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Abstract
Ever since the posthumous editorial process of Fernando Pessoa’s writings began in 1942, editors have found themselves confronted with several challenging tasks: one of them, undoubtedly, has been the deciphering of the author’s handwriting. Today, seventy years later, an important number of manuscripts remain unpublished, while numerous other transcriptions need to be revised. The present article concerns a small corpus that falls within the latter group of texts insofar as it reviews the transcriptions of one Portuguese poem, an unfinished French sonnet, three fragmentary English odes and a later English poem. I propose to undertake the revision of the selected corpus essentially with the aid of metrics. Particular attention shall be given to the genesis of each one of these compositions.
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Resumo
Desde que o processo editorial póstumo dos escritos de Fernando Pessoa começou em 1942, os editores têm-se confrontado com diversos desafios, um deles sendo, indubitavelmente, a decifração da caligrafia do autor. Hoje, setenta anos mais tarde, uma importante quantidade de manuscritos mantém-se inédita, outra parte ainda necessita de ser revista. O presente artigo diz respeito a um pequeno corpus deste segundo conjunto, na medida em que revê as transcrições de um poema em português, um soneto inacabado em francês, três odes fragmentárias em inglês e um poema posterior em língua inglesa. Proponho-me abordar a revisão do corpus seleccionado essencialmente com base na métrica. Será dada uma atenção particular à génesis de cada um destes poemas.

* Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa – Centro de Estudos Comparatistas.
Literary interpretation is grounded in the historical study of material texts (whether or not the scholars are aware of this grounding, and whether or not their criticism makes self-conscious use of it).

Jerome J. MacGann

Introduction

Anyone familiar with Fernando Pessoa’s archive is aware that deciphering his handwriting remains a most painstaking task, even if accustomed to it after years of regular practice. Different generations of editors have contributed to the publication of thousands of texts, as well as to the completion and revision of many others; yet, seventy years after the pioneering editorial work of João Gaspar Simões and Luís de Montalvor, more than half of Pessoa’s archive still awaits transcription and publication.

Not only concerned with unpublished texts, some Pessoan editors still deal with the revision of a fraction of the posthumously published documents. The small corpus I intend to examine here comprises this latter group: (§ 1) a Portuguese poem published by Manuela Parreira da Silva, Ana Maria Freitas and Madalena Dine (Poesia 1902-1917, 2005; henceforth P02-17); (§ 2) an unfinished...
French poem brought to the press by Patrick Quillier (*Fernando Pessoa. Œuvres poétiques*, 2001; henceforth *Œuvres*); (§ 3) three fragmentary English odes initially attributed by Pessoa to Charles Robert Anon and then to Alexander Search. These fragmentary poems were first critically published by João Dionísio in *Poemas Ingleses* (1997, tome II; henceforth *PI.1*) and subsequently (two of them and without the textual variants) by Luísa Freire in *Alexander Search. Poesia* (1999; henceforth *ASP*). Stanzas pertaining to one of the two odes also included in Freire’s edition were critically published by Jerónimo Pizarro and myself in *Cadernos* (2009, tome I). The revision of the odes concerns the transcriptions given in these three different editions.

I propose to undertake the revision of the selected corpus partly with the aid of *metrics* (study of versifying) arguing, in each case, that this discipline offers valuable tools for the stabilization of texts. Because metrics is not limited to aiding in the stabilization of exclusively handwritten documents, I shall also consider (§ 4) a typewritten English poem transcribed by Christopher Aureta and published by Teresa Rita Lopes in *Pessoa Inédito* (1993; henceforth *PIne*). This latter poem, without modification, was subsequently included by Luísa Freire in *Poesia Inglesa* (2000, tome II; henceforth *PI.2*).

It should be said from the outset that the relevance of metrics in textual criticism has been argued by other editors. In the preface to Plautus’s *Menaechmi*, for instance, A. S. Gratwick states:

> For an editor, a proper understanding of the playwright’s metrical technique is, in its way, as good as a fresh MS of high quality […]. For in Plautus we find celebrated some of the most attractive qualities of the Latin language, and the metrical texture of his writing is as much an inseparable part of that as alliteration, anaphora, or any of the more visible things that commentators are wont to talk about.

(1993: viii)

The “metrical texture” referred to by Gratwick corresponds to one of the three requirements for “a satisfactory editorial solution” given by Martin West in his *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (1973). West worded it thus: a suitable editorial solution should correspond “in language, style, and any relevant technical points (*metre*, prose rhythm, avoidance of hiatus, etc.) to a way in which the author might naturally have expressed that sense” (1973: 48; my italics).

As Luís Prista has shown in the re-edition of a Portuguese quatrain by Fernando Pessoa (Prista, 1995: 199-201), attention to the technical aspects of a text

---

8 The numerous transcriptions of “Poems by Alexander Search” done by Georg Rudolf Lind are found in Pessoa’s archive (78 Annex). The three fragmentary odes here reviewed are not found among these transcriptions.

9 The first time a term is introduced it will appear in italics. Unless self-explanatory, terms shall always be defined; the definition will appear in parentheses.
may prove useful for the editor. In Prista’s case it was the attention given to the rhyme scheme of the quatrain likely followed by Pessoa. But Prista’s instruments were not limited to metrics. Taking into account a paleographical study of the autograph document and the sense in context (two other requirements argued by West)\(^{10}\) he arrived at a different editorial solution.\(^{11}\) In the process of my revisions these two requirements will not be disregarded.

Before turning to the poems that I shall undertake for revision, let us add that, in Pessoa’s case, the value of metrics as an aid will be heightened by the use of his private library. Held at the Casa Fernando Pessoa in Lisbon since 1993 and now easily accessible in digital form,\(^{12}\) Pessoa’s book collection contains most, if not all, of the canonical verse forms that he learned and eventually put into practice. Not only are they present in the private library but they also carry the traces of his keen desire for apprenticeship; numerous poems in books, particularly those dating from the Durban years, are marked, underlined, commented upon and/or scanned (see Ferrari, 2012: Appendix IV). Consequently, the private library, along with certain *marginalia* (annotations in the margins, flyleaves and/or other parts of a book) will serve as precious guides. In this vein, though scattered in the author’s archive, metrical sketches, scansions and/or other notes on meter and rhythm will also be perused. Thus, the revising process will be conducted, as far as possible, with an eye (and ear) on the stages of the creative process itself.

1. A Portuguese Short-Line Poem Destined to *Ondas*

One of Pessoa’s earliest Portuguese poetry projects, datable from 1909, bears the title “*Ondas.*” In a notebook under the heading “Portuguese Works” we find it among some forty other titles of the most diverse sorts (e.g., feminism, on rhythm, essays on philosophy, inter alia; see 144D-1\(^r\) to 3; *Escritos sobre Gênio e Loucura*, 2006: I, 37-38). In this very notebook there figures a more specific reference to this never-concluded book of verse. In Roman numerals and under “‘*Ondas’ \| Livro

---

10 Dealing with classical texts (i.e., with authors whose textual witnesses are not available), West’s third requirement concerns the clarification of transmitted corruptions that the “presumed original reading” may have undergone (1973: 48). In Pessoa’s case, most of the autograph materials being available, this requirement may be simply characterized as a paleographical inspection of the textual witness in question.

11 His reading differed from those proposed by Lind and Coelho in *Quadras ao gosto popular* (1965) and by Sobral Cunha in *Quadras e outros cantares* (1997), respectively.

12 And has been since October 2010: [http://casafernandopessoa.cm-lisboa.pt/bdigital/index/index.htm](http://casafernandopessoa.cm-lisboa.pt/bdigital/index/index.htm). Jerónimo Pizarro, Antonio Cardiello, and I have co-directed the digitization of Fernando Pessoa’s private library. The paper publication of *A Biblioteca Particular de Fernando Pessoa* (Pizarro, Ferrari and Cardiello, 2010), which accompanies the site, gathers in one volume the majority of the books, magazines and newspapers that were in Pessoa’s possession at the time of his death, on 30 November 1935.
primeiro” Pessoa quoted the incipit of the first eight Portuguese poems (of a total of twenty; the last twelve entries were left blank) (144D-4). If we trust the date on the textual witnesses, he composed them between 15 November 1908 and 27 January 1909. In this section I wish to focus on the two existing witnesses of poem VII, dated 31 December 1908. In all they comprise approximately 200 lines: I. “Tenho em vez de pensamento...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-15; P02-17, 2005: 32-33); II. “Canção”: “Ide busca-l-a, Desejos...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-6; P02-17, 2005: 28); III. “Abenlied”: “O orvalho da tarde beija...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-7; P02-17, 2005: 29); IV. “Suspiro”: “Suspiro, quero ir contigo...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-8; P02-17, 2005: 29-30); V. “Nocturno”: “Dorme, creança, dorme...” dated 27 January 1909 (34-26; P02-17, 2005: 43-44); VI. “Marineiro-monge...” (34-36 and 38); VII. “Choras? Câia o teu pranto...” dated 31 December 1908 (34-25; cf. P02-17 2005: 40; Ferrari, 2012: 367); VIII. “Para que vens? Já perdi...” dated 31 December 1908 (34-14; P02-17, 2005: 30-31). Besides counting the texts signed Lança, Pip, and Pancracio (see Silveira, 1988), there are approximately a dozen Portuguese poems in Pessoa’s archive dated prior to 15 November 1908. These poems were written in 1902 and 1908, respectively. There is also a quadra with a rhyme scheme xaxa dated 27 August 1907 (17-2; Quadras, 1997: 188).

13 In all they comprise approximately 200 lines: I. “Tenho em vez de pensamento...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-15; P02-17, 2005: 32-33); II. “Canção”: “Ide busca-l-a, Desejos...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-6; P02-17, 2005: 28); III. “Abenlied”: “O orvalho da tarde beija...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-7; P02-17, 2005: 29); IV. “Suspiro”: “Suspiro, quero ir contigo...” dated 15 November 1908 (34-8; P02-17, 2005: 29-30); V. “Nocturno”: “Dorme, creança, dorme...” dated 27 January 1909 (34-26; P02-17, 2005: 43-44); VI. “Marineiro-monge...” (34-36 and 38); VII. “Choras? Câia o teu pranto...” dated 31 December 1908 (34-25; cf. P02-17 2005: 40; Ferrari, 2012: 367); VIII. “Para que vens? Já perdi...” dated 31 December 1908 (34-14; P02-17, 2005: 30-31). Besides counting the texts signed Lança, Pip, and Pancracio (see Silveira, 1988), there are approximately a dozen Portuguese poems in Pessoa’s archive dated prior to 15 November 1908. These poems were written in 1902 and 1908, respectively. There is also a quadra with a rhyme scheme xaxa dated 27 August 1907 (17-2; Quadras, 1997: 188).

14 While in the notebook Pessoa writes “Choras? Câia o teu pranto...” (i.e., “câia” with the diacritic indicating the acute accent), in the two existing versions of the poem (figs. 1 and 5) he omits it.
Below I quote the lines of verse\(^{15}\) (fig. 1) as they were first published in modern European Portuguese orthography by Parreira da Silva, Freitas and Dine:

Chorar? Caia o teu pranto  
Sobre a minha alma a sangrar  
Como caia sobre a terra o manto  
Do orvalho ou do luar.

(34-25; P02-17, 2005: 40)

My reading differs from theirs in the following: (1) inclusion of the verses below the dotted line (i.e., lines 5 and 6); (2) line 1: “Choras” instead of “Chorar”; (3) line 4: no period after “luar”; (4) line 4: the line is indented. Here is a possible new transcription:

Choras? Caia o teu pranto  
Sobre a minha alma a sangrar  
Como caia sobre a terra o manto  
Do orvalho ou do luar  
Eu quero ver-te ao ouvir meu canto,\(^{16}\)  
Sorrir em teu chorar.

(34-25; Ferrari, 2012: 160)

Although the last two lines were written with a different writing instrument, it is arguably a six-line poem in no set form that combines two lines of different lengths (given here in metrical syllables and with the following rhyme scheme): \(6a\) \(8b\) \(8a\) \(6b\) \(8a\) \(6b\). This addition remains well in accordance with the strrophe design (the length of lines and the line-end rhyme scheme) of the composition.\(^{17}\) Note that the three added words in line 4 (“orvalho ou do”,\(^{18}\) also penned with a different writing instrument) correspond to the number of metrical syllables required for the

---

\(^{15}\) Building on Jakobson’s three-way verse distinction (1960), modern metrists have opted for the term *verse instance* to describe an actual line of verse and the term *verse design* for the specific meter of that line. This helps differentiate the contents of each, because the verse instance clearly consists of linguistic material, while the verse design does not (if it did, all the lines in the poem would be the same). In fact, the meter (or *verse design*) is an abstraction that consists of a *template* comprising sub-units that we now call *positions* and a set of rules or constraints (*correspondence rules*, also known as *realization constraints*) for crafting verse instances. Correspondence rules determine the *quantity* (e.g., in syllable-based meters such as Shakespeare’s sonnets there is a maximum size of one syllable per position in the line [except for the last]) and the *quality* (e.g., except for the first position in an English iambic pentameter, a strong syllable of a polysyllabic word is constrained from occupying weak positions) (see Duffell 2000: 286, n. 3 and 2008: 13).

\(^{16}\) The crossed-out line (“Se a tua alma é triste o teu choro é santo”) has nine metrical syllables as opposed to eight, which is the length of the one below, as well as of lines 2 and 3.  

\(^{17}\) Strophe design also includes the number of lines in a given poem.

\(^{18}\) Regarding quotes from lines of poetry, punctuation not belonging to the quotation itself will be placed outside of the quotation marks, where pertinent.
hexasyllabic line. The regularity throughout this piece is a sign of the attention the author gave to structure.

In order to solve the second difference (“Choras” vs. “Chorar”), we may turn to the way in which the word that closes the poem appears written on the manuscript. The last letter of the verb that closes the poem (fig. 2) does not resemble the one that opens it (fig. 3):

![Fig. 2. Detail of (34-25').](image1)

![Fig. 3. Detail of (34-25').](image2)

Moreover, it should be noted that, syntactically speaking, the verb in the closing line could only be in the infinitive:

Sorrir em teu chorar.

![Fig. 4. Detail of (34-25').](image3)

Should these two evidences not suffice, the examination of a second textual witness (fig. 5), likely destined for Pessoa’s “Tratado de Prosodia e Poetica” and datable from 1909, will seal the matter.

![Fig. 5. (122-2').](image4)

---

19 Above the lines of verse we read: “Em poesia vale o rhythmo tanto como a grammatica” (122-2'; *Fernando Pessoa e a Nova Métrica*, 1993: 97; henceforth *FPNM*). For the genesis and content of Pessoa’s treaty see Ferrari (2012).
Below a transcription of Pessoa’s own Portuguese lines along with his scansion:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Choras} & \mid \text{caia} \mid \text{o teu pranto} \\
\text{Sobre} & \mid \text{a minha alma} \mid \text{a sangrar} \\
\text{Como cae} & \mid \text{sobre a terra} \mid \text{o manto} \\
\text{Do orvalho ou do lua} & \text{r} \\
\text{Eu quero} & \mid \text{ver-te} \mid \text{ao ouvir} \mid \text{meu canto} \\
\text{Sorrir} & \mid \text{em teu chorar}
\end{align*}
\]

(122-2; cf. FPNP, 1993: 97)\(^{20}\)

Except for the scansion and the punctuation, the transcription of the verses I propose for (122-2; fig. 5) does not differ from that of (34-25; fig. 1).

Interestingly, Pessoa’s own scansion (the opening word of line 1 is scanned as a stressed syllable [/\] followed by an unstressed syllable [\(\cup\)]) leads us to infer that the verb reads “Choras”. In other words, by relying on the stress pattern indicated by the author (“choras” and not to “chorar”) (the stressed syllable is underlined and given in bold by me) we arrive at the new editorial solution.

Whereas in this section it is the existence of a second textual witness (for which a new transcription was here given) that has greatly served to stabilize the transcription of a poem, in sections two and three, without disregarding Pessoa’s archive, I shall also turn my attention to his private library.

2. From Baudelaire’s Classical Alexandrin Lines to a New Transcription of an Early French Sonnet

The absence of a book in someone’s library should not lead us straightforwardly to infer that the volume never stood among those still extant or that some of its pages were not first read outside the private realm. One of the most revealing examples of such a scenario is thoroughly analyzed in “Shakespeare’s Small Library,” a chapter in Jonathan Bate’s recent study of the Stratford poet and playwright (Bate, 2008).\(^{21}\)

\(^{20}\) Besides the archive number on the right hand-side corner (122-2) the numbers “17/66” were not written by Pessoa. For the analysis of Pessoa’s scansion, as well as the possible influence of Marlowe’s Tamburlaine (via Robert Bridges) on this poem, see Ferrari (2012: 162-166). For the differences with Fernando Lemos’s transcription, see document (122-2) critically transcribed in Ferrari (2012: 368).

\(^{21}\) According to the eminent scholar, a copy of Plutarch’s Lives of the Noble Greeks and Romans in Sir Thomas North’s translation (and which might have belonged to Shakespeare) is preserved at the Greenock Library in Scotland (2008: 142). Shakespeare drew on Plutarch’s Lives, commonly called also Parallel Lives, for his Julius Caesar, Antony and Cleopatra and Coriolanus (2008: 113). Based on
A less Herculean, though still challenging task, is the reconstruction of Fernando Pessoa’s intellectual biography, that is, cataloguing both the extant books and journals in his private library (see Pizarro, Ferrari and Cardiello, 2010) and the titles that, absent from the collection, are attested in quasi-marginalia, quotations and intertextual instances. In order to undertake the latter, what may be called the virtual part of the library, Pessoa left us numerous accounts. Not only do we find in his archive lists of books purchased or expected to arrive at the Livraria Inglesa (see Cardiello, 2010), but also the titles of books, as well as notes and quotations from those he consulted, for instance, at the Biblioteca Nacional de Lisboa and at the Biblioteca da Academia das Ciências (see Sebastianismo e Quinto Império, 2011: 303-340). When reconstructing a writer’s library this are precious indices to take into account. Yet the true challenge begins not from lists and other references left in the archive, but rather from the less explicit presence in the writings themselves.

Being a vast area to explore in Pessoan studies, and certainly exceeding the purpose of this article, I shall take up just one single such example. Although purchased in 1934-1935 and left without a single mark, Les Fleurs du mal by Charles Baudelaire ([1857] 1934; fig. 6) is a work that Pessoa had closely read three decades earlier.

That Pessoa was interested in the works of the Parisian poet we deduce from different sources. In the oft-referred list of Pessoa’s literary influences for October 1905-1908 (see Côrtes-Rodrigues, [1945]: 88), Baudelaire appears at the top, before Cesário Verde, Edgar A. Poe and Antero de Quental, among others. In Pessoa’s archive we find the names of various French poets with the author of Les Paradis artificiels also on top (see 48B-114). References to him are varied (see Monteiro, 1988), including a signature trial “F. A. N. Pessôa | Ch. Baudelaire”, datable from 1905 (24-121v) and Portuguese octosyllabic verses dedicated to him (see 66D-2v; Ferrari, 2012: 380).

Influences and biographical information, Bate also remarks that Shakespeare “would almost certainly have taken home to Stratford [when he lived in London it is said that the playwright went to his hometown once a year] […] Florio’s Montaigne translation, which we know from Gonzalo’s borrowing was on his mind at the time of the Tempest and that was formative of the philosophical vision of King Lear” (2008: 149).

I borrow this term from George Whalley, the first editor of Coleridge’s complete marginalia: “Quasi-marginalia—notes written by Coleridge in a notebook or on separate sheets of paper, of a kind that might well have been written in the book they refer to if it had been convenient or appropriate for him to do so. These typically include the title of the book referred to and page-references” (Whalley, 1980: I. xxxi).

Les Fleurs du mal was expanded in 1861.

Poems such as “Ennui,” “l’Inconnue,” and “La Chercheuse” (titles originally in French), all of them included in the posthumous The Mad Fiddler (1999) have affinities (both in theme and diction) with lines in Spleen (see Quillier, 1988: 28-29). Baudelaire’s influence is not, as we shall see, limited to Pessoa’s English poetry.
Between the end of 1906 and 1908, Pessoa’s writings revolved almost exclusively around two languages: English and French. It may be argued that in this time period, perhaps more than any other time in his life, the miscellaneous production of the then unknown Portuguese poet was derived almost exclusively from his (re)readings—also primarily in these two languages. Intertextual examples abound, for instance, in Charles Robert Anon’s stress-syllabic lines and
Alexander Search’s ictic and syllabic verses, respectively (see Ferrari, 2012: 136-147).

In the pursuit to develop stylistic identities (his own as well as that of the fictional writers he gradually shaped), the poetic diction and metrical versatility attained by Pessoa before the decisive return to his native Portuguese is worth investigating—and his incursions in French verse are rather telling in this respect.

Dated 5 August 1908, “Été. La lune dort en rêvant sur la mer” (50A1-9; Ferrari, 2012: 371) echoes Baudelaire’s “Tristesses de la lune” (1934: 107), a sonnet (made up of two quatrains and two tercets) included in the first section of Les Fleurs du mal, “Spleen et idéal.” Not only does it share similarities in the choice of words, but it bears other affinities such as the rhyme scheme (rimes croisées, abab) and choice of meter (alexandrin). Pessoa’s (initial?) stanza of what seems to be an unfinished sonnet opens and closes with the simple primary rhythm given by phrasal stress (6 + 6). Unlike Baudelaire’s sonnet, Pessoa’s fragmentary composition does not always obey the classical alexandrin constraints: while lines 1 and 4 are a fine realization of the long-line meter, line 2 is a 4 + 8 measure (“Et la mer dort d’être sans te sentir ravie”) and line 3 has a break after syllable 4 and one after syllable 8, without any constraint on the corresponding caesuras (“La nuit, la mer, de mon cœur mèlent leur □ amer”). (For the typology of alexandrin variants see Cornulier 1982 and Dominicy 1992).

In spite of these differences (metrical variants) Pessoa’s lines could arguably be rendered as the first stanza of an unfinished sonnet. As it will be shown below, there is another Baudelarian sonnet in Pessoa’s archive where the apprentice-poet left at least two textual witnesses—the earlier one being made up of the opening stanza:

Dominicy gives two classes of caesura: “a caesura is ‘synthetical’ if, and only if, it is not separated from its break by any non-elided vowel; otherwise, it is ‘analytical’” (1992: 169). In other words, the former (if we take the alexandrin to illustrate it) is any classical alexandrin line (6 + 6) including lines with an elision at position 7. The analytical caesura is any variant of the alexandrin where syllable 6 is stressed in its word and (unelided) syllable 7 is a feminine syllable belonging to the same word. There are four lines in Baudelaire’s sonnet where elision causes the caesura to be synthetical (e.g., l. 1: “Ce soir, la lune rêve avec plus de paresse;”).

Although with a visible space between “leur” and “amer”, line 3 has 12 metrical syllables.
The second and much more elaborate draft (see fig. 8 below) will practically reproduce the first two lines just quoted above, also conserving the same 6 + 6 measure:

Oh, femme aux yeux si noirs, dont le sourire étrange
Comme un jour sans soleil m’a refroidi le cœur

(50B1-4; cf. Œuvres, 2001: 1635)

While the choice of theme and vocabulary may have been inspired by Baudelaire’s “Femmes damnées” (e.g., five of the nine words Pessoa wrote in rhyming position) (see Baudelaire, 1934: 222-223)—a poem arranged in quatrains and constructed according to the constraints of the classical alexandrin—Pessoa’s rhyme scheme follows the Baudelarian model present in various other sonnets throughout Les Fleurs du mal (e.g., “Le Possédé” in “Spleen et idéal”; see 1934: 62).

The identification of the possible source for Pessoa’s strophe design along with a paleographic study of both textual witnesses and sense in context has led me to a transcription that differs from the one proposed by Patrick Quillier (cf. Œuvres, 2001: 1635).

---

27 For a critical transcription see Ferrari (2012: 373).
Oh, femme aux yeux si noirs, dont le sourire étrange
Comme un jour sans soleil m’a refroidi le cœur
□
□

Tes yeux sont une voix sans être et sans mélange
Des abîmes non-vus, □ où la douleur
N’a de gémissements, ni de cris, ni de pleurs
□

Je ne saurais t’aimer. Il y a en toi le sable
D’où élève le mal son □
Qui est et qui n’est pas □

Je suis jeune et suis vieux, et je n’ai de ce monde
Que la haine et l’horreur, reflet de l’au-delà
Dont je n’ai que la peur – la peur noire et profonde.

(50B1-4; cf. Œuvres, 2001: 1635; Ferrari, 2012: 372)\(^\text{28}\)

\(^{28}\) For a critical transcription see Ferrari (2012: 372).
The three main differences between transcriptions are as follows: (1) the missing lines (lines 3-4 and 8) were not reproduced by Quillier; (2) the third stanza was given as having four lines; and (3) there was an indication that the poem had not been completed.

That lines 3, 4 and 8 are missing may be attested from the strophe design which, as argued above, is based on the Baudelarian model. Based on the design along with a paleographic examination of the second textual witness we rapidly infer that the sonnet is made of two *quatrains* and two *tercets*. Thus, the additions between lines 9 and 10 (first *tercet*) are textual variants for line 10 and the mark below the second *tercet* merely indicates the end of the sonnet. Last but not least, it may added that in a list of titles/incipits of poems published and dated by João
Dionísio, we find the incipit of this French poem with the indication regarding the number of total lines: “Oh femme aux yeux si noirs | (14)” (48B-94 to 102 [99]; PI.1, 1997: II, 294-299 [297]).

Except for the third stanza, the rest of Pessoa’s lines are all well-formed classical alexandrins: note the strict use of the caesura (no lines with césure enjambante). The classical alexandrin is so rigorously followed in this sonnet that in 7 out of the 11 lines the caesura is marked by punctuation. Remarkably, in two of the unfinished lines Pessoa leaves a gap after position 6 (line 6) and only constructs the first hemistich (line 11). Only in the third stanza do we have lines with hiatuses, a phenomenon generally proscribed in classical poetry; in the second hemistich of “Je ne saurais t’aimer. Il y a en toi le sable”, for instance, we have: “il y a” (three syllables in the prosody presupposed in classical verse), but here Pessoa adopts the normal, spoken [ilja] with two syllables. Apart from this classical prosodic deviation, the verse scans 6 + 6.

It may be necessary to point out that even if some of the French poets Pessoa read did not always restrict their use of the caesura to classical rules (e.g., Leconte de Lisle’s use of definite articles, prepositions, and even the masculine enclitic “-le” in position 6; see Dominicy, 1992: 174-75), his French versifying seems to have remained less experimental. For example, in the archive I have found only one instance of a definite article (“le”) in position 6, in the opening line of “Les Étangs,” a poem dated 21 November 1913 (“Oh les étangs où le soleil sent las et ombre!” [50A1-18a]).

Whether there are more such long-lines that deviate from classical norms or loftier numbers in Pessoa’s French verses a complete publication would certainly facilitate the undertaking. What is certain, though, is that in these early years of versifying Pessoa composed in regular verse and with metrical models at hand.

3. Milton’s “The Hymn” and Other Strophe Designs in Anon’s/Search’s Fragmentary Early Odes

In the following section I shall look into the strophe design of Milton’s “The Hymn,” which I believe served as a mold for a few strophes in “Ode to the Sea” and “Ode to the Storm.” I shall also analyze other strophe designs in “Ode to the Sea” and “Ode to Music.” Based on these metrical analyses and without leaving aside the sense of the texts and a paleographical study of the autograph documents, I shall revisit existing transcriptions of these odes.

While Milton’s “Nativity Ode” (composed in 1629) was centered on a sacred subject, Brewer points out that modern poets have rarely adopted its form ([1893] 1908: 7). Brewer’s book, which Pessoa likely encountered while in Durban, is cited in (122-4) and (174).
3.1. Milton’s Verse-Craft in Pessoa’s Private Library

Milton’s verse practice was profoundly recognized in the Victorian era, and though in decline during the years of fervent poetical innovation in twentieth-century Britain, Pessoa’s admiration was maintained rather steadily throughout his entire life.30

Commenting on *Samson Agonistes*, the English poet and metrist Robert Bridges asserted that in Milton “rhythm is always ready to follow his thought; a habit with him so essential to his style and so carefully trained, that a motive [...] could hardly have been passed over without some exceptional treatment (1901: 27; see instances 69-81 on pp. 41-43 from Bridges). Pessoa, who probably purchased Bridges’s *Milton’s Prosody* ([1889] 1901)31 in 1904-1905 while still in South Africa, had become thoroughly acquainted with Milton’s verse-craft (viz., the use of poetic meter and poetic rhythm) in the formal context of his final examination in Form VI.32 By this time, Pessoa had attentively read, along with Hazlitt and other literary critics,33 Johnson’s *Lives of the Poets* ([1781] 1890), as his markings in different passages from the essay on Milton reveal:

Fig. 9. Johnson. *Lives of the Poets*, 1890. Detail of page 171.

Shaping his own “system of diction” and “mode of verse” is exactly what the young aspiring poet began to work on in Durban. Selecting themes, words and, most importantly, learning where to place the words, was an art that Pessoa often acknowledged. He read the canonical poets with great diligence, and in terms of form it is always Milton who comes first. It may be for this reason that, years later, he placed him atop his list of influences for 1904-1905 (see Côrtes-Rodrigues,

---

30 Some of the most influential American and British writers of his time stood at the other end. Ezra Pound, for instance, said that “Milton got into a mess trying to write English as if it were Latin” ([1928] 1954: 40).

31 *Milton’s Prosody* by Robert Bridges and *Classical Metres in English Verse* by William Johnson Stone appeared in one single volume in 1901. This is the one that figures in Pessoa’s private library.

32 Milton’s “L’Allegro” and “Il Penseroso,” in *Palgrave’s Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics* (see Bell, 1902), were part of Pessoa’s intermediate examination in December 1904 (Severino, 1970: 57).

33 See note 36.
[1945]: 91). In fact, Milton’s metrical artistry is something that Pessoa read about, first in Durban and then again and again in Lisbon. William P. Trent (1899), whose John Milton: A Short Study of his Life and Work Pessoa probably bought between 1908/1909, was another critic to comment on Milton’s workmanship:

![Image](Fig. 10. Trent. John Milton: A Short Study of his Life and Work, 1899. Page 252.)

In several essays on Milton, the blind poet is compared to Shakespeare. Whereas Trent finished his book valuing them equally, Pessoa, just like Matthew
Arnold in his “Milton” ([1888] 1927) (see fig. 11 below), handed the palm to the author of Paradise Lost.

Fig. 11. Arnold. Essays in Criticism, 1927. Detail of page 63.

It may be argued that contact with Arnold’s essay was at the root of the following undated fragment, entitled “Modern Poems”:

It is not the line by line perfection for which Keats strove and which blamed Shelley for not seeking (…eyes folded), nor the rhythmical perfection which has occupied the minds of so many modern poets, but the organic perfection of the poem as a whole, and as a relation between the whole and its parts – that which Arnold preached, though he had not the strength to realize it.

Milton, and not Shakespeare, is the great type, the model for poets, not now but always.

(49B³-35; Pizarro, 2011A: 42)

That Pessoa placed the tutelary genius of Milton above Shakespeare in terms of composition (i.e., the attainment of ordered wholeness) was bluntly expressed on several occasions (see, for instance, 14C-51, 14C-86 and 87; critically transcribed in Patrício, 2008: 376 and 365-66).35 Pessoa’s metrical study of Milton’s artistry may be observed in his annotated The Poetical Works of John Milton:36

34 In this document Pessoa places Milton over Shakespeare, arguing that while the former has written for men the latter has done so for women who are incapable of appreciating “nobility,” “solemnity” and “purity of mind,” which are qualities Pessoa finds in the author of Paradise Lost (14C-51; Patrício, 2008: 376).

35 Milton’s superiority is referred to in other fields of knowledge, as we infer, for instance, from the title of a work attributed to Antonio Mora (see 71A-2; Obras de António Mora, 2002: 166 and 234).

36 On top of page 1 of Book I of Paradise Lost in The Poetical Works of John Milton (n.d.), we read the following handwritten annotation: “See Addison («Spectator» Nº 303)”; on page 18 (by l. 469 of Bk. I) we read “a telling word. | (Hazlitt).” The essay to which Pessoa alludes is in The Spectator, a book that he preserved until his death (Addison, 1896: 435-38). For Hazlitt’s interpretation of the word “lucid” (in l. 469 of Bk. I), see “On Shakespeare and Milton,” an essay that constitutes the third in a series of Lectures on the English Poets that the English critic delivered in London during January and February, 1818. For the reproduction and transcription of a passage by Milton and the British scholar A. J. Wyatt (on the former’s versification), annotated by Pessoa himself in his own copy of The Poetical Works of John Milton, see Ferrari (2008: 77-78). For the reproduction and transcription of other marginalia in this book, see also Ferrari (2010). For the reproduction and transcription of an
Ferrari
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annotation regarding line 204 of the “Nativity Ode” (Bell, 1902: 7), see Pizarro, Ferrari and Cardiello (2010: 425).

37 Pessoa’s penciled markings (ll. 116, 117, 119, 120-22, 124, 126, 127, and 132-34) divide syntagms for the most part. But Syntagmatic metrics lead nowhere: the syntagms of verse are identical to the syntagms of prose and are not especially regulated. It is not certain that these penciled markings are contemporary with the ink annotations, which date from 1904. Pessoa’s marginal note (“Elision”) refers to Milton’s “glory extinct” in line 141. Note that the “y” is crossed out.
In 1904, while a Form VI student at Durban High School, Pessoa used *Palgrave’s Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*. This anthology, which opens with “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity,” also contains Pessoa’s handwritten annotations regarding Milton’s versification:

> Fig. 13. Bell. *Palgrave’s Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics*, 1902. Pages 4 and 5.

---

38 Fernando Pessoa (1888-1935) lived in Durban, South Africa, from February 1896 to August 1905. In August 1901 he returned to Portugal where he remained until September of the following year, embarking once again for Durban. In December 1904 he completed his studies at Durban High School (Form VI). For detailed information regarding his British education see Severino ([1969/1970] 1983) and Jennings (1984).

39 Besides being in *The Poetical Works of John Milton*, “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity” appears in at least two anthologies extant in the private library. While the most important one dates from the formative years, likely purchased in 1904 and used for the Form VI (see Bell, 1902: 1-9), the other was only acquired more than two decades later (see Palgrave, 1926: 42-49). Only in this latter anthology do we fail to find any verses scanned.

40 The marginal note regarding “to” in line 132 is incorrect. The preposition is not stressed; it simply occupies a strong position. According to parametric theory monosyllables of any type (i.e., grammatical and lexical words) may occupy weak and strong positions (see Hanson and Kiparsky, 1996).
But nothing in Pessoa, especially when it comes to literary esteem, is one-sided. For the Portuguese writer, even the angelic Milton had faults. Around 1930 he wrote: “Blank verse is the ideal medium for an unreadable epic poem. All the metrical science of Milton, and it was very great, cannot make of ‘Paradise Lost’ anything but a dull poem. It is dull, and we must not lie to our souls by denying it” (19-67; _Páginas de Estética e de Teoria e Crítica Literárias_, 1967: 215). Yet how may one deny, for instance, Milton’s pervasive influence on Charles Robert Anon’s “On Death”? (see Monteiro, 2000: 46 and Ferrari, 2012: 137-140). Or, for that matter, the high appraisal Milton received in Pessoa’s debut as a literary critic in Portugal in 1912? Among Pessoa’s papers there is even a sketch for an “Ode after reading Milton”:

![Fig. 14. (48D-27v).42](image)

**Ode after reading Milton.**

I. (a) Who sang the cradle child  
   (b) This man, oh he was  
   (c) □

---

41 The marginal note “cataleptic” should be *catalectic* (a line of verse lacking a syllable at the end or ending with an incomplete foot). In isolation, an acephalic or headless iambic trimeter line [(o) 1 o 1 o 1] is indistinguishable from a catalectic trochaic line [1 o 1 o 1 (o)]. Pessoa is wrong, however, because the remaining lines in this strophe are iambic.

42 I thank Jerónimo Pizarro and Pauly Ellen Bothe for their aid in the transcription of this manuscript.
II. (a) Greatness is constructive not sentimental
(b) This was Milton’s greatness

Incessant as Pessoa’s literary production was, much of what he left in the famous trunk were parts of a work-in-progress. On the verso of this sketch, datable from 1918, there appears the title of this likely never-finished ode:

![Image of Pessoa's manuscript]

*Fig. 15. (48D-27).*

*English Poems.*
1. Elegy.
2. Antinous.
3. Ecstasy.
4. Ode After Reading Milton.
5. The Voyage.
3.2. Re-Editing Anon’s/Search’s Miltonic Stanza Form in “Ode to the Sea” and “Ode to the Storm”

I will turn without further delay to the versification of Milton’s “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity” and Anon’s/Search’s fragmentary odes, respectively. “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity,” composed when Milton was twenty-one years old, has 244 lines and opens with four strophes with a design consisting of six strict iambic pentameters followed by an alexandrine. These 28 lines contain no inversions, only two feminine rhymes and are in *rhyme royal* (ababbcc). The remainder of the poem bears the title “The Hymn” and consists of twenty-seven polymetric eight-line strophes that combine four lines of different lengths (given here in feet) with the following rhyme scheme: a3 a3 b5 c3 c3 b5 d4 d6.⁴³ All these lines are predominantly iambic: the pentameters and hexameters are strictly so, while the trimeters and tetrameter may be *headless* (the initial weak position in the template is unfilled). Headless lines have a long history in English poetry; they are a legacy of older beat-counting meters such as dolniks, where intervals, as well as anacruses, vary in size (see Duffell, 2008: 167-174). Designs that permit them are the precursors of strict iambic designs (thus even Chaucer’s iambic pentameters allow them) (Duffell, 2000: 286, n. 7).

As previously argued (Ferrari, 2010), this strophe design, which served for the construction of some stanzas in “Ode to the Sea” and “Ode to the Storm,” is found copied (and crossed out) in one of Pessoa’s earliest notebooks⁴⁴ (see Cadernos, 2009: I, 105). Since the strophe design underlying “The Hymn” will aid us in reviewing some previous editorial shortcomings, let us reproduce it from the notebook and transcribe it again in full:

---

⁴³ In strophic verse, as is the case with Milton’s “The Hymn,” each strophe comprises the same amount of lines.

⁴⁴ Only in 2007, after the Portuguese state purchased the notebook from Pessoa’s heirs, did this valuable notebook join the rest of the archive at the National Library of Portugal (see Dionísio 2008).
**Forms of Ode.**  
<References: →>  

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Iambic Trimeter. [Never changed].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Iambic Trimeter. [See line 5 below]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Iambic Trimeter. [OR, 1 2 3 4 5, to make meter rapid].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Iambic Trimeter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Iambic Tetrameter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(153-51v; cf. *Cadernos* 2009: I, 140)

The notes on the right-hand side of the strophe design reproduced in fig. 16 are not the realizations of the iambic trimeters we find in Milton, but rather in “Ode to the Storm.” As mentioned above, in “The Hymn” the iambic trimeters and tetrameter may be headless, which reverses the poetic rhythm (iambic > trochaic). Odes assigned to Charles Robert Anon also admit such practice (see, e.g., the iambic trimeter “Splinters overhead” in one of the fragmentary stanzas from “Ode to the Storm”; see fig. 29 below). Interestingly enough, in the stanza opening one of the fragments for “Ode to the Sea” (apart from the dimeter “Pretty sea”) all 16 complete lines of this stanza are trochaic tetrameters, half of them catalectic (see fig. 37 below). But let us focus now on the transcription review process.

In a later notebook we find the antepenultimate and the last stanzas of “Ode to the Sea,” both of them, as we shall observe, constructed after the Miltonic

---

45 When Pessoa writes “1. a. Iambic Trimeter. [Never changed]”, we know that the realization “never changed” does not apply to “The Hymn,” for line 93 (poem IX), for instance, is headless. On the other hand, “Ode to the Storm” and “Ode to the Sea” do follow the “never changed” realization. The remark “to make meter rapid” deserves clarification: English has a tendency for stress-timing (where “intervals between stressed syllables are made perceptively equal by varying the time allotted to unstressed ones”; Duffell, 2008: 31); therefore, three ictic positions that bear stress are perceived as occupying the same regardless of syllable count.
strophe design rendered above. Let me recall the revision of the antepenultimate stanza as it appears in *Cadernos* (2009: I, 168):

![Fig. 17. Superior half (144S-3°).](image)

Two different transcription errors in *Pl.1* (cf. 1997: II, 175), which reappeared in *ASP* (cf. 1999: 386), were reviewed in the transcription of notebook 153 (*Cadernos*, 2009: I, 168), which I transcribed in collaboration with Jerónimo Pizarro. Differing from the first two transcriptions that separated lines 1-4 from 5-8, in *Cadernos* the “Antepenultimate Stanza” was read as one strophe. For this solution we relied (1) on the layout of the lines in the textual witness and (2) the discovery that the strophe had been constructed upon the Miltonic design. Thus we proceeded to the correction of the noun “woes” (Dionísio and Freire; cf. 1997: II, 175 and 1999: 386) to “woe” (Pizarro-Ferrari). Occupying position 10 of the second iambic pentameter, we would expect “woe” (and not “woes”) to rhyme with “blow” in line 3. The physical aspect of the ending of the word in question, though, brought certain doubts as to whether the Miltonic design had been fully respected. The reader may observe that there is a tiny trace downward after the letter “e”:

![Fig. 18. Detail of (144S-3°).](image)

Following a paleographical examination of other textual witnesses, I compared the physical appearance of the “e” at the end of an English word in a document from the same period and in which the author may have even used the same writing instrument. Let us observe the following verse instance:

*At night returns & lingers which I grieve*
In both instances (figs. 18 and 19-20) the trace of the “e” hangs downward, yet the verb conjugated in the first person singular (“I grieve”) in figs. 19-20 reinforces our reading of letter “e” in fig. 18 as “woe” and not “woes”. Thus read, the strophe is in accord with the rhyme scheme of the Miltonic design (aabccbdd): line 3 rhymes with 6 (“blow” and “woe”).

Now, if we carefully observe the alignment of the Miltonic stanza in fig. 16 and the way in which the verse instances of the antepenultimate stanza were laid out (fig. 16), we notice that they almost coincide. The first two traces written between “b.” and “Iambic Pentameter” (fig. 16) indicate that these lines are not indented; the trace in the “Iambic Hexameter” is longer than the previous two (it goes over the period), which means that the non-indentation slightly differs in terms of alignment. While Anon’s/Search’s stanza (fig. 17) matches the alignment in verse instances 1-6, it does not in lines 7 and 8.

In my revisions I shall transcribe each one of the stanzas that follows the Miltonic design as it appears on the page, that is, respecting the layout in the textual witness. Below, I give a possible transcription of the antepenultimate stanza:

---

46 As referred above, the features of strophe design are line number, design shift and line-end rhyme scheme. Therefore, orthography (i.e., alignment) is independent of meter. In the transcriptions here proposed I shall follow the alignment as it appears in the textual witness. In fig. 16 the iambic trimeters and the tetrameter are equally indented. In each one of the stanzas of “The Hymn,” as it was published in Pessoa’s own copy of Milton (Palgrave, 1926: 43-49), the iambic pentameter instances are equally aligned, while the iambic hexameter instance is the outermost line. Furthermore, the alignment of iambic tetrameter instances is also different from the rest. This last feature was not included by Pessoa in the layout of the Miltonic stanza written in his notebook (153-51; Cadernos, 2009: I, 140). Note that in his Milton (n.d.: 413-19) only the iambic pentameter instances are indented; in Bell (1902: 2-9; see fig. 13), none of the lines are indented.
Could I describe thy might
In fitting words, and right
Methinks the earth should feel some horrid blow,
   But thy too awful tones\(^{47}\)
Are not in words, but moans,
And man knows not the rumblings of thy woe.
   For could thy rage in words be spun\(^{48}\)
In broken parts the earth should strike the waning sun.\(^{49}\)

(144S-3\(^{v}\); cf. Cadernos, 2009: I, 168)

The “Last Stanza,” (fig. 21) written in the same notebook as the “Antepenultimate Stanza,” follows the alignment of the strophe design reproduced in fig. 16 above. Below I furnish a possible transcription:

![Image of handwritten text]

But, ah, my power is vain,
More weakly than the rain
Doth seem which follows on thy slow retreat;
Let me but have the power
To spend the passing hour
Gaily and ne’er to know my heart’s last beat.
   For could I, but a fool, e’er trust

\(^{47}\) <horrid> \([\uparrow \text{awful}]\)
\(^{48}\) <might> \([\uparrow \text{voice}] [\downarrow \text{rage} \text{in \ words \ be \ spun} [\uparrow \text{done}]\) \ Note that, unlike in PI.1 (1997: II; 175), in ASP (1999: 386) and in Cadernos (2009: I, 168), the iambic tetrameter did not follow the alignment of the textual witness.
\(^{49}\) <The> /In\ broken parts the <earth> \([\downarrow \text{world} [\downarrow \text{earth} \text{ would} [\uparrow \text{should}] \text{ strike the waning} [\uparrow \text{waning}] \text{ sun.}}\)
To weave □ & truth of the □ dust?

(144S-4; cf. Cadernos, 2009: I, 168)

Neither Dionísio (1997), nor Freire (1999), nor Pizarro-Ferrari (2009) had aligned line five with the other iambic trimeters. Also, neither in PI.1 (1997) nor in Cadernos (2009) had the iambic hexameter been placed as in the transcription proposed above. In ASP (1999: 386) the last two lines of this stanza were not transcribed.

In “Ode to the Sea” other strophe designs were employed. Given that in one strophe my reading differs from the three editions just mentioned, I will come back to it in § 3.3. For now, I wish to remain with the Miltonic stanza form in view for it is this that was also taken up in some stanzas of “Ode to the Storm.” I will look at the transcriptions in the same order (and number) as they appear in PI.1 (1997: II, 176-78). The texts I review are the following: 102a, 102b, 102c, 102d, and 102f.

50 <To be than thou more strong, to be than God more just?> [↑To weave □ & truth of the □ dust?]
51 “Ode to the Storm” was not included in ASP (1999).
I read the opening stanza of “Ode to the Storm” as Dionísio did (*PL.1*, 1997: II, 176). My reading differs only in the alignment of the last two verse instances. Below, I give the stanza with this minor alteration:

Too early day has fled,
With soiléd rays of red
The sun hath sunk beneath its dismal shroud,\(^{52}\)
   In gathering storm array.
On the steps of day
The storm-fiend heaps a cloud upon a cloud,\(^{53}\)
   As in some dreary poet’s tale
The horrid hordes hell-torn of flocking phantoms pale.\(^{54}\)

\(^{52}\) The sun has [↓ hath] sunk [↑ it <is hid>] beneath <a> [↑ its] dismal shroud, ] In *PL.1* (1997: II, 448).
\(^{54}\) The <gal> [↑ horrid ] In *PL.1* (1997: II, 448). Following the alexandrine line the author wrote: “Note”.

\[\text{(49B}-91^{1}\); cf. *PL.1*, 1997: II, 176\]
Since some stanzas were seemingly not written in full (as we may assume from the document headed “Storm” and reproduced in fig. 23), the recognition of the verse design underlying these lines may help to surmount problems in deciphering them. Based on the design of the first stanza of the ode and given that Dionísio’s reading and mine coincide regarding the words in the entire second line and the rhyming word of the first line (“gone”) in fig. 23, I have some (but not all) of the elements necessary to believe that these verses are iambic trimeters: either lines 1-2 or 4-5 (for the Miltonic strophe design refer to fig. 16 above). Dionísio’s reading of the first line is “One hell-drawn sound □ & † gone” PI.1 (1997: II, 176). Before offering a possible solution I wish to dwell again on the physical appearance of what comes in between “One hell-drawn sound” (which I also read like Dionísio) and “gone”. Two things may be observed: (1) the space after “sound” and the space before “gone” do not differ significantly; in other words, either the author left two blank spaces to be filled with linguistic material or he did not; (2) the “s” from “sound” is not attached to the rest of the word.

There are other manuscripts from 1904 where Pessoa’s “s” is written like a cross closing in the bottom, as in the letter that comes after “sound” above. This is the case in another writing also attributed to Charles Robert Anon:
One of the words that Dionísio reads in the line in question is “&”. Here it may be pertinent to add that Pessoa writes this conjunction in different ways. Also dating from the same period, for instance, we find “&” detached from the next word and attached to the second, as in

Based on a paleographical comparison of figs. 26-27 and fig. 28 (below), there is no evidence to rule out the “&” from Dionísio’s reading.

It is here that metrics may help the eye. With the syllable-based iambic trimeter design in mind and accepting all the words in the transcription, except for “&”, we realize that “□ & †” is more linguistic material than the one syllable required for position 5. For this position I propose the monosyllabic “scarce”:

One hell-drawn sound scarce gone
Another follows on

(49B^4-33; cf. PI.1, 1997: II, 176)

Dionísio’s own transcription of the second stanza in 102d (fig. 30, below) confirms the reading that I am suggesting here.\(^{55}\)

\(^{55}\) Since these lines reappear in (49B^4-36; PI.1, 1997: II, 177) they could have been included in the critical apparatus of this latter document.
In *PI.1* (1997: II, 176) the verse instances in fig. 29 (bearing the heading “*Ode to Storm*”) are given as four lines, in turn paired up as two separate fragmentary stanzas. Except for one of the lines (“All nature shakes”)—which I believe was left incomplete—each one of the remaining lines fits a different verse design from the Miltonic strophe design (see fig. 16). It should be noted that in this fragmentary stanza, as well as in the next two (see fig. 30 below), the alignment of the verse instances seems to follow the one from “The Hymn” as it appears in *Palgrave’s Golden Treasury of Songs and Lyrics* (see fig. 13 above). The only difference between the transcription I propose and the one given in *PI.1* (1997) is my indication of four missing verse instances and line 6 being incomplete. Below is a possible transcription:56

□
Splinters overhead
And seems to wrench the roof & tear the sky
□
□
All nature shakes □
Through all its frame the mansion quakes.
□

(49B⁻³⁴; cf. *PI.1* 1997: II, 176)

---

56 Given the lack of space (for the insertion of one line) between the heading (“*Ode to Storm*”) and the line below it and between lines 3 and 6 (for the insertion of two lines; there is enough space for only one), the four lines in the autograph document may be lined up as they appear in Dionísio’s transcription (see 49B⁻³⁴; *PI.1*, 1997: II, 176). As Dirk van Hulle has pointed out, “[t]he aim of genetic criticism is not the reader’s convenience but the awareness that the published text is less of a finished product than it may seem” (2004: 4). However, having recognized the Miltonic strophe design in other stanzas of “*Ode to the Storm*” it is arguably the mould Pessoa (Anon > Search) had in mind here.
In PI.1 (1997: II, 176-77), the transcriptions from the manuscript reproduced in fig. 30 present the following differences with the reading here proposed: (1) four separate fragmentary stanzas; (2) certain words were not read in the same way while others were placed in a different position.

Although there is a clear space after line 7 (from top to bottom), I believe that there are two stanzas in (49B4-36). Let me first give the new transcription of the first stanza and then explain my editorial proposal accordingly:
In *PI.1* (1997: II, 176), the opening line of fig. 30 reads: “With pace corrupt □ lurid”. From the Miltonic ode strophe design we know that the first two iambic trimeters rhyme. Thus it is clear that, if we accept “abrupt” in the second verse instance as the rhyming word, the right choice in the opening line is not “lurid”, but “corrupt”. The adjective “lurid”, which was added later to the manuscript, is written with the same ink used to cross out a word following the preposition (“With”) that initially opened the line. The disyllabic adjective occupies the second and third metrical positions of the syllable-based iambic trimeter. In order to illustrate this more clearly, I place a *[ws]* template below the line in question:

```
/On/ lurid path corrupt
w s w s w s
```

As it may be observed, there are no *mismatches* (also known as *tensions*) between the verse instance and the template (i.e., the stressed syllables of both disyllabic words fall in strong positions). The other two words in this opening line that I read differently are: (1) because “On” was written after “With”—even if it was doubted by the author (“On” appears in parentheses, a mark that Pessoa sometimes used to indicate doubt)—I follow Pessoa’s critical edition procedure where the last word penned is the one the editor reproduces in the text (see Castro, 1990: 46). It may be argued that Pessoa’s possible doubt should be taken into account by the editor. In terms of sense, however, “On lurid path corrupt” reads much better than “With lurid path corrupt”; (2) I read the monosyllabic noun “path” (note that after “pa” there follows a “th” and not “ce”) instead of “pace” (cf. *PI.1*, 1997: II, 176).

In this stanza, lines 7 and 8 should not be given separately from the ones above, but as part of the same strophe (cf. *PI.1*, 1997: II, 177). The visible space between line 6 and lines 7 and 8 may be due to Pessoa’s habit of writing fragmentarily and by fits and starts. There are numerous cases in the archive

---

57 [← /On/] With <!> path corrupt [→ lurid] ] In *PI.1* (1997: II, 449), for the word that was crossed out we read: <!lurid>

58 sound<s>

59 w = weak position; s = strong position.
where lines that rhyme (following a given strophe design) have been worked out in isolation, that is, in a separate compositional phase than the rest. In fact, this is the case with two verse instances, probably lines 7 and 8 of an unfinished stanza, that were rightly integrated into “Ode to the Storm” by Dionísio (see 144S-13; PI.1, 1997: II, 178). This type of practice is a trait that may also be found in translation drafts scattered throughout Pessoa’s archive (see Quental, 2010: 257-261).

Let us now move on to the other stanza written in this manuscript (fig. 30). Below I give a possible transcription:

A lull & then again
In like & furious strain
□ storm
One hell-drawn sound scarce gone,
Another follows on,
Now 2 now 3 do join their power enorm
□
As if in drunken rage doth stagger o’er the clouds.

(49B4-36; cf. PI.1, 1997: II, 177)

I read the first line like Dionísio. In line 2, on the other hand, our reading differs. Dionísio reads: “In like /*spurious/ strain”. A paleographical study of “&” in the opening verse may, in fact, lead us to conclude that what follows “like” in the second line is not “&”:

![Fig. 31. Detail of (49B4-36).](image)

While in line 1 “&” curves from the bottom upwards, in line 2 this is clearly not the case. However, when we examine other manuscripts in Pessoa’s archive, we find that “&” has also been written with a curve hooked directly from above. We can attest this from a passage of a sketch found under the heading “Ode to Music,” also transcribed by Dionísio (13-12; PI.1, 1997: II, 178):

![Fig. 32. Detail of (13-12).](image)
With the conjunction solved based on a paleographical comparison of manuscripts from the same period and attributed to the same pre-heteronym (for a discussion of this term see Pizarro, 2012B: 73-97 [82]), I move onto the word placed after “&”.

The line rendered as such (i.e., “In like /*spurious/ strain”) does not correspond to the abstract pattern of the iambic trimeter. If line 2 is a strict iambic trimeter we expect either the unstressed syllable of a lexical word or a grammatical monosyllable (normally unstressed) after the stressed “like” (which occupies the second metrical position). This is fulfilled by the grammatical conjunction “&” just discussed. While a close inspection of the first letter of the following word seems to be “p” (I agree with Dionísio upon the rest of the letters, i.e., “urious”), there is no word such as “purious.” The same may be said with letters “g,” “j,” or “y.” The adjective “furious”, though not perfectly acceptable in terms of the physical appearance of the first letter, fits the metrical template of this line. Positions four and five of the template of this line (requiring the pattern [sw]) are filled by “furious”. Last, but not least, the reader should recognize lines 4 and 5 already transcribed above (see fig. 23).
In *PI.1* (1997: II, 177-78), the transcriptions from the manuscript given in fig. 33 present the following differences from my reading: (1) one word went unread; (2) three words were read differently; (3) alignment of line 8 (first stanza from top to bottom); (4) after line 8 a square was given representing a blank space (first stanza from top to bottom). Below is a possible transcription of the upper part of the autograph document (again a Miltonic stanza):

- Light, light & nought but light
- Fills the quivering sight
- And seems to sink the caverns of my soul<sup>60</sup>
- Its horrid beastly looks
- Into remotest nooks
- And all pervades. The thunders crashing roll
- Crush my sad heart, the storm’s bright gaze
- Seems to lay bare and clear my heart’s o’er shadow’d maze<sup>61</sup>

(49B<sup>-100</sup>; cf. *PI.1*, 1997: II, 177-78)

---

<sup>60</sup> <search>↑</search> sink the bottom <search>↑</search> caverns of my soul

<sup>61</sup> Seems to <search>↑</search> lay <search>↑</search> bare and clear my heart’s o’er shadow’d maze.
In *PI.1* (1997: II, 178), line 7 reads: “Crush my sad heart, the storm’s † gaze”. I agree with Dionísio’s reading of “storm’s” and “gaze”, as well as on there being one word between them (the latter fact was rendered by Dionísio with a cross which represents a word not read by the editor). Following the design of the iambic tetrameter, only a monosyllabic word is expected between positions 6 and 8. In terms of sense, before the noun “gaze” we would normally expect an adjective. The dot of a possible “i” in the second or third letter of this conjectured adjective may be observed in the detail below:

the storm’s † gaze

This hypothetical adjective is a lexical word placed in a weak position, but lexical words normally bear a stress. Adjacent to a lexical monosyllable (“gaze”), traditional metrics explains this permissible tension (in this case how a lexical monosyllable may occupy a weak position) as incursion, arguing that “its stress is neutralized by that of an adjacent word” (Duffell, 2008: 21). As Duffell points out, in iambic meters incursive stresses are always monosyllables; one of the most famous examples of this occurs in Milton’s *Paradise Lost* (II, l. 621), where the first three feet are occupied by lexical monosyllabic words (Duffell, 2008: 21). Therefore, given that by the physical appearance of the word we cannot arrive at a satisfactory editorial solution, let us rather (with the aid of sense, viz., the likelihood of its being an adjective; and meter, viz., a monosyllabic word is expected in position 7) turn to the “Nativity Ode.” The adjective “bright”, found three times throughout the ode fits the semantic and the metrical requirements, but not the paleographical one: the horizontal bar of the “t” is missing.

But this feature is not unfamiliar in the archive. In fact, in the last line of the autograph text reproduced in fig. 30 above (49B-36r), we have just such an
example, namely, the verb “stagger” (also written by the author without the horizontal bar of the “t”):

![stagger]

As for the last word in line 8, Dionísio hypothesized the following noun: “/*eyes/*” (PI.1, 1997: II, 178). While in terms of appearance and sense, it is acceptable, the rhyme scheme must also be our guide to decipher the word occupying position 12. From the strophe design thus far discussed we would expect line 7 (with “gaze” as the rhyming word) to rhyme with line 8. Based on this and sense (we expect a noun), I suggest “maze”.

All the other lines in fig. 33 fit patterns of verse designs in the Miltonic ode form. The verse instance that begins “Crash upon crash [...]” (PI.1, 1997: II, 178) could be a separate line (i.e., line 3), or form with the other two below it, lines 6 through 8 of a fragmentary stanza. “The thousand [...] / I die [...]” (PI.1, 1997: II, 178) are a tetrameter and a hexameter (i.e., lines 7 and 8), respectively. The verse instance “A swift deep crash yet shrill”⁶³ along with the other two lines below it could be either lines 1 through 3 or 4 through 6 of another incomplete stanza (note that the incomplete iambic pentameter “Into my heart □” is not aligned with the two iambic trimeter lines above it) (49B⁴-100; cf. PI.1, 1997: II, 178). As for the third set of lines (the ones on the right-hand side of the textual witness), they are either lines 1 through 3 or lines 4 through 6 of yet another unfinished stanza or lines that could have accompanied one of the two fragmentary stanzas just mentioned. From these latter verse instances I give a new transcription below:

The storm in horrid glee
Seems to speak to me
To me alone □

(49B⁴-100; cf. PI.1, 1997: II, 178)⁶⁴

Based on the rhyme scheme of the Miltonic strophe design, we expect a word other than “place” (Dionísio) to rhyme with “me”, which I read like Dionísio. Based on this, as well as on sense (the storm presented by the speaker as being in a certain state), I arrive at “glee”.

---

⁶³ Although paleographically speaking I read “shill”, like Dionísio (PI.1, 1997: II, 178), a stabilization of this word based on sense leads us to “shrill”.

⁶⁴ Since these lines could be either 1-3 or 4-6 of a stanza I am not in a position to choose where to place the symbol for the missing lines.
Tracing the genetic process, comparing manuscripts and inquiring into the sense of these two early fragmentary odes have assisted the review of several transcriptions. Nevertheless, we could ask ourselves the following: Would these editorial solutions have been possible had we not laid hands on Pessoa’s documentation regarding the Miltonic strophe design? In the next sub-section (§ 3.3), as well as in the final section (§ 4), I will turn to different transcriptions where the underlying metrical pattern that guided the new editorial proposals was derived from the stanzas themselves.

3.3. Re-Editing Other Strophe Designs in “Ode to the Sea” and “Ode to Music”

A poet’s feelings and ideas are one of the most distinguishing features of his or her art. Yet for a poem to stir the reader with intensity much more is certainly required. Pessoa was well aware of this from an early age, particularly from the time he began working on the poetry of his English main pre-heteronyms (Charles Robert Anon and Alexander Search). The varied versification notes in his archive, as well as the marginalia in his private library, testify that already in Durban he had begun to develop those other necessary elements on which a genuine literary work stands: diction and poetic rhythm. Coleridge, one of the numerous English authors Pessoa read before his final return to Lisbon, had put it thus: “In the truly great poets […] there is a reason assignable, not only for every word, but for the position of every word” (Coleridge, [1817] 1906: 4).

In the next four transcriptions (one from “Ode to the Sea” and three from “Ode to Music”) I will argue that, regardless of there being a literary influence or not, transcribing poetry also entails understanding the underlying pattern of the poem’s design. In reviewing previous transcriptions I shall also pay attention to the paleographical aspect of the autograph as well as the sense in context of the words in question.
The first word of line 18 from the manuscript reproduced in fig. 37 (a stanza from “Ode to the Sea”) went unread, both in Pl.1 (1997: II, 175) and ASP (1999: 384). This line was fully rendered in Cadernos (2009: I, 167). The word in question is the following:

While the first and second letters are hard to decipher, the rest of the word may be read as “-immering” (which leads us to believe that it is a gerund). Let me give the
full transcription as it first appeared in PI.1 (1997: II, 174-75) and then in ASP (1999: 384):

Pretty sea!

Moving, dimpling in its glee!

Ever moving, laughing chiming

And the babble of its wave.

All its waters gently sprinkling

Tinkling, tinkling, slowly tinkling

In its ripple never slave

In its hissing and its chaunting

Far from cruel or from daunting

Far from proud and far from flaunting

Praises useless never vaunting

In the babble of its wave.

† in thy golden flee

How I love thee, fair and free

Pretty sea!

(144S-3; PI.1, 1997: II, 174-5 and ASP, 1999: 384)

Without questioning whether the stanza was modeled after an existing one, we may observe that, except for lines 1 and 20, which are dimeters, and lines 2 and 4, which are incomplete, all 16 complete lines of this stanza are trochaic tetrameters, half of them catalectic, as mentioned in the previous sub-section. With regard to the trochaic tetrameter template, we know that it has eight positions and its orientation is left-strong (s > w). As for its correspondence rules, the position size is of one syllable, but in any given instance the final weak position of the template may be unfilled. This feature makes such a trochaic tetrameter the mirror image of a headless iambic line. The rest of its correspondence rules (prominence site and prominence type) are as follows: no strong syllable of a polysyllabic word may occupy a weak position (major constraint). Also, no two consecutive strong positions may contain a syllable without stress (minor constraint). Let me place the trochaic tetrameter template below line 18 as transcribed in PI.1 (1997: II, 175) and ASP (1999: 384). (Note that [v] stands for void; my addition).

---

65 <†> Pretty sea!
66 [†—tippling]
67 [†—rippling.]
68 All its waters <†> gently sprinkling
69 cha[t†]nting
70 <Pretty sea!> Shimmering in thy golden flee [ In PI.1 (1997: II, 446) we read: <Pretty sea!> †
† in thy golden flee [v]

sw s w s w s w

First of all, it should be said that the English trochaic tetrameter allows erosion in any ictus (e.g., the preposition “in” in the second strong position is eroded) but, unlike the iambic pentameter, it does not permit polysyllabic initial inversion (see Duffell, 2008: 175). Like Dionísio and Freire I read (“in thy golden flee”), which fits part of the trochaic template [sw sw s]. Metrically speaking then a disyllabic gerund occupying positions 1-2 is acceptable. Thus, aided by metrics, we come to “Shimmering”, a gerund that occupies the first two metrical positions of the template of this trochaic tetrameter catalectic line. This verb is also in accord with the sense of the stanza, namely, the reflection of light on the water.

Before leaving this ode behind, I believe it necessary to point out that the reading of the last stanza in (49A1-3) as proposed in PI. 1 (1997: II, 173), and which went unread in ASP (1999: 382), matches perfectly the underlying design of the trochaic tetrameter in which a great number of lines in this ode were written.

Let us now turn to the document headed “Ode to Music,” the third fragmentary ode undertaken for revision.

---

71 An exception is Longfellow’s Native American epic The Song of Hiawatha, where the poet forced the natural delivery of the opening of many lines. The reason for this lies in the structure of the English language: most sentences in English open with an unstressed grammatical monosyllable; thus Longfellow failed to find a trochee with which to open half his poem’s lines.

72 Following the strophe design, we would have expected the following alignment of lines: line 20 (being a repetition of line 1) equally indented; and, like the rest of the trochaic tetrameter catalectic lines in this stanza (lines 3, 6, 8, 11, 14 and 17), we would have expected lines 18 and 19 to be indented.

73 The only word that I read differently from the one suggested in (Pl. 1, 1997: II, 173) is “striving” in line 3. My reading is “rhiming” (see line 7 [“In the music of its rhyming”] in 144S-3; fig. 37).
While in ASP (1999: 388) the whole second stanza went unread, in PL.1 (1997: II, 179) there are two types of differences with the reading I propose for the second stanza. Dionísio’s reading of the opening line of the second stanza was: “As I listen I in □ seeming”. The third line of the same stanza was rendered thus: “And with heav’lly † teeming”. As I shall show, the review of these transcriptions may rely particularly on metrics. Below is a possible transcription of both stanzas:

As I sat my soul all smarting
With injustice pain & woe,
Sudden music slow upstarting
Raised its voice in magic flow
And my being all began then with a pleasant heat to glow.\(^74\)

As I listen I in seeming\(^75\)
Leave this mortal form behind\(^76\)
And with heav’lly bounties teeming
Self in regions higher find
Music seems above all earth, but to lift my aching mind.

(13-10\(^r\); cf. PL.1, 1997: II, 179)

From the scansion of the first stanza, which I read like Dionísio and Freire, we learn that the strophe design (given here in feet) and the rhyme scheme are as

\(^74\) And my being all began \(\langle\rangle [\uparrow\text{then}]\) with a pleasant heat to glow.

\(^75\) As I \(<\text{hear in wondrous}> [\uparrow\text{listen I in}]\) seeming \(\downarrow\text{seeming}\)

\(^76\) \(<\text{I this}> \text{leave}\)
follows: \( a4 \, b4 \, a4 \, b4 \, X4+b4 \) (\( a \) rhymes are feminine, \( b \) rhymes masculine [catalectic]). The “Ode to Music” is in exactly the same trochaic tetrameter as the stanza from “Ode to the Sea” discussed above, but the orthography in the former combines the final two lines of each strophe into one, thus saving a rhyme.

Based on the strophe design, even if there seems to be an actual space between “in” and “seeming”, it is most unlikely that the author planned to insert another word between them. Note that the trochaic tetrameter line had first been written thus:

As I hear in wondrous seeming

![Fig. 40. Detail of (13-10)].

Thus realized (“As I hear in wondrous seeming”) the line is metrical according to the constraints stated above. It is also the case even after the emendations:

As I listen I in seeming

\[ s \, w \, s \, w \, s \, w \, s \, w \]

It becomes clear that the space between “in” and “seeming” is a mere consequence of the emendation.

The third line of the second stanza in PI.1 (1997: II, 179) reads: “And with heav’ly † teeming”.

![Fig. 41. Detail of (13-10)].

From sense alone we may expect a noun after “heav’lly”. A paleographical analysis leaves us with a doubt: although the fourth letter does not look like an “n”, “bounties” may be a possible reading. But this noun is rare in the Searchian lexicon. Not only does it appear only once in Dionísio’s edition (see 49B°-93v; PI.1, 1997: II, 431), but when it does the physical appearance of all the letters is totally different:

![Fig. 42. Detail of (49B°-93v)].
Yet from the strophe design we know that the word not deciphered by Dionísio has to be disyllabic and that, if it matches the template, it should be made of an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed one. Like the opening line of the second stanza discussed above, the line in question is a trochaic tetrameter with a feminine rhyme. Despite paleographical differences and its rarity in the Searchian corpus, the conjectured noun is in accord with the metrical pattern as well as with the sense of the line:

\[
\text{And with heav'ly bounties teeming}
\]
\[
\text{s w s w s w s w}
\]

Once recognized, the abstract pattern underlying this strophe design becomes a mold to assist in the transcription of other strophes in this ode that, though incomplete, have lines that share the same verse designs. Thus is the case with the two following fragmentary stanzas.
In *Pl.1* (1997: II, 179) we find two possible faulty transcriptions and no indication that the strophe is incomplete. Line 3 was read “Natural things □ are stilly □” while line 4 was given as “All my soul with †”. Although destined for “Ode to Music”, as the title on the bottom left-hand side reads, and attributed to “CRAnon | C. R. Anon”, as we read on the top right-hand side, this document was not included in *ASP* (1999). Below is a possible transcription:

```
Thou art gone, the air is thrilling
With thy voice yet, □
    Natural things □ are stilling
All my soul with nothingness
```

(13-8; cf. *Pl.1*, 1997: II, 179)

By now we know the design. The odd trochaic tetrameter lines in the text reproduced in fig. 43 all have feminine rhymes. The gerund “stilling” fulfills this in line 3 above. This verb, present at least once in the Searchian corpus (see “A Tale of Love”; 49B1-79; *Pl. 1*, 1997: II, 169; a fragmentary poem listed among the three “Early Odes”; 144V-25; *Pl. 1*, 1997: II, 147), is also in accord with syntax as well as with the semantics of the text, an atmosphere of quietude instilled by the air and the voice of music.

Given the extreme difficulty that line 4 poses in terms of its deciphering, the strophe design again aids us in the transcription process. The abstract noun “nothingness”, which matches positions 5-7 ([sws]) of the template, occupies the last three metrical positions of this trochaic tetrameter catalectic line. In “nothingness” the first syllable is strongest and is said to have primary stress. Since the third syllable has more stress than its neighbor, it is said to have secondary stress. The stress profile of this abstract noun could be rendered thus: [Sws]. Part of Search’s poetic diction, this abstract noun appears in several poems attributed to this pre-heteronym (e.g., the iambic pentameter of the unfinished sonnet entitled “Woman” where it matches the [sws] template in positions 4-6; see 791-1; *Pl. 1*, 1997: II, 291).
If we accept that this strophe is constructed upon the strophe design thus far discussed in “Ode to Music,” the fact that the stanza is incomplete may be attested to by the transcription with a blank square in place of the fifth (missing) line.
Both in *PI.1* (1997: II, 179) and in *ASP* (1999: 388) there are two differences with the reading I propose for the stanza reproduced in fig. 44. Below is a possible transcription:

Let me strive while thou art giving  
Soul unto a dream divine  
To forget that I am living  
That a frame & heart are mine

In both editions line 3 reads: “To fight that I am living”. An inspection of the textual witness raises doubts regarding the word chosen by the editors for the second position of the line. For instance, there is no dot for the “i”. However, this is not uncommon in Pessoa. These hesitations are dissipated by a metrical examination. If, like the first line, the third line is a syllable-based trochaic tetrameter with feminine rhyme, we expect six metrical syllables before the stressed syllable of “living”. Like Dionísio and Freire, I read “To” and “that I am living”. A disyllabic verb (and not a monosyllabic) then occupies positions 2 and 3. The verb “forget” fulfills this. In terms of sense, the verb proposed is clearly more appropriate:

To forget that I am living

s w s w s w
Last but not least, just like the comment above regarding line 5, the stanza is not finished—thus the blank signaled by a square.77

*

Some lines in the three fragmentary odes have been reviewed. Nonetheless, a new exploration of Pessoa’s archive is required before we can ascertain that no additional documents are missing from the scattered corpus of these three early fragmentary texts. Only after having dealt with this will we be in a position to (1) thoroughly understand the place of certain loose verse instances not discussed here, and (2) to tackle the proposed arrangement of the odes given in PI.1 (1997), which was followed in ASP (1999).

4. On a Later English Poem

Over 50% of the English poems that Pessoa wrote during his lifetime still need to be transcribed and published (see Pizarro, 2011B). In PIne (1993) and in PI.2 (2000) there are but a small fraction of the total corpus in his archive. In both selections we primarily find (1) poems where Pessoa’s handwriting poses little or no difficulty (generally a reviewed draft); (2) typed poems; and (3) typed and emended poems. Nevertheless, despite the editors’ selecting process, there are texts inaccurately rendered. In the last section of this study I shall look at the transcription of one unsigned English poem dated 12 October 1914.

![Image of a handwritten note]

**Fig. 45. (49A3-62v).**

77 This was indicated in the transcription of the incomplete stanza in (49A1-4v; PI.1, 1997: II; 179-180), but disregarded in ASP (1999: 388).
The lines reproduced in fig. 45 were first transcribed by Christopher Aureta and published by Lopes in *Plne* (1993: 194). They were subsequently integrated without any alterations by Freire in *Pl.2* (2000: 32 and 34) and in the *Archivo Pessoa* available on-line. In the two paper editions, as well as in the digital one, there is a mistranscription in lines 3 and 10, respectively: (1) in line 3 the first handwritten word is “pain” and not “pang”; (2) in line 10 the penciled word is “void” and not “own”. These two solutions are not metrically based for monosyllables (whether grammatical or lexical) may occupy any position in the line. Before dwelling on the process that led to these two solutions let us spend a few moments on the strophe design of the poem.

The attentive reader may have noticed possible inconsistencies with the strophe design; either Pessoa intended that the strophe design of each stanza be different or there is a line missing from the first stanza (either because Pessoa left the stanza incomplete or because the editor did not transcribe it). From a scansion of the second stanza we learn that it consists of six iambic lines of the same length (given here in feet) and with the following rhyme scheme: \( a^4 b^4 a^4 b^4 c^4 c^4 \). Except for the first line of the design, the rest is perfectly realized in the first stanza. This fact generated skepticism regarding the transcription. The conjectured shortcoming was quickly confirmed by direct contact with the textual witness in Pessoa’s archive. On the other side of the document reproduced above we find the missing opening line of the third (not the first) stanza and the first two stanzas of the poem (which were not included in Christopher Aureta’s and Luísa Freire’s transcriptions).

---

78 See [http://arquivopessoa.net/textos/4146](http://arquivopessoa.net/textos/4146). This site is under the responsibility of the *Instituto de Estudos sobre o Modernismo* coordinated by Teresa Rita Lopes.
The complete poem would read thus:

NOTHING.

The day sickens into the lakes
The colour that its pallor wears…
A loss of contour overtakes
The landscape, and the horizon bears
Like a defeated flag the dim
Purposelessness of its dead rim.

Let my heart forsake everything,79
I shall be richer by all I.
Every breath, each passing wing
Takes me from myself. The whole sky
Eats into my self-consciousness
And detracts my true distress.80

For my true sorrow is not that
The day is sad as I am sad,
But that no moment can abate
That pain that is all I have had81
To take with me and see and feel
While life goes by like a mere wheel.82

No. Deeper things than skies and plains
Are dark and lower’d o’er in me.
My sorrows are more empty pains
Than of which plains can symbols be.83
And my void weight of life and self84
Resembles nothing but itself.

Metrically speaking, the opening line of the poem is either very subtle or very poorly constructed: second-foot inversion is generally avoided by L1 English poets (see Duffell, 2008). This line may be employing mimesis or it may simply be unmetrical, a syllabic octosyllable (like the French octosyllabe or Portuguese octossílabo with mandatory stress only in position 8). The syllabic octosyllable never caught on in England, even in Anglo-Norman (see Duffell, 2008: 73-83). Also, in the second strophe, Pessoa seems to slip from composing feet into counting syllables as in Portuguese.

---

79 Let my heart forsake ever<↓>/y\ thing.
80 And detracts <complete> my true distress.
81 That <sadness> [↑ pain] that is all I [→ have] had
82 While life goes by like a <□>/mere\ wheel.
83 Than <those> [↑ of which plains] landscapes can symbols be.
84 And <all> my [↑ void] weight of life and self
In spite of these metrical incongruences, particularly in the first two stanzas, it would be hard to argue that “Nothing” was not begun on 62r and finished on 62v. In fact, the textual witness of the typescript poem entitled “Emptiness” (31-34; PI.1, 1999: III, 52), confirms this. “Nothing” appears to be an earlier draft of “Emptiness” (31-34; PI.1, 1999: III, 52 and 155), which, with a few minor differences, became part of the third section of the The Mad Fiddler (PI.1, 1999: III, 155). An inspection of this later draft (typewritten and without handwritten emendations), critically transcribed by Marcus Angioni and Fernando Gomes, solved the two misreadings mentioned above, namely “pain” and not “pang” (line 3) and “void” and not “own” (line 10).

Final Note

The considerable number and diversity of documents extant in Pessoa’s archive lead us to believe that he did not throw much into the wastepaper basket: (un)finished texts in prose and poetry in Portuguese, English, and French, fragmentary essays, translations, thematic bibliographies, aphorisms, projects, postcards, horoscopes, letters (sent and received), commercial ideas, to-do lists, debts, quotes, inter alia; this man kept everything. His creative process, like that of many others before and after him, often involved reading—planned, pre-compositional work, contact with selected pages... Writing for Pessoa was about processes.

Now, in order to analyze the work habits of a writer one needs to enter “la coulisse, l’atelier, le laboratoire, le mécanisme intérieur,” as Louis Hay reminded us over three decades ago through the words of Baudelaire (1979: 227). And when the name of such writer is Pessoa, the sensitive aural Fernando Pessoa, this entails (both for editors as well as literary critics) utmost attention to the wide range of metrical models he gradually acquired and often skillfully practiced.

---

85 The editors of this critical edition refer and transcribe (49A³-62), but do not mention the incomplete publication in Pline (1993: 194).
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