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Abstract

Our present proposal is to critically revisit a limpid and very personal text written by José de Almada Negreiros, *Orpheu 1915-1965*, and rediscover the Portuguese Modernist generation in the words of this artist.
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Resumo

Com este ensaio, propomos a leitura de um texto limpido e muito pessoal escrito por José de Almada Negreiros, *Orpheu 1915-1965*, redescobrindo assim a geração modernista portuguesa nas palavras deste artista.
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Celebrating *Orpheu*

In 2015, *Orpheu*, the magazine and the generation of artists linked to it, celebrated its 100th birthday. Centenaries are usually opportunities to look back and reflect on legacies, but also to look forward towards future possibilities.

In 1913, José de Almada Negreiros (1893-1970) – known as Almada – left an ironical note in the catalogue of the second exhibition of the Group of Portuguese Humorists: “A data mais memorável da minha individualidade será por certo a de 1993, quando universalmente se festejar o centenário do meu nascimento” [“The most memorable date related to my own individuality will most certainly be that of 1993, when the centenary of my birth shall be universally celebrated”] (ALMADA, 1913: 14).

May we say as much for the *Orpheu* magazine in the midst of the recent centennial (and international) celebrations? The artists related to *Orpheu* were aware of the breach their gesture of modernity provoked within the Portuguese artistic expression of the XXth century. To celebrate *Orpheu* is (also) to keep *Orpheu* alive.

But *Orpheu* already celebrated its 50th birthday in 1965. In those days three of its authors were still alive (Almada, Côrtes-Rodrigues and Guisado), but “tanto a revista como a geração que nela se revelou não tinham uma aceitação unânime” [“neither the magazine nor the generation it revealed had an unanimous acceptance”], as Nuno JÚDICE (2015: 69-74) remarks. It was necessary to rediscover *Orpheu*.

According to this, our present proposal is to critically revisit a clear and very personal text written by José de Almada Negreiros, *Orpheu 1915-1965*, and rediscover *Orpheu* in the words of this Portuguese artist.

Almada was not the only member of the Portuguese Modernist generation to write a text about *Orpheu*, but he was, as we see it, the one who left the most prominent “notes for the memory” of the group that formed around the magazine. His notes are not the “notes for the memory” of a master; this figure did not exist, and Pessoa confirmed this point: “No *Orpheu*, corrente ou revista, não havia chefes nem mestres” [“In *Orpheu*, the literary movement or the magazine, there were neither leaders nor masters”] (PESSOA, 2009: 91). Almada’s notes were

---

1 The catalogue includes a portrait of Fernando Pessoa by Almada, with the following legend: “O Senhor Fernando Pessoa, vulgo o *Pessoa*” [Mr. Fernando Pessoa, commonly known as *Pessoa*].

2 The volume has been carefully anoted by Alejandro GIRALDO in a reedition based on a hand-written version, a typed versión and a render of the format for the final versión left by Almada Negreiros. See the bibliography at the end of this document.

3 Referring to a text of Álvaro de Campos, “Notas para a recodação do meu Mestre Caeiro” [“Notes for the Memory of My Master Caeiro”]. Almada was familiar with this text, which was published for the first time in *Presença*, n.º 30, Coimbra, January-February 1931.
rather destined to evoke a moment in history, that can only be seen in retrospect as such, and that will never finish being recounted nor “trapped”. For Almada, this moment of artistic modernity was the consequence of a happy encounter between writing and painting. In fact, it is hard to imagine a more inter-artistic age than that which occurred at the beginning of the twentieth century, and the historical avant-gardes may be understood, as Almada wanted, as one of the most important outcomes of the mingling of different art forms, as well as that of art forms with various sciences, trends, and disciplines of all types.

They, *Orpheu*

Before we undertake the reading of Almada’s text, let us take a look at the names of those who formed the group of *Orpheu*. It is not enough to consult the table of contents of the different issues. The list was modified with the passing of the years, due to forgetfulness and circumstances of the moment, and we could almost say that it was divided among protagonists, collaborators and the “audience”, this last a label given by Pessoa.

If we use the two issues that were published as a guide, *Orpheu* was formed by: Luís de Montalvor (1891-1947), Mário de Sá-Carneiro (1890-1916), Ronald de Carvalho (1893-1935), Fernando Pessoa (1888-1935), Alfredo Pedro Guisado (1891-1975), José de Almada Negreiros (1893-1970), Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues (1891-1971), José Pacheco (1885-1934), Ângelo de Lima (1872-1921), Eduardo Guimaraens (1882-1928), Raul Leal (1886-1964), Santa-Rita Pintor (1889-1918) and perhaps Antônio Ferro (1895-1956), who appears, in jest, as an editor but who never contributed any text. We say “perhaps”, because Almada, on December 3rd 1935, with seven members of the generation already deceased (Pessoa died on November 29th), and having celebrated the twentieth anniversary of *Orpheu* in the *Sudoeste* magazine (November 1935), sent a letter to the director of the *Diário de Notícias* in which he asked the director to correct a piece of information. According to the letter, – also found in Almada’s Archive ANSA-RI-62 – Ferro was not a representative contributor of *Orpheu*. He adds, “(…) serem hoje únicos representantes vivos do *Orpheu* Luís de Montalvor, Alfredo Guisado e eu, mais o colaborador extraordinário do *Orpheu*, Dr. Raul Leal” [“Today, the only living representatives of *Orpheu* [are] Luis de Montalvor, Alfredo Guisado and I, as well as the extraordinary contributor Dr. Raul Leal”] (NEGREIROS, 1935: n.p)

---

4 In this magazine, dedicated to the 20th anniversary of *Orpheu*, Fernando Pessoa signs the article “Nós, os de *Orpheu*” [“We, *Orpheu*”], which contains an imprecision: when referring to the Brazilian authors Ronald de Carvalho and Eduardo Guimaraens he says that they are missing because of the “motivos deestreiteza de tempo e largueza de distância” [“lack of time and excess of distance”], not mentioning that, by then (November 1935) both had already died.
It seems that, in this letter, Almada forgets to mention Côrtes-Rodrigues, whether because Almada was not able to include any of Côrtes-Rodrigues’s contributions in Sudoeste 3 or because Côrtes-Rodrigues had “disappeared” to an Azorean island, just as Pessoa refers in his article “Nós os de Orpheu” [“We, Orpheu”] (1935: 3); but Almada is emphatic when it comes to Ferro: he was alive but he neither contributed to nor represented Orpheu. Despite the fact they were friends, and actually collaborated with each other on some occasions; for example, Ferro presents Almada’s conference A invenção do dia claro [The Invention of the Clear Day], in 1921, at the Naval League, in Lisbon, and Almada illustrates diverse texts and books for António Ferro; their divergent ideologies end up creating a distance between them. Director of the National Propaganda Secretariat of the Estado Novo in 1933, Ferro went from being a legal minor who illegally served as the director of Orpheu (an illegality that pleased Sá-Carneiro and Fernando Pessoa in 1915⁵), to being Salazar’s right-hand man.

Moreover, in Almada’s archive there is a manuscript, with the date of 1936 attributed to it, which illustrates the clear differences between Almada and Ferro⁶. In this text, which bears the title “Não António Ferro não” [“No António Ferro No”], Almada Negreiros uses the plural, “nós, os artistas portugueses” [“we, Portuguese authors”], to report the abusive declarations of António Ferro about the relationship between art, modern artists and the State, which were published by the Diário de Lisboa on the 28th of April 1936 and by the Diário de Notícias on the 17th of May that same year. Almada Negreiros accuses Ferro of:

2.º De estabelecer propositadamente em público a confusão entre o seu nome pessoal e a entidade cargo que ocupa oficialmente. [...]  
4.º De fazer-se passar (sobretudo no estrangeiro) por animador da Arte moderna portuguesa e até por director do movimento modernista em Portugal! [...]  
8.º De tomar iniciativas de ordem artística como Director do Secretariado da Propaganda Nacional sem se consultar publicamente com os artistas [...]  
11.º De dar a entender em público que o Estado faz materialmente o bastante pelos artistas, que é absolutamente falso, e que, sendo falso ilude por conseguinte o Estado e prejudica colectiva e individualmente os artistas portugueses [...]”.

2nd, deliberately establishing in public a confusion between his own name and the position he officially occupies. [...]  
4th, pretending (especially abroad) that he is a promoter of Portuguese Modern Art and even the director of the modernist movement in Portugal! [...]  

⁵ Mário de Sá-Carneiro, with Fernando Pessoa’s complicity, chooses António Ferro to set him as editor of the Orpheu magazine because he was, at that moment, the only one of the group who had not yet reached legal age, just in case accusations were made. See Pessoa (2009: 89).

⁶ The complete document is in Almada Negreiros’s archive: ANSA-L-213 and also in Santos, Mariana Pinto dos, Almada Negreiros confronta António Ferro: um documento inédito (separata), in Colóquio Letras, n.º 190, Lisboa, Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, Setembro/ Dezembro 2015.
8th, taking artistic initiatives as the Director of the Ministry of National Propaganda without consulting the artists [...] 

11th, making the public believe that the State materially does enough for the artists, which is absolutely false, and that, in being false deludes the State and collectively and individually damages the Portuguese artists [...]”.

(Almada Negreiros’s archive, ANSA-L-213)

The list of accusations is extensive (we here present only some as an example). Almada repudiates any affinity with Ferro’s behaviour serving Portuguese Art and as a Director of the Ministry of National Propaganda.

But what reveals a letter published the 7th of July 1915 in the newspaper *O Mundo* is that, still in 1915, within the sequence of quarrels aroused by the *Orpheu* magazine, and its repercussion in the printed media which had already evolved towards political issues, António Ferro and Alfredo Pedro Guisado declared themselves distant from certain Orphics, “repudiamos qualquer solidariedade com esses senhores” [“repudiating any solidarity with two of *Orpheu’s* contributors”]: Raul Leal published a violent manifesto in 1915, and as Álvaro de Campos, Pessoa sent an sarcastic letter against the republican politician Afonso Costa and his party to a Portuguese newspaper the 6th July 1915 (cf. PESSOA, 2014: 537-538).

The last “Orphics”

Years later, Guisado appears as one of the *Orpheu* group. In a press cutting from 1953 (*O Primeiro de Janeiro*, October 20th), “the three boys left in the *Orpheu* group” are Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues, who has been “resuscitated”, Alfredo Guisado, who was already a prominent journalist, and José de Almada Negreiros, who is described as a “painter”.

![Fig. 1. Alfredo Guisado, Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues and José de Almada Negreiros, *O Primeiro de Janeiro*, October 20th 1953.](image)

Dr. Raul Leal, the “extraordinary contributor to *Orpheu*” is missing in the photograph. Had nobody heard about him lately? In 1959 he published a text, that
has been unfairly forgotten, titled “As tendências orfaicas e o saudosismo” [“Orphic Trends and the Saudosist Movement”] (Leal, 1959: 17-24). Leal’s absence is difficult to explain, but what is true is that he was always a little different, marginal, “extraordinary”, and his “Devaneios e Alucinações” [“Delusions and Hallucinations”], to cite the title of the book that he intended to publish, never fit comfortably into Portuguese literary history.

In 1960, the newspaper Diário da Manhã dedicated a page to the Azorean poet and ethnographer, Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues, publishing a photograph in which he is accompanied by Raul Leal.

![Fig. 2. Raul Leal and Armando Côrtes-Rodrigues, Diário da Manhã, December 25th 1960.](image)

In 1954, Almada Negreiros is called by the restaurant Irmãos Unidos in Lisbon to create a special work evoking Orpheu, to celebrate the group’s meetings
in this place. Among the many previous attempts there is one, which we here reproduce, that shows two young people (timeless) reading *Orpheu* in an artistic coffee-atelier atmosphere. On the brick floor, illuminated by a strand of light, there is a list with some of the names of the *Orpheu* group, in this order: “Fernando Pessoa, Luís de Montalvor, Mário de Sá-Carneiro, Côrtes-Rodrigues, José Pacheco, Alfredo Guisado, Ronald de Carvalho, Guimaraens, José de Almada Negreiros”. The list, which is incomplete, still has space to (who knows) be completed with the missing names.

![Fig. 3. Almada Negreiros, from the project to celebrate the *Orpheu* group (1953-54), FCG CAM DP 137.](image)

But the painting that will finally hang on the wall of the restaurant *Irmãos Unidos* will be the famous *Portrait of Fernando*, duplicated as if seen in a mirror, years later (in 1964), for the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Much more could be said about who was and who was not part of *Orpheu* (page proofs from *Orpheu* 3 are available\(^7\) and a draft index from *Orpheu* 4 is known\(^8\)), but we believe that this is sufficient to define the most “visible” nucleus of contributors before and after 1935 (Pessoa and Côrtes-Rodrigues’s correspondence wasn’t published until 1945, for instance). We opened this section mentioning Raul Leal, and it is important to note that Almada never forgot Raul Leal. In *Orpheu* 1915-1965, Almada even stated that he had distanced himself from those in the group who wanted to marginalise the apocalyptic philosopher.

---

\(^7\) Included in the “Orpheu Box” edited by Steffen DIX published in 2015 by Tinta-da-china.

\(^8\) For the history of *Orpheu*, see the first chapter of the critical volume *Sensacionismo e Outros Ismos* (Pessoa, 2009; especially pp. 79-82).
Fig. 4. Almada Negreiros, *Portrait of Fernando Pessoa* (1954), House of Fernando Pessoa, in Lisbon.

Fig. 5. Almada Negreiros, *Portrait of Fernando Pessoa* (1964), Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, FCG CAM 64P66.
Fig. 6. The fiftieth anniversary of Orpheu, O Primeiro de Janeiro, March 31st 1965.
Recalling Orpheu

Finally, let us learn more about the notes that made up *Orpheu* 1915-1965, a booklet from which a significant amount of preparatory material has been preserved in Almada’s archive. It is interesting to note that part of this text was published, by the poet Alberto Serpa, on March 31st 1965 in the newspaper *O Primeiro de Janeiro*, to celebrate the fifty years of *Orpheu* (See Fig. 6).

The photo of the “orphic trio” (published in 1953) was republished and it was stated, in a text box above the photograph on a yellow background, that Almada, Guisado, and Cortês-Rodrigues were indeed the only “three still walking among the earth and creating”.

The issue of *O Primeiro de Janeiro* dedicated to the fiftieth anniversary of *Orpheu* featured commemorative texts by José de Almada Negreiros, Alfredo Guisado and João Gaspar SIMÕES. The Portuguese critic and writer Gaspar Simões wrote: “Nunca em Portugal se publicara uma revista de tão curta vida que mais longa vida viesse dar à literatura e à arte nela representadas.” [“Never before in Portugal had a magazine been published for such a short time that would have such a long life in terms of its contribution to the literature and arts written about on its pages”] (*O Primeiro de Janeiro*, March 31st 1965, p. 6).

Therefore, the newspaper *O Primeiro de Janeiro* published an initial version (with minimal interferences) of the first half of *Orpheu* 1915-1965. The complete text was published afterwards by the Ática publishing house (2015), in a very close version to the typographic layout planned by Almada in a previous model.

Almada wrote this commemorative text on *Orpheu* in response to the request of the poet and friend Alberto Serpa, as testified in the correspondence existing in the archives of both authors:

According to a letter from Almada Negreiros to Alberto Serpa send in March 24th 1965, *Orpheu* 1915-1965 would come out around April 16th or 17th 1965: “A edição da Ática com o meu *Orpheu* na íntegra (como o desejo) sai um ou dois dias antes da Páscoa. A edição na íntegra é a que V. tem agora” [“The Ática edition of my *Orpheu*, complete (as I wish to see it) will appear one or two days before Easter. The complete edition is the one you have now”] (BNP_M_SER-15). In March 25th 1965, Serpa replied to Almada that he “muito desejava festejar o Orpheu antes do fim do mês” [“greatly wished to celebrate *Orpheu* before the end of the month”] (ANSA-COR-195).
In the last letter, Serpa refers to March, the month in which the modernist publication celebrated its anniversary. Today we can confirm that Serpa’s wish was fulfilled: the commemorative edition of *O Primeiro de Janeiro* appeared on the 31st. And later the booklet *Orpheu 1915-1965* was also published.

1915-1965: the archive

In *Orpheu 1915-1965*, Almada defines himself as a visual artist. Referring to the differences between Pessoa and himself, Almada writes: “Até ele todos me foram sempre alguma vez parecidos, não-parecidos, afins, contrários. Ele era o meu oposto. Era-nos impossível a inveja um do outro. Até o facto ele ser um auditivo e eu um visual, não o trocávamos.” [“Before him everybody resembled, or was not-similar, or alike, or contrary to me. He was my opposite. It was impossible for us to envy each other. Even the fact of him being an auditory person and I a visual person, we could not change”] (ALMADA, 1965: 7). In Almada’s literary work a visual or graphic preoccupation is often present, and this memory of *Orpheu* is no exception. The written word is also a drawing. The signifier becomes alive, of course, with the form of the letters, with the kind of paper, with the dance of the words on the page. Almada is a painter, a page planner and a designer, creator of his own book covers.
Orpheu 1915-1965 is an artist’s book, a harmonium-book, a modernity’s hallmark; it invites an active reading. The pages unfold as bellows of an accordion, revealing most of the book with a single movement. However, despite its fidelity, the printed edition does not completely conform to Almada’s projected model.

These are the book covers of the model created by Almada Negreiros (ANSA-L-98) and of the printed version published by Ática in 1965 (ANSA-IMP-20). As we can see, the title in the printed version has capital letters. But if we confront the second page of the model and of the book published by Ática in 1965, they are almost identical.

In addition to these testimonies, a handwritten version (ANSA-L-111) and a typewritten one (ANSA-L-112), with manuscript amendments, are preserved in Almada’s archive.
Fig. 11. Almada Negreiros, the model of Orpheu 1915-1965 (first page), ANSA-L-98.

Fig. 12. Almada Negreiros, the printed version of Orpheu 1915-1965 (first page), ANSA-IMP-20.
These are the first pages of the handwritten and the typewritten versions preserved in Almada’s archive. In due time, this text will need to be re-edited and the existing materials thoroughly collated in order to prepare a critical edition. But it is important to mention that during the celebrations of Orpheu’s centenary, Almada Negreiros’s heirs and the group forming the “Modernism online project”, a virtual archive of the Orpheu generation, were responsible for the reedition of the book printed in 1965. According to the editors, the differences between both texts and the graphic work of the model justified the publication of the facsimile by Ática, 2015.

1915-1965: The manuscript

It is interesting to examine a passage found in the handwritten version of the text. This version is the oldest known and there are a few lines that are preserved there that were never printed in block letters. On page 8 of the manuscript, the following text is found: “O significado único do Orpheu era a modernidade. A nossa modernidade. Não apenas a nossa modernidade nacional, que não tem sentido
sem a modernidade universal” [“The only meaning of Orpheu was modernity. Our modernity. Not only our national modernity, as this does not make any sense without universal modernity” ] (ANSA-L-111). The printed version, in page 14, gives us this later version: “O selo do Orpheu era a modernidade. Se quiserem, a vanguarda da modernidade. A nossa vanguarda da modernidade. Toda modernidade nasce vanguarda. É universal” [“The stamp of Orpheu was modernity; if you like, the avant-garde of modernity; our avant-garde of modernity. All modernity gives rise to an avant-garde. It is universal”].

This extremely reworked segment fits in thematically with another section on page 11 of the manuscript:

Maria Aliette Galhoz conta sete os ismos que perpassam no Orpheu: paulísmo, interseccionismo, sensacionismo, simultaneismo, futurismo, cubismo, simbolismo, e podia juntar-lhes ainda exoterismo e ocultismo. É admirável rememorar aqui esta circunstância do Orpheu: passam por Orfeu mais duma vintena de ismos das letras e da pintura. Três dos ismos [paulísmo, interseccionismo, sensacionismo] são criações de Fernando Pessoa. Criações da ordem literária. Como o surrealismo criado depois por dois literatos franceses e antes de chegar também à pintura. Mas os outros ismos são da ordem da pintura e um [simbolismo] abrange o pintado e o escrito. São criações francesas e italiana. É o momento também de relembrar que estas criações literárias de Fernando Pessoa sucedem de perto as criações francesas e italiana e sobretudo fazem de Portugal o primeiro país a criar a sua vanguarda da modernidade depois da França e da Itália. No Orpheu estava a dar-se primeiro que noutra qualquer parte do mundo o que a latinitude havia feito eclodir mundialmente em Paris e Milão: o encontro das Letras e da Pintura. Este encontro continuamente aprazado para mais tarde desde o Renascimento.

[Maria Aliete Galhoz speaks of seven isms introduced in Orpheu: Paulism, Intersectionism, Sensationism, Simultaneism, Futurism, Cubism, Symbolism, to which Exotericism and Occultism could be added.

It is admirable to remember this characteristic of Orpheu: more than a score of literary and artistic isms appear on its pages. Three of these isms [Paulism, Intersectionism, Sensationism] are Fernando Pessoa’s creations; creations exclusively of the literary order. Like Surrealism, later created by two French men of letters, before it expanded to include the world of painting. But the other isms are of the order of painting and one [Symbolism] covers the painted and the written. They are French and Italian creations.

It is also the time to remember that Fernando Pessoa’s aforementioned literary creations arose shortly after the French and Italian creations, and especially served to make Portugal the first country where an avant-garde of modernity was created, after France and Italy. This was happening on Orpheu’s pages before it happened anywhere else in the world; it was what Latinity had detonated internationally in Paris and Milan: the meeting of Literature and Painting. This coming together had been continually postponed since the Renaissance ].

(ANSA-L-111)

We believe various points can be drawn and polished from these lines: 1. - Orpheu, in effect, sought to bring as many isms together as possible and, above all, the most well known isms; 2. - Three of these isms (Paulism, Intersectionism,
Sensationism) were created by Fernando Pessoa, who also imagined other less aesthetical isms, such as political Atlantism and religious and philosophical Neopaganism; 3. – Pessoa explained Sensationism as a synthesis of all isms (2009); 4. – Pessoa never knew how to properly appreciate other art forms apart from literature, but within the open spirit of Orpheu, painting (supposing Santa Rita Pintor’s compositions can be described as painting, even though he was a self-proclaimed “Painter”) coexisted with literature, as would have been possible with music or sculpture, art forms that Pessoa tended to place below “literature” (belles-lettres); 5. – Cubism and Futurism were decisive in the composition of some poems – “Manucure” and “Ode Triunfal”, for example –, but German Expressionism and English Imagism, among other isms, should not be forgotten; 6. - In this sense, we do not think it would be accurate to say that Portugal was “o primeiro país a criar a sua vanguarda da modernidade depois da França e da Itália” [“the first country to create its avant-garde of modernity after France and Italy”] (Almada, [1965]: ANSA-L-111), forgetting, for example, Russia. Nor would it be accurate to state that “No Orpheu estava a dar-se primeiro que noutra qualquer parte do mundo (…): o encontro das Letras e da Pintura” [“This was happening in Orpheu before it happened anywhere else in the world (…): the meeting between Literature and Painting”] (Almada, [1965]: ANSA-L-111), forgetting the past: in the nineteenth century the Pre-Raphaelites and the Impressionists had already made a contribution to bringing certain art forms closer together and Wagner had proposed the concept of the total work of art.

What is true is that it was only in Portugal that a writer, Fernando Pessoa, had conceived so many isms and that a magazine existed where Luís de Montalvão’s and Álvaro de Campos’s ideals of beauty could coexist, among others. In terms of the coming together of literature and painting, Orpheu made a promise for a never reached future (Orpheu is a myth beyond the myth), as only two issues were published and Amadeo de Souza Cardoso’s paintings were not collated in the page proofs of the Orpheu 3.

1915-1965: Amadeo de Souza Cardoso

In Orpheu 1915-1965, Almada claims to have in his possession the reproductions of Amadeo which would have been included in the 3rd number of the Orpheu magazine: “A colaboração de Amadeo ficou nas fotografias em meu poder de quadros seus para o Orpheu 3” [“Amadeo’s collaboration consisted of some photographs of his paintings for Orpheu 3, which I now keep”] (Almada, 1965: 12). For a long time, the lack of information about these images fed several speculations: which paintings would Amadeo have chosen? The work at the archive of Almada Negreiros has enabled the localization of these images, signed and dated by Amadeo, thus satisfying the curiosity of researchers and all those
interested. Research made at the archive of Amadeo de Souza-Cardoso has also contributed to present different hypotheses about the hors-texte that would come to be published in Orpheu 3. We include those which belonged to Almada’s legacy as they relate to the essay we have been analysing in these pages. All are from 18th December 1916:

Figs. 15, 16 & 17. Amadeo de Souza-Cardoso, “Cabeça-Oceano”; “Trou de la serrure / Parto da viola / Bon ménage / Fraise avant-garde”; “Arabesco Dynamico = Real / Ocre rouge café rouge / Zig Zag / Vibrações metálicas / Cantante Couraceiro Bandolin / (Esplendor Mecano-geométrico)”, ANSA-IMP-62

For Almada, Orpheu was a “consequência do encontro das letras e da pintura” [“consequence of the encounter of letters and painting”] (Almada, 1965: 8). And that encounter, Almada illustrates as a pyramid: “O encontro das letras e da pintura tinha cá o vértice bem postado da pirâmide em Mário e Amadeo. A base da pirâmide era Fernando Pessoa” [“the encounter of letters and painting had the apex of its pyramid firmly posted on Mário and Amadeo. The base of the pyramid was Fernando Pessoa"] (ALMADA, 1965: 9). It remains, thus, suggested that Almada himself would be the other face to enable the existence of this metaphorical pyramid.

The book itself, Orpheu 1915-1965, is the achievement of this encounter between letters and painting, avoiding the denomination of “literature” [“literature”], one of the words presented, at the end, as “vocábulos perjurativos” em dias do 9

---


10 In the manuscript version of Orpheu 1915-1965 one reads “prejurativo” and in the printed version “perjurativo”.
Orpheu” [“perjurativos in the days of Orpheu”], beside “botas d’elástico” [“fuddy-duddies’] and “lepidótero” [‘lepidopteron’] (ALMADA, 1965: 26).

1965-2015: Orpheu lives on

Almada’s 1965 booklet has stood the test of time not because of its second half, which is more dysphoric, but because of the first half, which is more euphoric (there is joy at the evocation of his “unforgettable companions”); that is to say, today it can be read with pleasure, precisely because of these “useless” or more emotional notes, in which the author suddenly exclaims: “Francamente, isto interessa alguém no cinquentenário do Orpheu?” [“Frankly, will these notes be of any interest on Orpheu’s fiftieth anniversary?”] (ALMADA, 1965: 7). There is a moment in which Almada, facing a storm, yells, exalted, “Vivam os raios!” [“Long live the lightning!”] (ALMADA, 1965: 8); and Pessoa, terrified, hides under a table. Who would be interested in anything of this sort? But the reminiscence of the storm was necessary to leave an indelible portrait of two friends in the time of Orpheu.

Orpheu 1915-1965 is less a gallery brochure than a recollection of writers and artists. Orpheu 1915-1965 has the merit of evoking this collective without treating it as such, according to Almada, those who made up the group had only one thing in common: being different. They were a dozen “Éramos reclusos na mesma cela de prisão” [“we were recluses in the same prison”] (ALMADA, 1965: 3). Their prison was Art: it was the common denominator. Almada even goes so far as to say that the sine qua non of their friendship and companionship was non-identity, the total non-identification of two people. As such, for example, he describes himself as visual and Pessoa as auditory, and he says that he had never met anyone so different from himself...

Orpheu, accordingly, would not have been an organised group but rather a casual meeting of individualities. Almada emphasises less the affinities of a group of contemporary spirits and more their differences, with a certain cult of individuality and certain disdain for gregariousness: “Isto que parecia afastamento irremediável foi afinal causa de me nascer alegria” [“This which may have looked like an irreparable separation was at the end a motive of joy”] (ALMADA, 1965: 4).

What is most interesting is that today, his text seems especially alive due to this sort of “individual” resistance. Almada refuses to contribute to canonisation of Orpheu; he states that Orpheu was what was left by a series of individuals in response to an impertinent question that he cites in this text: “O que considera de mais extraordinário nesse movimento chamado do grupo do Orpheu? [“What do you think is especially extraordinary in this Orpheu group that has been called a movement?”] (1965: 12), and he responds: “De mais extraordinário não vejo senão que tenha sido um movimento os nossos encontros pessoais entre companheiros.
de revista” [“I just think it is extraordinary that our personal meetings have formed a movement”] (ALMADA, 1965: 12).

Sometimes Almada throws a bucket of cold water on Orpheu’s 50th anniversary, but when he does so, he brings his companions even more back to life and he challenges us, or so it seems, not to fossilise himself or the others. And from there comes his denial; “Roga-se que recorde a público Orpheu. Tomo o rogo por insolência. Nego-me” [“Someone has pleaded that I write a text in memory of Orpheu. I take this pledge as insolence. I refuse”] (ALMADA, 1965: 13). But this refusal, it must be said, was fertile and it generated a text of short stories, of minor episodes, that supposedly nobody would be interested in, but that are still read today and considered unique.
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