

O ANIMAL CORDIAL: AN ERASURE ON REASON

Fernanda Marra

ABSTRACT

This essay proposes a reading about the full-length film *O animal cordial*, of the screen-writer and director Gabriela Amaral Almeida (2018). The idea was to cover the plot observing the characters and describing how the Brazilian screen-writer and director questioned the validity and the appropriateness of the expression “homem cordial”, described by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1995) in his sociological analysis found in the book *Raízes do Brasil*. My proposal is to perceive (1) how that significant persists in contemporaneity in spite of its anachronistic sendings, and (2) in which way the film, beyond being a complaint-reading of this anachronism, is also a possibility of a rewriting of the concept by obliteration. Almeida (2018) films a night in a Brazilian restaurant attended by people who belong to an upper-middle social class, or to a class that moves economically upward way. What we watch that night is the downfall process of the “man” who changes place with the “animal” and brings about an overwriting, not only of the “man”, meaning the masculine genre, but of the “humankind” as a hole. This violent and bloody rewriting is what interests me in this film. In other words, what I present in this text stood up for the thinking of Hélène Cixous (1995), Alexandre Nodari (2017) and Achille Mbembe (2018), because, to my point, this process is what the full-length Brazilian film exposes in a beautiful and fierce way pointing “devires”.

KEYWORDS

Animal cordial; homem cordial; Brazilian film; otherness; “devires”

O ANIMAL CORDIAL: UMA RASURA DA RAZÃO

RESUMO

Este artigo propõe uma leitura do filme longa metragem *O animal cordial* (2018), da roteirista e diretora Gabriela Amaral Almeida. A ideia foi percorrer o enredo contemplando as personagens e descrevendo como a roteirista e diretora brasileira colocou em cheque a validade e a pertinência da noção de “homem cordial”, descrita por Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1995) em sua obra sociológica *Raízes do Brasil*. A proposta é observar (1) como esse significante persiste na contemporaneidade a despeito de seus envios anacrônicos e (2) de que forma o filme é, para além de uma leitura de homenagem ou denúncia desse anacronismo, uma possibilidade de reescrita do conceito pela sua rasura. Almeida filma uma noite em um restaurante brasileiro frequentado por pessoas pertencentes a uma classe social média-alta, ou economicamente ascendente. Nessa noite, o que se assiste é ao processo de ruína do “homem” que dá lugar ao “animal” e promove, com isso, uma sobrescrita não apenas do homem como do humano. É essa reescrita violenta e manchada de sangue o que me interessa no filme. É isso o que apresento neste texto amparada pelo pensamento de Hélène Cixous (1995), Alexandre Nodari (2017) e Achille Mbembe (2018), pois, a meu ver, é esse processo que o longa brasileiro expõe tão linda e visceralmente encetando devires.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE

Animal cordial; homem cordial; cinema brasileiro; alteridade; devires

This essay is about the full-length film *O animal cordial*, by Gabriela Amaral Almeida (2018). I did an analysis based on the impact of the enjoyment of this work and influenced by what I have recently read on philosophy, sociology, anthropology and psychoanalysis. I remark that my intention was to present a perspective in which the script and the images gained specific connotations as the film was watched. I would say that the standpoint used to approach the film here begins with the choice of its title and the connection to the concept proposed by Sérgio Buarque de Holanda (1995). I am not making this link between the allusion and the historian who researched and theorized about the Brazilian colonial period in order to simply make a homage and review his concept. The complexity of the work of Almeida (2018) lies on a discussion about the process in which the expression “homem cordial” (therefore referred as “cordial man”), depicted as a reduction which can explain and is the foundation of a specific Brazilian ethos, is anchored on the abrasion, erasure, and on conceptual emptying of that term. This process happens through a cinematic aesthetics, as I hope that I have shown in this essay. The title establishes a bold connection with this concept which can be seen as a hint of how the cordiality notion proposed by the historian Holanda (1995) is not yet surpassed. However, what the film maker proposes with her work is an overcoming, an update of the signifier, located between the homage and the denunciation. When Almeida (2018) brings the expression on the film’s title, it is not to make the cordiality idea fit in the contemporary characters as outmoded outfits. Instead, it creates using the cinematic narrative a descent from the human to the animal, to what is genuinely pulsional in the so-called civilised citizens. The procedure is done in order to juxtapose and resignify the historical notion of cordiality. The essay approach to the film is about this process of corrosion. This process not only puts in question an ethos made notorious by an historiographic thesis, but also rewrites and sends back that label, and by doing so, widens the possibilities spectrum of the meaning of the famous expression.

The full-length film *O animal cordial* is set on the premises of an uppermiddle-class Brazilian restaurant, located in a big city in Brazil, in an area with scarce night life. We can understand this by the beginning of the movie: it is the end of the workday, and the employees begin to worry about the time they are leaving as the public transportation has limited schedule. The boss, Inácio (Murilo Benício), demands that they stay. He wants them to serve the costumers who had just arrived to have dinner, just a few minutes before the end of their workday. The situation seems to be recurrent and therefore the tension is noticeable.

An unfriendly atmosphere between boss and employees is pictured in the dialogues and in the composition of the restaurant’s claustrophobic environment. Djair (Iranthir Santos) is in charge of the kitchen, with two assistants. Sara (Luciana Paes), the waitress and right hand of the boss, shares with him the counter, located in the restaurant hall. At the dinner tables, a lonely man (Ernani Moraes, as Amadeo) waits his meal. The couple, Verônica (Camila Morgado) and Bruno (Jiddu Pinheiro), enters the restaurant and takes a long time to decide what to eat. When they order, they show in an arrogant fashion their knowledge about wines. Sara talks to one of the employees, Lúcio (Diego Avelino), and

it is easy to see an intimate relation in a private space. She is exhausted and complains about the fact her body aches. He asks her out, but the boss calls for her help because new costumers enter. She offers to serve them, letting Lucio go away.

The kitchen assistants, however, angrily leave and go through the restaurant hall letting the garbage. The door is always locked, so they just can't take it outside. The disrespectful behavior enrages the boss a bit more. For many reasons, he is about to explode. He, who has greasy hair and short-tempered quality, struggles to be in control of himself, but is visibly failing. Right after the employees left and when Sara was taking the garbage outside, she is captured at the door by two burglars (Humberto Carrão and Ariclones Barroso) that invade the restaurant, and this incident is what makes the wrath of the boss explode and leads the situation to its collapse.

THE CORDIAL MAN

Sérgio Buarque de Holanda, in *Raízes do Brasil*, has an entire chapter dedicated to the concept of cordial man. Holanda's enterprise is an interpretative effort concerning colonial Brazil and the origin of the patriarchal family. Those would be the basis of Brazilian society and would also structure relations in society. The historian understands that the Latin radical "cordis" (*cordas* – heart), and its transformation in an adjective used to read the Brazilian colonial man, talks about a surface cordiality. It would be just a behavioral act as one couldn't stand the weight of bureaucracy's impersonality and the split between the public and the private spheres. The origins of cordial man date back to the colonial period. He takes the familiar structure rooted on the autocratic, dominant, and trail-blazer figure of the father, and extends it to the different relations established in the public arena. For instance, working relations. Cordiality rises from the confusion between public and private spheres, constantly harassed by the omnipotent and omnipresent figure of the father. He is the colonial man and in front of him there is a world to conquer and destroy; he knows it all and can make anything he wants because he is permeated with the mission to break new ground towards the barbaric and hostile world. As a paladin of the phallogocentric logic of the world, he is the father, and with its law, he wants the best for the one's belonging to him. He expects no less than obedience, acknowledgment and gratitude.

I take the plot of the film from Almeida (2018) as a fable-telling and watch the characters through the operation of the structures they embody so I can read cordial man crisis on Murilo Benício's character. It is a perspective that questions a stereotype and asks to move forward with the apprehension of the title. Far from agreeing with it, an erasure is created. By writing above the concept, it ends up rectifying it. The title makes the labels come to scene to better dismantle them – to dismember them, I should say – without the illusion that they will simply go away. The film signals with becomings, although this fact doesn't imply the absence of a long and smelly death process and decomposition. In fact, it is exactly what is shown.

So, I bring back the cordial man by addressing Inácio, the boss. He is in crisis and in the middle of a breakdown, which happens when the burglars enter. He isn't accepted

nor respected by his employees; he is humiliated by the snob costumers; he argues with his wife on the telephone, he breaks the bathroom soap dispenser and says to his wife he isn't on edge as he even smiles. He does nothing but smile to her, to the costumers, to everyone. He can't stand no more the frayed mask of cordiality he keeps and can't stand to see his power fading away. His anger comes as he sees that being the boss can't secure his power.

Gourmetization [Gourmetização], as it is frequently called, is a Brazilian market trend. It consists on creating demand on products and services that people see as high quality. When a product is sold as "gourmet", many times even written in their label print, a superior status is forged. Therefore, the overpriced costs of these products and services are seen as reasonable by those who can access them. Their costumers become a superior class of people as they can identify the best products and obtain them. When it comes to the "gourmet" logic of consumption, the restaurant's owner needs to know a lot about wine and food, as their costumers are members of a caste that demand "the best". His costumers are emergent, travelled, informed and pretentiously refined elite people, and as a result of their economic and social ascent, they seek to show off. He must then become more professional and invest in his business. However, when he reacts to the burglary using the gun he had in the counter, he is trying to retake the power he is losing.

One of the burglars, who had already molested the client and was intending to do the same with Sara, is shot by Inácio. The young man falls on the floor. Inácio doesn't let anyone help him or call the cops. His hatred eclodes at this moment, which is also a chance to get even with those who were menacing his façade cordiality. The blood bath then begins and inserts the movie in the horror genre cinematic tradition, attaching the movie to subgenres known as "slasher", "gore" and "giallo".

He enjoys the sadistic behavior as he slowly kills each and everyone around him, seem by him as enemies. It is the driver of his violence. Inácio is cold and has no rush to kill. He is thrilled to see the fear on his desperate victims and is delighted with the terror he inflicts before killing them. The burglar shot in the chest is the first to die. The second victim is Verônica, the snob client, that asks to be alone in the bathroom, but ends up shot by Inácio when she tries to escape. Amadeo, the ex-cop, is the third, unmasked in his pursue to give meaning to his empty life by becoming a martyr when he tries to dissuade Inácio from keep killing.

The second burglar dies right after, not without first confessing Sara was in fact his wife and that she conceived the crime's plan. Inácio cuts his neck with a knife, the same he uses to cut Djair's long hair, who was just next to the burglar and watched his execution. Djair believes he is next, but he doesn't become scared: he throws insults at his boss, showing he understands what is happening with this man who decided to unleash his anger and urge to kill. Djair provokes him by saying the boss couldn't stand the fact that the restaurant relies on his food: his business' success depending on the food of a homosexual, *nordestino*¹, with long-hair and thin eyebrows: "your problem, Inácio", yells Djair, "is with my butthole" (*O animal cordial*, 2018).

¹ Man from the Northeast Region of Brazil, many times target of prejudice from southern region people. The region is associated with a pulsating cultural expression despite this fact.

Djair isn't killed at that moment. With his hair cut, he comes back to the kitchen. He knows his end will come later, like the cherry on the cake, and the killer is going to savor the bruises he inflicts. The lawyer is the next to die, Bruno. He had already lost his wife and any trace of dignity. There's urine all over him and the boss tells Sara she should kill him to prove her loyalty. Inácio's gesture is nothing but a trap and Sara is unmasked. With the gun in her hands for the second time, she tries to shoot the restaurant owner and then realizes she was given the toy gun used in the burglary.

I emphasise that Lúcio, the employee who had left, is spared from the slaughter for the second time. He comes back to pick up his forgotten cell phone, but Sara doesn't let him come in. He is black, and I here point out an unusual decision when it comes to scripts of this cinematic genre. Black people are, especially in Hollywood film industry, usually in supporting roles. In general, they are the first to be cast off when the killing happens. I read in this film's decision a proposition of a *becoming-black*, accordingly to Achille Mbembe (2018). This goes beyond the field of the identitarian representation. It puts in question the own semantics of the word "Black" as a heritage of a "colonial library" that fabricates the black as "fiction of the Other" (Mbembe, 2018, p. 170).

THE CORDIAL ANIMAL

Verônica, the snob and rich client dies, who had tried to bribe the employee to let her scape, is killed. After, Sara ransacks her dead body. She takes her earrings, opens her purse and puts on the lipstick she finds. Not without first playing with the false eyelashes of the corpse, using them as a moustache and laughing at /in the face of the deceased woman. Sara didn't shoot Verônica, but I understand she is an accomplice of her death. Both Sara and Inácio are responsible for the murders that took place there. Sara's actions make me think about the killer Araweté², indicating a comparison between their practices by the difference of their approach. Not at all like Sara, the killer of the indigenous ethnic group afore mentioned believes he assimilates the spirit of the one he knocked down in an even fight. Also, he must go away from the weapons and his pairs, otherwise his enemy's fury, now merged with him, could lead him to harm his cherished ones. He pays attention to the differences of perspective on how to re-cognise the other, the enemy. The warrior actions show respect, the acknowledgement of the strength, and the fear of contamination. Oppositely, the character from the movie shows utter contempt for the woman and is interested on her belongings.

Sara goes to the dead woman to mock her and strip her props for her own use. They were Verônica's weapons in the war they fought, and they made her distinct by putting

² Eduardo Viveiros de Castro casts light on the matter proposing the merge between killer and enemy is permanent, so it implies a becoming-other of the one who kills. The perspective that emerges from tupi-guarani anthropophagy takes in account the ability one carries to see oneself as Other, from another point of view, not alike the original, as the anthropologist highlights. This conception of the enemy as whom you merge with by the end of the battle, he also states, assumes he has full humanity and a social relation established with this Other by seeing him as something other than a thing "(material system, anonymous body, animal automate)". He is not alike him (as one you wouldn't kill), but a robust and different-from-himself adversary, with whom you battle in even conditions. By the end of it, the enemy is not scornfully annihilated but become instead part of the singularity of the killer, as the enemy's own position is absorbed.

her rival in submission. However, it isn't a battle between qualities of one singularity against the other, but one of power and status gained by what one is (or isn't) carrying and possessing: the best and the most expensive products. Sara takes the ostentation out of the other, that belongs to the other. Sara despises her as enemy, as another person with whom is established some sort of relation. Therefore, there's a perpetuation of patriarchal syntax of spoliation as a form of domination and origin of power. Her actions make her feel powerful there, in the restaurant. The place is turned to a social microsphere, where the phallic law prevails in all the splendor of its potency, handed by Inácio, with whom Sara insists on establishing a relation that alternates between submission and competition.

Since the film's first shots, Sara mischievous glances going down-up signal there is something hidden. An expectation, a secret plan, or wishes perhaps concealed even from herself. At first, when the burglary happens, Sara seems to be only reacting to the facts, and using the opportunities she can to be noticed and valued by Inácio. Only after, when the burglar makes his confession, she reveals herself as the architect of the unsuccessful raid. Sara speaks ill of her colleagues, she rats on the ex-cop who suggests calling the police, she betrays her supposed accomplice and lover letting Inácio kill him. She also betrays Inácio both times she has the gun in her hand: at first, by ordering him to take his clothes off; and the second time, when tested in her fidelity, she turns the gun on him to try to kill him.

To what/whom is Sara faithful? What does she want? Where does she want to get? After all, what does the woman want?, is the Freudian question popping out Djair mouth's calling Sara to face and locate her enjoyment. Sara's bursting libido is noticed more and more as the script develops. Since the film's beginning, when Inácio is distracted and his arm accidentally bumps hers behind the counter where they work together, the employee reaction is put on spot. She desires him sexually and hates him altogether. This ambivalence un-balances her. The sex scene therefore mimics the disembarrassment peak of the stiff sexual hunger that hatches only by flowing all the violence sustaining it, hence the stratospheric orgasm of her convulsing body over Inácio's happening in the scene where she dictates the terms and time. Inácio, stretched on the floor, is more a spectator than a partner in her climax. She contorts with complete fulfilment, her body bathed in blood over a phallus she boldly takes for herself, as if she was taking the reins of her horse-ride.

When Sara reaches her climax an animal hunger is released inside her. She goes to the kitchen and eats up a meat on the bone, she snarls at the client-playboy and hears, once more, Djair's questions about what does she really want and where all her actions were leading her. Djair summons her outside of the gory horror, invites her to stop condoning her sadistic drive and asks her to untie his hands. The questions make Sara silent, and they bounce somewhere inside and come back. That is noticed because Sara leaves but after, in a different opportunity, decides to release Djair.

The character analysis comes to show how the film's title creates an erasure in "cordial man" concept of Holanda (1995). As Inácio embodies that structure of the humanist decline, what we watch is the moment of man's collapse and the animal's victory.

The animal, in the lapse of the clumsy movement and when the act fails, flees from the leash and doesn't know exactly where to go. That is how Sara stands there, at her owner/master feet, not knowing if she should destroy him, flee, or give up and stay. She agreed on joining the game in which she was thrown since, one day, she understood herself as a woman and decided to flip the tabletop. But she doesn't know if she should pick up the pieces, leave the table, or keep on playing. In my point of view, it is the Hegelian dialectic structure: there is no space for the developed living other that rises in the difference. The dialectics of annihilation is exposed and shred in the film through the (non-)relation between the man and the woman lead by Inácio and Sara.

Hélène Cixous (1995) proposes the existence of a logic which works by placing the woman as a discursive construction and by doing so reaffirms the primacy of the phallus. The woman is the "taste and danger" which exists as a depository instance of all mystery, evil and enchantment. One must guard a proper distance from her as to keep order, morality and reason untouched. The woman dehumanization here has a reciprocity with the procedures used in the constitution of the black as a "racial subject"³, which is another effect of the primacy of the phallus. The woman, Cixous (1995) states, since she starts to speak, therefore since her constitution as a subject, embodies her name as Africa, and she is "black" (Cixous, 1995, p. 20). Consequently, the woman identifies herself with all the spectrum of meanings attached to the terrible discursive construction which institutes, subjugates and put apart the black from the world, and mostly from himself. The woman is the dark and dangerous continent because dark is dangerous, in pitch dark no one sees. Fear of the dark has been internalized and puts the woman apart from herself, from what she wants.

I see the film as the process of that woman undressing herself, facing animality, and detaching herself (but not entirely) from humanity (as the phallic-hetero-eurocentric conception) in order to be in a horizontal position towards different worlds. From this place of animality and difference a cordiality emerges. It is not some kind of pantomime to better control and dominate the other, but a true cordiality born from alterity. To think about this original understanding of cordiality implies the erasure and rewriting of two sentences: 1. "the woman is black" and 2. "the woman is bisexual". Both procedures, as to say, begin with the question Djair emphasizes. It keeps on being inserted during the film of Almeida (2018), in Sara's ears, perforating those syntagmas.

I think about these re-writings as ways to subtract the human mask: when the cynicism masks fall gradually in the restaurant with Sara and Inácio undressing and dropping

³ When Achille Mbembe describes the historical process of the institution of race, he argues of a primary way to represent. Outer and complex worlds which couldn't be accessed nor understood were reduced to simplifications, making them inferior. The process is based on prejudices and happened in the called gregarious phase of Western thought. Mbembe argues the black, in this sense, is constantly produced, therefore leading to a "body-thing", a "body entirely subject to the master's will" (Mbembe, 2018, p. 42). He defends the black reason consists in a "pretentiously erudite system of narratives and discourses" forging a single African origin spoken on behalf of black people, despite their own opinions. It is about discourse and practice inventing the black as "racial subject and savage exteriority, fit for moral disregard and practical use as tools" (Mbembe, 2018, pp. 60-61). Race would then have the duty to create a simulacrum, to mask the human face so it wouldn't recognise itself in the other that annoyingly gives back an image of the one who sees. Consequently, the race veil must be covered to stop a relation from being established, therefore the other won't point the deformity of the I.

their decencies, politeness, and taboos. The film rewrites the sentences blurring the syntax as the script doesn't cast off the black and the homosexual, and as consequence it points to becomings.

BECOMINGS LÚCIO AND DJAIR

Lúcio, Sara and Djair are the characters who end up alive. It is important to return to the character Lúcio as he was spared from being killed twice: at first, when Sara accepts the request to stay longer in the restaurant and let him leave; and secondly, when he comes back late night to bring the cell phone he had forgotten. Sara then convinces Inácio to leave him out of the slaughter by keeping him from coming in. I understand this is the animal cordiality that only happens in the difference. When Sara looks at Lúcio, an image of herself comes back to her, and she doesn't acknowledge it as such. She doesn't identify with it. She holds this difference by feeling imposed to acknowledge this other and to act: she leaves him out of the terror, out of the zone of violence. Such is the rewriting the script does, disjoining the "woman is black" (*O animal cordial*, 2018) construction. The woman is not black as she can see, beneath the mask of racism, an image of dissimilarity to herself. She can see him as another being who doesn't belong in that butchery. Consequently, she sees this other as carrier of a perspective. Therefore, he is going to give her back a different image than the one she has about herself. She doesn't leave with him, showing she is attached to the bones with the killing spree. Letting him out of it, however, signals to an opening to the perspective of the other. In this sense I understand Lúcio as a character points to a becoming, the becoming-black of Sara.

Lúcio is outside the restaurant. On the other hand, Djair is about to leave. He picks up his hair scraps and asks Sara to get up and also leave. She stays there because she still has work to do. Sara needs to kill and butcher the cordial man. She won't leave, she is soaked in blood. Not only because, alongside with the cordial man, she feasted herself of all the violence associated with phallic supremacy, but due to the fact she herself is made from pieces of the shattered image of this man. Sara is still alive but doesn't leave for she is unable to do so. It is not about some need for revenge. The butchering she must finish is going to let her flee to then hide behind some alibi, but that is not the reason as well. She is part of that old order, she helped building it and now she helps to bring it down. She knows the fall of this cordial man is also the end of a reasonable and sensible woman, submissive to cordiality.

I see the cordial animal as the transition itself, and it needs to embody that transitory condition so it can glimpse becomings. He/she rises from the struggle, the confrontation against patriarchal/patronal order. He/she knows the asymmetrical opposite can't be unleashed. It would mean the adherence to the same logic, but from another bias. Sara, from her cordial animal condition, doesn't leave the restaurant because deep inside she knows "the man is the one who knows himself, recognise himself as such, knows his own self, re-cognise his self in his pairs, his species, those that are his image and his likeness, his mirrors" (Nodari, 2017, p. 26). Opposed to this kind of recognition, which

is no more than a projection of the self onto the other, Alexandre Nodari (2017) proposes literature, and arts too, would in general evoke the fable-telling possibility, functioning as

deforming mirrors [that] put on the spot the deferral (or refraction) of the images of the human, stating the defamiliarization of the self (to *other*⁴ oneself) as a singular procedure of knowledge (and even from one's own self: the best perspective one can have about oneself is that the other brings, and I here use a central motto from Eduardo Viveiros de Castro). (Nodari, 2017, p. 26)

The anthropologist brings this other, the same from Derrida (2011) when he claims one must be naked in front of this other so that it would be possible to start to think. This other doesn't recognise me as a naming living being and doesn't answer me in the language I pretentiously use to name him. To get naked in front of him would be to offer him a perspective, and this would give back an impression about me different than one I could wish to have before another man. The word animal is "a name [men] have forged to give to the living other, based on self-given right and authority" (Derrida, 2011, p. 48). The philosopher, however, takes the rupture in account, and doesn't ignore the immense distance between man and animal. He proposes to thicken that margin, to fold it, to make it complicated, to multiply it. This would show the power of a freer thought and less obtuse, less caught in the narcissistic act of naming wrapped in the *sui*-referential deictic: "I". Derrida (2011) blames the history of Western thought for what he sees: an autobiography mantells by himself to himself, as he pretentiously intends to be presented in the present and to eliminate the possibility to be seen, above all things naked, by a different species. In other words, he escapes the perception of himself from another point of view and its acuity. That said, I bring Sara again to say she undresses her humanity before whomever may look. Her body can be seen from other perspectives, like in the sequence where she voraciously eats in the kitchen, in front of everyone.

Considering all this, I think she releases the becoming-Djair or, in the sense Cixous (1995) brings, bisexuality as a place of nurturing and coexistence with the difference, not as a "neuter" spot⁵. So, the "queer", the trans, the woman-man, the man-woman, are released. And so is the freedom to look outside and inside, and from another perspective that crosses the lines put by sexual and thought structures. Not even by a moment Djair agrees with the horror taking place there. He talks to the locked characters as to calm them down, so they can keep some serenity and sometimes even to try helping them transcending the horror. This is also shown when he keeps on questioning Sara, and when he "prepares" a family recipe to the man tainted in fear. Like someone who offers some support and some comfort.

⁴ The noun "other" here functions as a verb.

⁵ Cixous (1995) addresses two bisexuality meanings: the fantasy of a "total" being which would replace the fear of castration and veil the sexual difference, the last one being marked by a mythical split. Here the bisexual would be closer to an asexuated being, made of two halves and not of two genders. The other bisexuality the philosopher brings doesn't enclose the subject in the "Phallogocentric Performing Theater", as she puts it. Both sexes are inside oneself and they reveal themselves according to each one's singularity.

Djair, by the way, had resigned his job in the restaurant a month before. He had already left the company for some time then and he wasn't part of the team anymore. His pleasure is somewhere else: in the plants he rejoices on watering, in the dance, in his boyfriend. He doesn't tie himself to the sick and hellish environment of the restaurant. His desire can be located on his body, in his hair he gets from the floor. He will have to work through the mourning of his dissatisfaction. It is a violent loss, but it also tells us how unable the cordial man is when trying to resist his drive and to stop the fire consuming him. Djair's hair is life's impertinence in its imperishable and imputrescible form, and it will keep on growing as he survived that night. Hair on a corpse keep on growing far from the corpse so they would grow anyway. Inscribed in the hair lies a powerful image of the body defying death and, even in death, life persists on being present, body manufacturing, and taking space.

The film doesn't end when Djair leaves with dignity, and instead takes us back to Sara's body. Astonishing, naked and bloodstained is her body, and the character is set on dealing with the cordial man's remains. There is a parallel to be drawn between Djair's position and Lúcio's. The first erases the phantom bisexuality and shows the space that touch and tenderness have in his body; the other defies black colonial semantics. Both point to an escape route and signal to the open space, and they link us to the wider possibilities of worlds outside the restaurant's enclosure. Despite all blood and slime that Gabriela's film offers, we can dream about exchanges, naming possibilities, delegations, mutualities and reciprocities that embrace the *All-World*, remembering the vigorous expression Mbembe (2018) uses.

Translation: Roberto Murilo Xavier Reis

REFERENCES

- Almeida, G. A. [Director] (2018). *O animal cordial* [Film]. Brasil: California Filmes.
- Cixous, H. (1995). La joven nacida. In H. Cixous (Ed.), *La risa de la Medusa: ensayos sobre la escritura* (pp. 13-107). Barcelona: Anthropos ; Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid. Consejo de Educación. Dirección General de la Mujer' ; San Juan: Universidad de Puerto Rico.
- Derrida, J. (2011). *O animal que logo sou*. São Paulo: Editora Unesp.
- Holanda, S. B. (1995). *Raízes do Brasil*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras.
- Mbembe, A. (2018). *Crítica da Razão Negra*. São Paulo: n-1 edições.
- Nodari, A. (2017). Filozooftia. *Revista Canguru*, 2, 21-27. Retirado de https://issuu.com/revista_canguru/docs/canguru_02
- Viveiros de Castro, E. (2013). A imanência do inimigo. In E. Viveiros de Castro (Ed.), *A inconstância da alma selvagem e outros ensaios de antropologia* (p. 267-294). São Paulo: Cosac Naify.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Fernanda Ribeiro Marra (Universidade de Brasília – UnB) studies Literary Theory (PhD in progress) on Programa de Pós-Graduação da Universidade de Brasília, researching the work of Argentinian poet Alejandra Pizarnik. From 2008 to 2015 she kept the blog *Marés e Ressacas* where she published her own poetic work, which now is going to be gathered in the book *taipografia*, by martelo casa editorial. The author also has critique published in Brazilian academic journals such as Landa, Entrelaces e Versalete.

Email: dizamarra@gmail.com

Address: Universidade de Brasília, Campus Universitário Darcy Ribeiro, Brasília-DF | CEP 70910-900, Brasil

* Submitted: 06-09-2018

* Accepted: 02-01-2019