
Fernando de Moraes Gębra

Orpheu From the Inside: A Historiographical Review of the Portuguese Modernism

Abstract: The present paper questions certain commonplaces in Portuguese literary criticism that establishes an irreconcilable ditch between the decadent and symbolist attitudes and the avant-garde experiments in the *Orpheu* magazine, which results in the canonization of some authors over others, and the oblivion of poets such as Alfredo Pedro Guisado (1891-1975). The *Orpheu* generation engages in a dialog with the past, where the poetic project of each member juxtaposes decadent and avant-garde discourses. That is why it is impossible to separate and classify the authors of *Orpheu* generation into different literary movements. As such, this paper aims to analyze memorialist discourses by Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor, Raul Leal and Alfredo Guisado in various texts about this literary generation, written across different periods from 1915 to 1965.

Keywords: Portuguese Modernism; *Orpheu Magazine*; Literary Criticism; Historiographical Review; Memorialist Discourses.

FERNANDO DE MORAES GĘBRA
Universidade de Évora, Portugal
fernandogębra@yahoo.fr

DOI: 10.24193/cechinox.2024.47.15

Introduction

In Portuguese literary historiographies, the *Orpheu* generation is typically viewed solely through its avant-garde aspects, neglecting the end-of-century decadent and symbolist discourses that are present in the compositions printed in the magazine and in books written by these artists. Nevertheless, astute critics such as Dionísio Vila Maior draws attention to the “intertextual and dialogic condition”¹ of *Orpheu’s* productions. He considers what Mikhail Bakhtin explains about the relations among discourses: in every utterance at least two voices resonate, and every discourse participates in a “live and tense interaction”² with other discourses, resulting in contractual and polemical relations. As the concept of discourse can be understood as “a sequence of utterances produced in a certain context of enunciation”³, a careful study of the epistolary genre and its statements about poetic discourses allows the understanding of the creation laboratory of these poets and the critical judgments emitted from ones in relation to the others.

In this critical orientation, the *Orpheu* magazine should be examined for its variety of literary approaches and styles, as

Fernando Pessoa (1888-1935) points out in a letter to Camilo Pessanha (1867-1926), probably written in 1915: "Our magazine welcomes everything that represents advanced art; this is how we have published poems and prose ranging from Ultra-symbolism to Futurism"⁴. In this way, the study of *Orpheu's* poetics must also take into account the dialogic relations with the discourses of the Portuguese historiographical tradition and the decadentist-symbolist literary tradition, an objective that I have pursued in my investigations and publications about *Orpheu's* poets who are not canonized by most literary historiographies.

Orpheu by Orpheu's

Despite the only two issues of the *Orpheu* Magazine (March 24th and June 28th 1915) and the ephemeral life of others that followed it, like *Exílio* (April 1916), *Centauro* (October 1916), *Portugal Futurista* (November 1917), *Contemporânea* (with irregular periodicity from 1915 until 1926) and *Athena* (with five issues from October 1924 until June 1925), the group that was responsible for the *Orpheu* magazine constitutes what is called the *Orpheu* generation. This generation was the starting point of the Portuguese Modernism, that has in its productions some elements from the end-of-century trends such as Decadentism and Symbolism, and the avant-garde experiments, especially Futurism and Cubism.

The core of the group was represented by Fernando Pessoa (1888-1935), Mário de Sá-Carneiro (1890-1916), Alfredo Pedro Guisado (1891-1975), José Pacheco (1885-1934), Luís de Montalvor (1891-1947), José de Almada Negreiros

(1893-1970) and Armando Cortês-Rodrigues (1891-1971). There were also two Brazilian writers who were not in Portugal at that time: Ronald de Carvalho (1893-1935) and Eduardo Guimaraens (1892-1928). In addition to these, there were those who interacted with the group and attended meetings at Irmãos Unidos restaurant and other cafes in Lisbon: Santa-Rita Pintor (1889-1918) and Raul Leal (1886-1964), who were collaborators of the magazine. There were also those who did not publish in the magazine, but shared the approaches of *Orpheu*: João Silva Tavares (1893-1964), Diogo de Macedo (1889-1959), Augusto Ferreira Gomes (1892-1953), António Ferro (1895-1956) and António Ponce Leão (1891-1918).

Some of the artists of the *Orpheu* generation also wrote texts in the Portuguese press, practicing literary criticism. Both in the exchanged letters and in the press texts written by the *Orpheu* artists, dialogic relations are verified, as one comments on the literary production of the others. Literary criticism, understood as a discourse genre, that is, a relatively stable type of statements, according to Bakhtin's approach⁵, responds, like any and all discourse, to other previous statements. In the case of Alfredo Guisado's critical discourse throughout the pages of *República* newspaper, between 1943 and 1972, his texts – literary essays with memoirist elements – react to the teaching thesis, formulated by Gaspar Simões and expressed in his book *Life and work of Fernando Pessoa. History of a generation [Vida e obra de Fernando Pessoa. História duma geração]* (1950).

It is quite certain that Mário de Sá-Carneiro accompanied him [Pessoa] – his

“Manucure” proves it – and that Alfredo Pedro Guisado, with his thirteen sonnets, *scholarly* and *methodically* “paulic”, followed him closely, as much happening to Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues, who, *disobeying* the *advice* that Pessoa had given him, had not sent him an “intersectionist” collaboration (something that can be explained, moreover, since the “intersectionist” practice presupposed an intellectual, visual and analytical virtuosity that Côrtes-Rodrigues was far from possessing), but “paulic”, one hundred percent “paulic” [...].⁶

According to Gaspar Simões’s review, Fernando Pessoa was a master who would have guided the other authors. By using the terms “accompanied”, “scholarly”, “methodically”, “followed”, “disobeying” and “advice”, Gaspar Simões classifies Fernando Pessoa as a leader or a teacher. He reviews the other authors from that generation according to their proximity or distance to Fernando Pessoa’s poetry. Simões also gives more emphasis to the avant-garde procedures such as Intersectionism, depreciating the other styles like Paulism. Simões seems to forget that Paulism is the first evolution of Symbolism in Portuguese Modernism, with a poetry full of lexical freedoms, unforeseen verbal patterns and metaphors and synesthesia.

The teaching thesis formulated by the critic of *Presença* magazine can be found in statements by critics such as Teresa Sobral Cunha, who highlights that Sá-Carneiro recognized “his [Pessoa’s] natural teaching”.⁷ Sobral Cunha seems to reproduce in 2003 what Gaspar Simões wrote in 1950, forgetting to point out Sá-Carneiro and

Pessoa exchanged many ideas in letters, one commenting on the other’s writings.

It is necessary to insist, once and for all, that *Orpheu* did not intend to create schools. *Orpheu* assumes its diversity, as can be seen in the note “What *Orpheu* intends?” [O que quer *Orpheu*?], by Fernando Pessoa, probably written in 1915.

Creating cosmopolitan art in time and space. Our epoch is one in which all countries, more materially than ever before, and for the first time intellectually, all exist within each other, in which Asia, America, Africa and Oceania are Europe, and they are all in Europe. Any European wharf – even that wharf in Alcântara – is enough to have all the land there in compressed form. And if I call this *European*, and not American, for example, it is because Europe, not America, is the *fons et origo* of this civilizational type, the civilized region that gives the type and direction to the whole world.

That’s why true modern art has to be maximally denationalized – to accumulate within itself all parts of the world. Only then will it be typically modern. May our art be one where Asian dolence and mysticism, African primitivism, the cosmopolitanism of the Americas, the ultra-exoticism of Oceania and the decadent machinery of Europe merge, cross, intersect. And, if this fusion is made spontaneously, an art-all-arts will result, a spontaneously complex inspiration.⁸

In this sense, all the compositions with elements from diverse cultures and different eras are consistent with the spirit

that animates the magazine. For instance, among the poems Fernando Pessoa, Alfredo Guisado and Ângelo de Lima published in the first and second issues of *Orpheu*, three of them are permeated with esoteric elements from Ancient Egypt: “Oblique Rain III” [“Chuva Oblíqua III”], by Pessoa, “Egyptian Dream” [“Sonho Egípcio”], by Guisado (first issue), and “Neitha-Kri”, by Ângelo de Lima (second issue). The intersection of the “decadent machinery of Europe” with the Greek tradition can be illustrated in the entire process of the poem “Triumphal Ode” [“Ode Triunfal”], by Pessoa’s heteronym Álvaro de Campos:

In a fever and looking at the engines
like a tropical Nature –
Great human tropics of iron and fire
and strength –
I sing, and I sing the present, and also
the past and the future,
Because the present is all the past and
all the future
And there are Plato and Virgil inside
the machines and electric lights
Just because Virgil and Plato once ex-
isted and were human,
And pieces of Alexander the Great
from perhaps the fifties century,
Atoms that will have a fever in the brain
of Aeschylus from the 100th century,
They move along these transmission
belts and these pistons and these
flywheels,
Roaring, grinding, hissing, crashing,
stinging,
Making me caress my body in a single
caress to my soul.⁹

The “Triumphal Ode” summons meanings beyond the glorification of energy,

machines, movement and modern civilization, a common attitude in Italian Futurism. Contrary to Marinetti’s postulates published in his “Futurist Manifesto” (1909), in which it is possible to note his contempt for the past, museums and classical works of art, the few futurist elements in *Orpheu*, namely in “Triumphal Ode” and “Maritime Ode” [“Ode Marítima”], by Álvaro de Campos, engage in a dialogue with elements of the past: “Because the present is all the past and all the future”. The past is not seen with contempt, but as an integral part of the dynamism that calls for the temporal simultaneity of the entire cultural heritage of humanity.

This diversity of cultures also confirms the dialogical condition of end-of-century aesthetics with avant-garde experiments. We cannot overlook the fact that many of the avant-garde experiments present in authors of the *Orpheu* generation are tributaries of end-of-century poetics, mainly Symbolism. This anti-positivist, anti-naturalist and anti-determinist approach seeks to investigate the subject’s unconscious states, dreamlike and metaphysical spheres. French Decadent movement, that shows the discomfort, boredom and melancholy in a decadent society – whose technological progress did not bring happiness, but rather exclusion – allows the poet to deny this external reality and start investing in his subjective states, in unconscious spheres. These are sources of various, diffuse and allogical experiences, that is, prior to logic itself, and often linked to the archetypal experiences of the collective unconscious. Poets look for a language that would account for these various, diffuse and allogical experiences, and there is nothing better than the symbol because it contains several spheres of meaning.

Moreover, the cosmopolitan dimension of *Orpheu* “represents a challenge to the educated Portuguese society, and the desire to elevate Portugal to the dimension of the modern, to the dimension of Europe”¹⁰. By accumulating in their literary processes various trends from many cultures, like Ancient Egypt, Greece, Babylon, France, England, *Orpheu* seems to respond to some trends like Saudosism, whose primary concern was the Portuguese culture itself and the search in the past for the sources of Portuguese nationality. The term “Saudade” is configured in a dialectical relationship between remembrance and hope: remembrance of a glorious past and the ancestry of the Race, and hope of a redemptive future and an upward movement towards God¹¹. Although some of the members of the *Orpheu* generation participated in that cultural movement, they projected their art in the “dimension of Europe”, which explains the cosmopolitan extent of the *Orpheu* magazine.

All the artists who participated in the *Orpheu* magazine were deeply attentive to what was happening in Europe, concerning the avant-garde movements, especially the Futurism and the Cubism. Some of these artists even lived in Paris, dynamizing center of these movements, as it’s the case of Mário de Sá-Carneiro, Santa-Rita Pintor and Almada Negreiros. The letters Sá-Carneiro sent to Fernando Pessoa testify a dynamic experience of contact with avant-garde arts.

Very attentive to the French culture, especially Symbolism and Mallarmé’s poetry, Luís de Montalvor (1891-1947), also gave his contribution about what *Orpheu* meant in Portuguese Literature. In 1945, Montalvor published, in *República*

newspaper, a text entitled “The thirty years of *Orpheu* or the literary revolution of 1915” [“Os trinta anos de *Orpheu* ou a revolução literária de 1915”]. The memoiristic text proposes a reflection on the limits and scope of the term “modernist”, the insurrection of this literary trend to the plastered forms of academicism and the characterization of this current as a “concert of individualities”¹². Montalvor dwells on the first aspect, that of the “incomprehension of some”, explaining the term “modernist” was improperly used by critics, whose generalization made this new form of art an enemy of the tradition forms of art that should be opposed by the audience.

Although he does not conduct a historiographical review of the years that precede the publication of *Orpheu*, he states that the term “modernist” was used by critics at that time as “the antipode of a category of art and literature considered in its contents and forms as defined and definitive in the historical frameworks of tradition”¹³. In this way, Portuguese Modernism constitutes a reaction to an academicist art category that immobilizes forms and contents. That is why some academics, journalists and even psychiatrists wrote numerous articles in the Portuguese press condemning the texts published in *Orpheu* magazine, either assuming these authors suffered from paranoia or they wanted to create an attitude of mystification.

In the critical panorama at that time (1915), psychiatrists had a very large preponderance, which is why they were requested by journalists to intervene in the critical reception of *Orpheu*. In some texts, these psychiatrists present discourses rooted in Positivism. This philosophical system ended up supporting exclusionary

psychiatric practices, such as those developed by Max Nordeau and Lombroso, related to the hygienist movement. The emphasis on a logical-rational language was one of the objectives of psychiatrists who acted as literary critics, which explains their devaluation of aesthetics such as Decadentism, Symbolism and avant-garde movements. Doctors like Júlio Dantas (also member of Science Academy of Lisbon), Júlio de Matos and Egas Moniz had, at that time, the authority to intervene in the Portuguese cultural field.

Contrary to what many critics continue to assert, Modernism is not opposed to the “historical frameworks of tradition”, but rather to the literary works produced by academics. According to Montalvor, *Orpheu* rebels against “the worn body of ideas and forms established as sacred and inviolable”¹⁴, represented by writers such as Júlio Dantas and Afonso Lopes Vieira. Perhaps Montalvor seems a little blunt when he states that the modernist writer focuses on the present. Terms such as “renovator *apport*”, “originality”, “movement”, “trend” and “universal” are used by the essayist to characterize the modernist movement; however, some were not sufficiently explained, as Raul Leal does in “The Orphaic trends and Saudosismo” [“As tendências orfaicas e o Saudosismo”], the next essay to be examined.

With regard to the universality of the art in *Orpheu*, Luís de Montalvor makes use of a metaphor that explains the dialogical condition that Orphaic artists establish with the arts of other countries: “Also a river in its natural and strong flow and with its rhythmic personality receives in its bosom the contribution of the affluents”¹⁵. The literary trend that was *Orpheu*, given

the diversity of aesthetics of the members of the group, received many tributaries from several cultures. As pointed out by Fernando Pessoa in the text “What *Orpheu* intends?” [“O que quer *Orpheu*?”], this generation received many contributions from different cultures, as it happened in other avant-garde movements. Since it was in the spirit of the century to integrate in art different cultural aspects, the artists of the *Orpheu* generation consider the foreign cultures part of their literary processes.

Truly, *Orpheu* was a trend. That’s what Fernando Pessoa called it. The common work of the *Orpheu* generation has been denied the character of a literary movement due to the lack of harmonic purposes, without a solution of continuity and, also, due to the indeterminacy of its own aesthetics. Rather, it would be a concert of individualities, a commitment of irreducible attitudes to a common style of thought and ideals of art.¹⁶

By emphasizing that *Orpheu* configured “a commitment of irreducible attitudes to a common style of thought and ideals of art”¹⁷, Montalvor seems to elaborate a veiled polemic in relation to critics like Adolfo Casais Monteiro (1908-1972) and João Gaspar Simões (1903-1987) who understood artistic movements as “subjection to a single aesthetic ideal”, “a defined body of aesthetics”, “the gregarious spirit of an artistic ideal”, “any perfect schooling”¹⁸. By using the expression “has been denied” in relation to the common work of the *Orpheu* generation, Montalvor alludes to Casais Monteiro, without mentioning his name, who had published a text in May

1943 in *Diário Popular* newspaper, entitled “The *Orpheu* generation”[“A geração de *Orpheu*”], in which he supports the idea that *Orpheu* was not a generation. Montalvor establishes what Mikhail Bakhtin calls “veiled polemic”¹⁹, by bringing someone else’s discourse into his utterance in order to combat it. Expressions such as “the lack of harmonic purposes”, “without a solution of continuity” and “indeterminacy of its own aesthetics” alludes to what Casais Monteiro considers to be a literary generation in the aforementioned text.

More explicitly than Montalvor’s text, regarding the fact that *Orpheu* did not intend to break with literary tradition, is an essay by Raul Leal (1886-1964), entitled “The Orphaic tendencies and Saudosismo” (1959). The essay presents the thesis that the *Orpheu* group never intended to break with the past and with tradition, but rather to update and transcend them: “The true function of modernism does not consist in destroying the Past but in going beyond it, taking it, however, as a starting point”.²⁰Raul Leal’s discourse opposes “academics that infest life”, “the mummies of senile Academies”²¹, “more or less academic rubbish”²². According to the poet-philosopher, the modernist discourse was not opposed to the literary tradition, but rather to the “more or less academic old tricks that intend to mummify ancient thought instead of seeking to rejuvenate it, giving it a new life-giving sap that in no way would distort it”²³. The literary tradition with which it establishes dialogic relations has always been present in the poetic production of Orphaic artists:

[...] the ultramodernist movement of *Orfeu* [...] did not arise, in any way,

to destroy what was most grandiose in the past, but only the academic mummification of ancient creations. These, in their purity, were respected by our group of intellectuals and artists who tried, however, to give them a new blood, with which we could overcome them, updating them so to speak, without deviating, however, properly of the Great Road that they had opened in the purest World of the Spirit. Our task was to continue its construction, interrupted by academics who infest life.²⁴

Raul Leal’s discourse seems to respond to statements by literary critics who understood *Orpheu*’s poetics as ruptures with the past. The expressions “did not arise” and “in any way” operate, within the statement, a negation of those critical discourses that still seem to permeate Luso-Brazilian literary criticism about the *Orpheu* generation. According to Raul Leal, *Orpheu*’s field of combat is therefore restricted to “academics who infest life”, as can be seen from the use of the restrictive expression “but only”. *Orpheu* establishes dialogues with a literary tradition, endorsed by the expressions “Great Road” and “continue its construction”. In the same contractual relation with the discourses by Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor and Raul Leal, Alfredo Guisado’s text published in *República* newspaper on February 10, 1961 deconstructs Gaspar Simões’s thesis that the poet of the heteronyms would have influenced and directed the literary productions of his companions.

By the continuation you say, I will say, of the essayists, critics and similar things, who have been around for a

few years now writing what they think, what they know and, above all, what they do not know about *Orpheu* and what in around it during, before and after its appearance, we come to the conclusion that Fernando Pessoa was the boss and Sá-Carneiro the deputy head of the other obedient boys, components of the group that organized that magazine and contributed within their respective strengths for the literary movement that came out of there and became noticed and notable. It should be explained that this is not true. There were never any bosses or subordinates there. Neither Fernando Pessoa thought of commanding, nor did Sá-Carneiro intend to be his lieutenant, nor did any of those who were part of the same group – as far as I know – ever felt subordinated to anyone. Each one thought for his own head, wrote as he saw fit and not by shadows let himself be dominated by A or B.²⁵

Upon reading the essays by Guisado in *República*, it is possible to point out that his statements are constructed in a polemical relation with Gaspar Simões's discourse, by showing that there was a dialogical and intertextual condition among the artists of *Orpheu*. This dialogism can be measured based on the letters that the artists of the group exchanged, where creative laboratories can be seen, since each written literary text was sent to the reader of the letter who shared their impressions. As an example, I highlight the process of constructing the short-story "The man of dreams" ["O homem dos sonhos"] based on textual statements in letters from

Sá-Carneiro to Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor, António Ferro and José Pacheco. It is possible to observe how this short-story was written and edited in each letter Sá-Carneiro wrote to his friends.

Orpheu from the Inside

Many of Alfredo Guisado's texts on *República's* literary page show a responsive attitude to the discourse of the *Presença* group, like Adolfo Casais Monteiro and João Gaspar Simões, who propagated in the Portuguese literary milieu that they were the great disseminators of *Orpheu's* texts. In May 1943, for instance, Adolfo Casais Monteiro, in the article entitled "The *Orpheu* generation" [A geração do *Orfeu*"] considers *Presença* as a generation, to the detriment of *Orpheu*; thus, he emphasizes that Sá-Carneiro and Fernando Pessoa "were isolated phenomena"²⁶ that only became known to the general public thanks to the *Presença* magazine.

Reacting to this discourse, Alfredo Guisado emphasizes the *Presença* generation, whose magazines were published from 1927 until 1940, were the extension of the *Orpheu* generation: "If *Orpheu* had not existed, it would not have been possible for *Presença* to have appeared"²⁷. It is true that *Presença* published many texts by some participants of the *Orpheu* generation, like Fernando Pessoa, Mário de Sá-Carneiro, Almada Negreiros, Raul Leal and Ângelo de Lima, however the authors of this movement later Second Modernism used these authors to boast of their feat of publicity. Furthermore, some of them like Gaspar Simões and Casais Monteiro exchanged letters with Fernando Pessoa only to have (according to Alfredo Guisado) his

written opinion about their literary productions in order to publish these letters, as it happened after Pessoa passed away on November 30th 1935.

The idea that *Orpheu* was more than just a group or a literary generation, even more than a literary school but the starting point of a new era in Portuguese Literature, can be found in “Comentário”, dated June 18, 1943²⁸. As seen in this text, the literary historiography of the time considered three eras in Portuguese Literature: medieval, classical and romantic. By taking as a periodological criterion the reach of the “cry of revolt”²⁹ that constituted *Orpheu* in relation to the stagnant waters of the way of making literature, Alfredo Guisado suggests that this movement was more than a mere generation, but rather a starting point of a literary era that opened the way for followers, such as *Presença*. Guisado understands *Orpheu* as a “literary movement that would start a new era”³⁰, that is, the modern era, and *Presença* as a generation within that era.

Another generation influenced by *Orpheu* was, according to Alfredo Guisado, the Portuguese Surrealism. In the critical review of the book *Erro próprio*, by António Maria Lisboa, Alfredo Guisado conceives the *Orpheu* generation, imprecisely named Modernism, as “the crossroads from which all other roads that appeared later began”³¹. Surrealism would be one of such roads, a movement that the literary critic of *República* newspaper comes to know more closely when evaluating works by António Maria Lisboa (1928-1953) and Mário Cesariny de Vasconcelos (1923-2006).

In the critical review of the book *Discurso sobre a reabilitação do real quotidiano*, by Mário Cesariny de Vasconcelos, on

December 5th, Guisado points out that the surrealist experiments would not have been possible without *Orpheu*: “I remembered, then, immediately, the much-discussed *Orpheu*. And I remember to say that if it had not existed, it would not have been possible to appear in our country everything that, since then, is imagined to be a step further forward”³². He sustains this thesis, pointing out that if the *Orpheu* generation had not appeared, Cesariny de Vasconcelos would have had to fight against the academics who wrote many negative reviews about *Orpheu* in the literary press. According to Guisado, *Orpheu* unblocked the path and, therefore, academics and alienists would no longer feel authorized to say “the nonsense they said on that occasion”³³, that is when that magazine was published.

Although Alfredo Guisado stamped on the pages of *República* several essays and memoirs about *Orpheu* since 1943, when he assumed the literary page of the referred periodical, I regard the year 1960 as a dawn of the poet’s wishes to solve the mistakes of Portuguese historiography and literary criticism about the *Orpheu* generation, especially in relation to the texts that were being published by critics arising from the *Presença* magazine, mainly Gaspar Simões and Casais Monteiro.

In a letter sent to Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues (1891-1971), dated July 4, 1960, Alfredo Guisado asks his partner of the *Orpheu* generation to collaborate with the project of a book in co-authorship entitled *Orpheu por Dentro* [*Orpheu from the Inside*], whose subtitle would be *Memórias* [*Memories*]³⁴. As explained in the missive, each one – Guisado, Côrtes-Rodrigues and Almada Negreiros (1893-1970) – would write a memoiristic discourse about

Orpheu, in response to the discourse of certain critics “very knowledgeable in what they do not understand and knowledgeable about what they do not know”³⁵.

Although this project did not materialize, Alfredo Guisado left on the pages of *República* several texts “from the book to be published soon: *O Orpheu por Dentro*” (Guisado, 1961: 8)³⁶. Some of these texts present core ideas and are built in a dialogic relations marked by tensions with Gaspar Simões’ and Casais Monteiro’s discourses, as is the case of the text from February 1961, mentioned above³⁷. Eighteen of the texts that would appear in the projected book *O Orpheu por Dentro* are about the reviews that the Portuguese press published about the *Orpheu* magazine and its associates in 1915, in newspapers like *A Capital*, *O Mundo*, *O Século*, *O Jornal*, *O Século Cómico*, *A Montanha* (Porto), *O Povo*, *A Luta*, *A Nação* and *A Ilustração Portuguesa*. Alfredo Guisado transcribed those press reviews and commented upon them on his literary page between December 31, 1960, and May 11, 1962, guided by his scrapbook.

I continue with these transcriptions because I was asked to do so, although this and others will appear later in the volume that will be published shortly with the title *O Orpheu por Dentro*, a volume that will conveniently elucidate readers about what that famous magazine was, what happened around it, etc., in order to end a large series of news with which several people intend to explain what they themselves do not explain because they do not know.³⁸

In this attitude of selection of texts from his scrapbook for publication on the

pages of *República*, a project of organization in a book can be seen, sometimes even explained during the transcripts. Furthermore, it is possible to detect a double intention of Alfredo Guisado when he reproduced on the pages of *República* the texts of the newspapers of the time of *Orpheu*: on the one hand, to document the history of the magazine and of the literary generation, on the other hand, to show that the misunderstanding of the critics at that time was similar to that of *Presença*’s critics, such as Gaspar Simões and Casais Monteiro. Guisado disqualifies, therefore, within his discourse, the critics of that time and the critics who were writing in the 1960s.

At the end of 1969, urged by friends, Alfredo Guisado gathered four of his books – *Elogio da Paisagem* (1915), *As Treze Baladas das Mãos Frias* (1916), *Mais Alto* (1917) and *Ânfora* (1918) – and grouped them in a volume that he gave the title of *Tempo de Orfeu*. The page containing the list of books “to be published” mentions *O Orpheu por Dentro (história de uma revista literária)*. The texts that would be part of this book present a genological hybridity, as there are elements from the essay, the chronicle and memorialistic reflections. It is, therefore, a meaningful set of texts about the gestation, publication and critical reception of the *Orpheu* magazine, as well as the scope and meaning of the artistic production of each member of this generation.

Conclusions

The texts commented on this paper – the essays by Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor, Raul Leal and, above all, those by Alfredo Guisado – emphasize the dialogical and intertextual relationships

among the various components of what came to be called the *Orpheu* group, responsible for the beginning of a new era in Portuguese Literature.

According to the discourses by Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor, Raul Leal and Alfredo Guisado, *Orpheu* assumes its diversity, considering different traditions and aesthetics that are part of the poetic project of each member of the group. Pessimistic attitudes related to the worship of boredom and melancholy as crepuscular states of the soul and optimistic and provocative attitudes coexist in the *Orpheu* group, the starting point of Portuguese Modernism, according to the literary historiographies. In the poetic projects of each member of the *Orpheu* generation, these discourses (decadentism and avant-garde) are juxtaposed. It is impossible to separate and classify them into two opposite literary categories.

Some critics who made part of the *Presença* generation, seen in the historiographies as a second Portuguese Modernism, state that *Orpheu* was not a literary generation and consider decadent and symbolistic poetics as marks of the past that would not integrate the modernity. Luís de Montalvor's, Raul Leal's and Alfredo Guisado's discourses show how these

ideas, propagated especially by Adolfo Casais Monteiro and João Gaspar Simões, were wrong because these critics did not consider the diversity of the productions inserted in *Orpheu*, as pointed out by Fernando Pessoa in a letter to Camilo Pessanha, that shows that magazine welcomed all the productions from Ultra-symbolism to Futurism.

The book *O Orpheu por Dentro*, which Alfredo Guisado had in mind to publish, but which was printed on the pages of *República* newspaper in a fragmented and incomplete way, allows the identification of a discourse by someone who was one of *Orpheu's* collaborators. Also, he began to claim, especially in the 1960s, his role, his proper place in the *Orpheu* group, mainly because at that time many texts that were being published did not mention his name and his importance in the group. In his various press texts, he claims his existence, his need to make known his work in the 1960s, so much so that in 1969, he gathered four of his books and published them with the title *Tempo de Orfeu*. Therefore, this literary critic, who was an important member of the *Orpheu* generation, can be seen, on the pages of *República*, reflecting on the legacy, meaning and importance of *Orpheu*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakhtin, Mikhail, "O discurso na poesia e o discurso no romance", in *Teoria do romance I: A estilística*, Translated by Paulo Bezerra, São Paulo, Editora 34, 2015a, p. 47-78.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, "Os gêneros do discurso", in *Estética da criação verbal*, Translated by Paulo Bezerra, São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2015b, p. 261-306.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail, *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*, Translated by Paulo Bezerra, Rio de Janeiro, Forense Universitária, 2015c.
- Campos, Álvaro, "Ode Triunfal", in *Orpheu 1*, Edited by Maria Aliete Galhoz, Lisboa, Ática, 1971, p. 101-110.
- Centeno, Yvette, "Os fantasmas de *Orpheu*", in *Fernando Pessoa. O amor. A morte. A iniciação*, Lisboa, A Regra do Jogo, 1985, p. 57-65.

- Cunha, Teresa Sobral “Prefácio”, in *Mário de Sá-Carneiro*, Correspondência com Fernando Pessoa Lisboa, Assírio & Alvim, 2003, p. i-xvii.
- Gebra, Fernando de Moraes, “*Orpheu* e a imprensa no caderno de Alfredo Guisado: ‘Recortes’ de uma revista literária”, in *Revista Solettras*, nº 40, 2020, p.72-99.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Comentário”, in *República*, nº 4489, 1943a.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Comentário”, in *República*, nº 4647, 1943b.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “O conceito de poesia como expressão da cultura, Hernani Cidade”, in *República*, nº 5214, 1945.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Vida e obra de Fernando Pessoa. Um novo trabalho literário do sr. dr. João Gaspar Simões”, in *República*, nº 7102, 1950.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Discurso sobre o real quotidiano – Mário Cesariny de Vasconcelos”, in *República*, nº 7896, 1952a.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Erro próprio – António Maria Lisboa”, in *República*, nº 7915, 1952b.
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Convém explicar que”, in *República*, nº 10812, 1961a
- Guisado, Alfredo, “Ainda as críticas do *Orpheu*”, in *República*, nº 11127, 1961b
- Leal, Raul, “As tendências orfaicas e o Saudosismo”, in *Tempo Presente, Revista Portuguesa de Cultura*, nº 5, 1959, p. 17-24.
- Montalvor, Luís de, *Para o túmulo de Fernando Pessoa e outras prosas*, Edited by Arnaldo Saraiva, Lisboa, Babel.
- Monteiro, Adolfo Casais “A geração do *Orpheu*. Situação do Modernismo”, in Blanco, José (ed.), *A poesia de Fernando Pessoa*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1985, p. 31-46.
- Pascoaes, Teixeira de, *Arte de ser Português*. Lisboa, Delraux, 1978.
- Pessoa, Fernando, *Páginas íntimas e de auto interpretação*, Edited by Georg Rudolf Lind and Jacinto do Prado Coelho, Lisboa, Ática, 1966.
- Pessoa, Fernando, *Correspondência: 1905-1922*, Edited by Manuela Parreira da Silva, São Paulo, Cia. Letras, 1999.
- Simões, João Gaspar, *Vida e obra de Fernando Pessoa. História duma geração*, the 5th edition. Lisboa, Dom Quixote, 1987.
- Vila Maior, Dionísio, *Fernando Pessoa: Heteronímia e dialogismo*, Coimbra, Almedina, 1994.
- Vila Maior, Dionísio, *Introdução ao modernismo*, Coimbra, Almedina, 1996.

NOTES

1. Dionísio Vila Maior, *Introdução ao modernismo*, Coimbra, Almedina, 1996, p. 65.
2. Mikhail Bakhtin, “O discurso na poesia e o discurso no romance”, in *Teoria do romance I: A estilística*, translated by Paulo Bezerra, São Paulo, Editora 34, 2015, p. 51.
3. Dionísio Vila Maior, *Fernando Pessoa: Heteronímia e dialogismo*, Coimbra, Almedina, 1994, p. 48.
4. Fernando Pessoa, *Correspondência: 1905-1922*, Edited by Manuela Parreira da Silva, São Paulo, Cia. Letras, 1999, p. 186 [m.t].
5. Mikhail Bakhtin, “Os gêneros do discurso”, in *Estética da criação verbal*, Translated by Paulo Bezerra, São Paulo, Martins Fontes, 2015, p. 262.
6. João Gaspar Simões, *Vida e obra de Fernando Pessoa. História duma geração*, 5th edition. Lisboa, Dom Quixote, 1987, p. 217-218, highlighted by me [m.t].
7. Teresa Sobral Cunha, “Prefácio”, in Mário de Sá-Carneiro, *Correspondência com Fernando Pessoa* Lisboa, Assírio & Alvim, 2003, p. vii [m.t].
8. Fernando Pessoa, *Páginas íntimas e de auto-interpretação*, Edited by Georg Rudolf Lind and Jacinto do Prado Coelho, Lisboa, Ática, 1966, p. 113-114 [m.t].
9. Álvaro de Campos, “Ode Triunfal”, in *Orpheu 1*, Edited by Maria Aliete Galhoz, Lisboa, Ática, 1971, p. 101 [m.t].

10. Yvette Centeno, “Os fantasmas de *Orpheu*”, in *Fernando Pessoa. O amor. A morte. A iniciação*, Lisboa, A Regra do Jogo, 1985, p. 60 [m.t].
11. Teixeira de Pascoaes, *Arte de ser Português*, Lisboa, Delraux, 1978, p. 141 [m.t].
12. Luís de Montalvor, *Para o túmulo de Fernando Pessoa e outras prosas*, Edited by Arnaldo Saraiva, Lisboa, Babel, p. 159 [m.t].
13. *Ibidem*, p. 155 [m.t].
14. *Ibidem*, p. 157 [m.t].
15. *Ibidem*, p. 158 [m.t].
16. *Ibidem*, p. 158-159 [m.t].
17. *Ibidem*, p. 159 [m.t].
18. *Ibidem*, p. 159-160 [m.t].
19. Mikhail Bakhtin, *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*, Translated by Paulo Bezerra, Rio de Janeiro, Forense Universitária, 2015c.
20. Raul Leal, “As tendências orfaicas e o Saudosismo”, in *Tempo Presente, Revista Portuguesa de Cultura*, 5, September 1959, p. 18 [m.t].
21. *Idem*, p. 17.
22. *Ibidem* [m.t].
23. *Ibidem* [m.t].
24. *Idem*, p. 18 [m.t].
25. Alfredo Guisado, “Convém explicar que”, in *República*, February 10, 1961a, p. 5 [m.t].
26. Adolfo Casais Monteiro, “A geração do *Orpheu*. Situação do Modernismo”, in *A poesia de Fernando Pessoa*, Edited by José Blanco, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1985, p. 39 [m.t].
27. Alfredo Guisado, “O conceito de poesia como expressão da cultura, Hernani Cidade”, in *República*, June 26, 1945, p. 3 [m.t].
28. Alfredo Guisado, “Comentário”, in *República*, June 18, 1943a, p. 3 [m.t].
29. Alfredo Guisado, “Comentário”, in *República*, November 23, 1943b, p. 3 [m.t].
30. *Ibidem* [m.t].
31. Alfredo Guisado, “Erro próprio – António Maria Lisboa”, in *República*, December 24, 1952b, p. 9 [m.t].
32. Alfredo Guisado, “Discurso sobre o real quotidiano – Mário Cesariny de Vasconcelos”, in *República*, December 5, 1952a, p. 4 [m.t].
33. *Ibidem* [m.t].
34. The epistle is in Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues’ collection, archived at Biblioteca Pública Municipal de Ponta Delgada, an institution I thank for making this important text by Alfredo Guisado available to me.
35. This letter was published in the following paper: Fernando de Moraes Gebra, “*Orpheu* e a imprensa no caderno de Alfredo Guisado: ‘Recortes’ de uma revista literária”, in *Revista Soletas*, n. 40, 2020, p. 72-99.
36. Alfredo Guisado, “Convém explicar que”, in *República*, February 10, 1961a, p. 8 [m.t].
37. The book *Orpheu por dentro*, by Alfredo Guisado, is in the process of being published in an edition organized by me.
38. Alfredo Guisado, “Ainda as críticas do *Orpheu*”, in *República*, December 29, 1961b, p. 5 [m.t].