



THE ABSENCE OF LITERATURE IN THE NATIONAL CURRICULAR COMMON BASE FOR HIGH SCHOOL

A AUSÊNCIA DA LITERATURA NA BASE NACIONAL COMUM CURRICULAR PARA O ENSINO MÉDIO

LA AUSENCIA DE LITERATURA EN LA BASE CURRICULAR NACIONAL COMÚN DE LA ESCUELA SECUNDARIA

Nathalia Soares Fontes¹
Fabiano Antonio Santos²

Abstract: Is there a place for teaching literature on the National Common Curriculum Base for High School? Is its presence important to the formation of humanization in individuals? The paper answers that, although it plays a founding role in the process of appropriation of the humanities, the teaching of literature is absent in the new document proposed by the Brazilian Ministry of Education. The starting point is the exacerbated pragmatism and spontaneity that pushes away school content to the detriment of an immediate teaching based on the development of skills and abilities as responses to the problems generated in this society. The analysis is made from a literary education perspective that enables the aesthetic enjoyment and the process of human objectification. It is argued that literature, as classical knowledge, should be in schools and, above all, converge with its learning objectives, which enable the construction of humanization and lead the individual to aesthetic catharsis. To this end, a documental analysis is carried out, establishing relationships between the theory of Marxist aesthetics and the approach to literature in the new regulatory document, highlighting points considered relevant for the formation of an emancipatory education.

Keywords: BNCC. Literature. Humanization.

Resumo: Há lugar para o ensino de literatura na Base Nacional Comum Curricular para o Ensino Médio? Sua presença é importante para a formação da humanização nos indivíduos? O artigo responde que, embora exerça papel fundante para o processo de apropriação das humanidades, o ensino de literatura é ausente no novo documento proposto pelo Ministério da Educação do Brasil. O ponto de partida é o pragmatismo e espontaneísmo exacerbados que afastam os conteúdos escolares em detrimento de um ensino imediatista e pautado no desenvolvimento de competências e habilidades como respostas aos problemas gerados nesta sociedade. A análise é feita a partir de

¹ Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Pantanal, Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil.

² Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Pantanal, Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil.

uma perspectiva da educação literária que viabilize a fruição estética e o processo de objetivação humana. Defende-se que a literatura, como conhecimento clássico, deve estar nas escolas e, sobretudo, convergir com seus objetivos de aprendizagem, os quais possibilitem a construção da humanização e leve o indivíduo à catarse estética. Para tanto, realiza-se uma análise documental, estabelecendo relações entre a teoria da estética marxista e a abordagem de literatura no novo documento regulador, destacando pontos considerados relevantes para a formação de uma educação emancipadora.

Palavras-chave: BNCC. Literatura. Humanização.

Resumen : ¿Hay un lugar para la enseñanza de la literatura en la Currículo Nacional Base Común para lo ensino secundário? ¿Es su presencia importante para la formación de la humanización de los individuos? El artículo responde que, aunque ejerce un papel fundador en el proceso de apropiación de las humanidades, la enseñanza de la literatura está ausente en el nuevo documento propuesto por el Ministerio de Educación de Brasil. El punto de partida es el pragmatismo y la espontaneidad exacerbados que alejan los contenidos escolares en detrimento de una enseñanza inmediata basada en el desarrollo de habilidades y destrezas como respuesta a los problemas generados en esta sociedad. El análisis se hace desde una perspectiva de educación literaria que permite la fruición estética y el proceso de objetivación humana. Se argumenta que la literatura, como conocimiento clásico, debe estar en las escuelas y, sobre todo, convergir con sus objetivos de aprendizaje, que hacen posible la construcción de la humanización y conducen al individuo a la catarsis estética. Para ello se realiza un análisis documental, estableciendo relaciones entre la teoría de la estética marxista y el abordaje de la literatura en el nuevo documento normativo, destacando los puntos considerados relevantes para la formación de una educación emancipatoria.

Palabras clave: BNCC. Literatura. Humanización.

1 INTRODUCTION

Art, and therefore literature, are human productions which, according to Lukács (1966, p. 11), represent a peculiar way in which the human being reflects reality. Thus, man, inserted in a concrete world, produces art as a reflection of social reality. However, it is not only a simple reflection of it, but the result of a process of abstractions and construction of concepts. In this formulation, man conceives a series of thoughts about reality and creates the work of art from it. This reflection is not the only way for man to interact with social reality, since philosophical and scientific reflections also originate from it; however, art differs from the reflections of the same reality produced in the sphere of daily life or produced in the sphere of science.

We understand that literary art allows for aesthetic catharsis – a moment of rising consciousness to a higher level of understanding of social practice, which can promote a change in world conception – which is often denied when literature is relegated to a secondary level in the school context.



The National Curricular Common Base for High School (BNCC-EM), object of analysis of this paper, treating literature as secondary content, inserted in the field of the Portuguese language, particularly associated with a utilitarian vision, does not offer, in our understanding, all the potential it has for the formation of the human race. The analysis of the document was oriented from the materialistic conception of literary art and the valorization of teaching, which makes humanization possible in the individual. We take aesthetics as an element to corroborate this analysis, more specifically the contributions of Georg Lukács, whose perspective understands the ontology of the social being - the man inserted in a historical and social context, which is constituted in society - by work.

The general principles of Marxist literature aesthetics and history are thus found in the doctrine of historical materialism. Only from historical materialism can the genesis of art and literature be understood, the laws of its development, its transformations, the lines of ascension and fall within the process of the whole (LUKÁCS, 1965, p. 14, our translation).

We consider, therefore, Lukács' works and studies concerning Lukacsian aesthetics in order to establish the criteria of artistic analysis, which includes all human production coming from social relations, including literary art. What is aimed at with literary teaching is the appropriation of literary literacy, defined by the High School Curricular Guidelines "as the state or condition of those who are not only capable of reading poetry or drama, but who effectively appropriate it through the aesthetic experience, enjoying it" (BRAZIL, 2006, p. 55, our translation).

By understanding the importance of teaching literature at school for the formation of the human being, we highlight the need for an incursion into the assumptions found in BNCC-EM, analyzing its objectives and the approach directed to literary teaching.

This article, the result of a master's thesis, aims to understand to what extent the work proposed by BNCC-EM can build or deconstruct art as a process of objectification of humankind from Marxian-lukacsian thought. The choice for the National Curricular Common Base for High School was made because we consider that the changes employed in its versions demonstrate, in a general way, how the focus of the training is on instrumental education, based on skills and competencies.

Starting from the materialistic conception of literary art and the valorization of teaching, which makes humanization possible in the individual. To corroborate this analysis, we take elements of the Lukacsian aesthetic. We seek to answer questions from the onto-historical conception of the human essence, in which it relates the formation of the social being – man and nature – from work.



Besides the formative aspects of Literature, we demonstrate how the BNCC-EM is centered on spontaneous teaching, making difficult the relationship of construction that work with artistic, scientific, cultural and philosophical contents can offer, when they take catharsis as a foundational aspect. It is precisely this theme, the teaching of literature at school as a tool for mediation between action and thought, that we highlight as fundamental to work from an emancipatory perspective, and for this reason, we present the limitations of BNCC-EM, which, even having aspects that seem to take literature from a critical perspective, come up against the essence that underlies BNCC-EM, teaching based on skills and abilities.

2 LITERARY ART AND ITS FORMATIVE ASPECTS

According to Duarte (2013), art should be seen as a specific form of objectification of the human race, that is, the human being relates to social reality through the transfer of the subjects' activities to the objects.

[...] It is the transformation of the subjects' activity into property of the objects. This occurs with material objects, such as the production of instruments, as well as with non-material objects, such as language and knowledge (DUARTE, 2013, p. 65, our translation).

This process is part of the most general constitution of the human being, contributing to its humanization. The origin of art comes from the immanent need of the social practice generated by work, since it is through work that man connects with material reality. From this reality is generated the philosophical, scientific and artistic knowledge, making the individual reflect on his condition in order to objectify his thoughts, findings and emotions, awakening senses that would not be perceived in everyday life.

The effort to understand the genesis of the aesthetic reflex and its implication in the process of human objectification is linked to the complex forms arising from work, whose levels of development have surpassed nature and have come to imply a corresponding reflection of the concrete exterior world.

In this sense, dealing with the abstract forms of the artistic reflex also presupposes an understanding of the genesis of the work and the forms of consciousness arising from it. Man has complexed his work activity throughout the process of its development until it gained specific characteristics, particularities of an essentially aesthetic activity. We know, then, that the subject-object relationship began on the basis of men's material life, that is, work, the practical activity that separated man from nature, that transformed it into an object of human activity itself and, by effect, made man a subject. Work is the first form of relationship between man and



the surrounding world. It is the foundation, the foundation of the different forms of consciousness, or reflection of material life. The work necessarily implies a corresponding reflection of the concrete external world. This premise is the proof of the priority of being over consciousness. In other words, the idea is not opposed to being, the idea of the world does not pre-exist to the factual world, to objective and concrete reality. However, the human consciousness gradually acts upon the being, submitting it to the objectives of the action previously established by the consciousness (FERREIRA, 2010, p. 122, our translation).

Art (literary), as an objective product of reality and originating from man's need, has great importance for the elevation of human consciousness over its own reality. According to Duarte (2009), works of art are effective in awakening and elevating human self-consciousness to a deeper relationship, generating the transposition of the subject's reality "in itself/to itself", which starts to understand deeply the external world. This concept of transposition, "in-itself/to-itself" of the subject, is explained by Lukács (1970) as the continuous development of social relations by human beings, in which they overcome spontaneous sociability, assuming the consciousness of the forces performed in these practices.

The aesthetic reflection creates, on the one hand, reproductions of reality in which the in-itself being of objectivity is transformed into a to-us being of the world represented in the individuality of the work of art; on the other hand, in the efficacy exercised by such works, it awakens and elevates human self-consciousness; when the receptive subject experiences – in the manner referred to above – such a reality in itself, a to-itself of the subject is born in him, a self-consciousness, which is not hostilely separated from the outside world, but rather signifies a richer and deeper relationship of an external world conceived with richness and depth, to man as a member of society, class, nation, as a self-conscious microcosm in the macrocosms of the development of mankind (LUKÁCS, 1970, p. 274-275, our translation).

Through the thoughtful reproduction of reality, individuals are enabled to experience knowledge and self-knowledge in relation to social practices, enabling their formation because, by clarifying what is naturalized in everyday life, man achieves greater understanding of common practices and, thus, in a conscious manner, can choose to perpetuate or modify them. In this dialectic, besides a change in his practices, man modifies himself by means of understanding about reality.

Art is an important formulation for the understanding of phenomena not yet experienced and perceived by the individual, besides being an enabler of man's contact with himself through the objective feeling. Literature, specifically, according to Candido (1972), is the objectification of reality through language. Thus, as an artistic form, it is possible to seize reality through the illusionary and, through this manipulation, the individual reflects reality in a thoughtful way.



Art, and therefore literature, is a transposition of the real to the illusory through a formal stylization of language, which proposes an arbitrary type of order for things, beings, feelings. It combines an element of attachment to natural or social reality, and an element of technical manipulation, indispensable to its configuration, and implying an attitude of gratuitousness (CANDIDO, 1972, p. 53, our translation).

Yet for this author, literature is a human creation to objectify his emotions through technical manipulation. Thus, through this objectification, man meets its own feelings, however, exteriorized. Moreover, literature allows man to experience the dramas of humanity of all times, both in the past and the projection of the future.

By providing man with the experience of facts that never occurred as if it were experiencing, literature, through the process of internalization, can make possible his contact with new experiences, thus, it is possible for the subject to elevate his knowledge through these indirectly experienced relationships and also rethink his ways of life through contact with the new.

Given such potential, the teaching of literary art has the possibility of awakening a sharpening in the perception of the reader, leading him to a high level of understanding of social relations. As we will follow in the sequence, the teaching of literature proposed in BNCC-EM is not close to an expanded view of literary art (regardless of the epistemological matrix assumed), presenting exactly a contrary and utilitarian view. BNCC-EM proposes to work with literature based on an exacerbated spontaneity, in a rather utilitarian view of teaching the Portuguese language. Spontaneity is a problem if we consider the importance of mediation in the teaching of literary art.

3 THE TEACHING OF LITERATURE AT SCHOOL: NECESSARY MEDIATIONS BETWEEN THOUGHT AND ACTION

The teaching of school content is the primary action and social function of the school and has the teacher as the main mediator of this process (SANTOS; ZANARDINI; MARQUES, 2020). This statement, as evident as it may seem to us, generates a series of controversies, especially by those who defend teaching from a pragmatic/active perspective. By accusing this premise of “content maker”, they do not consider that the teaching of school knowledge is capable of generating impacts on the subjects' social practice. The assumption of criticism takes as a truth that the contents taught can be accumulated in the minds of students without causing mediations between the thinking of these subjects and their practical action (DUARTE, 2016; LIBÂNEO; SILVA, 2020; DUARTE; MAZZEU; DUARTE, 2020).



The teaching of scientific, artistic and philosophical knowledge is part of the specificity of school education, ended through classical content. This formulation, widely discussed by Saviani and Duarte (2010), takes as its principle that the teaching of the classics should be a reference for the new generations that seek to understand the human objectives produced throughout history.

Teaching is the encounter of various forms of human activity: the activity of knowing the world summarized in the school contents, the activity of organizing the conditions necessary for educational work, the activity of teaching by the teacher and the activity of study by students (DUARTE, 2016, p. 59, our translation).

The teaching of school content should not be considered as a mechanical activity of knowledge transmission, much less of skills and competencies that should be assimilated by students, as if they were empty containers to be filled.

In the immediate contemporary logic, present even at BNCC-EM, the teaching of school contents has acquired pragmatic purposes, linked to human development to meet the interests of capitalist formation. This can be observed in the defense, for example, of teaching not based on classical school content, but on skills and competencies. BNCC-EM explains this immediate and pragmatic conception, affirming that its objective is to lead students to develop 10 general competences. To this end, they define competences such as:

[...] the mobilization of knowledge (concepts and procedures), skills (practical, cognitive and socio-emotional), attitudes and values to solve complex demands of daily life, the full exercise of citizenship and the world of work (BRASIL, 2017, p. 8, our translation).

It is possible to perceive the defense of teaching by competencies as a pragmatic activity, focused on the mobilization of concepts, procedures and skills for the resolution of demands. This is how, as we will follow, the teaching of literature proposed by BNCC-EM distances itself from the defense we make about the teaching of school contents. The pragmatic approach to the teaching of literature follows the perspective of the school model developed by capitalist society.

In the 18th century, with the organization of the bourgeois state, literacy and reading teaching began to be intensified due to the demands of this new social model, in order to disseminate the values adopted, which saw the school as an institution that would be responsible for this and, in literature, the possibility of validating the choices adopted. In this context, the current pedagogy intensively promoted reading for the propagation of Enlightenment ideas, which responded to the desires of the bourgeoisie that needed the modification of the social thought of the time, reminiscent of previous aristocratic ideologies.



It is not occasional that the school affirms itself as an institution from that period on, nor that it should start its activity by teaching to read and write. Literacy converts each individual into a reader, introducing him/her to the singular universe of writing signs, whose employment is made habitual through continuous training. This is the terrain upon which the practice of reading is installed, whose assiduity further facilitates the absorption of the ideals that determine its universalization: the primacy of rationalism and scientific research; the belief in the transformative properties, from the individual and social point of view, of education; the appreciation of intellectual knowledge (ZILBERMAN, 2010, p. 17-18, our translation).

Therefore, it is not by valuing classical culture or intellectual knowledge that literature has maintained its unquestionable presence in the school curriculum. Its validity was linked to the introduction of social habits as standardized in order to give man a conduct. In the 19th century, England, for example, entrusted several functions to literature, which was understood as a special type of writing.

Transformed in matters of instruction in the colonies of the British Empire, it was in charge of giving the natives an appreciation of the greatness of England and involving them as grateful participants in a historic civilizing enterprise. In the domestic sphere, it could counteract the selfishness and materialism fostered by the new capitalist economy, offering the middle classes and aristocrats alternative values and giving the workers a mark in the culture that, materially, relegated them to a subordinate position. It would at the same time teach disinterested appreciation, provide a sense of national greatness, create a sense of camaraderie among the classes, and ultimately function as a substitute for religion, which seemed no longer capable of holding society together (CULLER, 1999, p. 42-43, our translation).

Although for centuries the teaching of literature has faced methodological changes, few have questioned its existence and value (which responded very well to the utilitarian interests of bourgeois society). But it is in the 20th century that its importance loses its centrality to the project of capitalist formation, ceasing to look at literature as a formative tool and considering it an auxiliary discipline to language teaching. In Brazil, a good example of the discrediting of literature in the school space is its change in curricula. Changes in names, insertions in sub-areas are relegating secondary role to its teaching. “The subject ‘Literature’ has been replaced in secondary education by ‘Expression and Communication’ and in higher education by ‘Languages, Codes and their Technologies’” (PERRONE-MOISÉS, 2008, p. 14, our translation).

All the literature teachers in activity since the second half of the last century have noticed these changes. Many felt helpless because the assumptions and methods in which they were formed had lost their validity. Others adhered to new assumptions and methods, **based on such a broad concept of literature that the**



word itself fell into disuse, losing by far to the word “culture”, in the programs and research developed in literary departments (PERRONE-MOISÉS, 2008, p. 14, our translation, our emphasis).

In spite of the hegemonic objectives of the teaching of literature in the contemporary world being linked to a determinist perspective, focused on the formation based on skills and abilities expected to increase the productivity of future workers, the classics continue to be worked at school, to have their counter-hegemonic importance. For this reason, considering that it is still possible to perceive the classics as connecting elements between thought and action, the permanence of literature as a subject in the school curriculum has been discussed, either by the vision that understands it as utilitarian or by the one that understands it in its onto-formative aspects. According to Duarte (2016), the choice to teach from a utilitarian view, or from a classical-humanist view, is part of human history itself and therefore carries the contradictions generated by class struggle. It is necessary to understand the contents in the historical course of social contradictions and their possibilities of full development of the human being. With this, to defend the teaching of the classics is to point out the possibility of manifesting the full development of humanity, it is to establish the contents as mediations between thought and reality.

In societies seeking to establish egalitarian regimes, the assumption is that everyone should have the possibility of moving from popular to erudite levels as a normal consequence of the transformation of structure, with a significant increase in the capacity of each one thanks to the increasing acquisition of knowledge and experience (CANDIDO, 2011, p. 190, our translation).

From this perspective, the most developed knowledge is that which allows free human objectification, the humanization of the individual. This is only possible if the teaching of literature goes beyond the immediate, the daily, offering tools for the student to advance on his knowledge. It is not, therefore, about mobilizing skills and competencies for the demands of complex life, as BNCC-EM defends, but precisely the opposite, not responding to training based on the demands of this society. “It is certain that the more egalitarian society is, and the more leisure it provides, the greater should be the humanizing diffusion of literary works, and therefore the possibility of contributing to the maturation of each one” (CANDIDO, 2011, p. 189, our translation).

By justifying the work with skills, BNCC-EM defends education based on meeting new social demands. In an apparently critical discourse, it sheds light on local culture, different contexts, collaborative training, etc.



In the new world scenario, recognizing oneself in its historical and cultural context, communicating, being creative, analytical-critical, participative, open to the new, collaborative, resilient, productive and responsible requires much more than the accumulation of information. It requires the development of skills to learn how to learn, to know how to deal with information increasingly available, to act with discernment and responsibility in the contexts of digital cultures, to apply knowledge to solve problems, to have autonomy to make decisions, to be proactive to identify the data of a situation and seek solutions, to live and learn from differences and diversities (BRASIL, 2017, p. 14, our translation).

As it is possible to observe in the passage above, the defense of skills and abilities gains a pragmatic outline, associating the formation of students with the supposed historical-social requirements. The system proposed by BNCC-EM of overvaluing spontaneous knowledge will be the object of analysis in the next section of this text.

4 SPONTANEITY AS THE CENTRAL AXIS OF LITERATURE TEACHING IN BNCC-EM

BNCC-EM stipulates the guidelines of the language area through fields of action, including here the artistic field. From the Base's perspective, language is analyzed as a practical tool. Therefore, its study aims at pragmatic knowledge, committing itself to the expansion of discursive potential and the evolution of its theoretical level. Still according to such understanding, the whole teaching-learning process must contribute so that the student can position himself ethically in his practices; therefore, it is the social demands that guide what should compose the literary content.

These demands require high schools to expand the situations in which young people learn to make and sustain decisions, make choices, and assume conscious and reflective positions based on the values of democratic society and the rule of law. They also demand that students be able to expand their knowledge, reaching a higher level of theorization and critical analysis, as well as the continuous exercise of discursive practices in various languages. **These practices aim at qualified participation in the world**, through the argumentation, formulation and evaluation of proposals and decision making guided by ethics and the common good (BRASIL, 2017, p. 477, our translation, our emphasis).

These fields of action start from everyday life to stipulate what is essential to be enhanced in students. In general terms, the artistic field “is the space of circulation of artistic manifestations in general, thus making it possible to recognize, value, enjoy and produce such manifestations, based on aesthetic criteria and the exercise of sensitivity” (BRASIL, 2017, p. 480, our translation). In it, the need for an artistic teaching that contributes pragmatically to the contact with artistic manifestations in general in order to get to know them and value them, besides enjoying them, that is, the artistic knowledge is replaced by the practical possibility. It also shows that the intention of interacting with the artistic manifestations is not because they are an objectification of reality and,



therefore, a knowledge that should be taught to the individual, but for their practical possibilities of fruition. Thus, the possibility of aesthetic catharsis is denied by omission, which, according to Duarte (2009), “is the process by which the receiving individual is placed aesthetically in confrontation with the essence of reality, through the overcoming, even if momentary, of the extensive and superficial heterogeneity proper to daily life” (p. 472, our translation).

According to Ferreira (2010), it is common for literature teaching to be emptied in the school context to the detriment of what justifies the very existence of literature.

A literary compendium is learned in an atrophied way, merely descriptive and superficial characteristics of a certain aesthetic posture and juxtaposed to this is the handling of records with summaries of literary works. The student is almost never led to carry out a real activity of reading the literary work, that is, he or she excludes from the teaching of literature that which justifies the very existence of literature: the aesthetic experience of the literary text by its readers (FERREIRA, 2010, p. 135, our translation).

BNCC-EM, in its formulation, presents seven specific competences for the area of Languages and its Technologies, of which only the competence six approaches the artistic productions and, in the name of fruition, reduces the literary activity.

To aesthetically appreciate the most diverse artistic and cultural productions, considering their local, regional and global characteristics, and to mobilize their knowledge about artistic languages to give meaning and (re)build individual and collective authorial productions, in a critical and creative way, with respect to the diversity of knowledge, identities and cultures (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation).

The specific literary teaching in this general presentation is implicit in the artistic field, since it constitutes a type of art manifestation. However, it assumes a conception of art learning in a general and fruition way, leaving to interpretation the knowledge that must be taught in the name of fruition and construction of senses. The first orientations we find present an idealistic vision of art, which can be pleasurable, while it has linguistic tools to conceive meanings. Moreover, we emphasize that these orientations are destined to the area of languages, therefore, all disciplines are oriented by the same fields and, in the case of art, it should be taught in all disciplines of the area, that is, it is about all artistic manifestations in a pragmatic way.

We understand that guidelines are given in a hierarchical manner; therefore, guidelines for the area are comprehensive and those for the artistic field of the discipline are specific. However, the specific ones should be guided by the general orientations. In this logic, the curriculum, focused on artistic issues, should be built primarily thinking about the appreciation of art, based on the



construction of senses and use of language in an elaborate way, with the objective of knowing the works and enjoy them. Also, as a point of arrival of the educational act, the document proposes that:

At the end of high school, young people should be able to enjoy artistic and cultural manifestations, understanding the role of different languages and their relationships in a work and appreciating them based on aesthetic criteria. They are also expected to realize that these criteria change in different contexts (local, global), cultures and times, being able to glimpse the historical and social movements of the arts (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation).

Therefore, the main goal of the arts to compose the school curricula is the learning of fruition. In this logic, art is seen only as a disinterested activity. This notion that artistic manifestations are linked to fun and contentment denies the conception of art as a specific form of knowledge that can lead to catharsis, which is the moment of intellectual ascension, that is, the student continues with his daily and immediate knowledge inside the school. Thus, the general formulation of the artistic field relegates art to the level of fluid and fun learning, which will superficially pass through theoretical criteria of learning, since the objective is only to enjoy them.

The competences of the area formulate the skills that should be developed in this field of learning. However, the artistic field turns to pleasure - appreciation - and to the mobilization of artistic language, that is, its approach emphasizes art for pleasure, and not for being a knowledge, and places it as learning destined to the mastery of its language to make practices feasible once again. Thus, it is up to all disciplines of the language area to develop it. These are the subjects:

(EM13LG601) To appropriate the artistic heritage and the body culture of movement from different times and places, understanding its diversity, as well as the processes of dispute for legitimacy. (EM13LG602) **To enjoy and appreciate aesthetically diverse artistic and cultural manifestations**, from local to world, as well as to participate in them, in order to continuously sharpen sensitivity, imagination and creativity. (EM13LG603) **To express and act in creative processes that integrate different artistic languages and aesthetic and cultural references**, using knowledge of diverse natures (artistic, historical, social and political) and individual and collective experiences. (EM13LG604) To relate the movement's artistic practices and body culture to the different dimensions of social, cultural, political, historical and economic life (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation, our emphasis).

The skills that students must acquire in the literary field, according to BNCC-EM, are linked to the enjoyment as a naturalized activity of the human being. The ability to enjoy is not considered as an action that must be learned. The result of this almost immanentism view of art is the negation of literary teaching in all its depth and cathartic possibilities. Catharsis, in literature, is related to the



student's ability to overcome immanent visions of literary art. Therefore, a vision completely different from that presented by BNCC-EM.

The skills reduce the teaching of literature to a spontaneous view, as if the ability to treat it and the effects it causes would be natural, spontaneous and immediate. The guidelines contained in the document point to the supremacy of pleasure and open space to consider literary art any work that causes a feeling of enjoyment in the student.

Consequently, or perhaps at the same time, by treating literary teaching as a spontaneous activity, the BNCC relegates the role of the teacher to a secondary level, as a facilitator of the whole process. Without becoming unilaterally directive, it is important, in our understanding, that the foundations of literature teaching are clearer so that the teacher can position himself in front of his activity. If there is no such positioning, the same *laissez faire* problem observed in the concept of enjoyment is found in the role that the teacher should occupy.

Again on the spontaneity of literature teaching, present in BNCC-EM, it is not possible to discern what is nuclear in its approach to literary teaching, since at the same time as it guides the work with the classics, it places as equally important the reading of popular and media (SAVIANI, 2011). After all, what is nuclear in this teaching? From this problem arises, therefore, the commitment of classical teaching at school.

To this end, this competence foresees that students can contact and explore local and global artistic and cultural manifestations, **both valued and canonical as well as popular and media**, current and from other times, always seeking to analyze the criteria and aesthetic choices that organize their styles, including comparatively, and taking into account the historical and cultural changes that characterize them (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation, our emphasis).

BNCC-EM conceives artistic manifestations in a very generalized way, as essential for the curricular construction, which is to say that all kinds of manifestations must be contemplated and are equivalent in importance and value. The understanding of the document is that every artistic manifestation must be present in the teaching-learning process with the purpose of valorization and fruition. Nothing, however, is specified regarding the notions of works that are central and relevant, to the detriment of those considered popular and vice-versa. All manifestations seem to be similar and should be studied by the same aesthetic criteria. We wonder how this would be feasible. Although artistic manifestations belong to the group of arts, they differ from each other and have different degrees of aesthetic relevance. We therefore position ourselves differently in relation to the equation of classical and popular contents.



To understand the teaching of popular and classical artistic manifestations as having the same aesthetic value goes against the perception that art results from overcoming reality. As already mentioned, it is necessary that the student meets the literary patrimony of the highest degree of human elaboration. This is a responsibility from which an emancipatory education cannot be shirked. Although the artistic field of the Portuguese language highlights classical literary productions in order to intensify them, the orientation does not delimit the field to work with *literature* but covers the space for general manifestations. Even in the specific artistic-literary field, various texts are highlighted, among which is the classic.

In the artistic-literary field, the aim is to expand contact and to analyze cultural and artistic manifestations in general. At stake is the continuity of the literary reader's education and the development of fruition. The contextualized analysis of artistic productions and literary texts, with emphasis on the classics, is intensified in High School. Genres and diverse forms of productions linked to the appreciation of artistic works and cultural productions (reviews, *vlogs* and literary, cultural podcasts, etc.) or to forms of appropriation of literary text, cinematographic and theatrical productions and other artistic manifestations (*remediations*, parodies, stylizations, *videominutes*, fanfics, etc.) continue to be considered associated to more refined technical and aesthetic skills (BRASIL, 2017, p. 495, our translation, author's emphasis).

Through these guidelines, the importance of classical literary reading is not evident. However, the school should provide space for the aesthetic appreciation of the works, considering also the critical and theoretical tradition in their making, presenting to the students the works that have been configured as tradition. In *Arte Poética*, Aristotle (2001) explains that, in general, literary genres fit into the arts of imitation, and that imitation is produced through rhythm, language and harmony, employed separately or together. In its conception, the origin of poetry would be justified by the pleasure produced by the acquisition of knowledge through the arts. In this conception, because it has specificities in the production of mimesis, literature needs to be understood through teaching for the acquisition of its knowledge. Denying its specificities, or placing it in a larger group, does not contribute to its teaching, but perpetuates the secondary place of literature in school.

Art, however, will not be a constitutive element in the realization of human essence if it does not exist as a possibility produced by the historical-social objective process, that is, as the human being does not appropriate this possibility, or does not want to appropriate it, we are effectively facing a process of alienation (FERREIRA, 2010, p. 136, our translation).

In agreement with the idea that the school should be the space to work the scientific, artistic and philosophical contents and that it should prioritize the teaching of the classics, we resume the



statement that the BNCC-EM does not make possible the emancipatory literary teaching, capable of guaranteeing autonomy. It denies the power of literary art to make significant changes in the student through catharsis.

The catharsis operates a momentary change in the relationship between the individual conscience and the world, making the individual see the world in a different way from the pragmatism and immediacy of daily life. Through this momentary suspension of daily life, art exerts a formative effect on the individual, an effect that will have its repercussions on the life of the individual, but such repercussions do not occur in a direct and immediate manner, and between them and the aesthetic catharsis there is a complex web of mediations that makes it impossible to define a priori the consequences, for the life of a certain individual, of the process of receiving a certain work of art. The understanding of the formative character of the work of art requires, according to the Lukacsian perspective, the overcoming of two equally mistaken conceptions: that of the absolutely disinterested character of the artistic experience and that of the utilitarianism of this experience (DUARTE, 2009, p. 473, our translation).

In the logic presented by BNCC-EM, the space destined to literature is not configured as a knowledge enabler, but as an *instrumentalizer* of social practices, aiming at its utilitarian potentialities. At times when discussions about its teaching are encouraged, the aspects of fruition and culture of artistic manifestations are highlighted. Therefore, literary knowledge is not presented for its aesthetic value, but for the incentive to reading and the fun that it can provide, aiming, above all, at the acquisition of language.

5 THE NON-PRESENCE OF LITERATURE IN THE CURRICULUMS

In this section, our intention is to draw attention to a paradox: the teaching of literature does not place it as central content. It is, in this sense, an absent presence, that is, it is tied to the area of languages that, in turn, has in the Portuguese language its main curricular subject. Focused on the training of the working student, the Portuguese Language is, in general, restricted to the teaching of skills such as writing and reading. Literature, in that order, ends up becoming a tool to develop these skills in the student.

The permanence of literature in the school curriculum has been discussed by theorists of the area who emphasize the failure of the study and the questionable practices on the part of education professionals, in addition to highlighting the social changes caused by globalization and the constant technological change to which we are exposed. In this field, is there room for the presence of literary art? The answer must always be favorable. It is not by chance that over time, and with many modifications, literature remains valuable in the educational field because, beyond pragmatism, it



is linked to the deepening of the levels of understanding of society and of man himself, however, it is not disposed as an innate capacity, it needs teaching (PERRONE-MOISÉS, 2008, p. 18).

The understanding of the need to teach literature pervades an extremely relevant issue, which is the tendency to link the personal choices of young people by literary art. In this sense, it is common to notice that many students do not feel stimulated by classical reading and, therefore, talk about what they do not like. However, it is through practices and studies that students develop their skills and succeed in penetrating the art. Thus, it is a fact that no one is born appreciating literature or enjoying it. However, this process is accomplished through teaching-learning.

However, the lack of clarity for educational guidelines distorts the teaching of literature at school. Thus, practices can, and tend to, link literary teaching to popular culture because of the proximity to the reality of students. In addition, another problem is the use of incomplete texts to exemplify characteristics of literary styles. These practices perpetuate a distance between the teaching of literature and the students.

In this context, it is likely that the student of the public network, for example, does not reach high levels of intellectuality because it is responsible for the popular culture conferred on it, underestimating his abilities and making its cultural and intellectual rise impossible. This reality is a constant, although the Federal Constitution itself already guarantees the right to art. Thus, we understand that the effectiveness of artistic education is not a privilege, but a right, which should contemplate everyone.

In societies seeking to establish egalitarian regimes, the assumption is that everyone should have the possibility of moving from popular to erudite levels as a normal consequence of the transformation of structure, with a significant increase in the capacity of each one thanks to the increasing acquisition of knowledge and experience (CANDIDO, 2011, p. 190, our translation).

In this perspective, through equality in intellectual education, individuals can overcome the social barriers imposed and achieve high levels of intellectuality so that they do not live in an alienated way but are aware of their reality in this society. Thus, once they have access to classical culture, students can enhance their understanding of the world to the point where they perceive themselves as citizens. This dialectic makes it possible, therefore, to break hegemony. "It is certain that the more egalitarian society is, and the more leisure it provides, the greater should be the humanizing diffusion of literary works, and therefore the possibility of contributing to the maturation of each one" (CANDIDO, 2011, p. 189, our translation).



We also emphasize that different from what common sense says, the classics are not of interest to only a portion of the population. This understanding is nothing more than a discriminatory way of reducing to the most favored a type of art, which is the highest. How can we say that we do not like what we have never experienced? However, it is common to hear people say that a museum is boring, even if they have not attended. This is a perpetuation of common sense, which already determines who will experience certain aesthetic experiences.

Hegemony needs to be broken and this understanding demystified, because the classics should interest everyone. For that, everyone must have a true experience with their teaching and learn to read all their specificities and frustrate it. According to Candido (2011), “in the universal power of the great classics, which go beyond the barrier of social stratification and in a way can redefine the distances imposed by economic inequality, because they have the capacity to interest everyone and therefore must be taken to the greatest number” (p. 192).

The question regarding the function of literature in school is not new, but its conclusion has been unanimous regarding the permanence of its schooling “we will say that poetry has many possible functions. Its primary and principal function is that of fidelity to its own nature” (WELLEK; WARREN, 1942, p. 41-42, our translation). Thus, although it has been maintained over time, the teaching of literature is in failure, a fact that has been discussed by authors such as Antonio Candido, Regina Zilberman, Rildo Cosson, among others. But there is no historical doubt that the “poetic text provides the formation of the individual, and it is therefore necessary to expose him/her to literary raw material, an indispensable requirement for his/her intellectual and ethical improvement” (ZILBERMAN, 2008, p. 18, our translation).

6 THE LITERATURE IN THE BNCC-EM: ANNOUNCED ABSENCES

As we have already indicated above, literature has been relegated to a secondary level throughout its constitution as school knowledge. In this sense, there has never been a lack of recognition of the importance of this teaching, but policies that would ensure what is in fact considered relevant and essential in its learning process. As we have already highlighted in this text, literature appears, at BNCC-EM, associated with the contents of the Portuguese language, losing its centrality in school education.

We have also demonstrated that, in BNCC-EM proposition, competence is about strategy to mobilize knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to solve problems of what they call complex society. In this formulation, although it is possible to observe the definition of essential learning, they are



focused, in the whole document, for the practical resolution of problems. The document relates these learnings to the development of competences, treating them as complementary. “Throughout Basic Education, the essential learning defined in BNCC-EM should contribute to ensure the development of ten general competencies to students, which embody, in the pedagogical scope, the rights of learning and development” (BRAZIL, 2017, p. 08, our translation). It is, therefore, a response to the economic demands of a society that prioritizes what is pragmatic, that presents quick answers to problems that often require deep analysis and knowledge.

By adopting this approach, the BNCC indicates that pedagogical decisions should be oriented to the development of competencies. By clearly indicating what students should “know” (considering the constitution of knowledge, skills, attitudes and values) and, above all, what they should “know how to do” (considering the mobilization of this knowledge, skills, attitudes and values to solve complex demands of daily life, the full exercise of citizenship and the world of work), the explanation of competencies offers references for the strengthening of actions that ensure the essential learning defined in the BNCC (BRASIL, 2017, p. 13, our translation).

The formulation of skills and abilities fosters a series of absences with regard to guidelines for teaching literature. The first of the absences is the clear definition of the concepts of fruition and aesthetic criteria. These terms synthesize the work to be done in the artistic field, therefore, they should present greater explanations in their surroundings. The aspect of fruition, for example, is widely disseminated, but, by definition, little is understood about how the Base expects the realization of a “reader-fruiter”, a term it adopts in its objectives. “The fruition, fed by aesthetic criteria based on cultural and historical contrasts, should be the basis for a greater understanding of the effects of meaning, appreciation and emotion and empathy or repulsion brought about by the works and texts” (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation)

From the Base, the idea of fruition and valuing literature seems to be more important than the assimilation of the knowledge necessary for the student to make use of this enjoyment. If, on the one hand, it states that it should be valued, on the other hand, it points out that a set of initiatives should be ensured to qualify interventions through language practices and skills acquisition.

This occurs because, according to the document, high school should consolidate the learning that students have developed throughout their teaching. However, if we think about school practices, we would have classes with specific contents of textual and literary genres. This separation of textual types would be left to the teacher who should insert literary texts to form a reader-fruiter in its Portuguese language classes, which have the goal of language practices. This



structure is incoherent and problematic when we transport the theory presented in the document to the classroom.

If we think about the fields of action, by the structure, we will have specific objectives, but that converge in a bigger objective that are the language practices. In this sense, the orientation of the Base in what concerns the non-utilitarian teaching of literature would already be compromised. We have here an empty discourse, because it points to a humanizing idea and dimension, but which generally reinforces its utilitarian function.

In our understanding, the concept of enjoyment is only possible to the extent that scientific, philosophical, artistic and cultural knowledge is placed at the center of the learning process. They are the knowledge that can organize and direct the formation of the student who, after this course, can choose for a literary genre and better enjoy their reading, for example. The questions come from a lack of explicitness of terms essential to the realization of any work.

Documents such as the BNCC-EM have a striking feature: the lack of clear referrals and positions on the most appropriate ways to ensure learning. Added to this general characteristic of political texts, the BNCC-EM reveals itself as an apparently critical text – defending issues such as expanding contact with diverse cultural themes, analysis of literary texts and their contextualization, appropriation of literary texts and even plays, are part of the recommendations in the document – but it fails to propose a work of mediation of these practices, based on scientific knowledge. With this characteristic, BNCC-EM does not deepen, demonstrate relations or highlight concrete possibilities of Literature teaching.

Another concept we highlight are the aesthetics criteria. As we explain with the concept of fruition, is it possible to define aesthetic criteria if not even ways are pointed out to treat what is understood by aesthetics? Would its definition depend on the reader's point of view? Would it depend on cultural aspects? Would the objectification of literature be relegated to subjectivism and relativism? These questions seem to be clearly answered in the specific competence number 6 of Languages and their technologies in High School, already presented in this text and resumed here:

To aesthetically appreciate the most diverse artistic and cultural productions, considering their local, regional and global characteristics, and to mobilize their knowledge about artistic languages to give meaning and (re)build individual and collective authorial productions, in a critical and creative way, with respect to the diversity of knowledge, identities and cultures (BRASIL, 2017, p. 482, our translation).



The document continues to present that this competence should enable young people to enjoy and appreciate literary works based on aesthetic criteria:

At the end of high school, young people should be able to enjoy artistic and cultural manifestations, understanding the role of different languages and their relationships in a work and appreciating them based on aesthetic criteria. They are also expected to realize that these criteria change in different contexts (local, global), cultures and times, being able to glimpse the historical and social movements of the arts (BRASIL, 2017, p. 488, our translation).

As we can see, there is no mention of what these criteria would be. On the contrary, a relativistic character is highlighted for the teaching of literature, as if the enjoyment, appreciation and use of criteria were at the taste of cultures and individual experiences. Although, certainly, these practices involving literature have subjective, individual aspects, because it is a guiding document it is little to say that they should be worked on respecting these differences. It is necessary to highlight what is universal in the teaching of literature, what all students should know, have knowledge, have access regardless of where they live, and the social class to which they belong. It is also important to emphasize that, even though individual acts, constituted by subjectivity, are enjoyment and appreciation, the latter is the result of life in society, therefore of the formation of the social real. With this, we emphasize that pointing out criteria based on little objective values, dependent on the look of each one is the same as not saying much about how to teach literature so that the student can effectively achieve these objectives.

The second absence is, in our understanding, complementary to the problems presented in the first one: the omission of the founding knowledge that structures the teaching of literature at school, therefore the omission of what is understood by literature and its teaching. Put in a very generalist way, literature seems to be inserted in a list of themes that, treated in a broad way, would guarantee the “essential” formation of students.

To this end, this competence foresees that students can contact and explore local and global artistic and cultural manifestations, both valued and canonical as well as popular and media, current and from other times, always seeking to analyze the criteria and aesthetic choices that organize their styles, including comparatively, and taking into account the historical and cultural changes that characterize them (BRASIL, 2018, p. 488, our translation).

In this sense, the specific skill is omitted from more detailed guidelines. It does not delimit the formative aspects of literature, the objectives of its teaching, what kind of work should occupy centrality and how to curator it. It is important to emphasize that the document addresses valued



and canonical works, as well as popular and media works as objects of study. It is evident, therefore, that there is a neglect in these instructions.

7 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The intentional transmission of artistic knowledge effectively contributes to the formation of humans in individuals. The main objective of school education is to promote the process of development of the humanities through the acquisition of knowledge. The school should not be responsible for the immediate transformations of the society in force, but for the transmission of the most developed knowledge that humanity has ever produced. Thus, through the appropriation by the student there is the process of humanization. Art (literary) is the result of human objectification, a form of reflection of objective reality, which has as its main function, as well as school education, to contribute to the constitution of subjectivities in man. This production is not linked to the daily aspects of society, but to its overcoming.

The schooling of literature is a necessity because, according to Saviani (2011), classical knowledge is what needs to be part of the teaching-learning process. However, literature, when used as an instrument of introduction to Portuguese grammar, as a pretext for shallow interpretations or for the study of other areas of learning, denies the possibility of realizing aesthetic catharsis – a concept widely discussed in this dissertation. The gap in education leads to alienated training, which is guided by daily knowledge at school. Art must be taught, but for this to happen in an effective way, it is necessary to have clarity in the documental orientations.

BNCC-EM is negligent in relation to the literature guidelines. Its formulation makes it impossible to overcome spontaneity, emphasizes literary teaching by pragmatic functions related to language practices and adopts a utilitarian perspective, although it is denied in excerpts of the text, it is evident in the general configuration in the BNCC-EM, since the general competencies aim at the solution of problems focused on daily life.

REFERENCES

ARISTÓTELES. **Poética**. CultVox, 2001.

BRASIL. **Linguagens, Códigos e suas Tecnologias**. Brasília: Ministério da Educação, Secretaria de Educação Básica, 2006. 239 p.

BRASIL. Ministério da Educação. Secretaria da Educação Básica. **Base Nacional Comum Curricular**. Brasília, DF, 2018.



CANDIDO, A. **A Literatura e a formação do homem**. São Paulo: Ciências e Cultura, USP, 1972.

CANDIDO, A. O direito à Literatura. *In: Vários escritos*. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Ouro sobre Azul, 2011.

CULLER, J. **Teoria literária**: uma introdução. Trad. Sandra Vasconcelos. São Paulo: Beça Produções Culturais Ltda., 1999.

DUARTE, N. A Pedagogia Histórico-Crítica e a Formação da Individualidade Para Si. **Germinal: Marxismo e Educação em Debate**, Salvador, v. 5, n. 2, p. 59-72, dez. 2013.

DUARTE, N. Arte e educação contra o fetichismo generalizado na sociabilidade contemporânea. **Perspectiva**, Florianópolis, v. 27, n. 2, p. 461-479, jul./dez. 2009.

DUARTE, N. **Os conteúdos escolares e a ressurreição dos mortos**: contribuição à teoria histórico-crítica do currículo. Campinas: Autores Associados, 2016.

DUARTE, N.; MAZZEU, F. J. C.; DUARTE, E. C. M. O senso comum neoliberal obscurantista e seus impactos na educação brasileira. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. esp. 1, p. 715-736, ago. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24iesp1.13786>

FERREIRA, N. B. de P. A arte e a formação humana: implicações para o ensino de literatura. *In: MARTINS, L. M.; DUARTE, N. (Org.). Formação de professores*: limites contemporâneos e alternativas necessárias [online]. São Paulo: Editora UNESP, Cultura Acadêmica, 2010. 191 p.

LIBÂNIO, J. C.; SILVA, E. Finalidades educativas escolares e escola socialmente justa: a abordagem pedagógica da diversidade social e cultural. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. esp. 1, p. 816-840, ago. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24iesp1.13783>

LUKÁCS, G. **Ensaio sobre Literatura**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Civilização Brasileira S.A., 1965.

LUKÁCS, G. **Estética**: la peculiaridad de lo estético: cuestiones preliminares y de principio. Barcelona: Grijalbo, 1966.

LUKÁCS, G. **Introdução a uma estética marxista**. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 1970.

PERRONE-MOISÉS, L. O ensino da Literatura. *In: NITRINI, S. et al. (Org.). Literatura, artes, saberes*. São Paulo: ABRALIC, 2008.

SANTOS, F. A. dos; ZANARDINI, J. B.; MARQUES, H. J. Desafios políticos, econômicos e sociais para os docentes na América Latina. **Revista on line de Política e Gestão Educacional**, Araraquara, v. 24, n. esp. 1, p. 794-815, ago. 2020. e-ISSN:1519-9029. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22633/rpge.v24iesp1.13781>

SAVIANI, D. **Pedagogia histórico-crítica**: primeiras aproximações. 11. ed. rev. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados, 2011. (Coleção Educação Contemporânea)



SAVIANI, D.; DUARTE, N. A formação humana na perspectiva histórico-ontológica. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 15, n. 45, set./dez. 2010.

SOUSA, Jesus Maria. Repensar o currículo como emancipador. **Revista Tempos e Espaços em Educação**, São Cristóvão - SE, v. 9, n. 18, p. 111-120, 2016.

WELLELK, R.; WARREN, A. **Teoria da Literatura**. 5. ed. Nova Iorque: Publicações Europa-América, 1942.

ZILBERMAN, R. **A leitura e o ensino da literatura**. Curitiba: Ibepex, 2010.

ZILBERMAN, R. Sim, a literatura educa. *In*: SILVA, E. T. **Literatura e Pedagogia**: Ponto & Contraponto. São Paulo: ALB, 2008.

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Nathalia Soares Fontes

Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Pantanal, Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil. Master's Degree in Education (UFMS).

E-mail: fontes.nathalia91@gmail.com

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4872-8589>

Fabiano Antonio Santos

Professor of the Graduate Program in Education of the Pedagogy course, Federal University of Mato Grosso do Sul (UFMS). Pantanal, Corumbá, Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil. Doctorate in Education (UFSC).

E-mail: fabiano.santos@ufms.br

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7703-8520>

Received On: 09-10-2020.

Approved in: 10-19-2020.

Published in: 11-04-2020.

