fact that Ouro Preto's historical events, architectural styles, and political values were specific to 18th-century Minas Gerais, the designation of the city as a national monument provided a symbolic foundation for a shared historical and artistic identity. Federal preservation policies soon positioned Ouro Preto's Catholic and secular architecture and art as the primary cultural markers of Brazilianness, to be embraced by the entire population and recognized internationally.

During the Vargas Era, the concept of cultural patrimony was closely aligned with high art, excluding folkloric traditions from official recognition. Catholic edifices, administrative institutions, military defenses, and public infrastructure from the 17th and 18th centuries were the primary types of sites selected for heritage designation (*tombamento*). Moreover, the aesthetic principles of heritage preservation were explicitly rooted in nationalist ideals,

which understood Brazilianness in a way that primarily elevated Luso-Catholic heritage over all other cultural expressions. In the 1930s and 1940s, the idea of formally recognizing former maroon settlements (*quilombos*) or Candomblé temples (*casas de axé* or *terreiros*) as cultural heritage would have been inconceivable. Even when heritage-listed sites were constructed and predominantly inhabited by non-European populations—such as the Jesuit-Guarani mission of São Miguel (São Miguel das Missões)—the SPHAN (Serviço do Patrimônio Histórico e Artístico Nacional) significantly downplayed the role of the non-Europeans in shaping Brazil's artistic and cultural legacy. While the architectural and artistic heritage of the *barroco mineiro* was officially consecrated, the social realities of gold mining—shaped by impoverished immigrants from northern Portugal, enslaved Africans, and free non-European people—were largely absent from the dominant narrative. In its preservation work in Minas Gerais, SPHAN focused primarily on safeguarding the architectural and decorative culture associated with slaveholders, churches, and free artisans, while largely neglecting the enslaved and free individuals who played essential roles in creating and maintaining this artistic and material legacy. The institution's approach to aesthetics prioritized artistic beauty over historical depth or ethnographic inclusivity in determining which works warranted protection. As a result, Ouro Preto's Age of Gold was portrayed as a radiant and opulent era, rather than the harsh, labor-intensive, and exploitative reality of mining in 18th-century Minas Gerais. Alternative perspectives stood little chance of gaining traction, particularly in a cultural landscape where few Brazilians possessed the scholarly expertise to contest SPHAN's interpretations (Williams 2001, 101–107).

During the First Republic, the acceleration of industrialization, urbanization, and communication advancements reshaped how the passage of time was perceived, as old buildings were demolished and modern constructions symbolized a forward-looking society. The influx of foreign immigrants further weakened traditional ties to a Luso-Brazilian heritage, with São Paulo embodying an intense embrace of modernity. In reaction to this fading past, certain elites sought ways to preserve historical remnants. This effort took concrete form in 1922 when President Epitácio Pessoa founded his "school of patriotism," i.e., the first National Historical Museum, creating an institutional space for curating and showcasing national memory. Building on this initiative, the Vargas regime later leveraged museums to maintain a symbolic continuity between Brazil's past and present in a rapidly

evolving society. The version of history preserved from oblivion was far richer, more aristocratic, whiter, and more stable than any Brazilian could genuinely recall. The legacy of European colonization, slavery, race mixture, and economic hardship provoked unease among museum professionals and visitors, raising concerns about how a modern nation should engage with its historical narrative. These apprehensions went beyond past events, reflecting broader anxieties about the formation of Brazilian identity. Museums became arenas where elites, scholars, and the public attempted to mold history to align with contemporary interests. When historical narratives were successfully curated, an exclusive group of museum experts and visitors took pride in celebrating a past that appeared distinguished, honorable, and heroic (Williams 2001, 135–139).

The staff of the National Historical Museum—"Brazil's emotional home," which aligned itself with the Estado Novo by reinforcing its connection to the ideological foundations that validated Vargas' dictatorship—had access to extensive resources for constructing narratives about Brazil's past. Additionally, the museum was embedded within a broader network of cultural and educational institutions that shaped historical discourse through professional training, original research, and scholarly debate. Its director operated within the same intellectual sphere as leading historians of the Vargas era. However, unlike some of his contemporaries, he and his team deliberately avoided discussions of class dynamics, racial mixture, or labor relations. The groundbreaking work of Gilberto Freyre, for instance, found little reflection in the museum's exhibitions. Instead, visitors encountered an idealized version of Brazil's history, where labor and production were nearly invisible, and the overwhelming majority of faces were white. The nostalgia evoked by the museum centered on a vision of an aristocratic, hierarchical, and militaristic society, framed as one illuminated by the Catholic God's favor. Upon entering the exhibition space, visitors were meant to experience an emotional connection to the relics of elite life: this sentimental interpretation of national history was anchored in a collection of well-preserved material artifacts, which found their way into the museum's displays. The emphasis on durable material culture shaped the museum's historical scope, limiting representation to regions, families, social classes, and institutions that had historically produced and possessed such objects. As a result, the galleries prominently featured the aristocracy, landowning elites, the military, and high-ranking clergy—groups that had lived within an advanced material culture

characterized by fine jewelry, tableware, weaponry, metalwork, furniture, and religious (Catholic) artifacts. Social groups whose material culture was less durable were largely excluded from the museum's reconstructed vision of national history. When non-elite figures did appear, they were presented only through the material artifacts of the upper classes. This was evident in the representation of enslaved individuals, who were included in the exhibition but only through objects such as shackles and instruments of torture, emphasizing their subjugation rather than their culture and lived experiences. Moreover, the museum's collection was already shaped by narratives that minimized the agency of marginalized groups long before curators arranged the exhibits. For instance, "Allegory of the Law of the Free Womb" ("Alegoria da Lei do Ventre Livre"), one of the few pieces in the museum's permanent exhibition representing black Brazilians, was created from the perspective of white elites, celebrating the image of an enlightened emperor rather than acknowledging the enslaved and free Afro-Brazilians who actively fought for abolition. Similarly, Vitor Meireles' massive painting, "Naval Battle of Riachuelo" ("Batalha Naval do Riachuelo"), erased the presence of Afro-Brazilian sailors who participated in the 1865 battle, reinforcing their exclusion from national memory within the museum's commemorative space. The institution did little to challenge the prevailing narrative that emancipation was a benevolent act of the emperor rather than a victory secured through the struggles of various historical actors, including Afro-Brazilians in the navy. This historical erasure was perpetuated across both the 19th and 20th centuries (Williams 2001, 146–156).

Similarly, as Williams (2001, 158–174) acknowledges, in the National Museum of Fine Arts (Museu Nacional de Belas Artes, created in 1937), art forms such as popular, folk, and Indigenous art were excluded from the permanent exhibition. The scholars overseeing the MNBA prioritized works characterized by European influence, works that "built bridges between Brazilian culture and the Ancients, as well as between the Brazilian national gallery and the Louvre […, that inserted] Brazilian art into the universal history of Western art" (Williams 2001, 161–163). Even masterpieces considered Brazilian carried a strong European aesthetic, with many having been created on the continent itself. However, historical art could be just as contentious as contemporary art is today, particularly when displayed at an institution that positioned itself as the protector of the nation's artistic heritage. A key example is the Exposição da Missão Artística Francesa de 1816, a significant

retrospective on 19th-century Franco-Brazilian art, which took place at the National Museum of Fine Arts in 1940. Certain images featured in this exhibition had long unsettled the Brazilian elite. One particularly controversial lithograph, *Feitors corrigeant des nègres à la roça* ("Overseers Punishing Slaves on the Farm"), from Jean-Baptiste Debret's *Voyage*, had been especially disturbing not only to 19th-century but also to 20th-century elites. As the nation-building project relied on projecting a Europeanized image—if not necessarily the reality—of Brazilian society, the ruling class recoiled at Debret's stark depiction of a society in which slavery and brutality were deeply ingrained. His portrayal of a disorderly Portuguese character and his multiethnic representation of Brazilianness further unsettled them. By openly illustrating a society shaped by slavery, images like *Overseers Punishing Slaves* remained just as provocative in 1940 as they had been a century earlier. Through both subject matter and artistic technique, Debret's watercolors directly challenged the narrative of imperial grandeur, benevolent slavery, and social harmony promoted by figures such as Gilberto Freyre and most federal museums. The idea of a racially interdependent society, which Debret's work vividly portrayed, had been largely absent from Brazilian painting throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries. Even the modernist movements of the 1920s and 1930s had not addressed Brazil's multiracial dynamics with the same directness. In 1940, when Freyre's depiction of racial interdependence continued to spark controversy, the French Artistic Mission exhibition was bound to provoke contested interpretations. As a whole, the exhibit disrupted a long-standing intellectual tradition in post-abolition Brazil that sought to erase slavery and the African presence from the national narrative, and, as such, for Daryle Williams, it ranked among the most significant cultural events of the Vargas Era.

During that period, museums served as ideal spaces for promoting a vision of modernization that glorified the past, presenting it as a source of lessons, exemplary figures, and national pride. This narrative approach resonated strongly with both state officials and private individuals eager to see themselves reflected in the historical narrative. As a result, museum patronage became a key element in shaping collective memory at the same time that the federal government was significantly increasing both the number and quality of national museums. Four main groups emerged as key supporters of historical museums: 1) the descendants of the 19th-century upper class, 2) the federal elite, 3) the Catholic Church, and 4) industrialists and entrepreneurs. These groups not only visited museums regularly but also

made substantial donations. In return, museums celebrated them as national heroes and patriots (Williams 2001, 176–177).

Williams (2001, 184–191) also observes that entry to federal museums was free, as visiting these institutions was framed as both a civic duty and an act of patriotism. Mário de Andrade, who collaborated with Vargas' administration, even suggested mandating regular museum visits for students and workers. However, regulations at the National Historical Museum imposed restrictions on visitors who did not meet standards of "proper appearance." For Rio de Janeiro's large impoverished population—many of whom lacked access to running water, clean clothing, or footwear—this effectively barred them from entering, regardless of any interest they might have had in attending. Paradoxically, the museum under the first Vargas administration functioned as "an important site for the manufacture of memories that were eminently nationalistic, but closed to most of the nation" (Williams 2001, 191), which also reflects how limited and exclusive was the meaning that the "Brazilian nation" nodal point had within the hegemonic discourse.

For the Vargas regime, another opportunity to craft an idealized narrative of cultural revival were the expositions. These events were highly valued for the possibility of presenting a cohesive national identity (also abroad). Brazil's participation in the 1939–1940 New York World's Fair and the Golden Gate International Exposition, as well as the 1940 Exposição do Mundo Português (Lisbon) projected an image of a modern and stable society that had supposedly "exorcised the demons of colonialism, liberalism, communism, and underdevelopment" (Williams 2001, 192). At these international showcases, both Brazilian representatives and their foreign counterparts praised the country's impressive cultural transformation. Outside Brazil, the Estado Novo could assert itself as the guardian of a unified national culture, fully in command of its identity, could construct an aspirational vision of an industrious, cultured, and white society—one that had ostensibly moved beyond slavery and was now prepared to take its place among the world's leading nations. The Ministry of Foreign Relations and state propaganda agencies actively sought to cultivate a favorable international image, particularly among business circles and travel agencies in the United States and Western Europe. Cultural diplomacy increasingly complemented commercial promotion as a means of elevating Brazil's global standing and countering the perception that it was merely another impoverished republic. One of the strategies employed

to shape this image involved commissioning "young women *de boa aparência* (a codeword for white)" (Williams 2001, 204) to serve Brazilian coffee, hot chocolate, and yerba mate tea at the New York World's Fair and the Golden Gate International Exposition. Concerns about race and underdevelopment remained central to the decisions made by those responsible for curating Brazil's artistic representations abroad. Such subject matters as popular culture, favelas, or Afro-Brazilians were deemed unsuitable for official cultural delegations. The committees responsible for shaping Brazil's image abroad frequently made deliberate efforts to suppress representations of manual labor, Afro-Brazilian and working-class cultures from exhibitions, operating under the assumption that foreign audiences needed to perceive Brazil as a civilized and white nation (Williams 2001, 192–225).

At the Exposição do Mundo Português, in turn, in the Brazilian Historical Exhibit, the visitors could appreciate a massive mural depicting a "genealogical tree of the Brazilian race" (Williams 2001, 234), symbolizing Brazil as a flourishing flower with its roots firmly planted in Portuguese soil. Above the pavilion's entrance, an inscription displayed a Vargas statement, emphasizing Brazil's mission to develop its own civilization while preserving the legacy inherited from Portugal. Brazilian delegates asserted that Portugal had bestowed upon Brazil three fundamental pillars: "the invaluable gifts of European racial stock, a common language, and the Catholic religion" (Williams 2001, 236). However, during their participation in events and congresses celebrating the Lusophone world, Brazilian delegates remained conspicuously silent regarding the Colonial Section of the exhibition. While they actively engaged in various official ceremonies, they avoided any association with the colonized populations of Portuguese Africa (Williams 2001, 234–246).

Regarding Brazilian religious life, in the colonial period, Catholicism was not only the official religion but also a mandatory one. Practicing any faith outside of Christianity carried the risk of being branded a heretic and, consequently, an enemy of the king, whose authority was believed to derive from God. To ensure conversions and oversee the religious lives of its followers, the Church employed various measures of control and suppression against those who deviated from Christian doctrine. One of the most extreme and arbitrary institutions used for this purpose was the Tribunal of the Holy Office of the Inquisition. Established in Europe by the Church, this tribunal aimed to punish individuals accused of engaging in magical practices such as witchcraft, sorcery, or folk healing, as well as those involved in

sexual deviance or other "pagan" customs. The Church frequently attributed these behaviors to demonic influence. Consequently, activities deemed "suspicious," including festive gatherings with music or dancing, could be interpreted as witches' ceremonies where witches supposedly invoked the devil, indulged in excess, and committed grievous sins, including, as was imagined, child sacrifice. Those accused of such offenses were subjected to trials that often ended with public executions, typically by burning at the stake. In Brazil, the Inquisition never became fully institutionalized, but during its visits, it prosecuted numerous individuals of various backgrounds, including white, Indigenous, and black individuals. Many of those accused of sorcery or immoral behavior were deported and tried in Portugal's Inquisition courts. Through these and other conversion efforts, Catholicism became deeply embedded in colonial daily life. Religious observance was marked by festivals, processions, litanies, and other events within the Church's extensive annual calendar, which brought together the broader community. Daily prayers—recited in the morning, before meals, and at night after work—structured the rhythm of life. Indigenous and black populations, having been subjected to the religion of their oppressors, embraced Catholicism but also merged it with their own spiritual traditions (Silva 2005, 19–20).

To convert Indigenous populations to Catholicism, missionaries actively sought to suppress practices and traditions they deemed the most sinful and depraved. However, the Indigenous people that were converted did not completely abandon their beliefs and traditions. As they embraced Catholicism, they identified their deities with Christian saints and the Christian God. Meanwhile, Catholicism, in turn, equated Indigenous spiritual figures with demons. By the 17th century, Indigenous-Catholic syncretism had further evolved with the incorporation of religious influences brought by enslaved Africans. Today, reconstructing their original religious practices is extremely challenging. Based on the limited records available and comparisons with the religious traditions still practiced by surviving groups, scholars can only form a general understanding of their spiritual beliefs (Silva 2005, 23–26).

African religious traditions in Brazil were shaped by forced migration, cultural exchanges, and the influence of Catholicism. Enslaved people, including figures like Queen Agontimé of Dahomey, brought their spiritual beliefs, such as Vodun worship, which spread through communities like Casa das Minas in São Luís do Maranhão. Religious syncretism

was common, as African nations had long shared deities (as seen in the adoption of some Dahomean gods by the Yoruba and vice versa), and Islam had already expanded to West Africa before European colonization intensified racial and religious interactions. Through religious catechization, many ethnic traditions were transformed. While Catholic missionaries sought to convert enslaved Africans, their efforts were intertwined with the maintenance of slavery. Although the Church preached brotherhood and equality before God, it sanctioned—together with the Portuguese Crown—that enslaved people had to be baptized within five years of their arrival in Brazil and overlooked the suffering of enslaved individuals. Religious conversion—perceived as a way to transform people from pagans and sinners into Christians—was often superficial, intended to legitimize the institution of slavery rather than integrate African people into Christian society. The baptism and the adoption of Christian names (typically inspired by biblical figures or saints) did not guarantee humane treatment. At the same time, the Church closely monitored the personal lives of enslaved individuals to impose Catholic morality on them. Their marriages were arranged according to the preferences of plantation owners, with the goal of producing healthy children for agricultural labor. These unions were then blessed by local priests. African cultural expressions, such as music and dance, were sometimes tolerated as a harmless form of "folklore," but spiritual practices were condemned as diabolical. The Inquisition actively persecuted those who engaged in such rituals. Religious trances were seen as evidence of demonic possession, while divination, sacrifices, and other practices were classified as witchcraft or what became widely known as "black magic." Ultimately, while enslaved people were expected to adopt Catholicism, white society made little effort to understand African religious traditions, which were systematically demonized. Despite this suppression, African spirituality persisted, blending with Catholic elements to shape the religious landscape of Brazil (Silva 2005, 28–42).

Although the oral tradition of Candomblé asserts that the worship of African deities has always been organized in Brazil, determining the exact period in which the first Candomblé communities emerged remains challenging. One of the earliest known temples was Ilê Axé Iyá Nassô Oká—popularly referred to as Casa Branca do Engenho Velho—which was established in the 19th century by three Yoruba women from the city of Ketu: Adetá, Iyakala, and Iyanassô. Other historically significant *terreiros* include Ilé Íyá Omi Àse Ìyámase

(commonly known as Terreiro do Gantois) and Ilê Axé Opô Afonjá. As these three religious centers expanded, new *terreiros* emerged across different Brazilian states, each developing distinct characteristics that contributed to the formation of various Afro-Brazilian religious traditions. These included Batuque, Xangô, Tambor-de-Mina, Cabula, Jarê, and Umbanda, among others (Silva 2005, 57–99).

According to Nathália Fernandes de Oliveira,

> The classification of Afro-Brazilian religions as practices of magic and sorcery has fostered a negative perception of them. Unfortunately, this perception continues to persist in our society to this day. In other words, from the moment these religions emerged, they have been associated with evil, danger, the diabolical, the harmful, and the demonic [transl.—E. Ch.] (Oliveira 2015, 96).

The political, economic, and social changes that accompanied Brazil's independence in 1822 did not lead to a shift in religious legislation. The newly established Brazilian legal framework continued to uphold the supremacy of Catholic doctrines. As a result, African-derived religions remained oppressed, unrecognized, and equated with witchcraft. Both the 1824 Constitution and the 1830 Criminal Code reinforced the persecution, exclusion, and criminalization of Afro-Brazilian religious practices, which were interpreted by the police as an offense against public morality. For government and police officials, the traditions of black individuals and their descendants were associated with defiance and the risk of uprising. Religious ceremonies drew heightened scrutiny due to their ritualistic elements. These assemblies were perceived as inherently threatening, as they created an environment where resistance or revolutionary sentiments could develop. The so-called "civilizing mission" led by Brazil's elites and political leaders sought to reshape and restructure society to align with European standards. Within this framework, African cultural influences were regarded as an obstacle to modernization, viewed as a remnant of primitiveness that prevented Brazil from being recognized as a "civilized" nation (Oliveira 2015, 96–99).

In 1890, the Criminal Code of the Republic was enacted, in which references to Afro-Brazilian religions were subtly included but still noticeable to those initiated or familiar with them (especially in the parts related to the crimes against public tranquility and public health) (Oliveira 2015, 102–103).

Under the influence of the Church, the 1934 Constitution was proclaimed in the name of the Catholic God, reinstating Catholicism as the official state religion—a position that had previously been abolished by the secular Constitution of 1891 (Silva 2005, 102–104). Nevertheless, there was a certain strengthening of Candomblé in the 1930s, particularly thanks to the efforts of Mãe Aninha, the religious leader of Ilê Axé Opô Afonjá, who advocated for the legalization of Afro-Brazilian religions. A meeting between her and Getúlio Vargas resulted in Decree-Law 1.202 of 1939, which prohibited states and municipalities from suppressing the practice of religious worship. However, police repression of Afro-Brazilian religious practices continued throughout the whole Estado Novo period (in fact, "Candomblé remained on the margins of Brazilian society until the 1960s, when the popularization of Umbanda and the activism of the black movement sparked debates about it") (Oliveira 2015, 127)[35]. Angela Lühning, in turn, states that, although Vargas' regime established laws that warranted religious liberty, the police, under the pressure of the press (which in turn was under the pressure of the elites), brutally persecuted the Candomblé practitioners because of their "primitive traditions," which were incompatible with "Brazilian civilization" (1996, 204).

What also seemed to be incompatible with "Brazilian civilization" was communism (another important nodal point). The Brazilian Communist Party (Partido Comunista Brasileiro—PCB) was founded in 1922 and, since then, it was illegal until 1945 (with the exception of brief periods in 1922 and 1927). Before 1930, undermined by police repression and internal disputes, the number of party members did not exceed one thousand. Following directives from the Comintern in Moscow, the PCB aimed to expand its political influence by spearheading efforts to create a leftist coalition known as the National Liberation Alliance (Aliança Nacional Libertadora—ANL). This initiative sought to unite various progressive

[35] It is important to note here also Jorge Amado's role in securing religious freedom in Brazil. During his term as a constituent federal deputy for the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), Jorge Amado proposed Amendment No. 3,218 to the 1946 Constitution, which established the inviolability of freedom of conscience and belief, ensuring the free exercise of religious worship (Pontes 2018, 440; Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, "Jorge Amado. Biografia").

and socialist factions under a common front. The ANL's primary adversary was the Brazilian Integralist Action (Ação Integralista Brasileira—AIB), a far-right movement established in 1932 as a conscious replication of the fascist parties led by Benito Mussolini in Italy or António de Oliveira Salazar in Portugal (AIB was one of the first, if not the very first, truly nationwide party—in 1936, the number of its members was estimated to be between 300 thousands and one million). The integralists actively staged demonstrations promoting conservative ideals, rallying behind the slogan "God, Country, Family." Their largest gatherings occurred in urban centers and frequently escalated into violent confrontations with ANL members. The AIB's anti-communist stance, particularly its opposition to "godless" Marxist ideology, resonated strongly with segments of the middle class and the Catholic Church. A notable example of this support came from a bishop who enthusiastically labeled the integralists as "soldiers of Christ" (Fausto 2006, 303–304; Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 144; Malinowski 2013, 136).

Vargas's favorability toward integralism and hostility to communism were evident. While he appreciated the nationalism and discipline promoted by the integralistas, he viewed the growing radicalism of the National Liberation Alliance (ANL) with suspicion, particularly due to its ties to International Communism and its implicit threat of armed revolution against the capitalist system. In 1935, Vargas welcomed the approval of a National Security Law, which granted the executive broader authority to suppress subversive activities. This law was invoked to outlaw the ANL, marking it as an illegal organization. The perceived threat of communist violence provided Vargas with a pretext to suspend the 1934 Constitution, using the so-called "Bolshevik threat" as justification for reinstating authoritarian rule. A state of war was declared nationwide for ninety days and was repeatedly extended until June 1937. Backed by the military, the Catholic Church, and the middle class, the federal government launched an intense and ruthless anti-communist campaign. As a result, thousands of suspected members and sympathizers of the Brazilian Communist Party were arrested, imprisoned, or deported. Vargas continued to exploit the communist "threat" as a means to justify his self-coup, particularly since the 1934 Constitution rendered him ineligible for reelection. A crucial turning point came with the suspiciously timed discovery of the so-called "Cohen Plan"—a document allegedly outlining a communist conspiracy to assassinate key government officials and "unleash an orgy of violence." The document,

conveniently uncovered by army officers in Rio de Janeiro, was used as evidence of an imminent communist uprising. The public disclosure of the Cohen Plan triggered a vote in Congress to reinstate a state of war nationwide. As political tensions escalated and rumors of a pending military coup spread, troops surrounded and forcibly shut down the National Congress on November 10, 1937. That same day, Vargas addressed the nation via radio, announcing a state of national emergency, claiming it was necessary to "save the nation" from political instability and the looming danger of civil war (Smith, Vinhosa 2013, 145–146).

Interestingly, even the Brazilian communists denied, internationally, the existence of racism in Brazil until 1934 (Santana 2019, 10).

3.2.1.3 Conclusion

I have not described all the aspects of the hegemonic discourse in question, as such a task is unfeasible, given the discourse's practically limitless heterogeneity: the web of meanings that structures it is composed of countless signifiers. However, I have discussed the most relevant nodal points (as well as some lower-level signifiers), which reveal—when contrasted with the meaning attributed to them by the counter-hegemonic discourse examined in the following sections—"what different understandings of reality are at stake, where are they in antagonistic opposition to one another?" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 51). In other words, the discursive struggle that is the object of my study consisted mostly in a negotiation of the meaning of these particular signifiers. Therefore, in this section, I will briefly recapitulate how these signifiers were understood within the hegemonic "objectivity" of the period in which Jorge Amado wrote *Sea of Death*.

Based on what has been discussed in section 3.2.1 ("Real-world hegemonic discourse")—i.e., on my analysis of the social thought of 19th and 20th-century leading intellectuals and of the relation between their ideas and the factual social reality—it is possible to conclude that:

1) The meaning ascribed to the "Afro-Brazilians" signifier, shaped by racist ideas, was extremely negative. Within the hegemonic web of meanings, it denoted inferior beings, a lower-status social group, people, who were

perceived as civilizationally backward, primitive, immoral, dangerous, predisposed to criminal behavior, lazy, less important, culturally irrelevant, insignificant in the formation of Brazilian nation, rightly dominated by the Portuguese, inherently submissive, passive; perceived as external, imported workforce, as the weakest element of the local society, as a threat to white Brazil (a shameful element which degrades the Brazilian nation through miscegenation), a "societal pollution," an obstacle on Brazil's way to modernization, to cultural and economic progress; valued only in subordinate roles.

2) The "Afro-Brazilians" signifier had a strong connection with such signifiers as "Afro-Brazilian culture," "samba," "capoeira," or "Afro-Brazilian religions." Also in their case, the meaning was negative, due to the racist ideas that shaped it. As it has been discussed in the previous sections, within the hegemonic discourse in question, Afro-Brazilian culture was not considered a part of Brazilian patrimony and its alleged primitiveness was incompatible with "Brazilian civilization." Samba was associated with the underworld; perceived as an inferior and lascivious form of music, with slang deemed corrosive to the national language. Also capoeira connoted crime, threat, and illegality. Afro-Brazilian religions, in turn, were seen as heretic, "pagan," demonic, diabolical, evil, dangerous, suspicious, immoral, sinful; as a form of "folklore" or witchcraft (black magic), which was an offense against public morality; as a remnant of primitiveness that prevented Brazil from being recognized as a "civilized" nation; as criminal practices against public tranquility and public health.

3) The "Brazilian nation" signifier did not include in its meaning the people, the working majority of the inhabitants of the country. It excluded especially the poor, the rural, and the non-white groups. They were understood as a workforce that can be neglected, dehumanized, or instrumentalized, since the "national interest" signifier—with its very limited and exclusive meaning—was a synonym of "the elites' interest."

Thus, the "popular culture" and "folkloric traditions" were not understood as a part of Brazilian culture.

4) "The elites" signifier, in turn, within the hegemonic web of meanings had a strong connection with such signifiers as "the Portuguese," "Luso-Catholic heritage," "the white," "Europe," or "the State." "The elites" signifier denoted those who were considered to be the only important historical actors, who shaped Brazil's true history; the only legitimate beneficiaries of the national interest; inherently virtuous, moral, superior, and civilized. Also "the Portuguese" meant the decisive driving force behind Brazilian social processes, as well as glorious, heroic conquerors, and the founding fathers of the country. "Luso-Catholic heritage" was prioritized over all other cultural expressions, as a valuable legacy and one of the most important pillars of Brazilian identity; "Catholicism" was the only right religion, an invaluable gift from the Portuguese, and the guardian of morality was "the Church." "The white" signifier connoted progress, civilization, culture, purity, strength, prestige, racial superiority, stability, order, "respectable families," and the highest level of social development and moral virtues; it was understood as the cornerstone of Brazil's historical evolution. "Europe" had very similar connotations, but it also signified Brazil's ancient pedigree, the roots of its traditions, which affirmed the country's place within the broader "civilized world." "The State," in turn, was the guarantor of order, the guardian of tradition, culture, national interest, and Brazilianness.

5) "Colonization" signifier was a synonym of bringing civilization and did not necessarily connote violence, abuse, injustice, etc. "Colonial era" was regarded as the cradle of national culture; as an opulent period, rather than the harsh, labor-intensive, and exploitative reality—far richer, whiter, more aristocratic, distinguished, honorable, heroic and stable than it was in fact. Thus, the "slavery" signifier denoted a system that was beneficial to both sides, nearly harmonic.

6) "Conservatism" was considered the most valid political attitude, a synonym of "patriotism," since "patriotism" did not refer to loving the country as an inclusive whole, but rather to conservative ideals, which aimed at sustaining the current, oppressive social order. One of its most contrasting antitheses was "communism," which denoted a threat; a godless, anti-Catholic, dangerous, violent, and immoral ideology that was incompatible with "Brazilian civilization."

Such understanding of these nodal points was translated into the meanings ascribed to many other lower-level signifiers that were related to them (since nodal points determine the meaning of other signifiers by organizing a system of interdependent meanings around themselves). It is important to note, however, that my interpretation of the meanings of these signifiers does not imply that all Brazilians understood them in the same way. As previously discussed, since the discourse is a temporary closure (it fixes meaning in a particular way, but it can never be ultimately fixed), the hegemony can never be total and "there is always room for struggles over what the structure should look like, what discourses should prevail, and how meaning should be ascribed to the individual signs [emphasis in original]" (Jørgensen, Phillips 2002, 40). Hence, during the Vargas Era, in the Brazilian discursive field, there were also other discourses struggling for hegemony; there were currents of thought, individuals, and entire social groups, whose understanding of these nodal points differed from the hegemonic one. In the next section, a particular counter-hegemonic discourse will be examined.

3.2.2 A counter-hegemonic discourse

A strong counter-hegemonic discourse was articulated in the 1930s by the *romance nordestino* (social novel from the Nordeste region) writers. It was a discourse whose advocates intended to articulate a different web of meanings, to give the marginalized people a voice in the discussion about the definition of Brazilianness, and to give them representivity in the discursive struggles in question by trying to expose a literary equivalent of their collective subjectivity. One of the most important exponents of the *romance*

nordestino (next to Graciliano Ramos, Rachel de Queiroz, and José Lins do Rego) was Jorge Amado.

3.2.2.1 *Romance nordestino*

In the light of the taxonomic ambiguities I have observed during my research, I would like to begin this section by clarifying that, in my thesis, the term *romance nordestino* (literally, "Northeastern novel") refers specifically to "*Romance de 30 do Nordeste*," i.e. to the social novels from the Nordeste region that were written by the representatives of the Brazilian modernism's second phase (1930–1945), of the so-called "Generation of '30."

In Brazil, the 1920s were a turbulent and creative decade that played a crucial role in shaping the literary voice of the 1930s generation. The decade stands out as a time of intellectual growth, driven by distinct artistic movements. This period of intense cultural and political activity was largely influenced by two major global events: World War I (1914–1918) and the Russian Revolution (1917). Just as political divisions emerged internationally as a consequence of the previous decade's events, Brazil experienced a similar trajectory. Throughout this decade, one can observe "a clear expression of a desire for change in the country [and] the process of fully implementing capitalism in the country and the upward mobility of the bourgeoisie, two factors that affect the other social strata" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Lafetá 2000, 27). The political engagement of the preceding decade reverberates in the formal development of the 1930s novel and in the literary evolution of its authors, gaining substance and materiality from their earliest works (Duarte 1996, 20).

While the political and social aspects provide a broad framework for understanding the evolution of cultural and artistic expressions, there are also elements that are related directly to literary manifestations. One of these is the emergence of modernism, which was solidified during the 1922 Week of Modern Art (*Semana de Arte Moderna*, São Paulo). The literary advancements introduced by the movement that organized it fostered a rejection of traditional models and allowed 1930s authors to embrace these new paradigms with ease: "nonconformity and anti-conventionalism became a right, not a transgression" (Candido 1989, 186).

For Jorge Amado, however, the movement was not creative. In his opinion, it opened new paths, but when he started to write, modernism had already been surpassed. In his commentary for *Revista do Brasil*, he states that his

> testimony is that of a postmodernist, a writer who had no connection whatsoever with this movement. When it emerged and grew, I was a primary school and secondary school student. And if the appearance of *A Bagaceira* in 1928 […] is considered the milestone marking the end of this movement, it becomes evident that, having made my debut in 1931 at the age of 18, I had no connection with the movement [transl.—E. Ch.] (Amado 1940, 108).

According to Luís Bueno (2001, 63–65), for the intellectuals of the 1930s, there was a strong tension between modernism and postmodernism[36] (or, to use different terminologies, between the first and the second phase of modernism, between the Generation of ’22 and Generation of ‘30). The generation of authors who participated in the Week of Modern Art was primarily concerned with an aesthetic revolution, while those who debuted in the 1930s focused their attention on ideological issues.

In “Literatura e Subdesenvolvimento” (“Literature and Underdevelopment”), Antonio Candido states that:

> until approximately the 1930s, the prevailing notion in Brazil was that of a “new” country—one that had not yet fulfilled its potential but attributed to itself great possibilities for future progress. Even though the gap separating Brazil from wealthy countries had not significantly changed, the predominant notion [in the 1930s] was that of an “underdeveloped country.” According to the first perspective, emphasis was placed on virtual strength and, therefore, on a greatness yet to be realized. According to the second, what stood out was present-day poverty, atrophy—what was lacking, rather than what was abundant [transl.—E. Ch.] (Candido 1989, 140).

[36] Brazilian postmodernism of the 1930s needs to be differentiated from the postmodernism in its global sense. The “postmodernism” I write about is a literary-historical concept that refers to a reaction against the 1922 Modernist movement. It does not refer to the “global” postmodernism, which emerged in the mid-to-late 20th century, characterized by highly experimental, self-referential, and intertextual literature (influenced by such thinkers as Foucault or Derrida).

Thus, a significant ideological divide separated the generation that led the 1922 Week of Modern Art from the writers of the 1930s novel. This divergence in the prevailing vision played a crucial role in shaping the artistic and literary approaches of each group. The modernists embraced the idea of Brazil as a country to be built, a notion aligned with the avant-garde's inherently utopian outlook, which regarded the present as a launching pad for the future. Conversely, the growing awareness of underdevelopment postponed utopian aspirations, favoring an intense engagement with the incomplete and flawed realities of the present—a perspective that guided the novelists of the 1930s (Bueno 2001, 65).

According to Bueno (2001, 68), in the 1930s, a true "anti-Macunaíma" spirit prevailed (*Macunaíma* was a 1928 novel by Mário de Andrade, one of the founding works of Brazilian modernism). For instance, in 1938, José Lins do Rego, one of the most important *romance nordestino* authors, wrote that

> The literary movement that radiates from the Northeast has very little to do with the modernism of the South, not even in terms of language. The language used by Mário de Andrade in *Macunaíma* seemed as convoluted to us as the language of Alberto de Oliveira's sonnets. The language that Mário de Andrade sought to introduce with his book is an artificial construct—more of a refined philological arrangement than a practical tool for oral or written communication. Mário de Andrade's book was only truly understood by aesthetes and scholars, and its protagonist is […inhuman…]. Mário de Andrade turned to German erudition to craft his hero without any defining character. [… His] book is a repository of folklore—the most cerebral book ever written among us. If the author were not a great poet, *Macunaíma* would be nothing more than a lifeless work, a dry leaf, more of a catalog of folkloric erudition than a novel [transl.—E. Ch.] (Rego 1938, 95).

Jorge Amado, in turn, begins his *Cacau* (1933) with the following note: "I tried to recount in this book, with a minimum of literature and a maximum of honesty, the lives of the cacao workers in southern Bahia. Could it be a proletarian novel?" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Amado 1934 [1933], 9). As Candido (1984, 35) observes, the passage suggests that "honesty" and "literature" are somewhat incompatible, implying that literary refinement (understood here as formal embellishment) often distorts reality rather than faithfully representing it.

In the above discussion, some of the distinctive features of the *romance nordestino* become apparent. The most important ones are the following:

1) A "neo-naturalist," regionalist style that aims to depict Brazilian society with minimal mediation, using narratives that closely resemble reportage or sociological study (Bueno 2001, 10–14). Notably, for the privileged part of Brazilian society, the reality described by *romance nordestino* was often unfamiliar. It often experienced a cultural shock, caused by an *unprecedented* encounter with the perspective of the "other" (especially the urban population from the South of Brazil) (Bueno 263, 315, 345, 432; Malinowski 2011, 104, 198, 210). Also, it is significant that Gilberto Freyre—considered one of the most important Brazilian sociologists—argued that these novels had a quality of a sociological document; he considered them a "formidable documentation of regional life, of great sociological and even political interest, filling the gap left by the absence of surveys, inquiries, and systematic research," since "Almost nothing in these 'novels' is pure fiction—only the disguises; only the distortion for artistic effect" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Freyre 1936, 15).
2) A focus on groups that had either been largely overlooked or misrepresented through distortions, including Afro-Brazilians, Indigenous communities, industrial workers, rural laborers, homosexuals, women, individuals affected by a mental disorder, the impoverished, etc. (Candido 1984, 32; Bueno 2001, 20–21, 90). It is relevant to note here that the title of the first *romance nordestino*, by José Américo de Almeida, is *A Bagaceira* (1928), which denotes not only the place near the sugar mill where the leftovers that remain after crushing sugarcane accumulate, but also the people of a low social position.
3) Authors seek to bridge the gap that separates intellectuals from the lower social classes by writing in a more colloquial, oral, popular, and regional language (Bueno 2001, 20, 74).
4) The main themes of *romance nordestino* are: social inequalities (the novels depict poverty, drought, *coronelismo* [rural oligarchic power], and the exploitation of workers, reflecting the harsh realities of the Northeast, as in *Captains of the Sands* by Jorge Amado); class struggle (as in *Sweat* by Jorge Amado); Drought and forced migration (the devastating impact of droughts

and the mass displacements of people seeking survival, as in *Vidas Secas* by Graciliano Ramos or *O quinze* by Rachel de Queiroz); Violence and *cangaço* (the phenomenon of social banditry and its connection to resistance against oppression, as in *Cangaceiro*s by José Lins do Rego); Religion, messianism, and religious fanaticism (as in *Pedra Bonita* by José Lins do Rego); Folklore and oral tradition (the use of Northeastern myths, legends, and popular expressions, as in *Fogo Morto* by José Lins do Rego); Rural life and its traditions (a detailed portrayal of daily life in the *sertão*, i.e. the "backlands," and on plantations, as in *Cacau* by Jorge Amado)[37].

5) Insubordinate. As Bueno explains:

> The novelists of the 1930s produced a strong force of opposition to a "total"—or even totalitarian—vision of Brazil proposed by Getúlio Vargas. A significant contrast emerges between the perception of the country as a set of local realities, each deserving to be understood in its particularities, and the official model of national unity, which tended to erase differences in order to construct a singular concept of nationhood. The positive reception of regionalist novels, for instance—even considering the limited size of the Brazilian reading public at the time—was clear evidence of the disconnect between the official unifying project and the perspective that was becoming more viable for Brazilians themselves. Rather than adhering to a homogenizing vision, they simply wanted to learn about life on the sugarcane plantations, the hardships of drought, the Amazon region, the cacao and coffee plantations [transl.—E. Ch.] (Bueno 2001, 92).

The documentary dimension of texts by *romance nordestino* writers offered readers an unconventional and innovative vision of their homeland, as a country that is rich in cultural diversity and is governed by violent institutions that neglect and even oppress their own people. Since such activity was considered by the authorities to be communist and subversive, Northeastern writers faced repression. Jorge Amado, for instance, was imprisoned between 1936 and 1937, and his novels (1694 copies) were publicly burned (Silva 2009, 262), together with José Lins do Rego's novels (Bueno 2001, 537).

6) The prevalence of a collective hero over an individual protagonist, which reinforces the idea that the struggles depicted in these novels are not personal but social and structural, affecting an entire class or community (for instance,

[37] The list of the main themes of *romance nordestino* was made with the basis on my own research, as well as on works by Bueno (2001), Marques and Bueno (2015), or Bosi (1994).

Vidas Secas, by Graciliano Ramos, follows a destitute family; *Captains of the Sands*, by Jorge Amado, focuses on a gang of street children, and *Sweat*, also by Jorge Amado, portrays the harsh living conditions of several impoverished workers living in a crowded house in Salvador). Individual characters represent a larger social class—the protagonists, such as the *cangaceiro* (social bandit) or the exploited plantation worker, are often symbolic of broader societal issues (Bueno 2001, 257–266).

3.2.2.2 Jorge Amado

According to Jorge Amado's House Foundation official website (Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, "Jorge Amado. Biografia"),

> Jorge Amado was born on August 10, 1912, at the *fazenda* of Auricídia, in the district of Ferradas, in the municipality of Itabuna, in the southern region of the state of Bahia. He was the son of the cacao plantation owner João Amado de Faria and Eulália Leal Amado. At the age of one, he moved to Ilhéus, where he spent his childhood. He attended secondary school at Colégio Antônio Vieira and Ginásio Ipiranga in Salvador. During this period, he began working for newspapers and engaging in literary activities, becoming one of the founders of the Academia dos Rebeldes. In 1931, he published his first novel, *O País do Carnaval* (*The Country of Carnival*). In 1933, he married Matilde Garcia Rosa, with whom he had a daughter, Lila. That same year, he published his second novel, *Cacau* (*Cocoa*). He graduated from the National Law School in Rio de Janeiro in 1935. A communist militant, he was forced into exile in Argentina and Uruguay between 1941 and 1942, during which he traveled extensively across Latin America. Upon his return in 1944, he separated from Matilde Garcia Rosa. In 1945, he was elected as a member of the National Constituent Assembly under the Brazilian Communist Party (PCB), becoming the most voted federal deputy in the state of São Paulo. Jorge Amado authored the law, still in effect today, that guarantees the right to religious freedom in Brazil. That same year, he married Zélia Gattai. In 1947, the year their first son, João Jorge, was born, the PCB was declared illegal, and its members were persecuted and imprisoned. As a result, Jorge Amado was forced into exile with his family in France, where he remained until 1950 when he was expelled. In 1949, his daughter Lila passed away in Rio de Janeiro. Between 1950 and 1952, he lived in Prague, where his daughter Paloma was born. Upon returning to Brazil, Jorge Amado distanced himself from active political militancy in 1955, though he never formally left the Communist Party. From then on, he dedicated himself entirely to literature. On April 6, 1961, he was elected to chair number 23 of the Brazilian Academy of Letters, whose patron is José de Alencar and whose first occupant was Machado de Assis. Jorge Amado's literary work was adapted numerous times for film, theater, and television and was even the theme of samba school parades in

> various parts of Brazil. His books were translated into 49 languages, with editions also available in braille and audiobook formats. Jorge Amado passed away in Salvador on August 6, 2001. He was cremated, as per his wishes, and his ashes were buried in the garden of his home on Rua Alagoinhas on what would have been his 89th birthday. Jorge Amado's work earned him various national and international awards, including: Stalin Peace Prize (Soviet Union, 1951), Latinidade Prize (France, 1971), Nonino Prize (Italy, 1982), Dimitrov Prize (Bulgaria, 1989), Pablo Neruda Prize (Russia, 1989), Etruria Prize for Literature (Italy, 1989), Cino Del Duca Prize (France, 1990), Mediterranean Prize (Italy, 1990), Vitaliano Brancati Prize (Italy, 1995), Luís de Camões Prize (Brazil, Portugal, 1995), Jabuti Prize (Brazil, 1959, 1995), and the Ministry of Culture Award (Brazil, 1997). He was honored with the titles of Commander and of Grand Officer in orders from Venezuela, France, Spain, Portugal, Chile, and Argentina. Additionally, he was awarded the title of Doctor Honoris Causa from 10 universities across Brazil, Italy, France, Portugal, and Israel. The last title he received in person was Doctor from the Sorbonne, in France, in 1998, during his final trip to Paris, while already ill. Jorge Amado took great pride in the title of *Obá*, a civil post he held at Ilê Axé Opô Afonjá, a Candomblé temple in Bahia [transl.—E. Ch.] (Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado, "Jorge Amado. Biografia").[38]

Amado's vast work is usually divided in two phases. The first (1930–1956) was characterized by strong political commitment, particularly to Marxism. However, following the exposure of the Soviet regime's crimes in 1956, Amado decided to distance himself from the Brazilian Communist Party, and his writing took a different turn[39]. The release of *Gabriela, Cravo e Canela* (1958, "Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon") inaugurated a "supposedly less politicized phase of the author" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Calixto 2016, 46). Although Amado never stopped defending human rights to freedom and dignity, this phase was less *overtly* political and shifted towards celebrating Brazilian culture, folklore, sensuality, and humor.

Sea of Death, the novel I study, belongs to the first phase, which was an answer to the previously described hegemonic discourse. Amado brought to light the social problems of the Brazilian Northeast, of the state of Bahia, which in his novels was concentrating and symbolically representing the social problems of the whole country (Bueno 2001, 28–45; Santos 2013, 46–44). He was the first novelist to implement in Brazilian literature the *Négritude* ideas (developed mainly by francophone intellectuals from the African diaspora),

[38] For more details regarding author's biography, see, for example, Calixto (2016) or Jorge Amado's memoirs: *Navegação de Cabotagem* and *O Menino Grapiúna*.

[39] The repercussions of Khrushchev's revelations had a profound impact on communists of that era. Alongside the publication of the report, the Soviet invasion of Hungary further intensified tensions. These events prompted many communists, internationally, to sever ties with the USSR and the Third International (Calixto 2016, 46).

which, as Charchalis (2019, 85) states, proposed "presenting [the Black] as a cultural subject, with a set of cultural and anthropological characteristics, which meant considering the Black a rightful participant of the culture and a rightful literary work protagonist […]; relieving the Black of the hallmarks of an object or of an exotic element of a literary work landscape" [transl.—E. Ch.]. Furthermore, according to Eduardo de Assis Duarte (108), Balduíno, the principal character of Amado's *Jubiabá* (1935), was "the first black hero of the Brazilian literature" [transl.—E. Ch.] and, according to Vagner Gonçalves da Silva (2005, 101), with this novel, Amado makes Candomblé nationally known. In fact, its influence extended beyond national borders: *Jubiabá* also contributed to the international visibility of the religion. For instance, Pierre Verger, prominent ethnologist, after reading *Jubiabá* in the early 1940s, decides to move to Bahia, the setting of the book's characters, where he establishes close relationships with the Candomblé temples and produces important studies on the religion of the Orishas, as well as one of the most valuable collections of photography on the subject (Silva 2005, 105).

Apart from promoting the Afro-Brazilian culture richness, Amado promotes as well the culture of the Brazilian lower classes in general. Moreover, he legitimizes in his literature the "bastard elements" of the Brazilian culture, as Bueno names them (345), by presenting, in a very empathetic way, the problematic reality of such characters as beggars, sex workers, homeless orphans, alcoholics, criminals, drought refugees, vagrant adventurers, rural laborers, migrants, or *malandros*. In addition, by focalizing the marginalized, Amado's narrators introduced to the Brazilian literature also their sociolects with many characteristic regionalisms and colloquialisms.

In 1934, the author wrote that

> The sense of documentation, of outcry, is undoubtedly the most evident feature of the new Brazilian novel. It is not a matter of literary schools or group trivialities. It is a natural thought, something that inevitably had to happen. The new Brazilian novelists, not only those from the North, no longer believe in *brasilidade* or in green-and-yellow nationalism. They have seen further. They have seen this overlooked world that is Brazil. And Brazil is a cry, a plea for help. I am not referring here to the typical rhetoric of a Bahian congressman in the assembly: "Brazil is on the edge of the abyss..." That is the literature of those who earn six *contos* a month. Yes, this is a cry of entire populations, lost and forgotten, an immense source of material for immense books [transl.—E. Ch.] (Amado 1934, 49).

Regarding this material, in turn, in his preface to *Captains of the Sands*, "Os romances da Bahia," he claims the following:

> I only allowed myself the freedom to invent, to imagine the plots. I did not want to imagine the customs of my state, the feelings of its people, or the way they reacted to certain facts. What I call "gathering material" is going out and seeing how the people of Bahia truly live. I am certain that I did not produce the work of a reporter but that of a novelist. And I am equally certain that, although my novels narrate events, emotions, and landscapes of Bahia, they carry a broad universal and human meaning, precisely because of their social nature. This universal and human dimension is, without a doubt, far greater than that of those novels (…) which refuse any local or social character in their pages and, at their core, are nothing more than intellectual masturbation [transl.—E. Ch.] (Amado 1937, 12–13).

The editors of *Jorge Amado: New Critical Essays* (Fitz, Brower, Martínez-Vidal 2013), seem to confirm the author's words. In the introduction to their book, they state that "Amado has always been a realist in terms of recreating the defining details, customs, and problems of the common people whom he chooses to depict in his writings" (3); that his writing reaches its most powerful form when he elevates the everyday speech of "these unlettered people into poetry" (3); that through his rich narratives, he vividly animates these figures and "becomes their spokesperson" (3), calling for fairer treatment for them.

Jorge Amado's work has also received much criticism, especially in light of its supposedly propagandistic—and therefore reductive—character. Fábio Lucas summarizes the reasons of this rejection as follows:

> Critics identify the following persistent flaws in Jorge Amado's work:
>
> 1. A lack of inner complexity in his characters.
> 2. Unpolished language, absence of formal experimentation, and a novelistic structure and technique that follow traditional conventions.
> 3. Narrative action that is at times obstructed by discourse (usually poetic in nature) [transl.—E. Ch.] (Lucas 1972, 179–180).

Given the vast bibliography on Jorge Amado—comprising hundreds of publications that address a wide range of topics, many of which fall outside the scope of this study—readers seeking a more in-depth exploration of the author's life and broader oeuvre are referred to the works cited in the literature review (section 1.3).

3.2.2.2.1 Candomblé

According to Gildeci de Oliveira Leite (2021, 185–203), many of Jorge Amado's novels—including *Sea of Death*—can be considered as an example of "literature of *Axé*"[40], since Amado was "commited to ancestral knowledge," "to the black tradition through its dissemination and respect for its secrets" (185)—"A common habit among the old sages of Afro-Bahian culture is to speak enough to propagate memory, while at the same time using strategies to silence themselves, speaking little to avoid trivializing sacred knowledge" (190). Moreover, Amado spoke "from within the gate" (185), i.e. he demonstrated knowledge of somebody that was a part of a community of a Candomblé temple and "had some level of initiation" [transl.—E. Ch.] (201), as well as he enjoyed certain closeness with such eminent Candomblé figures as Mãe Aninha, Martiniano Eliseu do Bonfim, or Pai Procópio (202). Since a proper understanding of the themes explored in *Sea of Death* requires some knowledge of the Candomblé religion, this section offers a brief overview of its most relevant aspects.

J. Lorand Matory, the author of *Black Atlantic Religion: Tradition, Transnationalism, and Matriarchy in the Afro-Brazilian Candomblé*, states that "Candomblé is an Afro-Brazilian religion of divination, sacrifice, healing, music, dance, and spirit possession. The only rival to its beauty is its complexity" (2005, 1). An example of this complexity is the fact that there are scholars, who would not agree with him already at this initial stage of defining Candomblé: Bettina E. Schmidt observes that the term of "spirit possession" is "highly contested," not only due to "its negative connotation linked to demonic possession,"

[40] *Axé*, or *Aṣẹ*, in Yoruba language, is a term that denotes a spiritual force that flows through all things and connects them to the divine, a "creative power, the word, reason, the logos which 'holds' reality […], that principle which accounts for the uniqueness of humans" (Eze 1998, 173).

but also because "Human bodies are too fragile to hold the power of the orixás[41]" (2024, 3), i.e. of the divine beings associated with natural forces. According to the *babalorixá*[42] that she interviewed, who "challenges the widespread notion that incorporation is like being 'mounted' by an orixá like a horse" (6), "The orixá does not come from the outside but from within the body [, …] the connection between a human and an orixá exists from birth […], and after the person is initiated, the orixá takes the consciousness of the person. […] The human body becomes a vehicle for the communication" (6).

The origins of the religion's complexity also lie in the fact that oral tradition remains the primary mode of transmission for Candomblé's sacred knowledge—including myths, ritual procedures, chants, or herbal knowledge. Also, a significant portion of this knowledge is intentionally guarded as secret by practitioners (Matory 2005, 32, 124). Moreover, it is not a standardized religion and, as such, it does not have a central authority, unified doctrine, canonical text, or a universally uniform structure. Instead, it is a highly diverse and decentralized religious system shaped by local traditions and multiple "nations" (*nações*). This results in considerable variation among temples (*casas de axé* or *terreiros*): "Each house has its tradition, each house has its way to deal with the orixás" (Schmidt 2024, 5).

Among various ritual "nations," which preserve distinct cultural and liturgical traditions, there are the Congo, Angola, Gege (Ewe), Ijexá (Ijesha), Ketu (Queto), and Nago—the latter being a term historically used by the French to refer broadly to Yoruba-speaking peoples from the so-called Slave Coast. These "nations" can be differentiated based on their drumming techniques, musical styles, the language of sacred chants, ceremonial garments, the names of deities, and certain ritual features. Despite this internal diversity, the influence of Yoruba traditions has become predominant across Afro-Brazilian religious expressions. Yoruba metaphysics, pantheon, and ceremonial structure have largely shaped or even supplanted those of other African origins, such as the Bantu and Dahomean traditions. Among the various branches of Candomblé, the Nago, Ketu, and Ijexá lineages are considered the most "orthodox" or ritually pure (Bastide 1978a, 15).

[41] In my thesis, I have opted for the spelling "Orisha."

[42] A male spiritual leader in Candomblé, frequently referred to as *pai-de-santo* in Portuguese. This term is derived from the Yoruba word *bàbálórìsà*. "Baba" translates to "father," and "l'Orisha" is a contraction meaning "of Orisha." A female spiritual leader is *ialorixá* (*mãe-de-santo*).

As Roger Bastide observes (1978b, 197), Candomblé encompasses elements of both monotheism and polytheism, worshipping a Supreme God—Olorum (or Olodumarê)—while also honoring Orishas, i.e. his intermediaries (deified ancestors or personified forces of nature), believed to shape the lives of individuals (it is believed that each person has a guardian Orisha, which influences their personality). A key ritual involves practitioners' drumming, singing, and dancing to invite an Orisha to manifest him- or herself—they believe that, when an Orisha uses the body of an individual, they can directly communicate with the deity (Bastide 1978a, 17).

Among the most significant Orishas are Ogun, Oxumaré, Obatalá, Ossain, Oxóssi, Oxum, Iansã, or Xangó. In *Sea of Death*, however, the greatest focus is placed on Iemanjá.[43] Odé Kileuy and Vera de Oxaguiã (2009, ch. 24, *Iemanjá* section) explain that, in Brazil, she is the "mistress of the waters," "mother of all the Orishas," and it is believed that Olorum (Supreme God) granted her the title of "mother of all heads" and thus, made her responsible for the emotional, psychological, and spiritual balance of the human beings. For Candomblé practitioners, her importance is so great that all initiates, even those who do not have her as their main Orisha, have a special connection with her, as she is considered the mother of all the Orishas. Hence, all individuals initiated into Candomblé, at some point in their religious evolution, will have to honor Iemanjá[44].

3.3 *Sea of Death*

Jorge Amado's novel *Sea of Death* (*Mar Morto*, 1936)—translated into German, Bulgarian, Chinese, Spanish, French, Greek, Hebrew, Hungarian, English, Icelandic, Italian, Polish, Russian, Swedish, Czech, and Turkish (Validório 2008, 31)—is a seminal work in Brazilian literature that captures the life, struggles, and spirituality of the fishermen and

[43] Also known as Yemanjá, Yemọja, Yemaja, Yemoyá, Yemayá, Dona Janaína, Mãe d'água, Rainha do Mar, Inaê, or Princesa de Aiocá.

[44] To avoid straying too far from the scope of my study, this section provides only a concise overview of the key aspects of Candomblé—limited to what is indispensable for interpreting *Sea of Death*. It is crucial to acknowledge, however, that a deeper understanding of this religion (as well as of Jorge Amado's literature in general) can be gained not only through scholarly texts but also by incorporating the perspectives of practitioners of the tradition, such as those presented in *O candomblé bem explicado* (2009) by Odé Kileuy and Vera de Oxaguiã, *Meu tempo é agora* (2010) by Maria Stella de Azevedo Santos (better known as Mãe Stella de Oxóssi), or—with a specific focus on Iemanjá—in *Iemanjá: mãe dos peixes, dos deuses, dos seres humanos* (2019) by Armando Vallado.

maritime workers in Salvador, Bahia. Deeply rooted in the Afro-Brazilian cultural landscape, the novel blends elements of social realism with lyrical prose to depict the precarious existence of these marginalized workers. Through the protagonist, Guma, Amado constructs a narrative that intertwines personal destiny with collective hardship, highlighting the existential uncertainties of those who make their living from the sea.

The novel's thematic framework is shaped by the omnipresence of fate, religious syncretism, and the tension between human agency and divine will. Amado draws upon the cosmology of Candomblé, integrating African-derived deities (especially the sea goddess Iemanjá) into the daily lives of the characters, thereby emphasizing the cultural hybridity of Bahian society. The sea, personified as both a nurturing and destructive force, assumes a near-mythological role, shaping not only the physical world of the fishermen but also their worldview and spiritual practices.

Amado's prose in *Sea of Death* combines lyrical and folkloric elements with a keen social awareness, portraying the lives of the working class with both poetic reverence and critical depth. The novel oscillates between the personal and the collective, intertwining romantic tragedy with broader socio-economic conditions. Through its depiction of Guma and his fellow fishermen, the text engages with themes of labor, existential struggle, and cultural syncretism.

Sea of Death departs from the overt political partisanship found in Jorge Amado's earlier works. The narrative unfolds without directing its characters toward political activism, and, for this reason, the novel's reception among leftist intellectuals was mixed (Bueno 2012, 102). Critics and writers such as Graciliano Ramos (1946, 22) viewed the book as conveying a message contrary to its intent (according to Ramos, "certain refrains—'It's sweet to die in the sea'—say the opposite of what the author intends to convey" [transl.—E. Ch.]), while Rubem Braga (1937, 3) argued that it romanticized poverty and resembled literature associated with integralist ideology. As Bueno explains: "The repeated assertion that those lives are governed by an inescapable fate—to die at sea in order to meet Iemanjá—seems incompatible with rebellion and struggle. Why fight if the outcome is already determined? It is in this sense that the book has been interpreted. […] The conservative Graça Aranha Foundation awarded it a prize" [transl.—E. Ch.] (2012, 102).

Set in a mythical atmosphere, the novel distances itself, to a certain extent, from concrete historical contingencies, which are typically central to Marxist-oriented narratives. In Bueno's view (2001, 335–339), however, the ideologically committed writer "lowers his guard" and allows himself to envision a popular universe that no longer needs to be shaped by the ideological guidelines; *Sea of Death* presents marginality as a potential source of revolutionary energy and this is the deeper meaning of the novel as proletarian literature: to emphasize present suffering, but to locate within that same present the forces of rebellion that might allow one to imagine a "someday" when exploitation has come to an end.

To analyze the collective subjectivity of *Sea of Death* characters, first, it is necessary to ask whether this novel is a suitable object of study, i.e., whether it fulfills the criteria established in section 2.2.3.1 (regarding the collective narrative agents, subjectiveme indicators, etc.).

Already in the introduction, we can find the first indications of the collective character of the story. We read that the narrator[45] wants to

tell the dockside tales of Bahia. Old sailors who mend sails, pilots of sloops, tattooed blacks, rogues, all know these stories and these songs. […] Iemanjá's people have much to tell. […] And if you don't find [the story] beautiful, the fault won't lie with the rough men who tell it, but because you're hearing it from the mouth of a man of the land, and only with great difficulty can a man of the land understand the heart of sailors (Amado 1984, no page number available).	contar as histórias da beira do cais da Bahia. Os velhos marinheiros que remendam velas, os mestres de saveiros, os pretos tatuados, os malandros, sabem essas histórias e essas canções. […] O povo de Iemanjá tem muito que contar. […] E se [a história] não vos parecer bela a culpa não é dos homens rudes que a narram. É que a ouvistes da bôca de um homem da terra, e, dificilmente, um homem da terra entende o coração dos marinheiros (Amado 1965 [1936], 2).

As it has been previously discussed (in "Collective narrative agents" section), the three conditions (Margolin 2000, 593–594) for a collective narrative agent to exist are that 1) in various narrative propositions, whether explicitly or not, the argument position is occupied

[45] It is also possible that it is the author's voice, but I assume that it is narrator's, as there is no information that it is a preface, no author's signature (as in *Captains of the Sands* preface [Amado 1937], for example), the narration is stylized and it correlates with the narrator's last phrase in the novel. Also Luís Bueno identifies this voice as narrator's: "The narrator—who seeks to be mistaken for the author—immediately, in an opening note, positions himself in relation both to the world his characters inhabit and to the one in which his readers live" [transl.—E. Ch.] (2012, 103).

by an expression that designates a collectivity; 2) in these specific propositions, the predicate position is occupied by predicates that apply to the whole collectivity, as one entity, or by predicates that designate collective actions that can be carried out only by a group as a single unit; 3) the collectivity that occupies the argument position—as a whole, as a single entity—is ascribed a variety of thematic roles throughout the actions that are narrated (agent, experiencer, or patient).

Regarding the first condition, since they occupy the central role, along the whole novel there are numerous references—both explicit and implicit—to Iemanjá's people, sea people, maritime people, sea women, sloop masters, canoemen, fishermen, etc.[46] The examples include: *povo de Iemanjá* (Amado 1965, 2, 76), *povo do mar* (85, 125, 257), *os marítimos* (36, 75, 81, 86, 109, 123, 125, 126, 146, 150, 214, 241, 262), *homens do mar* (52, 85, 104, 215), *mulheres do mar* (28, 57), *homens do cais* (41, 43, 46, 60, 62, 72, 76, 77, 81, 89, 122, 124, 125, 194, 251), *mulheres do cais* (45, 57, 80, 123, 127, 256), *mestres de saveiro* (32, 34, 51, 86, 93, 127, 136, 214, 217, 218, 226, 237, 239), *canoeiros* (22, 32, 46, 51, 58, 72, 80, 86, 116, 127, 132, 170, 183, 198, 217, 239), *pescadores* (30, 52, 74, 127, 136, 161, 164, 165, 201,), etc.

Although these are different categories, which refer to different identities/collectivities, I would like to note that the implied author unites them with a chain of equivalence (Laclau 1988, 256). In Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory, antagonisms arise where discourses collide, when distinct identities are in mutual opposition, each excluding the other. That other is essential for stabilizing an identity, which is constituted, among other things, by a "common enemy." Thus, antagonisms are constructed through the logic of equivalence, through the creation of chains of equivalence, in which identities that are different from each other are united in a common project to oppose negative identities; the logic of equivalence links together different identities without completely eliminating their differences, "through a partial surrender of particularity, stressing what all particularities have, equivalentially, in common" (Laclau, 2005, 78). In *Sea of Death*, there is a clear antagonism between the "men of the land" (a category, which includes the elites, the "bourgeoisie," the police, soldiers, politicians, Catholic church, the rich, etc.) and the "men

[46] I have conducted my analysis based on the original, Portuguese version. Thus, there might be discrepancies in relation to the translated, English version.

of the sea," or "Iemanjá's people" (a category, which includes the fishermen, canoemen, sloop masters, the women of the docks, sailors, worshipers of Iemanjá, stevedores, etc.).

Also for the second condition, there are many examples along the whole story. Some of them are the following:

1. It's the people of the sea arriving, calling their queen. They are all subjects of the Princess of Aiocá, they are all exiled in other lands and that's why they live on the sea, trying to reach the lands of their queen (Amado 1984, 75).	1. É o povo do mar que chega, chamando pela sua rainha. Todos êles são súditos da Princesa de Aiocá, estão todos desterrados em outras terras e por isso vivem no mar procurando alcançar as terras da sua rainha (Amado 1965, 85).
2. The women of the docks, however, who are simple and valiant, […] call her Dona Maria, because Maria is a pretty name, it's even the prettiest of them all, the most venerated, and so they give it to Iemanjá as a gift, the way they take boxes of soap to her stone by the Dike (69).	2. Porém, as mulheres do cais, que são simples e valentes, […] a tratam de dona Maria, que Maria é um nome bonito, é mesmo o mais bonito de todos, o mais venerado e assim o dão a Iemanjá como um presente, como se lhe levassem uma caixa de sabonetes à sua pedra no Dique (85).
3. Men of the land (what do men of the land know?) say that they're moonbeams on the sea. But the sailors, sloop masters, canoemen, laugh at the men of the land who don't know anything. They know full well that it's the hair of the mother of waters who's come to see the full moon. It's Iemanjá who's come to see the moon. That's why men stand looking at the silvery sea on moonlit nights. Because they know that the mother of waters is there. Black men play the guitar, the concertina, beat drums and sing. It's the offering they bring to the mistress of the sea. Others smoke a pipe to light the way, so Iemanjá can see better. They all love her and they even forget their wives when the hair of the mother of waters spreads out over the sea (16).	3. Os homens da terra (que sabem os homens da terra?) dizem que são os raios da lua sôbre o mar. Mas os marinheiros, os mestres de saveiro, os canoeiros, riem dos homens da terra que não sabem nada. Êles bem sabem que são os cabelos da mãe-d'água, que vem ver a lua cheia. É Iemanjá que vem olhar a lua. Por isso os homens ficam espiando o mar prateado nas noites de lua. Porque sabem que a mãe-d'água está ali. Os negros tocam violão, harmônica, batem batuque e cantam. É o presente que êles trazem para a dona do mar. Outros fumam cachimbo para iluminar o caminho, assim Iemanjá verá melhor. Todos a amam e até esquecem as mulheres quando os cabelos da mãe-d'água se estendem sôbre o mar (32).
4. Canoemen, fishermen, sloop masters are afraid of love (121).	4. Canoeiros, pescadores, mestres de saveiro temem o amor (127).
5. But she belongs only to Guma, he was the one she married in the church of Monte Serrat, where fishermen, canoemen, and sloop masters marry (14).	5. Mas ela é somente de Guma, casou foi com êle na igreja de Monte Serrat, onde se casam os pescadores, os canoeiros e os mestres de saveiro (30–31).
6. The people who passed looked at them startled. It was a strange group. From a distance it could be seen that they were sea people, for they were coming with	6. As pessoas que passavam olharam espantadas. Era um grupo curioso. De longe se conhecia que eram homens do mar, pois vinham naquele passo largo e

that long, unsteady step of people who live on board ships. Their bodies wavered as if they were catching a strong wind (96).	inseguro dos que vivem nas embarcações. Os corpos gingavam como se houvessem apanhado vento forte (104).

Regarding the third condition, in turn, Iemanjá's people can be considered, in accordance with Mieke Bal's requirements (1997, 132), as a collective protagonist (or "hero") of Jorge Amado's novel, since *Sea of Death* focuses on their detailed characterization, their occurrence is frequent and independent, especially in significant moments of the story, they initiate actions, and they have relations with the biggest number of other characters. *Sea of Death* is a story about them, about their lives, struggles, beliefs, morality, culture, etc. While individual characters are present—even Collective Narratives are not fully composed of the story of their collective protagonists (Margolin 2000, 594)—the collective identity of the "sea people" often overrides individual distinctions. The sea people are not just a loose group of individuals but are portrayed as a cohesive force—an agent that shapes the narrative, as well as the fates of individual characters. They can also be read as experiencers, especially when dealing with the trials and emotional toll the sea exacts on them: their relationship with the sea (a central element of the narrative) is not purely passive; they endure its hardships and experience the sea's changing "moods." Moreover, in some parts of the novel, the sea people are positioned as the patients, particularly when the sea's violent or destructive nature impacts them. For example, when individuals drown or are caught in the perilous waters, the sea people suffer the consequences, suggesting that the collective group is sometimes acted upon by the forces of nature (as well as by the forces of a racist and exploitative social reality).

Uri Margolin admits that "neither 'numerous narrative propositions' [1] nor 'a range of thematic roles' [3] can be exactly quantified" and that "there will inevitably be borderline or disputed cases" (2000, 594), but he also enumerates other stylistic features that additionally emphasize the narrative focus on the group (595).

One of them can be the title—if it refers to things that can be associated with the collective hero. The title of the novel in question refers to the sea, which can be easily associated with the protagonists, who are fishermen and maritime workers, Iemanjá's people.

Although for Margolin, another indication are "Recurrent lists of proper names, […] or activities in the plural" (2000, 595), I would also consider recurrent lists of nouns that refer to the components of the collectivity:

1. But the sailors, sloop masters, canoemen, laugh at the men of the land (Amado 1984, 16).	1. Mas os marinheiros, os mestres de saveiro, os canoeiros, riem dos homens da terra (Amado 1965, 32).
2. Canoemen, fishermen, sloop masters are afraid of love (121).	2. Canoeiros, pescadores, mestres de saveiro temem o amor (127).
3. And then she will play with them, she will enter the body of a black woman and be just like the black people, the canoemen, the sloop masters, a woman like others on the waterfront, possessed by them, the wife of those men (76).	3. E então brincará com êles, entrará no corpo de uma negra e será igual aos negros, aos canoeiros, aos mestres de saveiro, uma mulher como as outras do cais, possuída por êles, esposa daqueles homens (86).

Margolin (2000, 595) also points out a particular sequence for introducing humans and objects, where both types of referents are initially presented and consistently mentioned in the plural form. References to individual entities of either type appear only later in the text, with the individuals portrayed as components or secondary elements of the respective collective groups. This kind of order of presentation of the characters is present in *Sea of Death*. The first seven paragraphs are about anonymous individuals who make up a collectivity, and only after that, Esmeralda, Rufino, Mestre Manuel, Maria Clara, and Guma are introduced with their respective names. This is how the story begins:

Night was running ahead of itself. *People* weren't expecting it at all when it fell upon the city with heavy clouds […]; many *sloops* were still cutting the waters of the sea when the wind brought on a night of black clouds. *The men* looked at each other as if asking a question. *They* gazed at the blue of the ocean, asking where that night that was ahead of time had come from. […] *the men* had a look of uneasiness […], *many men* would die at sea, *ships* wouldn't reach port, *widows* would weep over the heads of little *children*. […] The *canoes* by the firewood pier were bouncing,	A noite se antecipou. *Os homens* ainda não a esperavam quando ela desabou sobre a cidade em nuvens carregadas […], muitos *saveiros* ainda cortavam as águas do mar, quando o vento trouxe a noite de nuvens pretas. *Os homens* se olharam e como que se interrogavam, fitavam o azul do oceano a perguntar donde vinha aquela noite adiantada no tempo. […] *os homens* tinham um ar de desassossego […], *muitos homens* morreriam no mar, *navios* não terminariam a sua rota, *mulheres viúvas* chorariam sobre a cabeça dos *filhos* pequeninos. […] *As canoas*

and the *canoemen* resolved not to return to the *small towns* around the bay that night. The sail of the shipwrecked sloop fell onto the breakwater and then the *lights* went out on all the *sloops*, *women* said the prayer for the dead, the eyes of *the men* looked out to sea (emphasis added; Amado 1984, 3–4).	no Porto da Lenha se agitavam e os *canoeiros* resolveram não voltar naquela noite para as *cidadezinhas* do Recôncavo. A vela do saveiro naufragado caiu no quebra-mar e então se apagaram as *lanternas* de todos os *saveiros*, *mulheres* rezaram a oração dos defuntos, os olhos dos *homens* se estenderam para o mar (emphasis added; Amado 1965, 21–22).

The last stylistic feature that works as an indication of the existence of a Collective Narrative Agent I would like to address is

> A much more complex and decisive macrosemantic procedure, which serves as a bridge between microstylistic features and large-scale thematic concerns, [and] consists in the adoption of a collective perspective with respect to individual group members' properties, actions, and interactions. All of these are accordingly defined by means of intragroup categories. In sociological terms, microlevel (individual) as well as mesolevel (interpersonal, "jointness" level) properties and actions are defined via macrolevel (global) notions (Tuomela 1995: 5–6). The individuals in question are thus presented as being essentially members or constituents of a group or collectivity, as social selves rather than private ones (Turner 1987). Their actions are regarded not as those of autonomous, unique individuals but as those of members of a group (Margolin 2000, 595).

This "macrosemantic procedure" is closely related to the collective subjectivity and, as such, can be understood better thanks to studying the CS of literary characters, as we will see further on. The results of my analysis, which I will present in this section, confirm that Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death* also exhibits this particular stylistic feature.

Let us now examine more closely how the collective subjectivity is constructed in practice. Regarding the storyworld's hegemonic discourse, all the evidence indicates that it is a faithful reflection of the real-world hegemonic discourse, all the evidence seems to confirm what Jorge Amado wrote in his preface to *Captains of the Sands*: "In this series of novels about Bahia, I only allowed myself the freedom to invent, to imagine the plots. I did not want to imagine the customs of my state, the feelings of its people, or the way they reacted to

certain facts. What I call 'gathering material' is going out and seeing how the people of Bahia truly live" (Amado 1937, 12–13).

I recognize that storyworlds are autonomous possible worlds, which do not necessarily depend on the real world to be reassembled from the text by the reader, but they do depend to certain degree on the real world, which completes them, since storyworlds are ontologically incomplete, they have ontological gaps—no narrative art work can determine every detail of its whole storyworld. The discursive struggles within Amado's storyworlds, for an "ideal reader" (see Prince), are actually a reflection of those in the real world, because of Amadian fiction's documentary character, typical of the social novel, and because of the fact that, while reading a text and reconstructing a storyworld from it, readers assume that the storyworld is like their own until the text tells them otherwise. Nevertheless, it is necessary to clarify that I agree with Iser's (1978) thesis that it is the text that directs and pre-structures the creation of meaning by progressively furnishing elements of what will ultimately form the artwork. Hence, the evidence from the storyworld under analysis is to be treated with priority; what is explicitly stated in the text should be treated as a more solid evidence for an interpretation than what is a product of filling the ontological gaps, even if it is incompatible with the real-world state of affairs or history.

However, all the social configuration of the storyworld of *Sea of Death* is the same as the social configuration of Brazil in 1930s: the black characters suffer racism, their culture is persecuted, the poor are explored, abandoned and even oppressed by the government, exposed to many injustices, mistreated by the police and the elites, the elite representatives are unjustifiably privileged. In this context, it is necessary to remember that Discourse Theory "rejects the distinction between discursive and non-discursive practices" (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 107), and uses a concept of discourse, which "includes within itself the linguistic and the non-linguistic [to] emphasize the fact that every social configuration is *meaningful*" (Laclau 1990, 100; emphasis in original). There are several examples that confirm the overlapping of the storyworld's and real world's social configuration:

1. Only then did Iemanjá's wrath cease. Her festival was prohibited, and for a long time it was replaced by the procession of the Good Jesus of Navigators	1. Só então cessou a cólera de Iemanjá. Sua festa foi proibida e durante algum tempo a substituíram pela procissão de Bom Jesus dos Navegantes (Amado

(Amado 1984, 74).	1965, 84).
2. But that was when the stevedores went on strike. The sloop masters and a great many canoemen made common cause with the men on the piers. The stevedores won, cargo rates for sloops and canoes also rose. But there were persecutions (247).	2. Mas foi quando rebentou a greve dos estivadores. Os mestres de saveiro e grande parte dos canoeiros fizeram causa comum com os homens da estiva. Os estivadores venceram, as tabelas para transporte em saveiro e canoa também aumentaram. Mas houve perseguições (239–240).
3. There went Guma, who'd learned to read so quickly. He could have got into the Polytechnic School, been a great engineer, and maybe have invented a machine that would improve the lot of the sailors on the unstable sea. But waterfront children don't go to the university (39).	3. Lá ia Guma, que aprendera tão rapidamente a ler. Poderia ter entrado na Politécnica, seria um grande engenheiro, e talvez inventar uma máquina que melhorasse o destino dos marinheiros no mar instável. Mas os meninos do cais não vão às Faculdades (53).
4. João Pequeno understood that harbor so well that one day he was invited to be a pilot. He brought the ships in on stormy nights. He went out to meet them, rising over the waves, and he brought them in, avoiding the dangers of the difficult harbor entrance on stormy days. […] A ship didn't know its way, it was coming to Bahia for the first time. João Pequeno didn't come back from his adventure. The government gave his wife a pension, but they cut it off later for reasons of economy (57).	4. Entendia tanto daquela barra que um dia João Pequeno foi convidado para prático. Entrava com os navios nas noites de tempestades. Ia buscá-los lá fora, pulando sobre as ondas, e os trazia evitando os perigos da barra difícil nos dias de temporal. […] Um navio não sabia o caminho, vinha à Bahia pela primeira vez. João Pequeno não voltou da aventura. O Governo deu uma pensão à mulher dêle, mas depois cortou por economia (69).
5. The woman had been killed too. She'd got between Guma and the bullet the sergeant fired, but nobody worried about Rita, because a prostitute was of no importance. The boy was, he came from a good family, highly regarded in the town, the son of a lawyer. The inspector scratched his head (he'd been sleeping when they called him), looked at Rita's corpse, pushed it with his foot (102).	5. A mulher também estava morta. Se metera entre Guma e a bala que o sargento atirara, mas ninguém ligou para Rita, que uma prostituta não tem importância. O rapaz, sim, era de boa família, conceituado no lugar, filho de um advogado. O delegado coçou a cabeça (estava dormindo quando o chamaram), olhou o cadáver de Rita, empurrou com o pé (109).
6. At first Dr. Rodrigo went up to the city a lot. He went up to propose sanitary reforms for the houses on the waterfront. They were never made. He stopped going (110).	6. A princípio o dr. Rodrigo ia sempre à cidade. Ia propor medidas de higiene para as casas do cais. Nunca foi atendido. Deixou de ir (117).
7. Maybe sailors will be able to get married on that day, give a better life to their women and guarantee that they won't starve after their deaths or won't have to prostitute themselves. When will that day come? […] Beetle was brave and he was only killed by stealth, they cut his body to pieces, they had to look for the pieces for the funeral. He fought against the	7. Talvez, que nesse dia os marítimos possam casar, dar vida melhor para as mulheres, garantir que não morrerão de fome após a morte dêles, nem tão pouco precisarão de se prostituir. Quando chegará esse dia? […] Besouro foi valente e só o mataram à traição, cortaram seu corpo todo, foi preciso colar os pedaços para o enterro. Ele lutava contra os barões, condes,

barons, counts, viscounts, and marquises who were the owners of the plantations, the green cane fields, and who set the freight rates for sloops and canoes, he invaded plantations, took a little of what belonged to them and divided it among the widows and children whose fathers had died at sea. The barons, viscounts, marquises, and counts made speeches in Parliament, chatted with Dom Pedro II, drank expensive wines, deflowered slave girls, whipped blacks, treated the sloop and canoemen like servants. But they were afraid of Beetle, he was the Devil for them, a name they didn't like to hear. They sent police, they sent men and more men out against him (120–121).	viscondes, marqueses, que eram e são donos dos engenhos, dos campos verdes de cana, que estabeleciam as tabelas de fretes para os saveiros e canoas, ele invadia os engenhos, tirava um pouco do que era dêles e dividia pelas viúvas, pelas crianças cujos pais morreram no mar. Os barões, viscondes, marqueses e condes faziam discurso no Parlamento, conversavam com D. Pedro II, bebiam vinhos caros, defloravam escravas, surravam negros, tratavam os saveireiros e canoeiros como a criados. Mas de Besouro tinham medo, era o Diabo para eles, nome que não gostavam de ouvir. Botaram polícia, botaram homens e mais homens contra ele (126).
8. If they made a search, if [the police] found Traíra dying in the sloop, then his race would be over. There might not be any jail. It wasn't customary in cases like that. He might be found floating in the water with a knife in his side, as an example. It wouldn't do any good to take it out on Traíra, who was already dying, but they had to get their revenge on someone. The boy was from a good family, important people... (104).	8. E se dessem busca, se [a polícia encontrasse] Traíra agonizando no saveiro, então a sua carreira estava terminada. Talvez nem houvesse prisão. Não costumava haver por aquelas bandas. Talvez ficasse boiando na água com uma faca nas costas para exemplo. Não adiantava mais se vingarem em Traíra, que já estava morrendo, mas tinham que se vingar em alguém. O rapaz era de boa família, gente de prestígio... (111).

Moreover, also the storyworld's historical facts and figures overlap with the real-world ones: the black characters are descendants of enslaved Africans, they cultivate the memory of Besouro (which suggests that the action of the novel takes place after 1924, i.e., after Besouro's death), comment on Lampião's achievements (who was still alive and active—he died only two years after the publication of the novel, in 1938). Also the local geography is the same as in the real world: the same cities, rivers, lakes, streets, buildings, etc. In fact, in my analysis, I have not found any serious divergence or incompatibility between the real and the storyworld, and, therefore, for the purposes of my interpretation, I assume that the storyworld's hegemonic discourse is a faithful reflection of the real-world one.

In *Sea of Death*, I have analyzed 168 events, of which 95 can be classified as subjectiveme indicators, and 93, as the narrator's or implied author's legitimations of the CS of Iemanjá's people (one event can be both a subjectiveme indicator and a legitimizing event; it can also refer to more than one signifier). The main nodal points I have identified are the

following: Afro-Brazilian culture, the State, the elite, and morality. Each of them is a center that determines the meaning of lower-level signifiers: "Afro-Brazilian culture," for example, determines the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian religions" signifier, which in turn determines the meaning of "Iemanjá" and so on. Similarly, the lower-level signifiers also determine, to a certain degree, the meaning of the nodal point, although with less impact. Moreover, the four nodal points in question are the most relevant, because they can be considered floating signifiers, as they are signs whose meaning both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic discourses sought to define; their meaning varied depending on who was using them.[47]

In the collective subjectivity of Iemanjá's people, "Afro-Brazilian culture" is interrelated mostly with such signifiers as: Africa, Afro-Brazilian religions, Orisha, Iemanjá, Afro-Brazilian music, capoeira, Nago language, Afro-Brazilian historical figures, the Black, folk culture, etc.

There are many passages that let us deduce the meaning these signifiers have in the web of meanings in question. For instance:

The pai-de-santo Anselmo was the priest and spokesman for sea people before Iemanjá. […] he'd been a sailor before, had traveled to lands in Africa, where he'd learned the real language, the meaning of those festivals and saints. […] Now he was the one who presided over the feast of Iemanjá, who directed the macumbas on Monte Serrat, who, by order of Dona Janaína, cured illnesses, gave the sloops good winds, sent the frequent storms away. There was no one on that waterfront or in that great water world who didn't respect Anselmo, who had already traveled to Africa and could pray in the Nagô language. His white hair was enough of a signal for all the men from the docks and the canoes to take off their hats. It wasn't that easy to belong to Pai Anselmo's macumba and it was necessary for a black man to be a good sailor in order to sit among the ogãs of Iemanjá […]. Guma, a light mulatto with long, dark hair, would soon sit in one of the chairs placed around the pai-de-santo in the candomblé chamber. Ever since he had brought in the	O pai-de-santo Anselmo era o porta-voz dos marítimos perante Iemanjá. […] antes fôra marinheiro, andara pelas terras de África aprendendo a língua verdadeira dêles, o significado daquelas festas e daqueles santos. […] Era agora êle quem fazia as festas de Iemanjá, quem presidia as macumbas do Monte Serrat, quem com ordem de D. Janaína curava doenças, dava bons ventos aos saveiros, mandava para longe as tempestades freqüentes. Não havia naquela beira de cais e naquele mundão de água quem não respeitasse o Anselmo, que já andara na África e rezava em nagô. Sua carapinha branca fazia com que se descobrissem as cabeças dos homens do cais e das canoas. Não era tão fácil assim ser da macumba de pai Anselmo e era preciso ser bom marítimo para um negro se sentar entre os ogãs de Iemanjá […]. Guma, mulato claro, de cabelos longos e morenos, se sentaria em breve numa das cadeiras que ficavam em volta do pai santo, na sala do candomblé. Desde que trouxera o Canavieiras na noite do temporal sua fama corria de

[47] Some of the signifiers identified in my analysis of the hegemonic discourse have not been addressed in this section, as they turned out to be of considerably lesser relevance to the core discursive tensions explored in the present chapter.

Canavieiras on that stormy night his fame had gone from mouth to mouth, and it was proof that Iemanjá favored him. […] At the next feast of Iemanjá he would already […] take part among the ogãs in the initiation of the feitas, the iauôs, who are the black priestesses (Amado 1984, 70–71).	bôca em bôca, e estava provado que Iemanjá o favorecia. […] Na próxima festa de Iemanjá ele já […] assistiria entre os ogãs à iniciação das feitas, das iauôs, que são as sacerdotes negras (Amado 1965, 81–82).

Pai Anselmo is respected by *all* Iemanjá's people, because he traveled to Africa, could pray in Nago, and because he was their spokesman before Iemanjá, directed Candomblé ceremonies, "cured illnesses, gave the sloops good winds, sent the frequent storms away." Moreover, belonging to his religious community was considered prestigious. From this, it is possible to infer that, for them, the meaning of the "Candomblé" signifier was not negative, as it was in the hegemonic discourse, which viewed it as something primitive, heretic, "pagan," demonic, diabolical, evil, dangerous, suspicious, immoral, or sinful. Instead, it connoted prestige, it was viewed as something that had to be studied to be fully understood (and this valuable knowledge was not for anybody, since it could be acquired only in Africa); Candomblé temple was a sacred space and the women that were initiated in it were seen as "black priestesses." In the sea people's understanding, the "Pai-de-santo[48]" signifier denoted a respectable, important, and powerful person, who was in a close relation with the Orishas and whose power and African traditional know-how enabled him to heal people (although Brazilian law persecuted Afro-Brazilian healing practices [Oliveira 20015, 102]). Also the "Africa" signifier had a positive meaning: it appears here as their "real" land, as a cradle of their *culture*. The meaning of the "Nago language," in turn, was that of their "real language" and, as such, it also connoted prestige. The meanings of these lower-level signifiers determine, to a certain degree, the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian culture" nodal point.

The collective subjectivity was represented in this passage through explicit subjectiveme indicators (e.g. through the fact that Iemanjá's people, out of respect, take off their hats in Pai Anselmo's presence), but also through the narrative convention of "expression of consensus" (I discussed it in section 2.1.2 "Fictional minds"). In this case, the narrator focalizes the collectivity to convey their "communal point of view" (Leech, Short

[48] This term is derived from the Yoruba word "bàbálórìsà" and denotes a male spiritual leader in the Afro-Brazilian religions.

1981, 349–350), as in: "he was the one who […], by order of Dona Janaína [i.e., Iemanjá], cured illnesses"[49] (the implicit subjectiveme indicator here is the fact that sea people perceive Pai Anselmo as a healer "by order of Dona Janaína," and they seek his help).

It is necessary to acknowledge that the distance between the data and my interpretation is greater in the second case, since my observation regarding the expression of consensus is a product of more subjective interpretative efforts than in the first one: it is my choice to interpret this part as an expression of consensus, instead of reading it simply as the narrator's voice. Alan Palmer notes that "there is a certain sort of double-voiced discourse that may look like an expression of opinion by an intrusive narrator but that on closer inspection turns out to be the expression of a consensus. […] One way to identify the consensus type of thought report is to listen for the note of irony that it often contains" (2004, 84). In my opinion, to identify it, it is also necessary to pay attention to the contextual clues, in general, rather than to formal features, because they often decide how a sentence should be interpreted. For instance, when we encounter a sentence such as "Who wouldn't like to marry Lívia and be wept for by her when he died in the sea?"[50] (Amado 1984, 11), it is reasonable to assume that this is not the narrator's voice, as he is a man of the land. Also the language can turn out to be very indicative (especially when the narrator clearly adopts the collectivity's style of expression), as well as the system of values or beliefs that is conveyed through narrator's utterance, as in: "he was the one who […], by order of Dona Janaína, cured illnesses." In *Sea of Death*, this "double-voiced discourse," which expresses the communal point of view of Iemanjá's people, is extraordinarily abundant. After all, already in the introduction to the novel, we read about this duality, about the fact that the story is told by the sea people, but we are "hearing it from the mouth of a man of the land,"[51] who wants us to know what Iemanjá's people have to tell. Also, the last phrase of the book says: "That's what *they* tell by the edge of the docks"[52] (Amado 1984, 273), as if all the text between the introduction and this last sentence was a voice of Iemanjá's people, merely transmitted by the narrator. It is thanks to this "double-voiced discourse" that Amado can confer a marvelous aspect on his literary universe, while keeping its realist, documentary character at the same

[49] In original: "Era agora êle […] quem com ordem de dona Janaína curava doenças" (Amado 1965, 81).
[50] In original: "Quem não gostaria de casar com Lívia e ser chorado por ela quando morresse no mar?" (Amado 1965, 28).
[51] In original: "a ouvistes da bôca de um homem da terra" (Amado 1965, 2).
[52] In original: "Assim contam na beira do cais" (Amado 1965, 262).

time. In other words, it is thanks to this "double-voiced discourse" that the text "allows the marvelous to flow freely from a reality followed strictly in all its details," as Alejo Carpentier put it in his prologue to *The Kingdom of This World* (1993, *Prologue*).

From a different perspective, my interpretation based on consensus expression can be considered as well-grounded, because it is based on subjectiveme indicators that reveal the subjectivity of the whole collectivity, on utterances which focalize the whole collectivity, and not only an individual character interpreted as group's "spokesperson" (this kind of interpretation is also acceptable—when justifiable—but the distance between the data and interpretation increases).

There are also passages that allow the researcher to elaborate generalizations in which the distance between data and interpretation is less significant. A very peculiar signifier is that of "Iemanjá." For the sea people, it means much more than an abstract goddess. According to the meanings that were revealed through 55 subjectiveme indicators, she:

1) is real,

2) present in their daily life,

3) occasionally visible and audible,

4) is the ruler of waters,

5) has agency, personality, preferences, habits, a past, specific physical aspect and place of residence,

6) can affect people's lives, can take control of a human body, and of a storm.

Such an understanding clearly did not converge with the hegemonic "objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61). Moreover, the relevance of some of these interpretations has been confirmed even by characters' willingness to ritually sacrifice their—or their children's—lives[53], in order to be able to join Iemanjá in the underwater afterlife or to mitigate her fury. The following examples contain subjectiveme indicators which reveal such meanings:

[53] In Candomblé, the practice of human sacrifice is neither a tradition nor an accepted religious practice. In certain ceremonies, the religion involves ritual animal sacrifices (guided by the religion's ethics), but human sacrifices, are completely foreign to the practice of Candomblé and are a distortion of the understanding of the religion. Occasionally, such accusations may arise from prejudice or incorrect representations, often linked to cultural ignorance or sensationalist myths. Although Bastide (1978a, 259–260) mentions, in his *O candomblé da Bahia*, two women who offered their lives in sacrifice to Iemanjá, their cases were not examples of traditional, accepted practices, but rather two individual occurrences.

1. [Judith] was lying beside her man. She was looking into his face, the face that didn't move anymore, […] a face that had already passed under the waves, eyes that had seen Iemanjá, the mother of waters. Lívia thinks of Iemanjá with rage. She is the mother of waters, she is the mistress of the sea, and that's why all men who live above the waves fear her and love her. She punishes. She never shows herself to men unless they die in the sea. The ones who die in storms are her favorites. And those who die saving other men, those who go with her out to sea, just like a ship, touching all ports, sailing all seas. The bodies of these are never found, for they have gone with Iemanjá. In order to see the mother of waters many had already jumped into the sea smiling, never to reappear. Can it be that she sleeps with all of them in the depths of the waters? (Amado 1984, 12–15)	1. [Judith] ficou atirada junto do seu homem. Olhava para o rosto dêle, aquêle rosto que não se movia mais, […] rosto que já passara sob as ondas, olhos que já haviam visto Iemanjá, a mãe-d'água. Lívia pensa com raiva em Iemanjá. Ela é a mãe-d'água, é a dona do mar, e, por isso, todos os homens que vivem em cima das ondas a temem e a amam. Ela castiga. Ela nunca se mostra aos homens, a não ser quando êles morrem no mar. Os que morrem na tempestade são seus preferidos. E aquêles que morrem salvando outros homens, esses vão com ela pelos mares em fora. Igual a um navio, viajando por todos os portos, correndo por todos os mares. Dêstes ninguém encontra os corpos, que êles vão com Iemanjá. Para ver a mãe-d'água muitos já se jogaram no mar sorrindo e não mais apareceram. Será que ela dorme com todos êles no fundo das águas?[54] (Amado 1965, 29–31)

In this passage, the intensity of the sea people's faith is revealed through the fact that "In order to see the mother of waters, *many* had already jumped into the sea smiling, never to reappear." Also, the fact that "Lívia thinks of Iemanjá with rage" reveals how genuinely she believes in this Orisha. After this phrase, the narrator fluidly shifts the perspective—he gives the reader a more direct access to Lívia's mind, by merging his and her voices through the narrative convention of free direct thought, which could also be read as an expression of consensus: those seem Lívia's thoughts, but, at the same time, they convey the sea people's perspective. As Palmer observes: "The reason why it is not possible to distinguish between the various possibilities for the source of what is expressed is because everyone is in agreement" (2004, 84). Furthermore, the reader is informed that "*all* men who live above the waves fear [Iemanjá] and love her," which suggests that there really is a significant "common denominator" (the definitional element of the collective subjectivity concept) that allows us to suppose the existence of a collective subjectivity. The passage also reveals that, according to these characters, Iemanjá has agency ("She punishes"), habits ("She never shows herself to men unless they die in the sea"), and preferences ("The ones who die in storms are her favorites").

[54] As Gildeci de Oliveira Leite explains, this kind of sexualized view about Iemanjá, while existent, is more prevalent among those not initiated in Candomblé (2021, 195).

2. Men of the land (what do men of the land know?) say that they're moonbeams on the sea. But the sailors, sloop masters, canoemen, laugh at the men of the land who don't know anything. They know full well that it's the hair of the mother of waters who's come to see the full moon. It's Iemanjá who's come to see the moon. That's why men stand looking at the silvery sea on moonlit nights. Because they know that the mother of waters is there. Black men play the guitar, the concertina, beat drums and sing. It's the offering they bring to the mistress of the sea. Others smoke a pipe to light the way, so Iemanjá can see better. They all love her and they even forget their wives when the hair of the mother of waters spreads out over the sea. That's how Guma is as he looks at the silver swelling of the waters and hears the black man's song with its invitation to death. He says that it's sweet to die in the sea, because there you will meet the mother of waters who is the most beautiful woman in the whole world. Guma is staring at her hair, having forgotten that Lívia is there, her body stretched out, her breasts offered, Lívia who has waited so long for the moment of love […]. But now he's forgotten about Lívia, he's only thinking about Iemanjá (16).	2. Os homens da terra (que sabem os homens da terra?) dizem que são os raios da Lua sobre o mar. Mas os marinheiros, os mestres de saveiro, os canoeiros, riem dos homens da terra que não sabem nada. Êles bem sabem que são os cabelos da mãe-d'água, que vem ver a lua cheia. É Iemanjá quem vem olhar a Lua. Por isso os homens ficam contemplando o mar prateado nas noites de lua. Porque sabem que a mãe-d'água está ali. Os negros tocam violão, harmônica, batem batuque e cantam. É o presente que êles trazem para a dona do mar. Outros fumam cachimbo para iluminar o caminho, assim Iemanjá verá melhor. Todos a amam e até esquecem as mulheres quando os cabelos da mãe-d'água se estendem sobre o mar. Assim está Guma, que olha o bojo de prata das águas e ouve a música do negro que convida para a morte. Êle diz que é doce morrer no mar, porque irão encontrar a mãe-d'água, que é a mulher mais bonita do mundo todo. Guma está fitando os cabelos dela, esquecido que Lívia está ali, o corpo estirado, os seios se ofertando, Lívia, que tanto esperou a hora do amor […A]gora êle está esquecido de Lívia, êle só pensa em Iemanjá (32).

In the previous passage, it was the feeling of rage that revealed how genuine the characters' faith in Iemanjá is. Here, it is revealed by the fact that the men of the sea laugh at the men of the land because the latter do not know what the former know ("They *know full well* that it's the hair of the mother of waters who's come to see the full moon"). It is a strong subjectiveme indicator, because it reveals the subjectivity of the whole collectivity and not only of an individual character. For *all* of them ("They *all* love her and they even forget their wives" because of her), Iemanjá is present in their daily life ("they *know* that the mother of waters is there"). With her luminous hair, Iemanjá, "the most beautiful woman in the whole world," has a specific physical aspect. There are two contrasting perspectives juxtaposed in this excerpt: the one of men of the land (representatives of the hegemonic discourse) and the one of men of the sea. With this kind of narrative strategy, Amado confers a marvelous aspect on his literary universe, while keeping its realist, documentary character at the same time—it is up to the reader to decide with which perspective he identifies. Since the narrator presents himself in the introduction as a man of the land, it is reasonable to assume that such phrases

as “what do men of the land know?” or “It’s Iemanjá who’s come to see the moon” are an expression of consensus (of the voice of the sea people). Moreover, this series of subjectiveme indicators that reveal the subjectivity of the whole group is followed by a SI that reveals Guma’s individual subjectivity and, thus, confirms the convergence between these individual and collective levels: “Guma is staring at her hair, having forgotten that Lívia is there, […] he’s only thinking about Iemanjá.”

3. Storms filled the harbor, lifted the river up over its banks. In those days even children, even young girls were carried out as gifts for Iemanjá. She led them down to the depths of the waters and their bodies never appeared again. Iemanjá was in her terrible years, she didn’t want chants, melodies, music, bars of soap, or combs. She wanted people, living bodies. The wrath of Iemanjá was feared. They brought her children, they brought her maidens, a blind one was even offered and she went smiling (she would doubtless see beautiful things!), a child cried on the night they carried it off and shouted for its mother, its father, that it didn’t want to die. […] They took that child because she was the prettiest on the waterfront, she even looked like Janaína with her blue eyes. […] they could all hear the screams of the child who was taken along blindfolded. [… Only after that] did Iemanjá’s wrath cease […], she wanted no more children or virgins (73–74).	3. Os temporais enchiam a barra, levantavam o rio acima das suas margens. Nesse tempo até crianças, até môças, foram levadas de presente a Iemanjá. Ela as conduzia para o fundo das águas e nunca os corpos apareciam. Iemanjá estava nos seus anos terríveis, não queria cânticos, toadas, música, sabonetes e pentes. Queria gente, corpo vivo. Era temida a cólera de Iemanjá. Levaram-lhe crianças, levaram môças, uma que era cega até se ofereceu, e foi sorrindo (Iria, sem dúvida, ver coisas belas!), uma criança chorava na noite em que a levaram e gritava para a mãe, para o pai, que não queria morrer. […] Levara aquela criança porque era a mais bela do cais, parecia até com Janaína, pois tinha os olhos azuis. […] todos ouviam os gritos da criança, que ia de olhos vendados. [… Só depois disso] cessou a cólera de Iemanjá […], ela não quis mais crianças e virgens (83–84).

This excerpt contains very conclusive subjectiveme indicators. The fact that even children were sacrificed as gifts for Iemanjá proves, in my opinion, that, for the sea people, Iemanjá was much more than an abstract goddess. It is not an utterance which can be interpreted in two ways (as a voice that might be narrator’s or group’s), but a specific, unquestionable action of the group (“unquestionable” within Amado’s fictional storyworld—in Candomblé, the practice of human sacrifice is neither a tradition nor an accepted religious practice). Also very significant in this context is the fact that a person offered herself to be sacrificed, “and she went smiling,” since “she would doubtless see beautiful things!” She did it, because the sea people were genuinely convinced that Iemanjá

"*wanted* people, living bodies" and they feared her wrath (in their understanding, she has a will and emotions, like a living being, as well as a specific physical aspect—the child that was offered as a gift "looked like Janaína with her blue eyes").

4. It's not for the money that Guma is going out on the Valiant in an attempt to bring that ship to port. […] a man doesn't go to his death for two hundred *milreis*. […] It's simply because a sad whistle comes from a ship, a call for help, and the law of the sea ordains that a person attends to those who ask for help at sea. So Iemanjá will be pleased with him, and if he comes back alive she'll give him the woman he asked for (65).	4. Não é pelo dinheiro que Guma vai no Valente tentar trazer esse navio para o porto. […] não é por duzentos mil réis que um homem vai para a morte. […] É mesmo porque vem um apito triste do navio, um pedido de socorro, e a lei do cais manda que se atenda aos que no mar pedem socorro. Assim, Iemanjá ficará satisfeita com êle, e, se voltar com vida, ela lhe dará a mulher que pediu (75–76).

In this excerpt, Guma, the protagonist, makes a decision that puts his life at a very serious risk because he genuinely believes in Iemanjá and her powers. In this case, his faith appears to be so deep that it could be considered as a *background supposition*, i.e., as a basic, *taken-for-granted, inherently assumed* supposition about the world, which guides Guma's actions and thoughts. After all, this faith was instilled in Guma already in his early childhood, by his uncle Francisco, who raised him "on his own sloop, at sea"[55] (Amado 1984, 21), who explained him that Guma's father "died to save Francisco, and that's why he went off with Iemanjá to other beautiful lands"[56] (21), who did not want Guma to be raised by his mother, arguing that "If [Guma is] meant to belong to [Iemanjá], there's no way to free him from it"[57] (24), and who, in *Sea of Death*, is "responsible for the memory and history of the people of the sea" and has characteristics of an *apaló* (traditional storyteller), of an *orókin* (official historian) (Leite 2021, 185; transl.—E. Ch.), or, as José Benedito dos Santos (2013, 54–55) puts it, a "symbol of popular wisdom," a griot (a figure in parts of West Africa and its diasporas who preserves and transmits communal history, particularly through oral traditions such as storytelling, poetry, and music).

[55] In original: "dentro do seu saveiro, dentro do mar" (Amado 1965, 36–37).
[56] In original: "morrera para salvar Francisco e por isso fora com Iemanjá para outras terras muito lindas" (Amado 1965, 36).
[57] In original: "Se êle tem de ser de Janaína, não há saber que livre êle" (Amado 1965, 40).

177:12027

5. Iemanjá, who is mistress of the docks, of the sloops, of the lives of all of them, has five names, five sweet names that everybody knows. She is called Iemanjá, she has always been called that and it is her real name, as mistress of waters, lady of the oceans. […] she adores the moon she comes to see on cloudless nights, she loves black people's music (69).	5. Iemanjá, que é dona do cais, dos saveiros, da vida dêles todos, tem cinco nomes, cinco nomes doces que todo o mundo sabe. Ela se chama Iemanjá, sempre foi chamada assim e esse é seu verdadeiro nome, de dona das águas, de senhora dos oceanos. […] ela adora a Lua, que vem ver nas noites sem nuvens, ela ama as músicas dos negros (80).

Here, the narrator uses *doxas*, which, in Bourdieu's conception (2013, 159–170), are sentences that, by their internal logic, seem unquestionable, self-evident; that express society's taken-for-granted, unquestioned truths (a voice of common sense): "Iemanjá, *who is mistress of the docks*, […] has five […] names that *everybody knows* […], she has *always* been called that and it is her *real* name, *as mistress of waters*." In addition, the excerpt contains a subjectiveme indicator, which reveals the meaning of "Afro-Brazilian music" signifier: the collectivity understands it in a different way than the hegemonic discourse, which perceives it as an inferior and lascivious form of music. For them, this meaning is positive, they believe that even their goddess loves it. Such positive understanding of this signifier is confirmed also by the following SI: "[Dr. Rodrigo] had a radio set, and a lot of people came at night to hear music from other countries. They […] almost always ended up turning off the radio and singing the songs of the waterfront for the doctor to hear"[58] (Amado 1984, 110).

6. waters make up more than half the world, they are three-quarters of it, and all that belongs to Iemanjá. Where she lives, however, is in the stone by the Dike on the waterfront of Bahia or in her grotto in Monte Serrat. She could live in the cities of the Mediterranean, the China seas, California, the Aegean, the Gulf of Mexico. In ancient times she lived on the coasts of Africa, which they say is near the lands of Aiocá. But she came to Bahia to see the	6. as águas são muito mais que metade do mundo, são três, quartas partes, e tudo isso é de Iemanjá. No entanto, ela mora é na pedra do Dique do cais da Bahia ou na sua loca em Monte Serrat. Podia morar nas cidades do Mediterrâneo, nos mares da China, na Califórnia, no mar Egeu, no golfo de México. Antigamente ela morava nas costas da África, que dizem que é perto das terras de Aiocá. Mas veio para a Bahia ver as águas do rio Paraguaçu. E ficou morando

[58] In original: "Tinha um aparelho de rádio e muitos vinham de noite ouvir as músicas de outros países. Já entravam sem desconfiança, olhavam os livros grossos e bonitos como a conhecidos (a princípio se sentiam amedrontados com aqueles livros que os separavam do Dr. Rodrigo) e quase sempre terminavam por fechar o rádio e cantar as canções do cais para o doutor ouvir" (Amado 1965, 116–117).

waters of the Paraguacu River. And she stayed to live on the waterfront, near the Dike, in a stone that is sacred. There she combs her hair (beautiful slave girls come with combs of silver and ivory), hears the prayers of the women of the sea, unleashes storms, chooses the men she is to take on the bottomless journey to the depths of the sea. And it is there that her feast takes place, much more beautiful than all other processions in Bahia, more beautiful than all macumbas, because it belongs to the most powerful orixás, it belongs to the first ones, the ones from whom all others came (69–70).	no cais, perto do Dique, numa pedra que é sagrada. Lá ela penteia os cabelos (vêm mucamas lindas com pentes de prata e marfim), ela ouve as preces das mulheres marítimas, desencadeia as tempestades, escolhe os homens que há de levar para o passeio infindável do fundo do mar. E é ali que se realiza a sua festa, mais bonita que todas as procissões da Bahia, mais bonita que todas as macumbas, que ela é dos orixás mais poderosos, ela é dos primeiros, daqueles de onde os outros vieram (80–81).

In this extract, "Iemanjá" signifier denotes a real, practically tangible, and very important figure (even in comparison with other Orishas), who has a specific, well-known place of residence, possessions, habits, and her life's history; who coexists with the sea people from Bahia (although she could be living other places) and controls the storms. Through the expression of consensus, it is also revealed that the collectivity's understanding of the "Afro-Brazilian religions" signifier contrasts with its meaning within the hegemonic discourse—for them, their religious manifestations can be even greater than the Catholic ones: "it is there that her feast takes place, much more beautiful than *all other processions* in Bahia." The feast (as well as Iemanjá herself) is very important for the *whole* collectivity, with no exceptions: "On that day the waterfront will be empty, there won't be a canoe at sea, a single sloop carrying cargo, a sailor who won't find some way to leave his ship for a minute. Everybody will go to the dwelling place of Dona Janaína"[59] (Amado 1984, 72).

7. She will come from out of the sea with her long hair mysterious in color. She will come with her hands full of seashells and her face smiling. And then she will play with them, she will enter the body of a black woman and be just like the black people, the canoemen, the sloop masters, a woman like others on the waterfront, possessed by them, the wife of those men (76).	7. Virá do mar com seus longos cabelos de misteriosa cor. Virá com as mãos cheias de conchas e o rosto sorridente. E então brincará com êles, entrará no corpo de uma negra e será igual aos negros, aos canoeiros, aos mestres de saveiro, uma mulher como as outras do cais, possuída por êles, esposa daqueles homens (86).

[59] In original: "Nesse dia, o cais estará vazio, não haverá uma canoa no mar, um só saveiro transportando carga, um marinheiro que não arranje meios de deixar o navio por um momento. Irão todos para onde mora D. Janaína" (Amado 1965, 83).

Also in this case Iemanjá is seen as a practically tangible figure, who has a specific physical aspect ("long hair mysterious in color"), who coexists, interacts with the sea people, and can even enter their bodies ("she will play with them, she will enter the body of a black woman and be just like the black people, the canoemen, the sloop masters, a woman like others on the waterfront, possessed by them, the wife of those men"). The fact that the narrator, while focalizing the collectivity, uses future tense constructions, reflects the degree of certainty about what is being said ("She *will* come from out of the sea [… a]nd then she *will* play with them").

We have already seen that Guma is able to make a decision that puts his life at a very serious risk, in a decisive moment of the novel, because he genuinely believes in Iemanjá and her powers. Since the protagonist's decisions affect their trajectory and, therefore, the course of the whole story, it is relevant to quote here more subjectiveme indicators, which show how the sea people's common understanding of the "Iemanjá" signifier can affect characters' lives:

8. [Guma] doesn't want casual love, love found by chance, any old mulatto girl. It was Lívia that Iemanjá sent to him, he can't go against Iemanjá's orders (121).	8. [Guma] não quer amor de aventuras, amor de acaso, uma cabrocha qualquer. Foi Lívia que Iemanjá lhe mandou, êle não pode discutir as ordens de Iemanjá (127).
9. [Rosa Palmeirão] would go looking for trouble in other lands, drink cane liquor in other bars, travel over the waters of other seas. But never before the feast of Iemanjá, because otherwise she wouldn't have a fair wind, she'd find storms along her way (72).	9. [Rosa Palmeirão] iria procurar barulho em outras terras, beber cachaça em outros botequins, viajar nas águas de outros mares. Nunca, porém, antes da festa de Iemanjá, senão não teria bons ventos, encontraria tempestade no seu caminho (82).
10. It's been months since these black women, who are *feitas* today, had been initiated. First they gave them all a bath with the sacred leaves, shaved their heads, their armpits, their pubises, so the saint can penetrate them more easily, and then came the *efun*. They had their heads and their faces too painted with bright colors. Then they received Iemanjá, who penetrated them through the head or the armpits or the pubis. […] Then they spent all those months in	10. Faz meses que estas negras, que hoje são feitas, foram iniciadas. Primeiro deram a tôdas elas um banho com as folhas sagradas, rasparam-lhes os cabelos da cabeça, das axilas, do púbis, para que o santo mais livremente possa penetrar, e então veio o efun. Tiveram as cabeças pintadas e também as faces com côres berrantes. Receberam então Iemanjá, que penetrou nelas ou pela cabeça ou pelas axilas ou pelo púbis. […] Depois elas ficaram todos esses meses recolhidas. Não conheceram homem, não viram movimentos da rua e do mar. Viveram só para

seclusion. They knew no men, nor did they see any of the activities on the streets or at sea. They lived only for Iemanjá. Today is the day of the great festival when they will become real *feitas*, real priestesses of Iemanjá. They dance madly […] In the midst of the feast that has possessed all of them now (Iemanjá has been among them for a long time, resting in the body of Ricardina) […] Iemanjá greets Guma, who is protected by her (78–79).	Iemanjá. Hoje é o dia da grande festa quando elas ficarão mesmo feitas, mesmo sacerdotisas de Iemanjá. Elas dançam loucamente […] No meio da festa que já possui a todos (Iemanjá há muito que está entre êles, metida no corpo de Ricardina) […] Iemanjá saúda Guma que é seu protegido (88–89).

To summarize, the examples I have mentioned in this section so far show that neither the narrator nor the characters question the existence of Iemanjá, and that the sea people's common understanding of the "Iemanjá" signifier guides their actions and affects the storyworld in a very considerable way. We have seen that it affects sea people's daily life, emotional and spiritual life, their love life, family life; it affects their conception of morality, artistic production, the way they deal with adversities; it organizes their social life, leisure activities, festivities calendar; it determines what they say ("They don't spend much time on that story, however, because it would unleash the wrath of Janaína"[60] [Amado 1984, 74]); it determines the protagonist's decisions, trajectory and, therefore, the course of the whole story. To put it briefly, it is an essential element of their cosmogony and, because of that, Iemanjá seems to be one of the most important characters of *Sea of Death*, although, effectively, she can be considered as such only if the reader adopts the web of meanings of Iemanjá's people and interprets the work through this prism. It is particularly evident at the end of the book, at this climactic moment, which could not have occurred if Jorge Amado had not constructed this entire collective subjectivity along the whole story:

11. Sea birds fly about the [Flying Packet], pass close to Lívia's head. […] On the docks, old Francisco shakes his head. Once, when he did what no sloop master would do, he saw Iemanjá, the mistress of the sea. And isn't it she who now goes along standing on the Flying Packet? Isn't it she? It is, yes. It's Iemanjá who's going there. And old Francisco shouts to the	11. Aves marinhas volteiam em torno do [Paquete Voador], passam perto da cabeça de Lívia. […] No cais o velho Francisco balança a cabeça. Uma vez, quando fez o que nenhum mestre de saveiro faria, êle viu Iemanjá, a dona do mar. E não é ela quem vai agora de pé no Paquete Voador? Não é ela? Ela é, sim. É Iemanjá quem vai ali. E o velho Francisco grita para

[60] In original: "êles não vivem contando essa história, que ela faz desencadear a cólera de Janaína" (Amado 1965, 84).

others on the docks: "Look! Look! It's Janaína." They looked and they saw. Dona Dulce saw too as she looked from the window of the school. She saw a strong woman who was fighting on. […] On the waterfront the sailors saw Iemanjá, she of the five names. Old Francisco was shouting, it was the second time he had seen her. That's what they tell by the edge of the docks (272–273).	os outros no cais: — Vejam! Vejam! É Janaína. Olharam e viram. D. Dulce olhou também da janela da escola. Viu uma mulher forte que lutava. […] No cais os marítimos viam Iemanjá, a dos cinco nomes. O velho Francisco gritava, era a segunda vez que êle a via. Assim contam na beira do cais (262).

Where Francisco and the sailors saw the goddess Iemanjá, Dona Dulce—a "woman of the land" who did not share their beliefs—simply saw Lívia (a human protagonist), who was sailing the sloop named Flying Packet. The "miracle" is "possible" because of the subjectivity of those who perceive it. Similarly to what Vargas Llosa observed in *The Kingdom of This World*, the marvelousness consisted in a narration that adopted the perspective of a community that believes in miracles. The narrator does not question the "miracle." He conveys the perspective of the sea people (first he focalizes Francisco, and after his shouts, the whole group). He just informs that "That's what they tell by the edge of the docks"—after all, he tells the story, because he wants us to know what Iemanjá's people have to tell. It is the reader who has to choose which voice he wants to believe: that of the men of the land or that of the men of the sea (but the perspective of the sea people had been consistently legitimized along the whole story, to the detriment of the contrasting one). Thus, the theme, style, and level of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate the novel, as well as the plane of reality on which the story takes place, are so harmonized that the reader can have a sensation of deep immersion in the narrated reality.

In my view, it is one of Amado's particularly interesting means of attracting readers' attention to the perspective of the marginalized (the one of conferring a marvelous aspect on his literary universes, while keeping their realist, documentary character at the same time). One of the most representative examples of such balancing between fantasy and realism is Amado's *Ogun's Compadre* (1978 [1964]). In my view, the collective subjectivity of the Candomblé practitioners is the most important component of the novel and constitutes a *sine qua non* for its very existence. Only the collectivity's *genuine* belief in Orishas makes the *whole* plot possible. Massu, the main character, interprets an event as a message from the Orisha Ogum. After his conviction is confirmed by a prestigious Candomblé priestess, the

whole community believes him and acts accordingly. The story, in which the Orishas interact with the humans, becomes so incredible that it starts to seem fantastic. But everything is a matter of subjectivity and astute focalization. Occasionally, the narrator also focalizes those who do not believe in Ogum, and, thus, shows that it is all possible, although unreasonable from their perspective. The same people who are "mounted" by Orishas, for the Candomblé practitioners, seem drunk for the others. Only in this way is it possible to explain how Massu manages to baptize his son in a Catholic church, with the Orisha Ogum as the godfather (according to the Candomblé practitioners' conviction), which is the climax of the story.

Interestingly, in Amado's *Tent of Miracles* (2010 [1969]), there is an excerpt in which Pedro Archanjo—a protagonist with whose approach Amado identified himself, in an interview for "A Fondo"[61] (Soler Serrano, 30min 10s–33min)—explains, to a certain degree, Amado's project of negotiating the meaning of unjustly delegitimized signifiers, through the strategy of "marvelous" collective subjectivity construction. This is how Pedro Archanjo, in his dialogue with Fraga Neto, reveals "*the key to the hardest riddle of all*, the most painful enigma" (Amado 1971, 312), how Pedro Archanjo reveals the "position that"—in Amado's own words—"guided [Amado's] entire literary work" (Soler Serrano, 30min 10s–33min):

"I've been wondering how it's possible for you, a man of science [, …] to have any belief in Candomblé. […] Because you do believe in it, don't you? If you didn't, you surely wouldn't lend yourself to that performance of singing, dancing, and all those other capers, letting people kiss your hand [, …] you'll have to agree, Master Pedro, that it's all very primitive. Superstitious barbarism, fetishism, barely the initial stage of civilization. How can you do it? […]" "I could say it's because I like to sing and dance. […] That would be enough."	— Pergunto como é possível que você, um homem de ciência, […] acredite em candomblé. […] Porque você acredita, não é? Se não acreditasse, não se prestaria a tudo aquilo: cantar, dançar, fazer aqueles trejeitos todos, dar a mão a beijar, […] vamos convir, mestre Pedro, tudo muito primitivo, superstição, barbarismo, fetichismo, estágio primário da civilização. Como é possível? […] — Eu podia dizer que gosto de cantar, de dançar […]. Seria bastante. — Não, você sabe que não. Quero saber é como você

[61] In the interview, Amado says: "The city of Bahia [...] is truly a magical city. It's very difficult to explain, but if you spend a few days there, you will easily realize that reality and magic intertwine. It is this society that I sought to recreate and capture in my books. [...] I have a character in one of my books, [...] *Tent of Miracles*. In this book, I tell the story of the struggle of the people of Brazil [...] against racism, [...] of how the people fought to build this mixed civilization that is our Brazilian civilization. This character […] emerges from the working class to become one of the great sages of his time. When asked how he reconciles his materialism as a scholar with the Afro-Brazilian religious rites he continues to practice [...], he says: '*My materialism doesn't limit me*. I can believe in matter and believe in miracles.' I think *this is somewhat the position that guided my entire literary work*" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Soler Serrano, 30min 10s–33min). Moreover, also Zélia Gattai, Amado's wife, "often says that Pedro Archanjo is the most autobiographical character of Jorge Amado. 'Even that famous phrase of Jorge's, 'my materialism does not limit me,' he put into Pedro's mouth" (Belém 1997).

"No sir, it wouldn't. What I want to know is how you manage to reconcile your scientific knowledge with your Candomblé obligations. […] There seem to be two men inside you: the one who writes those books and the one who dances in the *terreiro*. The rum had arrived and Pedro Archanjo emptied his glass in turn; that meddler wanted *the key to the hardest riddle of all, the most painful enigma*. "Pedro Archanjo Ojuobá, the conversationalist and the bookworm, the man who talks and argues with Professor Fraga Neto and the one who kisses the hand of Pulquéria the *iyalorixá*—are they two different people, the white man and the black, perhaps? You're mistaken, Professor, if that's what you think. There is only one, a mixture of the two. Just one mulatto." […] "But Master Pedro, how can you possibly reconcile such enormous differences, be no and yes at one and the same time?" "Because I'm a mestizo, part black and part white, and so I'm white and black at the same time. I was born to *Candomblé*, I grew up with the *orixás*, and when I was still a boy I assumed a high position in the *terreiro*. Do you know what *Ojuobá* means? I, my distinguished professor, am the eyes of Xangô. I took on a commitment and a responsibility. […] You want to know whether I believe in it or not? I'm going to tell you something I've never told anyone except myself, and if you tell anybody I'll have to say you are lying. […] For years and years I believed in my *orixás* [...]. At that time all I knew was what I had learned in the streets. Later I went in search of other sources of knowledge, and though I learned many things that were good, I lost my faith. You, professor, are a materialist, you say. I haven't read the authors you like to quote, but I'm just as much a materialist as you are. […] I know, just as you do, that there is nothing except matter, but I also know that sometimes, even so, fear fills my days, and I am disconcerted. I am not limited by what I know, Professor. […] What was once the miraculous descent of the saints is reduced to a state of trance that any college freshman could analyze and expose. As far as I'm concerned, Professor, all that exists is matter. But that is no reason for me to stop going to the *terreiro* and carrying out the duties of my position as *Ojuobá*, of fulfilling my commitment. I refuse to limit myself, as you do. You're afraid of what other people may think; you're afraid to cut your materialism down to size." "At least I'm consistent, and you're not!" exploded	pode conciliar seu conhecimento científico com as obrigações de candomblé. […] Parece haver dois homens em você: o que escreve os livros e o que dança no terreiro. Chegara a cachaça, Pedro Archanjo emborcou o copo: aquele bisbilhoteiro queria *a chave da adivinha mais difícil, do cabuloso enigma*: — Pedro Archanjo Ojuobá, o leitor de livros e o bom de prosa, o que conversa e discute com o professor Fraga Neto e o que beija a mão de Pulquéria, a ialorixá, dois seres diferentes, quem sabe o branco e o negro? Não se engane, professor, um só. Mistura dos dois, um mulato só. […] — Como lhe é possível, mestre Pedro, conciliar tantas diferenças, ser ao mesmo tempo o não e o sim? — Sou um mestiço, tenho do negro e do branco, sou branco e negro ao mesmo tempo. Nasci no candomblé, cresci com os orixás e ainda moço assumi um alto posto no terreiro. Sabe o que significa Ojuobá? Sou os olhos de Xangô, meu ilustre professor. Tenho um compromisso, uma responsabilidade. […] Se acredito ou não? Vou dizer ao senhor o que até agora só disse a mim mesmo e, se o senhor contar a alguém, serei obrigado a lhe desmentir. […] Durante anos e anos acreditei nos meus orixás […]. Nesse tempo tudo que eu sabia aprendera na rua. Depois busquei outras fontes de saber, ganhei novos bens, perdi a crença. O senhor é materialista, professor, não li os autores que o senhor cita, mas sou tão materialista quanto o senhor. […] sei, como o senhor sabe, que nada existe além da matéria, mas sei também que, mesmo assim, às vezes o medo enche meu tempo e me perturba. O meu saber não me limita, professor. […] O que era milagrosa descida dos santos reduziu-se a um estado de transe que qualquer calouro da faculdade analisa e expõe. Para mim, professor, só existe a matéria. Mas nem por isso deixo de ir ao terreiro e de exercer as funções de meu posto de Ojuobá, cumprir meu compromisso. Não me limito como o senhor que tem medo do que os outros possam pensar, tem medo de diminuir o tamanho de seu materialismo. — Sou coerente, você não é! — explodiu Fraga Neto:—Se não acredita mais, não acha desonesto praticar uma farsa, como se acreditasse? — Não. Primeiro, como já lhe disse, gosto de dançar e de cantar, gosto de festa, antes de tudo de festa de candomblé. Ademais, há o seguinte: estamos numa luta, cruel e dura. Veja com que violência querem

Fraga Neto. “If you don’t believe in it any more, don’t you think it’s dishonest to take part in a farce as if you did believe in it?” “No. First of all, as I’ve already told you, I like to dance and sing. I love parties, especially *Candomblé* parties. Besides, there’s this: we’re engaged in a hard, cruel struggle. Look at how violently they try to destroy everything that belongs to us Negroes and mulattoes, our goods and even our very features. Just a short time ago, when Chief Pedrito was still around, anyone who went to a *Candomblé* was taking his life in his hands. […] Do you think if I had gone and argued with Chief Pedrito, as I’m arguing with you here, that any good would have come of it? If I had proclaimed my materialist philosophy, washed my hands of *Candomblé*, said that all that stuff was just a game for children, a product of primitive fear, ignorance, and misery, who would I have been helping? I would have been helping Pedrito and his pack of gangsters, Professor. I would have helped destroy that festival of the people. […] the *orixás* are a blessing to the people. *Capoeira* fighting, circle sambas, *afoxés*, *atabaques*, *berimbaus* are all blessings for the people. All those things and many others that you, with your narrow way of thinking, would like to do away with, just like Chief Pedrito, if you’ll pardon my saying so. *My materialism does not limit me* [, …] what today is a mystery that poor folk have to fight for – meetings of Negroes and mestizos, forbidden music, illegal dances, *Candomblé*, samba, and capoeira – why, all that will be the treasured joy of the Brazilian people […]. I know for a fact that nothing supernatural exists, that it is a result of emotion, not reason, and is almost always born of fear. Still and all, when my godson Tadeu told me he wanted to marry a rich white girl, I thought, unconsciously and without meaning to, of the shells cast by the *mãe-de-santo* on his graduation day. All that is in my blood, Professor […]. If I proclaimed my own truth to the four winds and said all this is nothing but a game, I’d be siding with the police (Amado 1971, 312–315).	destruir tudo que nós, negros e mulatos, possuímos, nossos bens, nossa fisionomia. Ainda há pouco tempo, com o delegado Pedrito, ir a um candomblé era um perigo, o cidadão arriscava a liberdade e até a vida. […] O senhor pensa que, se eu fosse discutir com o delegado Pedrito, como estou discutindo com o senhor, teria obtido algum resultado? Se eu houvesse proclamado meu materialismo, largado de mão o candomblé, dito que tudo aquilo não passava de um brinquedo de criança, resultado do medo primitivo, da ignorância e da miséria, a quem eu ajudaria? Eu ajudaria, professor, ao delegado Pedrito e sua malta de facínoras, ajudaria a acabar com uma festa do povo. […] os orixás são um bem do povo. A luta da capoeira, o samba de roda, os afoxés, os atabaques, os berimbaus são bens do povo. Todas essas coisas e muitas outras que o senhor, com seu pensamento estreito, quer acabar, professor, igualzinho ao delegado Pedrito, me desculpe lhe dizer. *Meu materialismo não me limita*. […] o que hoje é mistério e luta de gente pobre, roda de negros mestiços, música proibida, dança ilegal, candomblé, samba, capoeira, tudo isso será festa do povo brasileiro […]. Sei de ciência certa que todo sobrenatural não existe, resulta do sentimento e não da razão, nasce quase sempre do medo. No entanto, quando meu afilhado Tadeu me disse que queria se casar com moça rica e branca, mesmo sem querer pensei no jogo feito pela mãe de santo no dia em que ele se formou. Trago tudo isso no sangue, professor. […] Se eu proclamasse minha verdade aos quatro ventos e dissesse: tudo isso não passa de um brinquedo, eu me colocaria ao lado da polícia (Amado 2010, 245–248).

However, a collective subjectivity does not necessarily have to be characterized by marvelousness, spirituality, or faith-based thinking (as in Mario Vargas Llosa’s conception).

"Subjective" does not mean "untrue." It can simply be different from the hegemonic "objectivity" (Laclau 1990, 34, 35, 61) or from any other subjectivity. Within the web of meanings of the protagonists of *Sea of Death*, it is possible to identify certain signifiers that exemplify this.

In *Sea of Death*, the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian culture" nodal point is also determined by the meaning of the "Afro-Brazilian historical figures" signifier, which, in turn, is determined by the meaning of such lower-level signifiers as "Zumbi dos Palmares"[62] or "Besouro"[63] (whose name was translated into English as "Beetle"):

That town of Santo Amaro […] was the homeland of all sorts of barons of the Empire, viscounts, counts, marquises, but, people of the waterfront, it was also the homeland of Beetle. For that reason, for that reason alone, not because it produces sugar, counts, viscounts, barons, marquises, cane liquor, Santo Amaro is a town beloved by waterfront people. It is where Beetle was born, ran in the streets, shed blood, fought with his knife, with a gun, with capoeira foot-fighting, sang sambas. It was there, nearby, in Maracangalha, that they chopped him up with machetes, it was there that his blood flowed, and there that his star shines, large and clear, almost as large as Lucas da Feira's. He became a star because he was a brave black man. […] Guma looks up to the sky where he is shining. Even though the moon is larger and brighter and it's there that the eyes first turn, what they seek immediately after is the star of Beetle, the bravest of all blacks on the waterfront. The sky is full of brave men: Zumbi, Lucas da Feira, Zé Ninck, Beetle. There between the moon and Lucas is a place for Virgulino Ferreira Lampião, who isn't to die so young. But none of them was a man of the docks, the son of a sailor who traveled in swift sloops. Only Beetle. He was a man of the sea […]. That's why he's the one most loved by the men of the docks. [… Once,] after downing four policemen and wounding several others he went into the woods with two bullets in his jaw and	Essa cidade de Santo Amaro […] foi pátria de muito barão do Império, viscondes, condes, marqueses, mas foi também, gente do cais, a pátria de Besouro. Por esse motivo, somente por esse motivo, não é por produzir açúcar, condes, viscondes, barões, marqueses, cachaça, que Santo Amaro é uma cidade amada dos homens do cais. Mas foi ali que nasceu Besouro, correu naquelas ruas, ali derramou sangue, esfaqueou, atirou, lutou capoeira, cantou sambas. Foi ali perto, em Maracangalha, que o cortaram todinho a facão, foi ali que seu sangue correu e ali brilha a sua estrela, clara e grande, quase tão grande como a de Lucas da Feira. Êle virou estrela, que foi um negro valente. […] Guma olha para o céu onde êle brilha. Se a Lua é maior e brilha mais, se é para ela que primeiro os olhos se voltam, o que êles procuram logo depois é a estrela de Besouro, o mais valente dos negros do cais. O céu está cheio de homens valentes: Zumbi, Lucas da Feira, Zé Ninck, Besouro. Ali entre a Lua e Lucas está o lugar onde ficará Virgulino Ferreira Lampião, que não há de morrer tão cedo. Mas nenhum dêstes foi homem do cais, foi filho de marinheiro, viajou em rápidos saveiros. Só Besouro. Esse foi homem do mar […]. Por isso êle é o mais querido dos homens do cais. [… Uma vez], depois de derrubar quatro soldados e ferir muitos outros, êle entrou pelo mato com duas balas no queixo e uma no braço. Era uma noite escura e o perseguiram, cercaram o mato,

[62] Zumbi dos Palmares (c. 1655–1695) was a key figure in the resistance against the enslavement of Africans by the Portuguese in colonial Brazil. As the final king of the Quilombo dos Palmares, an independent settlement of people who escaped slavery, he remains a powerful symbol of African freedom in Afro-Brazilian culture.
[63] Besouro Mangangá (c. 1895–c. 1924) was a legendary master of capoeira from Bahia.

one in his arm. It was a dark night and they followed him, surrounded the woods. He jumped into the water and, wounded like that, swam like the good sailor he was until a canoe picked him up and a pai-de-santo took care of him. […When he died] all the people of the sea wept for him too, his funeral was like that of any baron, count, viscount, marquis of Santo Amaro. They wept, saying that he was good, open-handed with the poor, with a dagger ready to defend the rights of a sailor. […] Beetle's star twinkles in the sky. It's bright and large. The women say he's watching the evil deeds of the men (barons, counts, viscounts, marquises) of Santo Amaro. He's watching all the injustices that sailors suffer. One day he'll come back for vengeance. He'll come back as someone else, no one will know it's Beetle. His star will disappear from the sky and he will shine on earth. […] Maybe sailors will be able to get married on that day, give a better life to their women and guarantee that they won't starve after their deaths or won't have to prostitute themselves. […] He fought against the barons, counts, viscounts, and marquises who were the owners of the plantations, the green cane fields, and who set the freight rates for sloops and canoes, he invaded plantations, took a little of what belonged to them and divided it among the widows and children whose fathers had died at sea. The barons, viscounts, marquises, and counts made speeches in Parliament, chatted with Dom Pedro II, drank expensive wines, deflowered slave girls, whipped blacks, treated the sloop and canoemen like servants. But they were afraid of Beetle, he was the Devil for them, a name they didn't like to hear. They sent police, they sent men and more men out against him. And they couldn't get Beetle, because there wasn't a woman on the waterfront, on the river, in the towns around the bay who wasn't asking protection for him from Iemanjá. And there was no sloop, no canoe or punt that wouldn't give him a hiding place. […] Beetle will return one day […], asking for different rates, different laws, protection for widows and orphans. […] Santo Amaro is Beetle's land. It doesn't matter if noblemen of the Empire had been born here, the masters of innumerable slaves. […] Barons, counts, viscounts, marquises sleep beside the ruins of their feudal castles in closed tombs that time is eating away. But Beetle glows in the sky, he's a star (Amado 1984, 116–122).	êle se jogou na água e assim ferido nadou como bom marítimo que era, até que uma canoa o acolheu e um pai-de-santo o tratou. […Quando morreu,] todo o povo do mar o chorou também, seu enterro foi como o de nenhum barão, conde, visconde, marquês de Santo Amaro. Choravam que êle era bom, mão aberta para os pobres, punhal pronto a defender o direito de um marítimo. […] A estrela de Besouro pisca no céu. É clara e grande. As mulheres dizem que êle está espiando os malfeitos dos homens (barões, condes, viscondes, marqueses) de Santo Amaro. Está vendo todas as injustiças que os marítimos sofrem. Um dia voltará para se vingar. Voltará outro, ninguém saberá que é Besouro. A sua estrela desaparecerá do céu, êle brilhará na Terra. […] Talvez, que nesse dia os marítimos possam casar, dar vida melhor para as mulheres, garantir que não morrerão de fome após a morte dêles, nem tão pouco precisarão de se prostituir. […] Êle lutava contra os barões, condes, viscondes, marqueses, que eram e são donos dos engenhos, dos campos verdes de cana, que estabeleciam as tabelas de fretes para os saveiros e canoas, êle invadia os engenhos, tirava um pouco do que era dêles e dividia pelas viúvas, pelas crianças cujos pais morreram no mar. Os barões, viscondes, marqueses e condes faziam discurso no Parlamento, conversavam com D. Pedro II, bebiam vinhos caros, defloravam escravas, surravam negros, tratavam os saveireiros e canoeiros como a criados. Mas de Besouro tinham medo, era o Diabo para êles, nome que não gostavam de ouvir. Botaram polícia, botaram homens e mais homens contra êle. E não puderam com Besouro porque não havia mulher no cais, no rio, nas cidades do Recôncavo, que não pedisse por êle a Iemanjá. E não havia saveiro, não havia canoa e batelão, que não lhe desse guarda. […] Um dia Besouro voltará […], pedindo outras tabelas, outras leis, proteção para as viúvas e órfãos. […] Santo Amaro é a terra de Besouro. Não importa que aqui tivessem nascido nobres do Império, senhores de escravos inúmeros. […] Barões, condes, viscondes, marqueses, dormem junto às ruínas dos castelos feudais, em túmulos fechados que o tempo vai comendo. Mas Besouro brilha no céu, é uma estrela (Amado 1965, 122–128).

In this passage, the collective subjectivity of Iemanjá's people is revealed, on several occasions, through specific subjectiveme indicators (e.g. "*all* the people of the sea wept for him"), as well as through narrator's expression of consensus (e.g. "Beetle glows in the sky, he's a star"). Regarding "Besouro" signifier's meaning, the legendary master of capoeira is perceived as a historical figure, who:

1) is of far greater importance—also in the context of "Brazilianness" signifier's meaning negotiations—than those celebrated by official, elitist historiography,

2) became a star because of his heroic deeds (a belief that is a leitmotif in Jorge Amado's work—it is present also in *Jubiabá* and *Captains of the Sands*, among other novels),

3) deserves admiration and reverence, because he was a good man and he protected, with his capoeira skills, the victims of the barons, viscounts, counts, marquises, i.e. victims of those, who, within the hegemonic web of meanings, were considered to be the only important historical actor, which shaped Brazil's true history; the only legitimate beneficiary of the national interest; inherently virtuous, moral, superior, and civilized people,

4) has divine qualities—although he died, "He's watching all the injustices that sailors suffer" and, one day, "he'll come back for vengeance," with a different appearance, to save his people and give them a better life,

5) had protection of Iemanjá,

6) apart from capoeira, he appreciated samba.

Also Zumbi dos Palmares, Lucas da Feira, and Lampião appear in this passage as sea people's heroes. Interestingly, what all these historical figures have in common (apart from their trajectory of resistance) is the fact that, in the hegemonic discourse, they were very far from being seen as idols—they were all killed by order of the authorities (although the narrator predicts that Lampião's death is not near, two years after the publication of *Sea of Death*, he was killed by the police, his head was cut off and, similarly to Zumbi's head, put on public exhibition [Chandler 1978, 229]). Moreover, from the fact that Zumbi was regarded as a hero, one could indirectly infer that the "quilombo"[64] signifier also carried a positive connotation, while "slavery" had an extremely negative one. Similarly, since Lucas

[64] An independent settlement of people who escaped slavery.

da Feira and Lampião were regarded as heroes, it is possible to assume that also the meaning of "cangaço"[65] signifier was positive (however, although Lucas da Feira, one of the first *cangaceiros*, was Afro-Brazilian, it is important to note here that *cangaço* cannot be unquestionably regarded as a part of Afro-Brazilian culture).

The excerpt reveals as well that sea people perceive the Afro-Brazilian medicine as a valid solution to health problems, that when they need healing, they seek help from a *pai-de-santo* (although Brazilian law persecuted Afro-Brazilian healing practices [Oliveira 20015, 102]). Such interpretation can also be confirmed by subjectiveme indicators found in other excerpts. For example:

1) "[Pai Anselmo] was the one who […], by order of Dona Janaína, cured illnesses"[66] (Amado 1984, 70)—here, the subjectiveme indicator is implicit: it is not the fact that he cures, but the fact that sea people seek his help;
2) "'It was a cold, it got worse, it got awful, it turned into the disease…'
   The fat woman advised:
   'Have you taken him to Pai Anselmo yet?'"[67] (Amado 1984, 111).
3) "'Then there's Mariana, you know her, don't you? Zé Pedrinho's wife... '
   'Oh, yes!'
   'Well, she was like that. She got as skinny as a dried codfish. She coughed up a whole lot of blood, it looked like she'd cough up her heart someday. Well, Pai Anselmo gave her something to drink, it was tree bark'"[68] (Amado 1984, 111–112).

The excerpt about Besouro (Beetle) also reveals the meanings ascribed, within the sea people's web of meanings, to such nodal points as "the State" and "the elites." Although

[65] Originating in the Northeast of Brazil during the final decades of the 19th century, this phenomenon of "social banditry" emerged in a region notorious for its dry climate and harsh living conditions. In response to this environment and as a form of defiance against the authorities, numerous individuals—mostly men but also women—chose to lead nomadic lives as outlaws, traversing the backlands in pursuit of sustenance, wealth, and vengeance, among other things.
[66] In original: "Era [Pai Anselmo…] quem com ordem de dona Janaína curava doenças" (Amado 1965, 81).
[67] In original:
"— Foi uma constipação, foi ficando ruim, foi arruinando, deu na moléstia...
A mulher gorda aconselhou:
— Já levou êle pro pai Anselmo?" (Amado 1965, 118).
[68] In original:
"— Pois a Mariana, você conhece, não é? A mulher do Zé Pedrinho...
— Ah, sim!
— Pois ela tava daquele jeito. Ficou tão magra como bacalhau sêco. Botava cada posta de sangue, parecia que um dia botava o coração. Pois pai Anselmo deu uma beberagern, foi pau casca"(Amado 1965, 118).

within the hegemonic discourse “the elites” signifier carried very positive connotations, for Iemanjá’s people, the elites—represented in this passage by the barons, viscounts, counts, marquises, the owners of the plantations, and by those, “who set the freight rates for sloops and canoes”—were not good people. Their memory should not be celebrated. They do not become stars like those who opposed them—namely, Besouro, Zumbi, Lucas da Feira, or Lampião. They are the oppressors of sea people, enemies (they constitute the common enemy that stabilizes, to a certain extent, sea people’s own identity). Because of their injustices and “evil deeds,” the “sailors suffer.” The sea people’s hero fought against them, in defense of the marginalized, and the elites are responsible for his death. Only after vengeance and the defeat of the elites will the sailors be able to obtain “different rates, different laws, protection for widows and orphans,” to “give a better life to their women and guarantee that they won’t starve after their deaths or won’t have to prostitute themselves.” The elites were responsible for the suffering of the sea people’s ancestors during slavery, and the present is portrayed as a continuation of historical hierarchies: they “drank expensive wines, deflowered slave girls, whipped blacks, treated the sloop and canoemen like servants.”

The passage also exposes the fact that the elites were allies of the State: they had soldiers and police at their disposal, “made speeches in Parliament, chatted with Dom Pedro II,” shared common enemies (Besouro, Zumbi dos Palmares, Lucas da Feira, or Lampião); both the elites and the State were indifferent to the problems of the sea people. Therefore, within the web of meanings in question, there is a strong relation between “the elites” and “the State” nodal points—a chain of equivalence, which places the State on the side of the elites, i.e., on the side of the “men of the land.” Since the line separating them is tenuous, on many occasions, an interpretation that applies to one also applies to the other. The meaning of these nodal points is determined, to a certain extent, by the meaning of such lower-level signifiers as “government,” “police,” “soldiers,” “society,” “justice,” “the rich,” “Catholic church,” or “law.”

Before, we have already seen that “the men of the sea laugh at the men of the land who don’t know anything” (Amado 1984, 16). The following passage, in turn, suggests that, for Iemanjá’s people, belonging to this social group, regardless of whether one is a doctor or a Catholic priest, is something profoundly shameful:

if that woman took Guma away, what would become of the boy? He'd be a cabinetmaker, a stonecutter, maybe a doctor or even a priest, dressed like a woman, who knows! And old Francisco's face would be covered with shame over the fate of his nephew and there'd be nothing left for him but go meet Janaína himself at sea some night. No, he wouldn't let that woman take Guma away for anything. […] his face was saying there wasn't a force in the world that could make him give up Guma. The woman waved her hand in that vague gesture and answered: […] "I'll put him in a private school, he'll learn to read, maybe he'll become a doctor like his uncle, my brother... He's not going to drown…" "Oh, missy, fate is something that's decided up there. If he's meant to belong to Janaína, there's no way to free him from it. If he stays here he'll become a real man. If he goes with you he'll end up a weakling, like those cabaret people…" (Amado 1984, 23–24).	se aquela mulher levasse Guma, que seria do menino? Seria marceneiro, pedreiro, talvez doutor ou até padre vestido de mulher, quem sabe! E as faces do velho Francisco se cobririam de vergonha pelo fim de seu sobrinho, e nada lhe restava senão ir êle próprio ao encontro de Janaína numa noite do mar. Não, por nada êle deixaria que aquela mulher levasse Guma. […] seu rosto dizia que não havia fôrça que o fizesse entregar Guma. A mulher estendeu a mão naquele gesto vago e respondeu: […] — Boto êle num colégio, vai aprender a ler, talvez vire doutor como o tio dêle, meu irmão... Não vai morrer afogado... — Sei lá dona, destino é coisa feita lá em cima. Se êle tem de ser de Janaína não há saber que livre êle. Se êle ficar aqui, vira homem de verdade. Se for com a senhora, acaba um mofino que nem esses homens de cabaré... (Amado 1965, 39–40).

While this excerpt contains subjectiveme indicators that reveal an individual subjectivity (although, in my opinion, it is justifiable to read Francisco as the group's spokesperson, especially in the context of his responsibility for the group's memory and his *apaló*/*orókin* condition), there are also several passages, which reveal how the whole collectivity perceives signifiers that are related to "the elites" and "the State" nodal points. For instance:

Rosa Palmeirao has already hit six cops, seen the inside of twenty jails, hit a lot of men. Old Francisco sings: "Rosa beat up six cops, All on Saint John's Eve. They called their inspector up, He said I'm not going, won't leave. All of the cops came at her, She made a grab for her knife. The row was a terrible matter, A night for losing your life." She downed a man, chased off all the police. She was valiant and she was beautiful. Old Francisco sings of Rosa Palmeirao's deeds and they all applaud: "The order said bring her in,	Rosa Palmeirão já deu em seis soldados, já comeu vinte prisões, já bateu em muito homem. O velho Francisco canta: "Rosa bateu em seis soldados na noite de São João. Chamaram seu delegado. Êle disse — não vou lá não". "Veio tôda a puliça. Ela puxou o punhal. Foi medonho o rebuliço. Foi uma noite fatal". Ela bateu em homem, ela fez correr tôda a polícia. Era valente e era bela. O velho Francisco canta as proezas de Rosa Palmeirão e todos aplaudem: "Veio orde de trazer

Palmeirão dead or alive… She pulled out her razor thin, Men all around taking a dive…" They listen and they applaud. […] all that was left of her on those nights was her ABC ballad and the tales men told under the shade of the Market overhang. […] The image of Rosa Palmeirão passed through the memory of the men of the docks. […] they liked to hear her ABC and the tales of her fights (Amado 1984, 48–49).	Palmeirão ou morta ou viva… Ela puxou a navaia. Só se viu homem correr…" Ouvem e aplaudem. […] só resta dela nessas noites o seu ABC e as histórias que os homens contam debaixo da sombra que o Mercado projeta. […] Na memória dos homens do cais passava o perfil de Rosa Palmeirão. […] gostavam de ouvir o seu ABC e as histórias das suas brigas (Amado 1965, 61–62).

Here, the "police" signifier denotes a brutal enemy who persecuted, on several occasions, the sea people's heroine. Moreover, Rosa Palmeirão is perceived as a heroine precisely because she was able to "chase off" the police—the oppressor. Her heroic deeds are celebrated through folktales and ABCs, which, in Brazilian popular culture, especially in the Northeast, are popular songs that pay tribute to important figures—often a folk hero, a political or religious leader, or a respected member of the community. In this specific passage, it is only Francisco who sings the song, but "they all applaud," and it is "the men of the docks" who celebrate Rosa Palmeirão through their tales and ABCs. In addition, earlier in the novel, the narrator informs the reader that "The men of the docks, who know her, like her and no one will refuse her a light for her pipe and a long handshake"[69] (Amado 1984, 47). In *Captains of the Sands*, we even read that she became a saint in the Candomblé variety named "Candomblé de caboclo" (Amado 1937, 284, 286).

Such interpretation of the "police" signifier meaning can also be confirmed through the excerpt, in which the narrator focalizes Guma:

If they made a search, if [the police] found Traíra dying in the sloop, then his race would be over. There might not be any jail. It wasn't customary in cases like that. He might be found floating in the water with a knife in his side, as an example. It wouldn't do any good to take it out on Traíra, who was already dying, but they had to get their revenge on someone. The boy was from a good family, important people... […] the armed men will put an end to them. Later on they'll say they resisted. Guma can't even resist. A knife is	E se dessem busca, se [a polícia encontrasse] Traíra agonizando no saveiro, então a sua carreira estava terminada. Talvez nem houvesse prisão. Não costumava haver por aquelas bandas. Talvez ficasse boiando na água com uma faca nas costas para exemplo. Não adiantava mais se vingarem em Traíra, que já estava morrendo, mas tinham que se vingar em alguém. O rapaz era de boa família, gente de prestígio... […] os homens armados darão cabo dêles. Dirão depois que êles resistiram. Guma nem pode

[69] In original: "Os homens do cais, que a conhecem, gostam dela e nenhum lhe nega fogo para o seu cachimbo e um largo apêrto de mão" (Amado 1965, 60).

only good when it's man to man. When they jump on board the sloop it will be pistol in hand, rifles shooting (Amado 1984, 104–106).	resistir. Faca só serve corpo a corpo. Quando êles pularem para o saveiro, será de parabélum na mão, rifles atirando (Amado 1965, 111–113).

In this case, the police is not perceived only as an enemy, but also as unjust, vindictive, brutal, lying, gangster-like people, who do not respect the law, who kill the sea people without scruples, and who only serve the elite, "good" families of "important" people.

Furthermore, from Guma's perspective, the elites are extremely ungrateful and unjust:

Guma is in command. He gives the orders. Only in that way can a man from the waterfront ever get to be captain of a ship. Only through the wiles of Iemanjá. It will be a singular night. Tomorrow neither the Englishman nor Mr. Godofredo will recognize him when he passes on the Valiant. No one will call him hero. Guma knows that. But he knows that it was ever thus and that only a miracle, as Dona Dulce hopes, can change that law (Amado 1984, 68).	Guma é quem comanda. É êle quem dá ordens. Só mesmo assim um homem da beira do cais pode chegar a comandante de um navio. Só por arte de Iemanjá. Será uma única noite. Amanhã nem o inglês, nem seu Godofredo o conhecerão mais quando êle passar com o Valente. Ninguém o chamará de herói. Guma sabe disso. Mas sabe que sempre foi assim e que só mesmo um milagre, como quer D. Dulce, pode mudar essa lei (Amado 1965, 78–79).

Also dialogues can reveal how the sea people perceive the elites:

"Be careful. If that business blows up it will be a royal scandal. Nothing will happen to Murad, he's worth over a million, he can fix things. But it'll be hard on poor people like you (Amado 1984, 242).	— Toma cuidado. Se esse negócio rebentar, é um escândalo danado. Com Murad não acontece nada, êle tem mais de dez mil contos, se arranja. Mas o pau vai rolar nas costas dos pobres como tu (Amado 1965, 235).

Here, they appear as untouchable by the justice. The justice, in turn, is corrupt: it only punishes the poor and not the representatives of the elite. Iemanjá's people, however, have their own law, the "law of the docks," which, for them, is more important than the State's law (it can even contradict the official legislation, as in the following example):

[Guma] loved the law of the docks and it didn't permit anyone to pull a knife unless the enemy were greater in number. Anyone who didn't obey the law of the docks wasn't worth anything in his eyes (Amado 1984, 44).	[Guma] amava a lei do cais e ela não permitia que se puxasse uma navalha, a não ser quando o adversário era maior em número. Quem não cumpria a lei do cais não valia nada para êle (Amado 1965, 58).

While the State's law is violated by the sea people on numerous occasions, the meaning of the "law of the docks" signifier denotes a law that must not be broken, even in the face of deadly danger, and even when upholding it means risking one's life to help an antagonist:

1. It's not for the money that Guma is going out on the Valiant in an attempt to bring that ship to port. […] a man doesn't go to his death for two hundred *milreis*. […] It's simply because a sad whistle comes from a ship, a call for help, and the law of the sea ordains that a person attends to those who ask for help at sea (Amado 1984, 65).	1. Não é pelo dinheiro que Guma vai no Valente tentar trazer esse navio para o porto. […] não é por duzentos mil réis que um homem vai para a morte. […] É mesmo porque vem um apito triste do navio, um pedido de socorro, e a lei do cais manda que se atenda aos que no mar pedem socorro (Amado 1965, 75–76).
2. It's Traíra, who's going to jump into the water. He leaps on top of him and he still struggles, he wants to get it over with once and for all, he doesn't want Guma to be sacrificed because of him. The shaved head gleams in the light of the lantern. Guma drags him down into the hold. He looks at him with thanks and pride. He, too, knows that it's the law of the docks and that Guma knows how to obey it. The two of them will die, then. […] He catches sight of the lantern of a sloop. Who can be coming? He'll know in a little while. If it's a friend maybe everything can be saved. The sloop approaches. It's Jacques' sloop. Just that morning they'd had a fight on the waterfront. But Guma knows he can go to him for help. Because that's what the law of the docks says. At a signal from Guma's lantern Jacques' sloop stops. Jacques is startled. He'd been waiting for the moment to get his revenge on Guma. But the latter explains what had happened, the chase, Traíra lying there. Jacques doesn't argue. They transfer Traíra to his sloop (107).	2. É Traíra que vai se jogar na água. Se atira em cima dêle e êle ainda luta, quer acabar com aquilo de uma vez, não quer sacrificar Guma por sua causa. A cabeça raspada brilha à luz da lanterna. Guma o arrasta para o porão, êle o olha agradecido e com orgulho. Êle também sabe que a lei do cais é essa e Guma a sabe cumprir. Morrerão os dois. […] Enxerga a lanterna de um saveiro. Quem virá? Dentro em pouco êle o saberá. Se fôr um amigo talvez tudo esteja salvo. O saveiro se aproxima. É o saveiro de Jacques. Ainda esta manhã êles brigaram à beira do cais. Mas Guma sabe que pode recorrer a êle. Porque assim manda a lei do cais. A um sinal da lanterna de Guma o saveiro de Jacques pára. Jacques está espantado. Estava esperando uma hora para se vingar de Guma. Mas êste lhe explica o que aconteceu, a perseguição, Traíra deitado ali. Jacques não discute. Passam Traíra para o saveiro (114–115).

While in the hegemonic discourse, the nodal point "morality" was synonymous with Catholic morality, within the collective subjectivity of Iemanjá's people, "morality" referred to the moral code of the law of the docks, which was grounded primarily in such values as solidarity, fraternity, and bravery. Moreover, whereas in the hegemonic discourse Afro-Brazilians—along with their cultures and religions—were perceived as immoral and sinful (and the white elites as inherently virtuous, morally superior people), in *Sea of Death*, such perception is contested. Nevertheless, the legitimization of Afro-Brazilian people, cultures, and religions is achieved not only through the construction of collective subjectivity, but also through specific strategies that shape the ideological overtone of the novel (and reveal the narrator's/implied author's attitude towards the particularities of the ideological profile of the collective protagonist):

1) the narrator's explicit disapprovals or approvals (in accordance with his value system, for example);
2) the narrator's identification with the collectivity (which implied adopting its perspective);
3) the degree of exposure (the attention given to the CS, also in comparison with other subjectivities);
4) the proportion of the events which legitimize the CS, or its representatives, to those that delegitimize them (the implied author's presence and their ideologically biased selectivity is particularly perceptible in this aspect);
5) the representation of storyworld's social reality and the collectivity's situation within it;
6) negative or positive representation of other subjectivities;
7) ascription of structural roles (e.g., hero, helper, villain) to the CS representatives and their antagonists.

Regarding the first two points, the narrator states already in the introduction that "Iemanjá's people have much to tell"[70] and he invites the readers to listen to their stories, because he "*loves* these stories and these songs and attends the rites of Dona Janaína."[71] In addition, he admits that due to his condition as a man of the land, his perspective is more

[70] In original: "O povo de Iemanjá tem muito que contar" (Amado 1965, 2).
[71] In original: "ama essas histórias e essas canções e vai às festas de D. Janaína" (Amado 1965, 2).

limited than that of the men of the sea. After this introduction, as we have already seen, there are numerous explicit approvals of sea people's actions and behaviors—as well as disapprovals of the actions and behaviors of the men of the land—but most of the time they are conveyed through a double-voiced discourse, which expresses the communal point of view of Iemanjá's people, and thus, cannot be unequivocally identified with the narrator's voice. Nonetheless, the extraordinary abundance of this double-voiced discourse, without any perceptible irony, suggests that the narrator approves of what is being uttered (especially in the light of his introduction).

The legitimization in question is achieved also through the high degree of exposure, through the attention that is given to the CS of sea people: they are the main characters of the story, the narrator focalizes the collectivity on numerous occasions, which contrasts with the fact, that he nearly does not focalize the "men of the land."

In relation to the fourth point, the proportion of the events that legitimize the CS, or its representatives, to those that delegitimize them is overwhelmingly favorable for Iemanjá's people. Out of 168 events I have analyzed, 93 can be classified as the narrator's or implied author's legitimations of the CS of Iemanjá's people. The other 75 events are mostly neutral (or they delegitimize the "men of the land"). Even when sea people violate the law or behave in a dubious way, it is generally justified by their difficult living conditions and adverse social situation, which are presented as the root causes of such behavior. In Jorge Amado's novel, sea people are portrayed as solidary, humane, empathic, internally rich, honorable, talented, persevering, and morally superior to the men of the land; their culture is portrayed as rich, complex, and unique.

Regarding the storyworld's social reality and the collectivity's situation within it, we have already seen that all the social configuration of the storyworld of *Sea of Death* is the same as the social configuration of Brazil in 1930s and, therefore, sea people suffer racism, economic exploitation, their culture is persecuted, they are abandoned and even oppressed by the government, exposed to many injustices, and mistreated by the police and the elites. The elite representatives, in turn, are unjustifiably privileged.

As to the representation of other subjectivities, although the narrator rarely focalizes the collectivity of the men of the land, it is possible to identify a few individual cases of such

a focalization. Generally, it expresses the hegemonic consensus, exposes its unethicalness and prejudices, and therefore, delegitimizes the group. For instance:

1. The woman had been killed too. She'd got between Guma and the bullet the sergeant fired, but nobody worried about Rita, *because a prostitute was of no importance. The boy was, he came from a good family, highly regarded in the town, the son of a lawyer*. […] Nobody knew that she had only been purified, had left that life for which she hadn't been born. And she'd left it through her love (Amado 1984, 102).	1. A mulher também estava morta. Se metera entre Guma e a bala que o sargento atirara, mas ninguém ligou para Rita, *que uma prostituta não tem importância. O rapaz, sim, era de boa família, conceituado no lugar, filho de um advogado*. […] Ninguém sabia que ela tinha apenas se purificado, deixado aquela vida, para a qual não nascera. E a deixara pelo seu amor (Amado 1965, 109–110).
2. Her relatives, the aunt and uncle who ran a small shop and had put all their hopes in Lívia's beauty (She could make a good marriage…) didn't look upon Guma with good eyes, right after thanking him. They expected him to appear, receive their thanks, and go on his way without looking back. *What could Lívia hope for from a sailor? And what could they hope for from someone who was even poorer than they?* Six months during which, in order to see her, exchange a handful of words […], he had to pass under the eyes of the aunt and uncle. Looks of anger, antipathy, disdain. He'd saved their lives, but now he wanted to carry off the only hope for a better life they had left (125).	2. Os parentes dela, tios que tinham uma pequena quitanda e na beleza de Lívia (poderia fazer um bom casamento…) punham tôda a sua esperança, logo após os agradecimentos não viam Guma com bons olhos. Esperavam que êle aparecesse, recebesse os agradecimentos e seguisse sua viagem sem olhar para trás. *Que podia Lívia esperar de um marinheiro? E que podiam êles esperar de alguém que era ainda mais pobre que êles?* Seis meses em que para vê-la, para dar dois dedos de prosa […], tinha que atravessar sob os olhares dos tios. Olhares de raiva, de antipatia, de desprêzo. Êle lhes salvara a vida, mas agora queria tirar a única esperança que lhes restava de uma vida melhor (130).

Other subjectivities are represented only to create a contrast, which serves to produce an even more distinct image of the collective subjectivity of Iemanjá's people (in the last chapter, for example, when everybody sees the Orisha of water, Dona Dulce sees Lívia instead).

Regarding the last point (ascription of structural roles), sea people can be considered, in accordance with Mieke Bal's requirements (1997, 132), as a collective protagonist (or "hero") of the book, since Jorge Amado's novel focuses on their detailed characterization, their occurrence is frequent and independent, especially in significant moments of the story, they initiate actions, and they have relations with the biggest number of other characters. *Sea of Death* is a story about them, about their lives, struggles, beliefs, morality, culture, etc. To

be more specific, they can also be understood as a collective "hero-victim," i.e., a hero that is "confronted with opponents, but will not vanquish them" (Bal 1997, 132). The men of the land, in turn, can be read as opponents (or "villains," "antagonists") (Bal 1997, 201–202)—with individual exceptions of such characters as Dr. Rodrigo or Dona Dulce, who can be interpreted as helpers (Bal 1997, 201–202)—since they are the negative reference, the "common enemy;" their web of meanings is the hegemonic one and thus, it is in conflict with sea people's collective subjectivity. In Bueno's view (2012, 104), there is a radical separation between the men of the land and those of the sea, and he equates this division with the division between social classes. In *Sea of Death*, the men of the land are portrayed as immoral, cruel, evil, laughable, boring, unjust, ungrateful, exploitive, superficial, greedy, socially privileged, and as the main cause of the protagonists' misfortune. Hence, if we adopt the categories of "subject" and "object" (Bal 1997, 197–198), the sea people can be considered the subject who aspires towards reaching a decent life (the object), but the opponent (men of the land) "prevents the subject from reaching the object" (Bal 1997, 202), which is particularly evident in the episode of the strike that was organized by the sea people and opposed by the men of the land: "The sloop masters and a great many canoemen made common cause with the men on the piers. The stevedores won, cargo rates for sloops and canoes also rose. But there were persecutions"[72] (Amado 1984, 247).

3.4 Conclusions

This chapter has applied the theoretical, methodological, and contextual foundations laid out in the previous sections to conduct a model analysis of the collective subjectivity of the protagonists in Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death* and of its relation to the hegemonic discourse in 1930s Brazil. The analysis results reveal that:

1) *Sea of Death* can be regarded as a novel with a "collective hero"—not only in an informal or impressionistic sense, but also in a technical one, as it may be classified as a Collective Narrative (Margolin 2000, 593). The sea people are not just a loose

[72] In original: "Os mestres de saveiro e grande parte dos canoeiros fizeram causa comum com os homens da estiva. Os estivadores venceram, as tabelas para transporte em saveiro e canoa tarnbém aumentaram. Mas houve perseguições" (Amado 1965, 239–240).

group of individuals but are portrayed as a cohesive force—an agent that shapes the narrative, as well as the fates of individual characters. Collective subjectivity of Iemanjá's people works in this novel as a "complex and decisive macrosemantic procedure, which serves as a bridge between microstylistic features and large-scale thematic concerns" (Margolin 2000, 595), which determines the characters' actions, interactions, and properties by means of intragroup qualities (e.g. they understand a signifier in a determined way and therefore they act accordingly). As a result, characters are depicted primarily as components of a social group, rather than as isolated, individual selves.

2) The storyworld's hegemonic discourse is a faithful reflection of the real-world one (paradoxically, the hegemonic discourse of the Vargas Era, cannot be identified with the Vargas regime's discourse—it should instead be identified with a discourse whose origins date back to the colonial period, with "the brigantine cultural heritage"). The construction of the sea people's CS, in turn, occurs through the articulation (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 105) of an alternative, counter-hegemonic discourse, which is represented by the community of sea people. The discourse introduced a different web of meanings into the Brazilian discursive field, thereby negotiating the meaning of unjustly delegitimized signifiers, undoing the genesis amnesia (Bourdieu 2003, 19) of social inequalities, revealing the contingent nature of the hegemonic "objectivity," and trying to arouse in readers positive emotions, empathy, comprehension, and solidarity towards an "other" that was excluded from the meaning of the "Brazilianness" signifier. Although the history of the reception of Amado's novels provides a large number of facts that argue solidly for recognizing the impact of the strategy of collective subjectivity construction on social reality[73]—especially in the context of Van Dijk's findings about speakers' (including writers') potential to affect the future actions of their audience (1996, 88–89)—an estimation of its actual scale of impact exceeds the scope of this research.[74] However, it is noteworthy that Amado's widely-read (Bueno 2001, 266) literature had a

[73] See: Silva 2018; Silva 2006; Goldstein 2019.

[74] Particularly relevant in the context of this promising direction for future research are such papers as: Richard Gerrig's *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading* (2019); Suzanne Keen's *Empathy and the Novel* (2007); and Eva Maria Emy Koopman and Frank Hakemulder's *Effects of literature on empathy and self-reflection: A theoretical-empirical framework* (2015).

significant role (precisely because of the above-mentioned reasons) in the cultural and political emancipation of marginalized people not only in Brazil, but also in the Portuguese-speaking African countries, where it was the main inspiration for many important socially engaged writers, freedom fighters, and politicians (Bergamo 2020; Charchalis 58–61; Silva 2018, 208); "an inspiring stimulus to […] authors who produced significant works of African literatures in the Portuguese language, […] an aesthetic and ideological horizon that pointed toward promising paths leading to human emancipation" (Bergamo 2020, 125)[75].

3) The discursive struggle in question involved different understandings of reality, which were in antagonistic opposition to one another, especially regarding the meaning that they ascribed to such floating signifiers as the State, the elites, morality, or Afro-Brazilian culture (interrelated mostly with such lower-level signifiers as: Africa, Afro-Brazilian religions, Orisha, Iemanjá, Afro-Brazilian music, capoeira, Nago language, Afro-Brazilian healing practices, or Afro-Brazilian historical figures). The counter-hegemonic discourse contested the hegemonic web of meanings that was shaped by Brazil's colonial legacy, conservatism, pseudoscientific racial theories, Eurocentrism, or persistent racial and social hierarchies.
4) The counter-hegemonic web of meanings—with its nodal points being Afro-Brazilian culture, the State, morality and the elites—constitutes the common denominator of the subjective structure of the sea people, which allows us to assume the existence of their collective subjectivity (as an object constructed by the analyst, since it does not exist in such a delimited form—the delimitation, however, is evidence-driven).

[75] For instance, Pepetela—one of Angola's most renowned writers and intellectuals, who fought in the guerrilla war for his country's independence—states the following: "From a very young age [...] I had a connection with Jorge [...]. I don't know whether any literary influences remained from that encounter in my early youth. But there were certainly social and political influences. The lands and situations portrayed in his books were very similar to those of colonial Angola's coast" [transl.—E. Ch.] (2010, 57); Noémia de Souza—Mozambican poet and anti-colonial militant—in her *Poema a Jorge Amado* ("Poem to Jorge Amado"), included in the collection *Sangue Negro* ("Black Blood"), which compiles works written a few years before Mozambican War of Independence, celebrates enthusiastically the work of Jorge Amado (Sousa 2016, 125) and writes that in Mozambique, the people are the same as in Bahia, that they are "brothers to the sea people of Bahia" [transl.—E. Ch.]; Mia Couto—another prominent writer from Mozambique—recalls: "We lived under a colonial dictatorship. The works of Jorge Amado were subject to censorship. Bookstores were shut down, and publishers were persecuted for distributing those works. Our encounter with our Brazilian brother thus took place with the epic flavor of defiance and clandestinity" [transl.—E. Ch.] (2011, 62, 65).

5) In *Sea of Death*, the collective subjectivity was represented through both explicit and implicit subjectiveme indicators (which included characters' actions, utterances, thoughts, and emotions), as well as through such narrative strategies as the convention of "expression of consensus" (the narrator focalizes the collectivity to convey the "communal point of view" [Leech, Short 1981, 349–350] of Iemanjá's people—this "double-voiced discourse" is extraordinarily abundant).
6) On certain occasions, Amado juxtaposes two contrasting perspectives (that of men of the land, i.e., the representatives of the hegemonic discourse, and that of men of the sea) to confer a marvelous aspect on his literary universe, while keeping its realist, documentary character at the same time. In my view, the author's project of negotiating the meaning of unjustly delegitimized signifiers through the strategy of "marvelous" collective subjectivity construction constitutes a crucial aspect of his work. This is particularly evident in the light of the fact that, in the interview for "A Fondo," he identified himself with the approach of his character Pedro Archanjo, who reveals "the key to the hardest riddle of all" (Amado 1971, 312), who reveals the "position that"—in Amado's own words—"guided [Amado's] entire literary work" (Soler Serrano, 30min 10s–33min). Nevertheless, it is important to note that the sea people's collective subjectivity is characterized not only by marvelousness, spirituality, or faith-based thinking, but also by their understanding of specific social and cultural matters, among other things. Moreover, thanks to this particular narrative strategy, the theme, style, and level of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate the novel, as well as the plane of reality on which the story takes place, are so harmonized that the reader can have a sensation of deep immersion in the narrated reality.
7) Sea people's collective subjectivity affects the storyworld also in other ways: it affects the character's decisions, trajectory and, therefore, the course of the whole story (it is especially interesting in the light of the fact that Jorge Amado often emphasized that his literary characters gained autonomy during the writing process, at times making decisions that were unexpected and independent of his intentions as the author—for example, in an interview given to *Jornal Opção* [Belém 1997], he confessed that a character was "slipping away from him"). The sea people's common

understanding of certain signifiers affects their daily life, emotional and spiritual life, their love life, family life; it affects their artistic production, the way they deal with adversities; it organizes their social life, relations with other characters, leisure activities, festivities calendar; On certain occasions, it determines what they say or leave unsaid; Because of their common understanding of "Iemanjá" signifier, the goddess seems to be one of the most important characters of *Sea of Death*, although, effectively, she can be considered as such only if the reader adopts the web of meanings of Iemanjá's people and interprets the work through this prism—otherwise, Iemanjá's presence has to be considered as a consequence of a culturally conditioned unreliable narration (hence, it is reasonable to assume that even the narration is strongly affected by the collective subjectivity of the sea people, especially when the narrator focalizes individual characters or uses the "double-voiced discourse" to convey the sea people's communal point of view, which he does throughout the entire text with notable frequency—he adjusts his mode of narration to his intention of presenting the sea people's perspective). Furthermore, if Jorge Amado had not constructed this entire collective subjectivity along the whole story, the climax of the novel could not have occurred, and Lívia's character would not have acquired the significance she ultimately attains—when the sea people see Iemanjá in her place, at the end of the story. This observation is crucial, as Lívia's elevation plays a key role in shaping the novel's conclusion and overall message. This moment constitutes a major turning point: whereas the widows of the men of the sea had previously been doomed to a tragic fate, Lívia's "transformation" introduces a message of hope. It functions as a call to struggle for their dignity. In addition, the narrator's intention of presenting Iemanjá's people CS also affects the narrative's rhythm (Bal 1997, 99–111): the action is at times obstructed by long descriptions of the collective protagonist's habits, beliefs, etc.

8) The results of the CS analysis enabled me to describe precisely and systematically (in the form of a web of meanings) the particularities of the ideological profile of the sea people collectivity (as well as its other, non-ideological aspects). They also enabled me to analyze this profile in relation to the hegemonic "objectivity," as well as to the narrative strategies that shaped the novel's ideological overtone and revealed the

narrator's/implied author's favorable attitude towards the collective protagonist and critical attitude towards the sea people's opponents. Based on the results of this analysis, I disagree with the novel's interpretation by the leftist intellectuals mentioned by Luís Bueno (2012, 102), as well as with critics and writers such as Graciliano Ramos (1946, 22), who perceived *Sea of Death* as conveying a message contrary to its intended meaning, or Rubem Braga (1937, 3), who argued that the novel resembled literature aligned with integralist ideology. My position is more closely aligned with that of Bueno (2001, 335–339), who argues that *Sea of Death* presents marginality as a potential source of revolutionary energy, and that this constitutes the deeper meaning of the novel as proletarian literature: to emphasize present suffering while locating within that very present the forces of rebellion capable of inspiring the imagination of a "someday" when exploitation has come to an end. I would further argue that *Sea of Death* is a profoundly socially engaged novel, not only because it legitimizes the perspective of the marginalized social group whose worldview is distinctly counter-hegemonic (and thus, negotiates the meaning of unjustly delegitimized signifiers), but also because its ending (Lívia's "transformation" into Iemanjá, which could not have occurred, if Jorge Amado had not constructed sea people's collective subjectivity along the whole story) can be read as a powerful call to struggle. Although delivered in a subtle, symbolic, and non-explicit manner, this message remains unmistakably present. In this respect, my study with the focus on CS has helped illuminate "the complexity that *Sea of Death* attained but which was not fully recognized at the time of its release," and "acknowledge the novel's qualities and discern the importance of Jorge Amado within the Brazilian literary tradition—an importance that has yet to be fully appreciated" [transl.—E. Ch.] (Bueno 2012, 109).

9) In line with the task of reassessing of the novel's complexity and Amado's literary significance, it is worth reconsidering certain criticisms regarding the "persistent flaws in Jorge Amado's work"—as Fábio Lucas summarizes from the broader critical discourse (1972, 179–180)—particularly those concerning the "absence of formal experimentation" and the "use of traditional narrative techniques" (1972, 179–180). In light of the results of my study, these criticisms are open to question. For instance,

while Mario Vargas Llosa considered the narrator's point of view in *The Kingdom of This World* an "incredible technical achievement" (2002, 84–85), Jorge Amado had already achieved a comparable feat thirteen years before the Cuban classic, and, in my view, in a more consistent manner.

10) The theoretical-methodological framework I developed has proven to be well-suited for the analysis of *Sea of Death*, yielding valuable research findings.

In my view, I have demonstrated that collective subjectivity—especially its religious aspect—is an essential element of the novel. Both Luís Bueno's and Ebenezer Adedeji Omoteso's words regarding *Sea of Death* seem to additionally confirm the relevance of my analysis:

> all the action takes place, if not under the influence of supernatural forces born from Bahia's popular religiosity, then at least in relation to them. […] In the supernatural, both the worldview grounded in popular values and the novel's ideological framing are projected, along with an awareness of the divide between the narrator's world and that of the characters [transl.—E. Ch.] (Bueno 2012, 102–106).

> The role of the myth of Iemanjá, mother and wife of the valiant sailors, as structural principle is also significant. The myth indeed hangs like the sword of Damocles over the characters and controls the course of the narration. It certainly provides the novel's main structural feature, developing the action of the plot (Omoteso 1997, 12).

The distance between the data and my interpretation varied across the analysis—at times it was minimal, at others more significant. However, to support my claims, I employed a diversified range of methodological strategies, drawing on both individual-level and collective-level indicators.

To conclude, I would like to emphasize that I have not analyzed a collective subjectivity of a real social group, but that of fictional characters. All my observations regarding the sea people—their habits, beliefs, and so forth—refer exclusively to non-actual individuals: hypothetical beings created by Jorge Amado.

Conclusions

Drawing on the findings of this study, the collective subjectivity of literary characters can be defined as a concept that accounts for the common denominators of the subjective structure of the members of a group of literary characters (understood as non-actual individuals, hypothetical beings, in line with Uri Margolin's [1989] definition, which relies on Possible Worlds Theory). CS encompasses the common denominator of their ways of thinking, feeling, and acting (which are analyzable thanks to Alan Palmer's fictional minds framework), and is determined by socio-historical processes, everyday life, identification with social ideals, collective memory and projects, beliefs, positive or negative social experiences, and the group's acceptation or repudiation of public figures, among other factors that occur within storyworlds.

Similarly to real-world collective subjectivities (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso 2019, ch. 2, *Subjetividad colectiva* section), fictional *CSs do not refer to discourses*, although *they interpenetrate with them*. While discourses occur at the level of a (fictional) social space, subjectivities occur at the level of individual (fictional) minds; they not only shape, but also are shaped by discourses. It is an interplay of particular structures of meanings, each one occurring at its own level and affecting the other. Due to their analogies, they can both be analyzed and described in an analogous way: as webs of meanings (it is important, however, to keep in mind that delimiting CSs and discourses in this way requires understanding them as objects constructed by the analyst, since they do not exist in such a delimited form—the delimitation should be reasonable, evidence-driven). Additionally, the meanings, which stem from a particular subjectivity level, when articulated, begin to operate on another level, on the level of discursive struggles, whether they reproduce or alter common ascriptions of meanings. In other words, discourses are "structured totalit[ies] resulting from the articulatory practice" (Laclau, Mouffe 2001, 105), while subjectivities serve as reservoirs of meaning, from which these practices draw.

Furthermore, collective subjectivities do not presuppose any "collective mind"—they solely encompass the *common denominators* of the subjective structure of the members of a

group. Similarly to discourses (understood by Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe in a poststructuralist way), CSs are dynamic *structures*. They constitute "an open system, a dynamic totality which is relative to other dynamic totalities and implies not equilibrium, but equilibrations and reequilibrations" (Fabris 2012, 34). The meaning of signifiers that make up these webs of meanings can never be permanently fixed (although in literary works they tend to be relatively static).

For a fictional collective subjectivity to exist, a collective narrative agent (Margolin 2000) is necessary. The three conditions (Margolin 2000, 593–594) for a collective narrative agent to exist are that 1) in various narrative propositions, whether explicitly or not, the argument position is occupied by an expression that designates a collectivity; 2) in these specific propositions, the predicate position is occupied by predicates that apply to the whole collectivity, as one entity, or by predicates that designate collective actions that can be carried out only by a group as a single unit; 3) the collectivity that occupies the argument position—as a whole, as a single entity—is ascribed a variety of thematic roles throughout the actions that are narrated (agent, experiencer, or patient). Although Uri Margolin admits that "neither 'numerous narrative propositions' [1] nor 'a range of thematic roles' [3] can be exactly quantified" and that "there will inevitably be borderline or disputed cases" (2000, 594), he enumerates other stylistic features that additionally emphasize the narrative focus on the group (595; see section 2.1.3).

A collective subjectivity of literary characters can affect the storyworld in a variety of ways. For instance:

1) It works as a "complex and decisive macrosemantic procedure, which serves as a bridge between microstylistic features and large-scale thematic concerns" (Margolin 2000, 595), influencing the characters' decisions, actions, interactions, and properties by means of intragroup qualities, and thus favoring the depiction of collective narrative agents as a cohesive force.
2) If it affects the character's properties, decisions and actions, it also affects their trajectory and, therefore, the course of the whole story. Moreover, it can affect their daily life; emotional, spiritual, and love life; social and family life; relations with other characters, the way they deal with adversities; it can determine what they say or leave unsaid, etc.

3) It can shape the reader's perception of fundamental aspects of the storyworld, such as the identity of the protagonist or the significance of particular characters and events. As illustrated by the analysis of *Sea of Death*, the very existence of certain figures (e.g., Iemanjá) within the fictional universe may depend largely on the interpretive framework provided by the collective subjectivity represented in the narrative.
4) It can be essential to the development of key narrative events, including the occurrence of the climax or the transformation of character significance within the storyworld—as seen in the analysis of *Sea of Death,* the symbolic elevation of certain characters may depend directly on the interpretive framework established by the collective subjectivity. Such constructions can affect the ideological overtone of a narrative.
5) The narrator's commitment to representing the collective subjectivity can also affect the narrative's rhythm, as the action may be periodically slowed or interrupted by detailed descriptions of the collective's customs, beliefs, or shared experiences.
6) The portrayal of collective subjectivity may require the narrator to employ various narrative strategies, shifting between different modes of narration, narrative conventions, and techniques of speech and consciousness representation. Depending on the strategy, it can even determine the level of reality on which the narrator situates himself to narrate the novel and, if it is harmonized with the theme, style, and the plane of reality on which the story takes place, the reader can have a sensation of deep immersion in the narrated reality. Moreover, the level of reality on which the narrator situates himself—in accordance with the collective subjectivity he intends to portray—can influence how the narrative is classified in terms of genre. For example, according to Mario Vargas Llosa, Alejo Carpentier's *The Kingdom of This World*

> often unfolds on a mythical or legendary plane—the first level of fantastic literature or the last of realism—and is narrated by an impersonal narrator who, though he doesn't establish himself entirely on that same level, comes very close to it, brushing up against it, so that the distance he maintains from his material is small enough to almost make us live inside the myths and legends of his story and yet unequivocal enough to make us realize that what we are being told is not objective reality but rather a reality undone by the credulity of a town that has not given up magic, witchcraft, or irrational practices, although on the outside it seems to have embraced the rationalism" (2002, 84–85).

7) If the narrator adopts the perspective of a faith-based thinking collective, and the reader does not share this worldview, the resulting interpretation may characterize the narration as unreliable (Booth 1961).
8) It can be the central subject of a narrative, its most important component, or even a *sine qua non* for its very existence—as in Jorge Amado's *Ogun's Compadre* (1978 [1964]).

The results of my study confirm that the use of the concept of collective subjectivity can shed new light on our understanding of literary works (especially those with a collective protagonist). In my view, thanks to the systematic framework I have proposed, it constitutes a valuable analytic tool that can benefit narrative scholars who seek to expand our understanding of issues with which CS intersects, including unreliable narration, focalization, collective narrative agents, viewpoint, perspective, voice, speech categories, consciousness representation, ideology, discursive struggles, or characterization. Hence, the concept can be applied in practical analyses of specific narrative works, as well as in theoretical reflections on the universal aspects of narrative.

Moreover, it opens new avenues for examining broader narratological phenomena, such as the particularities of the genre of magical realism, the narration of which is "often characterized as 'childlike' or 'naïve'" due to the fact that the magical events "are narrated in great realistic detail but without the narrator registering surprise or commenting on their strangeness."[76] My approach can enable us to explain, in detail, why some narrations are not "childlike" or "naïve," but culturally conditioned, for example. In light of this, a text such as Amado's *Sea of Death* (published thirteen years before *The Kingdom of This World*), which has not been considered as an example of magical realism, could turn out to be one of the pioneers of the genre (or one of the pioneers of the marvelous real—although, for Faris, magical realism "Initially flourish[ed] primarily in Latin America, in such texts as Alejo Carpentier's *The Kingdom of this World*" [2005, 281], it is necessary, nevertheless, to

[76] *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, ed. David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan, (Routledge, 2005), s.v. "Magical Realism" (by Wendy Faris).

consider the distinction between magical realism and the marvelous real[77]). This hypothesis, however, remains a subject for further investigation.

Another topic that exceeds the scope of this study but constitutes a promising direction for future research is empirical research on the impact of fictional collective subjectivities on real-world readers, particularly in terms of empathy and self-reflection.[78] The concept of CS is also relevant in the context of the most recent literature, which—inspired by the new humanist ideas—more and more often discursively legitimizes all sorts of incarnations of the "other": e.g., literary works in which the "other" is non-human (as in *Warriors*, by Erin Hunter, which tells the story of a collectivity of feral cats, who have their own rules, beliefs, values, notions of good and evil, etc., which contrast with human, anthropocentric ones). An analysis of non-human collective subjectivities in such works can shed new light on the issues raised by posthuman studies. Although an analysis of non-literary works exceeds the scope of my research, other narrative art works, such as cinematographic ones, also seem a relevant object of study.[79]

Furthermore, since Discourse-Theoretical Analysis has a process-oriented focus, which prevents one from reducing the tensions and contradictions surfacing in the image of the "other" to incidental inconsistencies (Van linthout 2008, 344–351), my approach can contribute to a broader understanding not only of the result, but also of the complex process of the discursive legitimation (or delegitimation) of the "other" through narrative. The emphasis is on *how* the narratives mean, rather than on *what* they mean—my theoretical-methodological framework enables us to: 1) describe precisely the particularities of the ideological profile of a fictional collectivity (in the form of a web of meanings) and the narrator's/implied author's attitude towards it; 2) systematically relate this profile to the context (both the storyworld and real-world context).

In addition to these analytical contributions, this study also responds to a broader disciplinary need. While the application of Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory is

[77] See Chiampi 1983 (21–46).

[78] Particularly relevant in this context are such papers as: Richard Gerrig's *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading* (2019); Suzanne Keen's *Empathy and the Novel* (2007); and Eva Maria Emy Koopman and Frank Hakemulder's *Effects of literature on empathy and self-reflection: A theoretical-empirical framework* (2015).

[79] In the *Vikings* series, for example, it may be interesting to analyze the Vikings' collective subjectivity in terms of the narration's level of reality and its role in the discursive struggles between the "pagans" and the representatives of the Christian world.

common in political studies and occasional in media studies, "it is virtually nonexistent in the realm of literary and art studies" (Carpentier, Spinoy 2008, 18). After Carpentier and Spinoy convincingly explained the importance and appropriateness of filling this research gap (1–21)—which were confirmed in the following chapters of their book by the results of four literary analyses—the situation hardly changed: so far, I have found only two articles which attempted to fractionally fill the gap. Their authors confirm the persistence of this situation (Mehrmotlagh, Beyad 2018a, 140; 2018b, 4). Thus, this study contributes to the ongoing interdisciplinary stream that applies DT to the analysis of culture and media, while addressing the stream's neglect of literary fiction—it confirms that the application of Discourse-Theoretical Analysis can serve as a productive and insightful approach within literary studies.

I have also drawn on another conceptual framework that remains important yet underexplored within narrative theory: Alan Palmer's (2004) fictional minds approach. My study, however, brings a less disputable, in my view, alternative to Palmer's "collective mind," which has been convincingly criticized by Patrick Colm Hogan (2011) and Manfred Jahn (2011). It also enables us to describe very precisely and systematically the particularities of the ideological profile of a collectivity, which, for Palmer, who admits the importance of the issues of ideology in the context of fictional minds, was "well beyond the scope of [his] book" (2010, 48).

Regarding my contribution to Amadian Studies, in turn, it consists of an interpretational work that has been carried out through the lens of an unprecedented framework and, as a result, pointed out an important element of multiple Amadian storyworlds, the considerable impact it can have on them, and thus, brings us closer to understanding the "position that"—in the writer's own words—"guided [Amado's] entire literary work" (Soler Serrano, 30min 10s–33min). It also enables a reassessment of critical narratives on his alleged formal limitations, by demonstrating that Amado's narrative techniques—particularly in *Sea of Death*—are, in fact, more sophisticated than often acknowledged.

It is important to emphasize, however, that the primary objective of this dissertation has been the development of the theoretical-methodological framework itself. The analysis of *Sea of Death* has served primarily as a test case—intended to assess whether the proposed

framework functions effectively in practice, and whether the concept of collective subjectivity can serve as a valuable analytical tool. The research findings it has yielded demonstrate that the framework is well-suited for the analysis of *Sea of Death*. In principle, however, its applicability is universal, extending not only beyond this particular novel but also beyond the work of Jorge Amado and Brazilian literature more broadly.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge that the potential of the concept of collective subjectivity for literary analysis had already been partially discerned by the Nobel Prize–winning novelist Mario Vargas Llosa (1997; 2000) and science fiction writer and literary critic Gérard Klein (2011). Nevertheless, despite the fact that their contributions are very valuable, they are neither academic nor exhaustive. It was to address this gap that the present study not only theorized the concept in a more systematic manner but also developed an analysis methodology, conducted a model analysis, and assessed the concept's applicability within the field of literary studies.

Summary in Polish (Streszczenie)

Potencjał zastosowania pojęcia subiektywności kolektywnej w analizach literackich został częściowo dostrzeżony przez Mario Vargasa Llosę, Gérarda Kleina oraz grupę badaczy inspirowanych obserwacjami Kleina (Bellagamba, Picholle, Tron). Ponieważ żaden z nich nie zaproponował systematycznych ram teoretyczno-metodologicznych, opracowałem teorię dotyczącą pojęcia, metodologię jego analizy oraz przeprowadziłem przykładową analizę subiektywności kolektywnej „ludzi morza", czyli zbiorowego bohatera *Zamarłego morza* Jorgego Amado, a także jej relacji z dyskursem hegemonicznym obecnym zarówno w świecie przedstawionym powieści, jak i w realiach Brazylii lat 30. XX w.

Ponieważ analiza fikcyjnej subiektywności kolektywnej wymaga specjalnie dostosowanych do tego ram teoretyczno-metodologicznych, opracowałem je na podstawie zaskakująco nieobecnej w badaniach literackich teorii dyskursu Ernesta Laclaua i Chantal Mouffe oraz opartej o nią metodologii Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (Carpentier, De Cleen), a także na podstawie psychosocjologicznego podejścia do analizy subiektywności kolektywnej w rzeczywistości społecznej (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso) oraz ustaleń narratologicznych dotyczących teorii światów możliwych (Doležel) i fikcyjnych umysłów (Palmer).

Moje badanie wykazuje, że subiektywność kolektywna postaci literackich może wpływać na fundamentalne aspekty świata przedstawionego na różne sposoby, a zastosowanie tego pojęcia jako narzędzia analitycznego pozwala rzucić nowe światło na rozumienie dzieł literackich — zwłaszcza tych, których protagonistą jest zbiorowość. Może ono okazać się pożyteczne dla badaczy, którzy starają się poszerzyć nasze rozumienie zagadnień przecinających się z kategorią subiektywności kolektywnej, takich jak narracja niewiarygodna, fokalizacja, perspektywa, reprezentacja świadomości, ideologia czy zmagania dyskursywne. Ponadto zaproponowane przeze mnie ramy pozwalają: 1) precyzyjnie opisać osobliwości profilu ideologicznego fikcyjnej zbiorowości oraz stosunek narratora lub autora implikowanego do tego profilu; 2) systematycznie powiązać ten profil z

kontekstem. Pojęcie może być stosowane zarówno w praktycznych analizach konkretnych dzieł, jak i w refleksjach nad uniwersalnymi aspektami narracji.

Rozdział pierwszy zawiera przegląd stanu badań w czterech obszarach: 1) dotychczasowych zastosowań pojęcia subiektywności kolektywnej w literaturoznawstwie i psychosocjologii; 2) narzędzi teoretycznych wypracowanych przez narratologię; 3) twórczości Jorgego Amado; 4) dyskursu hegemonicznego epoki Getúlia Vargasa. Rozdział drugi definiuje subiektywność kolektywną postaci literackich i syntetyzuje ustalenia narratologii, psychosocjologii i teorii dyskursu, by zaproponować spójną metodologię jej identyfikacji i systematycznej analizy. Rozdział trzeci wykorzystuje zaproponowane ramy teoretyczno-metodologiczne do przykładowej analizy powieści Jorgego Amado. Przedstawia on zarys historii Brazylii oraz przegląd myśli społecznej czołowych intelektualistów brazylijskich XIX i XX w., by zbadać związek między ich ideami a ówczesną rzeczywistością społeczną. Stanowi to podstawę do analizy dyskursu hegemonicznego, który dominował w okresie, gdy Amado pisał *Zamarłe morze*. Następnie rozdział przedstawia dyskurs kontrhegemoniczny wyartykułowany przez powieści społeczne z regionu Nordeste, napisane przez przedstawicieli drugiej fazy brazylijskiego modernizmu (1930–1945). Omawia również twórczość Jorgego Amado i oferuje przegląd najważniejszych aspektów religii candomblé, gdyż właściwe zrozumienie tematyki poruszanej w *Zamarłym morzu* wymaga podstawowej wiedzy na ten temat. Ostatnia część rozdziału zawiera praktyczną analizę samej powieści. Rozprawę zamyka refleksja nad wkładem pracy w wymiarze analitycznym, metodologicznym i teoretycznym, a także identyfikacja możliwych kierunków dalszych badań i potencjalnych zastosowań zaproponowanych ram w szerszych kontekstach narratologicznych.

Summary in English

The potential of the use of the concept of collective subjectivity, in literary analyses, has been partially discerned by Mario Vargas Llosa, Gérard Klein, and a group of scholars inspired by Klein's observations (Bellagamba, Picholle, Tron). Since none of them have proposed any systematic framework, I have theorized it, elaborated an analysis methodology, and conducted a model analysis of the collective subjectivity of the "sea people," who are the central characters in Jorge Amado's *Sea of Death*, and of its relation to the hegemonic discourses of Amado's storyworld and of Brazil in the 1930s, respectively.

As analyzing a fictional collective subjectivity requires a custom-made framework, I have elaborated it on the basis of Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe's Discourse Theory, Discourse-Theoretical Analysis (Carpentier, De Cleen) (both alarmingly absent in literary studies), the psychosociological framework for real-world collective subjectivity analysis (Fabris, Puccini, Cambiaso), and narratological findings related to Possible Worlds Theory (Doležel) and fictional minds (Palmer).

My study confirms that a collective subjectivity of literary characters can affect fundamental aspects of a storyworld in a variety of ways and that the use of the concept as an analytical tool can shed new light on our understanding of literary works (especially those with a collective protagonist): it can benefit narrative scholars who seek to expand our understanding of issues with which collective subjectivity intersects, including unreliable narration, focalization, collective narrative agents, viewpoint, perspective, voice, speech categories, consciousness representation, ideology, discursive struggles, or characterization. Moreover, my framework enables us to: 1) describe precisely the particularities of the ideological profile of a fictional collectivity and the narrator's/implied author's attitude towards it; 2) relate this profile to the context systematically. The concept can be applied in practical analyses of specific narrative works, as well as in theoretical reflections on the universal aspects of narrative.

Chapter One reviews the state of research regarding 1) existing uses of the concept of collective subjectivity in literary studies and psychosociology; 2) theoretical tools from narratology; 3) Jorge Amado's work; and 4) Getúlio Vargas-era hegemonic discourse.

Chapter Two defines the collective subjectivity of literary characters and synthesizes contributions from narratology, psychosociology, and Discourse Theory to propose a coherent framework for its identification and systematic analysis. Chapter Three applies the proposed framework to a model analysis of Amado's novel. It outlines the history of Brazil and Brazilian social thought in the 19th and 20th centuries in order to examine the relationship between the ideas of the most relevant intellectuals and the social reality of the time. This serves as a basis for analyzing the hegemonic discourse that was in force during the period in which Jorge Amado wrote *Sea of Death*. Afterward, the chapter discusses a counter-hegemonic discourse articulated by the social novels from the Nordeste region that were written by the representatives of the Brazilian modernism's second phase (1930–1945). It also discusses Amado's work and offers an overview of the most relevant aspects of Candomblé religion, since a proper understanding of the themes explored in *Sea of Death* requires some knowledge on this matter. Lastly, I conduct a practical analysis of the novel itself. The dissertation closes with a reflection on the study's analytical, methodological, and theoretical contributions, as well as with an identification of avenues for future research and potential applications of the proposed framework in broader narratological contexts.

References

Abreu, Capistrano de. *Capítulos de História Colonial*. Brasília: Conselho Editorial do Senado Federal, 1907.

Amado, Jorge. "Apontamentos sobre o moderno romance brasileiro." *Lanterna Verde* 1, (May 1934): 49.

Amado, Jorge. *Cacau*. Rio de Janeiro: Ariel, 2nd ed., 1934.

Amado, Jorge. *Capitães da Areia*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1937.

Amado, Jorge. *Captains of the Sands*. Translated by Gregory Rabassa. New York: Penguin Books, 2013.

Amado, Jorge. "Interlude of the Christening of Felício, Son of Massu and Benedita, or, Ogun's Compadre." In *Shepherds of the night*. Translated by H. de Onís. New York: Avon Books, 1978, pp. 153–223.

Amado, Jorge. *Jubiabá*. Translated by Margaret A. Neves. New York: Avon Books, 1984.

Amado, Jorge. "Resposta de Jorge Amado." *Revista do Brasil* III, 22 (April 1940): 108.

Amado, Jorge. *Mar Morto*. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editôra, 14th edition, 1965.

Amado, Jorge. *Sea of Death*. Translated by Gregory Rabassa. New York: Avon Books, 1984.

Amado, Jorge. *Tenda dos Milagres*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010.

Amado, Jorge. *Tent of Miracles*. Translated by Barbara Shelby. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1971.

Amado, Jorge. *Navegação de cabotagem: apontamentos para um livro de memórias que jamais escreverei*. Sintra: Publicações Europa-América, 1992.

Amado, Jorge. "Os romances da Bahia." In *Capitães da Areia*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio, 1937.

Andrade, Mário de. *Macunaíma: The Hero Without Any Character*. Translated by Carl L. Engel. Philadelphia: King Tide Press, 2023.

Angermuller, Johannes. *Poststructuralist Discourse Analysis: Subjectivity in Enunciative Pragmatics*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.

Azevedo, Amailton Magno. "Samba: um ritmo negro de resistência." *Revista do Instituto de Estudos Brasileiros* 70 (2018): 44–58.

Bakhtin, Mikhail. *The Dialogic Imagination*. Translated by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981.

Bal, Mieke. *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2nd edition, 1997.
Barthes, Roland. *Le Plaisir du Texte*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973.
Bastide, Roger. *O candomblé da Bahia (rito nagô)*. Translated by Maria Isaura Pereira de Queiroz. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 3rd ed., 1978a.
Bastide, Roger. *The African Religions of Brazil: Toward a Sociology of the Interpenetration of Civilizations*. Translated by Helen Sebba. The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1978b.
Bellagamba, Ugo, Éric Picholle, and Daniel Tron, eds. *Les subjectivités collectives. Actes des Troisièmes Journées Interdisciplinaires Sciences & Fictions de Peyresq*. Nice: Somnium, 2012.
Belém, Euler de França. "Entrevista com Jorge Amado." *Jornal Opção* 14–20.09.1997.
Bergamo, Edvaldo Aparecido. "Jorge Amado na África: literatura, imprensa e colonialismo." *Revista Cerrados* 52 (2020): 116–126.
Blumer, Herbert. *Symbolic Interactionism: Perspective and Method*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1969.
Bomfim, Manoel. *América Latina. Males de origem*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Aguilar SA., 2000.
Bomfim, Manoel. *O Brasil nação. Realidade da soberania brasileira*. Rio de Janeiro: Topbooks, 1996.
Booth, Wayne C. *The Rhetoric of Fiction*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.
Bosi, Alfredo. *História concisa da literatura brasileira*. São Paulo: Editora Cultrix, 1994.
Bourdieu, Pierre. *Las estructuras sociales de la economía*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2003.
Bourdieu, Pierre. *Outline Of A Theory Of Practice*. New York: Cambridge Unviersity Press, 2013.
Braga, Rubem. "Luiz da Silva e Julião Tavares." *Revista Acadêmica* 27 (May 1937).
Bréan, Simon. "GK, SC, SF : Gérard Klein et Subjectivité Collective de la Science-Fiction." In *Les subjectivités collectives. Actes des Troisièmes Journées Interdisciplinaires Sciences & Fictions de Peyresq*, edited by Ugo Bellagamba, Éric Picholle, and Daniel Tron, 33–52. Nice: Somnium, 2012.

Bru, Sascha. “Literary Imaginaries: On Experiencing (In)determinacy in German Modernism.” In *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis: Media, Arts and Literature*, edited by Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy, 285–306. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2008.

Brubaker, Rogers, and Frederick Cooper. “Beyond "Identity".” *Theory and Society* 29, 1 (2000): 1–47.

Bueno, Luís. Uma História do Romance de 30. PhD diss., Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 2001.

Bueno, Luís. “Uma releitura de *Mar Morto*.” *Revista USP* 95 (2012): 101–109.

Burr, Vivien. *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Sage, 1995.

Calixto, Carolina Fernandes. História e memória da trajetória político-intelectual de Jorge Amado. PhD diss., Universidade Federal Fluminense, 2016.

Candido, Antônio. “A Revolução de 30 e a cultura.” *Novos Estudos* 4 (1984): 27–36.

Candido, Antônio. *Educação pela noite e outros ensaios*. São Paulo: Ática, 1989.

Carpentier, Alejo. *The Kingdom of This World*. Translated by Harriet de Onís. New York: Noonday Press, 1989.

Carpentier, Alejo. “Prologue to *The Kingdom of This World* (1949).” *Literature and Arts of the Americas* 26.47 (1993): 28–32.

Carpentier, Nico. “Deploying discourse theory: An introduction to discourse theory and discourse theoretical analysis.” In *Media and Communication Studies Interventions*: *The Intellectual Work of ECREA’s 2010 European Media and Communication Doctoral Summer School*, edited by Nico Carpentier, Ilija Tomanić Trivundza, Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, Ebba Sundin, Tobias Olsson, Richard Kilborn, Hannu Nieminen, and Bart Cammaerts, 251–66. Tartu: Tartu University Press, 2010.

Carpentier, Nico. “Discourse-theoretical analysis (DTA).” In *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies*, edited by John Flowerdew and John E. Richardson, 272–284. Routledge, 2017.

Carpentier, Nico, and Benjamin De Cleen. “Bringing discourse theory into media studies.” *Journal of Language and Politics* 6.2 (2007): 265–293.

Carpentier, Nico, Benjamin De Cleen, and Leen Van Brussel, eds. *Communication and Discourse Theory: Collected Works of the Brussels Discourse Theory Group*. Intellect, 2019.

Carpentier, Nico, and Erik Spinoy, eds. *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis: Media, Arts and Literature*. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2008.
Castejon, Mariângela. Processos de subjetivação no discurso religioso de matriz africana em textos de Jorge Amado. PhD diss., Universidade Federal de São Carlos, 2023.
Chandler, Billy Jaynes. *The Bandit King: Lampião of Brazil*. Texas A&M University Press, 1978.
Charchalis, Wojciech. *Między luzotropikalizmem a luzofonią. Polityczne uwarunkowania przemian w literaturach afrykańskich języka portugalskiego*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe UAM, 2019.
Chatman, Seymour. *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film*. Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1978.
Chmiel, Eliasz. "Collective Subjectivity of Literary Characters as Exemplified by Jorge Amado's Marginalized Figures." *O Eixo e a Roda: Revista de Literatura Brasileira* 32.4 (2023): 123–151.
Clark, Andy, and David J. Chalmers. "The Extended Mind." *Analysis* 58 (1998)*:* 7–19.
Cohn, Dorrit. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.
Cordeiro, Carla de Fátima. De Honório a Archanjo: Jorge Amado, questão racial e formação nacional. PhD diss., Universidade Estadual de Campinas, 2017.
Couto, Mia. "Sonhar em casa: intervenção sobre Jorge Amado." In *E se Obama fosse africano?* 61–67. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011.
Cunha, Euclides da. *Os Sertões*. Rio de Janeiro: Laemmert & C. Editores, 1902.
Dávila, Jerry. *Diploma of Whiteness: Race and Social Policy in Brazil, 1917–1945*. Duke University Press, 2003.
Derrida, Jacques. *De la grammatologie*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit, 1967.
Desch-Obi, Thomas J. *Fighting for honor: The history of African martial art traditions in the Atlantic world*. Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, 2008.
Dias, Denise. A tradição do romance picaresco e a obra de Jorge Amado. PhD diss., Universidade de Brasília, Université Rennes 2, 2019.
Diniz, Luis de Melo. Representações da infância ultrajada e da criança-herói: uma leitura de Charles Dickens e Jorge Amado. PhD diss., Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 2012.

Doležel, Lubomír. “Mimesis and Possible Worlds.” *Poetics Today* 9.3 (1988): 475–496.
Doležel, Lubomír. *Heterocosmica—Fiction and Possible Worlds*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
Domingues, José Maurício. *Sociological Theory and Collective Subjectivity*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1995.
Duarte, Eduardo de Assis. *Jorge Amado: romance em tempo de utopia*. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1996.
Eco, Umberto. *Interpretation and Overinterpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
Eze, Emmanuel Chukwudi. “The problem of knowledge in ‘divination’: the example of Ifa.” In *African Philosophy: An Anthology*, edited by Emmanuel Chukwudi Eze, 173–175. Oxford: Blackwell, 1998.
Fabris, Fernando. “La subjetividad colectiva como dimensión psicosocial del proceso socio-histórico y la vida cotidiana.” *Hologramática* 16.1 (2012): 23–42.
Fabris, Fernando, and Silvia Puccini. “De la expectativa al conflicto. Un análisis de la subjetividad colectiva durante 2008.” *Revista Campo grupal* XIII, 128 (2010).
Fabris, Fernando, Silvia Puccini, and Mario Cambiaso. *Subjetividad colectiva y realidad social. Una metodología de análisis*. Buenos Aires: El Zócalo, 2019.
Faris, Wendy. “Magical Realism.” In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*, edited by David Herman, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan, 282–283. Routledge, 2005.
Fausto, Boris. *História do Brasil*, 12th ed. São Paulo: Editora da Universidade de São Paulo, 2006.
Fitz, Earl, Keith Brower, Enrique Martínez-Vidal (eds.). *Jorge Amado: New Critical Essays*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
Forster, Edward Morgan. *Aspects of the Novel*. London: Arnold, 1927.
Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1972.
Freyre, Gilberto. “Sociologia e Literatura.” *Lanterna Verde* 4 (November 1936): 15.
Freyre, Giberto. *Order and Progress: Brazil from Monarchy to Republic*. New York: Knopf, 1970.
Freyre, Gilberto. *The Masters and the Slaves: a Study in the Development of Brazilian Civilization*, 2nd ed. Translated by Samuel Putnam. University of California Press, 1986.

Fundação Casa de Jorge Amado. “Jorge Amado, Biografia.” Foundation’s official website, 17 May 2025. https://www.jorgeamado.org.br/sobre/

Gee, James. *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourse*. London: Falmer Press, 1990.

Gerrig, Richard. *Experiencing Narrative Worlds: On the Psychological Activities of Reading*. Routledge, 2019.

Glynos, Jason, and David Howarth. *Logics of Critical Explanation in Social and Political Theory*. London: Routledge, 2007.

Godet, Rita Olivieri, Jacqueline Penjon (eds.). *Jorge Amado: lectures et dialogues autour d'une oeuvre*, Paris: Presses Sorbonne Nouvelle, 2005.

Goldstein, Ilana Seltzer. *O Brasil best-seller de Jorge Amado: literatura e identidade nacional*. São Paulo: Senac, 2019.

Gramsci, Antonio. *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916–1935*. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1999.

Heller, Ágnes. *Historia y vida cotidiana*. Ciudad de México: Grijalbo, 1985.

Hentschke, Jens, ed. *Vargas and Brazil: new perspectives*. Springer, 2006.

Hogan, Patrick Colm. “Palmer’s Cognitivist Challenge.” *Style* 45.2 (2011): 244–248.

Howarth, David. “Discourse Theory and Political Analysis.” In *Research Strategies in the Social Sciences*, edited by Elinor Scarbrough and Eric Tanenbaum, 268–293. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Hühn, Peter, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, and Jörg Schönert. *Handbook of Narratology*, Berlin, New York: De Gruyter, 2009.

Hühn, Peter. “Event and Eventfulness.” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/39.html

Ingarden, Roman. *The Literary Work of Art: An Investigation on the Borderlines of Ontology, Logic, and Theory of Literature*. Translated by George C. Grabowicz. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1973.

Instituto Brasileiro de Geografia e Estatística, *Censo Demográfico 2010*, 2010, 17 May 2025. https://indigenas.ibge.gov.br/estudos-especiais-3/o-brasil-indigena/lingua-falada.html

Iser, Wolfgang. *The Act of Reading*. London: Routledge, 1978.

Jahn, Manfred. “Mind= Mind+ Social Mind?: A Response to Alan Palmer’s Target Essay.” *Style* 45.2 (2011): 249–253.

Jannidis, Fotis. “Character.” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/41.html

Jeździkowski, Jarosław Jacek. Pilar do comunismo ou um escritor exótico? Estudo descritivo das traduções polonesas da obra de Jorge Amado. PhD diss., Universidade Federal da Bahia, 2019.

Jørgensen, Marianne, and Louise Phillips. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE, 2002.

Kafalenos, Emma. “The epistemology of fiction: Knowing v. ‘knowing’.” *Style* 45.2 (2011): 254–258.

Keen, Suzanne. *Empathy and the Novel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Kileuy, Odé, and Vera de Oxaguiã. *O candomblé bem explicado: Nações Bantu, Iorubá e Fon*. Rio de Janeiro: Pallas Editora, 2009.

Klein, Gérard. *Trames & Moirés: à la recherche d’autres sujets, les subjectivités collectives*. Nice: Somnium, 2011.

Koopman, Eva Maria Emy, and Frank Hakemulder. “Effects of literature on empathy and self-reflection: A theoretical-empirical framework.” *Journal of Literary Theory* 9.1 (2015): 79–111.

Kripke, Saul. *Naming and Necessity*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1980.

Laclau, Ernesto. “Metaphor and Social Antagonisms.” In *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, 249–257. Urbana: University of Illinois, 1988.

Laclau, Ernesto. *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London: Verso, 1990.

Laclau, Enresto. “Ethics, Politics and Radical Democracy – A Response to Simon Critchley.” *Culture Machine. The Journal* 4 (2002).

Laclau, Ernesto. *On Populist Reason*. London: Verso, 2005.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Chantal Mouffe. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy*. London: Verso, 2001.

Laclau, Ernesto, and Lilian Zac. “Minding the Gap: The Subject of Politics.” In *The Making of Political Identities*, edited by Ernesto Laclau, 11–39. London: Verso, 1994.
Lafetá, João Luiz. *1930: A crítica e o Modernismo*. São Paulo: Editora 34, 2000.
Leech, Geoffrey, and Michael Short. *Style in Fiction: A Linguistic Introduction to English Fictional Prose,* London: Longman, 1981.
Leite, Gildeci de Oliveira, Filismina Fernandes Saraiva, and Thiago Martins Caldas Prado (eds.). *III Webinário Estudos Amadianos: 110 anos de nascimento de Jorge Amado*. Cachoeira: Portuário Atelier Editorial, 2022.
Leite, Gildeci de Oliveira. “Amado Axé de *Mar Morto*.” In *II Webinário Estudos Amadianos: 20 anos de permanência*, edited by Gildeci de Oliveira Leite, Filismina Fernandes Saraiva, and Thiago Martins Caldas Prado, 185–203. Salvador: Quarteto Editora, 2021.
Levine, Robert M. *Pernambuco in the Brazilian Federation, 1889–1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978, p. 11.
Levine, Robert M. *Father of the Poor?: Vargas and his Era*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
Lewis, David. *Counterfactuals*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.
Lewis, Jeff. *Cultural Studies: The Basics*. London: Sage, 2002.
Lewis, John Lowell. *Ring of liberation: Deceptive discourse in Brazilian Capoeira*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.
Lucas, Fábio. “Plano, com epígrafe, de um estudo sobre a morte de Quincas Berro D’Água.” In *Jorge Amado Povo e Terra — 40 Anos de Literatura*. São Paulo: Martins, 1972.
Lühning, Angela. “‘Acabe com este santo, Pedrito vem aí....’ Mito e realidade da perseguição policial ao Candomblé baiano entre 1920 e 1942.” *Revista USP* 28 (1996): 194–220.
Lott, Wanessa Pires. “A capoeira no Brasil: da proibição à salvaguarda.” *Licere* (2018): 450–470.
Malinowski, Mariusz. *W poszukiwaniu brazylijskości. Główne nurty brazylijskiej myśli społecznej w XX wieku*. Warszawa: CESLA, 2011.
Malinowski, Mariusz. *Brazylia: republika. Dzieje Brazylii w latach 1889–2010*. Warszawa: Muzeum Historii Polskiego Ruchu Ludowego, Instytut Studiów Iberyjskich i Iberoamerykańskich UW, 2013.

Margolin, Uri. “Structuralist Approaches to Character in Narrative: The State of the Art.” *Semiotica* 75.1.2 (1989): 1–24.
Margolin, Uri. “The What, the When, and the How of Being a Character in Literary Narrative.” *Style* 24.3 (1990): 453–468.
Margolin, Uri. “Telling in the plural: From grammar to ideology.” *Poetics Today* 21.3 (2000): 591–618.
Markiewicz, Henryk. “O falsyfikowaniu interpretacji literackich.” *Pamiętnik Literacki* 87/1 (1996): 59–74.
Marques, Ivan, and Luís Bueno. “Em torno do romance de 30.” *Teresa* 16 (2015).
Marttila, Tomas. *Post-Foundational Discourse Analysis: From Political Difference to Empirical Research*. Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan, 2015.
Matory, J. Lorand. *Black Atlantic religion: tradition, transnationalism, and matriarchy in the Afro-Brazilian Candomblé*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
McHale, Brian. “Islands in the Stream of Consciousness: Dorrit Cohn’s Transparent Minds.” *Poetics Today* 2.2 (1981): 183–191.
McHale, Brian. “Speech Representation.” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 16 Feb. 2022. http://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/article/speech-representation.
Mehrmotlagh, Hanieh, and Maryam Soltan Beyad. “Perpetual Strife to Rearticulate Discourse, Meaning and Identity in Gordimer’s *July’s People*: a Discourse Analysis.” *Folia Linguistica et Litteraria* (2018a): 121–148.
Mehrmotlagh, Hanieh, and Maryam Soltan Beyad. “A woman of all times: A discourse-semiotic approach to André Brink’s *Philida*.” *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 5.1 (2018b): 1–20.
Mouffe, Chantal. “Every Form of Art has a Political Dimension: Chantal Mouffe interviewed by Rosalyn Deutsche, Branden W. Joseph and Thomas Keenan.” *Grey Room* 2 (2001): 98–125.
Mouffe, Chantal. *The Concept of the Agonistic Approach towards Public Space*. Lecture at Transformations of Public Space, 15–16 February 2007, Stedelijk Museum CS Amsterdam, the Netherlands.

Nascimento, Aline Santos de Brito. Tradição, tradução, hibridismo e resistência da identidade afro-brasileira na literatura amadiana. PhD diss., Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, 2017.
Niederhoff, Burkhard. “Focalization.” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/18.html
Nonhoff, Martin. “Hegemony analysis: Theory, methodology and research practice.” In *Discourse, Culture and Organization*, edited by Tomas Marttila, 63–104. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019.
Oliveira, Nathália Fernandes de. Repressão policial às religiões de matriz afro-brasileiras no Estado Novo (1937–1945). PhD diss., Universidade Federal Fluminense, Niterói, 2015.
Paleczny, Tadeusz. *Rasa, etniczność i religia w brazylijskim procesie narodotwórczym*. Kraków: Universitas, 2004.
Omoteso, Ebenezer Adedeji. “A study of intertextuality and mythology in Jorge Amado’s *Mar Morto*.” *Estudos Portugueses e Africanos* 30 (1997): 5–14.
Palmer, Alan. *Fictional Minds*. University of Nebraska Press, 2004.
Palmer, Alan. *Social Minds in the Novel*. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 2010.
Pavel, Thomas. *Fictional Worlds*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1986.
Pepetela. “Do outro lado do mar.” In *As mortes e o triunfo de Rosalina*. Jorge Amado. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010.
Pesavento, Sandra Jatahy. “Problem tożsamości narodowej: Brazylia wobec latynoamerykańskości.” Translated by Andrzej Dembicz and Renata Siuda. *Ameryka Łacińska* 4 (1996): 9–13.
Pichon-Rivière, Enrique. “Destino y computadora.” *Revista Primera Plana*, 203 (1966), 65.
Pichon-Rivière, Enrique. *El proceso grupal. Del psicoanálisis a la psicología social (I)*. Buenos Aires: Nueva Visión, 1975.
Pontes, Matheus de Mesquita. Jorge Amado: entre engajamento e a militância comunista (1929–1956). PhD diss., Universidade Federal de Goiás, 2018.
Prince, Gerald. “Reader.” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/52.html

Ramos, Graciliano. “Decadência do Romance Brasileiro.” *Literatura* 1 (September 1946): 20–24.
Rego, José Lins do. “Espécie de História Literária.” *Lanterna Verde* 6 (April 1938): 95.
Ritzer, George. *Sociological Theory*, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1992.
Rivas Hernández, Ascensión (ed.). *Jorge Amado. Relectura en su centenario,* Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 2013.
Roosevelt, Anna, and Alexandre Navarro. *Ancient Civilizations of the Amazon / Civilizações Antigas da Amazônia*. São Luís: Editora da Universidade Federal do Maranhão, 2021.
RSP, Editor. “Cultura e Serviço Social.” *Revista do Serviço Público* 3.1 (1938), 3–4.
Ryan, Marie-Laure. *Possible Worlds, Artificial Intelligence, and Narrative Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.
Ryan, Marie-Laure. “Possible Worlds.” In *The living handbook of narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/54.html
Santana, Geferson. “‘Negro e branco pobre, tudo é escravo, mas tem tudo na mão’: discussões sobre raça e classe no romance Jubiabá de Jorge Amado.” *Revista Novos Rumos* 56.1 (2019).
Santos, Camilla Ramos dos, and Marlúcia Mendes da Rocha. “O samba como signo identitário do Brasil e a sua literariedade nos anos 1930.” *Contexto* 31 (2017): 101–130.
Santos, José Benedito dos. “A recriação do mito de Iemanjá e Orungã: uma leitura do romance *Mar Morto*, de Jorge Amado.” *Revista Decifrar* 1.1 (2013): 42–60.
Santos, José Otávio Monteiro Badaró. Memória e recepção em "Terras do Sem Fim", de Jorge Amado. Master’s thesis, Universidade Estadual do Sudoeste da Bahia, 2020.
Santos, Maria Stella de Azevedo. *Meu tempo é agora*. Salvador: Assembleia Legislativa do Estado da Bahia, 2010.
Saussure, Ferdinand de. *Course in General Linguistics*. London: Peter Owen, 1960.
Schmid, Wolf. “Implied Author (revised version).” In *The Living Handbook of Narratology*, edited by Peter Hühn et al. Hamburg: Hamburg University, 17 May 2025. https://www-archiv.fdm.uni-hamburg.de/lhn/node/58.html
Schmidt, Bettina E. “Axé as the cornerstone of Candomblé philosophy and its significance for an understanding of well-being (bem estar).” *Religious Studies* (2024): 1–13.

Searle, John R. *The Rediscovery of the Mind*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
Shaw, Lisa. "São Coisas Nossas: Samba and Identity in the Vargas Era (1930–45)." *Portuguese Studies* 14 (1998): 152–169.
Silva, Anna Carolina Deodato da. (Re)leituras gastronômicas: o não-dito da comida em "Dona Flor e Seus Dois Maridos" e "Gabriela, Cravo e Canela." Master's thesis, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, 2021.
Silva, Márcia Rios. "Páginas candentes da história: os subterrâneos do Estado Novo por Jorge Amado." In *O Estado Novo: as múltiplas faces de uma experiência autoritária*, edited by Carlos Zacarias Júnior de Sena and Paulo Santos Silva, 237–272. Salvador: EDUNEB, 2009.
Silva, Márcia Rios. "Jorge Amado: The International Projection of the Brazilian Writer." In *Brazilian Literature as World Literature*, edited by Eduardo F. Coutinho, 199–220. Bloomsbury, 2018.
Silva, Márcia Rios. *O rumor das cartas: um estudo da recepção de Jorge Amado*. Salvador: Fundação Gregório de Mattos, 2006.
Silva, Vagner Gonçalves da. *Candomblé e Umbanda: caminhos da devoção brasileira*. São Paulo: Selo Negro, 2005.
Sim, Stuart. "Agonism and Literary History." In *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis: Media, Arts and Literature*, edited by Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy, 269–284. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2008.
Smith, Joseph, and Francisco Vinhosa. *A History of Brazil*. Routledge, 2013.
Soler Serrano, Joaquín. "Jorge Amado A Fondo - edición completa y restaurada." YouTube video. *A Fondo*, 17. May 2025. https://youtu.be/J8XIc_zWWx4
Sousa, Noémia de. *Sangue Negro*. São Paulo: Editora Kapulana, 2016.
Spinoy, Erik. "'These Really Comprehensible Poems That Really Touch You': The New Realist Discourse in Flemish Poetry." In *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis: Media, Arts and Literature*, edited by Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy, 307–332. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2008.
Torfing, Jacob. *New theories of discourse: Laclau, Mouffe and Žižek*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.
Torres, Alberto. *A organização nacional*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1938.

Validório, Valéria Cristiane. Investigando o uso de marcadores culturais presentes em quatro obras amadeanas, traduzidas para o inglês. PhD diss., Universidade Estadual Paulista, São José do Rio Preto, 2008.

Vallado, Armando. *Iemanjá: mãe dos peixes, dos deuses, dos seres humanos*. Rio de Janeiro: Pallas Editora, 2019.

Van Dijk, Teun. "Discourse, power and access." In *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, edited by Carmen Rosa Caldas-Coulthard and Malcolm Coulthard, 84–104. Routledge, 1996.

Van Dijk, Teun. "The study of discourse." In *Discourse as Structure and Process: a Multidisciplinary Introduction, Vol. 1*, edited by Teun Van Dijk, 703–752. London: SAGE, 1997.

Van Dijk, Teun. "Discourse and ideology." In *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, edited by Teun van Dijk, 379–407. SAGE, 2011.

Van Dijk, Teun. "Critical Discourse Studies: a Sociocognitive Approach." In *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, 3rd ed., edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 62–86. London: SAGE, 2015.

Van Dijk, Teun. *Antiracist Discourse in Brazil: From Abolition to Affirmative Action*. Lexington Books, 2020.

Van linthout, Ine. "Both Self and Other: The Construction of 'Flanders' in National Socialist Literary Discourse." In *Discourse Theory and Cultural Analysis: Media, Arts and Literature*, edited by Nico Carpentier and Erik Spinoy, 333–358. Cresskill: Hampton Press, 2008.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. *Cartas a un joven novelista*. Barcelona: Editorial Planeta, 1997.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. *Letters to a Young Novelist*. Translated by Natasha Wimmer. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2002.

Vargas Llosa, Mario. "¿Lo real maravilloso o artimañas literarias?" *Letras Libres* 13 (2000): 32–36.

Viana, Oliveira. *Populações Meridionais do Brasil. Populações rurais do Centro-Sul*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Nova Aguilar S.A., 2000.

Von Martius, Karl Friedrich. "Como se deve escrever a História do Brasil." *Revista de História de América* 42 (1956): 433–458.

Williams, Daryle. *Culture Wars in Brazil: the First Vargas Regime, 1930–1945*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2001.