

Between the real and the imagined, Brazilian history and literature in high school: the testimony of the military coup in *sombra de reis barbudos* by José J. through shared teaching

Fernando da Rocha Rodrigues^{1*}, Leonice de Andrade Carvalho¹

¹ Instituto Federal Goiano –Campus Urutaí. Rod. Geraldo S. Nascimento, Km 2.5, 75790-000, Urutaí, Goiás, Brazil.

* Corresponding author. E-mail: fernando.rodrigues@ifgoiano.edu.br

ABSTRACT. The present work proposes to deepen a discussion about shared teaching between the disciplines of History and Literature, which proposes to discuss the theme “Military Dictatorship” based on the text *Sombra de Reis Barbudos* by José J. Veiga. It is believed that the chosen text can assist in the understanding of the historical period within the scope of the dialogue that explores the overlap between the “fictional” text and the historicized facts that address the dictatorship in Brazil, especially the repression and the years of lead. The bet is that the teachers of the mentioned disciplines can activate the literary text as a tool articulated with the studies of History, demonstrating that both sciences can speak about a reality from different languages. This work is an invitation to the challenge of bringing closer the disciplines of the humanities in order to establish variations on the same theme.

Key words: history and literature; shared teaching; dictatorship; José J. Veiga.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33837/msj.v8i1.1670>

Received: 11/04/2024

Online published: 15/09/2025

Associate editor: Marcos F. Sobrinho

INTRODUCTION

Working with the theme of the “military dictatorship” with high school students has become, more and more, a great challenge for History teachers. The theme, by itself, is rough and not fully overcome in terms of the symbolic understanding that it provokes. Several communication mechanisms from the recent years of History and the movements of an extreme right have, over time, softened – and even denied – such events, producing an emptied reinterpretation of the 1964 coup, which extended until 1985, even proposing a change in the nomenclature: instead of military coup, it is called “civil-military revolution of 1964.”

In the daily classroom discussions, when the History teacher addresses the content, students already bring with them several pre-established pieces of information linked by informational networks of digital media that tend to soften, or even defend, the

establishment of the dictatorship in Brazil and in Latin America. A wave of right-wing aligned thinking allows such arguments that the dictatorship was a necessary evil to contain the advance of the feared “communism,” in the words of Karl Marx, “a specter is haunting Europe—the specter of communism” Marx and Engels (1999, p.12). It is not surprising that such “imported” ideas arrive in Brazil in the context of the 1960s, which lived in the context of the Cold War and the supposed war against communism, under the justification of the just conflict, that is: a bitter remedy to heal an even worse evil, communism. This ghostly approximation of an imminent danger that hovered in the air was quite useful to instill in minds and hearts the idea of a necessary evil to contain the notorious communism that, by haunting the world, served as a strategic support for the political interferences of the powerful capitalist totem.

These circulating ideas in the mid-1960s are always hoisted from an unresolved past to justify the same ingrained fears that from time to time reappear with a new disguise, in the form of attacks on the democratic system in a country with a fragile democracy, always attacked and degraded, as “The bitch that bore him is

Copyright © The Author(s).

This is an open-access paper published by the Instituto Federal Goiano, Urutaí - GO, Brazil. All rights reserved. It is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.



in heat again” to use the words of Bertolt Brecht (1964).

It can be noted that addressing the theme in the classroom, dueling with absurdly more stimulating forces (social networks), leaves to the historian an enormous challenge, which is, to duel with such forces with the intention of demonstrating the historical facts that occurred in the period between 1964 and 1985. By considering the literary text as a testimony in relation to the events of its time, it is possible to consider literary works as tools in History studies, through shared teaching, in the discussions of historiographical facts.

As a reaction or action to this reality, we point out as a possible and efficient alternative the shared teaching between History and Literature teachers for a classroom discussion of the historical and aesthetic process and its overlaps in literary texts which, through the aesthetic phenomenon, through fiction, expose an ideal materialization of the real movement, being capable of internalizing history within the aesthetic and ethical phenomenon, as well clarified by Antônio Candido in the text “A nova narrativa”:

“(...) fiction tried in so many ways to leave its norms, to assimilate other resources, to make pacts with other arts and means, that we ended up considering as fictionally better accomplished and more satisfactory works some that were elaborated without the concern to innovate, without ties to schools, without commitment to fashion; including one that is not fictional. Would it be a coincidence? Or would it be a warning? I would not know nor would I dare to say. I only verify one thing that is at least intriguing and stimulates critical investigation.” (Candido, 1987, p. 215)

Here, in particular, we point to the novels of the writer from Goiás, José J. Veiga, especially the novel *Sombra de Reis Barbudos*, and we begin to think about the contributions of Literature to History classes in High School, according to Barthes:

“Literature does not say that it knows something, but that it knows about something; or better: that it knows something of things, said in other words, literature transmits and demonstrates the experience lived by people in a given historical period.” (Barthes, 2008, pp. 18–19)

Literature can help us think, it serves to laugh, to cry, to travel, to be astonished, to resist, and to shed light through the aesthetic phenomenon capable of overcoming the barriers of superficiality. According to Ordine (2016):

“Literature to think about the world, or specifically, a reading of a specific form of the world that contains a physical memory, a time-space ‘unfinished’ from where people can understand how historical processes were listed and what their echoes are in the present.”

Literature is an instrument for representing the world and life, a movement of “disalienation” insofar as it destabilizes the everyday order and mobilizes questioning about the reality constituted as certain, orderly, and appropriate. These questionings highlight the world of contradictions and demand from the interpreters of this world an artistic construction that is a subject and that activates meanings present in the historical reality and in the work of art itself. For this purpose, literature is daring and provocative, since it concentrates knowledge in itself, including knowledge of historical facts, but in a distinct manner, since through the aesthetic phenomenon and the capacity for self-questioning, as Hermenegildo Bastos clarifies:

“The subjectivity of the writer is thus deeply rooted in social objectivity. And this manifests itself in artistic procedures, in choices, in the ways of treating time and space, in the configuration of the lyrical or narrative voice, in short, in the textual organization resulting from the poetic work. History is inscribed in the text and this, in turn, can reveal it even where it seems absent.” (Bastos, 2012, pp. 13–14).

The narratives involving the period of the military dictatorship have expanded and have been enumerated “in the last ten years” by cinema, the internet, podcasts, streaming platforms, and YouTube, promoting a varied interpretation based on the maxim “this is my opinion.” Ricoeur indicates the possible overlap of the combined effects of history and fiction through the narration of an interpretation of past events within a historical perspective and the fictionalization of a historical consciousness through the events narrated by Veiga, in which:

“The narrative function, taken in its fullness, encompassing developments from the epic to the modern novel as well as from legend to historiography, is ultimately defined by its ambition to refigure the historical condition and thus elevate it to the category of historical consciousness.” (Ricoeur, 2012, p. 173).

The literary work exposes perceptions, traces, testimony that art can be a repository. A record and interpretation of social imaginaries and values. In any case, “a trace, whether from history or fiction, is a path that leads back to something grasped by the narrative of the literary work” (Rodrigues, 2022, p. 171).

José J. Veiga¹ points a path to understand the events that occurred from the 1964 coup and its primary characteristics (repression, exile, torture, and worldviews outlined from this historical process). Veiga's writing fictionalizes the historical period, whose framework reflects "like a reversed mirror" the heterodoxy with the real world evidenced by the brutal action present in Brazil during the military dictatorship.

"Although we are never truly contemporaneous with our historical moment, in fact, we are closer to our formative pasts; the construction of a present-future can motivate us to collaborate on analyses of segments in an attempt to critically perceive Brazilian social mosaics." (Rodrigues, 2022, p. 69).

SOMBRA DE REIS BARBUDOS IN THE CONTEXT OF SHARED TEACHING BETWEEN HISTORY AND LITERATURE

Sombra de Reis Barbudos was published in 1972, right in the middle of the "years of lead," with the work recurrently classified as "Magic Realism." It is worth emphasizing (in the classroom) that the year of the work's publication corresponds to the period of greatest repression of the dictatorship, with recurring episodes of persecution, censorship, disappearances, deaths, torture, and deprivation of liberty, especially due to the publication of Institutional Act Number Five, AI-5, implemented in 1968, considered by Reis (2014) as the "coup of the coup," because it was the period when the military hardened the regime in response to the emergence of student protests. The military justified the promulgation of the act by the need to "contain subversive acts," without, however, realizing the subversive power of literary texts that circulated among students.

It is worth briefly reflecting on the title "Magic Realism," as if such works were dealing with an "other" world and had no commitment to the real world that developed daily. Concepts that interpret Veiga's work, among other aspects, such as the unusual or the unreal are placed and problematize nothing more than everyday life itself; that is, there is nothing outside the scope of everyday life experience. It is in this sense that the literary work, especially here *Sombra de Reis Barbudos*, is pointed to as a tool that can

contribute to History studies. Understanding this artifice of Veiga's work is an attempt to understand the world itself. Traversing Veiga's selected works from different publications and throughout almost a century of history (the 20th century), it is possible to identify the internal movements of the narrative and its dialectical formulations between fiction and reality, unusual and real, as well as to perceive the aesthetic work in its historical meaning, capable of directing the reader to their most immediate and simple daily life, highlighting its ability to achieve "defetishization" and clarify a conscious perception of everyday life.

Unlike what part of the criticism states about Veiga's short stories, the resource of the unusual takes the reader into the story, undoing the image of escape to a magical, childish world or to a simple allegorical association, but highlights the movements of everyday life, praising the complexity and dynamics of social life. What we propose is a reading that starts from everyday life and returns to it, which is possible considering the literary text as a realistic work, according to Lukácsian criticism. Thus, in Lukács, for a literary narrative to be relevant, it must grasp the human totality, narrate life events in their causes and causalities, reach the sphere of the necessary, and imprint the meaning of human anguish and afflictions. When the work opposes estrangement (fetishized life), it achieves its aesthetic efficiency; this is a literary work capable of configuring concrete characters in concrete situations, in action, and highlighting the meaning of History.

Evoking these elements, including the criticism already published about the author's work, allows us to understand how Veiga's narratives are works that deal with everyday life in a current way. The issues raised in his work are still those that problematize human life in peripheral regions, which makes the literary work an important aesthetic record of human afflictions, anguishes, and concerns in terms of highlighting exactly what immediacy insists on hiding. Through realistic criticism, we realize that the unusual is, in fact, the very path to the transfiguration of social life attached to living reality, understanding the meaning of history in its greatest complexity.

Thus, from the moment it is verified that the criticism about Veiga is centered on some points considered relevant, such as the issue of the unusual, the regionalist tendency, the juvenile literature aspect, and the historical denunciation, it is also necessary to identify that, although the unusual tone reaffirms the fantastic element in the narrative, the understanding of

¹ José J. Veiga (1915–1999) was a Brazilian writer, one of the most important novelists and short story authors of contemporary fiction. He was born at Fazenda Morro Grande, in Corumbá, State of Goiás, on February 2, 1915. Source: Biography of José J. Veiga – eBiografia, accessed on 04/03/2024 at 4:00 p.m.

the text moves toward its opposite, that is, dialectically, toward the understanding of history, of the reality contained in everyday life. For this reason, the path to making a realistic reading of the stories is configured as original in relation to the existing critical readings of Veiga's narrative.

For that, it is also necessary to highlight another relevant point in this meeting between Literature and History: the fact that it is literature developed in the Latin American world.

With the arrival of the 20th century and the avant-garde movements that emerged in Europe, aiming to overcome the positivist realist model, Latin America found itself facing a new order, as it assumed European paradigms at the same time that these paradigms showed little efficiency in the face of the complex and peculiar American reality. Thinking about Veiga's work is thinking about the reality that emerges in Brazil, as a country subjected to a strong process of colonization. For this reason, it is necessary to seek references in identity marks and in relations of alterity, turning to Latin America and its writers, since literature practiced in colonized countries reaffirms its commitment to nation formation, sometimes committing to a national project of the elites, sometimes reemerging as production of a counter-hegemonic discourse.

Even incorporating the logic of class society, the narrative manages to maintain essential structures for the preservation of artistic creativity, incorporated into human praxis, reaffirming the search for the historical meaning of humanity in the freedom contained in the act of narrating.

"Admitting the cognitive value of art, we will be forced to conclude that it provides a particular knowledge that cannot be supplied by knowledge provided by other diverse modes of apprehending the real. If we renounce the knowledge that art – and only art – can provide us, we mutilate our understanding of reality. And, since the reality whose essence art gives us an image of is basically human reality, that is, our most immediate reality, the renunciation of the development of artistic knowledge and, consequently, the renunciation of the development of the study of aesthetic questions, leads to the loss of an essential dimension in our self-consciousness." (Konder, 2013, p. 25)

This is how the literatures developed in Latin America, especially in Brazil, with the passage from the conception of the "mild awareness of backwardness," characteristic of the "new country," to the "catastrophic awareness of backwardness" corresponding to the notion of "underdeveloped country" (Candido, 1987, p. 142); develop. The Latin

American literary manifestations take place in a context of a "continent under intervention" (Candido, 1987, p. 142), since for colonized countries, cultural life was built based on the imitation of the mother cultures, that is, the literatures of the colonizing countries.

In this context of literary periphery, it was not enough to simply break with tradition, with the distressing influence of the colonizer. But above all, renewal presents itself with the promise of modernity, with the arrival of progress. The literature of José J. Veiga is an attempt to think about everyday life under the sign of peripheral modernity and, especially, in the perception of a humanity subjected to the domination of the commodity-form². According to João Luís Lafetá, thinking about literature is also thinking about the development of the capitalist economy in our country, and then, it is possible to see that it undergoes profound modifications, more complex than the agrarian-export system.

According to Polar (2000), the literature that was formed in Latin America was founded between immediacy and permanence, based on accounts of power relations. In the literary narrative, different instances are interwoven, such as the connection between a literature and its modes of production, generating a tension, which best defines the literature of the time. This means that the great transformations happened in the sphere of form, not translating into important changes in content, especially because, although the independence processes and the political autonomy of these countries took place, the reality of domination still persisted for a long time. This domination, allied with imperialism, in dictatorial systems that spread tyranny, subjugation, and exploitation of the underprivileged.

From 1964 on, many Brazilian intellectuals were exiled to neighboring countries due to the Brazilian military dictatorship. They then had the opportunity to think about Brazil and its problems as facts common to all of Latin America, as a continent that more resembled a province with strong social, economic, and cultural ties, relations highlighted by the increasingly evident globalization processes.

² The expression "commodity-form" is a way to explain how the result of labor incorporates mercantile interests. The important aspect is not to perceive the hidden value of a commodity, its concealed meaning between supply and demand, but rather the process that led to the metamorphosis into this form, highlighting its use-value and exchange-value. The theorization of the commodity-form was developed by Marx in the book *Capital: Critique of Political Economy* (São Paulo: Nova Cultural, 1985).

The literature that was formed in Latin America has always been an instrument of cultural transmission strongly linked to the ruling classes and to the ideological interests of the literate minority, being a fundamental element to adapt to the New World. In Latin American countries, literature was a practice of confirmation and formation of national sentiment, incorporating the country's historical-social consciousness, thus making this internalized bias in the literary work and in its criticism essential.

The directions in politics and economy given by the colonizer point to a Latin America not only renewed, since it makes the first contacts with modernity, but above all, in permanent tension, since contexts of economic inequality prevail, revealing a continent that remains in permanent crisis, highlighting and, gradually, becoming aware of the contradictions that prevent effective progress. In this contradictory reality is the fact that many groups who strived for the end of dictatorial regimes (a reality in almost all of Latin America) ended up assuming their places in power, but without restoring democracy.

This reality reaffirms the similarities between Latin American countries, which end up forming a bloc with realities and difficulties very similar to each other. Thus, history became a theme for literature, confirming in the literary text the contradictions that, in everyday life, remained imperceptible. By migrating to literary narrative, human life is laid bare in its essence and ceases to be historiography to become historicity.

Oligarchic states predominated in Latin American countries that, together with the ruling class, fought for the concentration of income and the maintenance of capital in the hands of the ruling class, thus making the less wealthy completely excluded from the world of opportunities. Any initiative aimed at removing people from peripheral life was seen as a contravention to the capitalist economic system and, therefore, highly fought against. Hence the great contradiction: peripheral modernization and democratization are paradoxically contradictory elements.

THE DICTATORSHIP, THE HISTORY, AND THE BEARDED KINGS

The book in question, *Sombra dos Reis Barbudos*, is narrated in the first person and has as its protagonist a boy named Lucas, who "remembers" the difficult episodes that occurred in a small town in the

countryside called Taitara. He narrates the installation of an industry in the city, "Companhia Melhoramentos," a company belonging to his uncle Baltazar.

When this industry was installed, all the people in the community lived happily and hopefully; in some way, the company aroused a certain prospect of a better life for the residents.

Some time later, the company underwent an intervention, and Uncle Baltazar was removed from the presidency and expelled from the city. The boy Lucas saw his father, Horácio, be promoted in the company to the position of inspector, having the duty of watching over people for the good of the company.

Little by little, my father gained a respect that not even Uncle Baltazar achieved in his great days right after the inauguration, when people scrambled to receive a greeting from him on the street. But there was a difference: with my father, it was not that spontaneous and disinterested respect of those who just want to honor someone for something already done; it was the flattery of those who are afraid of being harmed in some right; as an inspector, my father could harm or benefit, the inspectors worked with free rein and could not be contested. (Veiga, 1994, pp. 27–28)

The company became increasingly cruel, confiscating goods, including the vegetables produced in the family garden, and built walls in the city to the point that people got lost among them.

Suddenly the walls, these walls, from one night to the next they sprouted like this – straight, curved, broken, going down, going up, dividing the streets in half according to the layout, separating, blocking views, darkening, suffocating. To this day we do not know if they were built right there on the spot or brought from afar already ready and stuck there [...] (Veiga, 1994, p. 27).

Lucas witnessed his father Horácio leave his job at the company (CIA) and open a grocery store. Lucas helped him with the work, which was not going well due to his father's low popularity because of his previous job. With the failure of Horácio's business, inexplicably, some time later, he was arrested by CIA agents. From then on, Lucas's life became harder; he had to help his mother, who sewed clothes. He was still studying and working as a porter. With little entertainment, the only possible comfort for the children was to observe the mountains and the sky, since these were the only places the CIA did not control.

Several strange events begin to occur. Lucas starts to notice the presence of vultures, increasingly closer to the city. They became accustomed to people and, little by little, were domesticated to the point that it became natural to find people walking with vultures

on leashes as if they were dogs. Lucas also notices that in the sky it was possible to see (with binoculars and telescopes) people flying, at first in a very limited way, later these events became more frequent.

- *What do you need a telescope for? he asked without looking.*
- *To watch vultures, I said, discouraged.*
- [...] - *To watch vultures, huh? That's all we needed.*
- *It's fun, dad. Everybody is watching.*
- *But not for much longer, he said, stretching one side of his face to pass the razor. Thinking that he meant that a telescope doesn't last long, it breaks easily, it jams, it wears out, I explained more excitedly:*
- *It lasts a lifetime, dad, if we don't drop it from up high.*
- *That's not why. It's because in a few days there won't be anyone walking around with little telescopes and little binoculars in their hands. We're already watching them. (Veiga, 1994, p. 37)*

The narrative continues with a trip that Lucas makes to his uncle Baltazar's house, where he finds him sick and missing an arm that had been torn off. The boy sleeps at his uncle's house and shares an intimate comfort with his aunt, Baltazar's wife. As time goes by, the city became emptied but longed for the return of the flying men, who could no longer be seen, only their shadows were projected throughout the city.

It is observed that the work presents itself as a fictional testimony of a relevant historical period and can be used in the exercise of shared teaching between History and Literature teachers to speak of an "other" view of the same event. What stands out as "estimony" is the historical perspective for the intertwining of the view about the historical event and the dialogue between History and the fictional work. According to Gagnebin:

The witness is the one who does not go away, who manages to hear the unbearable narration of the other and who accepts that their words carry forward, as in a relay, the history of the other: not out of guilt or compassion, but because only the symbolic transmission, assumed despite and because of the unspeakable suffering, only this reflective resumption of the past can help us not to repeat it infinitely, but to dare to outline another history, to invent the present. (Gagnebin, 2006, p. 57)

The witness is not only the one who saw with their own eyes, but also the one who insists on the literary reminiscence narrated as a historical-fictional attempt to see, understand, interpret, and (re)invent the present based on the remembered events. According to Rodrigues:

Literature and testimony exist in the space between words, men, societies, and the real and unreal things of the world of men. This boundary between fiction and reality rescues what is most terrible in

the real to present it, even if for that it needs literature as its own vehicle. Thus, the primary tension that inhabits literature and its narrative in its relation with the real, of affirmation and denial, and the respective dichotomous surpassing of the supposed relation between truth and lie, is also found at the heart of the testimony addressed here. (Rodrigues, 2022, p. 20)

It is in this sense that the literary work is understood here as a testimonial contribution that, as already mentioned earlier, produces an ideal materialization of the real movement of the events reflected here, namely, the military dictatorship and the ways of working with it through shared teaching in high school classes between History and Literature teachers.

THE SHADOWS, THE BEARDS, AND THE KINGS IN THE PRAXIS OF SHARED TEACHING

José J. Veiga, in the analyzed novel *Sombra de Reis Barbudos*, composes, from a "fictional" work, the Brazilian space in the problematization about the military dictatorship, articulating within the significant core of the work the elements of repression in different categories. The author thus becomes a consonant voice that presents, through literary narrative, more than just fiction and imagination, but the memory and resistance of those who experienced the dictatorial period (since, due to the censorship imposed by the regime, works of magical realism were highly valued as a mechanism of resistance that tried to circumvent the established censorship). Veiga's literary and narratological knowledge can also be called praxeological because it deals not only with the system of objective relations in evoking the dictatorship itself, but also with the dialectical relations between these structures, which Rodrigues (2022, p. 20) would call "the double process of internalizing exteriority and externalizing interiority." In other words, Veiga proposes a study of human conduct that aims to understand the causes and consequences of the actions experienced within the scope of repression, from the outside to the inside, then from the inside to the outside.

That said, how can History and Literature teachers, in the experience of shared teaching, appropriate the literary narrative for a deepening of discussions about the historical fact? Is Veiga speaking of an imaginary reality? Or is the content of the literary narrative addressing (even if in a fictional way) the same lived reality that historians seek to prove with documentary evidence that should leave no doubt about the events

that occurred? Let's see some allusions and overlaps between the two poles.

The boy Lucas is "remembering," remembering so as not to forget, remembering so as not to repeat. The idea of remembrance (memory) is linked to the notion of a memorial movement that aims to immortalize the phenomenon in order to internalize it. Lucas remembers the difficult events that occurred in the city of Taitara. He narrates the construction of the "Companhia Melhoramentos" which the author later calls "CIA", making reference to the interference of the American intelligence agency in Brazil, which, in an attempt to contain the advance of socialism in the Soviet model, supported coups d'état throughout Latin America (especially after Cuba's alignment).

Lucas also remembers the deposition of uncle Baltazar, alluding to the coup that overthrew President João Goulart. He speaks of his father's promotion to the position of inspector at the CIA, showing that part of the Brazilian population initially supported the establishment of the dictatorship. His father now had the task of watching over people "for the good of Brazil." The CIA became increasingly atrocious, controlling the people, producing a separation between us and them through the construction of walls built in the city to the point that people got lost among them. When leaving home, people started tying strings to the locks on their doors so they could find their way back without getting lost. The strings symbolized this hopeful memory of returning again to the utopian limits of a better, possible, imagined country.

The pastime of the children of Taitara was to watch the mountains and the sky, for these were the only places the CIA did not control. The author is speaking of a dual reality that interacts and interpenetrates: "the children and the dreams," with the children representing the future. To look upward requires courage; it is an act of bravery, of struggle, of hope. However, this gaze was not always easy; sometimes it was necessary to use binoculars, to narrow the view in order to understand more deeply the phenomena that occurred. Even if this gaze glimpses men who fly – first in large numbers, then only their shadows projected over the city – it speaks of exile, arbitrariness, authoritarianism that even enchants people who suffer with this reality, and in the absence of hope, domesticates vultures. It normalizes this reality, one gets used to the unacceptable, or, in the words of Chico Buarque, "they fall silent, silent, chalice."

The shadows projected on the city of the flying people (the exiled) begin to appear more intensely, threatening order, or as Drummond would say, "piercing the asphalt, the boredom, the disgust, and the hatred." The shadows speak of hope, of longing for the return of the kings, the bearded kings, the kings' beards, the bearded kings. Soldiers do not wear beards, and the bearded ones will return, reestablishing the world of freedom, democracy, the end of censorship, and possibilities. The bearded kings are the kings of democracy, the kings who will pass from the flying shadows to the ground in fact. Uncle Baltazar is crippled, but uncle Baltazar is no longer a man; he is a longing, an idea, even if his wife may betray him. Precisely for this reason, memory must always be stimulated³.

Thus, the shared classes use the text as mediation for discussions, exploring textually its aesthetic and ethical aspects, from how the literary work internalizes the history of a people, of a country. Shared teaching enables plural, deep, and interdisciplinary views about an important time and space slice for a singular and relevant representation made by art, even in a defetishizing manner. Sharing the classroom space is sharing affections and intellectualities that are not always similar, but there are indeed many contradictions – that is, dissonant ideas – a fact that confirms the dialogical and democratic channel that is formed. What remains is a position always committed to good arguments and to a posture of debate, dialogue, and intellectuality, proper to the classroom and to teachers who understand their work as an eternal formation of the unfinished.

CONCLUSION

The disciplines of History and Literature can be intertwined in discussions about the Military Dictatorship to the extent that fictional texts appropriate for historical studies are taken as tools of analysis concerning the studied period. By pointing to the novel *Sombra de Reis Barbudos* by José J. Veiga as a literature of testimony that problematizes life during the dictatorial period in Brazil, the text can become a

³ We will not dwell extensively on the concept of memory, although it is necessary to briefly address Maurice Halbwachs' (2006) thought, who points out that collective memory is grounded in the construction of a people's identity. According to the author, it is not enough to reconstruct a past event in fragments to obtain a recollection; this reconstruction must operate from information or notions common among the members of a community. It is from collective memory that individual memory is produced.

didactic tool that presents experiential impressions regarding the repression experienced during the dictatorship.

In this sense, Veiga is speaking about a specific historical moment that, through fiction, demonstrates, unveils, illuminates how the feelings and sensations lived during the military era manifested themselves. The History teacher, in a shared class with the Literature teacher, can correlate the various testimonies regarding the historical fact, through historiographic texts and the literary narrative. In this way, the focus of discussions can be broadened and can address art, politics, culture, and life during the dictatorial period.

This text serves as a memorial to present what has been done in the humanities disciplines at the Federal Institute of Goiás / Urutaí, where such an experience has been shared in various perspectives of alignment between the Literature teacher and the History teacher. The result has been very fruitful, in the sense that such articulated knowledge serves as a stimulus to students who can observe various approaches to the same theme. In this case, the literary text, as testimony of a time, arouses impressions and feelings while the historiographic texts present the historiographic facts. The result: a dialogued didactic class in which the Military Dictatorship will be under the eyes and impressions of the already consolidated historical studies and the literary accounts (especially *Sombra de Reis Barbudos*) as a testimony of a time and an event that occurred between the years 1964 and 1985.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author(s) declare(s) no potential conflict of interest in connection with the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

REFERENCES

- Barthes, R. (2008). *Aula* (L. Perrone-Moisés, Trad.). Cultrix.
- Borges, J. L. (1985). *Cinco visões pessoais* (2ª ed., M. R. R. da Silva, Trad.). Editora da UnB.
- Brecht, B. (1964). *Escritos sobre teatro: Para uma arte dramática não aristotélica*. Portugalia.
- Cândido, A. (1987). Literatura e subdesenvolvimento. In *A educação pela noite e outros ensaios* (p. 142). Ática.
- Engels, F., & Marx, K. (1999). *O manifesto comunista* (5ª ed.). Paz e Terra.
- Gagnebin, J. M. (2006). *Lembrar, escrever, esquecer*. Editora 34.
- Halbwachs, M. (2006). *A memória coletiva*. Editora Vértice.

- Konder, L. (2013). *Os marxistas e a arte: Breve estudo histórico-crítico de algumas tendências da estética marxista* (2ª ed., Coleção Arte e Sociedade, p. 25). Expressão Popular.
- Lafetá, J. L. (2000). 1930: *A crítica e o modernismo* (Coleção Espírito Crítico, p. 26). Duas Cidades; Editora 34.
- Ordine, N. (2016). *A utilidade do inútil*. Editora Zahar.
- Polar, A. C. (2000). *O condor voa: Literatura e cultura latino-americanas* (M. J. Valdés, Org.; I. V. Carvalho, Trad., p. 43). Editora UFMG.
- Reis, D. A. (2014). *Ditadura e democracia no Brasil: Do golpe de 1964 à Constituição de 1988*. Editora Zahar.
- Ricoeur, P. (2012). *Tempo e narrativa* (Vols. 1-3). Martins Fontes.
- Rodrigues, F. R. (2022). *Cenas do Sertão, testemunho do sagrado em O livro dos homens de Ronaldo Correia de Brito*. Revista Caminhos, 20(2).
- Veiga, J. J. (1994). *Sombra de reis barbudos* (20ª ed.). Bertrand Brasil.

To cite this paper, use:

Rodrigues, F.R. & Carvalho, L.A. (2025). Between the real and the imagined, Brazilian history and literature in high school: the testimony of the military coup in *sombra de reis barbudos* by José J. Veiga through shared teaching. *Multi-Science Journal*, 8(1): 16-23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33837/msj.v8i1.1670>