



The Deployment of Autobiography in Heterobiography: Poetic Memory in *Boitempo* by Carlos Drummond de Andrade

Mirella Carvalho do Carmo¹, Andréa Portolomeos²

¹Master's student of Literature at the Federal University of Lavras (Universidade Federal de Lavras – UFLA).

²PhD in Comparative Literature and professor of Theory of Literature in the Department of Language Studies (Departamento de Estudos da Linguagem – DEL) at UFLA.

Received: 15 Jan 2023; Received in revised form: 11 Feb 2023; Accepted: 18 Feb 2023; Available online: 26 Feb 2023

©2023 The Author(s). Published by Infogain Publication. This is an open access article under the CC BY license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

Abstract— This article discusses the conflicting relationship between autobiography and poetry in poems within Drummond's *Boitempo* trilogy. Exploring this theme is significant for the problematization of a rather naive reading that seeks the reasons for a poem in its extraliterary sphere, that is, in the life of the poet, providing a broader understanding of the lyrical subject as a complex fictional element. Accordingly, in this study, we apply the theoretical conceptions of Hoisel (2019), Lejeune (2014), Arfuch (2010), Smith (1971) and Iser (1996, 2002) to debate autobiographical space in poetry and the reception of the most astute part of Drummond's lyrical remembrance. The article also discusses, following Halbwachs (1990), Silva (2009), Miranda (1988) and Santiago (2008, 2004), the collective nature of memory and the resemanticization of the subject in fiction. Moreover, our analysis of selected poems dialogs with the critical arguments of Candido (2000), Villaça (2006) and Pedrosa (2011) to clarify how Drummond's memorialistic texts propose the recreation of the past — of an "I" that is recognized as an "other" and projects itself in this "other", which is constantly cowritten through the act of reading.

Keywords— aesthetics of reception, autobiography, Drummond, memory, poetry.

I. INTRODUCTION

A memoryistic lyric is a space where poets fictionalize their experiences and memories through literary language. Thus, it is necessary to evaluate the work of autobiographical poets with the "possibility of it being crossed by multiple plastic and performative alterities, while written in writing" (Hoisel, 2019, p. 101). Hence, poetic-remembrance text demands a more careful reading to ensure that the reader is aware that the experiences expressed in a poem do not directly coincide with the empirical life of the poet.

Accordingly, in this study, we aim to understand, first, how some writers — at least those who dedicate themselves to a more deliberate elaboration of artistic language — articulate their memories and experiences in fiction, that is, how their lives are organized in relation to their imaginary, which results in a stylized and fictitious creation. The initial discussion follows Hoisel (2019), Lejeune (2014), Arfuch (2010), Smith (1971) and Iser (2002), theorists who

investigate the constitution of autobiographical space in poetry.

Continuing our analysis of memoryist poetry, we also investigate the reception pole to link this study to the idea of literary reading that has been proposed by Iser (1996) and Hoisel (2019), i.e., a reader needs to mobilize his or her imaginative capacity during a reading activity in which autobiography and poetry dialog. Thus, a memoir lyrical demands a less naive and more crafty type of reader, contrary to what might be assumed when dealing with text with reference marks. Elaborating on this relationship with readers, the article addresses, based on the concept of "collective memory" coined by Halbwachs (1990) and discussed by Silva (2009) and Miranda (1988), how autobiographical memories compose the framework of a general history.

This study also evaluates the resemanticization of the subject by drawing on the ideas of Santiago (2008, 2004),

thereby broadening our understanding of the relationship between autobiography and poetry, which entails the fictionalization of subjectivity. Accordingly, we focus on poems from the *Boitempo* trilogy by Carlos Drummond de Andrade with the support of part of the critical literature on Drummond, that is, Candido (2000), Villaça (2006) and Pedrosa (2011). Thus, we show how Drummond's lyrical remembrance is conceived as a sign representing the history of a group and, moreover, as a way to obtain self-knowledge for the reader and for the poet himself, i.e., the construction of this kind of lyric enables the recreation of the past of an "I" that simultaneously recognizes itself as an "other" and projects itself into this "other".

II. AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND FICTION IN POETRY

In *Bioficções: vozes expandidas [Biofiction: expanded voices]*, Hoisel (2019) reflects on the issue of biographical space in the works of multiple writers who occupy various social roles, such as artists, critics, or teachers. From this perspective, the author notes that all writing is pierced by the numerous alterities of a subject, although it is mainly in biofiction that the intensification of this ability to see oneself in the "other" occurs. Thus, the life of these authors is fictionalized in writing, making their text the stage for performing these multiple subjectivities. Because of such bias, such texts are written by an author who is simultaneously an actor, a subject who performatizes his or her own life. Therefore, memory in poetry, especially in Drummond's, is deemed a movement toward fictionalization of a multifaceted subject that subverts and reconstructs the traditional notion of autobiography.

This movement toward the fictionalization of the self via poetry is addressed by Lejeune (2014), who describes the porous relationship between autobiography and poetry, an issue that is even more pronounced in contemporary times but was already visible in the modern poetry¹ of Drummond. Specifically, the author analyzes a greater adherence among readers to poems that use "I", since these texts trigger the feeling of self-identification. In short, when a poet self-references, he or she puts his or her words at the disposal of a reader; these words — in Lejeune's terms — serve as a guise for our experiences. Based on this affective sharing, Lejeune (2014) emphasizes that any questions about the intimate life of a poet (extraliterary aspects) are merely speculative and not very relevant, since a reader should agree with a poem, not the history of its poet.

Given the suggestions of Hoisel (2019) and Lejeune (2014), it is essential to refer to the discussion of Arfuch (2010) on the debatable coincidence between the empirical life of an author and the lyrical subject. That is, this author argues that autobiographical poetry offers a "supplementary advantage"; in addition to granting a reader the appearance of legitimacy that is guaranteed by the presence of "I" in its discourse, such poetry enables its author to reconstruct himself or herself by the action of a reader's imaginary (the "I" is recognized as the "other" and vice versa).

In line with this argument, Smith (1971) proposes that the primordial factor in the conceptualization of a poem as a mimetic discourse lies in the fact that stating, expressing and alluding are, by themselves, fictitious verbal acts. In addition, the author notes that although certain formal aspects, such as verse, signal to the reader the fictionality of a discourse, the distinction between natural utterances² and fictitious statements is actually realized through the shared conventions between poet and reader. Thus, certain linguistic structures are not understood as verbal acts per se but as a representation of these acts:

The statements in a poem, of course, can be very similar to statements that the poet could truly and honestly have enunciated [...]. However, as long as they are offered and recognized as statements in a poem, they are fictitious (Smith, 1971, p. 269).

Furthermore, an autobiographical poet works with his or her own experience in his or her exploration of the expressive resources of language, which often results in a new language that is capable of meeting the needs of autobiography in poetry. It is this innovation of language that enables the resonance of the multiple constitutive voices of a subject and makes it plausible to consider an "I" a sign representing collective experience — a point that is developed in greater detail below in the section regarding the study of poetry in Drummond's memorial.

To understand how the notion of "I" can be a sign representing collectivity, it is necessary to resort, even if succinctly, to the concept of fiction proposed by the German theorist Wolfgang Iser, i.e., fictional strategies enable the transgression of experiential reality through the imaginary. Iser (2002) proposes that a triple relationship between the real, fictitious and imaginary is a property of any fictional text, where the acts of pretending, present in the production pole, are usually combined with the imaginary of a reader to promote the transgression of preestablished social and

through the proposal of a dilution of the boundaries between the genres of autobiography and poetry.

² Natural utterances are those that do not have a fictitious nature, that is, they are situated in the discourses of everyday life, science, etc.

¹ The *Boitempo* trilogy was published in the 1970s, a context that could already be considered postmodern. Accordingly, this poetry has strong features of postmodernity, such as a deconstruction of the lyrical subject category and an expansion of the literary field

cultural sensory limits. Accordingly, Iser (2002) emphasizes that there are two levels of transgression: (1) the unrealization of the real, which converts experiential reality into a sign of something else in the production pole; and (2) the realization of the imaginary, which leads to the loss of the diffuse character of the imaginary due to its determination in the act of reading by a reader. Notably, however, the imaginary is not made real by the determination that is achieved in the acts of pretending, although it is clothed with the appearance of reality and can thus act in the world.

We can therefore view an autobiographical space from the interaction that Iser (1996) discerns between text and reader. From the perspective of this German theorist, it is this dialogical text-reader relationship that makes literature come true, as the mobilization of a reader's imaginary enables the construction of meanings in a literary text and, moreover, legitimizes the polyvalent nature of poetry. This unavoidable role of the reader in autobiographical poetry is further explored below via the theoretical considerations of Hoisel (2019) and Iser (1996).

III. THE KNOWLEDGEABLE MEMORY READER IN POETRY

In *O leitor astucioso [The astute reader]*, Hoisel (2019) works with the idea of a more engaged reader, which is more useful for perceiving the linguistic strategies used by a poet in memorialistic writing. According to the author, autobiographical poets reconstruct their memories through a game of paradoxes and ambiguities where legitimate and illegitimate "selves" coexist amid authentic and inauthentic versions. This type of writing, however, provides reading clues that entail a greater commitment on the part of a reader in the act of reading. This idea is also present in Iser (1996), where the notion of literary reading is developed through the recognition that a text consists of "empty spaces" that require the intervention of a reader with his or her imaginary. Therefore, this theorist argues that the "life" of a literary work is effective, to some extent, in these indeterminate zones of its text, since the action of the imaginary of each reader will provide a variety of concretizations for the text over time.

Hence, the plurality of meanings in a literary text resides more in the figure of an astute reader who interacts with the text than in the text itself. Hoisel (2019) and Iser (1996) thus conceive a reader as a sufficiently active and shrewd subject who is capable of navigating and imaginatively cooperating with a text that offers him or her multiple interpretative possibilities, e.g., the poetry of memory, especially that of Drummond. We elaborate on the following notion below, in the section of this article focused on the case study:

[...] It is, therefore, to delineate the profile of a reader committed to certain reading protocols, using interpretive apparatus to support their affective investments, because [...] the reading is processed in an intertwined [way] with affectivity and knowledge. Precarious knowledge, which is neither totalitarian nor totalizing, but also nothing liberal, with regard to giving the text a consistent and univocal meaning (Hoisel, 2019, p. 91).

According to Hoisel (2019), memory writing is marked by paradoxes, since autobiography is a discursive typology, traditionally governed by the principles of the authenticity, legitimacy and unity of a subject — principles that in autobiographical poetry give way to uncertainties and the various alterities that constitute a subject. From this perspective, lyrical remembrance enables the coexistence of the various identities in the fragmentary process of the subjectification of the "I" in a poem.

Therefore, when a reader encounters a text in which the identities of the multifaceted subject materialize, it is up to him or her (the reader) to intervene with his or her imaginary to reorganize the mnemonic pieces and cooperate with the author in the organization of the text:

The reader thus has the task of arming, of assembling, that is, of intertwining this plurality of subjects, of identities, of stories, without seeking to fit it into a logic or grammar [...] with the objective of understanding it in terms of wholeness and completeness. The text asks the reader, in its various meanders, for a movement of additions, of substitutions, of supplements, in which meanings are superimposed on meanings in an incessant gesture that assembles and disperses fictions of fictions, paradoxes of paradoxes (Hoisel, 2019, p. 95).

To illustrate this idea of a more committed reader, we resort once again to the postulations of Lejeune (2014), which compare the fragmentary writing of autobiographical poets to a Japanese bouquet, i.e., arranged gradually with each inserted flower without, however, filling an entire space. Such unfilled space refers precisely to the place given to reader collaboration. Thus, a reading contract is established where these "empty spaces" instantiate the idea of Wolfgang Iser, i.e., they incite the interpretive cooperation of a reader who, with the strength of his or her imaginary, becomes a coauthor of the meanings in a text. Lejeune also compares this type of writing to workshops that awaken in a reader the desire to work together with a poet. Accordingly, while ordinary readers search for confidentiality and unrestricted access to a poet's workshop, "as if it were not in them, readers, that alchemy be done" (Lejeune, 2014, p. 113), astute readers, in turn, strive to

collaborate in the (re)construction of memories and to access a poet's office to work side by side with him or her.

IV. THE POETIC AND MEMORY: THE TRANSPPOSITION OF THE INDIVIDUAL SPHERE AND THE RESSEMANTIZATION OF A SUBJECT

To discuss the potentialities that memories have for transgressing the individual level in the poetic-literary field — a discussion that supports our study of the work of Drummond in the following section — we turn to the work of Maurice Halbwachs, a sociologist who coined the concept of memory collective. In *Memória Coletiva e Memória Histórica [Collective Memory and Historical Memory]*, Halbwachs (1990) proposes a distinction between autobiographical memory and historical memory, noting that memories have two modes of organization. The first mode refers to memories in the individualized sphere, that is, the memories that are grouped around an individual, encompassing his or her personal life. The second mode concerns collective memory, which, in short, are the memories that a subject evokes via his or her social environment as he or she acts as the member of a group and, therefore, needs to preserve the memories that are relevant to this group. However, although he proposes this differentiation, Halbwachs (1990) states that individual and collective memories can intersect; a social environment is extremely important for the “I” to remember its past. Accordingly, he notes that individual memory is not closed and isolated but mixed with social memories:

A man, to evoke his own past, often needs to appeal to the memories of others. He refers to reference points that exist outside of himself and that are fixed in society. [...] [T]he functioning of individual memory is not possible without these instruments, which are words and ideas, which the individual did not invent and borrowed from his environment (Halbwachs, 1990, p. 54).

Hence, personal memory has social memory as a substrate, since our life history is part of a more general history. Halbwachs (1990) thus observes that historical memory, because it is more comprehensive, presents the past in a schematic and summarized way, while personal memory depicts a more continuous and denser picture. This distinction occurs because social memory is apprehended through reports and readings, that is, a subject does not experience social memory deeply and directly and, therefore, has a summarized and more superficial perspective on it. In contrast, individual memory is experienced directly by an individual and, thus, has a more intense meaning load.

Nevertheless, in regard to remembering a historical fact that is known to the subject through the reports and memories of

the “others” who lived at the time of the salient event, there is an intersection of two memories: the personal, which attempts to reconstruct the past in the context of individual consciousness, and the historical, i.e., the narratives of the “others” who, in fact, lived through that past and therefore provide the basic references for the reconstruction of what occurred in the memory of the individual. Thus, here, the memory of the “other” ultimately preserves the memory of the “I”; the mnemonic gaps in a particular consciousness are complemented by the memories provided by other people. Accordingly, the social groups to which we belong are essential for the maintenance of our memories, provided the memories of these groups are related to the past events of the “I”. In fact, the perspective of the “other” sheds light on the reliability of our memories, as it is able to establish a shift from the point of view of the individual.

The gaps in memory are also filled by imagination, which recreates the past, mixes fact and fiction and elaborates events with the appearance of totality. Hence, when memory spaces are occupied by creations, there is the intersection of two spheres: the real, i.e., empirical experiences, and the literary, where personal life is imagined and the referenced facts have potentially materialized. However, as memory is contaminated by fiction, we encounter a simulation in which the possibilities are elevated to the extreme and fidelity is constantly put in doubt.

Regarding the fragmentation of memory, Halbwachs cites Bergson to point out that “the past remains entirely within our memory, as it was for us; but some obstacles, in particular the behavior of our brain, prevent us from evoking all parts of it” (cited by Halbwachs, 1990, p. 77). To overcome this physiological limitation, we need to resort to society, that is, to the memories of the “others” who experienced the same event as us, which offer us the information we need to fill the voids in our individual memory. Thus, we can reconstruct the past.

In line with Halbwachs, Silva (2009) seeks to understand biography while analyzing a personal trajectory, based on the social construction of memory, which aims to understand the past. Accordingly, the author shows how the time of memory is different from chronological time because during remembrance, the author and experienced reality become fictional elements. Furthermore, memory promotes the maintenance of the past in the present, as it allows the selection of individual and collective experiences and enables the construction of identities and alterities to link self and other, we and them (Silva, 2009).

Miranda (1988), in *Fios Memória [Strings of the memory]*, analyzes the presentation of memory in *Memórias do Cárcere [Memories from Prison]* by Graciliano Ramos and *Em Liberdade [In Freedom]* by Silviano Santiago to

explore how the memorialistic factor presents itself in “the demand for difference”. Conceiving the past as a place for reflection that is open to alterity, the author explains that memory enables the building of the “I” and causes a false sense of completeness:

[...] a reminder that leads those who remember to build a self-preserving monument, confirming the personal myth in which they recognize themselves and wish to see themselves re-known. In this case, by acting as an echo, archive, double-self, memory imposes on the subject who remembers the (false) consciousness of its fullness and autonomy [...] (Miranda, 1988, pp. 45-46).

Miranda (1988) also explains that a memory that manifests as a “demand for difference” is one that is able to reconstruct the past from the perspective of the present. Therefore, memory is a space for reflection because the past is taken up again to be revisited and reworked by an imaginary that is improved in the instant, the present, of remembrance. This aspect is analyzed more systematically below in the section where we address the poetics of memory in Drummond.

Here, to evaluate the identity configuration of a subject in memoirist writing, we follow two important studies by Silviano Santiago, a writer and literary critic who has analysed his own creative craft. In *Meditação sobre o ofício de criar [Meditation on the craft of creating]*, Santiago (2008) seeks, first, to define the status of self-fiction via a tri-dual procedure that involves (1) differentiation, (2) preference, and (3) contamination. Concerning differentiation, the author proposes a distinction between autobiographical and confessional discourse. Regarding preference, he reveals his preference for autobiography, to the detriment of any subjectivity expressed in confessional genres. With respect to contamination, Silviano states that autobiographical discourse is mixed with fictional discourse and vice versa, engendering a hybrid form that is capable of leveraging the imaginary and the possibilities of a writer in the context of “I” literature:

The preference for autobiographical discourse and the consequent contamination of it by fictional discourse became textual practice, that is, they configured a hybrid product at the moment when the [...] subject had the urgent need to [perform] a corner kick — or for the unconscious — [for] the confessional and combine the speech of their life experience with the fictional invention (Santiago, 2008, pp. 175-176).

Thus, to address the fictionalization of a subject and his or her preference for nonconfessional discourse, Santiago returns to a childhood experience, a period when his father forced him to go weekly to confess to the parish priest of his city:

I fictionalized the subject — myself — by narrating the sins listed. I invented for myself and the priest-confessor another less sinful and more judicious childhood, or at least [one] where the reprehensible attitudes and intentions remained camouflaged by speech. These lies, or autobiographical inventions, or self-fictions, had the status of lived, had [the] consistency of experience, thanks to the greater fact that preceded them — the premature death of the mother — [which] guaranteed the[ir] veracity or authenticity. On Saturdays, before the confessor, he assumed a hybrid speech — autobiographical and fictional — [that was] credible. He was “confessional” and “honest” without actually being [so] fully (Santiago, 2008, p. 177).

Furthermore, Silviano compares the role of the priest-confessor in his childhood with the role of his reader today. Accordingly, just as his priest received an apparently confessional discourse, which was actually a hybrid discourse that expressed false confessions and invented truths, his reader encounters, in the act of reading, self-fictional texts that by mixing autobiography and fiction, need to be craftily deciphered:

Confessional discourse — which in fact was not, was only an empty, despairing place, filled with hybrid discourses — could only be fully and virtually in a discursive bundle, in an open sum of self-fictional discourses, whose weight and final value would be the responsibility of the priest-confessor — and, today, of my reader. To the priest-confessor and the reader, I passed on some badly told stories (Santiago, 2008, p. 177).

Silviano also addresses poetic truth; in a fictional environment, he states that truth is presented implicitly, covered by lies and fiction. Nevertheless, a critic points out that it is precisely this implication — the truth metamorphosed by the fiction — that poetically reveals the truth to a reader. Therefore, Santiago claims to be a lie that always tells the truth³, demarcating the unavoidable paradox for scholars and readers of the writings of the “I” in the literature.

In his essay *Eu & as galinhas-d’angola [Me and the chickens from Angola]*, Santiago (2004) also discusses the

³ Silviano references the Greek drawing by Jean Cocteau, dated 1936, where the figure of a poet, Orpheus, can be seen saying, “Je suis un mensonge quid it toujours la vérité”.

fictionalization of the “me”, but here he uses the metaphor of the life of the sharecropper Zé-Zim, one of Guimarães Rosa’s characters in *Grande sertão: veredas* [*The Devil to Pay in the Backlands*]. Specifically, Silviano performs an analysis of the wild history of the sharecropper, who, when asked about why he does not raise guinea fowl, responds, “I want to create nothing [...] I truly like to change [...]”. Zé-Zim’s response represents, metaphorically, the transmigration of a sertanejo⁴ who changes body and, often, soul, when travelling to distant lands and, therefore, cannot create affective bonds, even with chickens that will be, sooner or later, abandoned by their breeder.

In addition to demonstrating the life of a migrant from the Minas Gerais backlands, the Zé-Zim sharecropper metaphor illustrates the life trajectory of Silviano Santiago himself, as he points out. That is, he sees himself as a wanderer who has left his homeland and migrated to Rio de Janeiro to study and improve his teaching practice. The “breeding of guinea hens” is therefore incompatible with this teacher/writer. Having made this analogy, Silviano identifies the nature of what we know concerning identity as a discourse given in the first person, namely, the writing of the “I”. Hence, he offers valuable reflections for understanding the differences between the first autobiographical person and the first fictional person. This discussion begins at the moment when this writer is invited to speak, in the first person, at a seminar, that is, as “Silviano Santiago”:

Is the desire to personify a body in a single face, to give the face a unique name, not in contradiction with the status of living-in-language, of reading and writing in postmodernity? Was it not to lose my identity and to be plural that I distanced myself from my native clod to study and improve myself; is it not to lose my face and be [in] a crowd that I read and write? (Santiago, 2004, p. 27).

In this way, the writer reflects on what “first person” he should invoke at the time of his public speech, given that he, as a postmodern subject, presents himself with multiple faces and without a stable identity, with plural “selves”. In other words, the writer and the individual in a postmodernity context throw dice in a double game between the “me” and the “other”: “this is what I call ‘my life experience’, and this is what I call ‘my writings’ [...] am I not being me?” (Santiago, 2004, p. 27). Although Silviano occupies the place of the speech of a postmodern subject, we can use his reflections to contemplate not only the configuration of memories in Drummond’s work — as the distinction between autobiographical subject and fictional

subject is quite expensive — but also the transition between the “I” and the “other” in poetry.

Silviano also addresses the issue of catalytic synthesis, that is, how literary entries canonize the first person of their authors. In this case, the name “Silviano Santiago”, found on the covers of books and in literary catalogues, manifests itself as an attempt to personalize an impersonal face and recompose an “I” that is actually much more complex, broader and multifaceted. Hence, Santiago (2004), during the lecture he participates in, emphasizes the third person — the “he” of the literary entry under the name of “Silviano Santiago”, renowned researcher and writer — i.e., the he who speaks in the first person, the “I” with a multiple origin:

Why is it that my first person, to be more admittedly himself, likes to play with my third person so much? [...] Am I not being a forerunner of Machado de Assis, who began his mature work through the voice of a “deceased author” who also says he is a “deceased author”? In the displacement of the adjective from the left to the right of the key noun, did not the warlock Cosme Velho find a way to disassociate the first autobiographical person from the first fictional person? (Santiago, 2004, p. 28).

Hence, the incompatibility between the “empirical self” and the “fictional self” is noted because the first autobiographical person, when inserted in the hybrid space of self-fiction, disguises himself or herself as “I word”, an “I”. Such a self-reference lacks the carnal force of the voice of a real subject but has the intense and multiform load of the voice of the imagination. In short, it is an “I” that tells the poetic truth by having the courage to assume the role of a liar, but “a liar who always tells the truth”. In view of this, Silviano argues,

[They] abstract me from the writings so that they can consider them what they actually are — dead body, dead letter. In a single image, they are guinea fowl, sacrificed and thrown to the god by the sharecropper and creator (Santiago, 2004, p. 28).

In this excerpt, there is a dialog between Silviano Santiago and Roland Barthes’s thesis on “the death of the author”. That is, both writers defend the perspective that the author, as a real person, mortifies himself or herself in his or her writing itself to give way to language, to the words that feed themselves and that are thrown, in a text, into a reader’s gaze.

In view of our discussion of this topic, we study Drummond’s *Boitempo* trilogy in the following section to systematize the issue of the unfolding of autobiographical

⁴ In Brazil, “sertanejo” means “a person from the countryside”.

memory into collective memory during a dynamic game between the “I” and the “other”.

V. A CASE STUDY: *BOITEMPO* BY CARLOS DRUMMOND DE ANDRADE

In this section, the trilogy of *Boitempo I* (1968), *Boitempo II* (1973) and *Boitempo III* (1979) — later grouped into a single volume with the title *Boitempo* — is analyzed via the memory bias that fosters a more astute reading to determine how memories within poetry are able to transgress the limits of the particular and fall into the category of a collective memory. As we have already mentioned, we evaluate memory poetry in *Boitempo* with the theoretical support of Candido (2000), Pedrosa (2011) and Villaça (2006), in addition to the authors we have discussed above.

Candido (2000) notes that there is a strong autobiographical trait, presented in a frank way, in *Boitempo I* and *Boitempo II*. Such autobiography reveals itself not as a feeling of guilt and/or restlessness but as a feeling of the world as a spectacle, in which the poet sees himself from the outside in and thus recognizes himself as a piece of the world. Hence, a change of tone occurs at the moment when the “I” sees itself as part of the worldly spectacle and thus abdicates its exacerbated individualism. In addition, Candido (2000) explains that *Boitempo I* and *Boitempo II* perform a movement toward the transcendence of a particular fact, insofar as the lyrical subject effects a double detachment from its present “I”. First, the lyrical subject sees itself as an adult who observes the past of his life and his family as objects external to him; second, the lyrical subject perceives itself to be an adult who observes the past and life not as expressions of oneself but as a constitutive part of the world that the lyrical subject is a part of.

This detachment is essential for the characterization of Drummond's lyrical remembrance, as it enables the transgression of the boundaries between the particular and the universal. Thus, the lyrical subject begins to use, without distinction, the 1st person (me) and the 3rd person (him). This indistinction of the 1st and 3rd person deserves the attention of the reader of this lyric because it allows double-entry reading, that is, it allows an astute reader to simultaneously read these memories as a personal experience of the “I” and as a heterobiography that “gives existence” to the world of Minas Gerais at the beginning of the century (Candido, 2000, p. 56). To elaborate on this idea, we focus on the following poem:

Wall⁵

A whole city wall
Wall around the houses.
Around, wall, of the souls.
The wall of the cliffs.
The family wall.
Streets made of sea walls.
The wall is the street itself,
where to pass or not to pass
is the same form of imprisonment.
Wall of humidity and shade,
without a crack for life.
The pocketknife punctures it,
the nail, the tooth, the slap?
If on the other side there is only
another, another, wall?

In this poem, “Wall”, by *Boitempo II*, the individual memories of the poet act as a kind of metaphor for the conservatism of small mining cities, e.g., Itabira, where there is a constant effort to limit via “walling” social behaviors. Thus, the social rules that structure the life of this group, which define what behaviors are considered right or wrong, as well as the limits imposed by the “family wall”, ultimately imprison the freedom of both the people and the poet, who is also included in this social group.

This heterobiographical characteristic of Drummond's poetry is also confirmed by Pedrosa (2011), who suggests that the notion of time functions, in these poetics, through lyrical subjectivity, which is configured as open by coexistence with the “other”, i.e., with all those whom the individual shares the same time and the same world with (Pedrosa, 2011). Hence, Pedrosa identifies Drummond's poetry as a place for staging the experience of modernity, as the latter problematizes the experiences of a subject who is immersed in his contemporaneity, a “me” who considers his life inextricably linked to his contemporaries and who develops “an acute awareness of time, in time” (Pedrosa, 2011, p. 19).

In addition, such remembrance poetry, which revisits the past while recreating it through the energy of the imaginary and memories, mobilizes the more active participation of a reader. This commitment of a recipient is necessary because, in this lyric, the memories of the past need to be perceived not as simple nostalgia but as a way of re-laborating the experiences of the subject and his social environment and, moreover, as a way of understanding reality.

⁵ “Paredão: Uma cidade toda paredão/ Paredão em volta das casas./ Em volta, paredão, das almas./ O paredão dos precipícios./ O paredão familiar./ Ruas feitas de paredão./ O paredão é a própria rua,/ onde passar ou não passar/ é a mesma forma de prisão./

Paredão de umidade e sombra./ sem uma fresta para a vida./ A canivete perfura-lo./ a unha, a dente, a bofetão?/ Se do outro lado existe apenas/ outro, mais outro, paredão??”

Building on the ideas of Candido (2000) and Pedrosa (2011) and the proposal that a more astute reading is required by memory poetry, Villaça (2006) indicates the presence of at least two voices that intersect and complement each other in most poems within *Boitempo*: the voice of the poet who speaks for the boy and the voice of the boy who speaks for the poet.

Accordingly, Villaça (2006) shows how in most of *Boitempo*'s poems, the evocation of remembrance expresses the paradigm of the lyric of Carlos Drummond de Andrade, i.e., of the old "ruminant" poet who considers the past "new food, again"; by recalling and updating the experiences of the past through the voice of the "old boy", he makes explicit the dynamism of life as a matter of his poetry. Importantly, the intertwined voices of the poet and the boy actualize the past as they enunciate it in the present, reviving it via the power of memory and imagination. The poem-epigraph "Intimation" in *Boitempo III* exemplifies this notion:

Intimation⁶

—You must urgently shut up
the silly memories of a boy.

—Impossible. I count my present.

With lust I returned to being a boy.

In the first two verses of this poem, the presence of the voice of the "I" is noted in the words of an adult who makes a subpoena for the mature poet to urgently stop "the silly memories of a boy". The poet, in turn, counters by stating that it is impossible to silence these memories, because what he does, in fact, is describe his own present; he does not simply remember the past with nostalgia, as the imperative voice suggests. Then, the poet still surprises his reader by declaring that he became a boy again "with lust". An astute reading of the last two verses thus allows us to perceive how the poet uses the present tense ("short story") to intensify the degree of temporal proximity to past experiences, reliving them in the instant of enunciation and, with this, developing a new perception for these experiences:

[...] everything that could be pure memory reappears with the impact of what is experienced in the here and now of the old boy, and not in illo tempore. [...] it is not only evoking an old perception, in the illusion of reviving it as it was, but building with it (and for it) a new perception (Villaça, 2006, p. 114).

Accordingly, in this poem, the presentification of the past occurs; the old experiences expand until they engender,

through the voice of the old boy, a rupture in the chronology. That is, the affective time causes the relativization of the chronological time. The connection of the past, as an image of the lost, with the future is made from the present. Hence, Pedrosa suggests that

[...] the poetic memory of childhood reading [...] indicates that childhood persists and insists, that chronology can be relativized, that narratives can overflow boundaries and that the poet [...] is actually an old boy, made of the past as it is effective today in his affective memory and in his poetic imagination, a past that thus becomes childhood, a new beginning, an open path (Pedrosa, 2011, p. 26).

Therefore, following Halbwichs (1990), Silva (2009) and Miranda (1988), we can confirm that the poetry of old age in Drummond does not randomly revisit the past but is driven by the search for a possible feeling of not only the totality of individual history but also, even more so, of social history. Hence, the poetry of maturity in Drummond allows reorganizing and restructuring the parameters — including aesthetics — within which language should be reformulated.

To extend the theoretical postulations of Candido (2000), Pedrosa (2011) and Villaça (2006), as well as the idea of a more attentive reading, further, we now turn to the poems "(In) Memory" in *Boitempo I* and "Collection of shards" in *Boitempo III* to briefly discuss the fragmentary configuration of the memories in these lyrics by Drummond:

(In) Memory⁷

Of shards, of holes
of gaps and voids
of ellipses, psiuses
it is done, it is undone, it is done
an incorporeal face,
Summary of existing.
The portrait is refined
in the same transparency:
eliminating face
Situations and traffic
suddenly stick
blocking the land.
And it reaches that point
where everything is ground
in the golden mortar:
a Europe, a museum,

⁶ "Intimação: — Você deve calar urgentemente/ as lembranças bobocas de menino./ — Impossível. Eu conto o meu presente./ Com volúpia voltei a ser menino."

⁷ "(In) Memória: De cacos, de buracos/ de hiatos e de vácuos/ de elipses, psiús/ faz-se, desfaz-se, faz-se/ uma incorpórea face./

resumo de existido./ Apura-se o retrato/ na mesma transparência:/ eliminando cara/ situação e trânsito/ subitamente vara/ o bloqueio da terra./ E chega àquele ponto/ onde é tudo móido/ no almofariz do ouro:/ uma europa, um museu,/ o projetado amar,/ o concluso silêncio."

the projected to love,
the final silence.

In this poem, a temporal dialog expresses how the experiences of the past are enunciated in the present tense (“done”; “refined”; “is”) to construct the duration of time, which expands in memory. Thus, the first verse of the poem reveals the fragmented, elliptical and hidden aspect of the memories (“shards”, “holes”, “hiatuses”) that the poet seeks to reorganize (“make, undo”) to reinvent the past that presents itself as an “incorporeal face”, a past *in memoriam*, lost but also present, already announced in the play on words in the title of the poem. Accordingly, the poet strives to re-elaborate what remains of the past, a place whose memories have been eroded by the vicious passage of time, that “golden mortar”. In addition, the passage of time has devastated not only what had existed but also what could have been experienced yet was not: “the projected love”, “the concluding silence”. The poet therefore aims not only to reconstruct the past with the intention of reviving it as it was but also to recreate it as it develops, in the present, constructing a new perception of it.

Collection of shards⁸

I no longer collect stamps. The world encases me.
There are too many countries, too many
geographies.
I give up.
I would never have had an album like Dr. Grisolia,
pride of the city.
And everyone collects
the same little pieces of paper.
Now I collect shards of crockery
broken a long time ago.
New shards do not serve.
Whites also did not.
They have to be colorful and worn,
unearthed — I insist — from the vegetable garden.
[...]
But I remake the flower by its color,
and it's only my flower, if the color is mine
in the shard of the bowl.
The shard comes from the land as a fruit
waiting for me, secret
that dead cook there testified,
so that one day I could unravel it.
Plowing, plowing with impatient hands

a neglected gold
by everyone in the family.
[...]
the collection and its blood sign;
the collection and its risk of tetanus;
the collection that no other imitates.
I hide it from José, why not laugh
nor throw away this dream museum.

In this poem, the link between the past and the present is expressed in two enunciative voices. The first is the voice of the old boy, always enunciated in the present tense, which confers a degree of temporal proximity between childhood and old age (“I have been collecting broken/broken pieces for a long time”). The second is the voice of the old poet, who reveals himself in the innards of the boy's voice and who participates in the childlike activity of “collecting shards” that are “colored and old” and “unearthed from the garden”. The fragmentary aspect of “shards of crockery” can be interpreted as a metaphor of the constitution of memories, given that memories are presented via the overlapping of lacunar images, “broken”, erased and lived “for a long time”. Regarding this, Eneida Maria de Souza (2007) notes that

[...] the memoirist becomes aware of the impossibility of completing the landscape because there are missing pieces [...]. Through the method of recomposition, proper to archeology, in which the piece of jug found stimulates the supplementary reconstitution of the object, the facts and words will also act as fragments of the life to be rewritten (Souza, 2007, pp. 21-22).

Therefore, the “I” who remembers is, in fact, a collector of memories who remakes the past into the present and adds new elements and perceptions to the living (“but I remake the flower by its color”). In addition, the mature and experienced poet suddenly finds himself notably involved and enchanted by the “dream museum” of the child, who boldly and surely claims to never have “an album like Dr. Grisolia” because it is nothing more than “pieces of paper”. Hence, the boy shows greater esteem for his collection of shards, and the old poet, in turn, seems to agree with him. Regarding this communion between the poet and the boy, Villaça (2006, p. 120) observes that “the old boy and the modern poet are, each in their own way, collectors of colored and worn fragments”. The poet thus rescues the boy

⁸ “**Coleção de cacos:** Já não coleciono selos./ O mundo me enquizila./ Tem países demais, geografias demais./ Desisto./ Nunca chegarei a ter um álbum igual ao do Dr. Grisolia./ orgulho da cidade./ E toda gente coleciona/ os mesmos pedacinhos de papel./ Agora coleciono cacos de louça/ quebrada há muito tempo./ Cacos novos não servem./ Brancos também não./ Têm que ser coloridos e vetustos./ desenterrados — faço questão — da horta./ [...] Mas eu refaço a flor por sua cor./ e é só minha tal flor, se a cor

é minha/ no caco da tigela./ O caco vem da terra como fruto/ a me aguardar, segredo/ que morta cozinheira ali depôs./ para que um dia eu o desvendasse./ Lavrar, lavrar com mãos impacientes/ um ouro desprezado/ por todos da família./ [...] a coleção e seu sinal de sangue./ a coleção e seu risco de tétano./ a coleção que nenhum outro imita./ Escondo-a do José, por que não ria/ nem jogue fora esse museu de sonho.”

who collects shards and, like him, reconfigures his memories in his work with poetry, since

Writing poetry, in addition to not being an inconsequential task [...] is also an activity in which the lyric consciousness ends up facing its desires, its intimate contradictions, its historical instability, its frustrated metaphysics. The boy hides his collection of shards so that his brother José does not laugh at him; as an adult, he will know that a poet is also a being Chaplinianly exposed to play, walking on a road of dust and hope (Villça, 2006, p. 121).

Critically, the memories in the two poems, shattered into "shards" and "holes", also require the crafty cooperation of a reader/archaeologist and his or her imaginary to "plow, plow with impatient hands" until the collection of these shards, the memories of this "incorporeal face", are organized and embedded ("made, undone") in an endless puzzle, which will always have loose pieces on the table. Accordingly, any reader, like the boy and the poet, is a collector of shards. In these reminiscences, offered as a matter of poetry, a reader is able to don the skin of the poet and recognize himself or herself as a fragmented subject, consisting of broken memories and contradictory desires ("ellipses, psiuses"). Thus, Carlos Drummond de Andrade's remembrance poetry proves dialectical, i.e., it offers a reader a way to access self-knowledge and is thus "poetry that none of us can renounce without loss for the understanding of oneself" (Villça, 2006, p. 121).

VI. CONCLUSION

In this article, our discussions have demonstrated that Drummond's poetry of remembrance proposes a reformulation of the traditional concept of autobiography. As poetic fiction, it builds tensions between its linguistic elements, creating a language that enables the overcoming of the particularizing notion of subject. Thus, the poetics of memory in *Boitempo* can be read as heterobiography, given that individual/autobiographical they expand the limits of time and present themselves as a constitutive part of collective/social memory. Hence, Drummond's lyrical remembrance elicits the collaboration of a reader to rewrite the memories, the past, the subject and time itself, sanctioning the modernity of a poetry that exposes itself to otherness and casts itself into the gaze of the "other". Hence, the poet, by enunciating himself as "I", plays the role of mouthpiece for the experiences of a group and strips the fictionality from his poetic-literary discourse by hybridizing memories and inventiveness.

Thus, the intertwining space of poetry and memory broadens its horizons and offers itself as a place for sharing various experiences, a place where poet and reader rewrite

their lives and those of their contemporaries by breaking with the linear flow of time and creatively revisiting the past from the perspective of the present. Finally, we have shown how Drummond's poetry, specifically, his autobiographical poetry, is able to transgress the conventional limits of individual and collective because it is a lyric; in it, the "I" and the "other" go hand in hand, collecting shards of memories and experiences. It is a poetry that expands and is thrown into abysses with the objective of understanding and encompassing the "feeling of the world".

REFERENCES

- [1] Andrade, C. D. (1968). *Boitempo & A falta que ama*. Rio de Janeiro: Sabiá.
- [2] Andrade, C. D. (1973). *Menino Antigo: Boitempo II*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.
- [3] Andrade, C. D. (1979). *Esquecer para lembrar: Boitempo III*. Rio de Janeiro: José Olympio.
- [4] Andrade, C. D. (2012). *Sentimento do Mundo* (1st ed.). São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- [5] Arfuch, L. (2010). *O espaço biográfico: dilemas da subjetividade contemporânea*. Translated by Paloma Vidal. Rio de Janeiro: EdUERJ.
- [6] Candido, A. (2000). *A educação pela noite e outros ensaios* (3rd ed.). São Paulo: Ática.
- [7] Halbwachs, M. (1990). Memória coletiva e memória histórica. In: Halbwachs, M. *A memória coletiva*. Translated by Laurent Léon Schaffter. São Paulo: Vértice/ Revista dos tribunais.
- [8] Hoisel, E. (2019). Bioficções: vozes expandidas. In: Hoisel, E. *Teoria, crítica e criação literária: o escritor e seus múltiplos* (pp. 101-112). Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- [9] Hoisel, E. (2019). O leitor astucioso. In: Hoisel, E. *Teoria, crítica e criação literária: o escritor e seus múltiplos* (pp. 87-100). Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- [10] Iser, W. (1996). *O ato da leitura: uma teoria do efeito estético*. Translated by Johannes Kretschmer. São Paulo: Editora 34.
- [11] Iser, W. (2002). Os atos de fingir ou o que é fictício no texto ficcional. In: Lima, L. C. (ed.). *Teoria da Literatura em suas fontes* (pp. 955-987). Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira.
- [12] Lejeune, P. (2014). *O pacto autobiográfico: de Rousseau à internet* (2nd ed.). Translated by Jovita Maria Gerheim and Maria Inês Coimbra Guedes. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- [13] Miranda, W. M. (1988). Fios da Memória. *O Eixo e a Roda: Revista de Literatura Brasileira*, 6, 43-60.
- [14] Pedrosa, C. (2011). Representação da aurora: poesia e história em Carlos Drummond de Andrade. In: *Ensaio sobre poesia e contemporaneidade* (pp. 19-35). Niterói: EDUFF.
- [15] Santiago, S. (2004). Eu & as galinhas-d'angola. In: Santiago, S. *O cosmopolitismo do pobre: crítica literária e crítica cultural* (pp. 26-29). Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG.
- [16] Santiago, S. (2008). Meditação sobre o ofício de criar. *Aletria: Revista De Estudos De Literatura*, 18(2), 173-179.

- [17] Silva, W. C. L. (2009). Biografias: construção e reconstrução da memória. *Fronteiras: Revista de História*, 11(20), 151-166.
- [18] Smith, B. H. (1971). Poetry as fiction. In: Smith, B. H. *New Literary History* (pp. 259-281). Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- [19] Souza, E. M. (2007). Lapsos da memória. In: Souza, E. M. *Tempos de pós-crítica* (pp. 21-29). Belo Horizonte: Editora Veredas & Cenários.
- [20] Villaça, A. (2006). Poética da memória. In: Villaça, A. *Passos de Drummond* (pp. 107-123). São Paulo: Duas Cidades.