

Camões and the First Edition of *The Lusíads* [*Os Lusíadas*], 1572: An Introduction to the CD-ROM

K. David Jackson
Yale University

The special issue on Luís de Camões (1524?-1580) of *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* (2003) of the University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth provides access for scholars and readers to most of the surviving copies of the first edition (1572) of the epic poem, *The Lusíads* [*Os Lusíadas*], one of the classic works of world literature, by reproducing for the first time 29 exemplars provided by libraries and collections from eight countries on three continents. Five other exemplars were surveyed and included in our study but were not available for reproduction, bringing the total consulted to 34. These are now available on the CD-ROM published by this academic journal, and each may be read consecutively as a book, from beginning to end. Readers of *The Lusíads* will now easily be able to read this classic work in its first edition. The aim of the CD-ROM is to make possible a comprehensive analysis of the first edition in all its variants, as a source of comparative study by scholars and appreciation by readers of Camões. To unite the remaining exemplars of *The Lusíads* that were “spread around the world in pieces,” to echo words of Camões, has been an ideal of scholarship since at least the 19th century, for reasons that have differed for philologists, grammarians, editors, and collectors.

In the first photo-lithographic reproduction of a first edition in 1898, Theophilo Braga considered the first edition of 1572 to be a key to the recovery of the poem’s authentic text: “The photo-lithographic reproduction of the first edition of *The Lusíads* is one of the most useful and important contributions towards the study of the pure and authentic text of Camões’s epic.” Then, at the fourth centenary of the voyage to India, Braga wrote about the rarity of the first edition of *The Lusíads* and the need to consult it in order to establish an authentic text for a work that had been so altered by editors and printers over the centuries:

The known exemplars of this edition are extremely rare, and when by whatever circumstances they appear on the market, they are monopolized by those privileged by fortune. [. . .] It is indispensable to have an accessible standard for the authentic edition of the *Lusíads* to which the constant reproductions of Camões’s poem could refer [. . .]. For the study of literary documents of this kind, recourse to first editions is irreplaceable [. . .]

.]. Happily modern industry has found a way to make unique exemplars accessible, which is a consolation, to think that literary thesauruses truncated by the accidents of time may be restored [. . .].

And what moment could be more significant for bringing to light the authentic reproduction of *The Lusíads* than now at this national jubilee of the fourth Centenary of the discovery of the maritime route to India? (“Aos Camonianos,” 1898)

In the mid-twentieth century, Professor Francis Rogers of Harvard University preferred to work with photo facsimile editions and believed that a full comparison of errors and variants would be essential to any critical edition. He had plans to publish a photographic reproduction, with all the variants from other exemplars and the rejected stanzas reproduced on facing pages. As did Braga, Rogers thought that a complete knowledge of the 1572 exemplars was essential for an accurate and authentic reading of the text, as Camões intended it. His long-range project, which time did not allow him to accomplish, was to compare photographic reproductions of all the remaining exemplars dated 1572. Our CD fulfills the vision of these two Camonian scholars in the wake of the celebrations of the fifth centenary of the Portuguese maritime discoveries, little more than a century after Braga’s first photographic reproduction.

*

A general description of the volume, taken from Francisco Dias Agudo’s study (1972), will introduce the reader to some of its most salient features:

The volume that contains the Poem is in 8°, with 2 X 186 leaves, and foliated. Grouped in 24 gatherings or printed leaflets, each denominated by a letter for each gathering from A to Z, beginning with CANTO I. At the bottom of each page in each gathering, there are indications: A for page 1, A2 for page 2, etc. The first gathering, which contains the title page, is an unsigned bifolium. The last gathering contains a small supplement of four pages. On the lower right side of each folio are the catchwords, one or two, with which the first verse of the following page opens.

O rosto— // Os // Lusíadas // de Luís de Ca- // mões. // Com privilégio Real. // Impressos em Lisboa, com licença da // Sancta Inquisição, e do Ordina- // rio: em casa de António // Gõçalvez Impressor. / 1572

These phrases are framed, as one can see, by an artistic composition formed in the design of two lateral columns, a lower piece and an upper, with the pelican in the middle. These are common features [. . .].

The critical study of the problems of the first edition has been a topic of research for more than three centuries, during which time it has taken on the different guises of a detective story, a romantic adventure,

a tale of piracy, or a quest for a lost original. Over time, the 1572 edition has challenged the capacity for observation and the philological knowledge of generations of scholars. Almost from the moment that Faria e Sousa, the great Spanish commentator of Camões's work, first observed in 1685 that the image of the pelican on the title page was turned in some copies to the reader's left and in others to the reader's right, it has been considered "general knowledge" that two different editions, or at least printings, were in existence. Faria e Sousa thought, as did the Morgado de Mateus in preparing his 1817 edition in Paris, that the pelican turned to the reader's right was the original, because of its extensive errata that the other made an attempt to correct: "I assure you that I have closely examined the two editions that I have for differences in characters, orthography, and errata that are in the first, and which have been emended in the Second; and some words changed to improve the expression" (qtd. in *Os Lusíadas*, 1980, 8). Each subsequent observation of a difference between the "pelicans" added fuel to the hypothesis: thought to be particularly significant was a difference in the reading of the seventh line of the first stanza, which begins "E entre" in the case of the "left" pelican and "Entre" in the "right." The "two editions" thus came to be known as "Ee" and "E." Over time, and given the special fascination with Camões both for Romantic writers and philologists during the nineteenth century, the myth of the "two editions" both dated 1572 became entrenched in the Portuguese imagination.

Perhaps more importantly, an inevitable consequence of the two-edition myth soon came to the fore in the assumption that one of them must be determined to be authentic and the other a fraud of some kind. Braga follows this line of thinking, while still accepting that the two editions were printed in the same year:

The constant necessity of returning to the authentic text led to an examination of the 1572 edition. Variants appeared that led to the recognition that two editions of *The Lusíads* were made the same year.

This new problem has been minutely debated and figures in all the Camonian bibliographies, with evidence toward the recognition of the first and the second edition of 1572. Which of them must be preferred? ("Aos Camonianos," 1898)

It was also generally accepted that the edition published first, whichever it might be, was authentic for that reason alone, and all changes were viewed with suspicion, whenever or however made, particularly in the face of what seemed to be extensive resetting of the folios.

The conception of the problem in terms of opposites in itself limited debate and scholarship to two opposing schools of thought concerning primacy and authenticity. Most of the early commentators thought “E,” the more flawed edition, to have been printed first, followed by another edition, “Ee,” that corrected it, although precisely when and how was unknown. This opinion continued to be expressed over time by such figures as José Gomes Monteiro (1880), who suggested that the corrected “Ee” would have been prepared because the first printing sold out, and author Aquilino Ribeiro, who in 1946 and 1949 embellished the idea that Camões himself was involved, in this case programming and directing the second, corrected printing, “Ee,” because of his dissatisfaction with what had happened in the first. The two versions exhibit some typographical differences, one being set with some capital letters in italic and the other in round type, and there are minor variations in orthography, punctuation, and other corrections that could indicate a new setting. Counter indications include the observation that the two pelicans on the title page are different images, not simply an inverse design. There are also few modifications to the layout, and many elements convey from one version to the other.

After the Romantic period of the mid-nineteenth century, however, the attraction of the idea of a pirated edition dominated, and all available evidence was interpreted to that end. Scholars Tito de Noronha (1880) and Francisco Gomes de Amorim (1889) used the words “falsification” and “counterfeit” to describe the spurious pelican. What was already an accepted myth gained scholarly credentials in the studies by Noronha and José M. Rodrigues (1921), both of whom used philological arguments to theorize when and by whom the flawed “edition” was prepared. Rodrigues emphatically rejected the idea, forwarded in his day by Silva Túlio, that “Ee” and “E” were not two distinct editions but only one, corrected during its printing. For his arguments, Rodrigues used as evidence the debatable observation that “E” had received a “new typographical composition, from its first to its last stanza.” Rodrigues’s conception conformed to the myth of a false edition, whose flaws would have been the result of an

incompetent attempt to copy a distinguished original. Noronha suggested that one of the “editions” had in fact been composed by another printer with the intention of duplicating the first—and with some success, given that no one noticed the differences for more than 100 years—for possible reasons of intrigue, piracy, censorship, or editorial chicanery.

This school of thought reversed the logic that had been applied to the flawed and corrected copies; as now the most correct edition, “Ee,” was thought to be the first, and the flawed edition, “E,” was considered to be an amateur and mistake-ridden attempt to reproduce it, probably either for pecuniary or moral purposes, in which the censored edition of 1584 was certainly involved. The latter supposition led some critics to suggest that “E” had been printed as late as 1590. The fact that the frontispiece with the pelican to the reader’s right was also used in the 1580s for books by other authors added to doubts about its authenticity and date. Additionally, “E” was filled with the most egregious errors, principally in the misunderstanding of classical allusions, theology, or points of grammar. These and other observations were taken as further evidence of its spurious nature, and whoever produced the copy was assumed to be erratic and unreliable. Braga accepted this thesis and even embellished it with another—although without any basis whatsoever—that the true edition was prepared under the supervision of the poet himself:

It has been proved that the second of 1572, which on the title page has the Pelican’s head turned to the left, is the authentic first one, printed under the supervision of the poet, and that the other was reproduced intentionally in order to escape the censors, and restore the text that had been expurgated in the 1584 edition, known by the name of *Piscos*. (“Aos Camonianos,” 1898)

Whether “E” or “Ee” was thought to be authentic, however, the “true or false” conception of the problem remained a centerpiece of scholarly research. In 1977, Rogers stated: “Let me make absolutely clear one point: only the Ee or E edition, whichever is deemed the first, is worth reading, and it must be read in its original form” (personal correspondence). This was an accurate statement of the critical imperative for studies of the 1572 “editions” up to the final decades of the twentieth century. One can observe that literary scholarship on this question respected the unassailable laws and codes of primogeniture so firmly embedded in Western law and social organization, to the extent of enshrining a first printing over any other consideration. Data had long existed documenting the thousands of changes

in the text of the poem; indeed, in 1874, Carl von Reinhardstoettner published the text of “Ee” with variants from nineteen subsequent editions up to 1873 in footnotes. Published in Strassburg in German, this volume, as far as I know, was never published in Portugal, where theory remained the primary consideration. Until Camões’s true textual heir could be determined, judgment about all subsequent editions of *The Lusiads* remained suspended.

The accepted problem for scholars of the 1572 *Lusiads* may be summarized in terms of three general alternatives: Where there were two different editions, that is, a first printing after which the book was re-set and printed again (whether by António Gonçalves or someone else); or two different states by the same press, with some of its errors detected and corrected, leading to copies with typographical errors in various states of correction; or one authentic edition by António Gonçalves and one pirated, spurious later edition by an unknown printer? The 1572 *Lusiads* may well exist in two different editions in different states; even so, there is ample evidence to suggest that if there were two different editions, which now seems doubtful, they were very closely related and associated both in time and in composition. Our study raises doubts as to whether the entire first gathering was re-set, since in spite of the different use of italic and round type, the typographical layout of traditional “E” and “Ee” is identical. Moreover, certain errors in composition are shared by every exemplar, and folios representing different states of correction are to be found intercalated among individual exemplars of the work. If the first gathering was entirely re-set, one may think that it was done so with the very same layout, identical errors, and sharing many folios belonging to the first gathering. Re-setting may have occurred for various reasons, for example, if the first edition was sold out or thought to be too full of errors.

It is possible that some of the extant copies of the 1572 are made up of leftover sheets from an earlier printing, that is, if the text was printed once and later reissued, then leftover sheets from the first printing may have been incorporated into copies of the second printing. Printers from this period generally had enough type to print one gathering at a time, before breaking down the type in order to set the next gathering. Inevitably there would be leftover sheets when the book was finally assembled. Some of the 1572 *Lusiads* may be composed of sheets from two separate printings. Aggressive correction, in any case,

may be shown to be at work in the second printing or state of the 1572 *Lusiads*, and the existence of copies that mix two states or editions is sufficient to assume that their production was linked, or consecutive.

*

Our CD-ROM suggests that the traditional sigla of “E” and “Ee” used to differentiate the 1572 *Lusiads* should be discarded, as they are not definitive in separating out the editions into their respective families. Although these sigla have been in use since the 17th century, they actually resulted from a coincidental observation and are not truly definitive features for the identification of separate editions. In the first place, a copy in the British Library (G11286) shows the pelican’s head turned to the left but the reading in the first stanza of “E,” that is, belonging to the other edition. Numerous single copies show mixtures of elements traditionally associated both with “E” and “Ee,” as will be shown below. While there are two variant settings of the fore matter, this material is routinely the last to be printed, making it possible for copies of the work to incorporate the variables of pelican, decorative borders, and *alvará* almost indiscriminately (see Table 1). Nothing of significance can be concluded about the relative priority based on this material, in contrast to the true typographical errors in the text, which allow a view into the concrete stages of correction and production sequence. The sigla that definitively separate out the editions are “OCTVO / OCTAVO,” the canto number on folio 128, and “149 / 145,” both being mistaken numbers of foliation on true f. 154. All copies of “E” (including the British Library G 11286, which has the left pelican but right text) possess the OCTVO reading on folio 128, and all copies of “Ee” have been corrected to OCTAVO. Similarly, all copies of “E” are numbered 149 on folio 154, whereas all copies of “Ee” carry the 145 reading (reversed algorisms). The 1572 *Lusiads* can only be accurately differentiated by the sigla OCTVO / OCTAVO and 149 / 145, both of which should replace the old “E” and “Ee” designations.

There are other sigla as well that are helpful to identify the exemplars first printed by António Gonçalves, before the first corrections were introduced. The first four elements to be changed are found by identifying the first corrections to be introduced into the text of “E,” although these are not present

throughout all the copies. First, the reading PRIMEIRO on folio 23 will be corrected to SEGUNDO; the mistaken number 118 on folio 108 will be corrected; OCTVO on folio 129 will be corrected to OCTAVO; and NONO on folio 160 will be corrected to OCTAVO. By examining volumes with unique combinations of these folios, one may conclude that the change from PRIMEIRO to SEGUNDO on folio 23 and from NONO to OCTAVO on f. 160, and from OCTVO to OCTAVO on f. 129 produced printed sheets incorporating one or another of these changes into copies of “E,” but not all of them in a single exemplar. The correction on folio 108 was made later, since only one copy of “E” shows it. We may observe that in printing the book certain of the gatherings resulted in many more errors than others, perhaps suggesting more inattentive or careless work.

*

The typographer António Gonçalves is mentioned in Venâncio Deslandes’s *History of Portuguese Typography* (1888) as an assistant to printer Duarte Nunes do Leão, who received a license in 1564. According to Deslandes, Gonçalves’s shop never rose in importance to equal the principal ones of his time, in spite of his having printed Camões’s epic:

We found no remembrance of the details of the life and person of Antonio Gonçalves, printer of books in Lisbon. His typography, which seems to have been established in this city about 1568 or a little before, and which never achieved a name widely known among those of its time, still had the enviable glory of making the first printing of the *Lusiads*, by the eminent epic poet Luiz de Camões. (77)

António Anselmo states that Gonçalves was a notable printer who produced some 27 or 28 titles from circa 1566 to 1576, using both round and italic characters. Some of his works were said to be exceptionally well executed, with metal engravings on the title pages:

A notable printer, who had the honor of preparing the first edition of the *Lusiads*. The first work that we know by him is from 1568, but it is certain that he already had his own shop in 1566, having produced some 27 or 28 works, in round and italic characters, some quite well executed. He did not use a mark. Some of the title pages of his impressions are engraved in metal. (1926, 194)

Most of the books published by Gonçalves are religious in nature or concern the virtues of kings and princes. Before 1572, only one large book had been printed, the *Tomo Primero dela segunda parte da la*

vida de Iesus (2-303 folios). In 1571-72 Gonçalves greatly increases his output, printing 926 folios in four books, twice the amount of his entire previous production. In the twelfth title published, the *Libro primero del espejo del Principe Christiano* (1571, 226 folios), Gonçalves is described as printer for the Archbishop of Lisbon, “impressor del illustrissimo y reueren / dissimo Señor don Iorge Arco / bispo de Lisboa.” This is also the first title to carry the name of Fr. Bertholameu Ferreira, who will approve four more titles by Gonçalves in as many years for the Church, including the *Lusiadas*, the last being the *Svcesso do Segvndo Cerco de Diu* in 1574.

In the very active year of 1572, after the *Libro primero* and as the Archbishop’s printer, Gonçalves publishes two large and one small books, besides Camões’s epic: *De Rebvs, Emmanvelis Regis Lvsitanae Invictissimi Virtvte et Avspicio Gestis Libri Dvodecim* (480 folios); *Compendio das Chronicas da Ord~e de Nossa Senhora do Carmo* (220 folios), compiled by Fr. Simão Coelho, and the *Instituição & Summario das graças, & priuilegios concedidos aa Ord_ da Sanctissima Trindade & Redempçam de captiuos* (26 folios). One can imagine the intensity of work in Gonçalves’s typography in 1572, printing more than 900 pages. The need to reset *The Lusiads* (2-186 folios) because of numerous serious errors, combined with a scarcity of type, could offer a possible explanation for the change from italic type in certain letters of “E” to round type in “Ee,” as well as certain spelling changes. In 1573 Gonçalves continues intensive work in his shop, printing two books of religious verses (*Versos devotos en loor de la Virgen sin mancilla*, 294pp.; *Versos Devotos en loor de Nuestra Señora*, 290 pp.) and António de Castilho’s *Comentario do Cerco de Goa e Chavl* (3-48 folios). The latter title could reflect Camões’s continuing influence on the printer, based on the poet’s long experience on the Malabar coast. Gonçalves continues to publish works on the historiography of the voyages the following year with Hieronymo Corte Real’s *Svcesso do Segundo Cerco de Diu* (1574) and subsequently Pero de Magalhães de Gandavo’s *Historia da prouíncia sãcta Cruz* (1576), which is prefaced with a sonnet by Camões. This is the last work published by Gonçalves.

Comments by Artur Anselmo (1982) and others asserting that the printing with the pelican to the reader’s right (“E”) would have had more problems with the Inquisition than “Ee” will not stand up to

analysis. Fr. Bertholameu Ferreira most certainly approved only one original manuscript, which would not have contained the errors committed in putting the long work into type in such a busy shop, and errors in folios both in “E” and “Ee” are intercalated in different exemplars. Furthermore, Gonçalves was the Archbishop’s personal printer, and Fr. Bert. Ferreira continued to be active up to 1587, rendering further problems with censorship under his name improbable. Differences between manuscripts as approved and actual printing would perhaps explain a proviso added to the Inquisitorial license, signed by Ferreira in the 1584 printing of *The Lusiads* by Manuel de Lira, not present in 1572: “after printing it will return to this Table with the original emended, so as to verify it and permit printing to continue” (Anselmo, 1982, 60). Would not the revision of “E” have been made compelling because of such egregious misprintings as “Filhos de Maia” for “Filhos de Maria,” an error more likely to have caught the attention of the clergy, just as the almost constant mistakes in classical references must have alerted the author himself? António Anselmo lists both “Ee” and “E” as publications of Gonçalves because, as he states, there is no other place to put them, since the type cannot be identified with any other printer active in Lisbon at the time:

We place this edition [E] among the works by Ant. Gonçalves [. . .] simply because [. . .] we have not found otherwise any certain basis for determining the printer to whom it should be ascribed [. . .]. Which printer would have executed it? That is still an undecipherable problem. An examination of the type does not permit us to attribute it to André Lobato, as Xavier da Cunha and sr. José Maria Rodrigues did. (1926, 200)

In a note, Anselmo incorrectly lists as “E” exemplars those of the Sociedade Martins Sarmento (Guimarães), the Gabinete Português de Leitura (Rio de Janeiro), and the B. N. of Naples—all of which actually have the pelican turned to the reader’s left (“Ee”). Such misidentification would seem to be yet more evidence of the unreliability of his sources and the impressionism that has characterized historical studies of this edition. From what is known about Gonçalves’s typography, one may observe that *The Lusiads* is the first historical work of the four that he published between 1572-1576 whose titles are based on the Portuguese voyages of exploration, discovery, and conflict. It is the sixteenth title published by Gonçalves, the sixth in the Portuguese language, and it was printed during the most intensive phase of Gonçalves’s production.

*

The CD-ROM of the 1572 *Lusiads* supports the theory that a full reading of the edition in all its variants will provide the data necessary for a fuller understanding of its provenance. Study of the first edition had always suffered from limited access to the relatively few surviving copies carrying the 1572 date. The copies available in Lisbon were the only ones available to most Portuguese scholars. In the 19th century, travelers to Brazil sent reports of the copy belonging to D. Pedro I, now in the Instituto Histórico e Geográfico of Rio de Janeiro and in very damaged condition, and later the copy of the Real Gabinete Português de Leitura. It was not until the second half of the twentieth century, however, that published comparative studies came to include the copies belonging to the University of Coimbra and to D. Manuel's library at the Paço Ducal of the Casa de Bragança at Vila Viçosa. Early judgements about the 1572 edition would perhaps have been different had scholars traveled to Madrid, where one of the two copies in the Biblioteca Nacional possesses rare variants—perhaps the very ones seen by Faria e Sousa in 1685—or had they traveled to England to examine some unique copies then in the Holland House, the University of Oxford, and the British Library (particularly G11286). The former Holland House exemplar is one of the most distinguished, with marginal inscriptions by an eyewitness to Camões's death. It left Portugal in the 16th century for Spain, England, and, in 1966, for the United States.

*

The CD-ROM provides ample evidence of the importance and profound influence that a single prominent exemplar of *The Lusiads* can possess, whether because of its rare variants, marginalia, or physical properties. A bookseller's commentary about the former Holland House volume now in the Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center at the University of Texas at Austin mentions some of the singular qualities of this copy of Camões's epic poem:

the Fray Indio-Holland House copy [of *Os Lusíadas*] is viewed as one which reveals previously unknown variants and will provide far-reaching evidence for a radical new approach to the problem. The existence of a hitherto undetected edition of the 1572 *Lusíadas* has been posited from both the bibliographical and textual evidence of previously known copies. The present copy does not conform exactly with any of the copies we have examined or with any of which we have detailed knowledge. The

remarkable condition of the copy, in its contemporary binding, unsophisticated, and substantially taller and wider than any copy we have examined, makes it the ideal exemplar for intensive examination. (personal collection of the author)

Our examination of this book in 1976 gave rise to the study of the bibliographical and textual problems associated historically with the 1572 *Lusiads* that culminates in the production of this CD. This is the most celebrated of all known copies because of the marginal note signed Fray Joseph Indio, the name of a South Indian priest and convert to Christianity who must have been well known to Camões, and at least thirty years his senior, having arrived in Lisbon in 1501 with Cabral's fleet. His comments written in Spanish on the verso of the title page purport to be an eyewitness account of Camões's death:

q cosa mas lastimosa q ver un ta' gran ingenio mal logrado yo lo ui morir en un hospital en Lychoa sin tener una sauanda co' que cubrirese despues de aver triunfado en la India Oriental y de auer nauegado 5500 Leguas per mar q aviso ta gra'de pa los q de noche y de dia se ca'san estudiando sin provecho como a araña en urdir tellas pa casar moscas.

In 1812 the passage was translated into English and written into the copy:

How grievous to see so great a genius brought so low! I saw him die in a hospital in Lisbon, without so much as a sheet to cover him, after having won success in India and sailed 5,500 leagues of the sea. What a warning for those who night and day wear themselves out by profitless study, like spiders spinning webs to catch flies!

Other inscriptions in English on the title page and its verso attest to the book's possession by the Barefoot Carmelite Monastery of Guadalcázar, Spain, to which Fr. Joseph Indio belonged. In the 19th century, the book was acquired by the British diplomat and author John Hookam Frere (1769-1846) in Seville, and in 1812 Frere gave the book to Lord Holland. For over a hundred years the Fray Joseph Indio copy remained at Holland House, except for a brief loan to Sousa Botelho, Morgado de Mateus, who relied on it to prepare his edition published in Paris in 1817 and whose praise of it is reproduced in Anne Gallut's study (1970). Other marginal comments in English attest to the high opinion given to this copy by the Morgado de Mateus:

Camoens, *Os Lusíadas*
Ed: Pr: 4º Lisboa 1572

It appears that there were two
editions both printed in 1572 and both
so rare that it is difficult to find
the means of collating them.
The best account of them will be

found in the edition of Camoens
 printed by M. de Souza 4º 1817 &
 given by him but not sold
 I call this Ed: Pr: because he
 inclines to think it so....
 The copy is quite compleat & perfect,
 and of excessive rarity.

If one accepts the veracity of Fray Joseph Indio's inscription, then inevitably the "E" "edition" must have been prepared before late 1579 and, in any case, is intimately connected with the poet himself. Jorge de Sena comments (1971) that the "famous exemplar of Fr. Joseph Indio was never duly traced to verify if the summary declaration of the priest is authentic or one of those mystifications of the many that were made in the XVII and XVIIIth centuries. The existence of the exemplar is known. And you can see references to it in biographies of Camões, for example, in Aubrey Bell." Bell reproduces the transcription of the note made by Princess Liechtenstein (*Holland House*, 1874, vol. ii, 176-8) and again examined by Dr. Henry Thomas of the British Museum in December, 1921. Bell adds the observation: "The note about Camões's death, the words 'fr. Joseph indio' and the words on the title-page 'Miseremini mej salté vos amici mej,' are all in the same fine hand" (1923, 144). Even in contrast to other copies of "E," this one is printed on a substantial paper, with the strongest impression, and its provenance is clearly indicated by marginalia. Other questions notwithstanding, it is a "compleat & perfect" exemplar and one of the most rare and distinguished copies of *The Lusads*.

*

Since 1817, single copies of *The Lusads* have been observed to contain "substituted" pages that corrected errors found in other copies. Examining the "two editions" some 132 years after Faria e Sousa, the Morgado de Mateus commented: "Confronting these two exemplars, we found [. . .] that they were from the same edition, with the only difference that [. . .] folios 41 and 42, 47 and 48 had been printed with newer characters where the typographical errors that existed in the other were seen to be corrected, such that it was evident to us that these two folios had been substituted as a correction" (Reinhardstoettner, IV). In the 1960s, Rogers had begun to observe differences among the exemplars available in New England: "the John Carter Brown Library at Brown University acquired an exemplar of

E [. . .]. As a result, I took a seminar of graduate students working on *The Lusiads* to Brown to see their exemplar. To our amazement, it contained features not in either Ee or E!”

*

The CD-ROM makes it possible to examine the variants by exemplar and to identify copies with unique intercalations. About one third of the surviving exemplars—twelve of the 34—possess variants that are mixtures in a single volume of elements traditionally associated with “E” or “Ee.” It is licit to conclude on this basis that one third of the printing process was occupied by revisions and resetting the type. One of the most singular exemplars, confounding all of the traditional theses concerning the 1572 edition, is the “left” copy in the British Library (G11286). This exemplar possesses the title page with the pelican’s head turned to the left, but the reading in the first stanza is “Entre,” that is, a page otherwise universally belonging to the other “edition”; its pages are a quilt of features associated with “E” and “Ee.” The volume, furthermore, contains variants not associated with either of the classic “two editions,” signifying the result of a transition between the two. No other single volume is remotely like it. Of any exemplar of the poem, this one contains the most intense mixture of elements traditionally associated with one pelican or the other. The volume must have been formed at the moment of most intense change and revision in the printing, when leaves containing both original and changed readings were placed in singular bound volumes.

Exemplars that draw from both traditional “editions” are not only scarce but also extremely significant for the observation of certain structural changes in composition, as illustrated in some unique combinations of elements. The “left” copies at the University of Coimbra and the Real Gabinete Português de Leitura in Rio de Janeiro, for example, conform to the “left” pelican with the single exception of folio 65, which carries the original “E” reading “CANTO QVARTO.” One of the “right” copies at Harvard University carries the opposite *alvará*, or permission to print with a date written in Roman numerals. The “right” exemplar in Madrid carries one single page in which the mistaken page number that runs throughout the “edition” has been corrected from 118 to 108. This unusual copy in Madrid can also be situated between the two “editions” because of its unique mixture of spellings in the

numbers of cantos on folios 116, 118, and 129. Seven “right” copies show a mistake in the number of the canto on folio 23 that has been corrected in other “rights” and in all “left” copies, evidence that suggests that these copies were among the very first to be printed. Those belong to the Biblioteca José Mindlin (E); Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208; Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38; Casa de Bragança (E); Hispanic Society of America, New York; John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence; and Theophilo Braga Fac-simile, 1898.

The exemplars that contain mixtures of elements traditionally “belonging” to “Ee” or to “E,” when carefully studied, can provide scholars with the crucial details necessary to ascertain which changes were made, in what order, and with what effect on the sequence in which the individual exemplars were produced. It is not simply a question of determining which was the first printed; rather, the objective, or point, is to determine what changes were made and when they appear in exemplars previously thought to belong either to one printing or another. The evidence provided by those exemplars with unique mixtures of elements does indeed suggest a definite conclusion about the sequence in which the volumes were produced. The age-old goal of finding an authentic text is, more than ever, a question of studying the kinds of alterations made in course and the reasons for their having been made.

The recent application of textual criticism, in a technical examination of the impressions and plates both of E and Ee, has provided more convincing proof and incontrovertible evidence against the two-edition myth. Francisco Dias Agudo, applying textual criticism in his perceptive study of the 1572 *Lusiads*, prepared for its fourth centenary in 1972, examined copies from Porto and Guimarães, as well as photocopies supplied from such international sites as Naples, the British Library, and the University of Oxford. Working from the exemplars at the Biblioteca Nacional in Lisbon and Coimbra, Agudo was able to demonstrate that the longstanding theory of two editions, one true and the other false, could not withstand the light of comparative and textual analysis. By first re-examining copies that had always been available in Lisbon, Agudo showed that pages representing different states of printing were mixed among the copies, as is also the case of the Coimbra copy. His analysis of the technical features of the printing

process, however, represented a new critical approach that left little doubt as to the unified printing and production of the 1572 *Lusiads*.

On almost all the pages, underneath but within the impression, there appear some fine lines, in general forming discontinuous marks at the end of the composition. They are also found at times underneath the last verse of the first or second stanzas of the page, or above it. These traces do not belong to the composition of the book, obviously, and are a fortuitous mechanical accident (as we shall see ahead). [. . .] These inopportune lines appear in all the exemplars [. . .] that we could study for this feature [. . .] produced only by the type or its wrong placement [in the press]. [. . .] From this one can conclude that the Poem had only one printing. (5-6)

Certain impressions of extraneous underlining left by the type and form used at Gonçalves's press appear as uniform in all extant copies of the text, as well as certain unidiomatic errors in typesetting ("Qut" instead of "Que") that no new composer of the text would likely reproduce, even if the intention were to copy the original exactly. The myth that either "E" or "Ee" was a spurious copy was no longer tenable, although it remained true that one exhibited attempts to correct the other. The answer to the mystery was to be found in the mechanism of printing and the materials available to António Gonçalves. Agudo presents a physical argument to explain the variants encountered in a book printed "at the same time" at the same press, which is the limited number of types on hand. By the time that the typesetters came to the last folio in the book, identified in the text by the printed letter "Z," for example, there were no longer enough types with the relatively rare character "ã" available. Thus the pages of this folio alternate between the final spelling "ão" and "am." Furthermore, Agudo suggests that the title page and permissions to print, the last elements of the book to be prepared, were made intentionally different so as to correspond to the differences that had been introduced into the printing of the folios, of which Gonçalves was aware. Realizing that this scenario is based on supposition, Agudo allows for other explanations ("For this reason or some other"), while falling back on the certainty that there was but one edition in 1572. The one major remaining problem would be to find out in what sequence and manner the edition was produced. Agudo glosses this problem by stating that the edition was printed "at the same time."

When reconsidered in this new light, the problem of the 1572 printing allows for a more complex set of possibilities than traditionally assumed, most still in the realm of conjecture. It is not known for sure how long the printing lasted, or exactly how the changes in the text came about. It has not been possible to examine the paper in the surviving copies, although one can observe a wide variation in quality judging from the impression. On thin paper, the impression of the recto almost obliterates reading of its verso; and on numerous pages in both “E” and “Ee,” part of the impression is incomplete, with the corresponding part of the text blank or partially printed. Agudo’s conclusion that the edition was produced “at the same time” is necessarily too imprecise and reductive, since some duration and sequence would have necessarily occurred in order to effect changes in twenty-four gatherings and so much type, a process with its own consequences. Although access to the 29 first editions reproduced on the CD does not, in itself, answer these complex problems, a careful comparative study of the mechanics of the text and the variants they produced—when combined with the observations of philologists of the past—becomes very suggestive.

Once one accepts the hypothesis that there was one unified edition, changed for whatever reasons, but within a fairly concise time period, some of the myths can be dispelled and other possibilities entertained. Rodrigues states that, according to the practices of the time, once a manuscript had been approved by the Inquisition its author was not allowed to alter or to interfere in any way with the text until it was printed. It is logical to think that typesetters, when faced with an unfamiliar manuscript and without the author to guide them, may have made the crassest mistakes at the beginning (“filhos de Maria” for “filhos de Maia,” for example). Even Agudo’s observation that changes were made in the physical materials and mechanics, even as the folios were being printed, does not mean that the individual exemplars were formed haphazardly or simultaneously. There was a sequence of changes in typesetting, about which a new theory must be formed, and a parallel but slightly different sequence for the collation of individual books from corrected folios. By first examining the kinds of major changes made in the mechanical production of the folios, and then by observing where these changes appear in the individual

exemplars, across the full spectrum of surviving copies, it is possible to advance a theory of the sequence in which the changes were made and the individual volumes formed.

It is not known whether Camões himself became involved in the printing or corrections of his work, but it is very reasonable to conclude that the corrections were made either in order to make the printed book correspond more faithfully to the author's original manuscript or to correct technical errors, or both. At the same time, massive changes were not made without introducing other errors of composition, in what might finally seem to be a very unstable first edition, without any certain guide to the question of authenticity. Unquestionably, the shop suffered from a lack of type and other resources, such that ingenuity, practicality, and sometimes incompetence took the place of consistency. As we shall see, adding to Agudo's observations, the main evidence for the unity of the 1572 edition lies in its technical errors and peculiarities, in what was in many respects a very imperfect printing. The other two principal arguments for a unified edition are, first, the existence of exemplars with folios showing features both of "E" and "Ee," and, second, the large number of corrections and variants in "E." If the latter were indeed a pirated edition, why should the publisher have made such an effort to introduce so many changes? Such a printer could have used the already published "Ee" as a model, yet apparently makes no use of it.

The correction and intercalation of folios that occurred in many exemplars should not be taken as evidence of the deturpation of a more authentic original. There remain, in fact, four major technical mistakes present in every single exemplar of the work: folios 97recto and 103recto are mistakenly labeled "CANTO QVINTO" instead of the true "CANTO SEXTO," and actual pages 110 and 120 are numbered 106 and 102, respectively. When placed in the context of exemplars with numerous elements that represent intercalations between the "two editions," the presence of these four indelible errors provides a unifying effect that unquestionably ties them all together. Changes in the printing blocks were indeed neither counterfeit nor spurious, but rather sequential, although made for different reasons at different times. The emendations were made necessary both because of the existence of errata and because of the physical scarcity of type and other materiel, including paper of different sizes and quality. The four universal errors are, in a way, the final pieces of the puzzle, serving as a foundation from which to deduce

the sequence of changes that would have led from one coherent “edition” to another. The CD will provide evidence from this comprehensive viewpoint to demonstrate that “E” led to “Ee” by an identifiable sequence of changes, in a gradual transition in which a number of unique and distinguished exemplars of the work were created. Our CD-ROM includes these, identified for the first time, alongside 17 almost identical exemplars of “Ee” and six of “E.”

*

In the CD-ROM, our macro analysis of the 1572 *Lusiads* examines each exemplar for the presence or absence of 33 selected structural elements that were changed in the printing of the edition, which are compared in Tables I-IV. These are the following:

- The pelican turned either to the reader’s left or right;
- Two decorative designs at the foot of the title page;
- The date of the *alvará*, written either “vinte & quatro” or “xxiiij”;
- The reading “E” or “Ee” in the seventh line of the first stanza;
- The spelling “ão” or “am” in the seventh and eighth lines of the first stanza;
- The presence of mistaken page numbers on actual leaves 13, 32, 69, 108, 110, 114, 120, 121, 122, and 154;
- The presence of mistaken numbers of CANTOS in the titles on leaves 23, 65, 97, 99, 100, 103, 148, 152, and 160;
- The spelling “SEPTIMO” or “SETIMO” on leaves 114, 116, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, and “OCTVO” or “OCTAVO” on leaves 128 and 129.

For the results of each Table, the exemplars are grouped according to similarity of contents. Table V is a full correlation of the other tables, with a final grouping of exemplars. There, one can identify both the exemplars that possess identical patterns of the 33 variables examined in the study as well as those with unique sets of variants.

The sequence of printing *The Lusiads*, following our analysis, probably began with six surviving “E” copies (Biblioteca José Mindlin E, Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38, Casa de Bragança E, Hispanic Society of America-New York, John Carter Brown Library-Providence, and the Theophilo Braga fac-simile, 1898). These have the pelican turned to the reader’s right, the date in the *alvará* spelled “vinte & quatro,” the “E” reading in the seventh line and the “am” spelling; the pagination errors occur on leaves 32, 108, 110, 114, 120, 121, 122, and 154. The actual leaf 154 is numbered 149. The sequence of CANTOS on the nine selected leaves reads “PRIMEIRO, QUARTO, QVINTO, QVINTO, QVINTO,

QVINTO, NONO, NONO, NONO.” And the spelling sequence on another nine selected leaves is “SETIMO, SETIMO, SETIMO, SETIMO, SETIMO, SETIMO, SETIMO, OCTVO, OCTVO.”

Perhaps the first volume to show significant alterations in sequence is British Library G11286, which has more intercalations than any other single volume. This exemplar does not yet show some of the initial changes noted in other “E” copies: leaf 23 retains the reading “CANTO PRIMEIRO,” and leaf 108 is still numbered 118, as in traditional “E,” yet the *alvará* has been altered to “xxiiij” and the heading of leaf 129 corrected to “CANTO OCTAVO” from “CANTO OCTVO.” We may conclude that this volume possesses two elements that are anterior to four other altered “E” exemplars, as well as further emendations they do not possess.

Other initial changes in “E” occur in four exemplars in which the reading “CANTO PRIMEIRO” of leaf 23 has been altered to “CANTO SEGVNDO” (British Library G11285, Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center-University of Texas, Harvard University PORT 5215.72, and PORT 5218.72.3). In Harvard University’s PORT 5218.72.3 the spelling in the *alvará* has also been altered to “xxiiij,” as it will appear generally in “Ee.” Finally, in the Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid (R-14208), the spelling on leaf 129 has been corrected to “CANTO OCTAVO” and the number on leaf 108 has been corrected from the mistaken “118”—the only “E” copy to show the corrected reading. Our analysis thus identifies four of the first alterations to have been made in the 1572 text: the date of the *alvará*, the heading of leaf 23, the heading of leaf 129, and the pagination of leaf 108.

The pelican right exemplar at the Biblioteca Nacional in Lisbon (1P) is the only “E” to show an altered title page. Agudo had previously observed that the title page was composed of separate pieces, which shift position irregularly in some exemplars (1972: 4). Additionally, small differences that can be noted in the floral patterns may indicate the use of different pieces, which to the untrained eye may appear to be identical. In 1P, the decorative element in the lower block follows a design found in “Ee,” being a floral design ending in three curved prongs or leaves. This is an incomplete volume at leaf 99, but it seems to conform to all of the norms of “E.” We may conclude that the press was obliged to alter one of

the blocks of the title page in this case, producing a mixture of the pieces normally used to produce either “E” or “Ee.”

*

We may postulate a sequence of changes, in which ten variables are at play, at the same moment at which individual volumes are being compiled from the folios, including for the first time the pelican left image. British G11286 is the first volume in the CD to show the pelican turned to the reader’s left, whereas most of its leaves come from the other printing. It has the reading “E” and the spelling “am” in the first stanza; and its pagination is similar to the first “right” pattern. It possesses one other significant sign of a transition to “Ee” in its numeration of leaf 154, which is numbered 145, whereas “E” carries the mistaken numbering of 149. While leaf 23 maintains the primitive “E” reading “CANTO PRIMEIRO”—which means that the volume was produced almost simultaneously with the four “E” copies described above—leaf 160 has been altered to the mistaken “Ee” heading of “CANTO OCTAVO.” Leaves 116, 118, and 129 have been altered to reflect the corrected “Ee” spellings of “SEPTIMO” and “OCTAVO,” while leaves 114, 120, 122, 124, 126, and 128 remain the same as “E,” unchanged. Thus, one can identify in this exemplar six specific changes that intercalate alterations characteristic of “Ee” into the “E” printing. The pelican left plate is present from the first moment when changes are introduced, or possibly prepared specifically for the use of volumes containing the altered pages. It may also have simply substituted for broken pieces.

Of the “Ee” exemplars to appear next in the sequence of changes, the University of Coimbra and the Real Gabinete Português de Leitura copies still possess one page, leaf 65, with the correct heading “CANTO QVARTO” found in “E,” rather than the incorrect “CANTO TERCEIRO,” the alteration found throughout “Ee.” Otherwise, these two copies show all of the changes found in “Ee.” As further illustration of this sequence of change in certain leaves, the copy reproduced by Hernani Cidade in 1972, as the commemorative edition of the fourth centenary of publication, shows the reading “CANTO TERCEIRO” on leaf 65, yet maintains the correct reading “CANTO NONO” on leaf 148, which is an original “E” reading that will later change to the mistaken “CANTO OCTAVO” in other “Ee” exemplars.

By maintaining two leaves of “E,” these two “Ee” exemplars illustrate not only a more intense stage in the change from one printing to another, but further exemplify how mistakes did occur in the resetting of the type during the process. The “Ee” exemplars belonging to the Ateneu Comercial do Porto and the Sociedade Martins Sarmento of Guimarães stand alone in retaining four mistakes in pagination of the leaves from “E” (22/32; 118/108; 104/114; 117/121; 128/122). At the same time, they also contain two mistakes found only in “Ee” (15/13 and 72/69). These volumes demonstrate that the errors of pagination of folios characteristic both of “E” and “Ee” coexisted at a specific stage of printing. That change, along with the new reading on folio 23 (PRIMEIRO changed to SEGUNDO) can be considered the first evidence of alterations once the printing of the book had begun. The co-existence of errors associated both with “E” and “Ee” may suggest that the book was not reprinted in its entirety, but only re-set with extensive corrections in different states. In the case of two editions, many folios from each co-existed and were incorporated into individual copies.

In what we may consider to be final sequence of printing the 1572 edition, we can identify seventeen “Ee” exemplars that are identical in the 33 characteristics compared in this study. These have the pelican turned to the reader’s left, the date in the *alvará* spelled “xxiiij,” the “Ee” reading in the seventh line and the “ão” spelling; and pagination errors occurring on leaves 13, 69, 110, 120, and 154. The actual leaf 154 is numbered 145, in what must have been a typographer’s inversion of the final two algorithms, while correcting the mistaken number in “E.” The sequence of CANTOS in the headings of the nine selected leaves reads “SEGUNDO, TERCEIRO, QVINTO, SEXTO, SEXTO, QVINTO, OCTAVO, OCTAVO, OCTAVO.” And the spelling sequence on the nine selected leaves is “SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, SEPTIMO, OCTAVO, OCTAVO.” This means that more than half of all the surviving 1572 copies show the traditional “Ee” printing, taken from a final phase when all of the changes and alterations had been concluded, generally for the better, but not always. The existence of this large number of similar “Ee” exemplars undoubtedly influenced previous studies of the 1572 *Lusiads*, not only because of their greater availability for study, but also given the seeming ubiquitousness of the volumes. By making the full range of exemplars available to criticism, the current CD-ROM illustrates

the importance of the twelve exemplars of the poem with major changes or emendations, as they represent unique sources of data concerning the intercalation of leaves, with their corresponding corrections or emendations. These twelve exemplars contain the only available evidence that can support a new theory of how *The Lusiads* was composed, in what general sequence the printing was altered, and which exemplars were printed first. Through comparative study, the CD-ROM demonstrates that the two pelicans, and “E” and “Ee,” do not correspond to full editions but rather to stages in the printing of *The Lusiads* in 1572.

The CD *Camões and the First Edition of The Lusiads* produced by *Portuguese Literary & Cultural Studies* provides the data necessary for future scholars interested in the problem of the 1572 first edition to carry out more comprehensive and microscopic contrastive studies of the few surviving copies of arguably the greatest and most significant literary work of early modern European literature.

The Lusiads [*Os Lusíadas*] 1572
Exemplars included on the CD-ROM [Complete text]

Academia das Ciências de Lisboa
Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (E)
Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (Ee)
Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 1P
Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P
Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P
Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P
Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207
Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208
Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74
Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572.1
Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
British Library C.30.E.34
British Library G.11285
British Library G.11286
Casa De Bragança, Vila Viçosa (E)
Casa De Bragança, Vila Viçosa (Ee)
Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas at Austin
Harvard University Port 5215.72
Harvard University Port 5215.72.5
Harvard University Port 5215.72.7
Harvard University Port 5218.72.3
Hispanic Society of America, New York
John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence
Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro
Theophilo Braga, Fac-simile, 1898
Universidade de Coimbra, Biblioteca Geral da Universidade

Os Lusíadas 1572

Other exemplars consulted but not reproduced

Academia Brasileira de Letras

Ateneu Comercial do Porto

Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38

Lello & Irmãos, 1939

Sociedade Martins Sarmiento (Guimarães)

Note: There are a few other copies in private hands in Portugal that could not be included on this CD-ROM.

The Lusiads [*Os Lusíadas*] 1572

Exemplars consulted by pelican

Pelican turned to reader's left:

Academia Brasileira de Letras

Academia das Ciências de Lisboa

Ateneu Comercial do Porto

Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (Ee)

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P

Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207

Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro

Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli

Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572.1

Bosch Library, Stuttgart

British Library C.30.E.34

British Library G.11286

Casa de Bragança, Vila Viçosa (Ee)

Harvard University Port 5215.72.5

Harvard University Port 5215.72.7

Lello & Irmãos, 1939 (Ee)

Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro

Sociedade Martins Sarmiento, Guimarães

Universidade de Coimbra, Biblioteca Geral da Universidade

Pelican turned to reader's right:

Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (E)

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 1P

Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208

Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38

British Library G.11285

Casa de Bragança, Vila Viçosa (E)

Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas

Harvard University Port 5215.72

Harvard University Port 5218.72.3

Hispanic Society of America, New York

John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence

Theophilo Braga, Fac-simile 1898

TABLE I
Os Lusíadas — 1572
 Comparison of Frontispiece, *Alvará*, E/EE e ão/am

Patterns

Variable

elements: Pelican

Tailpiece

E/EE

Alvará

ão/am

1. Reader's left



EE

xxiiij

ão

2. Reader's left



E

xxiiij

am

3. Reader's right



E

vinte &
quarto

am

4. Reader's right



E

xxiiij

am

5. Reader's right



E

vinte &
quatro

am

Exemplars by pattern

1.

Academia Brasileira de Letras
 Academia das Ciências de Lisboa
 Ateneu Comercial do Porto
 Biblioteca José Mindlin, (Ee)
 Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207

Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
 Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74
 Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572
 Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
 British Library C.30.E.34
 Casa de Bragança (Ee)
 Comissão do IV Centenário
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.5
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.7
 Lello & Irmãos, 1939 (Ee)
 Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro
 Sociedade Martins Sarmento, Guimarães
 Universidade de Coimbra

2.

British Library G.11286

3.

Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (E)
 Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208
 Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38
 British Library G11285
 Casa de Bragança (E)
 Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas
 Hispanic Society, New York
 Harvard University PORT 5218.72.3
 John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence
 Theophilo Braga, 1898

4.

Harvard University PORT 5215.72

5.

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 1P [copy incomplete in folio 99]

TABLE II
Errors in Folio Numbers

key= where one reads (printed number)
 one should read (true number)

Patterns

1.	<u>15</u> 13		<u>72</u> 69		<u>106</u> 110		<u>102</u> 120		<u>145</u> 154	
2.	<u>15</u> 13	<u>22</u> 32	<u>72</u> 69	<u>118</u> 108	<u>106</u> 110	<u>104</u> 114	<u>102</u> 120	<u>117</u> 121	<u>128</u> 122	<u>145</u> 154
3.		<u>22</u> 32		<u>118</u> 108	<u>106</u> 110	<u>104</u> 114	<u>102</u> 120	<u>117</u> 121	<u>128</u> 122	<u>145</u> 154
4.		<u>22</u> 32		<u>118</u> 108	<u>106</u> 110	<u>104</u> 114	<u>102</u> 120	<u>117</u> 121	<u>128</u> 122	<u>149</u> 154
5.		<u>22</u> 32			<u>106</u> 110	<u>104</u> 114	<u>102</u> 120	<u>117</u> 121	<u>128</u> 122	<u>149</u> 154

Exemplars by pattern

1.
 - Academia Brasileira de Letras
 - Academia das Ciências de Lisboa
 - Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (Ee)
 - Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P
 - Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P
 - Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P [original pagination destroyed by a reader]
 - Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207
 - Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
 - Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
 - Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74
 - Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572
 - Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
 - British Library C.30.3.34
 - Casa de Bragança (Ee)
 - Harvard University PORT 5215.72.5
 - Harvard University PORT 5215.72.7
 - Lello & Irmãos, 1939
 - Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro
 - Universidade de Coimbra
2.
 - Sociedade Martins Sarmiento, Guimarães
 - Ateneu Comercial do Porto
3.
 - British Library G11286
4.
 - Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (E)

Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38
 British Library G11285
 Casa de Bragança (E)
 Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72
 Harvard University PORT 5218.72.3
 Hispanic Society, New York
 John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence
 Theophilo Braga, 1898

5.

Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208

TABLE III

Titles of Cantos on folios 23, 65, 97, 99, 100, 103, 148, 152 e 160

Patterns according to the analysis of exemplars

	f. 23	f. 65	f. 97	f. 99	f. 100	f. 103	f. 148	f. 152	f. 160
<hr/>									
1. Segundo	Terceiro	Qvinto	Sexto	Sexto	Qvinto	Octavo	Octavo	Octavo	
2.	Terceiro	Qvinto					Nono	Octavo	Nono
3. Segundo	Quarto	Qvinto	Sexto	Sexto	Qvinto	Octavo	Octavo	Octavo	
4. Primeiro	Quarto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Nono	Nono	Octavo	
5. Segundo	Quarto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Nono	Nono	Nono	
6. Primeiro	Quarto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Qvinto	Nono	Nono	Nono	

Exemplars by pattern

1.

Academia Brasileira de Letras
 Academia das Ciências de Lisboa
 Ateneu Comercial do Porto
 Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (Ee)
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207
 Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
 Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
 Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74
 Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572

- Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
 British Library C.30.E.34
 Casa de Bragança, Vila Viçosa (Ee)
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.5
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.7
 Lello & Irmãos, Fac-simile (1939)
 Sociedade Martins Sarmento, Guimarães
2. Comissão Nacional do IV Centenário, fac-simile
3. Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro
Universidade de Coimbra
4. British Library G11286
5. British Library G11285
Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas
Harvard University PORT 5215.72
Harvard University PORT 5218.72.3
6. Biblioteca José Mindlin (E)
Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14208
Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38
Casa de Bragança (E)
Hispanic Society of America, New York
John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence
Theophilo Braga, 1898

TABLE IV

“SETIMO/SEPTIMO” on folios 114, 116, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126
 “OCTVO/OCTAVO” on folios 128 e 129

Patterns according to the analysis of exemplars

	f. 114	f. 116	f. 118	f. 120	f. 122	f. 124	f. 126	f. 128	f. 129
1.	SEPT	SEPT	SEPT	SEPT	SEPT	SEPT	SEPT	OCTAVO	OCTAVO
2.	SET	SEPT	SEPT	SET	SET	SET	SET	OCTVO	OCTAVO

3.	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	OCTVO	OCTAVO
4.	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	SET	OCTVO	OCTVO

Patterns by exemplars

1.

Academia Brasileira de Letras
 Academia das Ciências de Lisboa
 Ateneu Comercial do Porto
 Biblioteca José Mindlin, São Paulo (Ee)
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P
 Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207
 Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
 Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
 Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 74
 Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572
 Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
 British Library C.30.E.34
 Casa de Bragança, Vila Viçosa (Ee)
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.5
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72.7
 Lello & Irmãos, Fac-simile, 1939
 Real Gabinete Português de Leitura, Rio de Janeiro
 Sociedade Martins Sarmento, Guimarães
 Universidade de Coimbra

2

British Library G11286

3.

Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R14208

4.

Biblioteca José Mindlin (E)
 Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38
 British Library G11285
 Casa de Bragança (E)
 Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center, University of Texas
 Harvard University PORT 5215.72
 Harvard University PORT 5218.72.3
 Hispanic Society, New York
 John Carter Brown Library, Brown University, Providence
 Theophilo Braga, 1898

TABLE V
Correlation of Identical Exemplars (Tables I, II III e IV)

Tables	I	II	III	IV
Patterns	1	1	1	1

Academia Brasileira de Letras

Academia das Ciências de Lisboa

Biblioteca José Mindlin (Ee)

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 2P

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 3P

Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 4P

Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R-14207

				Biblioteca Nacional, Rio de Janeiro
				Biblioteca Nazionale, Napoli
				Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg.74
				Bodleian Library, University of Oxford Antiq.E.P.1572
				Bosch Brazilian Library, Stuttgart
				British Library C.30.E.34
				Casa de Bragança (Ee)
				Harvard University PORT 5215.72.5
				Harvard University PORT 5215.72.7
				Lello & Irmãos, Fac-simile, 1939
1	1	3	1	Universidade de Coimbra
				Real Gabinete Português de Leitura
1	2	1	1	Sociedade Martins Sarmiento, Guimarães
				Ateneu Comercial do Porto
1	?	2	?	Comissão do IV Centenário, Fac-simile
2	3	4	2	British Library G.11286
3	4	6	4	Biblioteca José Mindlin (E)
				Bibliothèque nationale de France Yg. 38
				Casa de Bragança (E)
				Hispanic Society of America, New York
				John Carter Brown Library, Providence
				Theophilo Braga, 1898
3	4	5	4	British Library G11285
				Harry Ransom Center, University of Texas
				Harvard University PORT 5218.72.3

4	4	5	4	Harvard University PORT 5215.72
3	5	6	3	Biblioteca Nacional, Madrid R14208

MIXED TITLEPAGE — “E” INCOMPLETE COPY

5	(5)	(4/6)	?	(MIXED TITLEPAGE)
				Biblioteca Nacional, Lisboa 1P (99f.)

Bibliography

- Agudo, Francisco Dias. “A Edição d’*Os Lusíadas* de 1572.” *Garcia da Orta: Revista da Junta de Investigações do Ultramar* [Lisboa] Número especial Comemorativo do 4º Centenário da Publicação de *Os Lusíadas* (1972): 1-9.
- Albuquerque, Alexandre de. *As Duas Edições dos Lusíadas de 1572*. Rio de Janeiro: Ribeiro, 1921.
- Amorim, Francisco Gomes de, ed. *Os Lusíadas de Luiz de Camões. Edição crítica e anotada*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1889.
- Anselmo, António Joaquim. *Bibliografia das Obras Impressas em Portugal no Século XVI*. Lisboa: Oficinas Gráficas da Biblioteca Nacional, 1926.
- Anselmo, Artur. *Camões e a Censura Literária Inquisitorial*. Braga: Barbosa & Xavier, 1982.
- . *Origens da Imprensa em Portugal*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional; Casa da Moeda, 1981.
- Bell, Aubrey F.G. *Luís de Camões*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1923.
- Bismut, Roger. “La Critique textuelle des *Lusiades*.” *Actas da I Reunião Internacional de Camonistas*. Lisboa: Comissão Executiva do IV Centenário da Publicação de *Os Lusíadas*. 1973.
- Bowers, Fredson. *Principles of Bibliographical Description*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1949.
- Braga, Theophilo, ed. *Camões. A Obra Lyrica e Épica*. Porto: Livraria Chardron, de Lello & irmão, 1911.
- . *Os Lusíadas de Luiz de Camões. Fac-simile da Primeira Edição dos Lusíadas com um Prefácio do Dr. Theophilo Braga*. Lisboa: Joaquim Eusébio dos Santos, 1898.
- Camões, Luís de. *Os Lusíadas*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1980.
- Carvalho, Francisco Freire de. *Os Lusíadas de Luiz de Camões. Nova Edição Feita Debaixo das Vistas da Mais Accurada Critica Em Presença das Duas Edições Primordiais e das Posteriores de Maior Credito e Reputação: Seguida de Anotações Criticas, Historicas e Mythologicas*. Lisboa: Typographia Rollandiana, 1843.
- Castilho Barreto e Noronha, José Feliciano de. *Memória sobre o Exemplar d’Os Lusíadas da Biblioteca Particular de S.M. o Imperador do Brasil*. Rio de Janeiro: Biblioteca Nacional, 1880. [*Annaes da Biblioteca Nacional*, t. VIII]
- Cerdeira, Eleutério. “Duas Grandes Fraudes Camonianas.” *Os Lusíadas*. Ed. Hernani Cidade. Barcelos : Comp. Ed. do Minho, 1940.
- Cidade, Hernâni. *Os Lusíadas de Luís de Camões. Edição Comemorativa*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1972.
- Coutinho, B. Xavier. “A Edição ‘Princeps’ de *Os Lusíadas*: Um problema complexo e difícil (ou insolúvel). Muito provavelmente houve 3 edições ‘princeps’, e não apenas 2, com a data (simulada) de 1572.” *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português* [Paris] 16 (1981): 571-719.
- Deslandes, Venâncio. *Documentos para a História da Typographia Portuguesa nos Séculos XVI e XVII*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1888.

- Dias, Augusto Epifânio da Silva. *Os Lusíadas de Luís de Camões*. Porto: Magalhães & Moniz, 1910: t.1, XXVI-XXIX.
- Flores, R. M. *The Compositors of the First and Second Madrid Editions of Don Quixote*, Part I. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1975.
- Gallut, Anne. *Le Morgado de Mateus, Editeur des Lusíadas*. Paris: Librairie Klincksieck; Lisboa: Livraria Bertrand, 1970.
- Gaskell, Philip. *A New Introduction to Bibliography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1972.
- Cruikshank, D.W. "Literature and the Book Trade in Golden-Age Spain." *Modern Language Review* [Edinburgh] 73 (1978): 799-824.
- Griffin, Clive. *The Crombergers of Seville: the history of a printing and merchant dynasty*. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Oxford UP, 1988.
- Guimarães, A. J. Gonçalves. *Os Lusíadas de Luís de Camões. Segundo o Têsto da Primeira Edição de 1572. Com as variantes da 2. Edição Impressa por Manoel de Lyra em 1584*. Coimbra: Imprensa da Universidade, 1919.
- Jackson, Kenneth David. "A contribuição dos exemplares mais raros de *Os Lusíadas*, 1572." *Estudos Portugueses. Homenagem a Luciana Stegagno Picchio*. Lisbon: DIFEL, 1991. 589-601.
- . "A Critical Edition of the 1572 *Lusíadas*: Preliminary Observations," *Camonian California*. Eds. Maria de Lourdes Belchior and Enrique Martínez-López. Santa Barbara: Jorge de Sena Center for Portuguese Studies; ICALP, Bandanna Books, 1985: 20-39.
- McKerrow, Ronald. *An Introduction to Bibliography for Literary Students*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1928.
- "Memória sobre o exemplar dos *Lusíadas* da Biblioteca Particular de S.M. o Imperador do Brasil." Biblioteca Nacional: Rio de Janeiro, 1880. [Extraído do tomo VIII dos *Annaes da Bibliotheca Nacional*]
- Monteiro, José Gomes. *Introdução a Os Lusíadas. Edição crítica-comemorativa*. Porto: Emílio Biel, 1880.
- Monteiro, Rolando. *As Edições de Os Lusíadas*. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria São José, 1973.
- Noronha, Tito de. *A Primeira Edição dos Lusíadas*. Porto e Braga: Livraria Internacional de Ernesto Chardon, 1880.
- Norton, F. J. *A Descriptive Catalogue of Printing in Spain and Portugal, 1501-1520*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978.
- . *Printing in Spain, 1501-1520*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1966.
- "Nota Preambular." *Os Lusíadas. Fac-Simile das Duas Edições de 1572*. Vol. 1. Quarto Centenário da Morte de Luís de Camões e Segundo Centenário da Fundação da Academia das Ciências de Lisboa. Lisboa: 1980: 7-21. [Bibliografia]
- Pimpão, Álvaro Júlio da Costa. *Os Lusíadas de Luís de Camões. Edição Comemorativa do IV Centenário da Publicação de Os Lusíadas*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional; Casa da Moeda, 1972. XXX-XLII.
- Reinhardtstoettner, Carl von. *Os Lusíadas de Luiz de Camões. Unter Vergleichung der Besten Texte, mit Angabe der Bedeutendsten Varianten und einer Kritischen Einleitung Herausgegeben*. Strassburg & London: Karl J. Trubner, 1874.
- Rhodes, Dennis, comp. *Catalogue of books printed in Spain and of Spanish books printed elsewhere in Europe before 1601 now in the British Library*. 2nd ed. London: British Library, 1989.
- Ribeiro, Aquilino. "A Edição *Princeps* dos *Lusíadas*." *Boletim da Junta de Província da Estremadura* (1946); reprinted in *Revista Ocidente* 138 (1949); and in *Camões, Camilo, Eça e Alguns Mais*. Amadora: Betrand, 1975. 67-81.
- Rodrigues, Dr. José Maria, ed. *Os Lusíadas. Reimpressão "fac-Similada" da Verdadeira 1.ª Edição dos Lusíadas, de 1572*. Lisboa: Tip. da Biblioteca Nacional, 1921.
- Sena, Jorge de. *Trinta Anos de Camões, 1948-1978*. Lisboa: edições 70, 1980.
- Trigoso, Sebastião Francisco de Mendo. "Exame Crítico das Cinco Primeiras Edições dos *Lusíadas*." *História e Memórias da Academia* [Lisboa] 8.1 (1823): 169.

Vasconcelos, D. José Maria de Sousa Botelho Mourão e [Morgado de Mateus], ed. *Os Lusíadas*. Paris: Firmin Didot, 1817.

Wagner, Klaus. *Catálogo abreviado de las obras impresas del siglo XVI de la Biblioteca Universitaria de Sevilla: España y Portugal*. Sevilla: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla, 1988.