Arquivo Virtual da Geração de Orpheu

BNP/E3, $14A - 7^r$

1. to shall discuss, in the first place, the arthutes problem unidered in " antinous " a, nother, in the dominication of " Antinous" as ministal. It is said of " Antineus" as it has been and from this standpoint of all artistic uses renouned to universal, " as artitically spirit by their universality that it is a lad prem : it is an univeral prem, as, how, than in so far as it is an animil it is a las (i.a. a untiles) for one

14A- 7

to punted out in an projecting considerations, as stade though at diadrantage to ansilve, sugglif the Si amin of this pinit by an uning, when the accessor, that "Antinors " is ununal, thigh as is not admit that & shad per that there is good rearm for our not armithing it But here as say "bt is suppose that it is animal . The carrynesses ; that "Antiness" uniedaty to appear pour the seen + we are brught face to face with the from pattern of the relation between art - manding + the origining whether the aniorality of a company appens it cathetic value. For, mice a have review, in dricing the part, to couch (here wing the) that "Artunes " " annual, if it he proved that the commustily of a form in us any offerts its aerthetic value, " Mutis', i'm if suppor animal, will mape arme in this orgent. If a bave said, in the dove payabe. " any form ,

+ aut " any anse y at" it is is planat is time of the subs to be applied to a point will be time of the rules to to apply to " But", for that " of a pain" and the antit to another of at, the and and and to more rates.

Transcrição

1. We shall discuss, in the first place, the aesthetic problem involved in "Antinous" or, rather, in the denunciation of "Antinous" as immoral. It is said of "Antinous" - as it has been said, from this standpoint, of all artistic works denounced as immoral, and as artistically spoilt by their immorality - that it is a bad poem *because* it is an immoral poem, or, better, than *in so far* as it is an immoral it is a bad (i.e. a worthless) po one.

As pointed out in our prefatory considerations, we shall though at disadvantage to ourselves, simplify the discussion of this point by assuming, with the accusers, that "Antinous" is immoral, though we do not admit that and shall prove that there is good reason for our not admitting it. But here we say "let us suppose that it is immoral". The consequence is that "Antinous" immediately disappears from the scene and we are brought face to face with the generic problem of the relations between art and morality, and the discussion of whether the immorality of a wor |poem| affects its aesthetic value. For, since we have decided, in discussing this point, to concede (however unrightly /wrongly) that "Antinous" is immoral; if it be proved that the immorality of a poem in no way affects its aesthetic value, "Antinous", even even if supposed immoral, will escape censure in this respect.

If we have said, in the above paragraph, "any poem" and not "any work of art" it is because the trend of the coming argument will be to establish a distinction between several forms of art, between statues and poems say, in respect to moral values, what is true of $\frac{1}{4}$ the rules to be applied to a poem will be true of the rules to be applied to "Antinous", for "Antinous" is a poem; {...}

Arquivo Virtual da Geração de Orpheu

BNP/E3, 14A - 8^r

2 14 A-8 2. Any product of social human articly, h it a status, a hit ar an election, is maptile y hig Bicund and 3 heats - one big The laws of the particular tertured, to as a to diena, to which it a is , below; to down, The Can of the type of anis which provers it , the Third The samit consitions in aluce, the chil or for aluce at is protund. This a statue is part, to he candand that the and arthets; a big for the standpart of Capineony; & an where for to the pit of "pretine" publities . A statum , and hij, " an shut, can the h could popular aly - the : toon to an analysi of the top of mind which curis to the hut the his a trinder the water. Lak either y the 3 portes day of and and a contar for Quishir stanspirit. Our con is with a form , a rate , with form in general . the texand i't and the aniant full to meets the as a most in party. he have then there arean' injurice to construct, the artentie an salid is whitten the convisality of a fam, ofpituidy curiter, and any any office the hand of a fire, agters curle?; the psychologie one, which is, whether the comption of the and foulther of the with does not andre a parallel, co. effect, a comptin y his atite facattion?, and the analysi on, ale it is thether The mateptation to small announcent promptively inwhen in the writing The - + have for Dostit of the - imply or came an article deficiency in the port? 4.4. all the time, are emented four should not be but right of : while we are discussing their public when the head of artheters, pryshilly a suisting, then are substrictions of the publicon, they are autonomiated I a present article

Transcrição

2. Any product of social human activity, be it a statue, a bridge or an election, is susceptible of being discussed under 3 heads - one being the laws of the particular technics, the art or the science, to which it or its {...}, belongs; the other, the |laws| of the type of mind which produces it; the third, the social conditions in which, through which or for which it is produced. Thus a statue is can, first, to be considered aesthetically, from the standpoint of aesthetics; a bridge from the standpoint of engineering, and an election from the standpoint of "practical" politics. A statue, a bridge, and an election, can then be considered psychologically - that is to say, by an analysis of the type of mind which conceived the statue or built the bridge or |*directed| the nation. Lastly, either of the 3 products chosen for examples can be considered from a sociological standpoint.

Our case is with a poem, or, rather, with poems in general. Its technical analysis falls under the head of aesthetics. Our case it to analyse the scientifically the relations between art and morality in poetry. We have then three successive inquiries to conduct: the aesthetic one, which is, Whether the immorality of a poem, objectively considered, in any way affects the beauty of a poem, objectively considered?; the psychologic one, which is, Whether the corruption of the moral faculties of the artist does not involve a parallel, coaffected, or {...} corruption of his artistic faculties?; and the sociologic one, which is, Whether the inadaptation to social environment presumptively involved in the writing of an immoral poem does - and how far does if it if it do - imply or cause an artistic deficiency in the poet?

Yet, all the time, one essential point should not be lost sight of: while we are discussing this problem under the heads of aesthetics, psychology and sociology, these are *subdivisions* of the problem, they are subordinated to a general *aesthetic*

Arquivo Virtual da Geração de Orpheu

BNP/E3, 14A - 9^r

14A-9 3 analysis. The purely projections, the purely the disaminis of the problem, will come later, in the Sund & their waters of their box. he Keyning n' mind the fact that are fining airty som at this summent formaning arthuter , and mut assisted (recularing) prychologi + multi, an are at one could & omply a quat part of the quitin For, having the arthet sublision intait for it 5 mith second for the Idivision itself bet as myneni with the questions put or territicity the pryships + to much fully for the arthutic Frandpar When, as the (sychologi) queter to be analyne, a say this it is thather the enmirality of the auther affects soluting his article families in direction & and when to works of his sents which that annuality As not for, in which it is not capiens. That and ha pures production a pund mend " arming an arthur pedlen. The selations liter the anew sconsortion of Tallost & the hants or perfect of his hotines, an abis that noments is at a prome constitute a fullion pany mend, fring pry dulyni. In it to have an attet the stag a fyrther, full, and put it is another no the univality acent h dection, that is mart h in the book itself, not the annivality of the authen a an man, but of the author as man. To the

Transcrição

analysis. The *purely* psychosociologic, the *purely* sociopsychologic discussions of the problem, will come later, in the second and third sections of this book. So, keeping in mind the fact that our primary investigation is now at this moment primarily aesthetic and only subordinately ^{/(secondarily)} psychological and sociologic, we are at once enabled to simplify a great part of the question.

For, leaving the aesthetic subdivision intact, for it is directly descended from the primary division itself, let us inquire into the questions put as constituting the psychological and the sociological problem, from the aesthetic standpoint.

When, as the psychologic-aesthetic question to be analysed, we say that it is, whether the immorality of the an author affects subjectively his artistic faculties, we obviously do not refer to works of his into which that immorality does not pass, in which it is not expressed. That would be a purely psychologic, a purely moral, nowise /in no detail an aesthetic problem. The relations between the arrant scoundrelism of Sallust and the beauty or perfection of his histories, in which that scoundrelism is not expressed, constitute a problem purely moral, purely psychologic. For it to become an aesthetic, though still a psychologic, problem, we have put it in another way — the immorality must be objective, that is, must be in the book itself, not the immorality of the author as au man, but of the author as man. So the

Arquivo Virtual da Geração de Orpheu

BNP/E3, 14A - 10^r

14A-10

Transcrição

4 question hermes: Fater at the families hidred an anting an amende form, que amine affect These unidred in uniting a from qua pren if we to about of to ahat extent it for how that get & arealy are related not related The result in this for, is the same. If an has that they are setated, that art deal he mand I have an hill the start hand the after the is this an unmaral poem how the poet who writes the poem is either hunsilf an moral, kno the vier or unwishing abil he has expressed in the form ; as here's not , & has cut that min a In the fait care, or are bright again with the question of Anthent must ark whether he cansiders that we as a for a an end thing. If he caniles it a good thing, not a vice at all, in an again at the con glallest; for

question becomes: To what extent if any Do the faculties involved in writing an immoral poem, quâ immoral, affect those involved in writing a poem, quâ poem, if so, to in what or to what extent? Now, whether we hold that art and morals are related, or that they are not related, the result, in this case, is the same. If we hold that they are related and that art should be moral (no one holds that they are related to one another or not should be moral), the artist 'poet' who is writing an immoral poem [...]

Now the poet who writes the poem is either himself immoral, has the vice or immorality which he has expressed in the poem; or he is not, and has not that vice or immorality. In the first case, we are brought again into the question of Sallust must ask whether he considers that vice as a good or an evil thing. If he considers it a good thing, not a vice at all, we are again at the case of Sallust; for {...}



DIREITOS ASSOCIADOS

O trabalho MODERNISMO - Arquivo Virtual da Geração de Orpheu de <u>https://modernismo.pt/</u> está licenciado com uma Licença <u>Creative Commons - Atribuição-NãoComercial-CompartilhaIgual 4.0 Internacional</u>.