

# REPRESENTATIONS OF POWER IN PILGRIM TALES FROM THE BRAZILIAN NORTHEAST \*

*Candace Slater*  
*University of Pennsylvania*

Padre Cícero Romão Batista, the priest who allegedly worked miracles until his death in 1934, has become a symbol for the vast, poverty-ridden Northeast of Brazil. Every year nearly a million pilgrims come to visit his adopted city, Juazeiro do Norte, in the arid interior of the state of Ceará. The fact that their journeys are not a remnant of the past, but a steadily growing reflection of the present, makes stories about the priest of special interest to social scientists as well as literary scholars. Although the pilgrimage in honor of Padre Cícero is not the largest in the country, it is the biggest in honor of a nonsaint anywhere in the Western world today.<sup>1</sup>

Most stories about the priest focus upon him primarily as a miracle worker; however, a small, but significant, number deal with the relationship between him and his political advisor, Dr. Floro Bartolomeu da Costa. These tales are noteworthy because upon analysis, they reveal specific local applications as well as a series of broader oppositions. On the one hand, the stories have roots in particular, documentable occurrences. On the other, the Padre Cícero who emerges from them represents a generalized heavenly or spiritual order, while his counselor, Floro, embodies a strictly temporal power.

There is a certain truth to this fictionalized portrait of the pair. Many Brazilian messianic leaders have enjoyed the services of a right-hand man or woman, and there is no doubt that Floro masterminded the more practical aspects of Padre Cícero's career.<sup>2</sup> Nevertheless, the doctor in these stories is often less fact than fiction because in order to create an all-too-human foil to an otherworldly priest, storytellers consistently exaggerate or transform the actions of the flesh-and-blood Floro.

Furthermore, while Padre Cícero and Dr. Floro provide convenient symbols of heavenly versus earthly power, they can also be seen as

\*I am grateful to the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation for supporting part of the fieldwork on which this discussion is based. I would also like to thank the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia and the National Endowment for the Humanities Summer Program for supplementary grants.

incarnations of two specific social and political orders. Whereas Padre Cícero is the idealization of a traditional landowning system, Floro represents a modernizing state that most of these extremely conservative storytellers perceive with disfavor. The doctor of these stories exemplifies the Old Republic, which spanned the period between 1894 and 1930.<sup>3</sup> The fact that the doctor cast his lot with the traditional oligarchy by representing "the patriarch of Juazeiro" in first the state and then the national legislature does not prevent storytellers from seeing the duo as opposing figures. For them, Floro is the secular, urban, and industrial middle class that was to triumph in the Vargas revolution. Thus, at the same time that people affectionately refer to Padre Cícero as *meu padrinho* (my godfather) and therefore a near-relative, they dismiss Floro as an *estrangeiro* (foreigner).<sup>4</sup> The priest's advisor is characterized as the epitome of a *doutor* (this title is given not just to physicians, but to anyone perceived to be sufficiently above oneself on the social ladder). Despite his status, however, Dr. Floro is an alien and therefore largely negative presence in these tales.

The following pages are meant to demonstrate how stories about Padre Cícero and his political advisor function on three levels. The tales grow out of specific, troublesome situations that storytellers would prefer to attribute to a villainous doctor rather than to a supposedly infallible priest. These situations also function as illustrations of a more general division between spiritual and temporal power as well as between two easily identifiable social systems.

#### THE BACKGROUND TO THE STORIES

Before looking at several stories about Padre Cícero and Dr. Floro, a little information about the historical figures who serve as their protagonists will be useful.<sup>5</sup> It should be recognized that although the tales are seldom factually accurate, they nonetheless grow out of a particular historical context.

Cícero Romão Batista was born in 1844 in the backlands city of Crato, Ceará. When the boy showed signs of a religious vocation, a wealthy relative agreed to finance his education at the seminary run by the Lazarist fathers in Fortaleza, the state capital. Following his ordination, the priest had no intention of accepting the chaplaincy of Juazeiro, Crato's impoverished neighbor, until a prophetic dream impelled him to do so in 1872. Precisely in that year, a dispute arose between the Brazilian emperor, Pedro II, and the leaders of the Roman Catholic Church. This "Imperial Religious Question" threatened the alliance between church and state that had been in effect since Brazil declared its independence from Portugal in 1822.<sup>6</sup> The dispute also proved disquieting to individual believers.

Religious doubts were not the only problem of those who lived in the backlands. During the drought of 1877–79, over a third of the population of Ceará, approximately three hundred thousand persons, either emigrated or died.<sup>7</sup> Given the magnitude of this disaster, it is not surprising that people throughout the interior panicked when no rain fell again in 1889.

On the first Friday in March of this difficult year, Padre Cícero offered communion to several women at a monthly mass in honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. One of these individuals was Maria de Araújo, an unmarried, illiterate twenty-eight-year-old mulatta laundress who was a *beata* (a member of an unofficial religious sisterhood much like the *beguines* of medieval Europe). Before this fateful date, Maria de Araújo had seemed no different from the other dozen or so beatas in the Cariri Valley. When Padre Cícero administered the host to her on this occasion, however, it allegedly grew red with blood. This transformation recurred on every Wednesday and Friday until Easter, and then daily until the Feast of Christ's Ascension.<sup>8</sup>

Padre Cícero initially was uncertain about the nature of the blood, but most of his peers were convinced that a miracle had occurred. Finally, some ten months after the event, the priest submitted a report in which he affirmed the divine origin of the blood. The empire's replacement by a secular republic toward the end of 1889 had created a considerable anxiety among Roman Catholics. This circumstance may have influenced Padre Cícero in his decision that the alleged transformation should be taken as a sign of the continuing validity of religious experience in an increasingly secular world. It is also possible that the pressure exerted by so many prominent citizens and fellow clergy finally had assured him of the truth of the event. In any case, this action was the only one involving himself that the priest ever proclaimed to be "miraculous." Although his followers subsequently would claim many other wonders for him, the priest apparently was not responsible for their dissemination.

The Bishop of Fortaleza, Dom Joaquim José Vieira, was particularly disturbed by implications of a Second Coming because of the messianic expectations that were already widespread among lower-class Northeasterners. Imbued with Portuguese Sebastianism and eager for a way out of their precarious circumstances, these rural Brazilians were all too ready to believe that Juazeiro was the New Jerusalem.<sup>9</sup> The bishop therefore sent two fact-finding missions to the Cariri Valley. The first of these corroborated reports of the events' "miraculous" nature. When the second, however, failed to discover any proof of divine intervention, the bishop suspended the cleric from preaching, hearing confessions, and counseling the faithful.

Dom Joaquim's actions diminished Padre Cícero's support among the upper classes and the clergy, but did nothing to stem the tide of

visitors to Juazeiro. Although many of these individuals were nearly penniless, they were able as a group to finance the priest's trip to Rome. There, in 1898, he presented his case to Pope Leo XIII. Although the pontiff did not restore his orders, the trip enhanced Padre Cícero's prestige among his followers back home.

The growing belief of Northeasterners in the priest's miraculous powers had profound economic and political ramifications. As new waves of pilgrims chose to settle in Juazeiro, the once-tiny city began to dwarf its neighbors. One result of this rapid expansion was Padre Cícero's increasing participation in practical matters. The arrival of Dr. Floro in the city in 1908 set the stage for the priest's official entry into the political arena.

After studying medicine in the capital city of Salvador, Dr. Floro Bartolomeu da Costa served as an itinerant doctor in the backlands of Bahia and Pernambuco. He also worked as a journalist and public notary, branching out into a series of commercial ventures, which included joining the French mining engineer Count Adolpho Van den Brule in a search for diamonds and semiprecious metals in 1907. A year later, the two men traveled to the Cariri Valley to visit the disputed Coxá copper deposits in which a Paris-based firm had interests. Because Padre Cícero had used money donated to him by supporters to acquire property rights to most of the copper fields, it was natural that he and Floro should meet. As a result of the encounter, Floro became the priest's representative in the Coxá matter and subsequently settled in Juazeiro after its resolution.

The dispute over the fields catapulted Floro into local politics. After a district court finally approved the priest's request to demarcate the properties, Floro and three others almost lost their lives in a retaliatory ambush. The doctor did not hesitate to strike back at the would-be assassins, who were in the service of a close relative of a powerful Crato landowner, Antonio Luís. Although Floro's armed rebuff was successful, it marked the end of Padre Cícero's longstanding political neutrality.

It is not difficult to imagine why the doctor might have chosen to stay in Juazeiro. Floro was a typical *bacharel*, one of those upwardly mobile graduates of urban universities who made a career of serving old style landowners or *coronéis* during this period. Often, the bacharel would marry the *coronel's* daughter.<sup>10</sup> In this case, Dr. Floro sought to become a second *padrinho* to the enormous family composed of the priest's followers by sponsoring numerous godchildren and dispensing medical advice.

Padre Cícero, in turn, must have respected Floro's education and his shrewdness. The Coxá mining dispute was just one of many skirmishes from which Floro was to emerge triumphant. In the Revolution of 1913–14, for instance, the doctor's willingness to form an alliance with his old enemy Antonio Luís allowed him to obtain Rio de Janeiro's sup-

port for Juazeiro's rebellion against the troops sent by state governor Franco Rabelo. The city's victory in this battle resulted in Padre Cícero's emergence as first vice-president of Ceará (a largely honorific title). Six years after arriving in Juazeiro, Floro himself became the president of the state legislative assembly. Reelected state deputy in 1916, he went on to the lower house of the national congress in the then capital of Rio de Janeiro as the Cariri Valley's representative in 1921, a seat he retained until his death at the age of fifty in 1926.

Floro's rapid rise to power earned him many enemies. Some were "native sons" who resented a newcomer's influence over Padre Cícero. Others were disgruntled political opponents or old friends of the priest who felt that the doctor had usurped their place in Padre Cícero's affections. These individuals denounced Floro as the priest's "alter ego." Floro also stirred opposition among the lower classes because he repressed a series of popular religious manifestations. Largely because he wanted to make Juazeiro look more modern and less "fanatical" to the outside world, the doctor took a strong stand against not only banditry and gambling but various religious sects. It was he who gave the order to disband a society of penitential flagellants who had become a tradition in Juazeiro and a millenarian group called "the Celestial Courts." He insisted upon the celebration of primarily secular holidays such as Carnival, the national independence day, and Juazeiro's anniversary of municipal autonomy. Many of the extremely conservative pilgrims who had come to settle in Juazeiro were upset by these measures, which they found sacrilegious.

Padre Cícero, however, apparently supported Floro throughout the course of their almost twenty-year association. The only documentable confrontation between the priest and the doctor, which occurred in 1914, was quickly resolved.<sup>11</sup> Although the priest did not share Floro's secular interests (let alone his rabid anticlericalism), he was nonetheless interested in not merely the survival but the material progress of Juazeiro. For this reason, he did not oppose measures that many of his followers undoubtedly regarded as attacks upon their particular vision of the world.

#### THE STORYTELLERS

This essay is based exclusively on orally transmitted stories that I recorded in Juazeiro do Norte during the six months I spent there in 1981 and 1982.<sup>12</sup> Like the other narratives in my collection, many of the tales about Padre Cícero and Dr. Floro were told by my neighbors along the Rua do Horto, a two-mile stretch of rudimentary houses that are interspersed with stations of the cross. A conscious imitation of Jerusalem's Via Sacra, the Rua do Horto is required passage for the city's hundreds of

thousands of pilgrims. Although the street's official name is the Rua Santos Dumont, it is called the Rua do Horto after the hilltop overlooking the city. Padre Cicero referred to this part of the Catole mountain range as the *horto* (garden) with the intention of recalling the Garden of Gethsemane. It was here that he began work on a chapel dedicated to the Sacred Heart of Jesus. Church authorities repeatedly opposed the construction of this building, whose framework was finally destroyed in 1944.

The great majority of the settlers on the Rua do Horto originally came to Juazeiro from various parts of the rural Northeast. Although the word *pilgrim* is usually defined as a *wayfarer*, a number of the city's permanent inhabitants call themselves pilgrims (*romeiros*). To identify themselves as such, they wear a rosary with a medal of Padre Cícero and the Virgin Mary in her guise as Our Lady of Sorrows around their necks. One measure of their faith is that some individuals actually wear two rosaries so that if they should die with the beads in their hand while praying, the second strand would still guarantee their salvation.

About two thousand people live along the Rua do Horto.<sup>13</sup> Although these individuals are technically citydwellers, both their livelihoods and their vision of the world suggest strong ties to their peasant past. Nearly all the men, like their fathers before them, are subsistence farmers who work fields farther up the hillside, which they rent from private landowners. The small number of male residents who are not primarily engaged in agriculture still maintain a modest plot of land for raising staples such as beans and corn to feed their families. These individuals tend to find employment in factories, construction sites, and brickyards. In the fall of 1982, the average daily wage was around two dollars a day.

Women customarily help their husbands and fathers in the fields on a part-time seasonal basis. They may also work in backyard gardens and care for pigs and chickens. Almost all of the street's female residents engage in some kind of artisanal work, such as weaving straw hats or painting plaster figurines of Padre Cicero. During the main pilgrimage season, which runs from late August through February, men, women, and children all supplement the family income by selling food and drink. They also sell a variety of religious articles, such as pictures of Padre Cícero or rosaries made of tiny coconuts, to the endless visitors who trudge up the Rua do Horto singing at the top of their voices at all hours of the day and night.

Life is clearly no easier for the people who live in the Rua do Horto than it is for the poor throughout the Northeast of Brazil. Only three persons in the neighborhood have the equivalent of a grade-school education. Infant mortality remains a chronic problem, and parasitic diseases debilitate both adults and children. Few persons can afford to

maintain an adequate diet or to make the monthly payments that would entitle them to government-sponsored medical assistance. Yet, despite these precarious living conditions, residents remain convinced that Juazeiro is a holy city. Given this belief in Padre Cícero's powers, it is not surprising that virtually everyone above the age of twelve should have at least one story to tell about the priest.

Although these stories have considerable surface variety, virtually all can be interpreted as challenges to Padre Cícero's authority. This challenge may be either positive (a believer seeks help) or negative (an unbeliever mocks the priest or attacks him or his followers). Padre Cícero then responds by helping the believer or punishing the scoffer and thus reasserts his extraordinary powers in a four-step sequence diagrammed in the figure.

*Four-Step Sequence of Padre Cícero Stories*

*Believer*

*Unbeliever*

1. Implicit Acceptance of Padre Cícero's Authority

Believer follows the priest's teachings that guarantee his or her spiritual and material welfare.

Unbeliever does not bother the priest or his followers.

2. Challenge

Believer is faced by physical danger or attacks by enemies and calls on Padre Cícero for aid.

Unbeliever attacks Padre Cícero or his followers with verbal abuse or physical aggression.

3. Response

Padre Cícero comes to his follower's aid in a miraculous intervention.

Padre Cícero counters the unbeliever's attack with ridicule or loss of property or life.

4. Reaffirmation

Padre Cícero's authority is reasserted when the follower is restored to spiritual or material wellbeing.

Padre Cícero's authority is reasserted when the unbeliever repents or dies.

The context in which tellers relate tales of Padre Cícero and Dr. Floro represents another bond between these stories and the rest of the miracle corpus. The tales tend to arise spontaneously in the course of conversation and are often triggered by a question such as: "Who was Dr.

Floro, Uncle Pedro?" They may also form part of a long stream of reminiscences. Sometimes these stories are recounted to illustrate a larger point, such as the untrustworthy character of candidates for public office. For example, one older woman said, "I don't even listen to these people because Padre Cícero told us to vote with our rosaries for the Virgin Mary."<sup>14</sup> She then launched into a story about how Dr. Floro broke his word to the priest after winning an election.

People in the Rua do Horto are always interested in hearing tales about Padre Cícero. Even if the listeners have heard the story in question many times before, they generally comment, shake their heads, or participate in other ways in the storytelling process. All such narratives actually reaffirm their own identity as residents of a privileged place. For those persons originally from other parts of the Northeast who have chosen to move to the priest's adopted city, the stories help justify a sometimes difficult choice. As members of a culture that stresses personal ties, they naturally have occasional doubts about a move that has meant not only financial difficulty but separation from friends and family. Thus, while the tales entertain, inform, and celebrate the past, they also reinforce the participants' sense of having made the right choice. As one old man explained, "My Padrinho Cícero said that everyone who came here should bring three sacks of money and then a sack of patience for when the money runs out."<sup>15</sup>

#### TALES OF DR. FLORO TOLD BY THE RESIDENTS OF JUAZEIRO

The accounts of local storytellers about Dr. Floro reveal the multiplicity, concreteness, and attention to detail that are characteristic of most of the miracle narratives. Their tales focus not upon a documentable event but on two historical figures. Although most accounts turn on an encounter between Padre Cícero and the doctor, the events described are considerably less important than the personalities of these individuals that are revealed through the events.

Floro lived in Juazeiro for approximately six years. Although he continued to visit the Cariri Valley after becoming a state deputy and then a national deputy, he spent most of his time in Fortaleza and Rio de Janeiro. Both the relatively short time that he passed among them and his superior social standing would have made it difficult for most residents to have experienced close or extended association with him. As a result, the storytellers' knowledge of the doctor is usually based on brief, superficial encounters or on a kind of hearsay that over the years has grown into a more or less fixed body of communal lore. Therefore, even though it is not difficult to find people whose mother or next-door neighbor could remember Floro, their tales of the doctor are apt to be less



immediate and personal than other accounts directly involving their own friends and relatives.

Floro usually appears as a negative figure in residents' stories. He is nevertheless a very distinct personage. A medical doctor from the state of Bahia, he appears as short and stocky, with a booming voice and an exuberant mustache that twirls up at both ends. Described as wearing a ring on his finger (symbolizing his university education), he tips his hat and winks at ladies on the city streets.

Some individuals inject their own memories of Floro into tales about him and Padre Cícero. Recollections of the doctor often spur a series of more general reminiscences about the past, in which the speaker ends up describing the old marketplace or one or another custom that has long since disappeared. Occasionally, a storyteller's personal contact with Floro will lead him or her to defend the doctor, possibly even to deny that an exchange ever occurred between Padre Cícero and Floro. "After the war of 1914," one man explained, "Floro started to lose control over his men. They became so disorderly that he finally had to use force to get them to obey him and that is where his reputation for violence started. But he was not a cruel person. He was a friend of my Padrinho until the day of his death."<sup>16</sup> "I knew Dr. Floro," said another, "and he was not at all like people say. Those stories about him are the invention of jealous people, and I know for a fact that my Padrinho wept on the day that he died."<sup>17</sup>

Most local storytellers, however, appear quite comfortable with the notion of Floro as a man with many flaws. Given this consensus, it is not surprising that virtually all of their tales conform to a common pattern. The great majority of accounts of Floro by residents build up to a verbal showdown between him and the priest. After the doctor consciously affronts his authority, Padre Cícero rebukes him in no uncertain terms. Floro then demands to know why the priest has given him so much power, if he does not like the way in which the doctor has chosen to use it. Padre Cícero retorts that the person who makes another great has the ability to make him small. This exchange can be diagrammed as a negative challenge in which the fourth step—reaffirmation—is not spelled out but is nevertheless implied: (1) Implicit Acceptance—Floro functions as the priest's most trusted aide; (2) Challenge—Heady with his newfound power, Floro rebels against Padre Cícero by pitting his authority against that of the priest; (3) Response—Padre Cícero rebukes Floro and affirms his own power to diminish the doctor; (4) Reaffirmation (merely implied)—Floro is presumably left speechless by the priest's assertion of his own authority.

Although the Floro stories can be broken into four stages of the negative challenge pattern, the lack of a conclusive ending sets the Floro

tales apart from the others. Most stories leave no doubt about the fate of individuals who dare to question Padre Cícero. A rancher who asks for rain loses all of his possessions and often his life. A girl who asserts that she will never walk to Juazeiro finds herself forced to crawl there as a snake. A priest who reneges on his promise never to deny Padre Cícero's miraculous powers pays with his sight. These direct, physical responses contrast markedly with the scolding that ends the Floro tale. Moreover, storytellers almost never indicate whether the doctor repents and grudgingly gives up trying to outmaneuver Padre Cícero or persists in his errant ways. Thus the climactic moment typical of the other miracle stories is conspicuously absent in the case of Dr. Floro.

The citizens' relative proximity to Floro helps explain why this story is different. Because the real Floro remained such an important, and at least sporadically visible, fact of political life for almost two decades, it would be difficult for them to insist upon the doctor's untimely demise. A more drastic conclusion would deny Padre Cícero's well known friendship for Floro at the same time that it would force storytellers to make an unmitigated villain of a man known to many of their relatives. Finally, and probably most important for those who live in Juazeiro, Floro's death would eliminate him as a convenient scapegoat. The ability to blame the doctor for a whole series of specific wrongs is important to local storytellers. By holding Floro responsible for actions that adversely affected themselves or acquaintances, residents effectively banish any implicit doubts about the priest. The stories are an effective way of asserting that Padre Cícero was, like them, a victim of the doctor who betrayed the priest's trust. The stories thus serve to dispel the painful and threatening suggestion that the man whom many regard as a saint could make mistakes.

Because a strong conclusion is therefore out of the question, storytellers adopt another course of action. Instead of developing the actual exchange between the two men, they concentrate instead upon the initial sequence that serves to illustrate the differences between them at the same time that it provides a motivation for the ensuing rebuke. These initial episodes reveal the sort of variation that one finds throughout residents' versions of the miracle stories. Although everyone's stories depict Floro doing something wrong, different individuals describe different offenses. The doctor may be described as insisting on staging a Carnival celebration against Padre Cícero's wishes or threatening to shoot an innocent soldier, who then goes running to the priest for protection. Floro may be presented as killing a bull belonging to Padre Cícero, jailing one of his beatos, or punishing a petty offense with unwarranted severity.

Although none of these incidents is strictly accurate from an objective standpoint, it is possible to discern the basis for a number of

them. Those “events” that do not relate directly to a particular occurrence usually function as symbols for a particular category of actions for which people would like to hold Floro accountable. These specific actions invariably fit into a larger context. Although their local application is important, these episodes also serve as illustrations of a larger division between spiritual and temporal power that is often found in tales of Christian holy figures. Floro’s vices make him a foil for Padre Cícero, whose virtues these tales thereby celebrate. These more general representative qualities can be broken down as follows.

Padre Cícero ( <i>spiritual power</i> )	Dr. Floro ( <i>temporal authority</i> )
Special relationship to the sacred	Irreverent, earthbound
Omniscient	Knowledge limited to the tangible
Uninterested in earthy power	Greedy for glory and therefore proud and rebellious
Controls through moral force	Lacking in moral authority and therefore dependent on physical force
Respects time-honored rules that grant the individual access to power	Interested only in self-aggrandizement that denies the powerless individual all potential for redress

Virtually every account of Floro and Padre Cícero reveals one or another of these fundamental oppositions. Padre Cícero’s special relationship to the sacred, for example, finds expression in stories stressing the doctor’s attachment to physical pleasures. In the following account, the speaker, who had delivered a present to Padre Cícero, describes one of Floro’s visits to the priest. Although superficially the tale is simply an eyewitness account of the doctor’s fondness for food, it functions as a more general assertion of a corporeal nature that contrasts with Padre Cícero’s lack of interest in earthly concerns. In the following account, the doctor comes to visit the priest, who simply watches while his guest wolfs down plate after plate of food. The “pei, pei, pei” here is meant to suggest the sound of the doctor’s greedy swallows. “Flory” is a common colloquial pronunciation of “Floro.” The doctor’s use of “Padre Cícero” instead of “my padrinho” indicates a lack of deference.

The doorbell rang and when my Padrinho Cícero opened the door, I saw Dr. Flory. He was short and fat with a mustache that curled up at both corners, and he talked in a loud voice. “Padre Cícero,” he almost shouted, “I am starving. Shall we eat?” “Of course, Dr. Flory,” my Padrinho told him. “There is food on the table. Serve yourself.” “No, Padre Cícero,” he said (that is, he bellowed), “I

will only eat if you do." "No, I am not hungry," he told him. "Thank you very much." "All right then, Padre Cícero, excuse me while I have a bite to eat." Pei, pei, pei, pei, that man ate and ate and ate so much that my eyes nearly popped out watching him. When he finished, he took a cigar from his pocket and started to smoke. Then when he finished, he left us. They say he had a woman friend whom he always went to visit, but I don't know for sure.<sup>18</sup>

Floro's disregard for spiritual matters is also evident in tales regarding his treatment of the beata Maria de Araújo. Because the alleged transformation of the host occurred in 1889, almost two decades before Floro's arrival in Juazeiro, the doctor could not have been a part of the bishop's official commissions of inquiry. This story is interesting, however, as an affirmation of the collective desire to blame Padre Cícero's humiliating suspension from his priestly orders on a single person. Floro's harsh and disrespectful treatment of the beata symbolizes his opposition to popular religious manifestations. His desire to murder Padre Cícero in this story is the way the storytellers affirm their perceptions of his desire to "kill" religious sentiment. The doctor symbolically violates the beata in an episode that reflects both popular opinion of his hostility to specific religious manifestations and a more general irreverence that is calculated to contrast with the priest's spiritual nature.

What I am about to tell you happened in the time that they were going to suspend my Padrinho Cícero from his right to marry, baptize, or engage in any sacrament. Well then, Dr. Floro came here with several other doctors in order to conduct an examination because he had heard that when my Padrinho Cícero administered communion to the beata Maria de Araújo, the wafer turned to blood. So he arrived here never thinking my Padrinho was a saint. And if when my Padrinho placed the host on the beata's tongue and it did not turn to blood, or if it became assassin's blood, Dr. Floro was going to take him to a distant country in order to kill him there. Dr. Floro was going to do that, he was going to murder Padre Cícero. Yes. Well, when the hour arrived for Padre Cícero to confess the beata, he washed her mouth and scoured it clean in front of Dr. Floro. At that point, Dr. Floro stuck his thumb, which was very big and very long, down the beata's throat. And Padre Cícero said, "Don't you go scratching the beata's throat on me, Dr. Floro!" And so he took out his finger and Padre Cícero consecrated the host, and then he put it on her tongue, holding a snowwhite towel beneath her chin. And when he told her to open her mouth again, the host had turned into blood. So then my Padrinho said, "Doctor, I am warning you! He that made you great can make you smaller than a speck of dust."<sup>19</sup>

Another good example of a story with immediate as well as more universal significance concerns Floro's imprisonment of the beato José Lourenço. The tale undoubtedly grows out of the doctor's action against a "celestial court" in 1918. In this community, in which each member represented a saint, the leader performed marriages, baptisms, and all other sacraments. Dr. Floro, with Padre Cícero's knowledge, decided to disband a particular group when the husband of a member who refused to return home to him complained to the priest. The priest then sent two

soldiers with a message for the leaders of the group. Because the soldiers frightened the community, its members threw stones at them. Floro then ordered these individuals arrested and their heads shaved. José Lourenço, who played the role of Saint Joseph of Egypt in the court, was one of the persons detained for a short time.

The priest's rebuke of the doctor in the following tale is clearly the storyteller's attempt to deny his documentable participation in the affair. Padre Cícero's explanation that José Lourenço is not in Floro's jail answers the troubling question of why Padre Cícero himself did not act to free the beato, who was also the head of a farming community in the Baixa d'Antan. Because the supposed prisoner is really elsewhere in this story, there is no need for Padre Cícero to leap to his defense.<sup>20</sup>

The beato Zé Lourenço remained a prisoner of Dr. Floro for seventeen days. He didn't eat, he didn't drink, he didn't sleep a wink. And so Dr. Floro got upset and went to see my Padrinho. "Padre Cícero, what kind of man is this who doesn't eat, who doesn't drink, and who doesn't sleep? He has been my prisoner for seventeen days now, and he just remains there without doing anything."

And so my Padrinho said, "Floro, you are thinking that José is in your jail when he is really in Baixa d'Antan with his followers—working, eating lunch, eating dinner, and praying. It is only a semblance of José that is sitting in your jail." At this point the doctor stormed out. He was really angry because my Padrinho knew all that he could not see. "Floro," my Padrinho said, "be careful because he who made you great can also make you small."<sup>21</sup>

While this story addresses an issue once of great concern to residents of Juazeiro, it also fits into a more general framework that makes the tale meaningful to persons who have forgotten or never knew about the specific incident. The story serves to contrast Padre Cícero's omniscience with Floro's dependence upon his own five senses. Because the doctor lives in a world of outward appearances, he must depend on Padre Cícero to interpret phenomena beyond his grasp. In this case, Padre Cícero must explain to Floro that his prisoner does not eat or drink because the real beato is not the semblance of the man who appears before his eyes. This affirmation causes Floro to fly into a rage not only because his prisoner has escaped him, but because the incident confirms the limits of his own knowledge and concomitant power.

Another good example of the residents' ability to set an incident with local significance into a more general scheme involving spiritual versus temporal power are those stories that deal with Floro's conduct during the Revolution of 1913–14. By attempting to play down the real doctor's leading role in both the events leading up to the "war" and the actual fighting, the storyteller denies any potential debt or consequent grounds for loyalty to Floro.

There was a doctor whose name was Floro—see, his name was the same as mine! Well then, it was Padre Cícero who was the keeper of Juazeiro, but Dr. Floro

wanted to be first in everything. My Padrinho said to him, "What are we going to do, doctor?" This was during the war of 1914 and the soldiers were forming a ring around Juazeiro, getting ready to attack. "What are we going to do, doctor?" he asked, and Dr. Floro hung his head because he didn't know. And so then my Padrinho said, "Look, how about doing this, that, and the other thing?" And he explained to Dr. Floro how they should proceed. "If we do this, that, and the other thing, I think we will win." Then Dr. Floro said, "Good idea, Padre Cícero," and he called everyone together—man, woman, and child—to build a trench around the city to defend it. Then he said, "Just leave everything to me, because I have already won three wars." And Padre Cícero looked at him and said, "Floro, be careful because he who made you great can also make you very small."<sup>22</sup>

This story simultaneously attributes victory exclusively to Padre Cícero and emphasizes Floro's general greed for fame and fortune. The priest's lack of interest in the trappings of worldly power is thus contrasted with the doctor's insatiable ambition.

The same theme of temporal pride versus divine humility is reiterated in stories about the prize bull known as the Boi Mansinho (Gentle Bull). Once again, this incident has some basis in fact. When rumors reached the doctor's ears that members of José Lourenço's following were worshipping a handsome white zebu, he reacted against this apparent display of religious fanaticism by ordering the animal's slaughter. Because Padre Cícero had entrusted the steer, a gift to him, to the community for safekeeping, the doctor's action must have struck many residents of Juazeiro as not only cruel, but insulting to the priest. It is therefore not surprising to find stories like the following in which Padre Cícero condemns a measure that he does not appear to have opposed in fact. The priest's punishment of the soldiers in the second narrative is the storyteller's way of asserting that the priest did not passively accept the doctor's affront to his authority.

There was a bull so tame that it was a pleasure to see. And because it belonged to my Padrinho, people treated it very well. But Dr. Floro wanted to be more important than my Padrinho. And so he arrived in Baixa d'Antan and set fire to everything because he said that the people there were praying to a bull. Then after the soldiers had burnt down all the houses, they paraded around that animal. My Padrinho Cícero sent a message that they were not to kill it, but they killed it anyway. The bull fell down with a shriek and tears streamed from its eyes. Then the soldiers roasted the carcass and made everybody eat a piece.<sup>23</sup>

According to another storyteller:

My Padrinho Cícero said that no one should kill that bull, but Dr. Floro did not pay attention. He ordered his soldiers to kill it and all of them who ate the meat got sick. They got sick because it was a Friday and my Padrinho Cícero had told them not to touch that bull. But they went right ahead and stomped on his word (*pisavam na palavra dele*). They ate that meat on Friday, and their tongues grew longer and longer until they were hanging way out of their mouths. And then their tongues began to itch and turned all red and bloody. It was a terrible sight. So then Dr. Floro complained to my Padrinho that his soldiers' tongues were

bleeding. "Be careful," my Padrinho told him, "because the great can become very small."<sup>24</sup>

In disassociating Padre Cícero from painful and therefore potentially disruptive memories, these stories also affirm a more general division between the priest and the doctor. According to the stories, although the doctor owes his elevated position to Padre Cícero, he is both proud and rebellious. His killing of the bull illustrates the greed for glory that most storytellers associate with temporal, as opposed to spiritual, power. Unlike Padre Cícero, who defers to secular and religious authorities so long as they do not attempt to make him act against his conscience, Floro goads the priest into rebuking him. Even more troubling are the doctor's attempts to impose his will on others through physical coercion.

Sometimes his use of force is actually amusing, as in the story in which he decides that he and his soldiers are going to celebrate Carnival despite Padre Cícero's wishes. When a rare rain drenches them, the doctor refuses to cancel the celebration, forcing the scowling men to parade through the puddles rather than cause their leader to admit defeat. The following tale clearly has roots in the real Floro's insistence upon Juazeiro's observance of a number of secular holidays.

My Padrinho Cícero told Flory that he didn't want Carnival celebrations in Juazeiro because he didn't like them. But Flory never listened to my Padrinho. He always thought that he knew better. And so when the day came, he ordered his men to get all dressed up in silly outfits and they went out together parading through the streets. They sang and danced and beat their drums and everybody stared. Well then, all of a sudden, the sky opened and a huge wave of water came pouring down over their heads. "It's time to go home!" yelled the soldiers, but Flory wouldn't let them. And so they went on dancing through the puddles for hours, banging on their drums and sneezing. "Flory," my Padrinho said, "you had better stop this nonsense before he who made you great decides to make you small."<sup>25</sup>

Padre Cícero himself is not averse to using violent means, according to the miracle stories. He sends down destructive storms and blinds people who refuse to see the error of their ways. His actions are nevertheless highly predictable and theoretically in the interest of the misdoer's ultimate salvation. The Carnival tale therefore provides an illustration of the larger opposition between moral persuasion and brute force. Floro does not make his men march for some higher purpose, but out of a desire for self-aggrandizement.

Not all instances of Floro's reliance on physical coercion are so lighthearted. The following story of his treatment of a woman accused of stealing is far more grim. The tale undoubtedly reflects people's memories of that "law and order" period following the Revolution of 1913–14, in which Floro's desire to eradicate the growing criminal element from Juazeiro resulted in severe penalties even for petty offenses. The same

heavyhanded justice that supposedly made it possible for residents of the city to sleep with their doors open is characterized in this disturbing account of two women and a turkey.

There was a woman who lived next door to another and this woman had a turkey that disappeared into the woods. When the turkey didn't return, the owner went to Dr. Flory and told him that her neighbor had eaten the turkey that had disappeared. Dr. Flory asked, "Are you sure that it was she who ate it?" and she told him yes, she was sure. Then he sent his soldiers to the neighbor's house. "Was it you who ate your neighbor's turkey?" the soldiers asked her, and she said, "No, it wasn't me. I wouldn't do a thing like that." The soldiers said, "Well, your neighbor's turkey has disappeared and she has accused you so you'll have to come with us." And so they took away that woman and she was never seen again.

After a week or so went by, the turkey returned home. It had been sitting on its nest, but now the eggs had hatched. When the turkey arrived, its owner went to see Dr. Flory. "The turkey has reappeared," she told him. "So you can let my neighbor out of jail because I was mistaken." But Dr. Flory's soldiers had already shot that woman, and so there was no way that anyone could free her.

"Well," he told the owner, "I cannot free your neighbor, but you are going to join her." And so the soldiers came and took away that woman. So then, when my *Padrinho* learned about what had happened, he called Flory to his house. "Doctor," he said, "how can it be that you are killing innocent people?" "Padre Cícero," said Dr. Flory, "didn't you give me the power to do as I pleased?" "I gave you power," my *Padrinho* told him, "but just remember that he who made you great can also make you small."<sup>26</sup>

In this case, the larger issue in the story is more than moral authority versus physical force. The two unwarranted deaths confirm that Floro has no principles to which an individual can appeal. Although the owner of the turkey accuses her neighbor too hastily, her conscience leads her to admit the error to Floro. Because the doctor is only concerned about protecting his own position, however, he willfully compounds an initial wrong. Unlike Padre Cícero, who unfailingly rewards good and punishes evil, Floro refuses to affirm the validity of those interpersonal obligations upon which the traditional notion of justice in the Brazilian Northeast relies.

This story also suggests the degree to which all of the preceding tales about the priest and the doctor reflect definite notions about the nature of authority. The priest is not only a symbol of spiritual power, but the idealization of a particular landowning system in which the patron is supposed to embody the ethical force known in Portuguese as *o moral*. In this context, Floro represents a secular, modernizing state that rejects quasi-religious values along with the hierarchical, highly personal social structure with which such values are associated.<sup>27</sup>

As initially mentioned, the heyday of these rural chieftains officially ended with the Revolution of 1930, in which Getúlio Vargas seized power in the name of the urban, industrializing middle class.<sup>28</sup> Yet de-



spite the fact that the traditional oligarchy's demise had begun even before the fall of the Empire some forty years earlier, remnants of the oligarchical system are still in effect today. Many agricultural workers in the Brazilian Northeast—including those subsistence farmers who form the majority of the population in the Rua do Horto—are still actively involved in a landowning system based on a series of unequal patron-client ties. It is true that the landowners no longer wield the power that they did in the past because disgruntled farmers can migrate to the southern industrial centers of São Paulo or Rio de Janeiro. Nevertheless, although this system is no longer absolute, remnants of it have survived well into the present. The interest of the military government also lies in maintaining a status quo that guarantees a cheap labor pool and the continued functioning of a political machine on which it increasingly depends for survival. Social change therefore has been and is likely to remain slow in coming.

Part of the coronel's legacy is a set of expectations whereby the worker owes his employer faithful service while the employer assumes responsibility for his workers' moral as well as economic welfare.<sup>29</sup> At least in theory, the landowner is bound not only to rent out his land and then buy back the harvest, but to make emergency loans, help the sick, bury the dead, and serve as arbiter in potentially disruptive feuds. In short, the relationship between patron and client is based on much more than money. As one anthropologist notes, "Throughout his life, the Brazilian peasant *submits* to a series of acknowledged disequal relationships in which he *obligates* himself in a variety of ways." Born of financial necessity, this behavior is sanctioned "by a set of general propositions about submissiveness to authority and obligation to meet debts which are reinforced by ideas from a variety of domains, above all the religious."<sup>30</sup>

The bonds uniting patrons and their clients are always forged on an individual basis. That is, even though landowners have many tenants, they maintain separate, unwritten contracts with each one. Thus, while some workers will form affective and economic ties among themselves, they do not consider themselves united a priori by the fact that they exist in a similar relationship to the same employer. This attitude means that appeals to the patron are always voiced by persons acting on their own behalf and not by tenants as a group. Although everyone may want the same thing, patrons have the option of accommodating or refusing their tenants on a selective basis.

These same kind of asymmetric one-to-one relationships are clearly present in the stories offered as illustrations. Both the priest's absolute authority and his willingness to respond to each follower in a distinctive manner is typical of a coronel in the Brazilian Northeast. Although all of the persons who consider themselves pilgrims acknowl-

edge the priest's miraculous powers, it does not follow that they think of themselves as members of a community based on shared beliefs. On the contrary, many appear to be in competition for a favored place in Padre Cícero's affections, the use of *meu* (my) instead of *nosso* (our) *padrinho* being symptomatic of this atomistic stance. Despite the fact that there are practices that everyone agrees are meritorious—reciting the rosary, visiting Padre Cícero's grave, wearing black on the anniversary of his death—these represent guidelines for individual understandings with the priest rather than fixed rules.

Padre Cícero is unique in his absolute spiritual authority. No storyteller expects a real-life patron to act in the same way as the priest. Nonetheless, the concept of a moral bargain implying mutual obligations remains operative in many persons' day-to-day dealings with others. Even if landowners regularly betray their tenants' trust, those tenants who fulfill their obligations may theoretically hope for redress, if not in this world, then in the next.

No such hope, however scant, exists in the system exemplified by Dr. Floro. The doctor's power in these stories is time and again equated with brute force. Even when he does not physically threaten people, they regard him as dangerous because of his incomprehension of or disrespect for time-honored rules. Anxious for some degree of stability in their own lives, storytellers are less repelled by Floro's reliance on violence—a fact of life in the Brazilian Northeast—than by the apparent caprice with which he acts. Because the doctor is motivated exclusively by personal ambition, it is impossible for people to predict his behavior in a given situation and thus to adjust their own behavior in order to maximize the possibility of gain. At heart, then, Floro is a villain not because he kills his enemies, but because he denies would-be dependents the potential access to power—and thus security—that a powerful patron has always symbolized.

In short, stories that set Padre Cícero against Dr. Floro operate on three separate, if related, levels. All grow out of memories, many now half-forgotten, of particular incidents that angered or distressed residents of Juazeiro. As such, the tales serve to quiet any troublesome doubts about Padre Cícero's infallibility by making the doctor a scapegoat. At the same time, they illustrate a more general opposition between spiritual and temporal polarities that can be found in Christian literature throughout the centuries. Finally, this opposition can be viewed in narrower, more culturally specific terms. The priest is not simply an incarnation of heavenly authority, but functions as an ideal Northeastern patron by respecting traditional values. The doctor, for his part, exemplifies a new, secular spirit that refuses to honor the unwritten, one-to-one contracts upon which the landowning system is based. The fact that the historical Floro actually placed his talents at the service

of an old-style oligarchy as an avenue to power does not prevent storytellers from seeing him as a symbol of the unchecked ambition and brute force that many of them associate with an impersonal, hence alien, modern state.

## NOTES

1. Padre Cícero was canonized by a breakaway faction of the Roman Catholic Church, the Igreja Brasileira Apostólica, in 1973. He has not been recognized in any way by the official Church, however. For a bibliography of scholarly works on contemporary Brazilian pilgrimages, see Pedro A. Ribeiro de Oliveira, *Expressões Religiosas Populares e Liturgia* (Centro de Estatística Religiosa e Investigações Sociais, Rio de Janeiro, 1980, mimeographed).
2. Most of the critical commentary on Dr. Floro Bartolomeu da Costa is extremely partisan. The best-known discussions are probably Nertan Macedo's *O Padre e a Beata* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Leitura, 1961), and Rui Facó's *Cangaceiros e Fanáticos* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira, 1963). Floro himself authored numerous newspaper articles in Juazeiro's *O Rebate* and *Gazeta do Joazeiro* and in Fortaleza's *Unitário*. He also published a book entitled *Joazeiro e o Padre Cícero: Depoimento para a História* (Rio de Janeiro: n.p., 1923).
3. For a useful chronological summary of Brazilian political history, see Rollie E. Popino, *Brazil: The Land and the People*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973), pp. 331–37.
4. A *padrinho* (godfather) is expected to oversee a godchild's religious education as well as to act as a second father, should the need arise. The use of the term in relation to Padre Cícero indicates general deference and affection on the part of the speaker.
5. A useful critical summary of book-length studies of Padre Cícero and Juazeiro is available in (Frei) Ildefonso Silveira, "Estado Atual da Pesquisa sobre o Padre Cícero," *Revista Eclesiástica Brasileira* 36 (1976):226–60. The single best overview of the subject, upon which I have drawn heavily in this summary, is that provided by Ralph della Cava, *Miracle at Joazeiro* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1970). Note that della Cava has retained the nineteenth-century spelling of Juazeiro.
6. The "Imperial Religious Question" erupted in 1872, when Emperor Dom Pedro II had two Brazilian bishops arrested and convicted for their failure to obtain royal permission to attack Masonry. The dispute, which dragged on for three years, prompted the Church to take a newly militant stand against not only the Masons, but positivists, republicans, and Protestants as well. For a discussion of the affair, see J. Lloyd Mecham, *Church and State in Latin America: A History of Politico-Ecclesiastical Relations* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1934), pp. 316–21.
7. The damage occasioned by periodic droughts explains the frenzied efforts by inhabitants of the backlands to ward off potential disaster. Between 1877 and 1915, one minor and four major droughts struck the Northeast, bringing agriculture to a halt and causing hundreds of thousands of deaths. For a discussion of the worst of the catastrophes, see Roger Lee Cunniff, "The Great Drought: Northeastern Brazil, 1877–1880" (Ph.D. diss., University of Texas at Austin, 1971). See also Anthony Hall, *Drought and Irrigation in Northeast Brazil* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1978).
8. Reports of bleeding hosts were common in Europe from the thirteenth century onward. These kinds of miracles, however, were not generally associated with a Second Coming, but were taken as indisputable proofs of the doctrine of transubstantiation, which was aimed at unbelievers. For examples, see E. Cobham Brewer, *A Dictionary of Miracles* (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott, 1884), pp. 489–91. This appearance of allegedly divine blood at a time of great social stress parallels the rise of Marian apparitions in similar moments of tension. See William A. Christian, Jr., *Apparitions in Late Medieval and Renaissance Spain* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1981).
9. Brazilian messianism grows out of Portuguese Sebastianism. After the death of young

- King Sebastian in the battle of Alcácer-Quibir in northern Africa, Portugal was annexed by Spain for sixty years. In reaction to this period between 1580 and 1640 (known as "the Captivity"), the defeated citizens invented stories in which King Sebastian was said to be alive and planning his return. The first colonists to the Brazilian Northeast undoubtedly took these stories with them to their new home. The classic theoretical discussion of messianic movements remains that of Anthony F. C. Wallace, "Revitalization Movements," *American Anthropologist* 58 (1956): 264–81. An extensive bibliography also exists on messianic movements in Brazil. Two of the best-known studies are Maria Isaura Pereira de Queiroz, *O Messianismo no Brasil e no Mundo* (São Paulo: Dominus Editora, 1965), and René Ribeiro, "Brazilian Messianic Movements," in *Millennial Dreams in Action*, edited by Sylvia Thrupp (The Hague: Mouton, 1962). Of particular relevance to Juazeiro is Ralph della Cava's "Brazilian Messianism and National Institution: A Reappraisal of Canudos and Joazeiro," *Hispanic American Historical Review* 48 (1968): 402–20. A more recent discussion that includes an updated bibliography is Patricia R. Pessar's "Unmasking the Politics of Religion: The Case of Brazilian Millenarianism," *Journal of Latin American Lore* 7, no. 2 (1981): 255–78.
10. The standard discussion of the coronel is still Victor Nunes Leal's *Coronelismo: Enxada e Voto* (Rio de Janeiro: Editora Forense, 1948). The English translation is *Coronelismo: The Municipality and Representative Government in Brazil* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976). See also Marcos Vinícius Vilaça and Roberto C. de Albuquerque, *Coronel e Coronéis* (Rio de Janeiro: Tempo Brasileiro, 1965).
  11. The dispute occurred at a particularly critical moment in 1914 when Floro broke with Ceará's new governor by publicly refusing to recognize two candidates that the latter had proposed for vacant seats in the legislature. Floro's rebuff placed almost unbearable pressure upon a regime that was already hard pressed by financial difficulties stemming from the war in Europe. Eager for a resolution, political leaders in both Fortaleza and Rio de Janeiro urged Padre Cícero to exert his influence in order to end the rift. The priest therefore wrote to Floro, who informed the priest that he must either trust him or end their alliance. Floro's gamble paid off when Padre Cícero backed down. For details, see della Cava, *Miracle at Joazeiro*, pp. 157–61.
  12. Although this discussion deals exclusively with orally transmitted stories, a number of the best-known tales are published in pamphlet, or *cordel*, form. For a discussion of the relationship between these spoken and printed versions, see Candace Slater, "Oral and Written Pilgrim Tales from Northeast Brazil," *Journal of Latin American Lore* 19, no. 2 (Winter 1983).
  13. Francisca Inácio da Costa, who conducted the official government census of one side of the street in 1980, provided much of this information. I am grateful to her for allowing me to live in her home on the Rua do Horto during the summer of 1981 and the fall of 1982.
  14. Josefa Maria de Jesus: Born in Lavras de Canhoto, Alagoas, possibly in 1913. Arrived in Juazeiro as a very young child at an uncertain date. Widow, retired. Interviewed on 8 August 1982.
  15. Olímpio Praciano de França: Born in Palmeira do Índios, Alagoas, in 1901. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1922. Widowed, still works as farmer. Interviewed 30 July 1981.
  16. Manoel Caboclo e Silva: Born in Juazeiro in 1906. Married, cordel poet. Interviewed on 2 July 1981.
  17. João Ferreira dos Reis: Born in Bezerros, Pernambuco, in 1901. Married, farmer. Interviewed 15 October 1982.
  18. All of the stories I have translated. I occasionally changed pronouns to nouns when the meaning was unclear. Otherwise, I have tried to remain faithful to the original. The endnote for each story contains the teller's name, date and place of birth, and date of arrival for purposes of residence in Juazeiro. His or her marital status, occupation, and the date of the interview follow. Thus, Pedro Ribeiro da Silva: Born in Paulo Jacinto, Alagoas, in 1900. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1971. Widower, guard. Interviewed on 10 October 1982.
  19. Sebastiana Fernandes dos Santos: Born in Maceió, Alagoas, in 1925. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1956. Married, makes straw hats and plaster saints. Interviewed on 7 July 1981.

20. The storyteller in this case is a former member of José Lourenço's community in Caldeirão, Pernambuco. A recent succinct summary of the community is that of Rosemberg Cariry, "O beato José Lourenço e o Caldeirão da Santa Cruz," *Nação Cariri* 1, no. 5: 12–14. See also James Charnel Anderson, "The Caldeirão Movement: A Case Study in Brazilian Messianism, 1926–38" (Ph.D. diss., George Washington University, 1971).
21. Enrique Ferreira da Silva: Born in Lisgomé, Rio Grande do Norte, in 1900. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1946. Married, repairs furniture. Interviewed on 2 August 1981.
22. Florismino ("Floro") Alves: Born in Canhotinho, Pernambuco, in 1916. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1967. Single, does odd jobs. Interviewed on 6 July 1981.
23. Luzia Maria das Neves: Born in Lagoa de Baixo, Paraíba, date unknown. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1946. Married, performs curative prayers. Interviewed on 2 August 1981.
24. Antonio Ferreira: Born in Bom Jardim, Pernambuco, in 1920. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1940. Marital status unknown, farmer. Interviewed on 23 July 1981.
25. Severina Maria da Conceição. Born in Panelas, Alagoas, in 1943. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1971. Married, sells vegetables. Interviewed on 14 November 1982.
26. Manuel Barros da Silva: Born in Garahuns, Pernambuco, in 1910. Arrived in Juazeiro in 1965. Married, farmer. Interviewed on 24 October 1982.
27. For a good general overview of the social structure of the Brazilian Northeast, see Shepard Forman, *The Brazilian Peasantry* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1975), and Allen Johnson, *Sharecroppers of the Sertão* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1972).
28. See Jordan M. Young, *The Brazilian Revolution of 1930 and the Aftermath* (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1967) for an analysis of the causes of the Vargas takeover and its significance.
29. There is a large body of literature on patron-client bonds. Some of the more useful discussions are: Peter Blau, *Exchange and Power in Social Life* (New York: John Wiley, 1964); George Foster, "The Dyadic Contract: A Model for the Social Structure of a Mexican Peasant Village," *American Anthropologist* 63 (1961): 1173–92; Bertram Hutchinson, "The Patron-Dependent Relationship in Brazil: A Preliminary Examination," *Sociologia Ruralis* 6 (1966): 3–30; John Duncan Powell, "Peasant Society and Clientelist Politics," *American Political Science Review* 64 (1970): 411–25; Eric R. Wolf, "Kinship, Friendship, and Patron-Client Relationships in Complex Societies," in *The Social Anthropology of Complex Societies*, edited by Michael Banton (London: Tavistock, 1966), pp. 1–22.
30. Forman, *Brazilian Peasantry*, p. 26.