



PROJECT MUSE®

The Literature of Cacao: Jorge Amado's *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*

Bede Scott

ariel: A Review of International English Literature, Volume 54, Number 3-4, July-October 2023, pp. 127-155 (Article)

Published by Johns Hopkins University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/ari.2023.a905712>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/905712>

🔗 *For content related to this article*

https://muse.jhu.edu/related_content?type=article&id=905712

The Literature of Cacao: Jorge Amado's *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*

Bede Scott

Abstract: Situated at the intersection of postcolonial studies and affect studies, this essay explores the emotional and generic significance of capitalist modernity in Jorge Amado's *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* (1958). Amado's novel is set in the provincial city of Ilhéus at the time of the First Republic (1889–1930), a particularly volatile period of Brazilian history that witnessed the decline of the regional oligarchies and the rise of the urban bourgeoisie. By combining these two different critical perspectives, I argue, we can understand why Mundinho Falcão, a wealthy investor from Rio, should find it necessary to establish a new emotional regime in Ilhéus, one that privileges capitalist rationality over the hyperbolic feelings associated with the existing feudalistic order. Moreover, as the novel progresses, it becomes clear that this transition at the level of story, whereby one dominant structure of feeling makes way for another, creates a corresponding disturbance at the level of discourse or genre—transforming a narrative of melodramatic antipathies and rivalries into one of bourgeois complicity and compromise.

Keywords: Jorge Amado, jealousy, emotional regime, capitalist modernity, coronelismo

At a given moment in the last pages of this novel, one of the characters says that cacao produces everything. . . . Today I can add that cacao also produced a literature. [It] is a genre with its own well-defined characteristics, with its own unmis-

takable brand, born of cacao [and] bearing a certain flavor of blood in its pages.

Jorge Amado, Preface to *The Violent Land* (xix)

If we want things to stay as they are, things will have to change.

Giuseppe Tomasi di Lampedusa, *The Leopard* (19)

I.

Jorge Amado's *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* (*Gabriela, Cravo e Canela*; 1958) begins on a "bright spring day" in 1925—the first fine day "after an unusually long rainy season"—with a horrific double murder (1). Having discovered his wife *in flagrante delicto* with the local dentist, Colonel Jesuíno Mendonça fires "two well-aimed bullets" (1) into each of the adulterous lovers. For the other inhabitants of Ilhéus, a provincial Brazilian city in the northeastern state of Bahia, this "crime of passion" (2) is both extremely shocking and entirely predictable. "The echo of the last shots in the struggle for the cacao lands was fading away," we are told,

but those heroic years [had] left the people of Ilhéus with a taste for bloodshed [and] certain laws of conduct, one of the most binding of which was observed on this fateful day: the law that required a deceived husband to avenge his honor by killing the deceivers. It came down from the old days, from the strong men who razed the forests and planted the first cacao. It was engraved in the collective conscience of the people—even now, in 1925, when plantations were flourishing on the land fertilized with corpses and blood, when fortunes were being multiplied, and when progress was changing the face of the town. . . . New streets had been opened, automobiles brought in, mansions built, roads constructed, newspapers published, clubs organized—Ilhéus was transformed. But the ways men think and feel evolve more slowly. (2)

In due course, we learn that such honour killings have always been committed with impunity in the northeastern part of the country:

“Whenever a man was tried for his observance of this unwritten law (and consequent violation of the written law against homicide), the jury brought in a unanimous verdict of not guilty” (104). But in this case, the verdict is surprising—one without precedent “in the history of Ilhéus” (426). On the very last page of the novel, we discover that Colonel Jesuíno Mendonça has been “sentenced to prison for having murdered his adulterous wife and her lover” (426); and one could argue that the intervening four hundred pages, separating the crime from its punishment, are ultimately motivated by a desire to make sense of this unexpected outcome. How could a character unanimously praised in Chapter Two for having performed “his duty as a husband and as a man” (105) be condemned, with the same degree of unanimity, in the novel’s final sentence? What social, political, and economic changes must Ilhéus have undergone in order to make such a verdict possible? And above all, how have these changes influenced—or been influenced by—the affective lives of the city’s inhabitants? The “ways men think and feel [may] evolve more slowly” (2), but they do evolve, and this process of affective transformation, this shift from one structure of feeling to another, will be my primary focus in the following pages.¹

Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon is set during a particularly volatile period of Brazilian history known as the First Republic (1889–1930), a period that witnessed the decline of the regional oligarchies and the rise of the urban bourgeoisie. In Amado’s novel, the conflict between these two elite groups generates much of the dynamic tension that drives the narrative forward. On the one hand, we have established plantation owners such as Colonel Jesuíno, who are the beneficiaries of a repressive, semifeudal patronage system known as *coronelismo*.² And on the other hand, we have a character by the name of Mundinho Falcão, a member of the Rio bourgeoisie who has come to Ilhéus looking for investment opportunities. Over the course of the novel, Mundinho struggles to modernize Ilhéus by improving the city’s infrastructure, reforming its political system, and introducing a more advanced capitalist economy. In order to achieve this objective, however, he must also establish a new emotional regime within the city, one that privileges more temperate emotions over the hyperbolic feelings (such as anger and jealousy) that

have traditionally been associated with *coronelismo*. Furthermore, it becomes clear as the narrative progresses that this transformation at the level of story, whereby one dominant structure of feeling makes way for another, creates a corresponding disturbance at the level of discourse or genre. Given its melodramatic tendencies, we are led to expect a climactic collision of opposites in the novel's final pages, a confrontation that will render these deeper social polarities legible and make it possible for virtue (here, the representative of capitalist modernity) to destroy vice (the various representatives of an archaic oligarchy). But instead we encounter a series of unexpected compromises and improbable alliances, which ultimately combine to give us a more nuanced vision of Brazil's social, political, and economic future.

This essay is situated at the intersection of two different critical perspectives. In addition to its postcolonial qualities, it engages quite substantially with the field of affect studies; and before proceeding, I would like to explain why it does so.³ For one thing, this critical conjunction provides a deeper understanding of the influence that various sociopolitical forces can have on the affective lives of ordinary people, whether these forces are experienced in the form of slavery, or capitalist modernity, or even *coronelismo*. Analysing the affective consequences of these historical processes offers, in Raymond Williams' words, a "felt sense of the quality of life at a particular place and time" (*Long* 63). And as such feelings typically lie at the "very edge of semantic availability" (Williams, *Marxism* 134), the evidence they leave behind can be identified most clearly, I believe, at the level of literary form, genre, and style. More specifically, the combination of postcolonial and affect studies, as a critical methodology, allows us to (1) trace the process by which certain sociopolitical forces penetrate the private sphere, where they induce corresponding (although frequently displaced or sublimated) affective states; (2) explore the way in which such affective states assume an intersubjective quality, becoming depersonalized structures of feeling; and (3) analyse the narratological consequences of these affective disturbances, as such feelings often infiltrate the structure of the narrative itself, which thereby comes to serve as a discursive correlative for the sociopolitical forces mentioned above (and for the various affective

disorders to which they give rise). Although this dynamic is not unique to postcolonial literature, approaching such literature from the perspective of affect studies can be particularly revealing, as the emotions we encounter in postcolonial narratives have often been reconfigured by their historical circumstances. If these circumstances involve autocratic governance, for example, or profound socioeconomic disparities, then the feelings in question may well acquire a pathological dimension. These emotions may be repressed or displaced (and therefore denied cathartic release); they may assume a disproportionate quality (becoming either hyperbolic or apathetic); or they may be so ubiquitous, so widely shared, that they simply merge with the general atmosphere.⁴ In such cases, I would argue, it is not merely interesting to consider the significance of emotion but necessary, for only by tracing these displaced, disproportionate, or depersonalized feelings back to their ultimate source in the public sphere are we able to make sense of the narratives in which they figure. In *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, this critical perspective allows us to understand the privileged position that jealousy occupies within the novel's affective economy. It also explains why Mundinho should find it necessary, as a representative of the urban bourgeoisie, to eradicate such atavistic impulses. And finally, it bestows a certain coherence on episodes that would otherwise defy the narrative's governing emotional (and generic) logic: episodes such as the unprecedented guilty verdict, the collective renunciation of strong feeling, with which the novel concludes.

II.

Jorge Amado was born in 1912 on a cacao plantation just outside the city of Ilhéus, and he was intimately acquainted with the region's violent history. In a 1965 essay on the subject, he writes that the

cacao lands were fertilized with blood. They were conquered foot by foot in ferocious struggles of indescribable violence. Men had set out to conquer the forest, to clear it and transform the landscape. . . . But those who set out were many, and they went armed. As though there were not land enough and

to spare for all, they fought one another, disputing each foot of that humid earth, ideal for the planting of cacao. At the very time that the seedlings were being planted, crosses were being set up to mark the spots where the brave had fallen, victims of ambushes or of encounters between hired gunmen [*jagunços*]. (Preface xix)

As a consequence of this colonial enterprise, the ecology, economy, and demographics of southern Bahia were utterly transformed. Between 1880 and 1920, the area grew from a forested territory with a settled population of some ten thousand people, roughly five hundred agricultural properties of various sizes, and an unspecified number of Indian communities to a region of two separate municipalities, more than six thousand cacao plantations, 105,000 residents, and a severely reduced Indigenous population (Mahony 104–5). As Amado indicates, the process of land acquisition during these early years was highly competitive and frequently descended into violence. “[M]en killed one another for possession of hills, rivers, and valleys” (*Gabriela* 8), his narrator remembers, and this violence was still a typical feature of plantation life in the early twentieth century when, to cite one historian, “[d]isputes over foreclosures, property lines, control of railroad stops, municipal appointments, elections, and family honor [often] boiled over into murders and gun battles” (Mahony 114). The plantations themselves relied on a semifeudal mode of production and a range of coercive labour practices, many of which were a legacy of slavery.⁵ “It is noteworthy,” Teresa Meade writes, “that the abolition of slavery in 1888 did not mean the introduction of wage-labor forms in most areas of [Bahia]” (17). Men who were no longer “attached to the estates as slaves [were drawn] into any number of bondage relationships with the landowners, among which were debt peonage, sharecropping, and [serving] as soldiers in the militias of the planters” (19). In the last of these cases, plantation workers were obliged to defend their master’s territory and, if necessary, to expropriate further land by force on his behalf. As Meade observes, the “*coronel* regimes of [northeastern Brazil] differed little in structure from

the feudal armies of Europe several centuries earlier”—the only distinction being that many of the “*coronel* armies” would survive, in one form or another, well into the twentieth century (19–20).

The territorial violence that occurred during these years was often associated, either directly or indirectly, with the concept of honour; and it has been suggested that this cultural value was introduced to the New World by early European settlers. “When the Spanish and Portuguese established colonies in the Americas,” Lyman L. Johnson and Sonya Lipsett-Rivera argue, “they brought not only their material culture . . . but also their affective and intellectual traditions. Among the more important elements of this cultural transfer was the notion of honor” (2). However, the Latin American preoccupation with honour was more than just a simple case of cultural conditioning, an inherited predilection for traditional Mediterranean values. During this period, honour was consistently invoked as a justification for violence; yet the defence or restoration of honour also served a practical purpose: “[I]nstead of symbolizing the [settlers’] attachment to an anachronistic cultural legacy,” Martha S. Santos writes in reference to the state of Ceará in the late nineteenth century, the “defense of masculine honor and reputation represented a rational strategy—elaborated within the cultural idiom of honour—to ensure access to material resources in a highly conflictive and competitive milieu” (86). In other words, under circumstances such as these, the notion of honour serves a specific socioeconomic function, allowing settlers to lay claim to limited resources, reinforce territorial boundaries, and delineate their spheres of influence.⁶ Once the patronage system of *coronelismo* was fully established, the notion of honour acquired an even greater political significance. For state-level figures such as deputies and governors, honour determined who “received votes for higher office and, in turn, the privilege and influence that allowed them to attract larger clientele” (Woodard 108); for “locally based state and federal functionaries,” it maintained their positions as “members of the legislature [or] regional bosses” (108); and for the *coronéis* themselves, it reinforced their political influence, which was ultimately determined by the number of votes they were able to offer the aforementioned figures.

At all three of these levels of patronage, as James P. Woodard notes, “the term ‘prestige’ (*prestígio*) conflated personal honor with the size of one’s political clientele” (108), thereby converting an abstract cultural value into a highly effective political resource.

The problem with honour, though, is that it can very easily give rise to its opposite—shame, dishonour, disgrace—and so it must be constantly reaffirmed and scrupulously protected. This was especially the case during the historical period I have been describing, when honour acquired a much broader social, political, and economic significance. To be dishonoured, under these circumstances, was not just a matter of losing face; it could also mean losing property, losing a livelihood (if not life itself), and, in many cases, losing political power. This explains why it was so important to safeguard both individual and collective honour during the First Republic, and why one emotion in particular—the feeling of jealousy—became so ubiquitous. As we have seen, under the system of *coronelismo*, there was a compelling need to assert one’s right to limited resources, to protect one’s property, and to maintain one’s social and political prestige. All of these imperatives were assigned to the general category of honour, which was the subject of unremitting vigilance and preserved by strong feelings of jealousy. Given its reliance on multiple levels of patronage, *coronelismo* also provoked “jealous” competition among those vying for favour, and even once such favour had been granted, there was always the possibility that it may be withheld or offered to some other party instead.⁷ This hypercompetitive dynamic encouraged a greater sensitivity to matters of honour; and as a consequence, jealousy, its affective corollary, was transformed into a dominant structure of feeling—one that infiltrated (and influenced) every level of society.

When Mundinho Falcão first arrives in Ilhéus, convinced of the city’s “great future” (Amado, *Gabriela* 40), this is precisely the kind of atmosphere he encounters. We are told that “[m]any things still reminded one of the Ilhéus of former days” (13), the most obvious example being the honour killing committed by Colonel Jesuíno Mendonça. And it is significant that the jealousy with which Colonel Jesuíno has protected his marital honour should be conflated, in the public mind, with his earlier

conduct as a settler, jealously protecting the territory he has carved out of the jungle. According to our narrator, in killing his wife and her lover,

Colonel Jesuíno had proved himself a real man, resolute, brave, honorable, as he had done so often during the period of struggle. People remembered that the colonel and his hired assassins had been responsible for many crosses in the cemeteries and at roadsides. . . . This Colonel Jesuíno Mendonça, of the famous Mendonças of Alagoas, had come to Ilhéus as a young man. He had cleared jungles and laid out plantations. He had defended his claim to the soil by shooting those who challenged it. His properties had increased and he had made his name a respected one. (103)

It is also significant that Colonel Jesuíno's crime should be met with universal approval by the other inhabitants of Ilhéus, as if they are incapable of imagining an alternative response: "The impact on the [city] was tremendous, for the shooting stimulated emotions associated with the old days. . . . The news, spreading like wildfire, increased the respect and admiration that already surrounded the planter's thin and somewhat somber figure. For this was how it was in Ilhéus: the honor of a deceived husband could be cleansed only by blood" (104). And then, of course, there is Colonel Coriolano Rebeiro, another wealthy plantation owner whose overdetermined jealousy is widely admired: "Though frugal where he himself was concerned, [Colonel Coriolano] was open-handed with his mistresses. . . . But he required them to stay indoors almost all the time, alone, with no right to friends or visitors. He was, as people said, 'a monster of jealousy'" (117).

As the novel progresses, however, it becomes clear that it is not only the *coronéis*, those anachronistic relics of a bygone age, who suffer from pathological jealousy. Almost every character in the novel experiences jealous impulses of one kind or another. And once an emotion achieves this kind of ubiquity, circulating freely between the public and private spheres, it becomes, to quote Mikel Dufrenne, "a supervening or impersonal principle in accordance with which we [might] say that there is an electric atmosphere or, as Trenet sang, that there is joy in the air" (168).⁸

Even Nacib, the easygoing café owner, grows increasingly possessive of Gabriela, a young immigrant who has recently arrived from Bahia's impoverished, semi-arid *sertão* (backcountry). "My God," he wonders to himself, "what was happening? . . . Why did he feel this fear, this terror at the thought of losing her, this sudden anger at the flower-stealing Judge and the other customers who eyed her, talked to her, and touched her hand?" (Amado, *Gabriela* 189). Nacib, we learn, "had never suffered so much during an infatuation nor experienced such jealousy, such fear, this dread of losing her" (227). But what he doesn't realize is that many of the other characters feel the same way, and it is typical of the structure of feeling, as theorized by Raymond Williams, that this should be the case. By using this formulation, Williams argues, we are "defining a social experience which is still in process, often indeed not yet recognized as social but taken to be private, idiosyncratic, and even isolating" (*Marxism* 132). And that is certainly true of the jealousy we encounter in *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*. Indeed, in this particular instance, only the omniscient, heterodiegetic narrator is in a position to recognize the true nature of Nacib's jealousy—only the narrator and perhaps that other privileged outsider, that agent of historical change from the metropole, Mundinho Falcão.

III.

When we first encounter Mundinho, he is standing on the bridge of a stranded ship, scrutinizing Ilhéus through a pair of binoculars. By now he has been living in the city for several years, and he has already achieved a great deal; but his modernizing project is only "just beginning" (Amado, *Gabriela* 75), and it is an ambitious one too. In the novel's opening pages, a minor character contemplates "the scope of the exporter's interests and the leading part he [has] played in almost every progressive innovation in Ilhéus: additional branch banks, the bus line, the avenue along the beach, the daily newspaper, the pruning of cacao trees under expert supervision, and [the introduction of] modern architecture" (75). Not content with these achievements, however, Mundinho is attempting to impose the cultural, political, and economic values of the urban bourgeoisie on a region that is still, in many

ways, feudalistic. In other words, he is hoping to bring about a classic bourgeois revolution, one that will lead to the demise of the existing feudalistic order (i.e., *coronelismo*) and the introduction of a modern capitalist economy.⁹ And in order to achieve this goal, the entire city will have to be subjected, willingly or otherwise, to the governing principles of bourgeois rationality: productivity, efficiency, discipline, and all the other qualities that we have come to associate with the “spirit of capitalism” (Weber 13).

The most obvious example of this process is Mundinho’s decision to have the harbour dredged so that cacao can be exported “direct[ly] from Ilhéus to Europe and the United States” (Amado, *Gabriela* 195). For many years, the economy of Ilhéus has suffered because of a dangerous sandbar that stretches across the mouth of the harbour, preventing large ocean-going ships from entering. As a consequence, all of the cacao produced in Ilhéus must be transported by rail to the port of Salvador de Bahia, which is located over three hundred kilometres away. “Ilhéus produces a large part of the world’s supply of cacao,” one character complains, “and yet the revenue from export taxes stays in [Salvador]. All because of that damned sandbar” (22). This issue becomes a subject of absorbing interest for the inhabitants of the city:

Every day, everywhere in town, people talked about the bar and the need to make the channel safe for large vessels. Measures were suggested, the state government was criticized, and the Mayor was accused of neglect. But no solution was forthcoming; the authorities made promises and the docks in [Salvador] continued to collect the export taxes. (22)

The reason for this political inactivity is fairly predictable: Colonel Ramiro Bastos, the most powerful *coronel* in Ilhéus, is beholden to the governor of Bahia, and “the last thing in the world the Governor would like to see is the removal of the sandbar. . . . Every bag of cacao that passes through [Salvador] means more money for the docks there, and the Governor’s son-in-law is tied in with the dock interests” (73). When pressed on the subject, Colonel Ramiro invokes the notion of honour, which, once again, is conflated with political power and social prestige:

“We have obligations,” he says. “Each one lives up to his own. Because if he doesn’t, he loses respect. I have always lived up to mine, as you well know. The Governor explained the matter to me and I gave my word” (240). We can see here how the archaic patronage system of *coronelismo* has, by the early twentieth century, become an economic liability for Ilhéus and so, in the interests of capitalist modernity, Mundinho arranges for the harbour to be surveyed and dredged. The project takes a long time and encounters numerous difficulties, but by the end of the novel it is finished: “Now there was a new channel, deep and straight. The ships of the Lloyd, Ita, and Bahiana lines could cross the bar without danger of getting stuck and, still more important, big freighters could now enter the harbor of Ilhéus and carry cacao directly to foreign ports” (415).¹⁰

Yet this process of rationalization is not purely economic; it infiltrates other spheres too. When Mundinho first arrives in Ilhéus, he quickly realizes that, in order to bring about the economic transformation of the city, he will also need to modify the affective lives of its inhabitants, as the adversarial feelings we discussed earlier are simply not compatible with the capitalist future he envisages. In *The Navigation of Feeling*, William M. Reddy argues that any stable political system must establish a normative emotional order that either endorses or anathematizes certain affective qualities. He describes this order as an “emotional regime” and offers as an example “the impact of the Iranian revolution on the experience of grief in that country” (48). Although previously a symbol of resistance, Reddy writes, “grief is now an emotion mandated by the state” (48), and as a consequence, it has become one of the dominant structures of feeling within Iranian public life.

We see the same thing in *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*; only, in this case, as part of his own revolutionary project, Mundinho anathematizes the volatile feelings associated with *coronelismo* and implicitly endorses the Aristotelian virtue of *metriopatheia* (the moderation of feeling). According to Aristotle, it is possible to feel emotions such as anger or jealousy “both too much and too little, and in both cases not well.” However, “to feel them at the right times, with reference to the right

objects, towards the right people, with the right motive, and in the right way, is what is both intermediate and best, and this is characteristic of virtue” (30). For Aristotle, virtue is “concerned with passions and actions in which excess [*hyperbole*] is a form of failure, and so is defect [*elleipsis*], while the intermediate is praised and is a form of success; and being praised and being successful are both characteristics of virtue. Therefore virtue is a kind of mean [*mesotes*], since . . . it aims at what is intermediate” (30). Seen from this perspective, *metriopatheia* would appear to be the quintessential bourgeois virtue, and it is certainly appropriate that an intermediate class (located between the aristocracy and the proletariat) should privilege an intermediate state of emotional being. It is also, as I have suggested, a virtue that is closely associated with capitalist rationality. By anathematizing the hyperbolic feelings of *coronelismo*, Mundinho is not only establishing a new emotional regime in Ilhéus but also introducing a new form of capitalism, one that dissolves the traditional boundary between the public and private spheres and, in so doing, allows each sphere to infiltrate and influence the other.

The sociologist Eva Illouz uses the term “emotional capitalism” to describe a similar conjunction of the affective and the economic. “Emotional capitalism,” she writes, “is a culture in which emotional and economic discourses and practices mutually shape each other, thus producing [a society] in which affect is made an essential aspect of economic behavior and in which emotional life . . . follows the logic of economic relations and exchange” (5). More specifically, she argues that the expansion of American companies in the 1920s led to the consolidation of “management theories” that “aimed to systematize and rationalize the production process” (11). During the same period, under the influence of these new theories, managers had to “revise, unknowingly, traditional definitions of masculinity and incorporate in their personality so-called feminine attributes—such as paying attention to emotions, controlling anger, and listening sympathetically to others” (Illouz 16). Or to put it another way, as Illouz does, this process of rationalization encouraged a higher degree of “emotional competence,” a facility that could be

converted quite easily into cultural or social capital. Such competence is cultural, Illouz says,

because [one's] emotional attitudes and style, like one's cultural taste, define one's social identity. . . . It is social because emotions are the very stuff of which social interactions are made and transformed. If cultural capital is crucial as a status signal, emotional style is crucial to how people acquire networks, both strong and weak, and build what sociologists call social capital, that is, the ways in which personal relationships are converted into forms of capital, such as career advancement or increased wealth. (66–67)

From our perspective, it is particularly significant that Illouz should associate this emerging form of capital with the bourgeoisie. Emotional competence, she argues, characterizes the affective “style and dispositions of the new middle classes which are located in intermediary positions, that is, which both control and are controlled, [and] whose professions demand a careful management of the self” (66). Although Illouz attributes this development to the expansion of American companies in the 1920s, Amado's novel suggests that the Brazilian bourgeoisie were undergoing a similar transformation during the very same decade.

Over the course of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, we encounter numerous instances of Mundinho's metriopathic tendencies and emotional competence, but for the purposes of this essay, just a couple of examples should suffice. It is worth remembering that one of the reasons Mundinho came to Ilhéus in the first place was to escape an “impossible passion” he had conceived for his brother's wife (Amado, *Gabriela* 40). “He owed his [emotional] cure to Ilhéus,” our narrator observes, and so it was “for Ilhéus [that] he would now live” (44). It is also notable that, despite this earlier passion, Mundinho is immune to the pathological jealousy that seems to plague everyone else in the city. At the beginning of the novel, Mundinho arrives with a beautiful dancer from Rio, and one of the other characters asks if she is “Mundinho's exclusive property.” “No,” someone else replies, “[h]e's not attached to her in any way. She's completely at liberty, free as a bird” (123). Once he decides to

run for Congress, this kind of emotional equanimity also characterizes his public life. When Colonel Ramiro's men invade the offices of the *Ilhéus Daily*, for example, and burn every last paper in the street outside, Mundinho is encouraged to retaliate. Yet he refuses to do so: "I'm not a coward," Mundinho says, "believe me. But . . . these methods belong to the past. It was exactly in order to change them, to get rid of them, to make Ilhéus a civilized place, that I entered politics" (224). And it is Mundinho's emotional competence—his ability to negotiate, to build consensus, to convert personal relationships into social capital—that ultimately allows him to achieve these objectives.

At this particular historical juncture, Mundinho's determination to replace the hyperbolic feelings of *coronelismo* with the metriopathic feelings of the Brazilian bourgeoisie carries a broader socioeconomic significance, facilitating the demise of the former and the rise of the latter. But what does it do to the narrative itself? How does this rejection of strong feeling influence Amado's novel at the level of discourse or genre? And what do these formal issues in turn tell us about the changes that Brazilian society was undergoing during the years of the First Republic?

IV.

Given its subject matter, it is perhaps not surprising that *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* should demonstrate many of the qualities that we typically associate with melodrama. To cite Peter Brooks' classic work on the subject, these features include "the indulgence of strong emotionalism; moral polarization and schematization; extreme states of being, situations, actions; overt villainy, persecution of the good, and final reward of virtue; inflated and extravagant expression; dark plottings, suspense, [and] breathtaking peripety" (11–12). Brooks is describing European melodrama here, but it is important to acknowledge that Brazil has a long-standing and vibrant melodramatic tradition of its own (albeit one that was originally derived from European sources). In the mid-nineteenth century, episodic narratives (*folhetim*) first began to appear in Brazilian newspapers. Many of these narratives were translated works (such as Eugène Sue's *Mysteries of Paris*, which was published in the *Jornal do Commercio* in 1844–45), but some were also locally produced

(such as José de Alencar's *Cinco Minutos*, which appeared in the *Diário do Rio de Janeiro* in 1856). In either case, these narratives were enthusiastically received by the reading public and demonstrated many of the melodramatic qualities listed above. "In its heyday," Mary L. Daniel writes, the *folhetim* was "ideally suited to the structure and tone of incipient Brazilian fiction, for the episodic nature, suspenseful chapter endings, and heightened emotional content of most early novels and novelettes benefited from an equally episodic, chapter-by-chapter mode of publication" (128). The latter years of the nineteenth century also witnessed the emergence of *literatura de cordel* (stories on a string), a genre of popular literature whose name describes the manner of its display. *Cordel* pamphlets (known as *folhetos*) began circulating in northeastern Brazil during the 1880s and reached the height of their popularity in the 1950s. The stories themselves were written in verse, employed regional and colloquial language, and were typically melodramatic in nature—full of tragic love affairs, exciting adventures, and terrifying crimes (Slater 317–19).

Although Amado's novel is clearly influenced by both of these traditions (see, for instance, the *folheto* verses that preface each of the four chapters), its melodramatic qualities can also be regarded as a generic response to the internal social and political dynamic of the narrative itself. As Brooks argues, with reference to Balzac, the melodramatic world is "subsumed by an underlying manichaeism, and the narrative creates the excitement of its drama by putting us in touch with the conflict of good and evil played out under the surface of things" (4). In a novel such as *Old Goriot* (1835), "[n]othing is spared because nothing is left unsaid; the characters stand on stage and utter the unspeakable, give voice to their deepest feelings, dramatize through their heightened and polarized words and gestures the whole lesson of their relationship" (Brooks 4). By doing so, they give us some intimation—however fleeting—of the agonistic forces operating beneath the surface of our daily lives. In the case of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, it is the conflict between Mundinho and Colonel Ramiro Bastos that brings these forces to the surface, so that every gesture, every utterance, overtly proclaims its own deeper meaning. For example, when an entire edition of the *Ilhéus Daily* is

incinerated by Colonel Ramiro's allies, one of the characters, "pale with fury," climbs onto a table and delivers the following speech:

Our local Torquemadas are trying to destroy freedom of thought, to blot out the light of the printed word with their criminal flames. . . . People, oh my people of Ilhéus, land of civilization and liberty! Only over our dead bodies will they ever set up a black Inquisition here to persecute the written word. We shall erect barricades in the streets [and place] tribunes on the corners. (Amado, *Gabriela* 200)

And then a short time later, when one of his allies suggests that he compromise with Mundinho, Colonel Ramiro delivers a monologue that is just as "angry" (241). "Listen to what I have to tell you," he says:

I may be left alone, even my sons may abandon me and join this outsider. I may be left without a single friend . . . but I won't ever compromise. No one else is going to rule Ilhéus. What was good enough yesterday is good enough today. Even if I have to die with my gun in my hand. Even if I have to order killings once again, God forgive me. There'll be an election a year from now and I'm going to win it, Colonel, even if the whole world turns against me, even if Ilhéus has to become again a land of bandits and killers. . . . I'm going to win! (242)

But these are precisely the kind of hyperbolic feelings that Mundinho is attempting to eradicate; and at the level of story, it doesn't take long for his new emotional regime, and the bourgeois rationality it privileges, to make its presence felt.

In the next chapter, for instance, when Nacib discovers his wife, Gabriela, in bed with a local lothario, he decides to defy the "unwritten law, long established and scrupulously observed in Ilhéus, requir[ing] that the honor of a deceived husband be washed clean in the blood of his betrayers" (365); and this decision is retrospectively justified by a legal sleight of hand. João Fulgêncio, the proprietor of the Model Stationery Store, identifies a procedural irregularity that will allow Nacib to annul the marriage, thus absolving him of the obligation to defend his

honour. Fulgêncio's logic can be summarized as follows: "[Nacib] had and had not been married; he had and had not been cuckolded; and so, in not killing his betrayers, he had and had not broken the unwritten law" (372). In a sense, the narrator concludes, "this cruel law had been outwitted *ex post facto*" (372). Or, one might equally say, it has been outwitted by the logic of bourgeois rationality in the form of Brazil's recently promulgated Civil Code (which states that "a marriage is null *ab initio* when there is [a] substantial error as to [the identity of] one of the parties" [Amado, *Gabriela* 368]).¹¹ Of course, this hardly makes for an exciting story, and the city's inhabitants soon turn their attention elsewhere. For some time now, Colonel Coriolano Ribeiro's mistress, Gloria, has been conducting a covert affair with a local schoolteacher. As mentioned earlier, Coriolano is notoriously jealous and has "an uncommendable record of violence" (392). So everyone agrees that if he were to discover this deception and "[pull] off one of his stunts—ah! then there would be something worth talking about, something exciting" (395). As it turns out, however, "nothing very exciting occur[s]" at all (395). When the two lovers are finally caught, much to everyone's disappointment, they are merely told to leave the building, and the door is "barred from the inside" (395). But why is Coriolano, that "monster of jealousy" (117), satisfied with "throwing Gloria and Josué out of the house" rather than "dealing with them" in the usual time-honoured way (399)? The answer is simple: because of "the bus line, the library of the Commercial Association, [and] the dances at the Progress Club"; because of his son, who is about to graduate from university; because of the "death of [Colonel] Ramiro Bastos"; but, above all, "[b]ecause of Mundinho Falcão" (399).

As a consequence of Mundinho's new emotional regime, things have certainly changed in Ilhéus. Life has become more sedate, more banal, more bourgeois—and this transformation at the level of story also has profound generic consequences. As the characters begin to repudiate the strong feelings associated with *coronelismo*, the narrative they occupy undergoes a shift in generic orientation, one that forces it to deviate, quite significantly, from its anticipated trajectory. A defining feature of melodrama is its schematic personification of moral absolutes, whereby

characters are either good (e.g., Mundinho) or evil (Colonel Ramiro Bastos and his allies). The narrative itself is typically structured around the conflict between these two opposing forces, and only one outcome is ever possible. As Peter Brooks explains, the final act of a melodrama

most often includes duels, chases, explosions, battles—a full panoply of violent action which offers a highly physical “acting out” of virtue’s liberation from the oppressive efforts of evil. This violent action of the last act is possibly melodrama’s version of the tragic catharsis, the ritual by which virtue is freed from what blocked the realization of its desire, and evil is expelled from the universe. . . . The play ends with public recognition of where virtue and evil reside, and the eradication of one as the reward of the other. (32)

Given its generic orientation, this is the kind of conclusion we expect to find in *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*—a climactic struggle between two irreconcilable adversaries, only one of whom will live to tell the tale. Yet that is not what ultimately transpires. Rather than witnessing the eradication of one allegorical figure and the apotheosis of the other, we encounter something far more subtle and revealing. As the elections draw nearer, one of Colonel Ramiro’s allies makes it clear that they are “going to win, even if [they] have to do it with guns” (Amado, *Gabriela* 383), and he orders his *jagunços* (soldiers) to prepare themselves for a war. Although Ramiro himself dies a short time later, he is replaced by an equally intractable colonel named Amâncio Leal, and everyone anticipates “a turbulent end to the electoral campaign . . . for Amâncio would almost certainly resort to violence” (394). One day, “a little after four in the afternoon,” Colonel Amâncio gets off the train and makes his way directly to Mundinho’s office. It is page 396, and the long-awaited confrontation between virtue and vice has finally arrived: “A knot of idlers [gathers] on the sidewalk in front of [Mundinho’s] building,” peering “into [his] office through the windows.” When his clerk announces Colonel Amâncio, Mundinho “take[s] his pistol out of [a] drawer and slip[s] it into his pocket” (397). And then . . . nothing. Colonel Amâncio settles into a “comfortable armchair,” lights a cigarette, and says:

Mr. Mundinho, I've been fighting you with all my strength. It was I who ordered the newspapers burned. . . . It was also I who ordered Aristóteles to be shot. . . . I was prepared to turn Ilhéus upside down. It wouldn't have been the first time. . . . [But then] Ramiro died. I went to the country and started thinking. . . . I saw only one man in Ilhéus to take my friend's place. And that man is you. . . . As for me, I'm through; I won't fight you. . . . I don't want anything for myself. If I vote, it'll be for you. . . . From now on, count on me as a friend. . . . [And when] the election is over, I want you to come out one day to my little plantation. We'll do some hunting. (396–98)

Mundinho is stunned; he had been “prepared for anything except the colonel's extended hand” (297). And the reader is likely to be surprised too. After all, this is not how a melodrama is supposed to end. As we have seen, the “ritual of melodrama involves the confrontation of clearly identified antagonists and the expulsion of one of them” (Brooks 17). It can provide “no terminal reconciliation” (Brooks 17), as such compromises, such intermediate states, are no longer deemed possible. But in the final pages of Amado's novel, that is exactly what we are offered: a handshake, a comfortable armchair, and an invitation to go hunting.

In order to understand this generic anomaly, it is necessary to consider the novel's broader sociopolitical setting, for only thus does the unused gun in Mundinho's pocket begin to make sense. During the 1920s, rising interest rates and unstable international prices for cacao were putting plantation owners under considerable economic pressure, and they were “forced to recognize that their inability to get along could lead to financial ruin” (Mahony 115). Increasingly, “cooperation rather than competition seemed to be required,” and by the end of the decade, the “development of a common elite identity was well under way” (Mahony 115). As Florestan Fernandes observes, the latter years of the First Republic witnessed “the historical maturation of the Brazilian bourgeoisie” (71) and the consolidation of a modern capitalist economy. But this process did not lead to the eradication of the regional oligarchies. Instead, Fernandes argues, it involved

a reshuffling of inherited economic, social, and political structures, whereby the oligarchic social strata, ancient or recent, were reabsorbed by the class society in the process of constitution and expansion. Thus there was no true displacement of the dominant “old class” or “old classes” by dominant “new classes” of contemporary origin. What took place was much broader and more dramatic, even though it did not appear so: namely, the *structural coalescence* of [the] different social strata and different economic groupings that made up the “possessing classes,” [a category that was] increasingly identified with a bourgeois outlook and a bourgeois style of life. (71–72; emphasis added)

In other words, rather than eradicating the regional oligarchies, this revolution simply facilitated their integration into the emerging bourgeois order. And by doing so, it allowed the agrarian elite to maintain their privileged position within Brazilian society—as long as they were able to adapt to the various imperatives of a capitalist economy.¹² According to Fernandes, this “structural coalescence” (72) also meant that the Brazilian bourgeoisie internalized the “autocratic tendencies” (101) of the *ancien régime*, tendencies that would eventually transform “bourgeois rule . . . into an overtly authoritarian and totalitarian social force” (77).¹³

And this, finally, explains why Mundinho’s pistol should remain unused at the end of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* (despite the fact that he has gone to the trouble of retrieving it from his drawer). In his 1966 essay “Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives,” Roland Barthes makes a crucial distinction between two different units of narrative meaning: functions and indices. The first of these he describes as “distributional” in that they follow the logic of causality and contribute to the syntagmatic unfolding of the narrative. The purchase of a revolver, for instance, has as its “correlate the moment when it will be used (and if not used, the notation is reversed into a sign of indecision, etc.)” (264). Indices, on the other hand, which Barthes describes as “integrational,” are narrative units whose significance can be understood only at a higher level of (paradigmatic) meaning, where they may

indicate “the character of a narrative agent,” for example, or “a feeling,” or “an atmosphere” (“Introduction” 267). In the case of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, Mundinho’s unused pistol moves from the first of these categories to the second, losing its functionality within the narrative and instead becoming an indice of something else, something that the novel itself only implicitly acknowledges. Although the pistol carries no real significance at the level of story, that is to say, under these specific circumstances, in the provincial Brazilian city of Ilhéus, in the year 1925, it carries an abundance of social, political, and economic meaning. It signifies the “structural coalescence” (Fernandes 101) of capitalism and *coronelismo*. It signifies the ultimate collusion of virtue and vice (rather than the cathartic encounter we may have been expecting). And it signifies the cultural ascendancy of those classic bourgeois values: rationality, discipline, competence, and, most importantly, the effortless moderation of strong feeling.

V.

In the essay cited above, Fernandes makes the point that the “structural coalescence” of the regional oligarchies and the urban bourgeoisie during the First Republic was an extremely dramatic process, “even though it did not appear so” (72). And this is also true of the scene I have just described. At the social, political, and economic level, the encounter between Mundinho Falcão and Colonel Amâncio carries an epochal significance; and yet, at the literal or proairetic level of the narrative, nothing much seems to be happening at all. Indeed, just when we are expecting a final flurry of melodramatic action, the novel undergoes a precipitous decline in narrativity—and its proairetic energy, the very energy that has sustained it for nearly four hundred pages, suddenly dissipates.¹⁴ Rather than witnessing a “highly physical ‘acting out’ of virtue’s liberation from the oppressive efforts of evil” (Brooks 32), we are instead offered a series of banal micro-occurrences: “The colonel shook his opponent’s hand, sat down in the comfortable armchair, and declined a liqueur, a glass of rum, and a cigar. . . . He lit a cigarette. . . . [He] puffed on his cigarette. . . . He fell silent. . . . He fell silent again, smoking,” and so on (Amado, *Gabriela* 396). This is the

point at which Mundinho's bourgeois values finally saturate the generic level of the narrative, transforming a work of melodrama into a classic example of literary realism. In his 2013 study of bourgeois culture, Franco Moretti argues that a similar generic transformation took place in Europe over the course of the nineteenth century. During this period, Moretti explains, the "great mechanism of [aristocratic] adventure was being eroded by bourgeois civilization" (*Bourgeois* 16). While the former had been characterized by its "turbulent passions," the latter promoted "the virtue of a peaceful and repeatable (and repeatable, and repeatable, and repeatable) everyday: less energy, but for a much longer time" (32). And this generic transformation, this *embourgeoisement* of the novel, ultimately served to "*rationalize the novelistic universe*, turning it into a world of few surprises, fewer adventures, and no miracles at all" (82; emphasis in original).

Jorge Amado's *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon* follows the same bourgeois trajectory. In order to modernize the city of Ilhéus, Mundinho is obliged to establish a new emotional regime, one that privileges the metriopathic feelings of capitalist modernity over the "turbulent passions" of *coronelismo*. And in addition to facilitating a series of far-reaching social, political, and economic transformations, this emotional regime reconfigures the novel's generic structure, removing much of its melodramatic substance (heightened narrativity, extreme states of being, hyperbolic feelings, etc.) in order to prioritize the bourgeois values of literary realism. Although we can find clear evidence of this affective and generic transformation in the conciliatory encounter between Mundinho Falcão and Colonel Amâncio, it is even more pronounced in the novel's postscript. This is where we finally learn the fate of Colonel Jesuíno Mendonça, who had murdered his wife and her lover in the opening pages. Whenever honour crimes are brought to trial, we have been warned, the jury always returns with a "unanimous verdict of not guilty" (Amado, *Gabriela* 104). But not this time. Instead, we discover that Colonel Jesuíno has been convicted of murder and sentenced to jail (426), thus repealing the "unwritten law" (104) that has legitimized such patriarchal violence for centuries. It is another moment of epochal change for Ilhéus—and another victory for Mundinho, whose

emotional regime has now expanded its sphere of influence to include the discourse itself. Last sentences are often charged with a particular significance, as this is where the ultimate predication of meaning usually takes place, where the narrative circle is closed, one way or the other. In *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, however, the last sentence carries even more weight as this is also where the novel's longest hermeneutic and proairetic sequences are resolved, finally satisfying our desire to know whether or not Colonel Jesuíno will be found guilty of murder. The answer, of course, is yes, and this dramatic conclusion could easily have given rise to an upsurge of strong feeling. But the principles of bourgeois rationality once more reassert themselves in order to preclude such an undesirable response. At the level of story, they do so in the form of the Brazilian judicial system (and "the written law against homicide" [104]), while at the level of discourse, they do so in the form of a simple declarative utterance. "For the first time in the history of Ilhéus," we are told, "a cacao colonel found himself sentenced to prison for having murdered his adulterous wife and her lover" (426). And there the novel concludes, with a sentence that is perfectly rational, perfectly composed, and perfectly bourgeois—indeed, rather ominously so. For the fact that Mundinho's victory is so complete, the fact that his emotional regime has now infiltrated every level of the narrative, provides us with a disquieting glimpse, in closing, of Brazil's totalitarian future. Only five years later, in 1930, an armed insurrection would bring Getúlio Vargas to power and for the next decade and a half, his dictatorial regime would have a profound influence on Brazilian society. Political authority would be centralized in Rio de Janeiro; the bourgeois ideologies of the Estado Novo ("New State") would become increasingly pervasive; and Vargas himself would rule the country by decree.

In *Ugly Feelings*, Sianne Ngai argues that the "ideology of a literary text may be . . . revealed more in its tone" than in "any of its other formal features" (48), and this is certainly true of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, which establishes a clear connection between the ideological dissonance of Ilhéus during the 1920s and the affective (or tonal) qualities of the novel itself.¹⁵ As I suggested at the beginning of the essay, this is a connection that becomes particularly apparent if we combine

the critical methodologies of postcolonial and affect studies. Only thus are we able to trace the process by which certain sociopolitical forces give rise to dominant structures of feeling within Brazilian society, as well as the process by which these feelings in turn penetrate the deeper reaches of literary discourse, influencing everything from the device to the genre.¹⁶ In the case of *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*, we are discussing a novel whose governing affective qualities are primarily determined by its delineation of a very specific set of social, political, and economic circumstances. As Lukács writes of Balzac, the destiny of Amado's characters is dictated not so much by the circumstances of their author—the historical figure of Amado himself, writing in the late 1950s—as by the “inner dialectic of their social and individual existence” in north-eastern Brazil in the mid-1920s (11). And this is what makes the novel so revealing, so instructive, if we choose to locate our analysis at the intersection of postcolonial and affect studies. By doing so, we can see how *coronelismo* transformed jealousy into a mechanism of political power during the early years of the First Republic, and we can understand why this particular emotion achieves such ubiquity within the novel, infiltrating both the public and private spheres. We can also see why it was necessary for the urban bourgeoisie to introduce a new emotional regime during this period, one that would facilitate the rise of a more advanced capitalist economy; and we can recognize the extent to which this regime influences the discourse itself, transforming a novel of melodramatic antipathies and rivalries into one of bourgeois complicity and compromise. But above all, this combined perspective allows us to make sense of certain things that may otherwise defy understanding: the guilty verdict received by Colonel Jesuíno in the novel's final pages, the strangely amicable encounter between Mundinho Falcão and Colonel Amâncio, and the fact that such a happy ending, as pleasing as it may be, should leave us feeling so apprehensive about what lies ahead.

Notes

- 1 The phrase “structure of feeling” is derived from the work of Raymond Williams, who uses it to describe the “specifically affective elements of consciousness” that could be said to characterize any given historical period (*Marxism*

- 132). According to Williams, the “best evidence” of a structure of feeling can be found encoded within “the actual conventions of literary or dramatic writing” (*Politics* 159).
- 2 *Coronelismo* was a system of oligarchic rule and patronage that dominated Brazilian politics from the 1890s until the 1920s. The colonels (or *coronéis*), who were usually wealthy plantation owners, would give their “support to the government in the form of votes” and, in exchange, the government would guarantee their power over various “dependents and rivals” (Schwarz and Starling 360).
 - 3 For a more detailed elaboration of this argument, see Scott, pp. 1–30.
 - 4 Frantz Fanon was the first writer to compile a detailed aetiology of such affective disorders. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, for instance, he explores the “psychopatholog[ical]” (132) consequences of the colonial presence in the French Antilles; and in *The Wretched of the Earth*, he argues that the colonial occupation of Algeria not only gave rise to a number of quite specific “psycho-affective injuries” (218) but also produced a more general “pathology of atmosphere” (289) that influenced every aspect of Algerian society.
 - 5 Although Brazil banned the importation of slaves in 1850, a thriving interprovincial slave trade continued until 1888, when the Lei Áurea (or Golden Law) was passed, definitively abolishing slavery throughout the country. During the three centuries prior to 1850, an estimated 3.5 to five million African slaves entered Brazil, and roughly 1.2 million of these slaves made landfall at the port of Salvador de Bahia. According to Timothy Walker, “the wide availability of enslaved Africans in Bahia contributed to the commercial expansion of cacao in Brazil. Along with [I]ndigenous American slaves, they provided almost all of the labor on Bahia’s cacao plantations during the critical founding phase of production” (81–83).
 - 6 Of course, we see this kind of functionality elsewhere too. As Jane Schneider writes, “intra-community conflict is a tremendously important feature of the rural Mediterranean, on both sides. Sometimes this is simply because people are competing for honor, and quarrel with each other over insults, or challenges to honor. More often, and more fundamentally, conflict has focused on strategic resources: arable land, grazing rights, routes of access to land, rights to utilize water. Mediterranean people have quarreled over encroachments on boundaries, usurpations of water rights, abusive pasturing, animal theft, the destruction of crops, adultery, and murder. They consider such violations as challenges to the honor of the property holding group. Thus honor can be thought of as *the ideology of a property holding group which struggles to define, enlarge, and protect its patrimony in a competitive arena*” (2; emphasis added).
 - 7 For more on the significance of patronage and favour in nineteenth-century Brazil, see Schwarz.
 - 8 In *The Particulars of Rapture*, Charles Altieri uses the term “mood” to describe this depersonalized, freely circulating form of emotion. “Moods,” he writes, “are

- modes of feeling where the sense of subjectivity becomes diffuse and sensation merges into something close to atmosphere, something that seems to pervade an entire scene or situation” (2).
- 9 For more on the subject of the bourgeois revolution, see Callinicos.
- 10 This aspect of the novel is historically accurate. In 1925, the entrance to the Ilhéus harbour was “finally dredged to accommodate deep-draft transoceanic vessels” (Walker 105), and in January of the following year, for the first time in its history, one such vessel left Ilhéus for the United States, carrying 47,150 sacks of cacao (F. Santos 212).
- 11 The Brazilian Civil Code was enacted on January 1, 1916, and became effective a year later. Although it was regarded as a “legislative masterpiece” at the time, it is now understood to have “reflected the interests of a small, conservative, bourgeois culture” (Camargo 163). The specific article that João Fulgêncio is invoking here, Article 219 (from Chapter VI, “Of Void and Voidable Marriages”), states that a marriage is “voidable if on the part of one of the parties there was, in consenting, an essential error in respect to the person of the other.” An essential error is in turn defined as “[w]hat was said (*o que diz*) with respect to the identity of the other spouse, [their] honor and good fame, if this error is such (*sendo tal*) that the subsequent knowledge of it renders the life in common unbearable to the deceived spouse” (*Civil* 56–57).
- 12 Readers may be reminded here of Antonio Gramsci’s theory of passive revolution, which also involves a strategic compromise between the ruling classes. “The problem,” Gramsci writes, “is to see whether in the dialectic ‘revolution/restoration’ it is revolution or restoration which predominates” (219).
- 13 In this passage, Fernandes is alluding to the regime of Getúlio Vargas, who would govern Brazil from 1930 until 1945, and then again from 1951 until his suicide in 1954.
- 14 Following Barthes, I am using the term “proairetic” to describe the logical sequences of action and behaviour that structure literary narratives.
- 15 “By tone,” Ngai writes, “I mean a literary or cultural artifact’s feeling tone: its global or organizing affect, its general disposition or orientation toward its audience and the world” (28).
- 16 With this observation, I am drawing on a distinction that Moretti makes in his influential essay “The Slaughterhouse of Literature”: “The branches [of literary history],” he argues, “are the result of the twists and turns of a *device*, of a unit much *smaller* than the text. Conversely, the branches are also part of something much *larger* than any text, which is the *genre*. . . . Devices and genres: two *formal* units. A very small formal unit and a very large one: these are the forces behind . . . literary history. Not texts. Texts are real objects—but not objects of *knowledge*. If we want to explain the laws of literary history, we must move to a formal plane that lies beyond them: below or above; the device, or the genre” (217; emphasis in original).

Works Cited

- Altieri, Charles. *The Particulars of Rapture: An Aesthetics of the Affects*. Cornell UP, 2003.
- Amado, Jorge. *Gabriela, Clove and Cinnamon*. 1958. Translated by James L. Taylor and William L. Grossman, Vintage, 2006.
- . Preface. Translated by Harriet de Onis, 1965. *The Violent Land*. Translated by Samuel Putnam, Penguin, 2013, pp. xix–xxi.
- Aristotle. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by David Ross, Oxford UP, 2009.
- Barthes, Roland. "Introduction to the Structural Analysis of Narratives." *A Roland Barthes Reader*, edited by Susan Sontag, Vintage, 2000, pp. 251–95.
- . *S/Z*. Translated by Richard Miller, Hill and Wang, 1974.
- Brooks, Peter. *The Melodramatic Imagination: Balzac, Henry James, Melodrama, and the Mode of Excess*. Columbia UP, 1985.
- Callinicos, Alex. "Bourgeois Revolutions and Historical Materialism." *International Socialism*, vol. 2, no. 43, 1989, pp. 113–71.
- Camargo, André Antunes Soares de. "The Revised Brazilian Civil Code." *University of Miami International and Comparative Law Review*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2003, pp. 161–66.
- Civil Code of Brazil*. Aldao, Campos, and Gil, 1920.
- Daniel, Mary L. "Brazilian Fiction from 1800 to 1855." *Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, edited by Roberto González Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker, vol. 3, Cambridge UP, 2006, pp. 127–36.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Richard Philcox, Grove, 2008.
- . *The Wretched of the Earth*. Translated by Constance Farrington, Grove, 1963.
- Fernandes, Florestan. "The Autocratic Bourgeois Model of Capitalist Transformation." *International Journal of Sociology*, vol. 11, no. 1–2, 1981, pp. 51–125.
- Gramsci, Antonio. *Selections from the Prison Notebooks*, edited and translated by Quintin Hoare and Geoffrey Nowell Smith, International Publishers, 1971.
- Illouz, Eva. *Cold Intimacies: The Making of Emotional Capitalism*. Polity, 2007.
- Johnson, Lyman L., and Sonya Lipsett-Rivera, eds. Introduction. *The Faces of Honor: Sex, Shame, and Violence in Colonial Latin America*, U of New Mexico P, 1998, pp. 1–17.
- Lampedusa, Giuseppe Tomasi di. *The Leopard*. 1958. Translated by Archibald Colquhoun, Vintage, 2007.
- Lukács, Georg. *Studies in European Realism*. Grosset and Dunlap, 1964.
- Mahony, Mary Ann. "A Past to Do Justice to the Present: Collective Memory, Historical Representation, and Rule in Bahia's Cacao Area." *Reclaiming the Political in Latin American History: Essays from the North*, edited by Gilbert M. Joseph, Duke UP, 2001, pp. 102–37.
- Meade, Teresa. "The Transition to Capitalism in Brazil: Notes on a Third Road." *Latin American Perspectives*, vol. 5, no. 3, 1978, pp. 7–26.
- Moretti, Franco. *The Bourgeois: Between History and Literature*. Verso, 2013.

- . “The Slaughterhouse of Literature.” *MLQ: Modern Language Quarterly*, vol. 61, no. 1, 2000, pp. 207–27.
- Ngai, Sianne. *Ugly Feelings*. Harvard UP, 2005.
- Reddy, William M. *The Navigation of Feeling: A Framework for the History of Emotions*. Cambridge UP, 2001.
- Santos, Flávio Gonçalves dos. “Two Paths: The Port and Work Options in the South of Bahia between 1872 and 1940.” *Almanack*, no. 21, 2019, pp. 205–38.
- Santos, Martha S. *Cleansing Honor with Blood: Masculinity, Violence, and Power in the Backlands of Northeast Brazil, 1845–1889*. Stanford UP, 2012.
- Schneider, Jane. “Of Vigilance and Virgins: Honor, Shame and Access to Resources in Mediterranean Societies.” *Ethnology*, vol. 10, no. 1, 1971, pp. 1–24.
- Schwarcz, Lilia Moritz, and Heloisa Maria Murgel Starling. *Brazil: A Biography*. Allen Lane, 2018.
- Schwartz, Roberto. “Misplaced Ideas: Literature and Society in Late Nineteenth-Century Brazil.” *Misplaced Ideas: Essays on Brazilian Culture*, edited and translated by John Gledson, Verso, 1992, pp. 19–32.
- Scott, Bede. *Affective Disorders: Emotion in Colonial and Postcolonial Literature*. Liverpool UP, 2019.
- Slater, Candace. “Brazilian Popular Literature (the *Literatura de Cordel*.)” *Cambridge History of Latin American Literature*, edited by Roberto González Echevarría and Enrique Pupo-Walker, vol. 3, Cambridge UP, 2006, pp. 315–28.
- Walker, Timothy. “Slave Labor and Chocolate in Brazil: The Culture of Cacao Plantations in Amazonia and Bahia (17th-19th Centuries).” *Food and Foodways*, vol. 15, no. 1–2, 2007, pp. 75–106.
- Weber, Max. *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*. 1905. Translated by Talcott Parsons, Routledge, 1992.
- Williams, Raymond. *The Long Revolution*. Chatto and Windus, 1961.
- . *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford University Press, 1977.
- . *Politics and Letters: Interviews with New Left Review*. Verso, 2015.
- Woodard, James P. “Coronelismo in Theory and Practice: Evidence, Analysis, and Argument From São Paulo.” *Luso-Brazilian Review*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2005, pp. 99–117.