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In the short story, 'The Library of Babel' (1941), Jorge Luis Borges imagines a library so vast that it is all-encompassing. Its architecture consists of superimposed hexagonal galleries. These are connected by a spiral staircase that cuts across the centre of the entire structure. The endless library holds all possible combinations of the letters of all alphabets, whether the languages are extinct, currently in use or yet to emerge. This random collection of letters is compiled in standard-size volumes, displayed in no particular or known order. All known books, whether based on fact or fiction, or yet to be written, are interspersed among an inordinate number of nonsensical compilations. The library is absolutely dysfunctional, since its totality denies the possibility of both specificity and order, which must always be deferred, cast to the field of speculation.

A similar sense of totality is evoked in certain works by Anna Maria Maiolino. I refer to her poured ink drawings and installations with clay, where the single and simple action that gives form gains significance through repetition. As in the case of Borges's library, this significance pertains not to the specific, whether the individual drawing or object, but to the absolute completeness of the work, which must also always be deferred. While the accumulation of marks or objects tends towards totality, each single gesture evolves, but never achieves, the primordial act it seeks to reproduce. Similar to the two infinite extremes of Borges’s library, these serial gestures are thus expansive in two directions: they tend towards both an origin and an end.

Elaborating on art historian Maria de Fátima Lambert’s suggestion that Maiolino’s drawings and installations can be read as “a proto-writing, it may be useful to refer to Walter Benjamin’s essay, ‘The Task of the Translator’ (1923).” One can associate the sequential mark or form-making in Maiolino’s work as a search for the perfect translation of that primal mark. The failure to achieve this (as all translations are ultimately inadequate) leads to the potential infinite reproducibility of those attempts. This potentially infinite translation of a primal code invokes a notion of essence, that which lies beyond strict communicability. While Borges’s narrator poses the question, “You who read me—are you certain you understand my language?”, Benjamin asks:

“For what does a literary work ‘say’? What does it communicate? It tells very little to those who understand it. Its essential quality is not communication or the imparting of information. Yet any translation that intends to perform a transmitting function cannot communicate anything but communication—hence, something insensuous. This is the hallmark of bad translations. But do we not generally regard that which lies beyond communication in a literary work—and even a poor translator will admit that this is its essential substance—as the unfathomable, the mysterious, the ‘poetic’.”

A similar conjunction of the singular act and its endless expansion has been proposed by Catherine de Zegher. The curator observed a resemblance between the making of Maiolino’s clay ‘rolls’ and the act of kneading bread. Suggesting another analogy that the work sets into play between origin and finality, de Zegher went further by recalling the resemblance between bread and feces. “The association of that which is ingested with that which is excreted presents us with a cycle that tend towards both an origin and an end.
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specific, that is, the myth of origin, with a universal ideal of culture. In other words, it proposed the presence of a mythical indigenous spectrum within Brazilian ethnic heterogeneity, and just as it was with another myth, that of the universal character of European culture. The reflected image thus undermined the purported purity of its source.

The fact that anthropophagy, since the late 1920s, has been re-conceptualised through the work of several generations of artists proves the ongoing versatility of the concept. With regard to the international dissemination and interpretation of Brazilian contemporary art, the concept is often seen as synonymous with notions of cultural hybridity or transculturation. Some caution is necessary in such associations, the latter being perhaps a better 'translation' than the former, for its implied transience. Benjamin is useful here since not only can anthropology be understood as a form of translation, but also, and perhaps more significantly, as an intergeneric and thus genealogical art historical unfolding.12 This unfolding becomes evident when considering the distinctions between the paintings of Tarsila do Amaral, who first transposed the concept pictorially in the late 1920s, and work by artists from Maiolino's generation. While Tarsila responded to the notion of anthropophagy through the portrayal of a mythical primal figure in Abaporu (1928), placing it in 'a tropical Arcadian' scenery, Maiolino re-enacted the anthropophagite feast itself.13 The subject matter thus evolved from the Abaporu ('the one who eats' in the Tupi-Guarani language) to the act of sound or eating (as in Maiolino's Glu Glu Glu from 1967 [p. 19, p.74], for example). Maiolino's creative trajectory is exemplary in this respect. The evolution of her delineates how the Brazilian notion of Anthropophagy was transferred from an overt representational theme into a procedure that would become integral to the materialisation of the work itself: a shift, in other words, from iconography to immateriality. Of course, such a transition within the internal formal procedures of art production responded to external factors. Tarsila's paintings, and her attempted insertions into the Parisian artistic milieu, seem to have sought a Brazilian modernism for export.14 While she continued to work in the 1920s negotriou into Brazilian primitivist themes, the re-emergence of anthropophagy during the 1960s responded to internal, national impulses. In yet another case of extremes resembling each other, reference to anthropophagy emerged in the mid-1960s as a foil of negation of a generalised aversion towards foreign culture. This was expressed across the political spectrum: if the left criticised American imperialism, the right-wing military government supported the concept of nationalism. Anthropophagy, in its 1960s tropicalist reincarnation, thus articulated Brazilian popular culture, kitsch and the rise of mass communication, in the face of censorship and political repression following the coup d'état that established the military regime in April 1964, much of the proximity between left-wing militants and marginalised layer of society was destroyed. Artists associated with the political spectrum then, were encouraged to explore themes of indigeneity. Maiolino had enrolled in the woodcut printing course at the Escola Nacional, a technique that had strong traditional associations with popular Cordel literature, to which the artist was introduced by Rubens Gerchman. Cordel evoked the drought-ridden culture of the country's northeast, a region that from the early 1960s had attracted the attention of leftist movements involved with projects of alphabetisation and agrarian reform.15

Although it is unclear precisely when Maiolino became aware of the concept of anthropophagy, even the earliest surviving examples of her work absorbed the aesthetics and themes of the local avant-garde while conveying impressions of an intimate, affective – in short, subjective – experience. Such a diverse set of influences, combined with the artist's invovvement in the avant-garde, as already discussed, in works such as ANNA of 1967 (p.17), where two figures utter the artist's name in a speech bubble shared between them. A number of opposing relationships are placed in tension here. The innate expressionism of the woodcut contrasts with the elegiac simplicity of a print, which evokes popular culture is configured within the picture frame, while the emphasis is on the written word and the relation between the black-and-white surfaces. Other consequences of the affective framework are placed in tension in the catalogue essay invoked the anthropophagite legacy as a means of understanding the diversity of references and styles that had emerged in Brazil in the 1960s, contrasting it with another myth and its association with French purism and the 'return to order', including: Ausubel, ‘Training Hybrid Strategies in Brazilian Modern Art’, in Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Painting: Hybridity, Hegemony, Aesthetics, Critical/Forum Series, ed. Jonathan Harris, Liverpool University Press and Tate, Liverpool, 2003, pp.139–70; Ausubel, ‘Some Notes on the Contamination and Quarantine of Brazilian Art’, in Architexture: Trajectories of Modernity, Concept and Practice at Work, 20th and 21st Centuries, ed. Melanie Bachmann, Milena Klein, Tereza Mariné and Gorgy Vassal, Wilhelm Faks, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2017, pp.141–162.

Cordel is a popular genre of unbound print-selling pamphlets or printlets containing folk tales and verses, written text of which is printed in northeastern Brazil. Illustrated with woodcuts that represent the popula (a theorem), they are sold regularly in markets and fairs where they are displayed on rope clotheslines (cordel) from which they derive their name.16

With the coup of 1964 that installed the military regime, much of the progress between left-wing militants and marginalised layer of society was destroyed. Artists associated with the political spectrum were encouraged to explore themes of indigeneity. Maiolino attended the – then conservative – Escola Nacional de Belas Artes, where she joined a circle of artists that would later form the core of Novo Figuraçao: Antonio Dias, Rubens Gerchman, Roberto Magalhães and Carlos Vergara. In the early 1960s, the art milieu became enthusiastic about popular imagery and its imaginary. Maiolino had enrolled in the woodcut printing course at the Escola Nacional, a technique that had strong traditional associations with popular Cordel literature, to which the artist was introduced by Rubens Gerchman. Cordel evoked the drought-ridden culture of the country's northeast, a region that from the early 1960s had attracted the attention of leftist movements involved with projects of alphabetisation and agrarian reform.15

Although it is unclear precisely when Maiolino became aware of the concept of anthropophagy, even the earliest surviving examples of her work absorbed the aesthetics and themes of the local avant-garde while conveying impressions of an intimate, affective – in short, subjective – experience. Such a diverse set of influences, combined with the artist's involvement in the avant-garde, as already discussed, in works such as ANNA of 1967 (p.17), where two figures utter the artist's name in a speech bubble shared between them. A number of opposing relationships are placed in tension here. The innate expressionism of the woodcut contrasts with the elegiac simplicity of a print, which evokes popular culture is configured within the picture frame, while the emphasis is on the written word and the relation between the black-and-white surfaces. Other consequences of the affective framework are placed in tension in the catalogue essay invoked the anthropophagite legacy as a means of understanding the diversity of references and styles that had emerged in Brazil in the 1960s, contrasting it with another myth and its association with French purism and the 'return to order', including: Ausubel, ‘Training Hybrid Strategies in Brazilian Modern Art’, in Critical Perspectives on Contemporary Painting: Hybridity, Hegemony, Aesthetics, Critical/Forum Series, ed. Jonathan Harris, Liverpool University Press and Tate, Liverpool, 2003, pp.139–70; Ausubel, ‘Some Notes on the Contamination and Quarantine of Brazilian Art’, in Architexture: Trajectories of Modernity, Concept and Practice at Work, 20th and 21st Centuries, ed. Melanie Bachmann, Milena Klein, Tereza Mariné and Gorgy Vassal, Wilhelm Faks, Leiden and Boston, MA, 2017, pp.141–162.
is replaced here by the simple thread, a line, the primal mark that precedes written language itself. Anthropophagy is still present through the oral reference but the process of making is significantly different. The transition from a manual and popular printmaking reproduction technique to a mechanical means is accompanied by a conceptual shift: the finiteness in ANNA is replaced by the notion of a potentially endless thread, where origin and infinity are set against each other.

Oswaldian irreverence was powerful enough, enough so to contain a critical positioning in light of geopolitical hierarchies, a mockery of a regime that proclaimed what it desired as the essential national character, and the possibility of absorbing a set of cultural references in order to express subjective experiences. Maiolino’s work from the 1960s to the 1970s would touch upon a similar range of positions, as can be observed in O Herói (The Hero) of 1966 (p. 76), with its mockery of military regalia, and É a que Sobra (What is Left Over) of 1974 (pp. 58–59), with its powerful commentary on violence (against the female body) and/or censorship, while Amor & Feião (Rice & Beans) of 1979 (p. 50) consisted of an installation that invited participants to ponder on hunger and the worldwide distribution of food.

The idea that the burden of the individual is inescapably shared with the collective is also invoked in her early work using Super 8 film and photography. The first examples of this work, produced under the military regime, refer to censorship, torture and more generally to the psychological, subjective experience of living under such conditions. As the artist herself put it:

> With the new media I attempted to elaborate on the political moment, to reflect while doing, searching in the act of poetic freedom the resistance to that which is established, imposed by the military dictatorship ... with its repression, (that) prevents human beings from reaching their plenitude ... I made use of my own body at that particular moment, not as a mere metaphor but as a truth, something that belonged to the domain of the real. Since, in a moment of repression and torture, all bodies become one in pain.18

The body, whose frailty and finite nature is for Borges the principle impediment to deciphering the secrets held by the Library of Babel, becomes in Maiolino’s work the carrier of the burden of repression and its poetic/subjective vehicle.19 It is both the single, subjective entity and the total collective self. Beyond the specifics of the historical moment of their production, Maiolino’s films also recall Borges’ tales by referring to the non-linearity of narratives in a similar manner to the way in which the ordering of the books in the Library of Babel or the pages in his other related short story, The Book of Sand does not follow any pre-established logic. Maiolino has stated that her films allow the possibility of interchanges within the sequential order of the images, precisely because they do not depend on a linear language.20

In the film In-Out (Antropofagia) (In-Out [Anthropophagy]) of 1973–74 (pp. 66–67), two mouths – a male and a female – undertake a wordless conversation. The frame is limited to these mouths only, shots alternating from one to the other. The female mouth is initially gagged with tape. The film progresses through a number of situations in which objects or substances are placed upon it, taken in, or expelled. In one instance, the female mouth expels a number of coloured threads leading one to associate In-Out with Lygia Clark’s group performance-therapy, Baba Antropofágica (Anthropophagite Drool), also of 1973. In Clark’s work a number of participants, holding cotton reels in their mouths, ‘vomit’ multi-coloured cotton lines over another participant. Despite the fact that Clark’s performance took place in Paris, Maiolino openly acknowledges that she had been an important mentor during the 1960s. The Oswaldian reference here becomes a testament to the narrow conceptual path both artists held, and is demonstrative of the general complicity between Brazilian artists during that period.

It is perhaps no coincidence that Maiolino’s association of the single with the collective body bears similarities with the fundamental basis of Oswaldian anthropophagy, where the spectre of the native is present in the collective socio-cultural being. For practitioners in the 1960s the re-emergence of anthropophagy invoked ideas around viscerality that increasingly privileged the body, participation and performance. But for Maiolino, anthropophagy would additionally have personal significance as a poetic tool through which the artist could articulate her own search for belonging. Although immediately recognisable as a comment on censorship, In-Out (Antropofagia) can also be understood as a response to the condition of being culturally displaced, with the communicative limitations that this implied.

Maiolino’s work over the course of the 1980s would undergo significant changes, particularly with the gradual dissolution of the military regime and the fragmentation of artistic practices characteristic of that moment. Yet, while it is not entirely surprising to find Maiolino confessing her disappointment with the fragmentation of concepts, themes and issues that had informed much of the artistic production of the 1970s, it seems paradoxical that she would express her discontent with the general abandonment of the belief in totality, in the transcendental power of art. This seems odd, coming from someone whose practice survived despite personal trials, and whose feminine and migrant subjectivity had been such an important aspect of her work. The artist explains this paradox as resulting from anxieties generated by the sense of lack produced by displacement,
which in turn drives a desire for totality, for a kind of communion within the collective. The foreigner is, after all, always incomplete in her new environment. Such a moment of creative crisis, it could be argued, would mark the beginning of the artist’s own transformation of anthropophagy as a concept.

My work ... produced by the ‘doing hand’ as the critic Paulo Venancio Filho called it, tries to bring a totality of fragments to the state of being a single work. There is an immanent anxiety about the totality, the longing for a whole is part of the process.21

Maiolino’s realisation that her work must respond to the abandonment of certainties and the fragmentation of judgement recalls Borges’s account of the gradual dissipation of joy following the hypothesised wholeness of the library. Interestingly, it is at this moment, from the 1980s onwards, that the relation with anthropophagy becomes absorbed by the process of art-making itself; in other words, Maiolino becomes engaged with the articulation of the very myths that sustain that concept.

Entrevidas (Between Lives) of 1981/2010 (pp. 84–85) is perhaps the moment when this first occurs, as the individual body walks carefully through eggs scattered across the street. A multitude of proto-beings, archetypal symbols of origin, are invoked. Reference to Anthropophagy has lost all connection to its traditional iconography and is now translated into the realm of the symbolic. The photographic medium frames the photopoemaction as the ‘self’ traverses a multitude of points of origin, rendering time both still and transient. In a statement made in 2002, Maiolino expressed the significance of the egg in her work as:

OVO, Portuguese for ‘egg’, has an ‘O’ before and an ‘O’ after the ‘V’, ‘V’ being the first letter of Vitoria (Victory) and its symbol. A parallel reading gives us the meaning: ‘Ovo Vive, Vive Ovo’ (Egg Lives, Live Egg). Thus, looking at the way the word itself is written reinforces it as an archetype par excellence of the OVO—life. Furthermore, it reinforces the presupposition that the word OVO forms a palindrome in that it can be read forwards and backwards. The OVO shares the simplicity of the ovality of the zero ‘0’ – the smallest form par excellence—which to the Hindu means: ‘previous to realisation—the aura of nothing’, and considered the ‘root of diversity’. Hence, faced with the egg we are faced by nothing and everything; the empty and the full, the beginning as past, the end and the infinite.22

To conclude this tentative conjunction between a short story about an infinite library, a 1920s manifesto, an essay on the theory of translation and the work of a contemporary artist, it is worth remembering Maiolino’s last solo exhibition in London. Her clay installations at the Camden Arts Centre occupied the site of a former north London library reading room. The coincidence was uncanny, although perhaps not improbable, since this was precisely what led me to suggest the association with Borges’s tale in the first place. The library, in other words, already contained this text before it had been written, as well as its different versions, its translations and enunciations. How appropriate, then, that this essay re-emerges to accompany an exhibition that begins its itinerary at the Padiglione d’Arte Contemporanea in Italy, Maiolino’s country of birth, and ends at Whitechapel Gallery, which has incorporated the neighbouring library as part of its recent expansion.


22 Maiolino, 2009, p. 90. Note that ‘Vitoria’ recalls the name of Maiolino’s mother, Vitalia, which further associates this work with ANNA and Por um Fio.