1. Introduction

In the Portuguese and Latin-Portuguese metalinguistic traditions, dating from the late 15th and early 16th century,1 one of the works that can be said to have had a considerable global impact in both the editorial and the doctrinal sense, was the Latin grammar Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres (Lisbon, 1572), written by the Madeiran Jesuit Manuel Álvares (1526–1583). However, in spite of the existence of some recent studies of significance (Ponce de León Romeo 2002; Gómez Gómez 2002) dedicated to the 1572 editio princeps, and despite even the considerable number of scientific publications that have been dedicated to several aspects concerned with its later and especially foreign editions (Ponce de León Romeo 2000, 2003, 2007; Kemmler

1. Having first been written in English, a Portuguese translation of an earlier (albeit imperfect) version of this paper appeared as Kemmler (2013b). The present paper is the result of continuous research and constitutes the final, significantly different version of the original English text the translation was based upon. It profited immensely from comments received from two anonymous referees, who obviously are very much informed about Álvares’ work and who deserve my public expression of gratitude.

1. The first metalinguistic work to be published in Portugal is the Latin ensemble entitled Grammatica pastrane (Lisbon, 1497), an edition of the late 14th / early 15th century Spaniard Juan de Pastrana’s grammar, organized by Pedro Rombo (?–1533), with his own annexes and those of his former teacher, António Martins (d. before 1497; see Ponce de León Romeo 2015, Kemmler 2013a). On the other hand, the Portuguese metalinguistic tradition started off with the 1536 and 1540 works by the Portuguese Renaissance scholars Fernão de Oliveira (ca. 1507–ca. 1581) and João de Barros (1496–1570).
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2012), we still remain far from a complete understanding of some of the most important questions related to Álvares’ grammar.²

Among the key items that have been lacking due attention in modern research, is the existence of a summarized version of Álvares’ famous Latin grammar and the role it plays in an overall appreciation of the worldwide impact of the Alvarenean grammar. In December of 2011, I was able to locate what seems to be the single existing copy,³ with handwritten annotations, of the rare editio princeps (Álvares 1573a). This discovery leads me to say something about the edition itself and its role in the general history of Álvares’ grammar.

2. Terminological issues: ‘arte pequena’ vs ‘arte menor’ vs ars minor

In his momentous paper about some of the key aspects of the history of Álvares’ grammar, the Italian Jesuit Emilio Springhetti (1913–1976) mentions the publication of a summarized version:

L’Alvares, che aveva inteso fare una grammatica completa da mettersi in mano ai professori, ai quali soprattutto erano destinate tutte le aggiunte di scogli, commentari e appendici, sentiva già da sé che la sua grammatica, così come era, poco si adattava alle menti e anche alla borsa dei fanciulli, e, mosso anche dalle osservazioni che in tal senso gli venivano fatte, tra la fine del 1572 e il Febbraio del 1573 attende a preparare e stampare un “arte pequena sin comentos” che di fatto uscì nel 1573 in Sivilia, con correzioni della precedente, ma senza scogli e commentari, di prezzo accessibile anche ai poveri, che sono i più. (Springhetti 1961/62: 291–292).⁴

2. For bibliographical repertoires on Álvares’ grammars, cf. the Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus: Première Partie: Bibliographie (Backer, Backer & Sommervogel 1890 I, cols. 223–247; 1898 VIII, cols. 1615–1620) and volume III of the Bibliografia Geral Portuguesa (ACL 1983: 207–376). Whereas these two printed bibliographies are very much incomplete (omitting reference to hundreds of editions), the online bibliography LUSODAT (s.d.) offers a more accurate, albeit still quite incomplete and occasionally defective, insight into the work’s worldwide editorial dimension. None of these repertoires tries to undertake the necessary differentiation between the different text traditions of Álvares’ work.

3. This copy belongs to the Biblioteca Geral of the University of Coimbra (call number V.T.–18–7–3).

4. “Álvares, who had intended to elaborate a complete grammar in order to put it into the hands of the teachers, for whom all the additions of scholia, commentaries and appendices were mainly intended, felt already by himself that his grammar, as it was, did little to fit to the minds of the children, and, also moved by the comments that were made to him to that effect, between
Citing an extract of two letters the grammarian himself had written to his superiors in Rome, the Italian investigator opts for the term ‘arte pequena’ (or ‘small grammar’) to designate the summarized version Manuel Álvares had elaborated for the Society of Jesus. However, Springhetti commits a crucial mistake in identifying as the editio princeps of the ‘arte pequena’ a book published in Seville in 1573. As a matter of fact, the 1573 Seville edition was but the first Spanish edition of De constructione octo partium orationis liber (Álvares 1573b) which really is none other than a republication of the book dedicated to syntax, first printed in Venice in 1570.5

Concerning the term introduced by Springhetti, in his letter to the Superior General Juan de Polanco (1517–1576) dated 3 March 1573, the grammarian Manuel Álvares himself only uses it somewhat fleetingly, as can be seen in the following extract:6

Yo estando en S. Anton para estampar la arte pequeña sin comientos fui enbiado de repente por el Padre Provincial […] para esta vnuiersidade y collegio de Euora por substituto del padre Miguel de Torres […] “When I was in S. Antão in order to print the small grammar without commentaries, I was all of a sudden sent by the Father Provincial […] to this University and College of Évora as a substitute of Father Miguel de Torres …”. (1573, 3 March: fols. 141r–140v).

In this Spanish letter, Álvares uses the term ‘arte pequeña sin comientos’ (with tilde on the Spanish word ‘pequeña’), meaning a ‘small grammar without commentaries’ for what can be viewed as the student’s textbook. While referring only to the absence of scholia in this edition, a similar use can be found in an earlier Spanish letter to the Vicar General Jerónimo Nadal (1507–1580):

the end of 1572 and February of 1573, he dedicated himself to preparing and printing a ‘small grammar without comments’, that indeed came out in Seville in 1573, with corrections of the former, but without scholia and commentaries, and with a price that was affordable to the poor, who are the majority”. (Author’s translations, unless indicated otherwise.)

5. Having been published without the author’s scholia even before the complete grammar was printed in 1572, the extract De constructione octo partium orationis liber had an independent editorial tradition that ran parallel to its publication as the second book of the complete grammar’s libri tres.

6. Citations in this paper will respect the orthographic and typographic characteristics of the original texts. Whenever necessary, abbreviations in manuscript texts will be expanded. Such expansions will be indicated with italics. Due to the suggestion by this paper’s referees, the use of allographic <i> ~ <j> and <u> ~ <v> in Latin citations has been normalized in accordance with current use in Latin philology.
Another without commentaries will be made at once for the boys as well as the poor who cannot buy the bigger ones.

(7 Oct. 1572, fol. 25r).

It is quite interesting that Álvares justifies this edition by stressing the utility of an abridged version for school boys and the poor who might be unable to acquire or use a copy of the complete grammar. This perspective coincides in part with what can be seen further on in Álvares’ paratext “Auctor Lectori”.

Referring to the summarized version of Álvares’ grammar, both the Jesuit historiographer Francisco Rodrigues (1939 II/2: 54–55) and, more recently, Telmo Verdelho, as a modern historiographer of Portuguese lexicography, have been making indiscriminate use not only of the Portuguese equivalent of Álvares’ term, i.e., ‘arte pequena’, but also of ‘arte menor’ (as opposed to ‘arte grande’ or ‘arte maior’).

A gramática de Manuel Álvares, na primeira edição e nas restantes edições integrais (Arte Maior ou Arte Grande), vem recheada de eruditos comentários e de abundantes citações de autores, que a tornavam naturalmente volumosa e de preço menos acessível. Para facilitar o seu uso e aquisição, diz o P. Francisco Rodrigues, “apressou-se o autor a reduzir a bom compêndio a Arte grande. Corrigiu-lhe os defeitos e suprimiu-lhe os comentários e maiores explicações, para que os principiantes do latim não se perturbassem nem perdessem o ânimo, enredados em tantos e tão longos, bem que eruditos, comentários, e no ano seguinte ao da primeira edição, o entregou aos prelados.” (História da Companhia

7. Obviously, these were not the only authors to consider aspects of the twofold text tradition of Álvares’ grammar. Even in more recent times, the hitherto lack of access to a copy of the first edition of the ‘arte pequena’ has led some scholars to create uncertainty or even to offer contradictory statements. In his 1984 paper, the Portuguese scholar Amadeu Torres (1998:93) limits himself to referring to the Sevillian edition (Álvares 1573b) and the Lisbon edition (Álvares 1573a), but unfortunately does not offer any references to other editions. Given these considerations, Ponce de León Romeo (2002: xc–xcvii, note 26) at first cannot help but follow Springhetti’s (1961/62: 291–292) path of an incorrect identification of Álvares (1573b) as belonging to the tradition of the ‘arte pequena’, stating, however, that the 1573 Sevillian edition he consulted is a copy of the De constructione octo partivm orationis liber. Further on (based on Torres’ paper), Ponce de León Romeo (2002: clviii–clix) discusses the beginning of unsatisfactory tradition, refraining, however, from using any terminology to distinguish the grammar’s different text traditions. In a more recent paper, Paul Gehl (2003: 441–443) correctly considers the twofold tradition of Álvares’ grammar as the elaborate “teacher’s edition” vs. the compact “student edition”. In his bibliographically-oriented approach, Gehl emphasizes the importance of the 16th-century Italian editions and revisions of Álvares’ grammars, but seems to have no knowledge of the 1573  

All rights reserved

With regard to the unknown first edition of the ‘arte pequena’, mentioned by Verdelho (1995: 471), there seems no doubt that this must be the same grammar (dated 1573) that the German researcher Sebastião Iken (2002: 60) alludes to. While Iken refrains from supplying any further bibliographical details other than the year of publication (1573), there seems no doubt that, what I discovered thanks to the leads offered by the aforementioned colleagues, is indeed the first Lisbon impression of Álvares (1573a). Besides, it seems evident that Verdelho uses the terms ‘arte pequena’ ~ ‘arte menor’ (as well as ‘arte grande’ ~ ‘arte maior’) as synonyms, without any clear preference. In contrast, Iken (2002) prefers to maintain the terms ‘arte menor’ ~ ‘arte maior’ throughout his paper.  

The use of the two Portuguese term sets or even of the author’s original Spanish term ‘arte pequeña’ (versus the corresponding ‘arte grande’) does not seem problematic for researchers with a Lusophone, Hispanophone or even Romance background. However, even if they doubtlessly are adequate for research in the Romance world, I believe it is both appropriate and necessary to contemplate yet another terminology that might exceed the limitations of their belonging to just one language family while doing justice to the projection of Álvares’ grammar and corresponding to the grammar’s subject language.  

8. “The Grammar of Manuel Álvares, in the first edition and in the remaining complete editions (Arte Maior ou Arte Grande), comes packed with erudite comments and abundant quotes from authors, which naturally render it bulky and less affordable. To facilitate its use and acquisition, says Father Francisco Rodrigues, ‘the author hastened to reduce the Arte grande to a good compendium. He corrected its defects and deleted its comments and the biggest explanations, so that Latin beginners would not be disturbed or lose morale, due to the entanglement in so many and so long, while scholarly, comments, and the year following the first edition he handed it to the presses’ […]. We have no other bibliographic news of this ‘Arte Menor’ ou ‘Arte Pequena’, but the same historian of the Society of Jesus makes it clear that it was taken by Father Anthony Velez who reissued and perfected it while joining also an ‘Index of the whole grammar Art’, ‘a real Latin Portuguese dictionary’ […]”. (Note that the terms ‘Arte maior’ and the like remain untranslated here.)  

Considering, after all, that Álvares’ grammar was without doubt elaborated in order to serve as the main grammar for the Jesuit educational system all over the world, the publication of a summarized manual, destined for the students (destitute of such typical erudite elements of the ‘arte maior’, which clearly had been elaborated in order to be used by the Latin Grammar School teachers), I propose the Latin distinction between

\[ \textit{ars minor } \sim \textit{ars maior}, \]

similarly to the use that had already been consecrated for centuries in the Latin tradition concerning Aelius Donatus’ classical treatises on Latin grammar (mid-4th century A.D.).

Being a Latin distinction that pertains to the classic Latin grammar tradition, the use of these equally synonymous terms seems quite adequate to distinguish the two types of editions of Álvares’ grammar that share the same title and the same didactic purpose. This permits the distinction of two traditions of the author’s grammar, represented by Álvares (1572 = \textit{ars maior}) and Álvares (1573a = \textit{ars minor}). In this sense, one needs to consider not one editio princeps, but two editiones principes!

Iken’s (2002: 60–63) research has established how the \textit{ars minor} played a major role in the circulation of Álvares’ grammar in Portugal, starting at least with the grammar’s recognitio vellesiana of the \textit{ars maior} (Álvares & Velez 1599) by António Velez (1549–1609), which, incidentally, seems to constitute the second and last Portuguese edition of the teacher’s handbook (Iken 2002: 60–61).

While some less well-informed sources may seem to suggest otherwise, no proof could be found of any copy of a Vellesian \textit{ars maior} printed in Portugal (or even abroad) after 1599. Indeed, the real impact of Velez’s recognitio is due not to the \textit{ars maior}, but to the changes introduced by the Jesuit grammarian in the \textit{ars minor}’s 1608 recognitio vellesiana (Álvares & Velez 1608). The extent and the overall impact of this somewhat later adaptation of the Vellesian \textit{ars minor} (reprinted in Portugal at least in 1680, 1689, 1694, 1695, 1699, 1728, 1744, 1748, 1751 and 1755; cf. Iken 2002: 61–63) still remain to be explored.

From the present point, it is, however, safe to say that for the most part the grammar’s earlier editions may be regarded as being the main model for the circulation of Álvares’ grammar in other countries.

10. See the editions of \textit{ars minor} Schönberger (2008) and \textit{ars maior} Schönberger (2009).
3. *Manuel Álvares’ ars minor in comparison to the ars maior*

Since the formal establishment of the Portuguese Inquisition in 1536 up to 1768, the licenses concerning the entire process of censorship for any printed publication normally were reproduced on the first pages of the books or booklets in question. Even today these documents supply relevant information about the respective publications. As can be seen in the 1974 facsimile edition, the inquisition licenses of the *ars maior’s* 1572 *editio princeps* date from 9 September 1572 (Álvares 1974: [ii]). The texts published on the first pages of the *ars minor* (printed in the year 1573 with the same title by the typographer João da Barreira) show that the censorship process for this grammar was completed just three months after the similar process concerning the earlier grammar:

VI os três liuros de Instituição Grammatica do padre Manoel Aluares da Companhia de Iesu, os quaes não tem cousa que contradiga aa fé, nem aos bons costumes, antes aproueitaram muito aos que estudão Latim & poesia. em Euora oje primeiro de Janeiro 1573.

*Dom Afonso de Castelbranco.*

Aprovação do conselho Real do sancto officio.

*VIsta a censura podese imprimir esta arte. em Euora a cinco de Janeiro. de 1573.*

*Manoel Gonçalves de Camara.*

*Manoel de Coadros.* (Álvares 1573a: [ii]).

The *editio princeps* of Manuel Álvares’ *ars minor* was, therefore, approved by the censors on 5 January 1573. Indeed, the only divergence that can be observed in relation to the *ars maior’s* license is the substitution of the Provincial of the Society of Jesus in Portugal, Father Leão Henrieques (1515–1589) by another deputy of the Santo Ofício (the Holy Office), namely, the Bishop of Guarda, D. Manuel de Quadros (c.1530–1593).

11. “I have seen the three books of Grammar by the Father Manuel Álvares of the Society of Jesus, which do not have a thing to contradict the faith nor good customs, but instead will bring much advantage to those who study Latin and poetry. In Évora today January first, 1573.

*Dom Afonso de Castelbranco.*

Approval of the Royal Council of the Holy Office

Having seen the censorship, this grammar may be printed. In Évora January fifth, 1573.

*Manuel Gonçalves da Câmara.*

*Manuel de Quadros.*
Among the important paratexts that are part of the 1573 edition, such as the republications of texts previously printed in the 1572 *ars maior*, one finds the privilege dated 14 September 1567 (Álvares 1573a:[iii–iv]), as well as the author’s foreword (Álvares 1573a:[v–vi]). Both texts do not present any significant disparities.

There is, howbeit, another essential text that does not appear in Álvares (1572) or in any other edition of the *ars maior*, namely the short prefatory statement “Auctor Lectori” in which the author addresses the reader. At least in the Portuguese tradition of Álvares’ grammar, this text is part of all the *ars minor*’s editions from 1573 to 1755.13

*Auctor Lectori.*

*Libros de Grammatica Institutione, quos nuper explanationibus illustratos edideram, compulsus sum Lector humanissime nudos ferè, ac luce priuatos, diligentissimis tamen correctos denovo foras dare: tum ne scholiorum multitudine impedientur tyrones, tum vt eis non solum ad diuites, sed etiam ad tenuiores, quorum multo maior semper fuit copia) aditus pateret. Quare te etiam, atque etiam rogo, vt eorum tenuitatem, vel nuditatem potius boni consulas. Vale* (Álvares 1573a:[viii]).

In this very significant text, the author complains about having been forced to publish his grammar anew, but this time without the explanatory comments of the *scholia*. In other words, the *ars minor* lacks most of the grammatical, critical or explanatory comments that are so typical of the *editio princeps* of the *ars maior* and its reprints. In the grammarian’s mind, the elimination of most of the *scholia*

12. Through this document, the then Cardinal-Infant D. Henrique (1512–1580, King since 1578) granted the Lisbon and Coimbra printer João da Barreira the exclusive right to print all of the textbooks of the Fathers of the Society of Jesus for the period of eight years (cf. Álvares, 1974: [iii–iv]).

13. The same can be observed, for instance, in the case of the first Aragonese/Spanish edition, published in Zaragoza (Álvares 1579; cf. Kemmler 2012) and similarly in the somewhat later Italian (Álvares 1588) and French editions (Álvares 1594b). There was even an edition of the *ars minor* printed in Japan (Álvares 1594a) — a facsimile edition of the Amakusa edition has been published recently with a study by Carlos Assunção and Masayuki Toyoshima (2012).

14. “The author to the reader. The books about the grammatical instruction that I recently have delivered, illustrated with comments, I see myself obliged, oh most humane reader, to publish them again almost nude and deprived of brightness — although rigorously reviewed —, with the purpose of, firstly, not embarrassing the beginners by the multitude of *scholia*, and secondly, that with them the access might not only be possible to the rich, but also to the humblest (of which there was always much greater number). Therefore, I beg you earnestly to esteem as good their humility and blandness. Farewell”.
renders the three books of his grammars ‘almost nude and deprived of brightness’. However, Álvares explains that the reduction of the grammatical corpus serves ultimately to prevent that the large amount of comments and the consequent high price for a book printed as an in-quarto format might result in an intellectual or financial obstacle for beginners or poor students.

And indeed it makes sense for this paratext to be included in all of the *ars minor*’s editions, published in Portugal or abroad, since it explains the grammar’s special characteristic as student textbook, compared to the inherent function of the *ars maior* as the ‘teacher’s handbook’.

The *editio princeps* of the *ars minor*, in-octavo-format, has [viii] unpaginated pages, 148 folios and [i] unnumbered page. In order to confront the two editions, I will compare Álvares (1573a) with a copy of the variant “Taxada cada Arte a Oyto Vintês em papel” of the *ars maior*’s first edition (Álvares 1572, 1974), which has [viii] unpaginated pages, 243 [rectè 249] paginated folios and [iii] unpaginated pages. In these two first two editions the following structure can be found:

---

15. Álvares (1573a, fol. 58v) presents the following errors in the pagination sequence which, incidentally, do not exert any influence on the final number of the grammar’s folios: 61-62-93-64-65 (instead of 63); 67-68-66-70-71 (instead of 69).

16. Since the facsimile (published by the Junta Geral do Distrito Autónomo do Funchal, Madeira, and prefaced with a brief study by João Pereira da Costa) is based on the copy belonging to the National Library of Portugal (call number Res–1242–p; see also the online resource of the same copy: http://purl.pt/23043), I have opted for basing my observations concerning this copy of Álvares (1572) on the 1974 Madeiran reissue which, incidentally, remains on sale in some Madeiran bookstores.


In addition, the facsimile edition lacks the folio numbers 2, 8, 33 (after 36) and 38 which can be found in the original copy on which the reproduction is based. With regard to other possible variants, it seems safe to assume that other discrepancies may exist between various copies of the *ars maior*’s first edition. It should be noted, finally, that the facsimile edition (Álvares 1974) presents a blank page between the unpaginated pages [i], [ii], [iii], [vii] and [viii] of Álvares (1572). Thus, what normally would be eight unpaginated pages comes to occupy a dozen unpaginated pages.

18. Iken (2002: 60) refers to the existence of seven typographical variants of the *ars maior*’s first edition, attributing them by mistake to the printer ‘António Barreira’ when the real printer was ‘Ioannes Barrerius’ or ‘João da Barreira’. In the context of the present paper, it is impossible to
devote the required space to the question of the existence of typographic variations. Suffice it to mention here that I know, beyond the already mentioned copy, at least two copies with variations of the taxation on the title page, namely “Taxado cada volume a 160. em papel” and “Taxado cada volume a em papel”. It seems that the other divergences among the copies of Álvares (1572) are more related to typographical issues such as pagination, etc. A final survey that takes into account all known copies, offering a comprehensive understanding of all variations is still a desideratum.

19. Without any proper chapter title, in Álvares (1573a, fol. 1r), the text begins abruptly with “Prima nominum declinatio”, after which follow the other declensions. Because it had been posted in front of a scholium that almost occupies a complete folio in Álvares (1974, fol. 1r), the chapter title “De nominum Declinatione” is omitted, appearing only in the ars minor’s headers along the chapter in question (Álvares 1573a, fols. 1v–2r).

20. In Álvares (1573a, fol. 6r), the text begins abruptly with the subchapter “De pronomini primitiuorum declinatione”, without any explicit chapter title. The chapter title that can be found in front of the scholia in Álvares (1974: fol. 7r) is only to be found in the respective headers of the ars minor (Álvares 1573a, fols. 5v–6r).

21. Álvares (1974, fol. 43v) introduces the category “De uerbis defectuuis”, followed by a brief scholium, ensued by observations about “Memini, Odi, & Noui”. However, the chapter “De uerbis defectuuis” does not offer any graphic distinction that allows the reader to realize that this is a separate chapter and not a subchapter of “De uerbis anomalis”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Page</th>
<th>Álvares (1573a)</th>
<th>Álvares (1974)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[title page]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[i]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[licences]</td>
<td>[ii]</td>
<td>[ii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privilegio Real.</td>
<td>[iii–iv]</td>
<td>[iii–iv]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuelis Aluari è Societate Jesu de Institutione Grammatica Liber primus.</td>
<td>[v–viii], 1v–58r</td>
<td>[v–viii], 1v–107v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praefatio.</td>
<td>[v–vi]</td>
<td>[v–vii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctoris carmen ad librum.</td>
<td>[viii]</td>
<td>[viii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ Idem ad christianum præceptorem</td>
<td>[vii]</td>
<td>[viii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auctor Lectori.</td>
<td>[viii]</td>
<td>[viii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[De nominum declinatione.]19</td>
<td>1v–6r</td>
<td>1v–7r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[De pronominum declinatione.]20</td>
<td>6r–9r</td>
<td>7r–10v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uerborum coniugatione.</td>
<td>9r–30r</td>
<td>11r–38v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uerbis anomalis.</td>
<td>30v–34v</td>
<td>38v–43v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uerbis defectuuis.</td>
<td>34v–35r</td>
<td>243v–45r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De uerborum impersonalium declinatione,</td>
<td>35v–36r</td>
<td>45v–45v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rudimenta siue de octo partibus orationis,</td>
<td>36v–45v</td>
<td>46v–63v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De generibus nominum, que ex significatione cognoscentur.</td>
<td>45v–48r</td>
<td>63v–78v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De nominum declinatione,</td>
<td>48v–54v</td>
<td>78v–93v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Under this title, Álvares (1974, fol. 108v) presents a small *scholium* in which he defines the term *syntax* and its parts. Both this text and the chapter title are omitted in the *ars minor*, so that the second book begins quite abruptly with the chapter on the intransitive construction (Álvares 1573a, fol. 58r).

23. Without any indication of being a different subject matter than “Genitiuus post uerbum”, the text begins with “Sum genitiuum petit, cum possessionem signiicat” (Álvares 1573a, fol. 67r). The chapter title “De constructione transitiua uerbi” that can be found in front of the *scholia* in Álvares (1974, fol. 125r) can only be localized on the *ars minor’s* respective headers (Álvares 1573a, fols. 67v–68r).

24. Although the chapter begins on folio 81r, the headers continue indicating that the content belongs to the chapter “De construc. uerbi actiui”. This can be observed during three double pages (Álvares 1573, fols. 82v–83r, 83v–84r and 84v–85r). It seems obvious that the confusion in the headers might have its origin in the *ars maior*, since it may already be observed in Álvares (1974, fols. 156v–157r, 158v–159r) where the header “De constructione uerbi infiniti” similarly cannot be found, like it should be (as can be observed on the correct headers in Álvares 1573a, fols. 157v–158r and 159v–169r).

25. Both in Álvares (1974, fols. 229v–236r) and in Álvares (1573a, fols. 129v–138r), the header “De ultimis syllabis” is repeated nine times, without any occurrence of what should be the correct header of this chapter, namely, “De syllaba communi”.
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In a brief analysis of this table of contents it becomes strikingly clear that the *ars minor* reproduces the original structure of the original version of the 1572 *ars maior*.

Quite obviously, typographic aspects like the reproduction (or not) of the chapter headers may diverge between the two *editiones principes* (for typographical reasons that would be due to the printer’s choice of capitals, small capitals, italics, or other elements of typographic value). Nonetheless, the comparison between the two grammars permits the understanding that even some of the *ars maior*’s vices like the repetitions of incorrect headers came to be reflected in the *ars minor*. This is yet more evident in the chapter “De iguris poet.” (which I presume to be “De figuris poeticis”). Given that the chapter is devoid of any chapter title in both grammars (Álvares 1974, fol. 238r; Álvares 1573a, fol. 140v), everything suggests that this omission has been passed on, without any correction, from the *ars maior* to the *ars minor*.

The omission of the chapter titles “De nominum declinatione” in Álvares (1573a, fol. 1r), “De pronominum declinatione” in Álvares (1573a, fol. 6r), and “De constructione transituia uerbi” in Álvares (1573a, fol. 67r) is especially striking because it allows us to perceive the genesis of the *ars minor* as a compendium of the *ars maior*. In these three cases one can observe that the chapter titles in Álvares (1974, fol. 1r, 7r, 125r) are followed immediately by quite elaborate *scholia* on the respective topics. Since most of the *ars maior*’s *scholia* were omitted, in these cases the chapter titles also suffered the same destiny. Similarly, the title “Quid sit

26. Without any indication of differing from the previous chapter, the new chapter on poetic figures begins with the paragraph titled “De Metaplasmo” (Álvares 1573a, fol. 145r). The title of this chapter is only mentioned in the header “De figuris poet.” of the following folios (Álvares 1573a, fols. 145r–146r). The same already happens in the *ars maior*, where there is no explicit reference to the chapter, while there is only a similarly implicit reference in the headers (Álvares 1974, fols. 242v–242v).
Syntaxis, & quot in partes distribuatur” in Álvares (1974, fol. 108°) was omitted, simply because the whole chapter with the definition was cut and was never taken advantage of in Álvares (1573a, fol. 58°).

4. Conclusions

While its existence had been (vaguely) known to modern researchers, I was more than moderately astounded to find that the first edition of Manuel Álvares’ ‘arte pequena’ had never before been the object of any historiographic study. On the other hand, given that the author is one of the most important Latin grammarians from the late 16th to the late 19th century, one cannot help but recognize that both he and his work are still much less known than would seem desirable.

Indeed, notwithstanding the existence of several bibliographical repertories that have tried in vain to provide adequate information about the editions of Álvares’ grammar, modern Álvaresian studies still find themselves at considerable distance from achieving a complete understanding of the real editorial universe of Álvares’ grammar. After all, a ‘simple’ collection of bibliographical data would not be enough. Such an undertaking should rather involve the elaboration of criteria according to which such contents are to be organized.

Without wanting to anticipate an answer for such a systematization before the undertaking of a thorough scientific analysis of the elements that are to be included (which must of course be preceded by a bibliographical survey that should be as thorough and complete as possible), the historic importance of Álvares’ grammar for the Society of Jesus leads me to consider firstly the complete grammar Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres (Álvares 1572). As this is the author’s grammar in its most elaborate form, I propose that this edition and all of the editions of Álvares’ grammar that reproduce the essence of the text of his three books, be designated ars maior.

Similarly, the 1573 publication of an abridged version (Álvares 1573a) has undoubtedly established an independent tradition of Álvares’ grammar, hence I propose using the term ars minor (like the term used for designating the student version of Donatus’ grammar).

The choice of an adequate traditional terminology seems only fitting, if one considers the grammar’s global projection along the centuries. After all, the ars minor was not only reprinted in Portugal (where between 1608 and 1755 none of the other two variants of Álvares’ grammar was reissued), but it was also published in several other countries during the late 16th century, like in Aragón/Spain (1579), Italy (1588), Japan (1594) and France (1594) — without considering other editions that are of yet unknown…
Also, it seems quite obvious that the second book De constructione octo partivm orationis liber, which has been published separately since 1570, should constitute one of the key bibliographical cornerstones for the organization of a systematization of the universe of Álvares’ grammar.

As a result of my brief analysis of the table of contents, I think I may conclude that a strong proximity can be observed between the contents of both editiones principes. While the manuscript for the 1573 ars minor is not conserved, the existence of annotated copies that were used for other 16th-century editions of Álvares’ grammar leads me to presume that the author might have used a printed copy of Álvares (1572) where he erased the content he wanted to omit. The obvious vices (in the typographical sense) which Álvares (1573a) retained from Álvares (1572) also indicate that he would have used a printed copy of his grammar as a manuscript.

The most essential distinctions between the 1572 ars maior and the 1573 ars minor, however, are the paratext “Auctor Lectori” as well as the almost complete absence of the scholia in the latter grammar. Indeed, the lack of these grammatical, critical or explanatory comments that have been serving as evidence of the author’s erudition mark the beginning of a coexistence of the two variants of Álvares’ grammar in the form of ‘teacher’s handbook’ vs. ‘student’s textbook‘ for the subsequent centuries (that is, outside of Portugal, where since 1608 the only reprints made were those of the ars minor). Consequently, modern researchers would do well to refrain from indiscriminately using any given edition of Álvares’ grammar without previously checking whether it is the ars maior or the ars minor they are using for their research.
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SUMMARY

Based on a hitherto unknown copy of Manuel Álvares’ (1526–1583) very significant Latin grammar *Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres* (Lisbon, 1573), this paper presents the first edition of what the author himself (in a Spanish letter to his superior in Rome) once called ‘arte pequeña.’ Additionally, the present paper exploits the distinction of *ars minor* vs. *ars maior* as a means of investigating the separate publishing history of the student’s textbook (Álvares 1573a) in comparison to the teacher’s handbook (Álvares 1572), thus enabling a better understanding of the impact these two grammars have had all over the world from the 16th century to the 20th century.

RÉSUMÉ

Basé sur un exemplaire jusqu’ici inconnu de l’éminente grammaire latine de Manuel Álvares (1526–1582) *Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres* (Lisbonne, 1573), cet article présente cette première édition de ce que l’auteur lui-même (dans une lettre en espagnol à son supérieur à Rome) a appelé une fois *arte pequeña* “petite grammaire”. A titre additionnel, il explore le concept d’*ars minor* vs. *ars maior*, comme un moyen d’enquête sur l’histoire de la publication séparée du manuel de l’élève (Álvares 1573a), par rapport au livre du maître (Álvares 1572), permettant ainsi une meilleure compréhension de l’impact que ces deux grammaires ont eu partout dans le monde du XVIe siècle jusqu’au XXe siècle.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

Anhand eines bislang unbekannten Exemplars von Manuel Álvares’ (1526–1583) grundlegender Lateingrammatik *Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres* (Lissabon, 1573), stellt dieser Beitrag vor, was der Verfasser selbst (in einem Brief auf Spanisch an seinen Vorgesetzten in Rom) einmal als ‘arte pequeña’ bezeichnet hatte. Zudem untersuche ich das Konzept von *ars minor* vs. *ars maior* als Mittel einer Untersuchung der unterschiedlichen Veröffentlichungstradition der Schülergrammatik (Álvares 1573a) im Vergleich zur Lehrergrammatik (Álvares 1572), wodurch ein besseres Verständnis der Wirkung ermöglicht werden soll, die beide Grammatiken weltweit vom 16. bis zum 20. Jahrhundert hatten.
RESUMO

Con base en un ejemplar hasta ahora desconocido de la gramática latina fundamental de Manuel Álvares (1526–1583) intitulada Emmanvelis Alvari è Societate Iesv de institvtione grammatica libri tres (Lisboa, 1573), este trabajo presenta la primera edición de lo que el propio autor (en una carta a su superior español en Roma) una vez llamara ‘arte pequeña’. Además, exploto el concepto ars minor vs. ars maior como medio de investigar la historia editorial diferente del manual del alumno (Álvares 1573a) en comparación con el manual del profesor (Álvares 1572), lo que permitirá una mejor comprensión del impacto que estas dos gramáticas han tenido en todo el mundo desde el siglo XVI hasta el siglo XX.
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