

The first Brazilian edition of Almeida's Garrett's *Frei Luís de Sousa*. Aspects of textual variation*

João Dionísio 

Abstract

*This article seeks to describe the first Brazilian edition of Almeida Garrett's *Frei Luís de Sousa*. Attention is given to "Arquivo Theatral", the series in which it was included, as well as to Junius Villeneuve, who was responsible for the press that printed the edition. This sets the framework for the identification and analysis of textual variation, as the result of the comparison between the Portuguese and the Brazilian first editions. After some considerations about the place of the Villeneuve publication of *Frei Luís de Sousa* in the printed transmission of the play, the variants are interpreted according to Greg's famous pair of conceptual adjectives, accidental and substantive. It is argued that the Brazilian edition performed a rather inclusive understanding of what is accidental in the Portuguese text and as such may contribute to a comparative history of the Portuguese language in its European and Brazilian variants or, at least, to a better knowledge of textual practices associated with the publishing of plays.*

KEYWORDS: Almeida Garrett; *Frei Luís de Sousa*; Textual History.

Financial Disclosure

The research for this article was conducted in the framework UIDB/00214/2020, FCT - Fundação para a Ciência e Tecnologia, I.P.

*I would like to thank José Camões for pointing out the existence of this Brazilian edition and Ana Isabel Vasconcelos, who generously shared with me its digitization.

Silvio Renato Jorge

Editor-chefe dos
Estudos de Literatura

Manoel Mourivaldo Santiago

Ceila Maria Ferreira Batista
Editores convidados

Received in: 24/10/2023

Accepted at: 13/03/2024

¹Universidade de Lisboa, Faculdade de Letras, Centro de Linguística, Lisboa, Portugal.
E-mail: joadionisio@campus.ul.pt

How to cite:

DIONÍSIO, João. The first Brazilian edition of Almeida Garrett's *Frei Luís de Sousa*. Aspects of textual variation. *Gragoatá*, Niterói, v. 29, n. 63, e58999, jan.-ago. 2024. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.22409/gragoata.v29i63.58999.en>

Introduction (sources and document witnesses)

Frei Luís de Sousa, the play by Almeida Garrett that premiered in 1843 and was originally published in the following year is unanimously seen as his major theatrical text “and one of the great prose dramas of the nineteenth century” (Prestage, 1909, p. 25). Until very recently only one critical edition had been made of this text, in 1943, prepared by Rodrigues Lapa for the journal *Seara Nova*, which had it published in several issues in May and June, and in a book that also came out in 1943. The 2022 critical edition, as part of the series founded and directed by Ofélia Paiva Monteiro and now coordinated by Maria Helena Santana, was reviewed by Maria João Brilhante, who underscored two features in the new publication: its genetic orientation and the number of document witnesses it deals with (Brilhante, 2023).

Resulting from the analysis of archival materials, the genetic orientation is overall visible in the introduction to the new critical edition. This analysis, while building on the identification of some sources Garrett used or at least was familiar with, is not in itself a fully-fledged source-oriented interpretation, which remains to be done. With that interpretation in view, two examples might suffice on this occasion to illustrate how Garrett’s knowledge of Portuguese and foreign literary traditions is central to the design and writing of *Frei Luís de Sousa*. First example: in act III, Madalena, unaware that the palmer is indeed her husband, is still thinking of the possibility of keeping her second marriage instead of becoming a nun and living in a convent from that moment on. She is immediately countered by Manuel de Sousa, her second husband: “our union, our love is impossible” (Garrett, 1909, p. 131); and next she is also opposed by her brother-in-law, friar Jorge: “Already now it is impossible... and always would be” (Garrett, 1909, p. 131). It is at this point in the drama that Madalena replies: “Tambem tu, Jorge?”, in what looks like an echo of the words that Julius Caesar allegedly said when he was being stabbed by his killers. According to the narrative written by Suetonius on the life of Julius Caesar: “And in this wise he was stabbed with three and twenty wounds, uttering not a word, but merely a groan at the first stroke, though some have written that when Marcus Brutus rushed at him, he said in Greek, ‘You too, my child?’” (Suetonius, 1913, p. 111)

In this regard, despite his close acquaintance with Roman and Greek literature, Garrett may have had in mind Shakespeare, rather than Suetonius, due to the famous passage in which Julius Caesar says in the eponymous tragedy: “*Et tu, Brutè?*” (Shakespeare, s.d., p. 101)¹.

The relevance of a future source study of *Frei Luís de Sousa* can be documented through another example, i.e., the way Garrett weaves his reading of friar António da Encarnação’s biography of Manuel de Sousa Coutinho into the play. The following table (Table 1)² seeks to illustrate the process of embedding and adapting Encarnação’s text:

¹It should be noted that both in Suetonius’ and Shakespeare’s texts Caesar’s last words are said in a foreign language (Latin, as we have seen, in Shakespeare; and Greek, in Suetonius: “Atque ita tribus et viginti plagis confossus est uno modo ad primum ictum gemitu sine voce edito, etsi tradiderunt quidam Marco Bruto irruenti dixisse: καὶ σὸ τέκνον”). There is no such code shift in Garrett’s *Frei Luís de Sousa*: neither in the transcribed speech by Madalena, nor in another scene in which the same formula is used. This scene takes place when the palmer is speaking to Telmo and guesses that the latter’s love for him did not stand the test of time: “Nem é preciso. Assim devia de ser. Tambem tu!” (Garrett, 1844a, p.140).

²All tables in this article, unless otherwise indicated, display information collected by the author.

Table 1. Comparison between a passage of Frei António da Encarnação's "Prologo e Vida do Author" and an excerpt from Almeida Garrett's *Frei Luís de Sousa*.

<i>Frei António da Encarnação,</i> "Prologo e Vida do Author", 1767, without page number	Almeida Garrett, <i>Frei Luís de Sousa</i> , 1844, p. 108
	JORGE. Sois portuguez?
(...) lhe deraõ recado que lhe queria fallar hum peregrino que vinha de fóra do Reyno. E mandado vir à sua presença disse: Senhora, sou Português, fui por devaçãõ vizitar os lugares santos de Jerusalem (...)	ROMEIRO. Como os melhores, espero em Deus. JORGE. E vindes?.. ROMEIRO. Do Santo-Sepulchro de Jesu Christo. JORGE. E visitastes todos os Sanctos-Logares?
	ROMEIRO. Não os visitei; morei la vinte annos cumpridos.

Garrett explicitly states in the introduction to the drama that he had read Encarnação's work, but only by a thorough textual comparison does one realize the extent of *Frei Luís de Sousa's* dependence on several sources. In this case, the dialogue between the two texts is made especially evident. First, when Jorge asks the palmer if he is Portuguese, a question that had been answered to in Encarnação's "Vida do Author" ("Sou Português"). Then, again when Jorge is using the verb "visitar" ("to visit"), which stems from Encarnação, only to be countered by the palmer's reply: he had not been to the Holy Land as a tourist, but rather lived there.

Apart from genetic information, including data on sources, another one of the major differences between the two critical editions made so far of Almeida Garrett's drama *Frei Luís de Sousa* is the number of document witnesses each editor could count on: the 1943 Seara Nova edition is based on the comparison between the draft, a handwritten copy produced to be checked by the "Inspeção dos Teatros" and the 1844 publication, all of them monitored by the author; the 2022 Imprensa Nacional edition depends on more document witnesses, including the handwritten materials that were used by the actors and actresses to learn the text of their roles when the play premiered and the clean copy revised by Garrett and annotated by the compositor at Imprensa Nacional. One document witness that, though acknowledged in the recent critical edition (2022, p. 19), was not otherwise taken into consideration is the first Brazilian edition of Garrett's play. Even if it does not contribute to a change in the textual establishment, its relevance in two regards is worth noting. On the one hand, it was the first printed edition of *Frei Luís de Sousa* outside Portugal, having been issued in the same year as the Lisbon publication; besides, it was issued when the play was performed in Brazil (Botrel, 1966). The present article intends to shed light on the textual variation that is found in this edition when compared to the text conveyed by the Imprensa Nacional publication.

Remarks on the Villeneuve typography and on the “Arquivo Theatral” series

The Brazilian publication indicates on p. 39 that it was printed at the “Typ. Imp. e Const. de J. Villeneuve e C. 1844”, i.e., ‘Typographia Imperial e Constitucional de Junius Villeneuve & Companhia’. The following brief summary of Villeneuve’s life is taken from some recent scholarly work on written media, as well as on the circulation of literary works in Brazil during the 19th century.

There are some data that are not consensually documented about Junius Villeneuve: e.g. his study of mathematics at the “École Polytechnique”, in Paris; his education in art, literature and music (Gimenez, 2014, p. 80). Despite these uncertainties, it is safe to say that he was born in France on the 17th of February 1804, having turned into one of the most successful businessmen in the media publishing activities in Brazil (Carvalho 2021, p. 38). Before, from the beginning of the 1820s onwards, he had served as a representative of the Brazilian navy in London. Then, he moved to Brazil in 1825, having participated as a second lieutenant in the so-called Cisplatine war (1825-1828), the military conflict between Brazil and the United Provinces of the Rio de la Plata for the possession of Cisplatina. After the war, he worked for the French consulate in Rio de Janeiro and became involved in commercial activities associated with French companies. Later on, in 1830, he was hired by Pierre Plancher to act as an editor in chief of the newspaper *Jornal do Commercio*, the most important Brazilian daily paper in the mid-19th century (Gimenez, 2014, p. 22). From 1832 to 1834 Villeneuve becomes co-owner, with Réol Antoine Mougenot, of the newspaper and in December 1834 he turns into its exclusive owner³ and a successful businessman, improving the graphical outlook of the publication, obtaining more subscribers, changing the size of the paper (31x43cm) and buying a mechanical press⁴. It is this mechanical press that boosts the business of the “Typographia Imperial e Constitucional de Junius Villeneuve & Companhia” (Gimenez, 2014, p. 79-81; Santana Júnior, 2017, p. 20 e 58-59), as can be seen in the following passage from a text published in *Jornal do Commercio* in May 1836:

Resolvemos, [...] mandar vir de Paris um PRELO MECÂNICO, como único meio de acabar com os estorvos que encontrávamos. Este PRELO MECÂNICO, o primeiro que passou o Equador, chegou e acha-se já a trabalhar; e o Jornal, que até agora com 2 prelos levava 10 horas a imprimir, fica hoje pronto com 2 horas de trabalho e estará distribuído em toda a cidade e subúrbios pelas 6 horas da manhã. (*apud* Santana Júnior; Granja, 2015, p. 852; Santana Júnior, 2017, p. 82).

The thus enhanced printing possibilities, among other factors, enabled Villeneuve to broaden his publishing scope (Santana Júnior, 2017, p. 82). The *Jornal do Commercio* published with success several *feuilleton* novels: Alexandre Dumas’s *Le Capitaine Paul* (the first to circulate, in

³When he died, in 1863, Junius Villeneuve was still the single owner of *Jornal do Commercio*, as well as of its typography (Granja; Santana Júnior, 2018, p.36, note 3).

⁴According to Moreira de Azevedo, the newspaper had reached almost 13.000 subscribers in 1865 (*apud* Santana Júnior, 2017, p.20).

1838, not yet on the bottom page); Pereira da Silva's *O aniversário de D. Miguel em 1828*; Eugène Sue's *Les Mystères de Paris*; Dumas's *Le comte de Monte-Cristo*, among many others (Gimenez, 2014, p. 82)⁵. Following the success of these serialized publications, Villeneuve's typography started printing novels in book format, but also poetry and drama works. As to these drama works, Granja and Santana Júnior refer that Villeneuve inspired himself on a French series bearing the same name to launch, in 1841, his "Archivo Theatral". The fact that the advertisements for this series went on in *Jornal do Commercio* for almost ten years is a sign of its success (Granja; Santana Júnior, 2018, p. 35).

Coincidentally, by the same time (1838-1845) a similar series was being published in Portugal, focused on plays of the Parisian repertoire. Its full title was "Archivo theatral ou Collecção selecta dos mais modernos dramas do teatro francez" (Santos, 2011, p. 119). A full comparison may also lead to the identification of material similarities between the two series: double column format, general lay out, typographic fonts⁶. Additionally, both series aimed at a monthly frequency of publication. Instead, the Portuguese series is more concentrated on French authors whose plays had been staged in Lisbon theatres, whereas the Brazilian one is clearly more heterogeneous, including, besides the French plays, Portuguese, Italian and Classical texts (Santos, 2011, p. 119; Santana Júnior; Granja, 2015, p. 853).

It is in the Brazilian "Archivo Theatral"⁷ that *Frei Luís de Sousa* comes out in 1844, the year when Villeneuve probably returned to Paris (Gimenez, 2014, p. 82). The following table (Table 2, on the next page) displays the titles that were published in each section of the series. The sequence of titles is given after the advertisements reproduced in Santana Júnior (2017, p. 85; 2020, p. 62).

The table shows that Garrett is one of the most represented authors in the series: with two texts in the first volume, one in the second volume (assuming *Merope* is the play that Imprensa Nacional published in 1841) and another, *Frei Luís de Sousa*, opening the fourth volume. All these texts are seemingly coming out in Brazil in the same year of their publication in Portugal (Santana Júnior; Granja 2015, p. 853; Granja; Santana Júnior, 2018: 36)⁸. Besides, it should be noted that the whole series started with a text revised by Garrett, Silva Abranches's *O Cativo de Fez*, which was instrumental to the genesis of *Frei Luís de Sousa* (Calado, 1962; Garrett, 1844b, p. 13-14).

About the book and its content

The differences in length between the Portuguese and the Brazilian publications of *Frei Luís de Sousa* are mostly due to two factors, content and lay out⁹. As to content, the Brazilian edition does not include two of the five sections the Imprensa Nacional publication is made of (see the table of contents (Table 3, on the next page), 1844b, p. 236):

⁵For the circulation of *feuilleton* novels in Portugal by the same time, cf. Duarte (2008).

⁶This is but a very general impression after the comparison of p.1 of two plays reproduced in Santos (2011, p. 119-120 and p. 1) of Garrett's play in the Brazilian edition. Despite the similarities, the Portuguese publication looks more elaborate than its Villeneuve counterpart because it makes use of a larger number of typographic fonts and displays more ornamented dividers.

⁷See the running title on the odd pages of Garrett's publication printed by Villeneuve: "ARCHIVO THEATRAL."

⁸Grey highlights refer to Garrett's play. Garrett's collection of poetry *Folhas Cahidas*, also printed in Brazil by Villeneuve & Co., followed this synchronous pattern of publication (Fadda, 1999, p.35).

⁹The Villeneuve publication was indirectly observed through a digitization of a microfilm produced by Fundação Biblioteca Nacional.

Table 2. Titles of plays included in “Arquivo Theatral”.

“Série”/Volume	Titles (given according to the advertisements)*
1	<i>O Cativo de Fez</i> <i>Fayel</i> <i>O Doente Imaginário</i> <i>Tancredo</i> <i>Francisca de Rimini</i> <i>O Castelo de Montlouvre</i> <i>O Alfageme de Santarém, ou, A espada do condestavel</i> <i>Alzira</i> <i>O Ralhador</i> <i>Diogo Tinoco</i> <i>O Jogador</i> <i>Um Auto de Gil Vicente</i>
2	<i>Mithridates</i> <i>O Falso heroísmo</i> <i>João Pinto Ribeiro</i> <i>Merope</i> <i>Os Dous Amigos</i> <i>Os Templários</i> <i>Nova Castro</i> <i>Ruy Braz</i> <i>O Pai de família</i> <i>O Marido da Viuva</i> <i>Maria Tudor</i> <i>Alonzo e Cora ou o Triunpho da natureza</i>
3	<i>O Avarento</i> <i>Iphigenia em Tauride</i> <i>Affonso III</i> <i>Medéa</i> <i>Tartuffo</i> <i>D. Ruy Cid de Bivar</i> <i>O Casamento Clandestino</i> <i>O Conde Andeiro</i> <i>Régulo</i> <i>D. Rodrigo</i> <i>O Marquez de Pombal</i> <i>O Poetico Heroismo</i>
4	<i>Frei Luiz de Souza</i> <i>Cornelia</i> <i>O Cioso</i> <i>Um Erro</i> <i>Athalia</i> <i>O Mudo</i> <i>O Sineiro de S. Paulo</i> <i>Montezuma</i> <i>O Velhos de 25 annos</i> <i>Hyppolito</i> <i>Os Dous Sargentos</i> <i>Os Dous primos</i>
5	<i>Lucrecia</i> <i>Glenarvon</i> <i>O Casamento de Figaro</i> <i>Constantino o Grande</i> <i>Álvaro Gonçalves o Magriço</i> <i>O Engeitado</i> <i>Clytemnestra</i> <i>Guerras do Alecrim e Mangerona</i> <i>Leonor de Mendonça</i> <i>Phedra</i> <i>A Madresilva</i> <i>O Gaiato de Lisboa</i>
6	<i>Andromaca</i> <i>Uma noite no Serralho</i> <i>A ponte do Diabo</i> <i>Rhadamisto</i> <i>Caravaggio</i> <i>Lucrecia Borgia</i>

*For the identification of these titles, despite some inaccuracies, cf. Maciel (2019, p.180-181).

Table 3. Contents in Imprensa Nacional and J. Villeneuve’s editions.

Imprensa Nacional, 1844	p.	J. Villeneuve, 1844	p.
Editors’s prologue	V-VIII	-	-
Garrett’s presentation at the Royal Conservatory	3-22	-	-
<i>Frei Luiz de Sousa</i> (text of the drama)	23-156	<i>Frei Luiz de Sousa</i> (text of the drama)	1-28
Notes	157-216	Notes	28-35
Appendix* (by Rebelo da Silva)	217-235	Appendix	35-39

*The appendix is a reproduction of Luís Augusto Rebelo da Silva’s “*Frei Luís de Sousa*”, which was originally published in *Revista Universal Lisbonense*, n.º 37, 1st June 1843, p. 461-462 and n.º 41, 29th June 1843, p. 511-513.

The three-part structure of the Brazilian publication is also reflected on the running titles: the odd pages systematically display “FREI LUIZ DE SOUZA.”, “NOTAS.” and finally “JUIZ [mistakenly printed instead of JUIZO] CRITICO”.

Apart from the absence of the editor’s prologue and the introduction to *Frei Luís de Sousa* that Garrett presented at the Royal Conservatory, the Brazilian edition displays the text of all three other sections in two columns and each printed line comprehends a larger number of letters.

For the sake of an example, it suffices to see the beginning of the play, when Madalena de Vilhena says the following (Table 4) (highlighted in grey the extra letters that the Brazilian edition accommodates when compared to the Portuguese publication):

Table 4. Beginning of the play in Imprensa Nacional and J. Villeneuve's editions.

Imprensa Nacional, 1844	'Naquelle ingano d'alma ledo e cego Que a fortuna não deixa durar muito...'
	Com paz e alegria d'alma... um ingano, um ingano de poucos instantes que seja... deve de ser a felicidade suprema n'este mundo.
J. Villeneuve, 1844	'Naquelle engano d'alma ledo e cego Que a fortuna não deixa durar muito...'
	Com paz e alegria d'alma.... um engano, um engano de poucos instantes que seja... deve de ser a felicidade suprema neste mundo.

The indented lines taken from Camões' *Os Lusíadas* that are being read by Madalena de Vilhena take the same space in both publications, but the following text is more compressed in the Villeneuve edition, which tends to hyphenate more frequently at the end of the line.

Besides content and lay out, another difference between the two publications has to do with the framework to which each one of them belongs. The extraction of *Frei Luís de Sousa* from Garrett's collected works to its inclusion in the "Arquivo Theatral" series had at least one textual effect, for part of one original note to Act II (Table 5) was coherently discarded in the Villeneuve edition:

Table 5. Note H, Act II, in Imprensa Nacional (F) and J. Villeneuve's Editions (V).

Section	F	V
II, note H	A igreja de Sanct' Anna, hoje do convento de freiras do mesmo nome, era então parochia. Veja o que a este respeito escrevi nas notas ao poema Camões, I vol. d'esta collecção. (p. 206)	A igreja de Santa Anna, hoje do convento de freiras do mesmo nome, era então parochia. (p. 33)

In fact, there is no point in referring to *Camões* as volume I of *this* series, when the new series differs from the one in which *Frei Luís de Sousa* originally came out. This leads us directly to the main subject of this article, the identification and analysis of textual variation that is noticeable in the Villeneuve edition.

Textual variation

In this section, I argue that the mistakes found in the published tradition of *Frei Luís de Sousa* during the life of Garrett confirm what can be intuitively known. There are three editions of the play that were published in 1844: two in Portugal (the special edition known as “Teatro do Pinheiro”, named after the private theatre where the play premiered, from now on *siglum P*¹⁰; and the volume included in Garrett’s collected works, *siglum F*) and one in Brazil (the Villeneuve edition, *siglum V*). Without surprise, the available textual data are in accordance with the sequence: $P \rightarrow F \rightarrow V$.

¹⁰I use the sigla already utilized in Garrett (2022, p. 18-19), adding the *siglum* that refers to the Villeneuve edition.

a) Affiliation and errors

According to Maas, there are some errors “which can be utilized to make stemmatic inferences” – he calls them “*Leitfehler* (indicative errors, *errores significativi*)” (Maas, 1958, p. 42). In the original circulation of *Frei Luís de Sousa*, there is a particularly useful indicative error, whose interpretation backs the view that the basis for *V* must have been *F*, and not *T*. The latter, designed in a larger format than *F*’s and meant for private offers, contains a typographic error on p. 84: when Manuel de Sousa Coutinho is addressing his daughter, Maria, he says “Se tu sabes tudo! Maria, minha Maria.”, which is followed by a stage direction, “(animando-a)”. This indication is misleading at this point of the drama, for Manuel is seeking, if anything, to moderate Maria’s imagination, rather than to animate her to continue musing about literature. The correct word, according to what one reads in *F*, is “(amimando-a)”, i.e., ‘cuddling her’. Since the Brazilian edition also presents “(Amimando-a.)”, *V* is likely based on the more widespread Portuguese text.

That *V* came after *F* can also be observed by the fact that some seemingly trivial errors in the Imprensa Nacional edition were corrected in the Brazilian publication (Table 6):

Table 6. The correction of trivial errors in J. Villeneuve’s edition.

Section	F	V
II.1	Ello alli está... (p. 79)	Elle ali está... (p. 12)
I, note F	characterista (p. 183)	caracteristica (p. 29)
Appendix	fude-se no quadro (p. 226)	funde-se no quadro (p. 37)

Whereas these mistakes were corrected in the Brazilian edition, a number of others, though, were not avoided, and some of them had already been identified. As a matter of fact, an errata placed at the end of the Imprensa Nacional publication locates and corrects 10 typo-

graphic mistakes. With the exception of the first, seventh and eighth errors, because they occur or refer to the prologue (a section that is not included, as we have just seen, in *V*), all could have been amended by the Villeneuve edition. The following table (Table 7) displays what happened in this edition as far as the seven other errors are concerned:

Table 7. The errata in Imprensa Nacional edition and the corrections introduced by J. Villeneuve.

Errata in <i>F</i>		<i>V</i>
p. 26: da meditação	na meditação	da meditação (p. 1)
p. 36: todos quantos	todos	todos quantos (p. 3)
p. 41: prespicaz	perspicaz	perspicaz (p. 4)
p. 95: olha	olhae	olha (p. 15)
p. 101: Qu	que	que (p. 17)
p. 224: oomposta	composta	composta (p. 36)
p. 225: Klopsck	Klopstock	Klopsck (p. 36)

Out of the 7 corrections, only three (highlighted in the previous table) are adopted by the Villeneuve publication and all three could have been or were very probably made in the ignorance of the errata, which, I believe, was not known to the Brazilian publisher. Besides these mistakes, several other trivial typographic errors can be found in the Brazilian edition (Table 8):

Table 8. Banal typographic mistakes in *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I. 2	e morto (p. 38)	É morto (p. 4)
III.12	a coroa de glória (p. 156)	o corôa de gloria (p. 28)
III.10	Si iniquitates observaveris, Domine; (p. 151)	Si iniquitates observareris, Domine (p. 27)
II, note A	Vimioso (p. 202)	Vimiosi (p. 32)

Other cases of variation may be due to slips of attention that were possibly at the origin of omissions of some parts of words, whole words or even phrases, seemingly without intent (Table 9):

Table 9. Omissions in V.

Section	F	V
I.2	a querer saber, a perguntar (p. 31)	a perguntar (p. 2)
I.2	E es tu o que andas, (p. 40)	És tu o que andas (p. 4)
I.2	ella faz: (<i>levantando-se</i>) que não (p. 42)	ella faz; que não (p. 5)
I.3	Á parte, e indo-se depois (p. 46)	A parte indo-se depois (p. 6)
II.1	vieram-me aqui dizer: (p. 80)	vierão-me dizer: (p. 12)
II.5	Então vou, meu pae, vou? (p. 94)	Então, meu pai, vou? (p. 15)
III, initial stage direction	guizamentos (p. 117)	guizamento (p. 20)
III.5	E se tu o não fôras, (p. 138)	E se tu não fôras, (p. 24)
III.5	E eu heide mentir, (p. 139)	Eu hei de mentir, (p. 25)
III.5	Tiraram-me tudo. (p. 140)	Tirão-me tudo. (p. 25)
III.11	e a atravessava entre mim e ti, (p. 154)	e atravessava entre mim e ti, (p. 28)
I, note K	por toda a parte (p. 186)	por toda parte (p. 30)
II, note I	Não te lembras o que lá diz do nosso rei D. Sebastião (p. 206)	Não te lembras o que lá diz o nosso rei D. Sebastião (p. 33)
III.3	TELMO, vai para deitar a mão á corda, pára suspenso algum tempo; e depois:	TELMO, indo para deitar a mão á corda, pára suspenso.
Appendix	usado ja no teatro grego! (p. 233)	usado no teatro grego! (p. 38)

In respect of case 2 in this table, it should be noted that the coordinating conjunction “and” is missing in Villeneuve edition at the beginning of several sentences, a similar type of omission occurring with single letter object pronouns (“o”, “a”). In the latter case, the sound repetition (“e indo...”, “tu o...”, “a atravessava...”, “toda a...”) favours the deletion of the shorter grammatical word¹¹.

Other deviations from the text in F may stem from intentions of amendment (Table 10):

¹¹ Contrary to the omissions in V, there is a trivial addition to the text in II.2 – F: (*Toma-lhe as mãos; sentam-se*) (p. 84); V: (*Toma lhe as mãos e sentão-se.*) (p. 13).

Table 10. Possible intentions of amendment in *V*.

I.7	O que fará , se lhes deres pretexto (...) (p. 58)	O que farás , se lhes deres pretexto (p. 8)
I.8	a este povo que os hade allumiar (p. 64)	a este povo que o ha de allumiar (p. 9)

In the second example, does the verbal form refer to a third person (*F*: “fará”) or to the second person (*V*: “farás”)? A few lines above there is another occurrence of the second person in the question asked by Madalena – “Que faras tu contra esses poderosos?” (Garrett, 1844b, p. 58) – which would suggest that “O que farás, se lhes deres pretexto (...)” is a welcome emendation. However, not only the document witnesses agree in the text “O que fará, (...)”, but also its sense is understandable (‘What will happen’, ‘What will it produce’).

Finally, other mistakes that appear in the Brazilian publication are forms graphically similar to the ones in *F*. With meanings close to or remote from what is found in *F*, they result from misreadings or faulty memory in the transition between the model and the reproduction (Table 11).

Table 11. Faulty transition between model and reproduction in *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	o amigo e camarada antigo (p. 30)	o amigo, camarada amigo (p. 2)
I.3	<i>chega-se toda para elle, acarinhando-o</i> (p. 45)	<i>(chegando-se a elle e acariciando-o)</i> (p. 5)
I.7	virão antes da manhan. (p. 57)	viraõ antes d’amanhãa. (p. 8)
I.7	O meu nobre pae! (p. 58)	O meu pobre pai! (p. 8)
I, note F	de teus amos (p. 183)	de teus annos (p. 29)
II, note G	mareantes (p. 205)	mercantes (p. 33)

In the first example, the word “amigo” is occasioned by a spelling akin to that of “antigo”, but also to the fact that shortly before there is a previous occurrence of “amigo” in the Brazilian publication. The second example displays a change of the verb into a synonym, perhaps less abstract than the word chosen by Garrett. As to the use of “acarinhar”, it should be noted that it also appears in act II, scene 5, in a passage that is *ad litteris* kept by the Villeneuve publication (p. 15). In the fourth example, a different letter at the beginning of the variant words suffices to produce an entirely different meaning.

b) Accidental and substantive variation

Since the affiliation of *V* bears no doubt, one can concentrate on the identification and description of textual variation without having stemmatic matters in mind. In order to facilitate such approach to textual variants, I would like to make an extensive citation of Walter W. Greg's classic article in which he proposed a revision of the concept of copytext. The passage that is of interest here deals with the distinction between:

the significant, or as I shall call them 'substantive', readings of the text, those namely that affect the author's meaning or the essence of his expression, and others, such in general as spelling, punctuation, word-division, and the like, affecting mainly its formal presentation, which may be regarded as the accidents, or as I shall call them, 'accidentals', of the text. The distinction is not arbitrary or theoretical, but has an immediate bearing on textual criticism, for scribes (or composers) may in general be expected to react, and experience shows that they generally do react, differently to the two categories. As regards substantive readings their aim may be assumed to be to reproduce exactly those of their copy, though they will doubtless sometimes depart from them accidentally and may even, for one reason or another, do so intentionally: as regards accidentals they will normally follow their own habits or inclination, though they may, for various reasons and to varying degrees, be influenced by their copy (Greg, 1950-1951, p. 21-22)

By saying that this conceptual distinction is founded on the observation of the general behaviour by scribes and composers, Greg invites us to observe the behaviour of the compositor of *V* (or is it the director of the series "Arquivo Theatral"?) to see what is substantive and what is accidental in practice.

Although in general *V* does sometimes deviate from the meaning of the text as transmitted by *F*, there are grounds for stating that the Brazilian edition has a rather generous understanding of what is accidental (i.e., liable to change) in *Frei Luís de Sousa*.

It is not surprising to find variation in punctuation (dashes are frequent in *F*, much less so in *V*) and in spelling (possibly with some phonological effect, as well) (Table 12):

Table 12. Variation in spelling.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.1	Camera	Camara
I.1	ingano	Engano
I.2	coisa	Cousa
I.2	testemunhos	Testemunhos

Contractions are also more current in *F* than in *V* (Table 13):

Table 13. Contractions in *F* and *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	d'Allemanha, ou d'Inglaterra (p. 28)	da Allemanha ou da Inglaterra (p. 2)
I.2	d'Alcacer (p. 37)	de Alcacer (p. 4)
I.2	E ess'outros ares (p. 43)	E esses outros ares (p. 5)

Another curious change has to do with the placement of stage instructions, tendentially located at the end of the text it refers to in *F* and at the beginning in *V* (Table 14):¹²

Table 14. Stage instructions in *F* and *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	vivemos (<i>com affectação</i>) seguros, (p. 40)	(<i>Com affectação</i>) vivemos seguros, (p. 4)
I.4	O que são éstas? (<i>pegando nas que ella traz na mão</i>). (p. 48)	(<i>Pegando nas que ella traz na mão.</i>) O que são éstas? (p. 6)
III.1	MANUEL. Para mim aqui está ésta mortalha: (<i>tocando no hábito</i>) (p. 125)	MANOEL, <i>tocando no hábito</i> . Para mim aqui está esta mortalha (p. 22)

¹²See that the displacement of the stage instruction in the first case is not indifferent, as the following cases seemingly are. There are also other types of displacement that are not necessarily intentional (e.g. – *F*: “anjo tal de” (p. 32); *V*: “tal anjo de” (p. 2)).

So far, we have seen that the scope of what can be textually changed in *F*, in the view of whoever was in charge in *V*, goes beyond spelling and punctuation, the components that Greg especially associates to the accidental dimension of texts. More generally, the textual changes seem to obey to a programme of economy, normalization and, in a degree that remains to be ascertained, of conformance to the Brazilian variant of Portuguese.

As to economy, the names of the characters at the beginning of each scene are often shortened in *V* (Table 15)¹³:

Table 15. Names of characters in *F* and *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I,2	Telmo Paes	Telmo
I.6	JORGE, MAGDALENA, MARIA, MIRANDA	OS MESMOS, MIRANDA
I.9	MIRANDA E OUTROS CRIADOS	MIRANDA, OUTROS CRIADOS,
III.3	TELMO, depois o IRMÃO CONVERSO.	TELMO, depois O CONVERSO.

¹³One exception is that *V* always uses the determinant when referring to the palmer, unlike what is read in *P* (*P*: Romeiro / *V*: o Romeiro).

At a microtextual level, this is in accordance with the material characterization of *V*, which accommodates a lengthy text (p. 23-235

in *F*, more than 200 pages) in no more than 39 pages. On a much larger scale, as we have seen, the most evident example of economy in the Villeneuve publication is the exclusion of the initial editorial note and of Garrett's introduction to the drama.

By "normalization" I intend to refer to a multi-level changing operation that converts Garrett's *Frei Luís de Sousa* into a less orally elliptical text. This is perhaps due to an intent of grammatical or even referential clarification, even though the text conveyed by the Portuguese publication is grammatically correct (Table 16):

Table 16. "Normalization" in *V*.

Section	F	V
I.5	O vosso e de Manuel de Sousa: (p. 53)	O vosso e o de Manoel de Souza, (p. 7)
II. INITIAL STAGE INDICATION	e os quatro nos quatro extremos (p. 71)	e os outros quatro nos quatro extremos (p. 10)
II.3	(<i>Tornam para o meio da casa.</i>) (p. 86)	(<i>Tornão para o meio da scena.</i>) (p. 14)*
III.3	<i>Ouve-se tocar longe</i> (p. 133)	<i>Ouve se tocar ao longe</i> (p. 23)
III.3	<i>faz venia</i> (p. 133)	<i>faz uma venia</i> (p. 24)

**V* does not correct in the same way the reference to "casa" at the initial stage direction of II.15.

Similarly oriented is the normalization of apheresis and prothesis forms typical of informal speech (Table 17):

Table 17. Apheresis and prothesis in *V*.

Section	F	V
I.7	Inda mal! (p. 57)	Ainda mal! (p. 8)
I.7	Ah! inda bem, (p. 57)	Ah! ainda bem, (p. 8)
II.4	Inda bem que vieste, (p. 88)	Ainda bem que vieste, (p. 14)
III.1	inda é cedo. (p. 126)	ainda é cedo. (p. 22)
III.3	<i>braço alevantado</i> (p. 133)	<i>braço levantado</i> (p. 23)
III.5	alevantando o cabelo (p. 136)	levantando o cabelo (p. 24)

Another coherent orientation that perhaps falls under this scope can be seen in the preference of *V* for reflexive forms (Table 18):

Table 18. Reflexive forms in *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	chegandoao pé (p. 27)	Chegando se ao pé (p. 1)
I.2	surrindo (p. 32)	sorrindo-se (p. 2)
I.2	rindo (p. 32)	rindo-se (p. 2)
I.2	deixemos (p. 32)	deixemo-nos (p. 3) <i>cf. context, maybe clarification & grammar</i>
II. 2	MANUEL, surrindo. (p. 84)	MANUEL, sorrindo-se. (p. 13)
II.3	(surrindo) (p. 85)	(sorrindo-se) (p. 13)

One of the best examples of normalization is the way the Brazilian edition occasionally deviates from the forms of address that are found in *F* (Table 19):

Table 19. Forms of address.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	Não me faças mais (p. 39)	Não me façais mais (p. 4)
II.1	e não teimes (p. 72)	e não teimeis (p. 10)
II.1	E não me repliques , (p. 72)	E não me repliqueis , (p. 11)
III.6	que aqui estais : abri. (p. 142)	que aqui estás : abri. (p. 25)

In the first example, Madalena is addressing Telmo in a familiar way by using the 2nd person singular, whereas the Brazilian edition converts it into the formal 2nd person plural, complying with the preceding words: “Conheço que **dezarrazoais**, e comtudo as **vossas** palavras mettem-me um medo...”. Although understandable, this change is not called for, because some fluctuation in the forms of address seems to be a trait in a few characters of the play (namely, Madalena, Maria and also Manuel) and goes side by side in this passage with the transition from the indicative (“Conheço que...”) to the subjunctive mood (“Não me **faças**”). A full description of the changes in the other cases is not called for, but the second and the third bear some resemblance to the first example. As to the last, the change is oriented in the opposite direction, introducing an alteration that is not cohesive with the preceding text.

Another curious instance of normalization has to do with mistakes that, intended or involuntary, result from choosing an alternative that is more current or trivial than the one read in Garrett’s text. All of the following examples have the outlook of *lectiones faciliores* (Table 20):

Table 20. *Lectiones faciliores* in *V*.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.2	bom linhagem (p. 34)	boa linhagem (p. 3)
I.2	(Desata a chorar). (p. 34)	(Põe-se a chorar.) (p. 3)
I.6	(Maria tem sahido para o eirado, mas volta logo depois.) (p. 55)	(Maria vai para o eirado, mas volta logo.) (p. 7)
II.1	'faredes o que mandado vos é' (p. 72)	fareis o que mandado vos é (p. 11)
II.1	No entretanto e ás últimas palavras (p. 82)	No entanto, e ás ultimas palavras (p. 12)
II.14	Se o vireis... (p. 115)	Se o virdes... (p. 20)
Appendix	retalhos inviusados (p. 228)	retalhos enviezados (p. 37)

As to the first case, Garrett wants to give his text the flavour of antiquity, though João de Barros (c.1496-1570), who died before the time in which *Frei Luís de Sousa* is set, already used “linhagem” as a feminine word: “de sua linhagem per muytos tempos”, “desta linhagem Maraunion” (Barros, 1988, p. 7). Besides, see that, differently from what happens here, the Villeneuve edition, act I, note H, keeps “bom linhagem” (*V*, p. 30). Similarly, whereas in the second case *V* prints “Põe-se” instead of “Desata”, later in the drama it maintains the verb in the stage instruction “Desata a soluçar” (*V*, p. 21).

Finally, it is not impossible that some of the changes are generally programmed to adapt Garrett’s text as to the variant of Portuguese being used. The following data are presented in order to be interpreted by the lenses of compared historical linguistics (the object under scrutiny being the European and Brazilian variants of Portuguese in the 19th century) and dramatic writing (namely the conventions associated with the writing of stage instructions). It is, I believe, against these two backdrops (language system or community practice) that the following data can be fruitfully interpreted.

One of the frequent features of the Villeneuve publication is that it resorts to the gerund much more frequently than the Imprensa Nacional edition does. This is especially noticeable in the stage directions. Even when the gerund is used in the Portuguese edition, the Brazilian publication makes a larger use of it (Table 21).

Table 21. The gerund in *V*.

Section	F	V
I.2	(<i>suspira</i>) (p. 28)	(<i>Suspirando.</i>) (p. 2)
I.2	(<i>pausa</i> : – <i>mudando de tom</i>) (p. 29)	(<i>Fazendo pausa e mudando de tom.</i>) (p. 2)
I.2	<i>inxuga</i> os olhos, e <i>toma</i> uma atitude (p. 34)	<i>enxugando</i> os olhos e <i>tomando</i> uma atitude (p. 3)
I.3	<i>vai-se abraçar com a mãe</i> (p. 46)	<i>Indo abraçar-se com a mãe</i> (p. 5)
II.1	(<i>Leva-o</i> <i>deante dos tres retrattos</i> (...)) (p. 76)	(<i>Levando-o</i> <i>diantre dos tres retratos</i> (...)) (p. 11)
II.2	(<i>Lança-se-lhe</i> <i>nos braços e beija-o</i> (...)) (p. 83)	(<i>Lançando-se-lhe</i> <i>nos braços e beijando-</i> <i>lhe</i> (...)) (p. 13)
III.1	(<i>Vai á porta da esquerda e volta.</i>) (p. 126)	(<i>Indo à porta da esquerda e voltando.</i>) (p. 22)
III.6	(<i>investe para a porta com impeto; mas</i> <i>pára de repente</i>) (p. 143)	(<i>Investindo com impeto para a porta e</i> <i>parando de repente.</i>) (p. 26)

One rare exception to this tendency to use the gerund in the Brazilian publication can be seen at the beginning of act I, scene 3 (this could also be the result of unintentional omission, but, as we have seen above, omissions normally fall upon small words) (Table 22):

Table 22. The gerund in *F*.

I.3	<i>entrando com umas flores</i> (p. 44)	<i>com umas flôres</i> (p. 5)
-----	---	-------------------------------

Besides the massive presence of gerund in *V*, it is curious to see the clitic “*lhe*” in the Brazilian publication being used as a direct object pronoun, which would not be acceptable in European Portuguese (unless the passage results from a mistake: “*beijando-lhe na face*” instead of “... a face”) (Table 23).

Table 23. The clitic “*lhe*” in *V*.

II.2	(<i>Lança-se-lhe</i> <i>nos braços e beija-o</i> <i>na face</i> (...)) (p. 83)	(<i>Lançando-se-lhe</i> <i>nos braços e</i> <i>beijando-lhe na face</i> (...)) (p. 13)
------	--	--

In the following case, apart from the transformation of a phrase into a sentence in the Villeneuve edition, note the enclitic position of “*se*” in a positive declarative sentence, which is in accordance with the Brazilian variety of Portuguese (Table 24):

Table 24. The enclitic “se” in *V*.

Dramatis personae page	Logar da scena – Almada. (p. 23)	A acção se passa em Almada (p. 1)
------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

Additionally, the pronoun “isso” sometimes substitutes what in *F* is “isto” (Table 25):

Table 25. “isto” and “isso”.

Section	<i>F</i>	<i>V</i>
I.3	crentes n’isto, (p. 45)	crentes nisso, (p. 5)
III.4	toda com isto: (p. 134)	toda com isso; (p. 24)

Lastly, it is also worthwhile checking if the use of the preposition “de” instead of the contraction “do” is a meaningful feature in the adaptation of Garrett’s text to a Brazilian readership (Table 26).

Table 26. The preposition “de” in *V*.

I.4	menina do teu juizo (p. 48)	menina de teu juizo (p. 6)
-----	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

Concluding remarks

Taking into account what has been presented above, it is safe to say that the Brazilian publication makes no contribution to the critical establishment of *Frei Luís de Sousa* (apart, that is, from the correction of some evident typographic mistakes in the Imprensa Nacional edition). Despite this, it seems to be very relevant in other regards: a) as an example of the swift circulation of texts between Portugal and Brazil against the backdrop of a web of commercial relations that deserve a much closer look; b) as an example of the textual transformation that Garrett’s text could and did undergo. As we have seen, the accidentals, following Greg’s terminology, include much more components in this case than punctuation and spelling. In this respect, Jerome McGann’s remarks on what is specific to literature might be instrumental to more fully understand how the double dimension of Garrett’s text in the Villeneuve publication is materialized. Based on Aristotle, McGann claims that there is a distinction between historical and literary works that “epitomize the difference between a form of writing that is committed to facticity and information, and a form, that is, by contrast, devoted to creation” (McGann, 1991, p. 70). In other words, as McGann puts it afterwards, ““literary” work, in its textual condition, is not meant for transparency, is not designed to carry messages” (McGann, 1991, p. 76). What seems to be at stake here is that forms of writing that are committed to facticity

and information are likely to be paraphrased with no loss of value whereas those devoted to creation will be corrupted if paraphrased. By observing the Villeneuve edition, one is led to conclude that the text of the drama itself is mostly taken as a creative text, while the stage directions and other subordinate texts (the notes, for instance), which are more likely subject to textual adaptations, seem to be viewed as informative, rather than aesthetic. These adaptations seem linguistically and functionally oriented. Linguistically, because some changes derive from the fact that the publication is addressed to a Brazilian readership; functionally, because other changes result from a frame of *Frei Luís de Sousa* that differs from the original Garrett's "Collected Works" series. The Villeneuve edition works as an eye opener to the parts of the text that were considered more prone to textual change. Is this typical of the edition of Portuguese texts in the mid-19th century? Is this common practice in Brazil? Or is this publication not as chronologically and geographically representative? Informed answers to these questions invite a broadening of the *corpus* under analysis and a joint analysis effort by textual scholars, historical linguists, historians interested on book production and trade, and theatre studies scholars.

References

BARROS, João de. *Ásia*. Primeira Década. Edited by António Baião. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 1988.

BOTREL, Jean-François. Quelques documents sur les premières représentations de *Frei Luís de Sousa* (1843-1850). In: BOTREL, Jean-François. *Etudes luso-brésiliennes*. Paris: P. U.F., 1966. p. 7-24

BRILHANTE, Maria João. Review of Almeida Garrett, *Frei Luís de Sousa*. Edição de João Dionísio. *Colóquio-Letras*, Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, v. 213, p. 166-168, maio-agosto 2023.

CALADO, Adelino de Almeida. O manuscrito original de "O Cativo de Fez" com as correcções de Garrett. *Revista de História Literária de Portugal*, v. 1, 1962.

CARVALHO, Roberto. *Maranhão, província tradutora: livros e tradutores em São Luís do séc. XIX*. PhD Thesis (Portuguese Studies – History of the Book and Textual Criticism) – Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Lisboa, 2021, 378 p.

DUARTE, Maria do Rosário Cunha. Rejeição e recepção das ideias francesas na literatura portuguesa. *Letras de Hoje*, Porto Alegre, v. 43, n. 4, p. 65-68, out./dez. 2008.

ENCARNAÇÃO, António da. Prologo e Vida do Author. In: CACEGAS, Luis. *Segunda Parte da Historia de S. Domingos, por Fr. Luis Cacegas (...) e por Fr. Luis de Sousa*. Lisboa: Oficina de Antonio Rodrigues Galhardo, 1767. Available from: <https://archive.org/details/1767primeiraquar02caceuoft>. Accessed on 25th May 2023.

GARRETT, Almeida. *Frei Luiz de Sousa*. Edição do Teatro do Pinheiro. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1844a.

GARRETT, Almeida. *Frei Luiz de Sousa*. Vol. 3 of *Theatro*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 1844b.

GARRETT, Almeida. *The "Brother Luiz de Sousa" of Viscount de Almeida Garrett*. Translated by Edgar Prestage. London: Elkin Mathews; MCMIX.

GARRETT, Almeida. *Frei Luiz de Sousa*. Critical edition based on the manuscripts by Rodrigues Lapa. Lisboa: Seara Nova, 1943.

GARRETT, Almeida. *Frei Luís de Sousa*. Edited by João Dionísio. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional, 2022.

FADDA, Sebastiana. Almeida Garrett além-fronteiras. *Revista de Teatro*, p. 35-37, Dezembro 1999. Available from: <https://repositorio.ul.pt/bitstream/10451/30640/1/Garret-35-37.pdf>. Accessed on 25th May 2023.

GRANJA, Lúcia; SANTANA JÚNIOR, Odair Dutra. Aquém e além-mar: agentes, textos e estratégias na publicação de romances-folhetim do jornal do commercio (1827-1863). *Revista interfaces*, v. 1, n. 28, p. 31-46, janeiro-junho 2018.

GIMENEZ, Priscila Renata. *Feuilletons dramatiques et transferts culturels franco-brésiliens au XIXe siècle: enjeux d'une édition de la "Semaine Lyrique" de Martins Pena*. Thesis (PhD in French Literature) – Université Paul Valéry - Montpellier III; Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho", 2014, 603 p. Available from: https://theses.hal.science/tel-01124304/file/2014_gimenez_arch.pdf. Accessed on the 25th May 2023.

GREG, Walter. The Rationale of Copy-Text. *Studies in Bibliography*. Bibliographical Society of the University of Virginia, v. 3, p. 19-36, 1950/1951.

MAAS, Paul. *Textual criticism*. Translated by Barbara Flower. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958.

MACIEL, Paulo Marcos Cardoso. O negócio da tradução teatral visto do Brasil do século XIX. *Urdimento*, Florianópolis, v. 2, n. 35, p. 173-192, ago/set 2019.

McGANN, Jerome J. *The textual condition*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1991.

PRESTAGE, Edgar. Introduction. In: PRESTAGE, Edgar. *The "Brother Luiz de Sousa" of Viscount de Almeida Garrett*. Translated by Edgar Prestage. London: Elkin Mathews; MCMIX, 1909. p. 7-35.

SANTANA JÚNIOR, Odair Dutra; GRANJA, Lúcia. Dos Rodapés aos livros: Literatura no *Jornal do Commercio* (periódico e tipografia). In: SANTANA JÚNIOR, Odair Dutra; GRANJA, Lúcia. *XV Abralic*. Rio de Janeiro: Abralic, 2015. p. 849-859

SANTANA JÚNIOR, Odair Dutra. *Bastidores da literatura nas horas ociosas da tipografia do Jornal do Commercio (1827-1865)*. Dissertação (Letras) - Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas da Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho", São José do Rio Preto, 2017, 233 p.

SANTANA JÚNIOR, Odair Dutra. *As coleções de livros Bibliotheca Brasileira (1862-1863) e Brasília Bibliotheca Nacional (1862-1876): internacionalização de práticas editoriais e formação do cânone nacional*. Thesis (PhD in "Letras") - Instituto de Biociências, Letras e Ciências Exatas da Universidade Estadual Paulista "Júlio de Mesquita Filho", São José do Rio Preto, 2020, 310 p.

SANTOS, Ana Clara. O *Archivo theatral*. Uma colecção de teatro francês. *Sinais de cena*, v. 15, p. 119-124, 2011.

SHAKESPEARE, William. *Julius Caesar*. Edition by Barbara Mowat, Paul Werstine, Michael Poston, and Rebecca Niles. Folger Shakespeare Library. Available from: <https://www.folger.edu/explore/shakespeares-works/julius-caesar/read/>. Accessed on the 25h May 2023.

SUETONIUS, Tranquillus C. The Life of Julius Caesar. In: SUETONIUS, Tranquillus C. *The Lives of the Twelve Caesars*. Loeb Classical Library, 1913. Available from: https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Suetonius/12Caesars/Julius*.html#ref:my_child. Accessed on the 25h May 2023.

A primeira edição brasileira do *Frei Luís de Sousa*, de Almeida Garrett. Aspectos de variação textual

RESUMO

Este artigo procura descrever a primeira edição brasileira de Frei Luís de Sousa, de Almeida Garrett. Presta-se atenção ao "Archivo Theatral", a colecção na qual a edição foi incluída, e também a Junius Villeneuve, o responsável pela tipografia que imprimiu o texto. É este o pano de fundo para a identificação e análise da variação textual encontrada no confronto da edição brasileira com a portuguesa. Depois de algumas observações sobre o lugar da publicação de Villeneuve na transmissão impressa do drama, as variantes são interpretadas segundo o famoso par de qualificativos cunhado por Walter Greg, substantivo e acidental. Defende-se que a edição brasileira adoptou um entendimento bastante inclusivo do que é acidental no texto português, podendo servir de corpus interessante para uma história comparada da língua portuguesa oitocentista nas variantes brasileira e europeia ou, pelo menos, para um melhor conhecimento de práticas textuais no âmbito da publicação de obras dramáticas.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Almeida Garrett; Frei Luís de Sousa; História textual.