

**OSVALDO MANUEL SILVESTRE AND PEDRO SERRA.*****Século de ouro—Antologia crítica da poesia portuguesa do século XX.***

Despite the scarce critical discourse about them, literary anthologies have played an important part in Portuguese poetry in the twentieth and beginning of the twenty-first centuries. They were a crucial tool for different members of the literary field to actively deal with the need to organize this field, and poets in particular made use of this format, among other purposes, to establish their position in it by assigning value to their peers and themselves. That was the case, for example, of poets such as Fernando Pessoa, Jorge de Sena, Eugénio de Andrade, and Herberto Helder, just to name a few of the most consecrated, in a tradition that in fact has seen an expansion at the turn of the millennium.<sup>1</sup>

The apparent paradox that lies in the reality of a large tradition of anthology making and little academic research about the topic owes to an assumption at different levels, in Portugal, that anthologies have in a more or less natural way reflected the best of a continuously changing or developing system.<sup>2</sup> However, a closer look will reveal that several anthologies have provoked—and oftentimes stemmed from—feelings such as fear or anxiety regarding history writing, authorial visibility, posterity and consecration, and of course oblivion and exclusion. As it happens, frequent position-takings that illustrate those same feelings can be found among Portuguese authors, critics, scholars, and, as we will see, even among those in political power. Published in November 2002, *Século de ouro—Antologia crítica da poesia portuguesa do século XX* is a clear case of a volume that illustrates both the interest in the anthology format and its impact in the literary field. By choosing to question the limits of literary historiography, *Século de ouro* led many authors, critics, and public officeholders to take varied stands on the anthology's methodology and selection of texts, which evidenced misconceptions and fears regarding the relation of anthologies and the literary canon.

*Século de ouro* was edited by Osvaldo Manuel Silvestre and Pedro Serra (professors at the universities of Coimbra and Salamanca, respectively) and sponsored by the cultural program Coimbra—Capital Nacional da Cultura 2003

(Coimbra—National Cultural Capital 2003), also called Coimbra 2003. The title of the anthology adopts an expression that started circulating among poets and critics at the end of the twentieth century in reference to the period's Portuguese poetry. The editors state in their introduction that there is a "critical consensus . . . about the golden nature of the Portuguese twentieth century" and reference personalities in the field who used the expression ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 34). But if the book's title and front cover seem to state that twentieth-century Portuguese poetry indeed corresponds to a golden century, the back cover warns that this anthology presents itself as "the critical place where the consensus on the topic of the golden age of Portuguese poetry itself is questioned." The decision to simultaneously affirm this golden century and question the consensus about it marks the entire project, from conception to reception. Moreover, the questioning of this consensus is tightly connected with a theoretical stance that chooses to challenge the limits of literary historiography.

For a number of reasons, ranging from its title to its high number of collaborators to its status as a critical anthology, *Século de ouro* gathered the conditions to be perceived as a definitive assessment of twentieth-century Portuguese poetry. Nevertheless, this anthology is highly inspired by postmodern thought, and the editors resorted to radically uncommon organizational criteria in an attempt to question historiography itself and obtain an unpredictable result. The final outcome generated strong controversy, fueled by its having been partly financed by public funds. This polemic rippled across the Portuguese literary field, involving poets, the press, and academia, but it went far beyond these borders and, perhaps surprisingly, reached the Portuguese parliament.

The standing of Coimbra 2003 as the first of the National Capitals of Culture was relevant, as in the discussion of *Século de ouro*, some critics argued that the editors' lack of familiarity with the cultural program's guidelines resulted in the volume's inadequacy. To this contributed the metonymy in the designation of the cultural program. One could ask which Coimbra was the Capital of Culture? The city? Or the university founded in 1290? Or even a projected Coimbra? Naturally the concept of the program, even if directly referring to the city, partly encompassed all of the connotations associated with its designation. One of the relevant metonymical understandings of the title Coimbra 2003 with regard to *Século de ouro* is what Lakoff and Johnson call "the place for the institution" (38), in this case the name of the city representing the main university contained in it. The organizers of the cultural program developed in the city of Coimbra could

easily legitimize the designation by associating it with the university, a national reference. On the other hand, as we will see, criticism of *Século de ouro* could just as easily question a lack of local representation, by focusing on the particular geographic space of Coimbra and pointing out the absence of a number of poets who lived in or referred to it.

*Século de ouro* presents itself as an unusual project, both in its scope and criteria. As the editors' introduction tells us, seventy-three critics collaborated in the anthology, and each was asked to choose three poems "of the corpus of twentieth-century Portuguese poetry" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 20). The two editors subsequently selected one of the three poems chosen by each critic, so as to include as many poets as possible. According to the editors, no poem or poet who had not been chosen was afterward included in the volume. The editors requested that the critical essays that follow each poem be written in the format of a close reading. Finally, and the most unusual characteristic of the project, the poems ultimately chosen were organized according to a computer-generated MATLAB matrix, therefore avoiding a more conventional order. The seventy-three poems were assigned a number (1 to 73, following alphabetical order); the MATLAB software produced ten matrixes with a random organization of these numbers; and finally a second random draw selected the matrix to be followed, which dictated the final organization of the volume's poems. The outcome was an anthology with seventy-three poems by forty-seven authors, in which some poets usually seen as canonical obtained few or no nominations, several less consecrated poets were included, some poets were represented by more than one poem, and—surprisingly or not, given the process—Fernando Pessoa was the central figure, with nine poems. As Vincenzo Russo remarks, referring to the fact that Pessoa's heteronym Álvaro de Campos was the most chosen "poet," "it is the poems of a naval engineer who doesn't exist (and never existed) that have the biggest representation" (Russo 2004, 85).

In this volume, it is the critics—mostly from Portugal, Brazil, and the United States—who are included in an attempt to create representativity, rather than the poems they have selected. The collaborators are mostly members of academia (some of them poets as well) and a few poets. The majority of the collaborators write their own literary criticism, both in the context of academia and in the press. Regarding the breadth of the collaborators, the claim by Osvaldo Manuel Silvestre and Pedro Serra that *Século de ouro* is up to the moment of its publication "surely the most ambitious [anthology] of the last century's Portu-

guese poetry ever made" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 19) seems undeniable.<sup>3</sup> In line with the selection of the poems by the collaborators, the editors' purpose was to broaden "the choices to a panorama representative of the several trends in the century . . . being faithful to the concentration of choices in certain authors . . . and avoiding the repetition of poems" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 20). Hence the criteria are unambiguous, and yet they problematize the notion of representativity. The expectation of obtaining as a result of this process of selection "a panorama representative of the several trends in the century" cannot be understood as an intention of controlling the process to guarantee such a result but rather as a tentative approach, made in order to widen the options resulting from chance. In that sense, the process of selection in *Século de ouro* works precisely in opposition to the concept of panorama itself, since what was required from the collaborators was not a personal selection of the group of voices that could make that same panorama but only three of their preferred poems from this period. As critic Rosa Maria Martelo points out, the process of selection made the collaborators themselves approach the volume as a labyrinth (2003, 200). Arguably, the conflict between the choice of adopting randomness as an organizational principle and the alleged expectation of obtaining a representative panorama mirrors the tension that, from the beginning, places this anthology between the two desires of presenting a golden age and questioning the consensus about this concept.

The criteria defined by Silvestre and Serra in principle shielded the anthology from the criticism of having committed active exclusions, a criticism that notwithstanding was still made, as we will see. More important, though, the criteria refused to provide what could be called a totalizing view of the Portuguese poetry of the twentieth century and attempted to undermine all those elements that traditionally, in critical anthologies, display historiographical characteristics. This is why the editors chose the format of close reading for the essays to follow each poem, intending namely to avoid notions such as that of "reflection," or why they used a random sequence in ordering the poems, intending to do away with subjectivity or, as Silvestre and Serra call them, the notions of "historical reason" or "processual History" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 28).

In these characteristics, *Século de ouro* is directly inspired by the discussion on historiographical methods developed in the essay "After Learning from History," by Hans Ulrich Gumbrecht, from his *In 1926: Living at the Edge of Time*.



Gumbrecht's starting point is the idea that until recently the belief existed that it was possible to "learn from History" by reflecting upon its teachings and that from a certain moment on—one he associates with the collapse of the Eastern Bloc—that belief ended. For Gumbrecht, history currently faces the paradox according to which "the claim that 'one can learn from history' has lost its persuasive power" but "books about the past continue to attract a growing number of readers, and . . . history . . . as a discipline remains unchallenged" (1997, 411). One should, however, note that while Gumbrecht states that we have stopped learning from history, what his analysis seems to indicate is that we have stopped believing that it is possible to learn from history. All the same, we should point out that this is a perception that seems to be learned from history itself, if we are to accept it as valid.

As a way to preserve the awareness of the degree of subjectivity underlying history writing, and at the same time to oppose a sort of self-castration in that act, Gumbrecht proposes "six rules of thumb for history writing, after learning from history" (425) that directly influence *Século de ouro*. These rules valorize randomness and chance as a method for selecting themes for study, and valorize the concept of simultaneity in the presentation of historical snapshots, by addressing periods of time such as "one year" through a fragmentary description of facts and artifacts, hypothetically as the individual experiences them firsthand.

Gumbrecht's suspicion regarding causality or sequence in the description of past events is in line with the fear or disbelief regarding narrative in historic discourse, as described by Hayden White: "The fact that narrative is the mode of discourse common to both 'historical' and 'nonhistorical' cultures and that it predominates in both mythic and fictional discourse makes it suspect as a manner of speaking about 'real' events" (1987, 57). In this distrust regarding historical narrative, Gumbrecht's proposal also reflects one of the most often-cited characteristics of postmodernity. Authors including Jean-François Lyotard, Linda Hutcheon, and Fredric Jameson coincide in describing a suspicion regarding any form of historical discourse that is seen as teleology. Lyotard states that the "grand narrative has lost its credibility, regardless of what mode of unification it uses, regardless of whether it is a speculative narrative or a narrative of emancipation" (1984, 37). Hutcheon puts the question in very similar terms in addressing history, when she talks about a "radical suspicion of the act of historiography" as a central characteristic of the postmodern (1988, 90). Jameson goes as far as to state that the cultural productions of history hardly can

"result in anything but 'heaps of fragments' and in a practice of the randomly heterogeneous and fragmentary and the aleatory" (25). And precisely a thorough characterization of different fragments would be the best description of Gumbrecht's methodology in his aforementioned *In 1926*.

Still in line with this discussion, David Perkins's study dedicated to "The Postmodern Encyclopedia," from his *Is Literary History Possible?*, may help us better understand the characteristics of *Século de ouro*. Perkins addresses the format adopted by some histories of literature, in which essays on different topics are gathered without complying with a main plan concerned with lending internal coherence to the collection. The clearest virtue of this format, for Perkins, is that its fragmentary nature is transparent. Contrary to traditional histories, the encyclopedic format allows the reader, from the very beginning, not to mistake a representation of the past with the past itself, since the information is not presented in a causal or sequential manner. He argues: "Encyclopedic form does not distort the past at all, for in it the events that make up the past are not interrelated in a determined way. . . . Thus the encyclopedic can be a relatively open form of literary history" (1992, 55). Perkins notes that these volumes can bring together "biography, bibliography, intellectual history, social history, information about the reception of works, and criticism, moving from one to another with a flexibility that cannot easily be matched in narrative history. When a literary history has no plot, nothing appears as a digression" (54). According to Perkins, this sense of history is characteristic of the postmodern period, even if not altogether new (55). He finishes his study, however, with a negative judgment of this format, writing that its "audience is a limited one, composed mainly of specialists . . . and theorists of literary history. A literary history of this type is logically ancillary or supplemental" (58). For Perkins, therefore, this is not yet the method that answers the paradox described by Gumbrecht, since this history with encyclopedic characteristics presents the alleged crisis of literary historiography but does not go beyond it: "Encyclopedic form is intellectually deficient. . . . It precludes a vision of its subject. Because it aspires to reflect the past in its multiplicity and heterogeneity, it does not organize the past, and in this sense, it is not history. There is little excitement in reading it" (60).

Perkins's analysis is relevant here if we consider the historiographical aspect typical of critical anthologies, and that *Século de ouro* precisely refuses to provide a historical perspective of the literature of the period it covers and states that its own title corresponds to a "posthistorical" figure ("Desaprender (com)

a história," 2002, 21). The editors tell us that this is a "posthistorical" project and that "posthistory is, in this book, a critical exercise that is suspicious of all pretensions to a pacified and happy posterity" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 65). In fact, more than doing away with history and therefore being ahistorical, *Século de ouro* places itself at the core of the postmodern suspicion regarding the possibility of writing history, and it is in that sense that it claims a posthistorical status.

Because of the fragmentary nature of anthologies, there are multiple ways of reading them. For every reader who is obstinate about following the laid-out sequence, another one can always be found who will read the anthology in a random or personal order. This is true even in the case of critical anthologies, despite their higher degree of contextualization. Such an understanding of anthologies as mainly fragmentary makes us inevitably ask what the consequence of preventing a more conventional order is. In this light we could consider *Século de ouro* under three very different, and all partial, perspectives. First, it can be seen as an improvement to the format of anthologies, as the editors in fact claim, in the sense that it perfects the random and fragmentary nature of any anthology ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 31). Second, we can see its unusual organization as a redundant effort, if we are to consider that it only reinstates what any anthology can already be, that is, an object to be read in random order. Yet *Século de ouro*, more than affirming this possibility, adopts it as its main characteristic, forcing it to be factored in the reading, and making us think of the characteristics and limitations of the anthology format itself. Third, through adopting a more conservative view of history, we can consider *Século de ouro* as an impossible anthology, since the volume boycotts the option of reading in an arguably more transparent way (namely, the chronological), a group of poems gathered under a title that aims exactly at a historiographical concept. But, again, *Século de ouro* avoids this third view by drawing attention to the limitations of the format and history at the same time that it incorporates alternative indexes at the end of the book, such as indexes of poets, critics, titles or incipits, and even a chronological organization of the poems.

The editors' suggestion that these indexes be seen as "other potential random entries in the book" ("Desaprender (com) a história," 2002, 33) is logical in a project that claims to be posthistorical. The claim evidences the belief that none of these methods provides an understanding of twentieth-century poetry that is any clearer than the random one, given the editors' suspicion that nar-

rative may attribute meaning to what may not possess it to begin with. However, the inclusion of these indexes can also be seen as a recognition that a random reading does not necessarily present more advantages than a traditional one and, ultimately, that the reader to whom a golden century was promised might be expecting to find a sense of history and organization of the past. To point this out is hardly any criticism, since the editors themselves raise the question of whether “historical legitimization, even if undeclared, can be dismissed in an anthology of poetry of an entire century” (“Desaprender (com) a história,” 2002, 39). The question arises from the decision by many critics who contributed to the anthology with critical essays to not limit themselves to close reading after all, but instead to contextualize the poems both with regard to the authors’ works and their periods or movements. In my view, this preference illustrates a recognition that literary value also lies in factors that may go beyond the textual constructions, although it does not exist without these. At the same time, these critics’ stance undermined the option of considering the entire century as a simultaneous unit, since they preferred to highlight processes of influence between the century’s different poetic trends. Ultimately, by questioning if historical legitimization can be dismissed in an anthology dedicated to a century, the editors decide, more than questioning history, to take up the very concept of posthistory that has been operative for their own work, and leave it to the readers—and time—to provide an answer.

The impact of a project that questioned both the consensus about the figures of the century as well as the possibility of writing that history to begin with was quite significant. The early elements of a polemic were already present in the first references to *Século de ouro* found in the press in November 2002, although the general reception has been frankly positive. The anthology is considered “polemical and eccentric” (Silva 2002), owing to the oddity of the criteria, and the important *Diário de notícias* dedicated a full page to the volume, under the title “Os 73 ouros do século XX” (The 73 Golds of the Twentieth Century; November 15, 2002), including a small box titled “Intelligentsia deixa de fora mais de 30 autores” (“Intelligentsia Leave Out More than 30 Authors”). Although the title seems to point to active exclusions, the article considers these absences the contingency of all anthologies. *Século de ouro* is therefore said to have the very same sort of fallibility of all anthologies, despite its radically different criteria. With the exception of José Carlos Vasconcelos (*Jornal de letras*), who writes that the anthology “doesn’t give a minimally coherent panorama” of what he agrees



is a golden age, most critics praised *Século de ouro* in the period immediately following its publication. Ana Marques Gastão (*Diário de notícias*) considers it “essential in any library.” Sara Belo Luís (*Visão*) evaluates the anthology as a “great essayistic work about twentieth-century Portuguese poetry.” In a text symptomatically titled “666”—an apocalyptic reference that plays on the anthology’s page count and alludes to its intrinsic oddness—João Barrento (*Público*) states that the volume’s preface displays “a solid theoretical basis, for its critical and informative clairvoyance,” and António Guerreiro (*Expresso—Cartaz*) valorizes the originality of the project.

Nonetheless, between November 2002 and late January 2003 the discussion would evolve and the reception change drastically, and already in the months of February and March the anthology would be highly criticized. Ana Marques Gastão (*Diário de notícias*) reports what is by then seen as “the anthology of disagreement” (“A antologia da discórdia”; January 28, 2003). The news was no longer the volume itself but rather the polemics attributed to the noninclusion of poets associated with Coimbra, illustrated by statements provided by poets, professors, and critics. Particularly outstanding was the position by Manuel Alegre, a well-known poet from the area of Coimbra, a former opponent of the fascist dictatorship and a member of parliament who later ran to be president of the republic (in 2006 and 2010). Alegre rejects the project by stating that “Nobody can understand that in an anthology sponsored by Coimbra 2003 Afonso Duarte, [Miguel] Torga, and myself are not included. This story is all the more unfortunate since these poets, connected to Coimbra, were already censored during the dictatorship” (January 28, 2003). Helena Roseta, another member of parliament, criticizes the use of public funding to sponsor “an editorial project based on a methodology whose results are incompatible with the objectives of Coimbra 2003” (“Tiro nos Pés,” January 30, 2003). Most strikingly, a month later the members of parliament of the two main—and rival—Portuguese political parties elected in the district of Coimbra presented a self-titled “Manifesto contra uma antologia poética grosseiramente discriminatória” (“Manifesto against a Grossly Discriminatory Poetic Anthology,” Gabinete de Imprensa, February 25, 2009). In this manifesto the members of parliament expressed their “sincere indignation” regarding the criteria of the compilation and provided a list of poets who, in their view, were excluded or *saneados*, a Portuguese word that means “banned” and is associated with political persecution.

It is worth analyzing in more detail the three main arguments used against

*Século de ouro* with regard to its stance on historiographical discourse. The first one—the absence of some authors of Coimbra in an anthology sponsored by Coimbra 2003—implies a misunderstanding or a rejection of the criteria of the anthology. Manuel Alegre's position (and that of his fellow members of parliament), in particular, is paradigmatic, since the poet understands these criteria but rejects them as inadequate. According to his position, an anthology should be representative of the concept or product that sponsors it, and not of the topic chosen or the corpus addressed. The reaction lets us understand that Alegre believes he should be part of any anthology of twentieth-century Portuguese poetry, since he knows the scope of the book and considers his absence a flaw. But in defending the argument for his presence, he cites his own connection to the city of Coimbra, because he believes an anthology sponsored by Coimbra 2003 should have a representation of local authors.<sup>4</sup> However, by reducing the scope of the compilation from a collection of Portuguese poetry to a group of poets whom Coimbra would choose, or by stating that the anthology should at the very least include the most consecrated authors of the city, Alegre inadvertently reduces the reach of his own poetry to a local dimension, since for all purposes he emphasizes this local component as the real oversight. Ultimately, his argument expresses a deeper anxiety regarding the posterity of his work in the framework of twentieth-century Portuguese poetry. Alegre certainly believes he already belongs in what could be called the canon of poets of Coimbra, as well as the canon of twentieth-century Portuguese poetry—something that, no doubt, most critics recognize. But his dismissal of the criteria of *Século de ouro* seems to evidence a writer's common fear that exclusion from an anthology may imply exclusion from a hypothetical canon. This happens namely because, at first glance, this anthology in particular presents itself as a sort of balance book of the century and also because it originates from within the university, which along with the school, as John Guillory explains with regard to the concept of the literary canon, is the most important threshold for authorial consecration.

The controversy furthermore illustrates a confusion associated with the parliament members' status as elected figures of Coimbra. Both Manuel Alegre and the members of parliament who signed the "Manifesto" attempted to transfer to the literary field the authority conferred upon them in a political election and claim legitimacy to represent the population in aesthetic and critical judgments. The public funds used in *Século de ouro* gave the argument of legitimacy that the parliament members needed to express their opinion. Bourdieu reminds us that

"The state . . . has the power to orient intellectual production by means of subsidies, commissions, promotion, honorific posts, even decorations, all of which are for speaking or keeping silent, for compromise or abstention," and that this applies particularly to "artists and especially professors coming from the petite bourgeoisie [who] are most directly under the control of the state" (1993, 125). In this case, the public money allowed the parliament, a synecdoche for the state, to chastise the members of the literary field involved in the production of this anthology. Essentially, the political authority criticized the performance of the cultural authorities precisely when the cultural authorities destabilized consensus and questioned the limits of history writing. *Século de ouro* also offered to the most consecrated poets the unique opportunity of denouncing a proximity to power of the youngest and least consecrated, who, precisely because of their lesser degree of institutionalization, allowed for an accusation of mispending public funds. In fact, for the parliament members, the "minor poets" included in *Século de ouro* were gold of "a lesser carat."

The third argument used by critics of the anthology has to do with the rigor expected from members of academia. For these academics, the ability to define literary value, more than any power, is indeed an obligation. Some critiques of *Século de ouro* focused particularly on the argument that the anthology originated in the intellectual space of the University of Coimbra, and sometimes in violent terms stated that the readers "expected more" from those ironically called "enlightened brains" (Braga 2003), that is, the editors of the volume, now cast back to the hypothetical ivory tower of academia.

In conclusion, the editors' choice of an anthology to present their own challenge to the format of literary history and its epistemological limits is particularly relevant since anthologies, even if prolific and celebrated in Portugal, have been seen as unproblematic in their format, even when they have polarized multiple anxieties about their representations. In the literary field, the need to write the history of a given period is felt all the more intensely the closer one is to that period; therefore, raising an immediate expectation of historicism, a critical anthology was the ideal match for the editors' desire to question the limitations of historiography. The reactions to *Século de ouro* reflected an obvious fear that an anthology with apparent characteristics of a balance book of a literary century seen as one of the most valuable, if not the most valuable, of Portuguese poetry would lead to the exclusion or the absence in the memory of the literary field itself, in other words, of what is usually called under different perspec-

tives the canon. *Século de ouro* reminds us that anthologies tend to the writing of history by organizing the past, and because readers and authors will expect, or still do expect, such to be the case, that is an expectation anthologists also deal with. In other words, contrary to what anthologists and poets sometimes want to convey, often with evident effort to hide their belief otherwise, anthologies do not merely reflect a natural selection of the best works but rather try to add to the shaping of the canon with their own perspective. *Século de ouro* destabilized the idea, relatively common in Portugal, that the literary canon represents an honor list—or pantheon—into which authors enter peacefully. The anthology that chose not to choose was the wrench needed to remind us that authors are remembered due to different processes of consecration, namely recognition at the university level, which may lead them to influence subsequent writers, and that this is something most authors know rather well.

Moreover, *Século de ouro* was the perfect emblem for the paradox, expressed by Gumbrecht, of being attracted to history while doubting the possibilities of learning from it. The anthology celebrated the conflict inherent in proposing a sample of a century beforehand considered golden, while programmatically trying to avoid a historical approach and questioning a general consensus all too easy to reproduce in print. As far as its reception is concerned, *Século de ouro* was trapped in that same conflict, as it received a high volume of criticism and demagogical positions generated by the misunderstanding or the rejection of its heterodox methodology and theoretical proposal. An assessment of its merits and flaws directly depends on whether the reader agrees that a historiographical methodology such as the one used provides a better knowledge of the past, and/or that we have stopped learning from history, to begin with. The project of *Século de ouro* should therefore be applauded not only for choosing to face the difficulty of writing the history of a literary period so close in time, but even more for trying to do so with a strong awareness of the limitations of historical discourse and a clear willingness to question it and, by doing so, contributing to a debate that is largely open.

#### NOTES

1. I thank Osvaldo Manuel Silvestre for agreeing, in the early stages of my research for this paper, to talk with me about *Século de ouro* and for providing me with a number of press articles that were invaluable in documenting the reception of this anthology.

2. For an accurate listing of anthologies published in Portugal in that period and a



thorough discussion on the topic, see Patricia Odber Baubeta's *The Anthology in Portugal: A New Approach to the History of Portuguese Literature in the Twentieth Century*. For an analysis on the role of anthologies in the literary field and the relation between authorship and anthology making, see Ricardo Vasconcelos's "Quem tem medo de antologias?—Antologias de poesia portuguesa e brasileira do século XX no meio literário português."

3. Also evidencing the strong attention currently paid to this format, a number of anthologies have since been published. A volume that is impressive for its dimensions, both in terms of the number of collaborators and its sheer number of pages (2,149), is *Poemas portugueses—Antologia da poesia portuguesa do séc. XIII ao séc. XXI*, eds. Jorge Reis-Sá and Rui Lage (Porto: Porto Editora, 2009). The many collaborators assisted in the production of the bio-bibliographic notes of the 267 poets included. Although the anthology covers close to eight centuries, about half of it is dedicated to the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, both reinstating the belief that this is a golden age and, of course, raising the issue of whether time will allow that belief to be kept.

4. Manuel Alegre also invokes the imaginary of regional anthologies dedicated to Coimbra, such as those edited by Afonso Lopes Vieira (*Cancioneiro de Coimbra*, Coimbra: França Amado, 1918) or Eugénio de Andrade (*Memórias de Alegria—Antologia de Verso e Prosa sobre Coimbra*, Porto: Inova, 1971).

#### WORKS CITED

- Alegre, Manuel. Answer to the inquiry "Concorda com os critérios?" *Diário de notícias*, January 28, 2003, 45.
- Barrento, João. "666." Review of *Século de ouro*. In "Mil folhas," *Público*.
- Baubeta, Patricia Odber. *The Anthology in Portugal: A New Approach to the History of Portuguese Literature in the Twentieth Century*. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*, edited by Randal Johnson. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Braga, João. "Antologia ou antrologia?" Review of *Século de ouro*. *A Capital*, March 9, 2003.
- Coelho, Eduardo Prado. Answer to the inquiry "Concorda com os critérios?" *Diário de notícias*, January 28, 2003, 45.
- Gabinete de Imprensa do Grupo Parlamentar do Partido Socialista. "Coimbra Capital da Cultura: Manifesto contra antologia poética grosseiramente discriminatória." February 25, 2009. <http://www.ps.parlamento.pt/?menu=actualidade&id=237>.
- Gastão, Ana Marques. "Os 73 ouros do século XX." Review of *Século de ouro*. *Diário de notícias*, November 15, 2002, 51.
- . "A antologia da discórdia." Review of *Século de ouro*. *Diário de notícias*, January 28, 2003, 45.
- Guerreiro, António. "Campo de batalha." Review of *Século de ouro*. *Expresso—cartaz*, November 23, 2002.

- Guillory, John. *Cultural Capital*. Chicago: University Chicago Press, 1993.
- Gumbrecht, Hans Ulrich. *In 1926: Living at the Edge of Time*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1997.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *The Poetics of Postmodernism*. London: Routledge, 1988.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism; or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003 [1980].
- Luís, Sara Belo. "Antologia—O livro do desassossego." Review of *Século de ouro*. *Visão*, November 21, 2002, 198.
- Lytard, Jean-François. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984.
- "Manuel Alegre fala de 'ódio' no texto de opinião sobre antologia de poesia." *Público*, March 3, 2003, 35.
- "Manuel Alegre incapaz de 'comentar o ódio.'" *Diário de Coimbra*, March 3, 2003, 3.
- Martelo, Rosa Maria. "No labirinto: Notas para a leitura de *Século de ouro*." *Inimigo Rumor* 14 (2003): 199–205.
- Pereira, Andreia Marques. "Poesia portuguesa do século XX—a antologia . . ." *O primeiro de Janeiro*, November 20, 2002, 22.
- Perkins, David. *Is Literary History Possible?* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992.
- Russo, Vincenzo. "L'antologia della fine: Il 'Século de Ouro' Portoghese." Review in *SO: Rassegna Iberistica* 79 (2004): 83–86.
- Silva, Patrícia Isabel. "Ensaístas reflectem sobre 'Século de ouro' da poesia portuguesa." *Diário de Coimbra*, November 16, 2002, 5.
- Silvestre, Osvaldo Manuel, and Pedro Serra. "Desaprender (com) a história." Introduction to *Século de Ouro—Antologia crítica da poesia portuguesa do século XX*, edited by Osvaldo Manuel Silvestre and Pedro Serra. Lisbon: Angelus Novus, Cotovia, 2002. 15–65.
- , eds. *Século de ouro—Antologia crítica da poesia portuguesa do século XX*. Lisbon: Angelus Novus, Cotovia, 2002.
- "'Tiro nos pés' de Coimbra 2003" [news article about a statement by Helena Roseta]. *Diário de notícias*, January 30, 2003, 42.
- Vasconcelos, José Carlos. "Livros—Antologia crítica do século XX." Review in *SO: JL—Jornal de Letras, Artes e Ideias*, November 27, 2002, 26.
- Vasconcelos, Ricardo. "Quem tem medo de antologias?—Antologias de poesia portuguesa e brasileira do século XX no meio literário português." PhD diss., University of California, Santa Barbara, 2010. ProQuest, July 9, 2012.

White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*.

Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press: 1987.

RICARDO VASCONCELOS is an assistant professor of Luso-Brazilian literature and culture, and Portuguese language, at the University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee. He received his doctorate from the University of California, Santa Barbara, with a dissertation entitled "Quem tem medo de antologias? Antologias de poesia portuguesa e brasileira do século XX no meio literário português." He holds an MA in modern and contemporary Portuguese literature, and a BA in Portuguese and English, from the University of Porto (Portugal). He is the author of *Campo de Relâmpagos—Leituras do Excesso na Poesia de Luís Miguel Nava* (Lisbon: Assírio e Alvim, 2009) in addition to various articles. He may be reached at ricardov@uwm.edu.