The first history of cinema in a volume of its own was only published in Portugal in 1941, authored by film critic and film club director Manuel de Azevedo, under the title O Cinema em Marcha [Cinema on the Move] (Author’s edition, 1941). According to Jorge Pelayo (Bibliografia...[Bibliography...], 1971, p. 71), this work is so close to Usine de Rêves (Gallimard, 1936), by Ukrainian journalist and writer Illya Ehrenbourg, that “it is almost [its] condensed Portuguese translation.” However, it includes a brief chapter entitled “Portuguese Cinema” in which a philosophical rather than a true historiographical style is adopted. The work sold out, perhaps due to its novelty, and a second edition was published in 1944, this time by the Livraria Latina [Publishing House].

In 1943, a unique history was published: A História do Cinema vista através de Filmes Castello Lopes (Exposição Internacional de Arte Cinematográfica, 1943) [The History of Cinema seen through Castello Lopes Films (International Exhibition of Cinematographic Art)], by Mota da Costa, with evident advertising purposes. Indeed, the second work published in Portugal was História do Cinema [The History of Cinema] (Publicações Europa-América, 1949), the Portuguese translation of Histoire du cinéma (1942), by the French journalist of Italian origin Joseph-Marie Lo Duc. The same year was also the first known attempt to publish an ambitious history of cinema written from scratch by Portuguese authors. A Maravilhosa História da Arte das Imagens [The Marvellous History of the Art of Images] was coordinated by journalists and directors Fernando Fragoso and Raul Faria da Fonseca, edited in fascicles between 1949 and 1956, and constituted a joint effort by various authors to disseminate general data, although it lacked rigour in the analysis and problematisation of the information presented.

Ten years later, Livros Horizonte [Horizon Books Publishing House] launched História do Cinema Mundial [History of World Cinema], a concise Portuguese version of around 700 pages of the six volumes of Georges Sadoul’s celebrated work (Histoire du cinéma mondial, Denoël, 1946-54), a comprehensive work that would become popular worldwide. Meanwhile, in 1956, Fernando Duarte launched the first (and only) volume of his História do Cinema [History of Cinema] on the beginnings of cinema, specifically North American and Czech cinema. Finally, in 1962, journalist Manuel Moutinho Múrias also launched his História Breve do Cinema
[Concise History of Cinema] (Editorial Verbo [Verbo Publishing House]), a summary with a strong personal bias and lacking historiographical rigour.

In fact, the first outline of a history of Portuguese cinema had appeared some time earlier, in 1946. With over 44 pages, "Panorama histórico do Cinema Português" ["Historical Overview of Portuguese Cinema"] was an offprint of the Anuário Cinematográfico Português [Portuguese Cinema Yearbook] (Edições Gama, 1946), covering the main moments in the history of Portuguese cinema until then and listing the main facts of Portuguese cinema in a chronological and descriptive manner. Manuel Félix Ribeiro, its author, was a prominent figure in Portuguese cinema: he began in the cinematographic milieu as a journalist and was invited by António Ferro to head the cinema section of the Secretariado de Propaganda Nacional [Secretariat of National Propaganda] (SPN); from a very early stage, he was committed to the ambitious task of setting up the "Arquivo Cinematográfico Nacional" ["National Cinematheque"]. In 1948, with the foundation of the Cinemateca Nacional [National Film Library], Félix Ribeiro was appointed the first and main person responsible for this new entity. He was also, most likely, the author of a 24-page brochure published by the SNI only in French, English and German, which outlined a brief overview of Portuguese cinema.

While performing his public duties, Félix Ribeiro became engaged in an activity that prioritised the preservation of Portuguese cinema's heritage, from the search for materials and objects related to cinema to the collection of documents which were thought to be lost, the organisation of exhibitions and the promotion of the first retrospectives dedicated to Portuguese and foreign cinema. The extensive work of Félix Ribeiro also focused on the writing of the first drafts and syntheses of the history of Portuguese cinema, dispersed across several monographs and texts published throughout the specialised press. His most significant work, published posthumously, fully illustrates his historiographical activity and style: Filmes, Figuras e Factos do Cinema Português 1896-1949 [Films, Figures and Facts of Portuguese Cinema 1896-1949] (Cinemateca Portuguesa, 1983) and is a valuable report of decades of data collection on the themes to which the title alludes, bringing together credits, images, press prints and backstage stories.

Manuel Félix Ribeiro was a sort of first "official film chronicler of the kingdom", that is, a proto historian of Portuguese cinema who bound his personal version to the official version of the Cinemateca Nacional. As a pioneer, he defined the structure of a narrative on the history of the first fifty years of Portuguese cinema which, in essence, is still in force today in most of the main Portuguese historiographical publications.

Jorge Pelayo played an equally important role in this first phase of the historiographical construction of Portuguese cinema. In addition to collaborating in the main periodicals specialising in cinema, and besides being the organiser of important classical cinema sessions and retrospectives of Portuguese sound cinema, Pelayo also organised the Filmoteca [Film library] of the SNI/SEIT with great patience. However, the work that granted him a key footing in the history of Portuguese cinema was published in 1966 and has already seen two updated and expanded editions (1985 and 1998): Bibliografia Portuguesa de Cinema [The Portuguese
Bibliography of Cinema] is an indispensable tool - as it was for the writing of this text - for any work on the history of Portuguese cinema. The change of the subtitle of the first edition (Bases para um ensaio teórico [Bases for a theoretical essay]) to Uma visão cronológica e analítica [A chronological and analytical view] corresponds to a deliberate methodological mutation that guided the second and third editions. Doing away with the "judgmental function" of his personal appraisal of the first edition, the author valued the "informative function" and expanded the corpus of his work considerably, namely through the inclusion of periodicals and serial publications.

An interesting and important work was published in 1949 by António Horta e Costa. With a considerable volume of information (122 pages), Subsídios para a História do Cinema Português [Subsidies for the History of Portuguese Cinema] (Empresa Literária Universal [Publishing House], 1949) is an excellent chronological list of films and written production on cinema in Portugal relating to the preceding 50 years (1896-1949). Similarly, a few years later, a pivotal work dedicated exclusively to the film press emerged, namely the Breve História da Imprensa Cinematográfica Portuguesa [A Brief History of the Portuguese Film Press] (Clube Português de Cineartística [Portuguese Cinema Club], 1954), by Henrique Alves Costa. Less significant, but equally valuable, was the contribution of journalist Chitónio Montalverde, with Nomes e Números do Cinema Português [Names and Figures in Portuguese Cinema] (Author's Edition, 1969) and Os Primórdios do Cinema Português [The Beginnings of Portuguese Cinema] (Author's Edition, undated), where the author added new data to under explored biographies and filmographies.

The field of film criticism also offered important contributions geared towards a critical history of Portuguese cinema. Among the more enlightened critics, Manuel de Azevedo contributed most to enriching the debate around the cinematographic phenomenon in Portugal. The approach of this author to Portuguese cinema began through his collaboration in several periodicals, in a journalistic, critical and reflexive style that generally sought an initial contact with aspects of the cinematographic phenomenon. The first contribution was published in a separate volume entitled Ambições e Limites do Cinema Português [Ambitions and Limits of Portuguese Cinema] (Seara Nova [Journal], 1945), bringing together a collection of articles previously published in the Seara Nova journal. The following publication, Perspectiva do Cinema Português [Perspective of Portuguese Cinema] (Cineclube do Porto, 1951), was another timely work where the author called for a new reflection on the current status of Portuguese cinema from its historical perspective. Some years later, compiling a significant number of texts dispersed across several publications not specialised in cinema, he published À Margem do Cinema Nacional [On the Fringes of National Cinema] (Cineclube do Porto, 1956). However, Manuel de Azevedo's name will always be linked to film societies, both for his outstanding participation in the movement and for his serious first approach to its study in the volume O Movimento dos Cineclubes [The Film Club Movement] (Cadernos Seara Nova [Seara Nova Notebooks], 1948).

The invitation to Manuel de Azevedo by the renowned historian Joel Serrão to collaborate in the important Dicionário de História de Portugal [Dictionary of the History of Portugal] directed by Serrão (Figueirinhas, 1971)
is a showcase of Azevedo’s worth as a critic. Proof of recognition of the author’s contribution to the study of Portuguese cinema is the entry in this prestigious dictionary on “Cinema in Portugal”, which was the first public example of the need to include cinema in the scientific treatment of historiography.

Roberto Nobre, a prominent figure among the cultural opponents of the Estado Novo [New State], was another well-known critic during this period. In addition to writing a number of critical and reflexive texts of a theoretical-aesthetic nature, with occasional participations in various periodicals, Nobre also paid particular attention to the history of Portuguese cinema, devoting a separate work exclusively to this theme: Singularidade do Cinema Português [The Uniqueness of Portuguese Cinema] (Portugália, 1964). Despite reflecting a very personal experience, it contains several methodological alerts that are even more interesting since they come from someone with no historiographical background.

In short, Manuel de Azevedo and Roberto Nobre were two of the main figures in film criticism who constantly disputed the official version of the history of Portuguese cinema produced by Félix Ribeiro and sponsored by public entities.

Also within the scope of criticism, but from an opposite ideological field to the last two examples, two names are particularly noteworthy: Manuel Moutinho Múrias published a significant work, História Breve de Cinema [Concise History of Cinema] (Editorial Verbo, 1962), devoting some poorly developed references to Portuguese cinema; and Fernando Duarte, a film club leader from Rio Maior, director of the film journals Visor [Screen] (1953-56) and Celulóide [Celluloid] (1957-1984) and author of publications such as Primitivos do Cinema Português [The Primitives of Portuguese Cinema] (Cinecultura, 1960), Elementos para a História do Cinema Português, do livro e a imprensa cinematográfica e do cineclubismo [Elements for the History of Portuguese Cinema, of the book, film press and film club] (Celulóide, 1976) and Apontamentos para a História do Cinema Português que não se fez [Notes for the Unaccomplished History of Portuguese Cinema] (Celulóide, 1978).

This inventory of the first historiographical writings on Portuguese cinema would not be complete without a reference to Alice Gamito, an author with invaluable work in the research on agricultural cinema. Like Félix Ribeiro, she undertook a two-sided task: a practical work in the organisation of the Filmoteca do Serviço de Informação Agrícola [Film Library of the Agricultural Information Service] and an editorial production on rural and agricultural cinema in Portugal, especially based on the activities promoted by the Festival de Cinema de Santarém [Santarém Film Festival].

This first phase of the historiography of Portuguese cinema, which can be marked between the first text by Félix Ribeiro (1946) and the first work entirely dedicated to the history of national cinema (A Aventura do Cinema Português [The Adventure of Portuguese Cinema] by Luís de Pina, 1977), was characterised by an important group of figures who were of particular relevance in the inventory and collection of dispersed materials, the validity and main value of which would become evident later on. The texts from this period were also part of a type of expository narrative, placing greater emphasis on critical appraisals with a strong personal
bias. This period was also marked by a significant editorial surge with thematic collections from several publishers and translations of major international authors, thus allowing for the dissemination of fundamental historical and aesthetic elements. This climate of editorial euphoria reflected a general enthusiasm that stemmed, above all, from the film club movement which, in its golden age, fostered the cultural and artistic enhancement of the cinematographic phenomenon.

Precious archaeological remains may be traced back to this phase, exemplarily documenting the type of vision promoted by a group of authors on the trajectory of Portuguese cinema. Mostly supported by records of a memorialistic nature, these authors promoted a construction of the Portuguese cinematic imaginary where priority was given to the establishment of a golden age anchored on "comédia à portuguesa" ["Portuguese comedy"] and the "historical films" framed by the official vision of the regime. One of the best examples of this construction of memory is António Lopes Ribeiro, especially in the presentation and production of the television success Museu do Cinema [Cinema Museum] (1957-74), where it was possible to broadcast the great silent film classics on television.

As already mentioned, surprisingly, the first autonomous work dedicated exclusively to the history of Portuguese cinema would only emerge in the late 1970s, under Luís de Pina, and with the intriguing title of A Aventura do Cinema Português [The Adventure of Portuguese Cinema] (Editorial Vega, 1977). Prepared over the course of a decade, this "chronicle of the evolution and current status of Portuguese cinema" - as termed by the author - includes chapters dedicated to specific themes, as well as an exhaustive chronology, useful film biographies of the authors and attached bibliography. A relevant and precursory work in the historiography of Portuguese cinema, it attempted to fill "an old gap" by aiming to synthesise an "adventurous journey travelled by Portuguese cinema, the facts, the trends, the figures and the main human interpreters." (Pina, Luís de, A Aventura..., 1977, pp. 5-6).

The following year, the same author published Panorama do Cinema Português [Overview of Portuguese Cinema](Terra Livre, 1978), a work that essentially sought to vulgarise and popularise contents related to the history of Portuguese cinema. Part of a series of breviaries on Portuguese culture, it targeted a non-specialised audience looking to acquire basic knowledge of the history of Portuguese cinema.

Confirming his prolific activity as a self-taught writer and historian, Luís de Pina updated several data in História do Cinema Português 1896-1986 (Publicações Europa-América, 1986), a "paperback" that became the main reference for cinema studies in Portugal for its comprehensiveness.

As Félix Ribeiro's successor at the Cinemateca, Luís de Pina played a decisive role in the consolidation of this institution as a research and editorial centre around the preservation of film heritage. On an individual
level, besides his published stories, he collaborated with several periodicals and also insisted on the dissemination of marginalised themes, little known to the public. On the other hand, as a civil servant, he organised several cinematographic services and, during the Marcelist phase of the regime, he promoted the Estado Novo’s official view on the history of Portuguese cinema. Like his predecessor at the helm of the Cinemateca, Luís de Pina left his personal mark on the institution’s organisation and was rightly honoured for his valuable role on behalf of Portuguese cinema. In an obvious manner, Luís de Pina succeeded Félix Ribeiro as the “official chronicler of the kingdom.”

Against the backdrop of the Revolução de Abril de 1974 [April Revolution of 1974], the cinematographic panorama underwent important changes. The publishing activity dedicated to cinema invariably also reflected the new ideology, with the publication of interesting works that until then had not been possible. The ensuing years witnessed the publication of *O Imperialismo e o Fascismo no Cinema* [Imperialism and Fascism in Cinema] by Eduardo Geada (Morais Editores, 1977), *Cinema e Censura em Portugal* [Cinema and Censorship in Portugal] by Lauro António (Arcádia, 1978) and *Rumos do Cinema Português* [Directions of Portuguese Cinema] by Germano Cleto (Fundo de Apoio aos Organismos Juvenis [Support Fund for Youth Organisations], 1979).

Viewed from a highly political standpoint, a common factor among these publications, these works illustrated the type of editorial effervescence that marked the “ongoing revolutionary process”. The new political and aesthetic orientations resulting from the revolution fostered a redefinition of the official vision of the history of Portuguese cinema, focusing above all on themes of a social and political nature which, during the former regime, would have encountered serious difficulties in terms of their publication.

In the meantime, Henrique Alves Costa, a film club member, resumed the publication of works written as revisitations of the past, with little methodological attention, and which relied heavily on the author’s memories. In a coherent fashion, his *Breve História do Cinema Português 1896-1962* [Concise History of Portuguese Cinema 1896-1962] - part of a collection of cultural syntheses edited by the Instituto de Cultura Portuguesa [Institute of Portuguese Culture] – advances a very personal view of the national cinematographic trajectory, where his preferences and aesthetic objections are evident.

Considering the publication of a follow-up to this concise history, the Instituto de Cultura Portuguesa delegated its update to another non-historian: Eduardo Prado Coelho, a renowned film critic with even fewer methodological concerns than the author from Porto, was the author of *Vinte Anos de Cinema Português 1962-1982* [Twenty years of Portuguese Cinema] (1983), a kind of catalogue of the most significant films of that period. Using a strictly internal analysis of the cinematographic works, Prado Coelho rejects factors of a contextual nature alien to the narrative construction, valuing the work as a purely aesthetic product. Using a

---

1 Period between 1968 and 1974, when Marcelo Caetano, a politician and scholar, was the second and last leader of the Estado Novo after succeeding António Salazar.
similar approach, Salvato Teles de Menezes reviewed the Portuguese film production of the decade following the 1974 revolution. After a brief general introduction to the period under study (1974-84), he focuses on film production and analyses those he deems most important and representative of Portuguese cinema of the post-April 25 period.

From a historiographical point of view, António Videira Santos who was committed to the "primitive" history of Portuguese cinema, was a highly relevant figure during this period. As a collaborator in several periodicals, he was noteworthy for his study of the pioneers, and was rightly considered the main historian of the beginnings of Portuguese cinema. His various works popularised the "founder" of Portuguese cinema, Aurélio da Paz dos Reis, and other pioneering figures such as Pinto Moreira and Ernesto de Albuquerque. His fundamental work, published by the Cinemateca Portuguesa, Para a História do Cinema Português [Towards a History of Portuguese Cinema] (1991), was a lengthy and useful piece on the founding periods of Portuguese cinema, containing unpublished data on the emergence of the cinematograph in the archipelagos of Madeira and the Azores.

From the 1980s onwards, due to the essential driving force of Luís de Pina and his team of collaborators at the Cinemateca Portuguesa, a considerable surge was seen in the historiographical production of cinematography. Dividing its attention among the organisation of retrospectives of Portuguese cinema, the coordination of catalogues dedicated to directors and actors, the promotion of monographs on precursory figures, the stimulation of the study of the main historical moments and aesthetic movements and the history of the institution itself, the Cinemateca Portuguesa quickly became the main centre of editorial production of Portuguese cinema, with dozens of publications.

One of the Cinemateca's collaborators who contributed greatly to the advance of research in the history of Portuguese cinema was José de Matos-Cruz, under whom two pivotal works were published: O Cais do Olhar [The Quay of Vision] (IPC, 1981; a "revised, updated, corrected and enlarged" re-edition, Cinemateca Portuguesa, 1999) and Prontuário do Cinema Português [Portuguese Cinema Handbook], 1896-1989 (Cinemateca Portuguesa, 1989). Marking the culmination of several years of exhaustive laboratorial research, these two works sought to initiate the accomplishment of an ambitious Encyclopaedia of Portuguese Cinema and were part of a remarkable film inventory effort that included the research of "published bibliography, press in general, specialised journals, censorship records, catalogues, programmes, private studies, multiple files of several organisations, laboratories and companies, lists of the main archives, film library editions, thousands of loose documents - of Portuguese or foreign origin, covering the more than nine decades under study - in addition to personal contacts and testimonies" (Matos-Cruz, José de, Prontuário... , 1989, p. 5).

Dividing his important activity between the two main public institutions linked to cinema, namely the IPC and the Cinemateca, from the late 1970s onwards, Matos-Cruz was able to compile an impressive collection
of data on Portuguese cinema that led to the above-mentioned works and also to several precursory studies on issues that had been under studied until then.


Finally, João Bénard da Costa, Luis de Pina's successor as director of the institution, is one of the indispensable references in Portugal's cultural landscape of the last four decades. Devoting particular attention to cinema from the late 1960s onwards, around the time he became director of the Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation's film department, Bénard da Costa gradually became a significant reference in film criticism in Portugal. His natural growth within the Cinemateca served to reinforce the idea that this cinephile had become a crucial element in the construction of the institution's identity, under his directorship between 1991 and 2009. The guiding principles behind the Cinemateca's programming and editorial activity reflected the strong core ideas that marked the personality of this director. By the same token, the personal appraisal of a kind of authorial cinema, conveyed from the mid-1960s onwards, mainly in the pages of O Tempo e o Modo [Time and Mode], gradually became, in general terms, the institution's official vision of Portuguese cinema over the last decades.

In the early 1990s, on the occasion of the Portuguese exhibition at Europalia, Bénard da Costa produced a work that falls within the scope of a fairly large set of summaries on Portuguese culture, Histórias do Cinema [Cinema Stories] (Imprensa Nacional Casa da Moeda [National Mint], 1991), which marked the end of a period in Portuguese film historiography. The great merit of this work lies in the apt combination of cinematographic events and the political and social history of the country, integrating cinema as a kind of cultural complement to the evolution of society. Furthermore, it attempts to establish a conception of a history of Portuguese cinema
based on a former approach to history, namely by placing particular emphasis on the main guardian figures and their periods of greatest influence.

In his fascinating work on Portuguese film criticism in the 1960s and 1970s, Eduardo Paz Barroso defines what he terms as “Bénard da Costa's canonical perspective”: through his ironic writings, Bénard da Costa “achieves a personal and authoritative vision of the cinema made in our midst,” calling upon his own cinematic experiences and memories as justification and legitimation. Given Bénard da Costa’s influence on the critical construction of Portuguese cinema, Paz Barroso admits that “it is perfectly acceptable to say that João Bénard da Costa is to Portuguese cinema what Harold Bloom is to Western literature.” (Barroso, Eduardo Paz, Justificação [Justification…], 2002, pp. 73-76).

In the late 1980s, another indispensable tool for the study of Portuguese cinema emerged: the Dicionário do Cinema Português [Dictionary of Portuguese Cinema], written by Jorge Leitão Ramos and published by Caminho, in three volumes covering the period 1895-2003. The publication of the first volume, in 1989, marks the end of a second period in the historiographical production of Portuguese cinema. In little over a decade (1977-89), writing had shifted from a generally memorialistic register, with some historiographical pretensions, to an awareness of the need for interdisciplinary scientific and methodological bases. Despite the importance of continuing to inventory the information, a task timely initiated and proficiently undertaken by the Cinemateca Portuguesa, some interested parties alerted to the urgency of embarking on a critical treatment of the data available and to be made available.

The first academic studies on cinema began to emerge in Portugal in the 1990s. During this period, film studies were introduced in some Portuguese faculties (Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Coimbra [Faculty of Arts of the University of Coimbra], Departamento de Ciências da Comunicação da Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas da Universidade Nova de Lisboa [Department of Communication Sciences, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, New University of Lisbon]) and research centres (Centro de Estudos Interdisciplinares do Séc. XX da Universidade de Coimbra [Centre for Interdisciplinary Studies on the 20th Century, University of Coimbra]), which significantly changed the state of the art. Several master's dissertations and doctoral theses on cinema were produced, but it was the launch of the book O Cinema sob o Olhar de Salazar [Cinema under Salazar's eye] (Círculo de Leitores, re-edited in 2011), coordinated by Luís Reis Torgal in 2001, which symbolically marked the passing of the torch to the academy of film studies in Portugal. It brought together unpublished texts by a series of authors who, in previous years, had presented academic works initiating the problematisation of the history of Portuguese cinema which had, in the meantime, been canonised by the publications of former decades.

In less than a decade, a considerable volume of knowledge had emerged in several universities and research centres resulting from research projects, with FCT funding, proposing new interdisciplinary approaches to cinema in Portugal: Teoria e Estética do Cinema Documentário [Theory and Aesthetics of Documentary Cinema] (LabCom/UBI); Principais Tendências do Cinema Português Contemporâneo [Main

Moreover, in several academic institutions abroad, especially in Brazil, publications have also emerged signed by academics who have shed new light on Portuguese cinema through literature, theatre and history. Several works by scholars such as Carolin Overhoff Ferreira (UNESP, Brazil), Renata Soares Junqueira (FAPESP, Brazil), Jorge Cruz (UERJ, Brazil), Leandro Mendonça (UFF, Brazil), Randall Johnson (UCLA, United States), Iván Villarmea Álvarez (U. Santiago Compostela, Spain), Glòria Salvadó-Corretger (U. Pompeu Fabra, Spain) among many others, have appeared in the Portuguese publishing market as a result of a growing interest.

With the contribution of many of these scholars, two particularly significant collective works of a new methodological approach to Portuguese cinema were published: O Cinema Português através dos seus filmes [Portuguese Cinema through its films] (Campo das Letras 2007, republished in 2014 by Edições 70), coordinated by Carolin Overhoff Ferreira; and Cinema Português: Um Guia Essencial [Portuguese Cinema: An Essential Guide] (SESI-SP, 2013), organised by Paulo Cunha and Michelle Sales. Among dozens of recent publications available in the publishing market on the history of Portuguese cinema, the following are worthy of note, particularly for their historicising occurrence and scope: A Invenção do Cinema Português [The Invention of Portuguese Cinema], by Tiago Baptista (Tinta-da-China. 2008); the two volumes of Cinema Português. Um País Imaginado [Portuguese Cinema. A Country Imagined], by Leonor Areal (Edições 70. 2011); Viagens, olhares e imagens [Travels, visions and images], organised by Sofia Sampaio (Cinemateca Portuguesa. 2017); and Uma nova história para o novo cinema português [A new history for the new Portuguese cinema], by Paulo Cunha (Le Monde Diplomatique/Outro Modo. 2018).

In this last period, from 1992 to the present day, the history of Portuguese cinema has experienced a diversity and scientific enhancement fostered above all by the academy, which has enabled a transdisciplinary action - with anthropology, architecture, sociology and philosophy, among others. This has served to definitively transform historiographical practice in Portugal, with a clear shift away from the pseudo-authors and those committed to the object who had spearheaded the publications of the initial phases. Promoted within
the scope of individual projects (master's theses or doctoral dissertations) or as part of collective initiatives (research projects or the transfer of knowledge to the community), a vast bibliographic production based on scientific methodologies has returned to the sources and proposed a revision of the knowledge that is gradually being transmitted by academia and reaching the publishing market, also contributing to its dissemination in the artistic and cultural arenas.

Over recent decades, the production of knowledge on Portuguese cinema has become diversified and benefitted from the contribution of other scientific and disciplinary areas, essentially reflecting the professional and intellectual acumen of its authors and the degree of personal, economic and corporative commitment to the object of study itself. During the first decades, whether directly or indirectly, the State controlled the narrative that progressively became consolidated, ensuring its institutionalisation, first through the SNI then, after the fall of the Estado Novo dictatorship, through public entities such as the Cinemateca or the successive Institutos de Cinema.

The evolution of the historiographical practices around Portuguese cinema was gradual and too slow, from the first proto-historiographical writings by pseudo-authors and journalists, with their memorialistic or assumedly subjective styles. The arrival of the object to the academy, generalised in the 21st century, paved the way for the problematisation of undisputed questions and for opening up the debate on fields and genres that had been undervalued or even ignored, such as the production of scientific, industrial, and tourist cinema, among others, the relationship between cinema and political and economic power, and, more recently, the studies on Portuguese cinema that adopt post-colonial and feminist perspectives, among others.


Paulo Cunha