

Essays in Medieval Studies 5

[Page numbers of the printed text appear at the right in bold.]

page 71

**John Trevisa and the English and Continental Traditions
of *De proprietatibus rerum***

West Virginia State College

The first two Volumes of Trevisa's translation of Bartholomaeus Anglicus' encyclopedia used 2 Latin texts as controls for editing the Middle English text--MS Bodley 749 and the Vatican copy of a text printed in 1485 by Georg Husner of Strasbourg. The textual commentary uses some 18 Latin MSS to consider what Latin Trevisa may have actually had before him.¹ Just how much, though, has been studied? The Latin text was not edited, but several studies of different portions were made: M. C. Seymour, the general editor, collated the first 5 folios of each book; Ralph Hanna studied Book V; Susan Clinton's work on Book X is separately available as her doctoral thesis, and Traugott Lawler did Book XI.

The average folio of the English MSS provides for just under six pages in the printed text, so five folios means just under thirty pages. There are 1,396 pages; taking away Books V, X, and XI and the first thirty pages of each other Book leaves 715 pages not included in the survey of Latin MSS for the textual commentary. That accounts for just under half the text, then, but favors the first Volume: the three Books studied are all there, it contains thirteen Books to the second's six, and the unsurveyed material in the second Volume is nearly three quarters of all unsurveyed material.

page 72

Would results based mostly on the first half of the text be sufficiently representative of the whole?

A quick check for comparison is to collate, edit, and study the results of the last half of the last Book; and this is what I have done--the sections on mathematics, measures, and music. This section is thrice the size of Clinton's Book X, about 3% of the whole encyclopedia and just over 8% of the unsurveyed part of Volume 2. The results are somewhat different from those published by Clinton and in the textual commentary. Clinton finds her

evidence... points to two large groups, IJLOTV(M) and NPQRSUWXY. Within IJLOTV, JLV are very closely related, perhaps copies of the same exemplar; IT form a pair. M is more remotely related to the group than the others. The relationship of manuscripts in the second group, outside of the possible pairing of PW, remains unclear. (59)

The textual commentary's results are rather similar: [IK] [(JLV)OTX₁] [(MNQ)SUX₂X₃Y] [PRW] with O possibly based on a MS like R and with S appearing "to change its character at the end of Book IV" (3:4).

In the last part of the last book, however, one large family of MSS appears: JLNSTUVY, within which JS and NT are pairs and JLSVY is a group; but JLV is not as close as for Clinton or the textual commentary. Of the other MSS, PQR form a trio and WX₃ form a loose pair. I and O are free agents, both separately contaminated with NT. (K is wholly lacking, M is mostly missing, and Y lacks perhaps a quarter of the text.) Of the correcting hands, that for U evidently used a source not related to JLNSTVY.

When M. C. Seymour surveyed "Some Medieval English Owners of *De proprietatibus rerum*" the year before the Trevisa translation appeared, he noted that, "Because of textual incompatibility (in some cases supported by a later date of writing or inaccessibility in a known location), none of [the MSS listed] could have been used by Trevisa as the copy-text for his translation" (157 n. 1). Trevisa finished his translation at Berkeley on 6 February 1398/99, as he himself tells us (1396); any MS he could have used must have been written before then and must have been available

to him for some time, if not in his personal possession then at least available for lengthy consultation somewhere he could be for long periods.

One likely suspect, as Seymour noted, is the MS willed in 1368 by Simon Bredon (d. 1372) to Queen's Hall, Oxford, which Trevisa had entered in 1369.² Trevisa might have had this in his hands for a time. On 6 January 1376, Thomas Carlisle, a northerner, was elected provost of Queen's; the southerners, among whom was counted Trevisa, objected to this. The dispute went on and, two years and four days later, the southerners took off with many items of college property, including the college seal. Repeated demands for return of the property, including books, led to an indenture drawn upon 13 May 1378 attesting the return of goods including the college seal and twenty-four books whose *secundo folio* incipits are recorded. *De proprietatibus rerum* is not on this list; but the list may have been incomplete, for as late as 20 October 1379 John Trevisa is cited among others who had not yet returned various goods, including unspecified books.³ Even if Bredon's copy were not one of the books taken, Trevisa may have had access to it earlier and long after, for he evidently rented rooms at Queens, whether or not he occupied them, in the 1380's and 1390's (Fowler "New Light" 305), not long before he finished this translation.

Regardless of date or location, however, the MSS used could be taken in varying degrees as representing their lost ancestors or other relatives which Trevisa might have consulted. Still, the lack of closeness between Trevisa's translation and what the Latin MSS offer is complicated not just by the sometimes bewildering variety of choices available among the variants but also by the fact that good English often requires grammatical and rhetorical constructions different from those of Bartholomew's Latin. For example, *nam particularia. quorum quolibet sunt in se perfecta. perfecta sunt quando ad unitatem sunt redacta* (4.15-5.1) is rendered "for alle particulere [th]inges, [th]e whiche euerich is parfite in hitsilf, be[th] parfite whan [th]ey be[th] redact into oon" (1355.14-16). Since Trevisa translated *quolibet* as "euerich," the verb *sunt* needs be singular--"is." This sort of matter does not help us discover the Latin he worked from. Similarly, his preference for native English active verbs in parataxis over Latin passive verbs

and participles in hypotaxis blurs our view of what Latin conjunctions, inflections, or other details lay before him when he wrote: when he renders *Universitatis conditor Deus in circulo designatur* (46.9-10) as "God is creatour and makere of alle and is designed in a cercle" (1369.24-25), we cannot tell if the first "is" occurs because Trevisa saw *Universitatis est conditor Deus* as in NOQT or because he added it himself to make better sense in English. To these must be added Trevisa's peculiarities, such as the habit of occasionally adding his own comments or examples,⁴ his penchant for English doublets (even occasional triplets) for Latin words or phrases,⁵ and his evident dislike for *sive* and *vel*, generally rendered as "and."⁶ In addition to the comments he added, often there are bits and pieces he left out, which may be due to their being lost in his Latin copy, to their loss in the tradition of copying Trevisa's text itself, or to his own omission of them.⁷

As Lawler points out, Trevisa's vocabulary could reduce a variety of Latin words into a single English one (281-82), even though it vacillates between giving "an English technical vocabulary" and giving "the Latin term currency in English" (280). He modifies what Perry before him had pointed out (*civ*), showing how Trevisa earlier might "sacrifice accuracy for intelligibility" but in *De proprietatibus rerum* has "a firmer regard for accuracy" (282). This helps us discover the Latin behind Trevisa's Middle English. Where he reproduces the Latin term alone or in a doublet, we can be fairly certain of the reading in his Latin text; elsewhere, we cannot. Thus *Dorica cytharum* at 107.6--for Isidore's *Dorica lingua kioapa* (III.22.2)--with its bewildering array of variants among the Latin MSS, is in Trevisa simply what he saw: *toricha citharum* (1391.22).

Nonetheless, Trevisa did nod at the end of this long work; e.g., he anglicizes *reducuntur* and *redacta* to "be[th] reduct" and "be[th] redact" (4.14 and 5.1, 1355.12 and .16) where Fristedt would expect a form of "a[y]enlede."⁸ Similarly, he does not grasp that *Dyatesseron enim et dyapente et diapason ab antecedentis numeri nominibus nuncupantur* (115.1-2) means that the name *dyatesseron* is based on the earlier numerical term *tessera* and that *dyapente* is based on the prefix *penta-*, though we should excuse his not realizing *diapason* is based on the Greek for "stave"; instead of telling us that these terms were coined from preexisting numeric

terms, he confuses us by saying they "haue[th] [th]e names of [th]e nombres [th]at go[th] tofore in [th]e bigynnyng of [th]e names" (1393.29-30).

But usually the translation is what produces uncertainties about what Trevisa saw. For example, in the beginning of the text, we read *Ad dictas proprietates rebus insertas* (1.3), which Trevisa gives as "To [th]e forsaide propretees of [th]inges" (1353.25); "foraide" could represent either *dictas* as in most MSS or *predictas* as in WX, and "of [th]inges" does not let us know if his Latin copy-text read *rebus insertas* as in OPQRU, *rerum insertas* as in INT, or *rebus insectas* as in JLSVWXY. The lack of closer rendition may reflect Trevisa's confusion or unwillingness to deal more precisely with but a small phrase of little significance. And Trevisa often simplified, which further complicates attempts to find what he worked from: the nice *bis senos scilicet xii* becomes the simple and clear "twies sixe" (30.6 1363.23), the self-evident definition of a sphere--*exterius evexa interius convexa*--the natural "holow wi[th]inne" (44.13-14 1368.34), and the redundant *Mulgarium est vas in quo pecorum lac mulgetur* the direct "Mulgarium is a milkyng vessel" (69.4-5 1378.22).

There are quite a few instances where none of these sixteen Latin MSS can account for Trevisa's translation. Clinton noticed in her study of Book X that, although "W agrees with the translation most often, this may be because it is an early manuscript of high quality that preserves a text of the same calibre as Trevisa's reconstructed Latin source" (76). Where his copy agrees in correct readings, its affiliation cannot be identified. Quite often when Trevisa agrees in correct readings involving numbers and other matters, we cannot know if this is by independent correction or by his having had a good Latin copy.⁹

Yet it must be remembered that Trevisa was frequently a bit careless in his intent to translate the ideas faithfully. For example, at 76.1 Bartholomew, listing some measures, finished up saying that a *pertica* is *passus ii, id est pedes x*: Trevisa has the correct *x* at the end, thus agreeing with IOQW (X has no reading and the rest have *xx*), but does not correct his error "elleuene" for *ii id est* in spite of having been reminded just a few words before that a *passus* is *pedes v* (1380.35). The error is not original with him, for it also appears in SUW, so it seems that for this whole passage he could have had a good text, like W, before him. Where Bartholomew

discusses how among numbers *alius pariter par, alius pariter impar, alius est impariter par* (20.14-21.1, Trevisa simply states "Som is par, and some is vnpar" (1360.18-19). Though here the Latin MSS are confused, they are basically clear when the terms are defined individually; but in Trevisa the distinction is wholly lost: *pariter par* becomes simply "par" (21.1 1360.19) and *pariter impar, impariter par, and impariter impar* all become "impar" (21.7 1360.24, 21.11 1360.28, and 22.3 1360.33).

At times it seems we find Trevisa following two texts simultaneously. When giving references, he gives *de materia ... materia* as *de materia vel natura ... natura* where Q has *natura* both times at 53.4-5 (1372.12-13), his spelling "Phisolagia" is close to O's *phisalogie* and R's *phisologie* at 74.6 (1380.16), and he follows U² in adding *Ezechielis* to the *xl* at 76.5 while following X in adding *capitulum d* (1381.4-5).¹⁰ Where Bartholomew wrote *centurias* at 75.7, Trevisa first follows JLNOTU with "centories" and then adds the spelling of IQ as an alternative: "o[th]er centuries" (1380.27). When dealing with 86.12, Trevisa did not recall Matthew 10: 29 *nonne duo passeris esse veneunt* as witnessed by the confusion in the Middle English MSS over the last word, which is spelled out only in NT of the Latin MSS--*IQU* have *v* and *JLOPRSVWX* have *ve*. The Middle English MSS are split over variations upon *veniunt* evidently followed by some form of *vyfe* (1385.8). Here, his comparing MSS could explain the readings, if we assume he noted down *ve* from one MS, which he understood as meaning *veneunt*, and added *v* from another, then taken as the number five.

On the whole, Trevisa's translation does not seem to follow any of the main textual groups, being more eclectic, as already seems evident from the examples posed. Simply counting up the support of Latin MSS where Trevisa errs in fairly certain agreement finds that his Latin copy resembled most, in order, Q in seventeen errors, R and X in thirteen, P in twelve, and I, O, and W in ten.¹¹ Anything else--including JLNSTV and U, but ignoring the incomplete M and

Y--agrees with Trevisa less than ten times. It is curious that IOPQRWX in agreement also tend to show readings original to Bartholomew (although they do not form a family). Why, again, JLNSTV is isolated as a group is not clear. But it is clear that in this part of *De proprietatibus rerum* Trevisa's Latin copy most resembles the trio PQR, Q most of all, then X, and then I, O, and W.

page 77

Nonetheless, Trevisa's Latin copy does not resemble PQR as a group: that is, readings supported by the trio PQR which help us to identify these as a group are not readings that Trevisa seems to have seen in the Latin. Rather, his Latin copy bears some resemblance to what PQR came from. Earlier, we saw that X, though having some loose relationship to W, is generally independent of the MSS edited; here, it is as close to what Trevisa saw as are P and R. PQRX does not form a related group of MSS except insofar as the translation is concerned; it occurs only once in error, at 44.9, adding a superfluous *scilicet* after *vero* where Bartholomew discusses finding a "geometric" middle and gives the example that *vi et xii multiplicata faciunt septuagesies dispondius, media vero viii et ix multiplicata tantum faciunt*. Evidently not understanding this simple arithmetic, Trevisa omits the latter part, leaving only "sixe and twelue ymultiplied make[th] two and seuenty" (1368.28-29).¹²

As in our conclusions about the MSS' relationships, Clinton's conclusions and mine about what Trevisa's Latin copy most resembled again differ but for the possibility that Trevisa compared texts. In the latter part of Book XIX, Trevisa's copy was something resembling both the ancestor of PQR and that of X; in Book X "Trevisa's primary exemplar seems to have been a manuscript related to the group NPQRSUWXY. It is safe to rule out P, R, and Y as possibilities," though "he sometimes followed readings exclusive to IJLMOTV" (76). Ruling out P, R, and Y leaves NQSUX; so the only agreement we have is that W and X look at all like what Trevisa saw. The two being generally unrelated late in Book XIX and not particularly close in Book X leads to the conclusion that Trevisa conflated copies or owned a copy that itself had conflated different traditions. Seymour concludes that Trevisa's copy-text was related to a subgroup JLOTVX, "a single Latin manuscript, no longer extant, primarily of an L-type text which had been sporadically conflated with an I-type manuscript" (3: 9). His evidence is based on selected readings throughout the work, though favoring the first thousand pages, and is admittedly provisional. Now, of course, the three of us obviously disagree, but I would say that this apparent contradiction is due to the evidence surveyed, to its presentation, and to the history of how Bartholomew's text was copied on the continent.

page 78

In his 1974 article, Seymour included the British Library Sloane MSS 471 and 511, written by English hands, among those of English origin; but for the Trevisa project not only were the fragmentary and abridged MSS left out of consideration but so also were these two, for they were considered as being "of the French rather than of the English tradition" (Clinton 12). In all, Seymour traced 23 substantial MSS (157), 15 with extracts including one in Welsh (158), 5 in bindings (156-57 n. 4), 36 references to ownership (159-63), and 7 uses by other writers in English (164). International travel and commerce were well developed and the English "nation" at the University of Paris had already had a long history, its seal first appearing on an act of 1252 and some of its masters founding St. Andrews University in Scotland as late as 1413 (Toulouse 16, 28). Bartholomew himself had taught at Paris ¹³and left long before Trevisa began his translation.¹⁴ Even during Trevisa's lifetime the Hundred Years War did little to lessen the English nation's lists of *suppositi*, those over whom the nation had jurisdiction (Boyce 31, 28 n.4).

Trevisa himself travelled abroad. In his translation of Higden's *Polychronicon*, which he says he finished 8 April 1387, he noted that he had seen the hot baths "at Akene in Almayne" and used those "at Egges in Sauoy" (2:61), that he changed money at "Brisak uppon [th]e Ryne" (6: 259), and that Higden is wrong about there being only one kind of French, for "[th]ere is as many dyuers manere Frensche in [th]e reem of Fraunce as is dyuerse manere Engliche in [th]e reem of Engeland" (2:161). Clearly, he must have crossed the Channel, passed through Belgium or Holland to Aachen just inside Germany, then probably to Cologne for a boat trip along the Rhine, stopping at Breisach (just west of Freiburg) not far from the Swiss border, and on, either inland through Aix-les-Bains between Geneva and Grenoble or elsewhere, maybe stopping at Aix-les-Bains on the return trip, perhaps a land route across France, though when he speaks of "money of turoneis" he merely speculates about practice in Tours (6:259). If he went to Italy on this trip, he did not reach Rome, for his comment that the Coliseum "was [th]e place of [th]e yimages of provinces and of londes"

(6: 337) betrays his ignorance and simple repetition of what Higden wrote before (1: 216-19) and his comment that the "Alpes bee[th] hi[y]e hilles in Lumbardie side" (4:343) shows no particular visit beyond the Alps.

page 79

This was not his only trip abroad, for the Close Rolls show that on 29 January 1387/8 Angelus Christofre, a Lombard banker living in London, received a license to make a letter of exchange for twenty marks payable to Trevisa, probably for a trip to Italy (Richard II 5: 524). And the Treaty Rolls in the Public Record Office show he gave power of attorney to Robert of Hodersale and William of Faryngton on 5 November 1390 when he was about to go abroad--*qui de licencia Regis ad partes transmarinas profecturus est* (Perry lxviii). Evidently, by the time he finished this translation in 1398 he had already been on the continent at least three times. Since he could have obtained a copy of *De proprietatibus rerum* on any of his trips, he could well have used a MS not of English origin. Further work, then, should include study of continental MSS, especially those in England.

There are eleven complete manuscripts of continental origin now in England, and six incomplete ones.¹⁵ In Europe and the US, there are well over one hundred more.¹⁶ Only a few were available to me, and to satisfy curiosity just a little I looked at them in a few places where certain MS groups had unique readings and where the general picture was of interest.¹⁷

For example, among both the English and the continental MSS sometimes there is glossing, sometimes there is not. At 11.9-10, saying Aristotle praised God by the number three, LQUVWX have the gloss *Nota de frigiditate virili*, though it does not make much sense. This gloss is given also in twelve continental MSS,¹⁸ it is omitted from two others (El Esc o and Ste-Gen, just as in NT), and thirteen more MSS lack glosses at large, just like IJOPRSY.¹⁹ One other MS reads instead *Nota de firmitate virili*, and four more agree in this reading but place it by 12.5-7, which says the quadrangle signifies the stability of the Church and of the faithful soul.²⁰ Evidently it was misplaced in the majority. Much later, at 94.1-4 on subtle voices, the gloss in LNTWX and probably also in QUV (where it may be in the gutter) reads *Nota contra juvenes doctores*; here fourteen continental MSS agree, two omit it, a leaf is missing in yet another, the same thirteen and IJOPRSY have no glosses, and two MSS show variants: *Nota contra detractores juvenes* and *Nota juvenes doctores*.²¹ Similarly, where some chapter divisions were not made by one or more of the English MSS, those chapter divisions were also not made in some continental ones and may even have been corrected.²²

page 80

Where readings unique to known groups were checked, a curious event occurred: readings peculiar to INT and to JLNSTV were almost without exception not attested by any continental MS.²³ Eight unique errors of PQR surveyed among the continental MSS produced an interesting find:²⁴ BN lat 346A agrees throughout, two more agree but when they lack portions of the text, and at least six of the eight errors are shared by six other MSS. Moreover, BN lat 16099 would agree with PQR seven times, having its own error once, but for corrections in all but two of the readings chosen. Sixteen of the MSS never agree with PQR. All of those sixteen but one agree with WX at least six of nine times, with an ambiguous abbreviation the only thing forbidding complete agreement among WX and two of them, which never agree with PQR.²⁵

Further, where Trevisa's Latin copy evidently read *Exechielis xl capitulum d* (76.5, 1381.4-5), this is the reading only in the English MS X and in twelve of the continental MSS.²⁶ Though this would make it seem Trevisa used a MS related to WX and the continental cousins, it is not necessarily so, for later his version *toricha* (1391.22) seems based on *torica* (107.6) in MRV and Arras, Autun, BN lat 346A, 16098, and 16099, Brugge, Brux 7568, El Esc o, Hunter 391, Schullian, Sloane 511, Ste-Gen, and Upp, which was later compared to some other copy (like T or C-F, Eins, Kob, Praha, Reims, W 2337, or Zürich) and expuncted to show an eyeskip that left out this word. Here, his Latin copy evidently would not resemble a MS like WX and its relatives.

Moreover, we know that--on the continent--*De proprietatibus rerum* was copied in the University of Paris *pecia* system. In the university list of 1275 that defines the prices of books the stationers should make available to the scholars, the work is included as being in 102 *pecie* for rent at four *sous* apiece; in the list of 1304, it is in 100 *pecie* at six *sous* apiece.²⁷ The complexities of what copying by *pecia* means are too much to go into here, but I will note two

things. First, if we estimate how much text each *pecia* would take, we can divide up our text into *presumed pecia* texts and see if MSS change affiliations from one such portion to another; in the section I have studied, some did while others did not. So far as I know, no copy of *De proprietatibus rerum* with marks showing *pecia* divisions has come to light. But effects of the *pecia* system can be felt in a general way.

page 81

Although the MSS ranged widely in number of folios, from U's 183 to N's 343, the average was 236; when the stationers provided *De proprietatibus rerum* in 100 *pecie*, this meant one *pecia* would produce 2.36 leaves, and when in 102 *pecia* 2.31 leaves. If we rely on an average 101 *pecie*, the result is 2.34 leaves. The result for each individual MS would be different, of course, but at present it is the average that concerns us, since it is the fairly constant size of the text that is, in effect, the common denominator of all the inconstant sizes of the MSS. My portion of Book XIX averages about 9.37 leaves, ranging from barely over six in W to nearly twenty in X. So if a *pecia* would result in about 2.34 leaves, then the average 9.37 leaves in my portion should be the product of a shade over four *pecie*. Although this does not discover the actual demarcations (particularly since the final *pecia* probably also included the list of authors, not part of the text edited), it does reveal that--if the MSS vary affiliation because of different *pecie* in their traditions--such variations could be discoverable by considering the text one fourth at a time.[28](#)

An interesting thing happened with the trio PQR: although it agreed 13 times in the first quarter and 12 times in the last, it agreed only 6 times in the second and 4 times in the third. Most notably, the pair WX varied greatly in closeness. The two almost never agree in the first and last quarters--only 4 and 3 times--but are much closer in the middle, agreeing in the second 9 times and in the third 8 times (though three of these as IWX). Unless a threefold increase of coincidental agreement can account for this, it seems evident that the background of these two MSS implies changes of exemplars.

While the numbers themselves are not particularly significant, the changing frequency is, for it is that which indicates subtle shifts of affiliation from part to part and thus implies potential changes of *pecia* exemplars. This may best be seen in U's increasing agreement with JLNSTV: without I and O, U agrees with JLNSTV only 3 times in the first quarter and 5 in the second, but this grows to 12 times in the third and 16 in the last. So what is U doing in the first two? In the second, nothing in particular, for it never agrees with anything else more than twice. In the first, it agrees with P and with X 3 times apiece and with I 4 times; this may mean very little, for IU occurs 5 times in the third and 3 times in the fourth quarters, and both I and U agree with JLNSTV 4 times and

page 82

3 times in the last two quarters respectively. Only in the third quarter does JLSUV occur, and that only 3 times. So it appears that the ancestry of U may well lie in the Paris university *pecia* system, and that U's readings increasingly come from the common ancestor of JLNSTV

Second, the fact of copying by *pecia* means that results of MS study for some portions of the whole text may not agree with results of study of other portions. Some MSS--English as well as continental--may descend from within the *pecia* system, others from without, and yet others may be mixed. Only a complete study can show which ones descend how. These three different surveys produce similar yet divergent results because of the nature of what was surveyed. The transmission of *De proprietatibus rerum* both within the Paris university *pecia* system and without it has produced a tradition where the MSS may or may not shift their allegiance from one section to another, where they are at times unwavering and at times seemingly arbitrary in deciding with whom, with what other MS, they will side.

There is yet room for one final example: in Book XVIII,[29](#) Wien 2287 reads *Si quis fumigaverit domos formicarum, flores et germina et frondes corrodendo violant*--if anyone fumigates the ants' homes, they ravage the flowers, buds, and foliage by gnawing away at them. It is not that the ants are really this vengeful, but that the MS has lost about a half a column, comprising *cum sulphere velorigani ... ad summitates arborum scandunt*. The continental MS Schullian agrees in this omission, as do Eins and the English MS Y. Now, even though the missing text is added in the bottom margins of BN lat 346A, BN lat 16099, and the English MS Q, a most remarkable thing happens: BN lat 346A simply adds the text, Q glosses it, and BN lat 16099 places those glosses inside the addition and marks them by underlining.[30](#)

However, we cannot tell whether Trevisa saw a copy with the text where it belonged or in the margins, just that he did not have a copy that lacked that portion of the text.

This conspicuous instance of textual error and correction shows both the necessity and the difficulty of studying all the available MSS and throughout the whole of the text. The relationships of the Latin MSS are mutable and fickle, depending on which portions of the text are read; settling their relationships is difficult enough, but clearly it cannot be done by surveying bits and pieces

page 83

as we all have done to date. Discovering Trevisa's Latin relies heavily on a certain identification of the textual relationships, yet even so striking an instance as the last can have little import in the context of identifying his Latin source.

Either Trevisa used two or more unrelated MSS or he had a single MS conflated of two (or more) traditions represented in England by different branches of a textual tradition originating on the continent. In this, all three of our studies agree. It is undeniable that the tradition of copying *De proprietatibus rerum* in England is an integral part of its being copied in France, in Germany, Spain, Italy, and elsewhere. The different results shown by the textual commentary to the Trevisa edition, by Clinton, and here should not be seen as contradictory or inconclusive; rather, they should indicate the reality of a complex textual tradition underlying the history and development of Bartholomew's text and the fragile state of our understanding of Trevisa's work at translating it. To return to the opening question, we can answer that each study is sufficient to the material it surveys. Results summarized above are as precise as possible for the small portion of the whole encyclopedia studied; results given elsewhere are accurate representations of what can be known given what had been investigated. What remains is to begin with the discoveries of all and, acknowledging the strengths and apparent disparities, to reach forwards towards a more full understanding and appreciation based not on isolated sections or on hopeful surveys, but on thorough study of the whole encyclopedia and its history.

Notes

1. The sigla and MSS are listed in the appendix, below. References to the Latin text are to my edition unless specified as to the Minerva reprint of the whole work; those to Trevisa's translation are to the Oxford edition. These are given by page and line number, separated by a dot; Trevisa references are identifiable as usually having page numbers of four digits and should be clear from context. Superscript numbers 1 and 2 with MS sigla indicate states before correction (or original hands) and after (correcting hands). The siglum "X" refers to different MSS in the context of different parts of the text, as indicated on p. 92.
2. But Seymour adds later that, if this were the same MS later bequeathed by Robert Rygge (once chancellor of Oxford) to Exeter Cathedral, it could not be the MS Trevisa used, for the readings of this MS, extant as Bodley 749 (L), do not match the translation (161). If Trevisa were willing to travel from Berkeley to Oxford to consult a MS of *De proprietatibus rerum*, then he might also have been willing to travel an equal distance elsewhere. For example, Hereford, just about as far in another direction, had at least two copies not noted by Seymour in 1974: William Davy (d. 6 October 1383), rector of Kingsland, county of Hereford, in a draft will of 10 February 1383 left a copy to Master Nicholas Brydpor[t]; and John Trefnant, bishop of Hereford 1389-1404, owned a copy with a *secundo folio* recorded as *sive localis* (probably *[men]surae localis* Minerva 9) and a value estimated at six marks (Charles and Emanuel 355-56). The lesson of Seymour's article and these two additional examples is that more copies were available in England for Trevisa's use than for ours. I was able to notify Mr. Seymour about these additional references barely in time for the textual commentary (3: 9 n. 3, continued from 2 n. 3).
3. For details of this matter and others in Trevisa's life see Fowler's works, here particularly "John Trevisa and the English Bible." The list of books mentioned is reproduced by Magrath (1:126) and Fowler (94). Higden's *Polychronicon*, another work translated by Trevisa, is among those books listed, and Trevisa shows some familiarity with the contents of a few more there. A copy of the indenture is printed in *The Stonor Letters and Papers* (1:12-13).
4. Those in the portion I edited are swiftly listed: 1355.28-29 "and horse," .30 "and o[th]er white [th]inges," .34 "o[th]er subiecte," .35 "as colour and sauour"; 1356.26 "By [th]at vnite God and man is oon," .27-28 "in [th]re persones and oon God," .35-36 "as man is animal and hors is animal,

and so of o[th]er bestes"; 1359.30-31 "and endynge"; 1361.33-34 "But here he speke[th] of euene mesuryng party [th]at is so ofte ytake [th]at it make[th] euene [th]e same nombre"; 1362.13-14 "as oon tweyne"; 1363.16 "or [th]e four[th]e"; 1367.21 "in leng[th]e and brede and fernes"; 1367.35-1368.1 "and is al yliche longe, brode, and depe"; 1368.13 "in [th]is wise"; 1370.24-25 "if tweye lynes be[th] ydrawe and strecche[th] fro tweye corneres to [th]e contrary corneres"; and 1375.22-23 "as paners, basketes."

5. I counted eighty-eight doublets, five Latin doublets turned into English triplets, and twenty-eight reductions of Latin doublets. On these in general, as well as other broad stylistic features, see Traugott Lawler's "On the Properties of John Trevisa's Major Translations," especially pages 275 to the end (doublets are discussed briefly on pages 278-79); Fristedt (3: 28-29); and Perry (civ-cix).

page 85

Whether or not Trevisa was involved in the translation of the Bible, he may have felt obliged to distance himself from that translation by this time. The earliest versions of the Wycliffite Bible bore alternative translations, rather than doublets, and some brief notes underlined in red (so they could be found easily later) and joined by "or" or "either," which the later version would resolve. Copies of that version frequently misunderstood the significance of the underlining and thus either reproduced it blindly in the same ink as the writing or ignored it. (This practice of underlining alternative translations and occasional explanations in red is not, of course, visible in Forshall and Madan's edition but must be consulted in the MSS themselves, such as MS Bodley 959 and its copy and continuation, MS Douce 369.) The later version generally shows these alternatives to have been resolved, so they and the underlining have disappeared.

Knowing of the practice of translating *via* alternatives joined by "or" or "either," Trevisa may well have deliberately employed "and" in their stead. Indeed, Fristedt traces a gradual shift from "or" to "and" in the translation of the *Polychronicon* and notes that "The introduction of duplicate renderings and very short explications preceded by *or*, *ether* and sporadic *that is* constitutes the main characteristic of the First Revision" of the Wycliffite Bible (3:29).

The same habit may be found in some MSS of the translation, probably made by a Lollard, of Clement of Llanthony's gospel harmony, possible related to the Early Version of the Wycliffite Bible. In MS Bodley 771, for example, we find red-underlined additions and alternatives such as these: "In [th]e bigynnyng *ei[th]er first of alle*" f. 8, he [th]at sei[th] to his bro[th]er racha [th]at is a word of scorn shal be guilty of counsel" f. 23, and 'leue[th] ouer *ei[th]er is superflu*" f. 33. The text is the same in MSS Bodley 481 and 978 but for the underlining, and the latter shows signs of someone's having gone about expuncting such interjections as "forso[th]e" and "so[th]eli." It seems that the intent was to mark thus anything added to the literal translation; e.g., "fissis" once after "goode" and again after "yuele" (from Latin nominal adjectives) is underlined in a passage comparing the realm of Heaven to a net cast into the sea, from which afterwards "[th]e goode" are separated from "[th]e yuele" (f. 7).

6. The reason for this is speculated on in the preceding note.

7. For a list of readings where Trevisa or his Latin copy does not match any of the MSS used here, see Appendix D in my thesis. One example may be of immediate interest, though, an item of censorship in the section discussing different kinds of roads: Bartholomew notes that prostitutes often gather and wait at crossroads, saying *In biviis etiam expectant vel circumveniunt meretrices* (79.14-80.1). This is too delicate for Trevisa, and he proposes in its place the warning "And also comyns ben ofte yrobbed in suche place" (1382.21). Similarly, he could not bear to translate the discussion of menstruation in Book IV and so just copied the Latin without translating it (154.18-155.30).

8. This I surmise from his conviction that Trevisa was among the Wycliffite translators (3: 39-41), from the understanding that the translators worked to a definite set of established principles and attempted a standard vocabulary, and from the entry in his "Word-List" (2: 153) showing *reducis* translated as "a[y]nledist" in Genesis 8: 3, the "first appearance of the rendering" in the Wycliffite Bible (2: 122). In summing up his look at the translation of the *Polychronicon* ascribed to Trevisa, he asserts that the "author of the partly emended draft in H 1 was a (Lollard) versionist whose method of translation and vocabulary closely agree

page 86

with those of that Bible. This author can be no other than Trevisa" (3:39). See also Lindberg 129-30.

9. At 2.9 the context implies that *mathematica* is the most reasonable reading in the phrase *sine cognitione numeri nullius scientia mathematica possidetur* but MS support for that is weak and split among *mathematica* (certain in IX¹), *mechanica*, *methaphisica*, or some combination of these (where the abbreviations' intent is clear); yet Trevisa does read "mathematica" (1354.13). Though at 4.16 *sunt in se perfecta perfecta sunt* is quite confused in the Latin MSS, but for QU² because of the *perfecta perfecta* Trevisa does give it as "is parfite in hitsilf be[th] parfite" (1355.15). At 16.10 *aliis paribus* is given as "so [th]at he be liche in o[th]re [th]inges" (1359.15) where all but INQST have *aliis paribus*. Trevisa sees or infers correct numbers at 21.3-4 (1360.21), 21.8 (1360.25), 26.8 (1362.16), 26.9 (1362.16), 27.11 (1362.33); 30.5 (1363.23), 30.12 (1363.31), 38.11-12 (1366.28-29), 56.9 (1373.27), 114.2 (1393.18), and 117.1 (1394.10). Cf. also 42.5-6 (1368.1), 44.1 (1368.22-23), 49.1-2 (1370.20-21), 53.14 (1372.20-21), 50.8 (1371.9), 61.1 (1375.7), 101.10-11 (1390.18-19), and 112.5 (1393.2).

10. Among the continental MSS, *Ezechielis xl c. d* is found in Brux 213, C-F, El Esc e, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Reims, Sloane 471, Upp, W 2326 and 2337, and Zürich. BN lat 16099 was corrected to this from 40 and Ste-Gen has an erasure where *d* would go.

11. If we add to these the agreements in poorly attested correct readings, we find this: Q in 3l, I in 26, X in 24, R in 20, P in 19, O in 18, W in 14, and anything else less than ten. Of JLNSTV, V is closest with 9 agreements in error, then J and T with 7, and L, N, and S with 6. Agreement in correct readings shows agreement with T 12 times in all, with N 8, and with S 7. U agrees with Trevisa's Latin only 7 times in error but 16 times if we add in the correct readings. Among the correctors, U² agrees once in error and four times in all, and X² twice in error.

12. All other instances are accepted as correct readings and so must be considered as of no evidence in genetic grouping. At 14.10 *in se* is also translated (1358.32-33), while at 44.3 *consistit*, 46.11 *monas*, and 49.11 the word order of *est principiiis* cannot be distinguished from their variants in the translation (1368.24, 1369.25, and 1370.32-34). Trevisa does seem to translate *ita*, only in PQRX at 43.6 (1368.14), though he could have added it himself; but he follows the more common reading *in se* rather than PQRX's *se* at 47.1 (1369.32). Any other reading found in PQRX is supported by other MSS as well.

13. As Salimbene put it. *Magnus clericus fuit et totam Bibliam cursorie Parisius legit* (1:134).

14. In 1231, *frater Iordanus custos Thuringie in Saxoniam rediens misit fratrem Iohannem de Penna cum fratre Adeodato Parisius pro fratre Iohanne Anglico ministro et pro fratre Bartholomeo lectore. ut ipsos honorifice conducerent in Saxoniam*, for whom the general minister had written a year earlier to the minister of France (Jordanus 53-54, 50).

15. Cambridge Fitzwilliam Museum MS CFM 15; Glasgow UL MSS Hunter 389 and 391; BL MSS Add. 8928, 24074, and 34606; London Institute of Electrical Engineers MS 3; Wellcome Institute for the History of Medicine MS 3; and Bodleian MSS Bodley 965b, Canon misc. 78, and Digby 12 are complete. The incomplete MSS are Glasgow UL MS Ferguson 234; BL MS Sloane 3167; Wellcome Inst. MSS 310, 335, and 730; and Bodleian MS Ashmole 1397.

page 87

16. A preliminary finding list of mainly complete MSS may be forthcoming in a separate Volume on *Bartholomaeus Anglicus and His Encyclopedia*, proposed by M. C. Seymour.

17. The readings examined for the known groups were chosen by starting at the beginning of each quarter (as described below, note 28) and finding the first interesting one and then starting from the end of that quarter and looking backwards until another good variant was found. A few additional readings were added if there was something of general interest otherwise.

18. Thirteen, probably, since BN lat 346A may have it in the gutter, not legible in the microfilm. The rest are Arras, Basal, BN lat 16098 and 16099, Brugge, C-F, El Esc e, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Schullian, and W 2326.

19. Autun, Bamberg, Brux 213 and 7568, Eins, Gdansk, Harburg, Heilig, Kob, Sloane 471 and 511, and W 3949 and 3964.

20. W 2287 has that gloss by the number three; Reims, Upp, W 2337, and Zürich place it by the number four.

21. It is in BN lat 346A (presumably, not legible in the gutter), 16098, and 16099, Brugge, C-F, El Esc e and o, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Schullian, Upp, and W 2287 and 2326. It is omitted by Ste-Gen and W 2337, and the leaf is missing in Arras. The variants are in Reims and Basel respectively.

22. Page 12: no division in PR and Arras, Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16099, C-F, El Esc o, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389, Kob, Schullian, Upp, W 2326 and 2337, and Zürich; corrected in Q and Eins, Reims, Sloane 511, and W 2287.

Page 13: exactly as above, but no division also in Ste-Gen and W 3949.

Page 28: no division in PQ¹RX¹ and Arras, Bamberg, Basel, BN lat 346A and 16099, Brux 213 and 7568, C-F, Eins, El Esc e and o, Gdansk, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389, Kob, Praha, Schullian, Sloane 447 and 511, Ste-Gen, W 2287, 2326, 3949, and 3964, and Zürich.

Page 59: no division in IQRSX and Arras, Autun, Bamberg, Basal, BN lat 346A and 16098, Brugge, Brux 213, C-F, El Esc e, Gdansk, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389 and 391, Kob, Reims, Sloane 471, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2287, 2326, 2337, and 3964, and Zürich. BN lat 16099 planned a chapter division but left it a paragraph, and Praha might have expected a chapter division but also left it a paragraph. In Autun, the last letter of the preceding chapter's final word (*ephy*) is out in the margin, and in C-F *Amphora* begins after a slight gap. All this indicates confusion over whether or not a chapter division would be made and that the section beginning here was not always available. We could posit a *pecia* division here to account for such confusion; happily, it does occur just a bit before the next change in quarters, at 60.8 *Acceptabulum* (see note 28 and the text to which it refers).

Page 97: no division in IPQ¹R and Bamberg, Brux 7568, BN lat 346A and 16099, C-F, El Esc o, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389 and 391, Kob, Reims, Schullian, Sloane 471, SteGen, Upp, W 2287, 2326, 2337, and 3949, and Zürich.

Page 116: no division in Rand Arras, Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16099, Brux 213, C-F, Eins, El Elc o, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389, Kob, Reims, Sloane 471 and 511, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2287, 2326, 2337, 3949, and 3964, and Zürich.

Page 118: no division in Q¹ and Brux213, Kob, Sloane 511, and W 2287 and 3964.

page 88

Page 119: no division in MPQ¹R and Arras, Bamberg, BN lat 16099, Brux 213, C-F, Eins, El Esc o, Harburg, Heilig, Hunter 389 and 391, Kob, Reims, Schullian, Sloane 471 and 511, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2287, 2326, 2337, 3949, and 3964, and Zürich.

23. INT's *rerum insertas for rebus insertas* (1.3) is approached only by *rerum insectas* in El Esc o, but all the rest are split between *rebus insertas* and *rebus insectas*. No continental MS reads with NT *ducte* (23.6, om. Brux 7568, Heil, and W 3949), *positum* (56.5), *reposita* (61.6, though cf. *deposita* in Eins), *parte seu latere* (76.7, om. with something not visible in gutter BN lat 346A, leaf not filmed Heilig), *et* (95.5), or *instructa* (119.4). And where INT have *continentur seu edocentur* at 42.1, only Bamberg comes close, but it agrees with U² in *continentur et edocentur*. JLNSTV's loss of *omnis* (4.7), *publicus* (65.3), *siliquis* (85.13), and *previa* (122.1) are not shared by any continental MSS, nor is the eyeskip *interdum ... interdum* (98.12-13). The readings *quando* for *ante* (22.2), *pisolium* or *phisolium* for *publicum* (65.4), and *diversitas contra discordes* for *diversitas* (91.7) are also not to be found anywhere else. The only agreements with JLNSTV are *quam* for *circa* in Brugge and Ste-Gen (38.9) and *oxifal scilicet* for *oxifalus* in Brux 7568 and Eins (55.1). These examples, chosen from widely scattered portions of the text, indicate that any agreements between JLNSTV and continental MSS are most likely accidental and they confirm that the contamination between I and NT is probably from NT to I, not the reverse.

24. I.12 *scire*] om. PQR and Autun, Bamberg, Basel, BN lat 346A and 16098, Brux 7568, Eins, El Esc o, Heilig, Kob, Schullian, and W 2287 and 3949. Corrected in BN lat 16099.

27. 12 *a v quinques*] om. PQR and Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16098, Brux 7568, Harburg, Heilig, Schullian, Sloane 511, and W 3949 and 3964. Corrected in BN lat 16099 and Eins. Out in Kob.

41.14 *longitudine et latitudine continentur*] *longitudinem et latitudinem continent* PQR and BN lat 346A and 16098, Brux 7568, Heil, Kob, and W 3964. BN lat 16099, El Esc o, and W 2287 have *longitudinem et latitudinem continentur*. Arras lost a leaf.

56.8 *ex*] om. PQR and Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16099, Brux 7568, Eins, El Esc o, Heilig, Kob, Schullian, Sloane 511, and W 2287, 3949, and

3964.

68.11 *ex] quia ex* PQR and Arras, Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16098, Eins, El Esc o, Heilig, Schullian, and W 3949. Corrected in BN lat 16099. Out in Brux 7568.

78.12 *vie]* om. PQR and Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16098, Brux 7568, Eins, El Esc o, Kob, Schullian, and W 2287 and 3949. Corrected in BN lat 16099. Leaf not filmed in Heilig.

101.14 *adaptavit] aptavit* PQR and Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16099, Brux 7568, El Esc o, Heilig, Kob, Schullian, Sloane 511, and W 2287, 3949, and 3964.

122.7-8 *intelligenda et investiganda] inv- et int-* PQ¹R and Bamberg, BN lat 346A and 16098, Brux 7568, Eins, El Esc o, Heilig, Kob, and Schullian. Corrected in BN lat 16099. Out in W 2287 and 3949.

25. The sometimes dubious quality of the errors chosen for examination is due to WX's paucity of unique errors. Quite often, WX agree with other MSS when erring. As a check, one correct reading was used as well.

1.3 *dictas] predictas* WX and Autun, Bamberg, Basel, Brugge, Brux 213, C-F, El Esc e, Gdansk, Harburg, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Reims, Schullian, Sloane 471, Upp, W 2337, and Zürich.

page 89

25.3 *compositus] incompositus* all but WX and Bamberg, Brux 213, C-F, Gdansk, Harburg, Praha, Reims, Sloane 471 and 511, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2337 and 3964, and Zürich. Corrected in Autun, BN lat 16099, and probably W 2326. Om. in Brux 7568 and Heilig.

38.9 *procreabis] procreabit* in WX and Brux 7568 and Sloane 511. Ambiguous *procreab'* in C-F, Eins, El Esc e, Praha, W 2287 and 2326, and Zürich; *generab'* in BN lat 346A. Leaf lost in Arras.

56.2 *congiarium] congrarium* WX and Arras, Autun, Basel, Brugge, C-F, El Esc e, Gdansk, Harburg, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Reims, Sloane 471 and 511, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2326 and 2337, and Zürich.

56.4 *congiarium] congrarium* WX and Arras, Autun, Basel, BN lat 16099, Brugge, C-F, El Esc e, Gdansk, Harburg, Hunter 389 and 391, Praha, Reims, Sloane 511, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2337, and Zürich.

60.13 *dicta]* om. WX and Autun, Basel, BN lat 16098, Brugge, C-F, Gdansk, Harburg, Hunter 389 and 391, Reims, Sloane 471, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2326 and 2337, and Zürich.

73.10 *illud] istud* WX and all but Arras (*ysid*); El Esc o, Kob, Schullian, and W 3949 (*i^d*); and Heilig (leaf not filmed).

91.7 *diversitas] diversitas contra discordiam* WX and Autun, Bamberg, Basel, BN lat 16099 (by addition), Brugge, C-F, El Esc e, Harburg, Hunter 389, Praha, Reims, Sloane 471, Ste-Gen, Upp, W 2326 and 2337, and Zürich. Gdansk and Hunter 391 have *diversitas contra concordiam*. JLNSTV has *diversitas contra discordes*. *Contra discordiam* occurs as a marginal gloss in QX and Basel, BN lat 16098 and 16099, Brugge, C-F, El Esc e and o, Hunter 391, Praha, Reims, Schullian, Upp, W 2287, 2326, and 2337, and Zürich. It may also appear in the gutters of BN lat 346A and Hunter 389, but I was unable to see there in the microfilms available.

94.14 *est vox] vox est* WX and Arras, Autun, Basel, BN lat 16098, Brugge, Brux 213, C-F, El Esc e, Hunter 389, Praha, Reims, Sloane 471, Upp, W 2326, 2337, and 3949, and Zürich. Reims and Ste-Gen have *vox est vox*, Hunter 391 has *est vox est* and Eins is out.

26. See above, note 10 (the leaf in Heilig was not filmed).

27. *Chartularium universitatis Parisiensis* 1: 644; 2.1: 109. Here, the first is dated 1286, but the note at the end explains that it was apparently made between 1275 and 1286 since it does not contain works written after that time (649). Destrez's closer argument for 1275 has generally been accepted (32 n. 1). Although the text may have shrunk somewhat during the intervening twenty-nine years, the price for the whole grew to 30 *livres* from 20 *livres* 8 *sous* an annual inflation rate of only about 3%.

28. The text was divided into four parts of equal length: from the beginning to 32.11 *qui*, 32.11 *latitudine* to 60.7 *exemplis*, 60.8 *Acceptabulum* to 87.5 *pars*, and 87.5 *uncie* to the end. With these guides as to hypothetical *pecia* divisions, the variants for each quarter were looked at separately. Since M bere text only in the fourth quarter, since Y was lacking in virtually all of the third (and a few lines in the second), and since neither showed any peculiarities as a result of this test, both were omitted, as were agreements occurring less than thrice.

29. 1205.15-37 in the Trevisa edition; Minerva pp. 1072-73.

page 90

30. The last gloss to the addition reads *Nota contra hereticos et detractores*. It is also found in Arras, C-F, Gdansk, Hunter 391, and the English MSS L and V. Most of the MSS on microfilm available to me when looking into this did not carry the text preceding my portion of Book XIX. BN lat 16098 squeezed a number of glosses together where this one belongs, and so may have left it out for lack of space, and Ste-Gen may just have decided to leave it out. MSS generally without glosses at this location include Autun, Eins, W 2287, the English MSS U and Y, and quite a few others.

REFERENCES

Bartholomaeus Anglicus. *Bartholomaei Anglici De genuinis rerum coelestium, terrestrium et inferarum proprietatibus*. 1601. Frankfurt: Minerva, 1964. (Cited as Minerva.)

Boyce, Gray Cowan. *The English-German Nation in the University of Paris during the Middle Ages*. Brugge: Saint Catherine, 1927.

Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office... Richard II London: HMSO, 1925.

Charles, B. G., and H. D. Emanuel. "Notes on Old Libraries and Books." *Cylchgrawn Llyfrgell Genedlaethol Cymru: The National Liorary of*

Wales Journal 6 (1949-1950): 353-72.