

Armstrong analisa a recepção das obras de cada um dos cinco escritores dentro e fora do Brasil. Chega à conclusão de que existe mais interesse acadêmico no exterior para a obra de Amado do que no Brasil e que, fora do círculo acadêmico, Rosa é quase desconhecido internacionalmente. Parte do problema de recepção estrangeira está no entendimento do lugar da literatura brasileira no meio acadêmico exterior. Outro ponto pode ser a dificuldade de tradução das obras, como ilustrado pelo caso de *Grande Sertão: Veredas*, embora já traduzido para vários idiomas. Existe uma diferença entre as recepções no Brasil e fora, entre autores e entre recepção no meio acadêmico e por parte do público leitor não acadêmico. Jorge Amado é o único escritor que consegue sucesso em todas as recepções embora a crítica não o avalie de maneira unânime, pois a avaliação de Amado é melhor fora do Brasil, ao contrário dos demais autores. O caso da relativa pouca recepção dos brasileiros é mais interessante quando Armstrong a compara com escritores do *Boom* da América de língua espanhola. Armstrong conclui que a literatura brasileira está fadada à obscuridade internacional por não atender ao “apetite” deste mercado.

No quarto capítulo, “Sócio-Antropologia e Cultura Popular”, há uma quebra da análise literária e avalia-se a ligação entre a tradição sócio-antropológica e a literatura no Brasil. Armstrong utiliza exemplos como Euclides da Cunha e Gilberto Freyre para evidenciar a relação entre as áreas. As análises de símbolos culturais como carnaval, Rio de Janeiro, Bossa Nova, cultura Afro, nordeste (Bahia) e música salientam a complexidade da identidade cultural e social brasileira que leva à conclusão, no capítulo final, sobre a uso inadequado do termo Terceiro Mundo aplicado ao Brasil, já que este termo falha em captar as especificidades nacionais. Finalizando, Armstrong retoma as idéias desenvolvidas anteriormente para chegar à triste conclusão para os admiradores da literatura brasileira de que ela tem falhado em se fazer notar e admirar fora do Brasil. Só nos resta trabalhar para mudar este cenário.

Paula Rodrigues Pontes  
University of Georgia

*O Brasil dos Brazilianistas: Um guia dos estudos sobre o Brasil nos Estados Unidos, 1945-2000.* Org. Rubens Antonio Barbosa, Marshall C. Eakin, and Paulo Roberto de Almeida. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2002.

Brazilianism is an odd phenomenon. Its usage among academics seems to contain a kind of biological assumption: that scholars of Brazil born in the United States (and perhaps the United Kingdom) “naturally” have a unique “unBrazilian” understanding of the country. The assumption seems quite country specific: there is little discussion in Brazil of “o brasilianista” Levi-Strauss (born in France) or of “a brasilianista” Katia M. de Queirós Mattoso (born in Greece) while the “anthropologist” Levi Strauss and the “historian” Mattoso seem to merit much interest. Yet it is rare indeed when the introduction to a publication or lecture by a United States-born scholar of Brazil does not include the word “brasilianist” and all its associated cultural baggage.

It is exactly the uncontrollable “naturalness” of “Brazilianism” that seems to result in heated discussions often based on a kind of “new eugenics” theory where citizenship is related to some kind of incontrovertible idea of national race. Even Brazilian Ambassador to the United States Rubens Antônio Barbosa, who sponsored the project that led to the book (and to make a full disclosure, in which I participated as a guest of the Embassy),

makes a linguistic distinction between “brasilianstas americanos” and “estudiosos brasileiros.” Is “estudioso” the opposite of “brasilianista” or a synonym? How curious.

*O Brasil dos Brasilianistas* is primarily an intellectual history in the tradition of José Carlos Sebe Bom Meihy, *A Colônia Brasilianista: História Oral de Vida Acadêmica* (São Paulo: Nova Stella, 1990), and a recent update organized by Fabiano Maissonave and published in the *Folha de S. Paulo* (*Caderno Mais*, 6 June 1999, pp 1-6). From this perspective the book is a success. With academic precision the various chapters destroy many of the myths surrounding Brazilianism and its ostensible practitioners. First, *O Brasil dos Brasilianistas* makes a clear distinction between the generation that was originally anointed with the term and the two following ones by showing the immense changes in research topics and the expanding relationship with Brazilian scholars. Second, it breaks apart the unitary category of “Brazilian Studies” by suggesting that historians and literary scholars of Brazil rarely speak the same language or even engage the same materials. Third, the various bibliographies make clear how much intellectual exchange takes place between the United States, the United Kingdom and Brazil (the list of scholars whose work is published in both Portuguese and English is impressive indeed) AND that there is still much work to be done. Yet all of this, as Robert Levine notes poignantly in one chapter, often makes little difference among a Brazilian press (and some scholars) that treats research and analysis by U.S. born scholars as a kind of insidious plot that aims to ruin the minds of Brazilians from the left, right and center, all at the same time.

The volume is in many ways a classic historiography. The various articles chart generational changes in research themes, from politics to race to gender and ethnicity. These shifts, as would be expected, reflect trends in intellectual life in Brazil, the United States and the United Kingdom. The division in three parts, tracing the history of Brazilian studies, a disciplinary examination of research, and a chronology that links Brazilian-United States political relations with the topics of study, is excellent. It shows that “brasilianismo” is about the exchange of ideas, not the imposition of them. Indeed, *O Brasil dos Brasilianistas* should put the nail in the coffin to the idea that non-Brazilian scholars operate in a world distinct and divorced from that which they study.

The editors of the book are to be commended for their careful bibliographical work, and especially for their hard work in including both English and Portuguese language volumes in the bibliographies. This makes the volume more than one of intellectual history but a “must-read” for all scholars working in Brazilian studies in the humanities and social sciences. An academic library that includes all the volumes mentioned in *O Brasil dos Brasilianistas* will have a fine basis for secondary research.

For those interested in issues of globalization and transnationalism, *O Brasil dos Brasilianistas* suggests significant challenges. For example, the authors of the various chapters tend to assume (as do most Brazilian intellectuals) that place of birth is the primary, and place of study the secondary, factor in determining who is a “Brazilianist.” A U.S. born scholar who lives and works permanently in Brazil is a “Brazilianist” while a Brazilian born scholar who studies, lives and works in the U.S. is not.

In an age when increasing numbers of foreign-born scholars of Brazil have much more than an academic relationship with the country (often through family, dual citizenship, or permanent resident status) the term “Brazilianism” perhaps needs to be deconstructed further. Brazilian-born scholars often study abroad and if training is critical to intellectual production, then the whole biological/national assumptions behind Brazilianism need to be challenged. Of course there are national and cultural differences between academic training and academic markets. Yet what makes the discussion of Brazilianism so curious is the assumption that training is divorced from academic production. Academic study is about the free flow of ideas, not the restriction of them,

and Brazil is not the only country where non-native born scholars conduct research. Indeed, where would academic study of the United States be without de Toqueville or Myrdal or da Matta?

The organizers of *O Brasil dos Brazilianistas: Um guia dos estudos sobre o Brasil nos Estados Unidos, 1945-2000* are to be applauded for encouraging this kind of debate. The articles show clearly that scholars of Brazil, irrespective of their birthplaces or training, are in dialogue with each other. The governments of both Brazil and the United States (and other countries as well) are eager to promote intellectual exchanges in order to guarantee the conversation and this is good for scholars, their students, and the interested public. Brazilianism only exists as a function of Brazil and, as *O Brasil dos Brazilianistas* shows, the tension between the poles makes for a fertile intellectual landscape

Jeffrey Lesser  
Emory University

Afolabi, Niyi. *The Golden Cage: Regeneration in Lusophone African Literature and Culture*. Trenton: Africa World Press, 2001. 256 pp. Notes. Bibliography. Index.

Niyi Afolabi's *The Golden Cage* is a worthwhile contribution to the field of Lusophone African Cultural Studies. The book focuses on four authors, one Angolan (Manuel Rui) and three Mozambicans (Luís Bernardo Honwana, Mia Couto, and Ungulani Ba Ka Khosa). Through impressive close readings of selected texts, Afolabi develops the argument that there is, in Lusophone African literature, a carnivalesque regenerative tradition that neutralizes hierarchies and celebrates the "complementarity of opposites" (228). In essence, he is asserting that these writers deconstruct the colonial and neo-colonial binaries they inherit.

While many of Afolabi's textual readings are interesting, sometimes his reasoning lacks rigor, particularly when he tries to pass subjective value judgments off as universally agreed objective truths. A very glaring instance of this is his muddled explanation of the book's title. After claiming that Portuguese colonialism was "the most brutal" of all colonialisms (xii), and implying that it uniquely "required an armed warfare to dismantle" (xii), he then proceeds to assert that "these non-Portuguese-speaking parts of the African world offer a richness and a diversity that have been hidden to the rest of the world due to language barrier, the devastating armed struggle, as well as harrowing civil wars that have underdeveloped rather than develop that part of the continent" (xii). Even assuming that Afolabi means the Portuguese-speaking parts of Africa, and not the opposite as he states and which makes his argument nonsense, he seems to fall into a number of intellectual traps in order rhetorically to bludgeon his reader with an idea which could more simply be stated as the problem of the Anglophone bias in African Studies. Reducing Lusophone Africa to an underdeveloped, homogenous and unique war zone that suffered at the hands of, and as a result of, the "most brutal" colonial regime, overlooks the relative stability of Cape Verde, the turmoil, civil wars, independence struggles, and underdevelopment of large tracts of Francophone and Anglophone Africa, not to mention that it morally downgrades the brutality of the British, French, Belgian, Italian, Spanish and German presences in Africa. A more convincing argument for general ignorance of Lusophone Africa is the semi-peripheral position of Portugal recently addressed by Margarida Ribeiro in *Portuguese Studies* (2002). When the