Virtue Language and Boundary Drawing in Modern Brazilian Historiography: a reading of Historians of Brazil, by Francisco Iglésias

Falando de Virtudes e Estabelecendo Fronteiras na Historiografia Brasileira Moderna: uma leitura de Historiadores do Brasil, de Francisco Iglésias

João Rodolfo Munhoz Ohara
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8946-4714

ABSTRACT

In *Historians of Brazil*, Francisco Iglésias reviews some of the great names in Brazilian historiography as divided by him into three distinct moments: up to 1838, from 1838 to 1931, and from 1931 onwards. This article shall focus on the third of these moments, which has traditionally been considered the moment of the "modern Brazilian historiography". More specifically, I would like to draw attention to Iglésias' use of virtue and vice language to assess those historians and their works. Virtues and vices have long been used not only in moral evaluations but also in epistemic ones. Being recognized as a historian includes cultivating repertoires of virtues which are deemed to be necessary for actually being a historian. As Iglésias evaluates his predecessors, we will have a glimpse into how a particular way of being a historian – that of the university professor in the 1980s – clashes against previous models of scholarly selfhood.

KEYWORDS

Francisco Iglésias; Brazilian historiography; Epistemic virtues.

RESUMO

Em Historiadores do Brasil, Francisco Iglésias avalia alguns dos grandes nomes da historiografia brasileira, dividindo-os em três momentos distintos: o primeiro, até 1838; o segundo, de 1838 a 1931; e o terceiro, de 1931 adiante. Este artigo focará no terceiro desses momentos, o qual tem sido tratado como o momento da "historiografia brasileira moderna". Mais especificamente, gostaria de focar no uso que Iglésias faz de uma linguagem de vícios e virtudes para avaliar aqueles historiadores e seus trabalhos. Vícios e virtudes têm sido usados há muito não apenas para avaliações morais, mas também para avaliações epistêmicas. Ser reconhecido como historiador inclui cultivar repertórios de virtudes consideradas necessárias para ser, de fato, historiador. Enquanto Iglésias avalia seus predecessores, veremos como uma maneira particular de ser historiador - aquela do professor universitário dos anos de 1980 - confronta modelos anteriores de subjetividade acadêmica.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Francisco Iglésias; Historiografia brasileira; Virtudes epistêmicas.

Introduction

Much work has been done, both in theoretical explorations (PAUL 2011a; 2012; OHARA 2016) and in empirical case studies (PAUL 2011b; 2013; 2016; ESKILDSEN 2013; HUISTRA 2013; OLIVEIRA 2013; CREYGHTON et al. 2016; ENGBERTS 2016; MANTEUFEL 2016; SAARLOS 2016; OHARA 2016), to demonstrate how virtue language is used to assess individuals and their performances as historians. These studies evidence that virtues and vices, either epistemic or not, are important components of recognition mechanisms which make it possible to recognize an individual as a "proper historian." While the substantive content of such mechanisms is more or less dependent on local contexts, the mechanisms themselves do seem to be a part of how disciplinary fields are structured in general. Therefore, it should not surprise us that Brazilian modern historians evaluate their peers based on, among other things, constellations of virtues, characteristics deemed to be part of the subjectivity of a "good," "proper" historian.

These virtues and vices, which make it possible to recognize this "proper historian," exceed their epistemic value in many ways. This is the case not only in the sense that "erudition" or "imaginative thinking" might have other moral or political implications, but also in the sense that we recognize that extra-epistemic values, i.e., those which have no seeming connection to the acquisition of knowledge, might actually shape our ways of seeing, thinking, and, therefore, our ways of conceptualizing knowledge. A good example is the difficulty which feminist epistemology faced trying to demonstrate how social location determines who we consider to be epistemically trustworthy (DAUKAS 2006). By recognizing how these categories shape our ways of thinking, we gain an important and concrete insight into the relationship between knowledge and the social factors which shape our knowledge-producing practices.

This paper explores how Francisco Iglésias, a prominent 20th century historian, evaluates "great historians" from the first

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

generation of the "modern Brazilian historiography" – how he characterizes their work, how particular virtues and vices have informed their thought, and how these virtues relate to Iglésias' own conception of what meant to be a "proper historian." He does so in the context of a book called *Historiadores do Brasil: capítulos de historiografia brasileira* [Historians of Brazil: Chapters of Brazilian Historiography]. There, he surveys authors whose works, he thinks, constitute Brazilian historiography in the last four centuries. His analyses make ample use of virtue language to characterize those authors, and this helps us to better understand a particular moment in which Brazilian historiography was completing a disciplinary movement to become an institutionalized discipline in the university system.

Iglésias, His Book & the "Third Moment" of Brazilian Historiography

Francisco Iglésias (1923-1999) was a Brazilian historian who specialized in economic history as well as the history of historiography. He got his BA in History and Geography from the Faculdade de Filosofia de Minas Gerais in 1944, and his License in 1945.[1] In 1949, he was appointed Professor of Economic History at the Faculdade de Ciências Econômicas de Minas Gerais, where he also defended his habilitation thesis in 1955.[2] He was part of the first generation of historians whose undergraduate education was done in specialized history courses and witnessed an important period in which history writing was slowly being incorporated by the university system (cf. SANTOS 2013; 2017). While previous history had been the subject for self-taught intellectuals, Iglésias' generation was the first to have individuals specifically trained in the discipline. They would be part of a general movement towards the establishment of a new, specific ethos of being a historian, one which would be defined in opposition to the previous ways of studying and writing history.

1 - Before the 1930s, Brazil had some Faculties of Law, Engineering, and Medicine, which mostly trained the technical and intellectual elites. See FERREIRA 2013; RIBEIRO 2013; RODRIGUES 2013; SANTOS 2013; FALCON 2015.

2 - Most higher education institutions were structured in a system of chairs (Cátedras). Here, I have translated "Livre Docência" as habilitation because its structure resembles that of the French and German "habilitation".

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Iglésias started writing *Historiadores do Brasil* in 1985, but the book was edited and published only after his death, in 2000.[3] *Historiadores* is a survey of the most notable historians in Brazilian historiography, spanning over 400 years, from the 16th century to the 1980s. In his book, Iglésias identifies three different moments in the history of Brazilian historiography: the first one, from 1500 to 1838, consisted in something like a "pre-history" of Brazilian historiography – mainly books that "are more like historical chronicles than history, more like sources than elaborate works" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 23). Next, he argued that the creation of the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico Brasileiro [Brazilian Historical and Geographical Institute, henceforth IHGB] in 1838 marked the beginning of a "second moment" of Brazilian historiography. In this period, Iglésias highlighted the enormous effort of the IHGB to collect documents relevant to the writing of Brazilian history, "in the manner of the *Monumenta germaniae historica,*" as well as the publishing of *História Geral do Brasil*, by Francisco Adolfo de Varnhagen (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 23).

For what he considered to be the "third moment," Iglésias stated that he had selected only "actually exceptional" authors, whose "names and titles [were] of superior significance than the preceding mean" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 183-184). Chronologically, this third moment started in 1931, with the educational reform enacted by Francisco Campos,[4] and ends in the 1980s, the period in which the book was written. Iglésias refrained from doing any detailed analysis of those who, like him, were already part of the "new system," that is, those who were trained in history courses created in the 1930s. Instead, individual analyses are restricted to the last generation of the self-taught intellectuals who were then transforming the ways of writing Brazilian history. Regarding the "university historiography," Iglésias makes only general observations on, among other things, the poor organization and quantitative growth of history courses in Brazil (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 230-232).[5]

3 - On the Editor's preliminary note, we learn that the Introduction, Chapter I, and part of Chapter II were already on their "final versions" between 1997 and 1998, while Chapter III and the end of Chapter II were still in their 1985-1987 versions.

4 - Francisco Campos was the first education minister of the New State (Estado Novo), a fascist dictatorship headed by Getúlio Dornelles Vargas. For a social history of Brazilian intellectuals in the 1930's, see GOMES 1996 and MICELI 2001a.

5 - Iglésias did comment on some authors, such as Alice Canabrava, and Fernando Novais. However, their works being so recent, such comments assumed a minor character when contrasted to what he had done for the previous periods.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Indeed, others have considered the 1930s to be a decisive decade for Brazilian historiography. This is mainly due to the existence of a generation of prolific social thinkers and essayists who were then trying to understand the foundations of the Brazilian history (FRANZINI; GONTIJO 2009), but also because of the creation of the Faculties of Philosophy, Sciences and Letters and the institutionalization of undergraduate history courses. Later, many complained that those courses had left research behind and were only training secondary teachers (see RODRIGUES 1978 [1952]; LAPA 1981). In the 1980s, after another educational reform in 1968 and the creation of graduate programs, this transition towards a history written in the university could finally be considered complete.[6] Iglésias' book, in this sense, is part of an interesting context in which Brazilian historians, now mostly attached to universities, were rethinking their disciplinary values and their own conceptions of what it meant to write history.[7]

Who Were Those Historians?

As mentioned before, Iglésias selected only a few names from this period. The seven historians he picked were all considered by him to be "actually exceptional" figures: Francisco José de Oliveira Viana, Gilberto Freyre, Caio Prado Jr., Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, Roberto Cochrane Simonsen, Nelson Werneck Sodré, and José Honório Rodrigues. Of those, four had graduated from law schools (Oliveira Viana, Prado Jr., Buarque de Holanda, and Rodrigues), three had studied and/or worked abroad (Freyre and Rodrigues in the USA, Buarque de Holanda in Germany and Italy), six of them were of middle class or rich families (the exception being Werneck Sodré), and all had close relations to the Brazilian State (all were either politicians, bureaucrats, or military).

These characteristics are not coincidental: before history courses were institutionalized, being a historian was the privilege of those who could afford to spend time with their intellectual enterprises, either by being heirs to wealthy

6 - In 1968, the Brazilian military dictatorship enacted a new educational reform targeting institutions of higher education which ended the system of chairs (Cátedras). It also established and regulated graduate studies programs. See SANTOS 2018.

7 - This may explain why many recent studies have focused on the 1980s for the history of Brazilian historiography – e.g. RAMOS 2015; OHARA 2017; SANTOS 2018.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

families, by working in the State bureaucracy, or by having a benefactor. Most intellectuals up to then were graduates from Faculties of Law, earning a degree that for a long time gave access to posts in the State bureaucracy but that was losing its social value between the 1920s and the 1940s. Many of those law graduates also worked as journalists, publishing chronicles in literary supplements and establishing important social connections with other intellectuals.[8] I next present each of the seven historians and provide a brief account of their social positioning and intellectual careers.[9]

Oliveira Viana was born in 1883, the sixth son of a farmer and colonel. He graduated from the Faculdade Livre de Direito do Rio de Janeiro in 1906 and went on to teach at the Faculdade de Direito do Estado do Rio de Janeiro in 1916. After the coup in 1930, he was nominated for a post in the Ministry of Labor, where he worked until 1940. He then became a minister of the *Tribunal de Contas da União*, an office he occupied until his death in 1951. As an intellectual, he was a member of many important institutions, such as the IHGB, the Brazilian Academy of Letters (henceforth ABL), and other foreign institutions. Iglésias referred to him as a "legal scholar" interested in "sociology, politics, and anthropology" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 189).

Gilberto Freyre was born in 1900 to a judge and professor from the *Faculdade de Direito do Recife*. He graduated from Baylor University and got his master's degree at Columbia University before returning to Recife in 1924. Having refused posts at the *Universidade do Brasil* and at Harvard University, and having taught for brief periods in different institutions, Freyre's relation to the university system was ambiguous at best – Iglésias wrote he "was not a university professor" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 194), which is technically true, even if he was often invited to speak at universities. He worked for the governor of Pernambuco, who opposed Getúlio Vargas, until the coup in 1930. Between 1946 and 1950, Freyre was a representative of Pernambuco at the Federal Congress. He continued writing until his death in 1987.

8 - For more on the social context of the creation of Faculties of Philosophy, as well as the social positioning of Law graduates in the period of crisis, see MICELI 2001b.

9 - Biographical information gathered from PARADA; RODRIGUES 2018 and the Brazilian Historical-Biographical Dictionary, by FGV, available at: https://cpdoc.fgv.br/acervo/dhbb. It was then compared to information Iglésias himself offered in the book.

Caio Prado Júnior was born in 1907 to a rich family in São Paulo. As expected from a young man of his social position, he graduated from the *Faculdade de Direito do Largo São Francisco* in 1928. In 1931, he joined the Communist Party and invested heavily in exploring the Marxist thought. His communist activism took a toll, and he was jailed many times during his life. In 1937, Prado Jr. went to Europe (France, the Netherlands, and Scandinavia), where he lived for two years. In 1954, he failed to get a chair at his alma mater but received his habilitation, the title of *livre-docente*. The next year, he started *Revista Brasiliense*, an important medium for left-wing intellectuals of the period. Prado Jr. published widely until the 1980s, with some books having a profound impact in Brazilian historiography – *Evolução Política do Brasil* (1933), *Formação do Brasil Contemporâneo* (1942), and *História Econômica do Brasil* (1945) being the most successful ones. He died in 1990.

Sérgio Buarque de Holanda was born in 1902, son to a pharmacist and professor. He graduated from the *Faculdade Nacional de Direito* in 1925. Buarque de Holanda was deeply involved with the Brazilian modernist movement of the 1920s, writing pieces for one of the movement's reviews, *Klaxon*, while still in college. In 1927, he started working as a journalist and in 1929, he moved briefly to Germany to work as a correspondent for the newspaper *Diários Associados*, returning in 1930. 1936 was an important year for Buarque de Holanda, as he was hired as an assistant for Henri Hauser in the chair of Modern History at the *Universidade do Distrito Federal* and published his first major book, *Raízes do Brasil*. When the university was closed in 1939, he went on to work for the *Instituto Nacional do Livro* and then the *Biblioteca Nacional*. In 1945, he published Monções, his second book, and in the next year, he was assigned as director of the *Museu Paulista*. Between 1952 and 1954, he taught at the *Università di Roma*, occupying the chair of "Brazilian studies." Returning to Brazil, he started teaching at the chair of History of Brazilian Civilization at the *Universidade de São Paulo*, becoming the chair holder in 1958 with the thesis *Visão do Paraíso*. He retired from his chair in 1969, protesting

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

the compulsory retirement of many colleagues by the military dictatorship that then ruled the country,[10] but continued to study and publish widely on Brazilian history until his death, in 1982.

Roberto Simonsen was born in 1889 to a rich and traditional family in São Paulo. He graduated in Civil Engineering from the *Escola Politécnica* in 1909. He was an important entrepreneur and a leading figure of Brazilian industrialists during the 1920s. He was also involved in discussions of economic and labor policies during the 1930s and the Estado Novo, with which he collaborated extensively. Simonsen was also one of the main figures in the creation, and the main patron, of the *Escola Livre de Sociologia e Política de São Paulo* (ELSP), an institution whose main purpose was to train highly specialized and technical staff (with a focus in sociology and public policy) to be employed in both public and private administration. There, he taught Brazilian economic history. With the end of the New State in 1945, Simonsen was elected senator. During his career, he was a member of many important intellectual institutions in Brazil and abroad, including the ABL and the Portuguese Academy of History. He died in 1948.

Nelson Werneck Sodré was born in 1911 in Rio de Janeiro. In 1931, he entered the *Escola Militar de Realengo*, from which he graduated as an artillery officer in 1933. The next year, he was sent to an artillery battalion in the city of Itu, in the state of São Paulo. The same year, 1934, he started writing as a literary critic for the newspaper *Correio Paulistano*. In 1937, Sodré returned to Rio de Janeiro as an assistant to an army general. There, thanks to his writings, he established an important intellectual network. In 1938, he published his first book, *História da Literatura Brasileira*. In 1942, he was transferred to an army post in Salvador, where he also wrote for a newspaper. In 1946, after graduating from the School of Army Command, he was designated as an instructor of military history in the same institution. He was dismissed from the post in 1951, after publicly expressing controversial political opinions. In 1955, he contributed to the creation of ISEB (*Instituto Superior de*

10 - The military dictatorship promoted several "purges" in the universities, aiming to "cleanse" the institutions of "communist influence". For more details on the tensions between the universities and the military regime, see MOTTA 2014, esp. chapter 4.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Estudos Brasileiros), where a group of intellectuals promoted courses and lectures on social sciences. From then until 1964, Sodré oversaw the course on the Historical Formation of Brazil. Iglésias mentioned he was head of ISEB's history department and visiting professor at the University of Brasília (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 213). In 1964, the new military dictatorship closed the ISEB and arrested him. He continued writing until his death in 1999.

José Honório Rodrigues was born in 1913 to a Catholic, middle-class family in Rio de Janeiro. He graduated from the *Faculdade Livre de Direito do Rio de Janeiro* in 1937. In 1940, he published *Civilização Holandesa no Brasil*, for which he received an award from the ABL. In 1943 and 1944, he studied at Columbia University thanks to a Rockefeller Foundation research grant. In 1946, back in Brazil, he was appointed Director of Rare Books and Publications of the *Biblioteca Nacional* and was hired as a professor of history in the *Instituto Rio Branco*, the institution that trains Brazilian diplomats (about this, Iglésias has only mentioned Rodrigues' post as Director of the Research Section (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 217)). In 1958, he left the *Biblioteca Nacional* to become the Director of the *Arquivo Nacional*, position he occupied until the military coup of 1964. During his career, he taught courses in many different faculties and universities in Brazil (*Universidade de Brasília*, *Universidade Federal Fluminense*) and abroad ("in Austin (63-4 and 66) and at Columbia (70)" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 218)), but he never held a chair. He was also a member of the ABL and the IHGB. He continued writing and publishing until his death in 1987.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Name	*Birth and Death*	*Education*	*Work*
Francisco José de Oliveira Viana	1883-1951	Law (Brazil, 1906)	Professor of Law (1932-1940), Bureaucrat (1940-1951)
Gilberto Freyre	1900-1987	Political and Social Science (the USA, 1920)	Professor of Sociology (1928-1930, 1935), Politician
Caio Prado Jr.	1907-1990	Law (Brazil, 1928)	Lawyer, Politician, Journalist
Sérgio Buarque de Holanda	1902-1982	Law (Brazil, 1925)	Journalist, Professor of History (1936-1939, 1952-1954, 1958-1969), Director of the São Paulo Museum (1946-1956)
Roberto Cochrane Simonsen	1889-1948	Civil Engineering (Brazil, 1909)	Entrepreneur, Politician, Professor of Economic History
Nelson Werneck Sodré	1911-1999	Military School (Brazil, 1933)	Military (1933-1961), Professor of History (1955-1964)
José Honório Rodrigues	1913-1987	Law (Brazil, 1937)	Section Director at the National Library (1946-1958), Director of the National Archives (1958-1964), Professor of History (1946-1951, many further occasions as an invited professor)

Table 1: Historians selected by Francisco Iglésias

Oliveira Viana was the oldest in the cohort, but also the one whose work most resembles that of the previous, "older" generation. He was a member of the IHGB after all. Nevertheless, what connects him to the others, with maybe the exception of José Honório Rodrigues, is the fact that in the 1930s, he,

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

too, was engaged in producing wide-scope essays that aimed at understanding "the problems of Brazil," its "formation," and its "essential characteristics." These essays are an important characteristic that separates the generation of the 1930s from their predecessors, whose main occupation had been collecting documents and writing factually-oriented monographies.

Prado Jr., Buarque de Holanda, and Freyre later became widely known as the central triad of "interpreters of Brazil."[11] As Sergio Miceli noted, they "worked on their own, having no ties to the university institution, literally entrepreneurs of their works, and still quite affected by the procedures of essayism. The three developed their intellectual careers using basically their material and social estate, owing almost nothing to political, partisan, or academic mentors" (MICELI 2001b, p. 125). In the context of the institutionalization of history (and of the social sciences in general), "they were, strictly speaking, the last representatives of a category of great self-taught intellectuals […] that the ensuing institutional development would extinguish" (MICELI 2001b, p. 126).[12] This observation applies reasonably well to Roberto Simonsen as well.

Werneck Sodré, in turn, remained mostly forgotten until the late 2000s. Many historians of the late 20th century, now properly institutionalized and disciplined, criticized his mechanistic reading of Marx and the rigidity of some of his concepts. He, like the others, was deeply engaged in trying to understand the large historical processes that shaped Brazilian identity with an eye on proposing solutions that could lead Brazil towards becoming a developed country. This generation of intellectuals and their essays, which peaked in the 1930s, were decisive on the process of disciplining and institutionalizing history in the then newly created universities. In the 1980s, being called an "essayist" was indeed an offense, and its reference was precisely to those authors of the 1930s who tried to overcome the weaknesses of the historical sources to which they had access by producing large scale interpretations of the Brazilian past and present.

11 - This grouping was made famous by the preface Antonio Candido Mello e Souza, godfather of the modern Brazilian literary criticism, wrote for the fifth edition of Raízes do Brasil, by Buarque de Holanda, in 1969.

12 - Miceli notes that by self-taught he refers specifically to "the disciplinary approach and the intellectual production with which they secured their reputations" (MICELI 2001b, p. 126), even if they had gone through higher education institutions.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

In this sense, José Honório Rodrigues might seem an odd inclusion. The youngest of the cohort, he was never fully a part of the university system but his work was much more aligned to what was being discussed inside the universities' history departments. He occupies an odd place in the history of Brazilian historiography: while he criticized the Faculties of Philosophy for neither training researchers nor doing historical research, his connections to institutions abroad gave him access to a vocabulary and to concerns very different from those of the self-taught intellectuals. Rodrigues dedicated his time to establishing, or at least trying to establish, the infrastructure historical scholarship needed to work properly.[13]

The brief mention to Roberto Simonsen is also noteworthy. Iglésias dedicates only 3 pages to Simonsen, in which he characterizes Simonsen as someone who "saw in history not an intellectual leisure, but the orientation to better directions in the economic life" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 212). Iglésias praises "the criterium and intelligence" of Simonsen, which "explain [his book's] high quality" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, loc. cit.) and describes him as "a man of action, a pragmatic, non-intellectual given to history" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 213). But this practical orientation in his historical work is not explored further, even if some others, like Prado Jr. and Honório Rodrigues, are also said to share this practical concern.

Iglésias' selection illuminates the historical context of Brazilian historiography in the first half of the 20th century, but also of the consolidation of a particular identity that university historians were building in the 1970s and 1980s. His chronological cut in the 1930s and his refusal to comment in detail the work of other university-based historians (of his own generation and that of their first students) is particularly informative. Published posthumously, only in 2000, *Historiadores* is part of a wider context in which disciplined historians affirmed the boundaries of their practices in contrast to their predecessors.

13 - Rodrigues was even an interlocutor to Francisco Iglésias on matters of the history of Brazilian historiography. With José Roberto do Amaral Lapa and Nilo Odália he laid the groundwork for much of the current context of the history of Brazilian historiography. See FREIXO 2011 and FREIXO 2013.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Historians, their Virtues, their Vices: A Disciplined Historian Looks Back

When Francisco Iglésias started writing *Historiadores* during the 1980s, history was going through an important transition. Until then, some of the first history graduates had been pursuing their doctorates under the chair holders in São Paulo (most notably Eurípedes Simões de Paula, chair of History of Ancient and Medieval Civilization (1946-1968), Eduardo de Oliveira França, chair of History of Modern and Contemporary Civilization (1951-1968), and Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, chair of History of Brazilian Civilization (1958-1968)[14]). Others went on to occupy positions in faculties and universities, which were spreading to other regions of the country. Only during the 1980s Brazilian historiography completed its move towards a relatively autonomous, university-centered disciplinary field: the first and second generations of history Ph.D. graduates had then mostly established their intellectual and social positions, their books and articles had become the main resources for historical knowledge, and specializations were better defined in the disciplinary landscape. Iglésias himself, licensed in 1945 and *livre-docente* since 1955, had experienced and witnessed firsthand this process. Therefore, when Iglésias set himself the task of assessing the 1930s generation, we have a glimpse into the ways the new, disciplined historians related to their disciplinary, although undisciplined, predecessors, and how they emplotted the history of their own discipline. Three axes, in particular, have crossed most of Iglésias' assessments – historical sources, writings, and politics – all three of which lead us to the underlying principle of Iglésias' evaluation: a procedural conception of history which was prevalent not in the 1930s, but in the 1980s. Assessing his forebearers in terms of virtues and vices, then, was an important procedure for establishing as correct a particular conception of history and of what it meant to be a historian.

14 - Between 1968 and 1971, with the extinction of the system of chairs, all chair holders had their positions changed to [Full] Professor (Professor Titular). Simões de Paula worked until his death in 1977. Oliveira França retired in 1985.

It should not come as a surprise that attention to the sources, or the lack thereof, is one of the main axes of the evaluation. Oliveira Viana, for instance, could have been a good

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

historian "if he had appreciation for the documentation, the evidential sources, to which he did not care" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 190-191); also Nelson Werneck Sodré, whose reflections Iglésias considers to be mature, but "do[es] not reveal original research, frequency to the archives, [or] the use of primary sources" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 215). Heirs to the "archival turn" of the 19th century (ESKILDSEN 2008) and to the widening of possibilities in matters of sources by the social, economic, and cultural histories in the vein of the *Annales*, Brazilian modern historians have fiercely defended the empirical nature of their craft and the virtues to which archive work was connected (see OHARA 2017, esp. chapter 2). In this sense, Gilberto Freyre, an author who "adopts no labels," is praised because he "uses a technique that is very characteristic of historians, with documents, books of all kinds [...]. Few works of the native literature suppose such dilated and well-conducted research" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 195-196). Similarly, Caio Prado Jr. "makes wide use of primary sources, most of which have already been printed" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 204). Archive work, then, is a common thread, a criterium that has direct consequences on being qualified as a proper historian by Iglésias. Thus, the qualities of a good archive analyst are deemed to be virtues of a good historian.

The texts themselves and their aesthetic characteristics are another important axis. Here again, Oliveira Viana was particularly ill fit against the others – his work was "far from the scientific tone of modern historiography" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 188). Freyre, for his turn, was better aligned to a generalist, "eminently humanist science, with much of fiction, of myth, and even of poetry, to the scandal of the orthodox" (*ibid*., p. 195). About Buarque de Holanda, in particular, Iglésias noted that "his books are also distinguished by the excellence of their form, as a strong, stylistic writer" and said that, "in his prose, he was the most artistic of the native historians, distinguishing himself not only among his contemporaries, but also among his predecessors" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 206). In contrast to Freyre and Buarque de Holanda, Prado Jr.'s writing was "sometimes arid. The author does not woo popularity and

is deprived of literary interest. His books look not for glow, but for density" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 205). Much has been said in Brazil and abroad about how badly historians write. So, since Iglésias seemed to have no issues with the difficulty in reading Prado Jr., one might say that aesthetics did not play an important role in determining who was a good historian. But if that was the case, how could the "most artistic" of the group be the one that also had the strongest standing in intellectual terms, as much now as when Iglésias wrote those lines? The writings of Buarque de Holanda have been the focus of many important studies in the history of Brazilian historiography (e.g. NICODEMO 2008; MONTEIRO; EUGÊNIO 2008), and the construction of a disciplinary memory around his legacy has proved resilient to criticisms.

Politics constitutes the third main thread. For instance, Oliveira Viana was "profoundly influenced by already overcome prejudices and authors, conservative and even reactionary" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 189). These characteristics structured many of the problems Iglésias sees in Viana's works – e.g. "It is natural, then, that [Viana] fell for authoritarianism of the fascist kind, so fashionable in a time marked by the seduction of the right. What is interesting is that with so many negative points, he had produced something worthy of note" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 190). Prejudices, racial prejudices in particular, are so prevalent that Iglésias mentions the word "prejudice" at least two other times (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 189 and 191), and "racism" on page 191. Another author on the conservative side of the political spectrum was Freyre, "a traditionalist, infatuated with the casa-grande[15] and with what he supposes to be the rural aristocracy" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 196). Iglésias continues, saying, "The traditionalism gives him a special vision on society, without good global capture. Furthermore, it causes him to get lost in detail, in the anecdotal, in the chronicle, leaving aspects out that are very well more alive and important. The author is the best representative of the ancient, of the aristocratic, which takes him to problematic misunderstandings" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 197). Conservatism and traditionalism

15 - Casa Grande was the name given to the main living building of Brazilian large plantations. There lived the senhor de engenho and his family, while slaves lived in the Senzalas. Casa Grande & Senzala is one of the most famous books by Gilberto Freyre.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

structure Oliveira Viana and Freyre's thoughts on history, what we would now call their "historical imagination" (WHITE 2014 [1973]), and Iglésias' remarks on it make it seem like this structuring is detrimental to their historical understanding.

On the opposite side of the political spectrum, Nelson Werneck Sodré and Caio Prado Jr. were both important Marxist intellectuals whose work had a profound impact on the debates between left-wing intellectuals. Both, however, represent very distinct types of Marxist intellectuals: while Sodré is usually portrayed as a mechanistic, inflexible theorist, deeply committed to the Communist Party, Prado Jr. has been praised for his insights relating Marxist theory to the reality of Brazil. As Iglésias puts it, many had "already written in the name of Marxism among us but in a loose, naïve, or mechanistic way. Caio [Prado Jr.] is the first to do it with criterium and no simplifications" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 201). One of the most powerful traits of Prado Jr., according to Iglésias, was precisely his "understanding of the interdisciplinary character of the social sciences" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 203), which enabled him to produce important syntheses of the Brazilian historical process. In contrast, Werneck Sodré was frequently accused of "a certain mechanistic schematism in the adoption and practice of the Marxist thought" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 213), which "diminish[es] the rigor and lucidity of [his] analyses" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 216). These new lines provide us with more clues to understand Iglésias' criticisms on the political structuring of the historian's thought. The issue here is not that the prefigurative structure of Marxism can foreclose historical understanding, or Prado Jr. would not be able to write his important books. On the contrary, Marxist thought is entirely connected to Prado Jr.'s brilliance. What differs between Sodré and Prado Jr. is that Sodré seeks to apply Marxist categories in mechanistic ways, while Prado Jr.'s understanding of history as a process enables him to produce a "powerful synthesis, [which] reveals the capturing of the essential" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 202). This brings us to the final layer of Iglésias' assessment on the beginnings of modern Brazilian historiography.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

The final layer of Iglésias' assessment is comprised of a cognitive capacity that is fundamental: the understanding of *the nature of history as process*. As we have seen before, Iglésias reproached Freyre for getting "lost in detail, in the anecdotal, in the chronicle" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 197). The consequence of his traditionalist political stance also has an important cognitive result, in that Freyre "illustrates historical knowledge, but does not face the fundamental questions, does not contribute to the better instruction of the country's most urgent problems" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, loc. cit.). Oliveira Viana had his comprehension of the historical process clouded by his excessive reliance on those "overcome theories." In Iglésias' words, "he who believes more in theories – and those which he himself enrolled and prefers – than in the sources is ill fit for being a historian" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 191).

That was where Prado Jr. and Buarque de Holanda proved to be better, more virtuous historians. Prado Jr. had "complete control over the native trajectory, in an original vision. Synthetical, he captures the essential of the process of the Colonial, transitional, and Empire periods" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 201). Meanwhile, Buarque de Holanda was a "subtle author, exquisite and metaphorical, very demanding of the reader, escaping those without reading habit and without knowledge of a wider, interdisciplinary literature" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 208-209), whose erudition, "research rigor, and lucidity on the understanding of the process" made him "one of the greatest names to be admired" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 211). In the same sense, José Honório Rodrigues was also praised for comprehending "the [historical] activity as a living thing, active, connected to the country and the time" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 219) and for his "attentive research, the will to clarify, to interpret, pointing directions, aiming at overcoming hindrances" (IGLÉSIAS 2000, p. 221). These intellectual virtues are crucial to the construction of a particular notion of what it means to be a proper historian, one that is normative in nature.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Iglésias' assessments do inform us on many important issues around those authors, who were publishing their first important works in the 1930s. But more than that, as with any assessment, they inform us about the repertoire of essential characteristics an individual cultivated while becoming a historian at the time those assessments were made. In an article published in 1983, Iglésias wished to analyze what was then the "contemporary Brazilian historiography" in terms of the promises and the risks of interdisciplinarity. After listing many authors whose works had a significant impact on Brazilian historiography during the 20th century, he stated, "those authors, the most important in our current literature, are responsible for the renovation of History, exactly by possessing interpretive instruments borrowed from the social sciences. Some of them, as we have seen, did not even present themselves as historians" (IGLÉSIAS 1983, p. 133). This long text warned historians about the seduction of the social sciences – "for their theories, their results, their work techniques" (IGLÉSIAS 1983, loc. cit.). While their theories and methods could provide an important resource for better interpreting past events, a historian that relies "excessively" on them is also at risk. For Iglésias, historians should focus on what he considers their fundamental work: (1) "Time is the essential category of the historical science. [...] To situate in time [...] is the basic task of the historian" (IGLÉSIAS 1983, p. 135), but also (2) "The capacity to capture change is one of the distinctive traits of the historian" (IGLÉSIAS 1983, loc. cit.). Writing like many of his colleagues at the time, Iglésias pays his respects to Marc Bloch, the one who "best conceptualized the specialty [of history]" (IGLÉSIAS 1983, p. 136). This idea of procedural history, of historians whose "historical sensibility" made them capable of understanding different layers or durations of time, was then hegemonic.[16] And when Iglésias assessed his predecessors, he contrasted them to this new, disciplined model of being a historian. Their strengths and their weaknesses, their virtues and their vices, were directly related to those characteristics the disciplined historians of the 1980s chose to keep and those they chose to drop in favor of their own, "modern" conceptions.

16 - For an investigation on the virtue of "historical sensibility" in Brazilian historiography in the 1980s, see OHARA 2016.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

Conclusion

Francisco Iglésias was one of the most important figures at the moment when Brazilian historians were looking back towards their pre-disciplinary past. During the 1970s and the 1980s, he and other historians were deeply involved in discussing how to write the history of their own discipline (see ANHEZINI 2015). As disciplinary histories and memories are constantly being made and remade, they needed to grapple with the issue of attributing praise and blame onto those who had come before them (COLLINI 1988). In a significant move, they appropriated much of what had been built between the 1940s and the 1960s, placing a rupture in the 1930s – the date of birth of the "modern Brazilian historiography" (see FRANZINI; GONTIJO 2009). Moreover, Iglésias is often cited as an author whose work paved the way for our contemporary approaches to the history of Brazilian historiography. Together with José Roberto do Amaral Lapa, Nilo Odália, and José Honório Rodrigues, his analyses of Brazilian historians in the 1930s and before were important to establish as legitimate the concern with our disciplinary past. His particular way of doing so might have been superseded by other ways, especially when we consider a more general turn towards disciplinary critique that was also gaining momentum at the time (see CEZAR 2015), but the narratives his generation produced structured how many "proper," "brick and mortar" historians still see themselves today.

When Iglésias treats Sérgio Buarque de Holanda and Caio Prado Jr. as paragons of what meant to be a historian in the 1930s, he is also presenting a statement of what it means to be a historian in the 1980s. By crediting their success in producing important works of history to their understanding of the historical process, Iglésias projects on them a particular concept of history that, for many reasons, turned out to become intellectually and socially hegemonic only after (and, in certain aspects, because) those important works were published. Miceli is right to point out that, by the 1930s, Buarque de Holanda, Prado Jr., and Gilberto Freyre were still young intellectuals and,

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

"compared to their European and North American counterparts, they would be considered early career, young researchers and could hardly deserve since then the status and treatment of masters of 'Brazilian' thought and 'reality'" (MICELI 2001b, p. 125). Therefore, Iglésias' assessments help to affirm a particular narrative of the history of Brazilian historiography as well as a particular repertoire of ways of being a historian that are in no way the necessary result of the intellectual enterprise of the 1930s. Virtue language, then, was a weapon that helped establish the boundaries of the "proper historian".

But virtue language in evaluative texts is more than proxy for specific concepts of history and more than a conflict between two or more individuals. Those virtues and vices, either moral or epistemic, structure how historians perceive themselves and remember their discipline. They help historians learn to differentiate themselves from the neighboring specializations, to "defend" their field from "foreign attacks" as well as to establish who is indeed a "proper" historian and what value should be ascribed to their work. While Brazilian historians in the 20th century might not appeal to the same categories their German, French, or British colleagues did in the 19th century, virtue language *still* has a place and performs a disciplinary function in our current activities. And being conscientious of that is a necessary condition to think about when we consider who is apt and capable of writing about the past.

REFERENCE

ANHEZINI, Karina. Arautos da História da Historiografia: as disputas por um conceito de historiografia nas cartas de Amaral Lapa enviadas a Nilo Odália. **Patrimônio e Memória**, São Paulo, v. 11, n. 1, p. 4-21, 2015. Available at: http://pem.assis.unesp.br/index.php/pem/article/viewFile/515/778. Accessed in: 3 apr. 2019.

CEZAR, Temístocles. Hamlet Brasileiro: ensaio sobre giro linguístico e indeterminação historiográfica (1970-1980). **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 17, p. 440-461, 2015. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/741/557. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

COLLINI, Stefan. "Discipline History" and "Intellectual History": reflections on the historiography of the social sciences in Britain and France. **Revue de Synthèse**, Paris, v. 109, n. 3-4, p. 387-399, 1988. Available at: https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/BF03189137. Accessed in: 21 mar. 2019.

CREYGHTON, Camille; HUISTRA, Pieter; KEYMEULEN, Sarah; PAUL, Herman. Virtue Language in Historical Scholarship: the cases of Georg Waitz, Gabriel Monod and Henri Pirenne. **History of European Ideas**, Abingdon, v. 42, n. 7, p. 924-936, 2016. Available at: https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01916599.2016.1161536. Accessed in: 28 mar. 2019.

DAUKAS, Nancy. Epistemic Trust and Social Location. **Episteme**, Cambridge, v. 3, n. 1-2, p. 109-124, 2006. Available at: https://muse.jhu.edu/article/209434. Acesso em 2 apr. 2019.

DONGEN, Jeroen van; PAUL, Herman (eds.). **Epistemic Virtues in the Sciences and the Humanities**. Cham: Springer, 2017.

ENGBERTS, Christiaan. Gossiping About the Buddha of Göttingen: Heinrich Ewald as an unscholarly persona. **History of Humanities**, Chicago, v. 1, n. 2, p. 371-385, 2016. Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/687973. Accessed in: 29 mar. 2019.

ESKILDSEN, Kasper Risbjerg. Leopold Ranke's Archival Turn: Location and Evidence in Modern Historiography. **Modern Intellectual History**, Cambridge (UK), v. 5, n. 3, p. 425-453, 2008. Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/modern-intellectual-history/article/leopold-rankes-archival-turn-location-and-evidence-in-modern-historiography/B1CA6AD8F32C32F7064AB4F1C1AFB4B0. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

ESKILDSEN, Kasper Risbjerg. Inventing the Archive: testimony and virtue in modern historiography. **History of the Human Sciences**, New York, v. 26, n. 4, p. 8-26, 2013. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0952695113496094. Accessed in: 1 apr. 2019.

FALCON, Francisco José Calazans. A Cadeira de História Moderna e Contemporânea e o Ensino e a Pesquisa Históricas na FNFi-UB. *In*: FALCON, Francisco José Calazans. **Estudos de Teoria da História e Historiografia**, volume II: historiografia. São Paulo: Hucitec, 2015. p. 184-202.

FERREIRA, Marieta de Moraes. **A História como Ofício**: a constituição de um campo disciplinar. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 2013.

FRANZINI, Fabio; GONTIJO, Rebeca. Memória e História da Historiografia no Brasil: a invenção de uma moderna tradição, anos 1940-1960. *In*: SOIHET, Rachel et al. (orgs.). **Mitos, Projetos e Práticas Políticas**: memória e historiografia. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2009. p. 141-160.

FREIXO, Andre de Lemos. Um 'Arquiteto' da Historiografia Brasileira: história e historiadores em José Honório Rodrigues. **Revista Brasileira de História**, São Paulo, v. 31, n. 62, p. 143-172, 2011. Available at: http://ref.scielo.org/hzv9x3. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

FREIXO, Andre de Lemos. Ousadia e Redenção: o Instituto de Pesquisa Histórica de José Honório Rodrigues. **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 11, p. 140-161, 2013. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/514/350. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

FUNDAÇÃO GETÚLIO VARGAS. **Dicionário Histórico-Biográfico Brasileiro**. 3rd ed. Rio de Janeiro, 2010. Available at: https://cpdoc.fgv.br/acervo/dhbb. Accessed in: 21 mar. 2019.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

GOMES, Angela de Castro. **História & Historiadores**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora FGV, 1996.

HUISTRA, Pieter. The Trial of Henry of Brederode: historians, sources and location under discussion in 19th-century historiography. **History of the Human Sciences**, New York, v. 26, n. 4, p. 50-66, 2013. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0952695113500290. Accessed in: 1 apr. 2019.

IGLÉSIAS, Francisco. A Historiografia Brasileira Atual e a Interdisciplinaridade. **Revista Brasileira de História**, São Paulo, v. 3, n. 5, p. 129-141, 1983. Available at: https://www.anpuh.org/arquivo/download?ID_ARQUIVO=1714. Accessed in: 4 apr. 2019.

IGLÉSIAS, Francisco. **Os Historiadores do Brasil**: capítulos de historiografia brasileira. Rio de Janeiro: Nova Fronteira, 2000.

LAPA, José Roberto do Amaral. **Historiografia Brasileira Contemporânea**: a história em questão. 2nd ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1981. [1st ed. 1976].

MANTEUFEL, Katharina. A Three-Story House: Adolf von Harnack and practices of academic mentoring around 1900. **History of Humanities**, v. 1, n. 2, p. 355-370, 2016. Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/687972. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

MICELI, Sérgio. **Intelectuais à Brasileira**. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2001a.

MICELI, Sérgio. Condicionantes do Desenvolvimento das Ciências Sociais. *In*: MICELI, Sérgio (org.). **História das Ciências Sociais no Brasil**, vol. 1. São Paulo: Editora Sumaré, 2001b, p. 91-133.

MONTEIRO, Pedro Meira; EUGÊNIO, João Kennedy (orgs.). **Sérgio Buarque de Holanda**: Perspectivas. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp, 2008.

MOTTA, Rodrigo Patto Sá. **As Universidades e o Regime Militar**: cultura política brasileira e modernização autoritária. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2014.

NICODEMO, Thiago Lima. **Urdidura do Vivido**: Visão do Paraíso e a obra de Sérgio Buarque de Holanda nos anos 1950. São Paulo: EdUSP, 2008.

OHARA, João Rodolfo Munhoz. The Disciplined Historian: "epistemic virtue", "scholarly persona", and practices of subjectivation. A proposal for the study of Brazilian professional historiography. **Práticas da História**, Lisboa, v. 1, n. 2, p. 39-56, 2016. Available at: http://www.praticasdahistoria.pt/issues/2016/12/PDH_02_JoaoOhara.pdf. Accessed in: 5 apr. 2019.

OHARA, João Rodolfo Munhoz. Virtudes Epistêmicas na Prática do Historiador: o caso da sensibilidade histórica na historiografia brasileira (1980-1990). **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 22, p. 170-183, 2016. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/1107/654. Accessed in: 5 apr. 2019.

OHARA, João Rodolfo Munhoz Ohara. **Virtudes Epistêmicas na Historiografia Brasileira (1980-1990)**. Assis: Unesp, 2017. PhD thesis.

OLIVEIRA, Maria da Glória de. O Nobre Sacerdócio da Verdade: reflexões sobre o ofício do historiador no Brasil oitocentista. **Lusíada. História**, Lisboa, n. 9/10, p. 191-207, 2013. Available at: http://repositorio.ulusiada.pt/bitstream/11067/1122/1/LH_9-10_9.pdf. Acesso em 3 apr. 2019.

PARADA, Maurício; RODRIGUES, Henrique Estada (orgs.). **Os Historiadores**: clássicos da história do Brasil, vol. 4: dos primeiros relatos a José Honório Rodrigues. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2018.

Hist. Historiogr. v. 12, n. 30, maio-ago, ano 2019, p. 44-70 - DOI 10.15848/hh.v12i30.1475

PAUL, Herman. Performing History: how historical scholarship is shaped by epistemic virtues. **History and Theory**, Middletown, v. 50, n. 1, p. 1-19, 2011a. Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2303.2011.00565.x. Accessed in: 21 mar. 2019.

PAUL, Herman. Distance and Self-Distanciation: intellectual virtue and historical method around 1900. **History and Theory**, Middletown, v. 50, n. 4, p. 104-116, 2011b. Available at: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1468-2303.2011.00606.x. Accessed in: 22 mar. 2019.

PAUL, Herman. Weak Historicism: on hierarchies of intellectual virtues and goods. **Journal of the Philosophy of History**, Leiden, n. 6, p. 396-388, 2012. Available at: https://brill.com/view/journals/jph/6/3/article-p369_4.xml. Accessed in: 21 mar. 2019.

PAUL, Herman. The Heroic Study of Records: the contested persona of the archival historian. **History of the Human Sciences**, New York, v. 26, n. 4, p. 67-83, 2013. Available at: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0952695113500291. Accessed in: 21 mar. 2019.

PAUL, Herman. The Virtues and Vices of Albert Naudé: toward a history of scholarly personae. **History of Humanities**, Chicago, v. 1, n. 2, p. 327-338, 2016. Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/688036. Accessed in: 23 mar. 2019.

RAMOS, Igor Guedes. **Genealogia de uma Operação Historiográfica**: Edward Palmer Thompson, Michel Foucault e os historiadores brasileiros da década de 1980. São Paulo: Cultura Acadêmica, 2015.

RIBEIRO JÚNIOR, José. Memórias de um Profissional de História. **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 11, p. 33-44, 2013. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/555/344. Accessed in: 4 apr. 2019.

RODRIGUES, José Honório. **A Pesquisa Histórica no Brasil**. 3rd ed. São Paulo: Cia. Editora Nacional, 1978. [1st ed. 1958].

RODRIGUES, Lidiane Soares. Armadilha à Francesa: homens sem profissão. **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 11, p. 85-103, 2013. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/539/347. Accessed in: 1 apr. 2019.

RODRIGUES, Mara Cristina de Matos. A Formação Superior em História na UPA/URGS/UFRGS de 1943-1971. **História da Historiografia**, Ouro preto, n. 11, p. 122-139, 2013. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/544/349. Accessed in: 3 apr. 2019.

SAARLOS, Léjon. Virtue and Vice in Academic Memory: Lord Acton and Charles Oman. **History of Humanities**, Chicago, v. 1, n. 2, p. 339-354, 2016. Available at: https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/687971. Accessed in: 2 apr. 2019.

SANTOS, Alessandra Soares. Francisco Iglésias e o curso de geografia e história da Faculdade de Filosofia de Minas Gerais (década de 1940). **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 11, p. 104-121, 2013. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/521/348. Accessed in: 1 apr. 2019.

SANTOS, Alessandra Soares. A Normatização Disciplinar da Historiografia Universitária: Francisco Iglésias e a sua tese de Livre-Docência. **História da Historiografia**, Ouro Preto, n. 23, p. 64-77, 2017. Available at: https://www.historiadahistoriografia.com.br/revista/article/viewFile/1151/671. Accessed in: 1 apr. 2019.

SANTOS, Wagner Geminiano dos. **A Invenção da Historiografia Brasileira Profissional, Acadêmica**: geografia e memória disciplinar, disputas político-institucionais e debates epistemológicos acerca do saber histórico no Brasil (1980-2012). Recife: UFPE, 2018. PhD thesis.

WHITE, Hayden. **Metahistory**: the historical imagination in 19th-century Europe. 40th anniversary edition. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014. [1st ed. 1973].

ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND INFORMATION

João Rodolfo Munhoz Ohara
ohara.hal@gmail.com
Pós-doutorando na Universidade Estadual Paulista
Franca
São Paulo
Brasil

Projeto financiado pela FAPESP (no. 2017/26988-3).

RECEIVED IN: 10/APR./2019 | APPROVED IN: 3/JUNE/2019