

Capistrano de Abreu, traveler

Rebeca Gontijo*

ABSTRACT

The article explores the relationship between the trajectory of Capistrano de Abreu in search of a place for himself in a specific social space, and his trajectory in search of Brazil and Brazilians. The goal is to understand the question posed by

Capistrano about the formation of Brazil as a nation, considering the link between historiography and ethnography at the end of the nineteenth century.

Keywords: Capistrano de Abreu; historiography; indigenous language.

Since it is not in the figuration of the narrator in the manner of a illustrious traveler or in the atemporalized and landscaping armor of his gaze which now meets the mark of the journey... And it comes to form a voluble point of view, an auto-reflexive narration. Here the 'sensation of not being whole' does not impel that narrator to wander from one side to the other, from the scenario to the plot, from the plot to the feuilletonistic mold, but always with the eyes of the medusa. The auto-reflexive turn, volubility as a mark, as Goethe does when he observes the mountain, seem to impede rests and atemporalities. Including on the part of the reading, in whom the not being of everything, purposefully worked as a narrative procedure, seems to leave traces. The imprint of a sensation accentuated by temporality. Not time framed by historical novels, nor the eternal present of the chronicle. However, the irremediable succession of minutes, hours, days. A concrete, corrosive, time.

Flora Süssekind, *O Brasil não é longe daqui* ¹

This article seeks explore the relationship between the trajectory of Capistrano de Abreu in search of a place for himself in a determined social space and his trajectory as a historian in search of Brazil and Brazilians. Closely following the interpretations of Ilmar Rohloff de Mattos and Daniel Mesquita Pereira, and taking as a motto the relationship between the narrator and the voyage

* Doctor in Social History, Universidade Federal Fluminense (UFF). Department of History, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro (UFRRJ). Antiga Estrada Rio-São Paulo (BR-465), km 7 - 23890-000 Seropédica - RJ - Brazil. rebeca_gontijo@hotmail.com

analyzed by Flora Süssekind, my aim is to comprehend the question posed by Capistrano about the formation of Brazil, considering the connection between the writing of history and ethnography at the end of the nineteenth century.²

TRAVELLING FROM THE PROVINCE TO THE COURT:

‘I CAME, I SAW AND I CONQUERED’

At the end of the nineteenth century young well-educated people in the interior of Brazil faced a dilemma: either curtail their capacities in the province, with scant possibilities to comfort them, or disappear into the anonymity of Court, saturated with ‘men of letters’. Like many others, João Capistrano Honório de Abreu chose to go to Court, perhaps believing in what – according to what he even said himself – was the motto of every naive provincial intellectual: ‘I came, I saw, I conquered’. On board the *Guará*, the ship carrying him from Fortaleza to Rio, he wrote:

The day before yesterday was a party day here. The sky appeared black and obscure like the inside of a tomb. The drizzle fell mercilessly. The sea flung itself impetuously like the flames of a fire, sometimes with an immense eruption, wide as a forest of mountains. Almost all the passengers felt sick, and even I for five minutes was unable to resist. This spectacle was one of the most beautiful I have witnessed. On foot, with my arms wide open, my breathing suspended and with a steady gaze, I watched all the changes which assumed the perspective and saw all the phases of the struggle, only having one hope – that it would last; only having one desire, being able to take part of that clash of colossi.³

Capistrano arrived in Rio de Janeiro on 25 April 1875, at the age of 22, coming from the interior of the province of Ceará, where he had been born on 23 October 1853. He arrived armed with a combative spirit and with some ‘weapons’, foreseeing his entrance into an arena of disputes. Shortly before leaving his native land, he had a brief contact with a famous contemporary: the writer José de Alencar, who wrote about him in a letter to his friend Joaquim Serra:

In my research I was helped by a young compatriot of mine, Sr. João Capistrano de Abreu, notable for his talent, amongst so many teeming in the exuberant sap of our country, which God made more rich in intelligence than in gold. This young man, who is already an easy and elegant writer, aspires to the

internship of the press of this Court. I believe that in addition to obtaining a helpful collaborator, Fluminense journalism will have the fortune of opening the path to glory for a man of the future, something which only minimum incidents have prevented so far.

Alencar was a type of patron of Capistrano in supporting his coming to Rio. They met in 1874 when the eminent writer was visiting his native land. Thanks to Alencar, Capistrano obtained an important recommendation from Joaquim Serra to the powerful Machado de Assis, in which the former said:

My dear Machado. I would like to present to you the bearer of this letter, Sr. João Capistrano de Abreu, a young man much recommended by his literary merit and who was presented to me by our friend José de Alencar. Sr. Capistrano de Abreu thinks highly of you and would like to meet you personally; I am certain that you will welcome him as a friend and colleague. Best regards from your friend SERRA.⁴

This recommendation probably helped Capistrano get his first job in Rio, in the prestigious Garnier Bookshop, which at the time was called ‘Sublime Porta’, since by passing through success in the world of letters could be attained. With humor it was said that to stop before its door was the same as ‘posing for posterity’. Another observer noted that the bookshop was not “a simples commercial establishment, but a club, an academy, a court of patronage”.⁵ Capistrano’s work was to write publicity notes about the books released by Garnier Publishers. Also in 1875 he debuted in the Rio press, publishing talks he had given the year previously in Ceará. Capistrano, who had learned to read in his native land, had not finished his preparatory studies for the Faculty of Law in Recife in the 1870s. He was self-taught with some experience as a writer, acquired in the newspapers in Fortaleza and in the literary conferences of the French Academy of Ceará. The press was then an attractive place for intellectuals from all over the country, and Capistrano was no exception. Alongside diplomacy and teaching, journalism was part of the set of prominent intellectual activities.

Capistrano wrote reports on new literary releases and critical articles, generally aimed at causing disputes with the criticized authors. At this time he also worked as a teacher of French and Portuguese at the important Aquino College. Perhaps he had begun to make a name for himself in the intellectual area after a controversy involving one of the most important literary critics of the time,

Silvio Romero from Sergipe. In 1876 the young Abreu (as he liked to be called then), then aged 24, published articles criticizing one of Romero's texts, entitled *The national character and the origins of the Brazilian people*, according to which Brazilians were different from Portuguese, not just because of nature or mixing with the indigenous peoples, but because of the presence of blacks.

Using the strategy of citing foreign authors as an argument of authority and reproducing the contradictions in the text analyzed, Capistrano opposed the thesis presented, affirming the importance of the environment in the formation of Brazilian nationality and emphasizing the role of the indigenous element. Several years later in 1880, Capistrano had a new opportunity to attack Romero, for the same reasons as mentioned above. He published in *Gazeta de Notícias* three articles under the title "Patria History", criticizing the book *A literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna*. This time he sought in the laws of science and in 'historical truth' arguments to contradict his interlocutor, as can be seen in the second part of this text.⁶

Between one provocation and another he published two works that called attention: the obituaries of José de Alencar (1877) and the Visconde de Porto Seguro, Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen (1878). At the time of his death Alencar was facing severe criticism, which gave greater potential to the position assumed by Capistrano. Alencar had participated in the top echelons of political life in the Empire, even becoming a minister of state. However, he had been ostracized by D. Pedro II after having criticized Gonçalves de Magalhães' book *A Confederação dos Tamoios* (1856) – Magalhães was part of the select group of *protégés* of the Emperor –, governmental policies and the intellectual qualities of the monarch.

Under the pseudonym of Ig, the young and unknown Alencar stated that Magalhães' Indians could figure in a European, Arab, or Chinese novel. Although he shared the fashion of romantic 'Indianism' that was consecrated in the 1850s and 1860s, he approached the theme from another perspective: he refuted Magalhães' epic perspective, opting for drama instead. He wanted to be able to write about his own land, forgetting his own ideas of civilized man and like other authors of his time, including Varnhagen, he defended that the knowledge of the indigenous language was the best means to promote the nationality of literature. In his work, he avoided the 'excesses of imagination' and sought to demonstrate knowledge of the nature and natives of Brazil, resorting to a didactic and occasionally ethnographic narrative, with the use of footnotes. He privileged the contrasts of the struggle between barbarianism

and civilization, as well as the romantic taste, and suffered severe criticism, which accused him of not being nationalist or original, due to his French inspiration. For Ivana Stolze Lima, “the literary nationalism of Alencar led him to reflections on language as a body in transformation, indelibly marked by history”. From here came the emphasis that Portuguese had its own history. An emphasis seen in a pejorative form as the “mania to make *Brasileiro* a different language from the old Portuguese”.⁷

Emphasizing the fact that Alencar was his contemporary, Capistrano presented him as “the first and principal Brazilian man of letters”, “the founder of Brazilian literature”, calling attention to a particular aspect in his work: interest in the people, their traditions, uses and customs. He stated that Alencar’s name should be part of the pantheon of history, alongside the great foreign authors, and highlighted his efforts to “create for himself immortality in the short period of twenty years”, through works which future generations would read as teachings.⁸

While the death of Alencar can be seen as the key that opened the doors of the Carioca intellectual world to Capistrano, it can also be said that the obituary of Varnhagen opened the doors of the world of scholars of history to him. Like Alencar, Varnhagen also suffered severe criticism, being accused of writing history “without criticism and without style”, although his capacity as an “investigator of historical sources” was praised. Capistrano took it on himself the task of valorizing the contribution of the Visconde to Brazilian historiography, referring to him as the “historian of the patria”, “a great example to follow and to be venerated”, “the master, the guide, the lord”.⁹

In 1879 he became part of the body of leader-writers of *Gazeta de Notícias*, specializing in literary criticism. He also took part in a public contest for the Public Library of the Court, winning first place. Alongside the Public Archive and the Brazilian Historical and Geographic Institute (*Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro* - IHGB), the Library was the guardian of a precious documentary collection and brought together professionals renowned for historical studies, and was an important instance of intellectual consecration, one of the ‘mills of glory’, as Capistrano once referred to the Brazilians Academy of Letters, the Academy of Medicine and IHGB.

Despite having found a leading place in the Library, Capistrano opted to go on a new flight: he took part in the public contest for the Imperial College of Pedro II in 1883. The chair he disputed was the most prestigious one: Chorography and the History of Brazil. He presented his dissertation *O descobrimento do*

Brasil and was approved by 17 voted to 5. He began to lecture the same year. Years later the entrance of Capistrano to the College of Pedro II was still remembered by some of his contemporaries. In 1907 the literary critic José Veríssimo commented:

The question, the same for all the candidates, was about the discovery of Brazil and its development in the sixteenth century. I have read these dissertations. With the exception of that of Sr. Capistrano de Abreu, they were good summaries of what was in Varnhagen and in other common works, without any novelty, neither in investigation nor in thought. To the contrary of these, and what here are usually competition dissertations, where their own studies and originality shine by their absence, that of Sr. Abreu was distinguished by those two rare qualities, and if it did not reveal a teacher – a subject capable of reading in class, by heart or not, the subjects to be taught – he clearly showed himself to be a professor capable of ‘doing’ science himself and transmitting to his disciples the taste and the capacity to do it.

Upon the extinction of the chair of Chorography and History of Brazil in 1899, Capistrano was suspended, with it being alleged that he was not able to give classes in General History, since he was a specialist in the History of Brazil. Before he died he was considered an important scholar, a type of living encyclopedia of the history of the patria. José Veríssimo, who also dedicated himself to the study of Brazilian themes, wrote about Capistrano in 1907, commenting on the book *Capítulos de história colonial*, which had just been published. Anticipating Calógeras words after the death of Capistrano, Veríssimo located the historian from Ceará in relation to Brazilian historiography, stating that before him the History of Brazil was written “in the form of chronicles, reports or annals, in the official style of the old reports of Portuguese successes, with unnecessary circumstantial detail, a meticulous and impertinent profusion of dates, a sickening superfluity of names, nicknames, sobriquets and titles”.

In relation to the book *Capítulos de história colonial*, Veríssimo commented:

It is not yet history; however, it is more than everything he has done before: it is the foundation of its construction, the master walls of the finished framework. Based on the foundations that are there, the walls, it can be seen what the building and the architecture will be like... It is a book of a master for masters, and these should discuss it.

Capistrano stood out due to his “security of investigation, breadth of information, depth of knowledge, and the intelligence of the subject”, qualities which distinguished him from his predecessors and contemporaries. His book *Capítulos de história colonial* is considered by Veríssimo as “the most complete synthesis, the most ingenious, the most perfect and the most exact that we can desire of our historic evolution”. A summary of approximately thirty years of historic studies about Brazil. The author also called attention to Capistrano’s knowledge of German historiography, valorizing its utility in secure methods of historical investigation. He also pointed to the presence of a philosophical direction in his production, capable of freeing Capistrano from being ‘a simple scholar’. His great merit was his critical capacity, used in the analysis of documents and in the criticism of previous studies.

He not only checked the monuments and sources from which they [his predecessors] had drunk, but discovered or took advantage of new ones, and from the old ones got what they had let escape. And it is this work of the critic, an indispensable preliminary to all historic construction, which since the beginning has been his principal task, which preeminently marks the place and the role of Sr. Capistrano de Abreu in our historical cultural. He is above all a historical critic, or a critical historian, but a critic with constructive capacities...¹⁰

After the death of Capistrano in the 1920s various speeches characterized him as an intellectual symbol of a nationality which intended to be cultured and civilized and at the same time close to the uncivilized *sertão*, a place where it was believed Brazil was more authentic. This ‘*sertanejo*’ historian was a type of mediator between the worlds of civilization and barbarianism, since he possessed what was expected of a historian: erudition, general culture, original information, “an ability to investigate meticulously, allied to the method of comparison, deduction and presentation” and perhaps most importantly the “sentiment of [Brazilian] land and people.”

Coelho Neto, for example, presented him as “a stranger in time and in his environment” due to his withdrawn temperament, interpreted as a “survival from ‘barbarianism’, latent in the super-civilized”. In his opinion Capistrano was a “savage turned by study into one of the greatest exponents of our culture”, in such a way that “the book purified the barbarianism, allowing his name achieve glory”. His supposed indigenous ancestry had contributed to improving his capacities as a writer and investigator, at the time in which the study of history in Brazil could be associated with the act of entering in a ‘dark jungle’,

or in ‘pathless undergrowth’. Capistrano once defined himself as an old ranger, whose practical knowledge allow him to follow old paths that are little or even unexplored in the area of historiography and indigenous linguistics.

However, alongside appearance and manners, which authorized references to the interior world and the world of the indigenous peoples, the type of knowledge developed by Capistrano allows another type of approximation. As noted by Assis Chateaubriand, Capistrano’s great merit was have understood *brasilidade* (Brazilianness) – a distinctive property of Brazil and Brazilians – translating it through his studies on indigenous language and customs and also on colonial history.¹¹ The next part of text looks at part of Capistrano’s study of Indians in search of the ‘Brazilian people’.

TRAVELLING THROUGH BRAZIL IN SEARCH OF THE ‘BRAZILIAN PEOPLE’

... the tenebrous question: are the Brazilian people a new people or a decrepit people? And do the facts idealized by time value more than those that have actually passed?

Capistrano de Abreu¹²

... it is history, but live history, animated, brilliant like a drama, great and majestic like everything that appears to us through the dual veil of time and death.

José de Alencar¹³

Capistrano de Abreu sought to explain the formation of Brazilian nationality through sources arising out of a *popular culture* identified with a specific space – the *sertão* – and with a legacy: that of indigenous traditions. Considering literature as a ‘social fact,’ the author stated that popular tales – whose “eternal heroes are the *caboclo* and the sailor” – are “the most important documents for our history”.¹⁴

One of the first texts that dealt with the theme of national *formation* was published in two parts in 1876. This was the already mentioned criticism of Silvio Romero entitled *O caráter nacional e as origens do povo brasileiro*. As mentioned above, for Romero the Brazilian was distinct from the Portuguese, not because of nature or intermixing with the indigenous peoples, but due to the presence of the blacks. Capistrano was opposed to these perspective,

affirming the importance of the environment in the formation of Brazilian nationality and stressing the role of the indigenous element.¹⁵

Mesological theories were then widely accepted as being capable of explaining social inequalities. According to Capistrano nature was one of the ‘motors’ active in the “production of national character”. Another ‘motor’ was race, whether it was seen as a product of nature or a primeval and irreducible factor. However, as he affirms, environment and race were not the only factors that contributed to the construction of social structure. He also believed that both “acted on society, and society reacted against them; the social environment of effect became the cause; the result came to be the component.”¹⁶

Defending the connection between the use of theories and the examination of the documentary *corpus*, Capistrano believed that “the findings of modern criticism” (the basis of Romero’s argument) are empirical generalizations, and as a result, provisional. In this way the laws of science “are an inquiry and not a sentence: they cannot be contracted to facts, but have to be adapted to them”, leading the author to conclude that “theories only serve to discover the facts”.¹⁷

As we have seen, in 1880 Capistrano had a new opportunity to ‘attack’ Romero, for the same reasons as already mentioned. In his articles criticizing the book *A literatura brasileira e a crítica moderna*, where the thesis persisted that the influence of blacks on Brazilian society was greater than the influence of the environment and the indigenous populations, Capistrano stated: “My thesis is as follows: in relation to what differs Brazilians from European, the most part of this I attribute to the climate and the indigenous peoples. Without denying the action of the African element, I think that it is less than the two other factors, whether taken in isolation or in conjunction”.¹⁸

He sought in the ‘laws of science’ (sociology) and in the ‘historical truth’ arguments to contradict Romero. However, in addition to using a set of ‘scientistic’ theses, guided by methodological determinism and the search for laws, he understood that ‘truth’ was be reached through the study of colonial chronicles and the confrontation of original sources.

In the 1890s Capistrano started his systematic studies of Indian languages and customs, something which would occupy him until the end of his life. However, the task would impose many difficulties on him: only a few referential works existed, produced by foreigners, such as the German Karl Von den Steinen (1855-1929), author of *Die Bakairi Sprache* (1892) – whom Capistrano considered to be the “first specialist in savage ethnography” –, and by Brazilians,

such as Teodoro Sampaio (1855-1937) and Batista Caetano (1826-1882). The former was the author of *O Tupi na geografia nacional* (1901) and *Dicionário Histórico, Geográfico e Etnográfico* (1922); the latter was author of *Apontamentos sobre o Abaíneenga* (1876), amongst other works.

In a meticulous work Beatriz Protti Christino has mapped the networks of Americanists between 1890 and 1929 – a period that coincides with the intense journeying of German ethnographers to the Amazonia region – seeking to locate Capistrano de Abreu in the context of the production and reception of his work on the Caxinauá language. According to Christino, the existence can be noted during the second half of the 1890s of a process of the internationalization and inclusion of American scholars in the community that produced knowledge about the American peoples, which until then had been restricted to European scholars. In this context, groups previously considered as indistinct acquired new contours, demarcating the great diversity of *indigenous peoples*. Capistrano became a key figure among the scholars working with the registration, description and analysis of South American languages not related to the previously all encompassing Tupi. The Brazilian scholar was recognized by his contemporaries in Brazil as someone who had “[r]enewed the methods of analysis [and] [t]ransplanted to our environment the critical processes of German ethnology”. Abroad his work was praised for its “high scientific value, almost without parallel in South American linguistics and ethnography. The greatest and best material ever published among the South American language of the Indians”.¹⁹

For Teodoro Sampaio the ideal scientific procedure was to:

Register what in intimate and diurnal experience with the Indian we see as phenomenon of his language or the genuine product of his intellect and his memory, this should be the objective to be reached by those who may propose to know the wild man in his past, in his relationship with other peoples.

An example of this procedure was Capistrano’s work on the Caxinauá tongue. According to Sampaio:

Rã-txa-hu-ni-ku-i has in linguistics all this range, such as the grammar, text, and vocabulary of the *Caxinauás*, and even as legends, tales or fables, competing to decipher the obscure march of these people in the past... The model, just by itself, will produce its good fruit in the future and the science of indigenous

languages, now entering in a new phase, will give him the preeminent place that he deserves for his assistance in the solution of the great problem.²⁰

Despite the recognition of the specialists – not shared by many of those who considered these studies a useless waste of time – Capistrano’s investigations in the domains of indigenous linguistics and ethnography appear to have been accompanied by constant frustration. In 1909, for example, he concluded in relation to the works he had carried out: “I lightly sought a heavy enslavement and wasted my precious time, as with all frankness I declare this, I was not prepared for so much and things did not end up like I wished”.²¹ Supposedly this ‘heavy enslavement’ was the result of the combination of three aspects.

In first place is the inherent difficulty in the study of indigenous languages, dependant on the collaboration of native informants. Over time Capistrano lived with six Indians in his own house or in houses in the countryside lent to him by friends, with the aim of concluding his work of collecting and translating words and information about different indigenous groups. However, faced with an activity marked by tediousness and reciprocal irritations, he even stated that “working with Indians is neither easy nor agreeable; but nor is it impossible: it urgently needs to be done.” His method consisted of “suggesting nothing” and “only asking questions when the answer was known beforehand”. The scholar recognized the differences between activities in the field and in the *cabinet*, stating in his time there were two modes of studying an American language: the confessional and the mission. Having chosen the former, he concluded: “I see how imperfect it is: the most categorical affirmations only acquire value, contrasted with daily use”. He thought that “if I went to a village on the first day I would understand almost everything, and I believe that at the end of the first week, I would speak easily”.²²

In second place were the conditions of working with few resources. Committed to the publication of a book on the Caxinauá language, he said: “wretched is the one who decides to publish a book on indigenous languages in South America, or at least in Brazil, or at least in the National Press”. Conflicts with printers and publishers were continual and marked by unforeseen events such as a fire which destroyed part of the originals. The difficulties did not stop there. To publish the work of the German ethnographer Karl Von de Steinen, who could not find a publisher, the US anthropologist Franz Boas had to collect subscriptions of 50 dollars in Brazil, asking Capistrano for help.

Finally, there was the obstacle resulting from the urgency of the task, which at

times could evoke despair given the size of the task, as if it were really impossible despite being necessary. Like many scholars of his time, Capistrano believed that the Indians were about to disappear, even stating, for example: “in any case, I turn my back on History; they shall not lack for their own Tacitus and Suetonius: the poor Indians shall disappear from the world; all I want is that they do not go unaccompanied to the tomb”. However, to the contrary of the prevailing idea during the nineteenth century, this disappearance would not occur due to the decadence or degeneration of Indians caused by natural or racial factors. Rather he related this disappearance to the contact (seen as noxious) of indigenous peoples with the white element, represented by the figures of the *seringueiro* in Brazil and the *caucheiro* in Peru – both of which were forms of rubber tapers. Sometimes even contact with the scholar himself could ‘pervert’ Indians, who in another form would maintain their inherent ‘purity’. Capistrano even lamented that one of his informants, fed up with extenuating interviews, preferred to absent himself, running off to the city. On discovering this Capistrano said: “the Indian did not resist a year of contact with civilization and has already gone bad. I am now looking for a means to re-export him”. He believed that “bad urban company” had a noxious effect on the moral of the Indian Mogói, in such a way that he “could no longer live among his own” and in the city deteriorated each day. In this way Capistrano’s case could only with difficulty be adapted to the perspective in force in the nineteenth century that the relationship between the researcher and his informant could be controlled through a descriptive objectivity. The correspondence of this historian-ethnographer contained various examples of the tension, annoyances, affections and constant frustrations that marked his personal relationship with the Indians.

Amongst other motives, Capistrano wanted to write about indigenous to avoid what had happened with a particular language of Orinoco, which according to Humboldt, had only been “conserved by a parrot”.²³ This type of rhetoric of loss, or the disappearance of the indigenous peoples, had been in force since the nineteenth century, and the work of Martius was paradigmatic in the Brazilian case. The paper written by this German naturalist with Johann Baptist von Spix, *Viagem pelo Brasil* (published in Germany in 1823), was considered a ‘splendid companion’ by Capistrano: “it can be said: American humanity no longer has a future and before our eyes it will disappear”. The same could be said of Varnhagen, known opponent of philanthropic practices aimed at the Indians, critic of ‘caboclo indigenism’, defender of indigenous slavery, for whom the “time would come when it would not be known what color the Indians were:

much less, we can add, if they knew their languages, uses and customs, if this does not occur before”.²⁴ One of the proofs that showed this ‘disappearance’ through cultural contact seen as noxious was the fact, which Capistrano considered curious, that his ingenious informant “did not know the old traditions, he had to learn them with me, and bring them to the wise men”.²⁵

The end of the nineteenth century and the initial decades of the twentieth in Brazil were marked by an intense expansion of the agricultural frontiers of economic exploration, which contributed to emphasize the old belief that the extinction of the Indians was inevitable and would occur in the short term. As a consequence of this, research into the indigenous peoples intensified inside and outside the country. João Pacheco de Oliveira called attention to the fact that the same movement which sought to ‘save’ the indigenous peoples through systematic studies, contributed to their ‘disappearance,’ because to the extent that it affirmed the existence of an authentic and pure indigenous culture in the process of disappearing, it produced interpretations that denied the existence of ‘authentic Indians,’ since these had disappeared during the process of acculturation. As a result of this there arose the stigma of ‘mixed Indians,’ seen as ‘false’ Indians.²⁶

In the nineteenth century interest in the study of indigenous languages mobilized authors such as Gonçalves Dias, José de Alencar and the already cited Varnhagen. This study was associated with the collection – “from the lips of the people dispersed across its territory” – of ‘Brazilianisms’, indigenous histories and popular songs, directly connected to the search for ‘national poems’, ‘ancestral heroes’, and the ‘foundational texts of nationality’. In the words of Varnhagen:

I am increasingly convinced that for the study of indigenous races nothing can be of more help than the knowledge of their languages. For this reason I do not spare myself the work to gather together all the printed works and manuscripts that I will find about this, and I never thought that just about South America that there would be published such important works.²⁷

The study of indigenous languages was considered fundamental for the understanding of population migrations and as a result the settlement of territory, seen as a foundation for the *formation of nationality*. Moreover, the description of indigenous tribes was based on a linguistic perspective, so that the old dichotomy between the Tupis and Tapuias was equivalent to the distinction between the speakers and non-speakers of a general language,

respectively. The belief that language was the key to deciphering the history of all humanity persisted. Thus it was believed that there existed original, pure, languages, whose corruption could supposedly be evaluated and measured.

In Capistrano's studies this concern with detecting the 'corruption' of language is not noticeable, though it could be possible. Supposedly the author was more concerned with understanding language as a living dynamic and complex system. His analyses aimed at identifying through comparisons differences between native languages. Language is an organism that needs to adapt to the environment, losing and acquiring functions in accordance with a 'plastic principle'. For this reason, he is attentive to the possibility that one day a 'chronology of language' may be established. He also looks for another path in the study of indigenous languages, distinct from those identified with the "ancient, philosophical point of view", characterized by abstract questions and *a priori* ideas and not by "irrefutable facts".

His interest in accessing the history of the Indians through the study of linguistics is worth noting. An effort that, it can be said in passing, identified *popular* and indigenous traditions as marked by memory and anachronism. Following Steinen's trail, Capistrano pays attention to the different temporalities of the verbs of the Bacaeri language, identifying three types of past (remote, mid-term and recent), "perhaps two presents" (often confused with the past and the remote past) and the future which is rarely used.²⁸ These analyses, far from being an eccentric and deviant investment, appear to have complemented his historical studies, although the author often marked his withdrawal from the latter due to his interest in the former. This assertion is only possible by considering that for Capistrano the 'tenebrous question' raised in the epigraph was knowing whether the Brazilian people were a new people or a decrepit people. The study of indigenous languages and customs was useful to answer this question, in such a way that thinking about Indians was equivalent to thinking about Brazilians and the *formation* of nationality. As well noted by Maria da Gloria de Oliveira, Capistrano's studies of Indians should not be seen as something dislocated from his studies of the history of Brazil, but as a decisive element for the constitution of this history. Capistrano's critique of the work of Oliveira Lima, *Pernambuco e seu desenvolvimento histórico* (1894), is a good example of how the historian could deal with the question: where should the history of Brazil begin?²⁹

Diverging from the Varnhagen's interpretation, who saw the unity of the indigenous language and race as prevailing, Capistrano's studies appear to have

led him to a frequent finding of diversity and, as a result, the fragmentation of the ‘national being’. This meeting with diversities can be perceived both in the studies of indigenous languages and customs, and in his historical studies. As noted by Ronaldo Vainfas in his analysis of *Capítulos de história colonial* (1907), what prevailed was the comprehension that “centrifugal and dissolving forces” were predominant in the Brazilian case. Only the “passive force of religion” and the “active force of language” permitted the identification of a Portuguese America.³⁰ While, on the one hand, this finding could lead him to pessimism, on the other it could be said that it fed a continual quest to discover more and to an arduous effort to decipher what he himself defined as “the knot of our history”: the settlement of the *sertão*. The know was there in the “great curve of the São Francisco river, the passing of the Cariris and Borborema, the entering of the Parnaíba, the land road from Maranhão to Bahia”. A settlement that was only possible when the ocean was forgotten and relations with the indigenous peoples intensified. One of the chapters of this history of Brazil was marked by these relations, observed in principle in two main centers: Pernambuco and São Paulo. Here the crucial questions arise: was there any common factor in such distant points that could result in similar manifestations? In his interpretation, although the Portuguese had prospered in Pernambuco and São Paulo this was due, at least in part, to the relations woven with the indigenous peoples in the two regions. Thus the Indians entered into history, not as a simple “erudite curiosity,” but as a fundamental element in the occupation of territory, guided by a dual movement: of man and of nature.³¹

It is worth remembering, even briefly, the quarrel that opposed Capistrano to the historians who defended the so-called ‘origin myth of Paulista society,’ which since the eighteenth century was based on a set of affirmations related to grandeur of São Paulo to the Tupi inheritance. The basis for this affirmation was the association of the Guaianás of Piratininga with the Tupis. At the end of the nineteenth century some scholars raised the hypothesis that the Guaianás had not belonged to the Tupi group and furthermore were the remote ancestors of the contemporary Kaingang, associated with the Tapuias, the group most despised by modern science. Capistrano was one of the defenders of this thesis, basing himself on studies which showed the diversity of groups until then homogenized by the terms Tupi and Tapuia.

From the diversity of indigenous languages to the diversity of the *Brasis*, passing through the doubt about the ‘evolution’ or ‘dissolution’ of the Brazilian *people*. In a letter to Paulo Prado in 1922, Capistrano drew a diagram to demonstrate the process through which his interlocutor could comprehend (and explain)

the São Paulo phenomenon. The ‘Pauliceia’ reached a climax to afterwards fall and finally regenerate (ascension – climax – decline – regeneration). The application of this formula to human societies was not new, having been used numerous times with the purpose of escaping the condemnation imposed by the notion of decadence or degeneration. In Capistrano this formula offered a solution to the ‘tenebrous question’ which afflicted him.

Returning to Flora Süssekind’s text which served as an epigraph and the essay of Ilmar Rohloff de Mattos, which presents the trajectory of Capistrano from the province to the court as a journey of discovery of himself and of Brazil, it is possible to perceive some similarities between the construction of the modern narrator of fiction and the modern historian. In relation to the perception of time, this *travelling* historian knows that

Brazil is not far from there, and to discover it, it was necessary for him to leave, to go abroad, to rethink it from a distance, as the modernists would later preach, and yes tame its interior, reveal its more intimate nature, through many journeys, real and imaginary, in a way very similar to what the romantics would do. Hard travel, but full of novelties; journey that would constitute a repository of a set of elements that raised at the same time admiration and fear: wonderful journeys! (Mattos, 1997, p.2)

Although he wanted to share the dilemmas and disbeliefs of the ‘new generation’ of 1870 and to propose a ‘tenebrous question’, by considering the possibility regeneration, Capistrano seemed to reaffirm the movement of history. A movement that supposedly would have allowed the ‘weight’ of the past to be doubted and questioned if “the facts idealized by time were worth more than the facts that have really happened”. In the end, it can be said that “neither would be capable of straightening out Brazil, nor of making it sink forever.” Movement that allowed him to think that one of his informants, the Indian Tuxinin, was “a real Cearense; even calling Portuguese *marinheiro*”. The Bacaeri Indian about to ‘disappear’ is *reborn* in the figure of the Cearense, who for some at least was the synonym of Brazilian.³²

NOTES

¹ Süssekind, Flora. *O Brasil não é longe daqui: o narrador, a viagem*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1990, pp.153-154.

² Part of this reflection is contained in Gontijo, Rebeca. *O velho vaqueano: Capistrano de Abreu, da historiografia ao historiador*. Dissertation (Doctorate in History) – UFF. Niterói

(RJ), 2006. For the writing of this article, I would like to register my debt to two studies that discuss the trajectory of Capistrano as a traveler/discoverer: Mattos, Ilmar Rohloff. Capítulos de Capistrano. In: PUC-RJ. *Os descobridores*: Mário de Andrade, Capistrano de Abreu e os descobrimentos do Brasil. Rio de Janeiro: PUC, integrated research report, 1997, available at modernosdescobrimentos.inf.br/desc/capistrano/frame.htm in May 2005; and Pereira, Daniel Mesquita. *Descobrimentos de Capistrano: a História do Brasil “a grandes traços e largas malhas”*. Dissertation (Doctorate in History) – PUC. Rio de Janeiro, 2002. See also: Süssekind, 1990.

³ Letter from Capistrano de Abreu to Ana Nunes de Melo, 23 April 1875. In: Menezes, Raimundo de. Há cem anos nascia Capistrano de Abreu. *Revista Investigações*, ano V, no. 51, Separata, pp.14-15, Oct.-Dec. 1953. Also see: Abreu, Capistrano de. Livros e Letras (Seção). In: _____. *Ensaios e estudos* (crítica e história), 4ª série. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira; MEC, 1976, pp.104-107. Unsigned article, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, Rio de Janeiro, 18 Nov. 1879.

⁴ Respectively, Alencar, José de. *Obras completas*. Rio de Janeiro: Aguilar, s.d. vol. 4, p.969; and Letter from Joaquim Serra to Machado de Assis, dated 11 May 1875. *Revista da Academia Brasileira de Letras*, ano II, no. 5, p.70, July 1911.

⁵ The reference to Garnier as the ‘Sublime Gateway’ was made by the writer João Luso in *Kosmos*, Nov. 1908.

⁶ Abreu, Capistrano de. O caráter nacional e as origens do povo brasileiro, in 1976, 4ª série, pp.3-24, originally published in *O Globo*, Rio de Janeiro, 21 Jan. 1876 and 8 Mar. 1876, respectively; and História pátria, in 1976, 4ª série, pp.3-24, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, 9, 10 and 13 Mar. 1880.

⁷ Lima, Ivana Stolze. Índios e língua nacional em José de Alencar. In: _____. *Cores, marcas e falas*. Rio de Janeiro: Arquivo Nacional, 2003, p.165. See also: Schwarcz, Lília Moritz. *As barbas do imperador*: D. Pedro II, um monarca nos trópicos. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 1998, pp.125-157; Pinto, Maria Cecília de Moraes. *A vida selvagem*: paralelo entre Chateaubriand e Alencar. São Paulo: Annablume, 1995.

⁸ Abreu, “José de Alencar”, in 1976, 4ª série, pp.42-45, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, 13 Dec. 1877. Capistrano also published other texts about Alencar: one on the occasion of the second anniversary of his death (*Gazeta de Notícias*, 12 Dec. 1879) and another on the fifth anniversary (*Gazeta de Notícias*, 12 and 20 Dec. 1882), *ibidem*, pp. 51-55 and 56-58, respectively. In relation to the link between Capistrano and Alencar, see the observations of Amoroso, Marta Rosa. *Capistrano de Abreu e os índios*. Text presented in the Encontro Anual Da Anpocs, 19. Caxambu (MG), 17-21 Oct. 1995, in the Indigenous History and Indigenism Work Group.

⁹ See Abreu, Sobre o Visconde de Porto Seguro, in 1976, 1ª série, pp.131-147, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias* on 21-22-23 Nov. 1882; *idem*, Necrológio de Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen, Visconde de Porto Seguro, in 1976, 1ª série, pp.81-91, originally published in *Jornal do Comércio*, 16-20 Dec. 1878. In relation to the criticism of Varnha-

gen, see, for example: Araripe, Tristão de Alencar. Indicações sobre a História Nacional. *Revista do IHGB*, vol. LVII, parte 2, pp.259-290, 1894.

¹⁰ Veríssimo, José. O Sr. Capistrano de Abreu. *Jornal do Comércio*, 16 Sept. 1907; se also: Abreu, Capistrano de. Letter to João Lúcio de Azevedo, 13 Sept. 1926, in *Correspondência*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira; Brasília: Inep, 1977, vol. 2, p.365; _____. Programa de História do Brasil. *Gazeta Litteraria*, 24 Nov. 1884, pp.377-380.

¹¹ Alencar, Mário. Sobre um livro de Capistrano. *Jornal do Commercio*, 25 Oct. 1907; Coelho Neto, Henrique. Redimido. *Jornal do Brasil*, 21 Aug. 1927; Chateaubriand, Assis. Capistrano de Abreu. *O Jornal*, 14 Aug. 1927; see also: Gontijo, Rebeca. O intelectual como símbolo da brasilidade: o caso Capistrano de Abreu. In: Abreu, Martha; Soihet, Rachel; Gontijo, Rebeca (Org.). *Cultura política e leituras do passado: historiografia e ensino de história*. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2007, pp.309-327. At the beginning of the twentieth century the term *brasilidade* was used to indicate a type of ‘essence’ of the beings and things of Brazil, composing what Temístocles Cezar defined as the ‘rhetoric of nationality’. See Cezar, Temístocles. A retórica da nacionalidade de Varnhagen e o mundo antigo: o caso da origem dos tupis. In: Guimarães, Manoel Luiz Salgado (Org.). *A escrita da história*. Rio de Janeiro: Sete Letras, 2006, p.29. Note the use of the term in: Celso, Afonso. *Por que me ufano do meu país*. (1.ed. 1900). Rio de Janeiro: Expressão e Cultura, 1997. The hypothesis here is that Capistrano contributed to the rereading of the notion of *brasilidade*, informed by an anti-chauvinistic perspective, as can be seen in *Retrato de Brasil* (1928) by Paulo Prado; see Keuller, Adriana T. A. Martins. Retrato do Brasil: uma análise da tristeza pradiana. *Dimensões – Revista de história da Ufes*, no. 9, pp.181-192. Available at: www.ufes.br/ppghis/dimensoes/artigos/Dimensoes9_AdrianaTAMartinsKeuller.pdf.

¹² Letter from Capistrano de Abreu to Mario de Alencar, 18 Jan. 1911, in ABREU, 1977, vol. 1, p.226.

¹³ Alencar, José de. Cartas sobre a Confederação dos Tamoios. In: *Obra completa*. Rio de Janeiro: Aguillar, 1959, p.891.

¹⁴ For Capistrano there were two methods of studying literature: the qualitative and the quantitative. While the former considered the literary ‘product’, giving it a value and appealing to the ideal, the latter considers the ‘process’, the ‘characteristic’, the ‘antecedents of reality’. The former judges, seeking beauty and perfection. The latter defines and seeks the ‘psychic and social condition’. The author opted for the second method, considering the close relations between the ‘social element’ and the ‘literary element’, in order to suppose that “literature is the expression of society”. See Abreu, A literatura brasileira contemporânea, in 1976, 1ª série, p.37 e 61, originally published in *O Globo*, 28 and 30 Nov. 1875.

¹⁵ Abreu, O caráter nacional e as origens do povo brasileiro, 1976, pp.3-24; idem, História pátria, op. cit. Capistrano’s article has the same title as the text by Silvio Romero which is the target of the criticism, included as an appendix in a series of articles on the work of Couto de Magalhães, also published in *O Globo* newspaper. See: Wehling, Arno. Capistrano de Abreu e a História do Brasil. *Trajetos – Revista de História da UFC*, Fortaleza, vol. 3, no. 5, 2004, pp.49-63. Some observations on these texts can be found in Gontijo, Rebeca.

Além do IHGB: Capistrano de Abreu e a escrita da história do Brasil (1870-1880). In: Lessa, Monica Leite; Fonseca, Silvia Carla Pereira de Brito (Org.). *Entre a monarquia e a república: imprensa, pensamento político e historiografia (1822-1889)*. Rio de Janeiro: Ed. Uerj, 2008, pp.183-207; and Oliveira, Maria da Gloria de. *Crítica, método e escrita da história em João Capistrano de Abreu (1853-1927)*. Thesis (Masters in History) – UFRGS. Porto Alegre, 2006, pp.129-149.

¹⁶ Abreu, O caráter nacional..., 1976, p.5. In relation to mesological theories, see, for example, Bresciani, Maria Stella Martins. *Identidades nacionais: uma questão sensível*. In: _____. *O charme da ciência e a sedução da objetividade: Oliveira Vianna entre intérpretes do Brasil*. São Paulo: Unesp, 2005, pp.19-147. And in relation to racial theories: Ortiz, Renato. *Memória coletiva e sincretismo científico: as teorias raciais do século XIX*. In: _____. *Cultura brasileira e identidade nacional*. São Paulo: Brasiliense, 1994, pp.13-35.

¹⁷ Abreu, O caráter nacional..., cit., p.10 and 14.

¹⁸ ABREU, História pátria, in 1976, 3ª série, p.106 and 111, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, 9, 10 and 13 Mar. 1880.

¹⁹ See: Abreu, Capistrano de. *Rã-txa hu-ni-ku~i*: gramática, textos e vocabulário caxinauás. A língua dos caxinauás do rio Ibuacú afluente do Murú (Prefeitura de Tarauacá). (1.ed. 1914). Rio de Janeiro: Sociedade Capistrano de Abreu, 1941. 2.ed. com emendas do autor e estudo crítico do prof. Theodor Koch-Grünberg; Christino, Beatriz Protti. *A rede de Capistrano de Abreu (1853-1927): uma análise historiográfica do rã-txa hu-ni-ku~i em face da sul-americanística dos anos 1890-1929*. Dissertation (Doctorate in General Linguistics) – FFLCH, USP. São Paulo, 2006, pp.26-27. In 1895 Capistrano was elected as a corresponding member of the Society of Anthropology, Ethnology and Pre-History of Berlin. In 1924 he became a member of the Société des Américanistes de Paris. See also: Calógeras, João Pandiá. Capistrano de Abreu – Discurso proferido a 13 set. 1927 pelo Exmo. Sr. Dr. João Pandiá Calógeras na sessão do Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro, comemorativa do trigésimo dia do passamento do historiador, *Annaes do Museu Paulista*, vol. 3, pp. XXI-XXXIII, 1927; and Grünberg cited in Christino, 2006, p.31.

²⁰ Sampaio [1915] cited in Christino, 2006, p.29.

²¹ In 1914, for example, Oscar Lopes asked: “What is the purpose of all of Capistrano de Abreu’s efforts, and what profit does he make and do we obtain from the divulgation of an Indian language, a language no one wants to learn and Indians whom will be absorbed by civilization?”. Lopes cited in Christino, 2006, p.20. See also: Abreu, Cartas a Mário de Alencar, 28 Dec. 1909 and 6 Sept. 1915, in 1977, vol.1, p. 212 and 239, respectively.

²² Capistrano counted on the help of Cândido Rondon (his neighbor), João Pandiá Calógeras, Oscar de Miranda and Luis Sombra, who supported his meetings with the Indians in Rio. His informants (or ‘tongues’) that have been identified are: the Caxinauá cousins Bôrô (Vicente Pena Sombra) and Tuxinin (Luis Pena Sombra); and the Bacaeris Irineu, Antonio (‘tongue’ of the ethnographer Karl von den Steinen) and Mogói. He actually lived for two years with one of the Bacaeris. See Abreu, Capistrano de. *Os guaianases de Piratininga [1917]*. In _____. *Caminhos antigos e povoamento do Brasil*. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia;

São Paulo: Edusp, 1989, p.27, originally published in *Jornal do Commercio*, 25 Jan. 1917. See also: Abreu, Os caxinauás, in 1976, 3ª série, p.229; _____. Cartas ao barão do Rio Branco, 22 Jun. 1895; a José Veríssimo, 20 Nov. 1909; and a João Lúcio de Azevedo, 13 Aug. 1921, in 1977, vol. 1, p.135 and 197, and vol. 2, p.220, respectively. At a certain time Capistrano mentioned that if he had known an article by Steinthal about how to collect 'savage languages', it would have facilitated his work. See Abreu, Carta a [Mendes da Rocha], in 1977, vol.1, p.58. Heymann Steinthal (1823-1899), a German philosopher and philologist, student of Wilhelm Von Humboldt in the University of Berlin, where he also lectured, dedicated himself to the study of racial psychology.

²³ Abreu, cartas a João Pandiá Calógeras, 22 Aug. 1911; to João Lúcio de Azevedo, 20 Oct. 1923; to Paulo Prado, 6 Feb. 1923, in 1977, vol.1, p.377, and vol.2, p.283 and 438; to Mário de Alencar, 1915, p.239, respectively; and also carta a Alfredo Pujol, 29 Abr. 1916, in 1977, vol.3, p.66; and to João Lúcio de Azevedo, on 17 Jan. 1925 and 15 Apr. 1925, in 1977, vol.2, p.316 and 326. See also: Abreu, Os caxinauás, in 1976, 3ª série, p.250, originally published in *Jornal do Commercio*, 25 Dec. 1911 and 7 - 14 Jan. 1912.

²⁴ Respectively, Martius [1905] cited in Kodama, Kaori. *Os filhos das brenhas e o império do Brasil: a etnografia no Instituto Histórico e Geográfico do Brasil (1840-1860)*. Dissertation (Doctorate in History) – PUC. Rio de Janeiro, 2005, p.142, paper published with the title *Os índios do Brasil: a etnografia do IHGB entre as décadas de 1840 e 1860*. Rio de Janeiro: Fiocruz; São Paulo: Edusp, 2009; Varnhagen, Francisco Adolfo de. Sobre a necessidade do estudo e do ensino das línguas indígenas do Brasil, *Revista do IHGB*, tomo III, 1841, p.55. See also: Abreu, Carta a João Lúcio de Azevedo, 19 Dec. 1917, in 1977, vol. 2, p.78. And also, Cezar, 2006. For the latter, the research on indigenous languages carried out in the nineteenth century, as well as providing elements for the romantic ideal, possessed a relevant epistemological aspect for the historian's works, since it permitted the creation of historical proof, important for the debate about the origin of the 'invaders' who occupied American territory.

²⁵ Abreu, Cartas a Paulo Prado, 6 Feb. 1924, and to João Lúcio de Azevedo, oitava da Constituição [1924], in 1977, vol.2, p.452 and 290, respectively.

²⁶ See Oliveira, João Pacheco de. Uma etnologia dos 'índios misturados'? Situação colonial, territorialização e fluxos culturais. In: _____. (Org.). *A viagem de volta: etnicidade, política e reelaboração cultural no Nordeste indígena*. Rio de Janeiro: Contracapa, 1999, pp.11-36.

²⁷ Adet e Sousa e Silva [1844], cited in Sússekind, 1990, p.479 and pp.479-480, and Varnhagen, Francisco Adolfo. Ethnographia indígena: linguas, emigrações e archeologia. *Revista do IHGB*, tomo 21, 1858, p.390.

²⁸ Abreu, Livros e Letras, in 1976, 4ª série, pp.171-172 and pp.271-273, originally published in *Gazeta de Notícias*, 6 Nov. 1890 and 17 Jul. 1881, respectively. A reference to Capistrano in this way is the work of A. Thimme, a scholar of German folklore, author of *Das Märchen* (1901), which characterizes 'popular traditions' as strikingly anachronic, since despite having a 'very ancient background' always incorporate the 'most modern accessories', in

such a ways that their anachronism is congenial. See Abreu, *Os caxinauás*, in 1976, p.223; and *Os bakaeris*, 1976, p.172.

²⁹ Abreu, carta a Mário de Alencar, 18 Jan. 1911, in 1977, vol. 1, p.226; Pernambuco e seu desenvolvimento histórico, in 1976, 4ª série, pp.177-184; see OLIVEIRA, 2006, p.46. It is worth noting that in the middle of the nineteenth century, Karl F. P. Von Martius stated that “the most general and most significant document” for the historian willing to write the history of Brazil was the language of the Indians. See: Martius, K. F. P. Von. *Como se deve escrever a história do Brasil*. In: _____. *Estado de Direito entre os autóctones do Brasil*. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia, 1982, p.92.

³⁰ Vainfas, Ronaldo. Capistrano de Abreu – Capítulos de história colonial. In: Mota, Lourenço Dantas (Org.). *Introdução ao Brasil: um banquete nos trópicos*. 2.ed. São Paulo: Senac, 1999, p.187. See also, Abreu, Capistrano de. *Capítulos de história colonial, 1500-1800*. Belo Horizonte: Itatiaia; São Paulo: Edusp, 1988, p.256.

³¹ Para Capistrano, “only through linguistic means could the question that for me is capital be resolved, of investigating the cleavage between the villagers with a Bahian and Pernambucan origin in S. Francisco, Borborema, Cariris and in Parnaíba”. Abreu, cartas a João Lúcio de Azevedo, 26 Jan. 1917, 14 Sept. 1916, in 1977, vol. 2, p.30, 16; Pernambuco e seu desenvolvimento histórico, in 1976, 4ª série, p.179, originally published in *A Notícia*, 22 Dec. 1894. This is a summary of the book by Oliveira Lima with the same title and published in the same year.

³² Abreu, cartas a Paulo Prado, 23 Dec. 1922 and 7 set. 1925, in 1977, vol.2, p.432 and 472; carta a João Pandiá Calógeras, 15 Nov. 1901, 1977, vol.1, p.357. See also Abreu, 1989, pp.24-28. In relation to Tapuia *versus* Tupi quarrel, see Monteiro, John Manuel. *Tupis, tapuias e historiadores: estudos de história indígena e do indigenismo*. Dissertation (*Livre docência* in Antropologia) – IFCH, Unicamp. Campinas (SP), 2001. In relation to the 1870 generation, see Alonso, Angela. *Ideias em movimento: a geração de 1870 e a crise do Brasil-Império*. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002. Participating in the Scientific Exploration Commission for the Northern Provinces (1859) – also known as the Butterfly Commission and the Defloration Commission – Gonçalves Dias thought that it was no longer possible to find ‘pure Indians’ in Ceará, except for a few Chocós. It would be necessary to go further north, to the Amazon to find tribes with little contact with whites. Ceará was the land of ‘mixed’ people. Responding to a local inhabitant, who wanted to know if the Empire had come to Brazil, he responded with a charade saying “Brazil already sees what is Ceará...”. Dias, cited in Kodama, 2005, p.267.

Article submitted in May 2010. Approved in July 2010.