

TEXTUAL HISTORY OF *LI LIVRES DOU TRESOR*: FITTING THE PIECES TOGETHER

DAWN E. PRINCE

Iowa State University of Science and Technology

Introduction

Modern editors of medieval texts all face the singular difficulty of determining which version of a text they will edit. Will they adhere to one manuscript? Will they attempt to recreate the author's original? Will they eliminate or include interpolations and glosses? In the Middle Ages, the concepts of literary originality and authorship were not exalted as they are today. In fact, as succinctly stated by Cerquiglini (1989, 25), "L'auteur n'est pas une idée médiévale." Rather, literary compositions were fluid artifacts which were commonly modified with every copying or recitation, although they were frequently attributed to one source. Today, when faced with several extant versions of a given text, scholars of medieval texts must inevitably choose one for publication and subsequent incorporation into the literary canon. As Speer (1991, 42) asserts, the factors which determine how an editor shapes his/her text can be found in a three-fold response to the question "What is the text?" These factors are (1) the material considerations, grounded in codicological evidence; (2) literary history, which considers the author and his socio-historical milieu; (3) theoretical perspectives, stemming from the intent of the piece.

If we concede that the primary function of the textual editor is that of historian, then the editor should seek to offer modern-day readers "a genuinely medieval document, a text that a medieval public had received as the author's composition" (Speer 1991, 8). In order to accomplish this, modern scholars should ideally edit the version of a work that was best known to its public, for it is this rendering which circulated and influenced a tangible set of readers. Within this theoretical context, the specific aim of this study is to show how one version of Brunetto Latini's popular thirteenth-century encyclopedia, *Li livres dou tresor*, appears to have enjoyed greater notoriety among the medieval public than any other. Using data culled from a preliminary critical edition of the Aragonese translation of the original French *Tresor*, this paper will demonstrate that one considerably interpolated version circulated widely during the 13th-15th centuries, serving as model for Italian, Catalan, and Aragonese translations. I contend that any new critical edition of this French text should be prepared based on this version.

Part of the specific difficulty surrounding the editing process of the *Tresor* is its complicated textual transmission, from its first composition to its two modern editions. In order to follow more accurately its evolution, I will follow the textual history of the *Tresor* chronologically, before focus-

ing on the revealing relationship among the translations, and the light they shed on the French text.

Brunetto Latini and the Textual History of the French *Tresor*

Brunetto Latini (ca. 1220–1294) was a Florentine rhetorician and notary, who became engulfed in the disputes of his native city's rival political factions. As a Guelph politician, Brunetto was exiled to France as a consequence of the Ghibelline conquest of Florence in 1260. While there, he spent his time involved in literary translation and compilation. His three major works, the *Rettorica*, the *Tesoretto*, and the *Tresor*, were written during his six-year sojourn in France. With the Ghibelline defeat at the Battle of Benevento in February 1266, Brunetto was exonerated and welcomed back into Florence.

Upon his return, Brunetto brought with him the complete text of the first version of the *Tresor*. This first encyclopedia written in a vernacular language made much practical knowledge accessible to a new middle class unversed in Latin. The encyclopedia is divided into three books: the first treats practical knowledge such as biblical and secular history, geography, astronomy, and a bestiary; the second discusses vices and virtues, based on a partial translation of Aristotle's *Ethics*; the third book teaches man how to speak and govern effectively, and contains a translation of parts of Cicero's *De inventione*.

More than half of the extant MSS preserve this first version of the text, which was quickly copied, recopied, and interpolated. By 1268 an Italian translation, *Il tesoro*, based on this version was already in circulation.

Some years later, Latini revised the *Tresor*, expanding the historical section of Book One to include events through the assassination of Conradino in 1268. Second-version *Tresor* MSS add material to Ch. 91 and an additional seven chapters (I.92–98). Wide variation in the rubrics of these chapters suggests that they were a later addition by someone other than the author. Second-recension MSS are also identified by the omission of several sections of the bestiary. Missing is part of ch. I.55, and chs. I.156–66 and I.198–200. Carmody (1948) places the blame on the loss of four folios from Brunetto's original copy, accounting in this way for the abrupt interruption of the chapters mentioned. This bi-partite division of the extant French manuscripts has met with little challenge, until quite recently. Baldwin (1986) reports that a newly discovered thirteenth-century French codex (Escorial L.II.3 = M³) belongs to the expanded second recension, yet contains the missing bestiary passages. This codex, unknown to the text's first editor, Polycarpe Chabaille, and inaccessible to the *Tresor*'s only 20th-century editor, Francis J. Carmody, because of the Spanish Civil War and World War II, appears to be the only known complete version of the *Tresor*. Its implications for the textual history of Brunetto's encyclopedia will be examined below.

Critical Editions of the French *Tresor*

Of the 73 extant French manuscripts of this compendium, most date from the end of the thirteenth to the beginning of the fifteenth century, reflecting the popularity of the text during this period.¹ Although the work lost popularity during the fifteenth century, it still enjoyed the prestige of the printing press. An edition of the French text titled *Le Trésor qui parle de toutes choses*, based on Jean de Corbichon's French translation of the Italian *Tresor*, was printed in Lyon (1491) and in Paris (1539), as shown by Barrois (1830, 41).

The patronage of Napoleon I (1769–1821) brought about the first decisive effort at a comprehensive critical edition (Langlois 1911, 331). The history of Franco-Italian cultural relations over the centuries was of keen concern to the Napoleonic regime, which had its eye on the annexation of its neighbor to the south. Brunetto and the *Tresor* served as an excellent model of cultural cooperation: an Italian patriot writing in the French language, deemed by him to be “la parole plus delitable” (*Tresor* I.1.4). Although Napoleon's wishes were not fully realized, a partial critical edition of the government section of Book III was finally published by Charles Lénormant (1840). Plans for a complete edition were revived under Napoleon III and the Second Empire (1852–1870), and the task was confided to Polycarpe Chabaille, an experienced textual critic, who published the first comprehensive edition of the *Tresor* (1863).

The Edition of 1863 by Polycarpe Chabaille

Chabaille's edition is based on the examination of 41 French codices, as well as the 1533 edition of the Italian translation. Using the empirical Lachmannian approach, Chabaille chose a base manuscript, which he then collated with the remaining witnesses to produce an integral text. He chose **F**, a first version text composed in the Francien dialect, primarily for its early date of production (1284).² Fully aware of the existence of two authorial recensions, Chabaille nevertheless preferred the earlier version. He provides copious variant readings and interesting interpolations, but the fact that they are not exhaustively documented or systematically adduced constitutes the major failing of the edition. While Chabaille did not organize a stemma, a careful check of his variants reveals certain patterns. For the modern scholar lacking direct access to the original *Tresor* manuscripts, facsimiles, or paleographic editions thereof, Chabaille's edition provides the sole approach to the myriad of textual variants.

The Edition of 1948 by Francis J. Carmody

A more conservative route, based on the best manuscript methodology of Joseph Bédier, was chosen for the edition by Francis J. Carmody (1948), who sought to provide a more accurate account of Brunetto's work, criticiz-

ing Chabaille's earlier venture as "un texte *variorum*" (1948, i). He wanted to publish the *Tresor* as Brunetto had ultimately written it – free from scribal interpolations, which he vehemently condemned as falsifications. Carmody first divided the extant witnesses into first- and second-version texts, then subdivided according to interpolations. In this fashion he was able to construct a stemma (1948, xxxvii) based on the nearly 50 MSS he was able to consult. Earlier Carmody (1936) had provided a preliminary listing and justification for the stemmatic groupings based on a genealogy of 43 MSS.

In the case of the *Tresor*, a classification of MSS based on interpolations is a valid editorial method, and perhaps the only one plausible, given the abundance of intentional scribal interventions. Any attempt at categorization founded on the Lachmannian method of common errors would be extremely difficult because of the number of MSS, as well as the length of the text.

As his base manuscript Carmody ultimately selected second-version MS **T**, the very manuscript used by Lénormant (1840). This mid-fourteenth century MS was written for Gian Galeazzo Visconti, Duke of Milan (1351–1387), and later passed into the possession of the Duke's mother, Blanche de Savoie. According to Carmody, the branch containing **T** "ne contient aucune interpolation et très peu de mauvaises leçons" (1948, xxxviii), and is characterized as "le *Tresor* définitif," despite the presence of numerous homeoteleuta. MS **T**, written in the Picardian dialect, was adhered to almost blindly by its editor.

The stemma devised by Carmody has come into question in recent years. Holloway (1986, 20) labels it "unworkable," without offering an alternative. Baldwin (1986), too, finds little justification for Carmody's scheme, backing his position with evidence drawn from his editorial work on **M**³. While Carmody's edition is philologically more accurate than Chabaille's and offers the reader a wealth of source references, as well as a useful glossary, the paucity of variants make the edition of limited use to the textual critic. Mascheroni (1969, 485) sums up the difficulties posed by the editions of both Carmody and Chabaille, in justifying her *modus operandi*:

Ogni riferimento al *Tresor* è fatto in base all'edizione Chabaille che, pur con le sue lacune e con le citazioni non sempre esatte, mi sembra la più completa e la più attendibile, trascurando l'edizione Carmody anche se più recente e quasi sicuramente più esatta come testo, ma sprovvista di un adeguato apparato di varianti.

The Δ Branch of Interpolated Manuscripts

As can be learned from an inspection of the stemma provided by Carmody (1948, xxxvii), this stemma can be broken down into several distinct clusters. The branch designated Δ appears to offer the clearest and most cohesive grouping of all extant textual witnesses. Including manuscripts **C**²**MNORR**²**V** and the Italian translation of the *Tresor* (= **It.**), Δ derives

from an early interpolated manuscript of the first version. In an earlier stemma Carmody (1936) delineated the filiation of these codices relative to their French original (= **Fr.**).

The principal interpolations of this family are religious in nature, treating biblical or dogmatic topics. Characteristic of this branch is the affixation of *saint(e)* to all names of saints, as well as the expansion of the names of other religious figures, i.e., **Fr.** Dieu > Δ Nostre Seignor Dieu; **Fr.** Sainte Marie > Δ Sainte Marie, mere de Nostre Seignor. By far the most extensive interpolations appear in the chapters on biblical history, e.g. I.12.2 **ORVIt.** Li angles qui devinrent mauvés ne seroient jamés cheus; mais celui qui ot nom Lucifer, á cui Diex avoit tant d'onor fet qu'il l'avoit establis sor tos les autres, il s'orguelli et asseura de la seignorie que il ot.³ The Δ version contains nearly 150 interpolations in Bk. I alone (e.g., I.12.2, I.22.1, I.71.2, I.107.3, I.124.4, I.187.3, etc.).

French Manuscripts **ORV**

Three Δ family codices, **ORV**, are very closely related among themselves, and bear a strong similarity to the Italian, Catalan and Aragonese translations. Chabaille used these three witnesses extensively in his edition, thus making variant readings available. Another Δ codex, **MS M**, cannot be included with **ORV** since it was used by Chabaille only marginally in his selection of variants. Little textual proof can be adduced to clarify its position among the Δ witnesses.

Once owned by the influential bibliophile Jean, duc de Berry (1340–1416), brother to Charles V of France, **MSS M** and **O** both date from the late fourteenth or early fifteenth century. Typical of Berry's artistic-literary tastes, both manuscripts contain beautiful miniatures and historiated initials.⁴ **O**, copied in Italy (Carmody 1948, li), had already disappeared from Berry's collection before the first inventory in 1402. **M**, documented in earlier inventories (1402, 1413, 1416), was on loan to the Duchess of Bourbonnais between 1413 and 1416 (Delisle 1907, 2: 247).

The fourteenth-century codices **R** and **V** prove to be even more intimately related to the Romance translations of the *Tresor*. Carmody suggests that they were written either in Italy or by an Italian scribe. This is supported by Holloway's affirmation (1986, 23–24) that they are written in a Bolognese *libraria* hand typical of early Latini MSS. Gathercole (1950) reports that these two MSS are among the most richly illuminated of those housed in the Bibliothèque Nationale. The customary presentation scene, typical of codices of the period, can be found in **V** (f. 5). Langlois (1927, 3: 334) reproduces a similar illustration from **R**, f. 112, which depicts Brunetto offering his *Tresor* to a patron.

MS V, a first-version *Tresor* manuscript of a notable Champenoise dialectal flavoring, boasts a second-version table of contents replete with French-Piedmontese dialect forms. This raises the possibility of separate

textual traditions (geographically based?) for *Tresor* rubrics and text.

Chabaille (1863, xxxiii–xxxiv) and Holloway (1986, 23) state that **R** is more closely akin to the Italian *Tesoro* than any other extant French MS. Its affinity with the Aragonese and Catalan translations is equally close. However, neither of the *Tresor*'s two editors considered **R** to be a reliable witness, for Carmody (1948, li) described it as a "mauvais texte par un scribe ignorant," while Chabaille (1863, xxxiii) labeled it "l'oeuvre d'un Italien qui ignore les premières règles de la langue française au XIII^e siècle."

French Manuscript **M**³

The earliest putative witness of the Δ family is Escorial MS L.II.3 (= **M**³). This thirteenth-century parchment codex provides testimony to the early date of the Δ interpolations. First mentioned by Amador de los Ríos (1863, 1: 19 n. 2), **M**³ continues to be the only known representative of the French *Tresor* tradition in Spain.⁵ Brunetto may well have sent the Escorial codex to the Castilian king, Alfonso el Sabio, after his brief ambassadorial visit to Spain in 1260. Holloway (1990, 118) draws attention to the marginal notes in Latin found in the section on vice and virtue, which she asserts may have been made by Brunetto for the benefit of Alfonso X. If this account is correct, it constitutes another clear instance of authorial approval of this interpolated version of the *Tresor*.

As Baldwin (1986) has shown, **M**³ belongs to the Δ family, a relationship confirmed by the interpolations it shares with **ORV**, e.g. I.122.26 **OR** Et de cele fontaine naissent les .iiij. flums que vos aves oi: c'est Phison, Gion, Tigris et Eufrates; and **M**³ & de celle fontaine naissent .iiij. flueuz que voz avez ici oi: c'est Physon, Tion, Tigriz et Oufratez.⁶ Additional examples can be found in I.41.1, I.44.3, I.85.2, I.122.26, I.168.1, I.198.2, etc.

Medieval Romance-Language Translations of the *Tresor*

During the Middle Ages, the *Tresor* was translated from its original French into Italian, Castilian, Catalan, and Aragonese. The Italian and Castilian translations date from the thirteenth century. Extant witnesses point to the late fourteenth century for the production of the Aragonese translation, and the early fifteenth century for the Catalan. The mere existence of these translations attests to the popularity that Brunetto's encyclopedia enjoyed, as well as its universal appeal. Careful cross-examination of these translations yielded the unanticipated finding that three—the Italian, Catalan, and Aragonese translations—represent the extensively interpolated Δ tradition. In light of this result, it seems judicious to examine further the textual evidence, in the hope of finding some clue as to why this version was so favored.

The Italian *Tesoro*

The 44 manuscripts of the Italian *Tesoro* represent a single translation based on an interpolated first-version Δ model. However, whereas the French *Ethiques* section in Bk. II was based on Hermann the German's Latin translation of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, the Italian *Etica* section used Taddeo Alderotti's 1244 translation of Aristotle. Carmody (1936, 95) contends that the Italian *Tesoro*, together with a separately transmitted *Etica* (1568), underwent a second series of interpolations and omissions which further distanced it from the main cluster of Δ manuscripts.

An incomplete fourteenth-century Venetian MS (**M**) identifies the translator of the Italian *Tesoro* as one messer Bono Giamboni. Most later printed editions attribute the Italian translation to Giamboni, while all earlier ones do not. The attribution to Giamboni is understandable, for he was a Ghibelline judge whose name appears together with that of Brunetto in municipal documents (Holloway 1986, 26). Giamboni also authored a compilation, *Libro de' vizi e delle virtudi*, and several translations from Latin: *De miseria humane conditionis* by Innocent III, *Historie adversum paganos* by Paulus Orosius, and *Epitome rei militaris* by Flavius Vegetius. Latini's Italian *Tesoro* and Giamboni's translation of *De miseria humane conditionis* are bound together in **D**² (1446), further fueling speculation on the Giamboni attribution.

Segre (1959, 311) questions the grounds for this attribution, while Muñoz Sendino (1949, 119 n. 6) presupposes Brunetto's authorship of the Italian *Tesoro*, completely ignoring the attribution to Giamboni. Holloway (1986, 26), based on stylistic considerations, believes that the *Tesoro* is Brunetto's own translation, but can offer no documentation in support of her thesis. If the *Tesoro* is indeed Brunetto's own handiwork—an allegation which seems highly plausible, given the weak textual grounds on which the Giamboni attribution is substantiated—then we must assume that Latini sanctioned the use of an interpolated version of his original. In essence, he bestowed authorial approval on the Δ branch.

The first modern edition of the *Tesoro* is that published by Carrer (1839), based on the Venice edition of 1533. Sorio (1857) was followed by de Visani (1869), who edited the first book from a collation of several MSS, printing it together with the original French text. Gaiter's four-volume edition (1877-83) attributing the translation to Giamboni is the last modern edition. A serious attempt at a new edition based on all of the known witnesses is needed.

The Castilian *Tesoro*

Amador de los Ríos was the first scholar to document the existence of a Castilian translation of the *Tresor* (1863, 4: 19-20), in the context of Brunetto's dealings with Alfonso X, the Learned, of Castile. Alluding to

the existence of various codices containing the translation, Amador identified only Madrid, B.N. MS 685, as the oldest text consulted (Valladolid, 5 December 1433). A century later López Estrada (1960) and Faulhaber (1973) renewed modern interest in the fate of Brunetto's encyclopedia in Spain by documenting the existence of nearly a dozen manuscripts of the Castilian version of the *Tresor*.

The first critical edition of the *Libro del Tesoro* (Baldwin 1989) used B.N. 685 as its base text. The thirteen extant Castilian codices, described by Baldwin (1989), are thought to represent one original translation based on a first-version text. Baldwin's base manuscript establishes that the translation was made in 1292 by Pascual Gómez, scribe to Sancho IV, and Alonso de Paredes, doctor to Fernando IV. Baldwin proposes no stemma for the Castilian witnesses. Despite interest in locating the French model for this translation, Baldwin points to "dificultades insuperables" (1989, vii n. 19) which make the task virtually impossible. His base manuscript agrees at times with Chabaille's first-version text, and at other times with Carmody's second version, and thus neither French edition serves as a reliable control upon which to establish even a hypothetical relationship among the Castilian codices. The omission of the characteristic Δ interpolations eliminates the Castilian translation from further consideration here.

The Catalan *Tresor* (= *Cat.*)

The Catalan texts represent several translations of Brunetto's encyclopedia. The only complete version, **B** (Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, MS 357, *Tesoro de maestro Brunet Latino en lengua catalana manuscrito*), was translated by Guillem de Copons (d. ca. 1404) "en lengua valenciana" (I.1.7) for the son of Pere d'Artés (d. 1440), advisor and "mestre racional" to Joan I of Aragon. Although the extant copy is dated Valencia, 1 May 1418, Wittlin (1971, 67–68) judges that the original translation was made shortly before Copons' death in 1404.

Wittlin's four-volume edition of **B** (1971–89) shows that, like the Italian translation, the Catalan text is based on a first-version Δ model. This is confirmed by the presence of characteristic Δ interpolations, e.g., I.71.2 **ORV** Il resuscita .i. enfant qui estoit mort de .xiiij. ans passés, and **Cat.** Ell ressucità un infant que era mort xiiii anys havia passats. Further examples may be found in I.131.2, I.62.2, I.65.1, I.64.2, etc. Wittlin's unfamiliarity with **M**³ caused him to conclude that the Escorial codex "no té cap relació amb les traduccions catalans" (1988, 634 n. 7; 1971), although he accurately assessed Copons' source as a Δ text.

Five manuscripts of the Catalan *Tresor* are listed by Wittlin (1971, 1988): **B**, Barcelona, Biblioteca de Catalunya, MS 357; **H**, Barcelona, Arxiu Històric de la Ciutat de Barcelona, Gremis 1/129 (containing a fragment corresponding to *Tresor* II.2); **M**, Madrid, Biblioteca Nacional, MS 10264, *olim* li-65, ff. 78r–94v (giving only Bk. III.1–28 in the same version as

S, and at one time in the library of the Marqués de Santillana [Schiff 1905, 381]); S, Barcelona, Biblioteca Episcopal del Seminari Conciliar, MS 74 (fifteenth century, *Libre dels ensenyaments de bona parleria* [Fàbrega Grau 1965]); and V, Vic, Biblioteca Episcopal (a fifteenth-century codex containing Aristotle's *Etiques arromansades per M. Brunet*, corresponding to *Tresor* II.2–48). In addition, Holloway (1986, 32) cites a sixth manuscript, one now lost: Escorial, Catalan 234, *Ethiques de Aristotil a Nichomacho arromançades per mestre Brunet Latin Florenti en la sua obra apellada lo Tresor*. The translation, which allegedly contains corrections taken from Bruni Aretino's *Ethica*, was attributed to Carlos, Prince of Viana (Holloway 1986, 31).

The Aragonese *Tresor*

The Aragonese *Trasoro*, contained in MS G (Gerona, Cathedral, MS 20,a,5), is based on a first-version text. In his colophon, the translator indicates that he converted the text “de lengua francesa en aragonesa” (G, f. 200vb26) for a supposed member of the Aragonese court; see Prince (1990b) for more detail. Codicological evidence points to a production date within the period 1425–60 for G, which is not the original Aragonese translation, but rather a copy. A rapid glance at the interpolations contained in G suffices to show its alliance with the Δ branch of Carmody's stemma, e.g., I.151.1 RV Et se aucuns venist avant que il deist qu'il n'est pas voir, je li diroie que li marinier qui l'ont veu le tesmoignent; G E si alguno viuyes adeuant e que dixies que esto no fues verdat, yo diria que los marineros que lo testimonyan la han visto (64ra10–12). Additional examples may be found in I.12.2, I.17.1, 132.1, 151.1, etc.

An attempt to situate the Aragonese translation of the *Tresor* in the stemmatic structure established by Carmody, and outlined above, revealed a previously unknown relationship between the French Δ manuscripts and the Italian, Catalan and Aragonese translations.

Textual Affinity of Catalan and Aragonese Translations

The geographical relationship of the two eastern translations of the *Tresor* (G and Cat.), both produced at the request of esteemed members of the Aragonese court (a certainty for the Catalan text, and a strong possibility for G), inspired an early hypothesis that the two texts were related, a hypothesis confirmed by a careful comparison of both versions. Moreover, it quickly becomes apparent that these texts shared a common or identical French model. Among the traits which link Cat. and G are the following:

(a) Cat. and G often agree against all documented French readings, e.g., Fr. sacrés vs. Cat. anunciat, G denunciado (25va13); Fr. merien vs. Cat. fusta, G fusta (56rb3); Fr. piés du mont vs. Cat. en les partides, G a las partidas (56vb24–25).

(b) Their common model was plagued by numerous homeoteleuta which have been passed on to these peninsular translations, e.g., I.4.9 **Fr.** *trespasse les homes dont li home trespassent*, **Cat.** *e que d'açò [...] trespassa*, **G** *va [...] a los otros* (10vb6); I.39.34 **Fr.** *son fiz. Après lui regna l'autre Mirovem son fiz que*, **Cat.** *son fill [...] que*, **G** *su fillo [...] que* (22vb20); I.177.4 **Fr.** *noirs, beles cornes et noires, oreilles*, **Cat.** *negres [...] orelles peloses*, **G** *negros [...] orellas pelosas* (70rb30–31). The number of shared omissions (no fewer than 30 in Bk. I alone) simply cannot be attributed to coincidence, and suggests that the French model used for these translations was, if not a solitary codex, then analogous copies of the same codex.

Textual Affinity of **G**, **Cat.** and **M³**

In searching for the French source of the Aragonese and Catalan translations, it seemed logical to examine the extant French *Tresor* manuscripts located in Spanish libraries. The only known extant French codex in Spain is the earlier mentioned thirteenth-century interpolated Δ text in the Escorial, **M³**. A comparison of selected passages shows that the Escorial codex manifests a remarkable similarity to both Eastern translations.

All three peninsular manuscripts share certain similarities. For instance, they contain identical chapter divisions, two of which are absent in Carmody: I.144a *De salamandre* (also in **AKR**) and I.190a *Du loup cervier* (also in **C²OV**). There are also numerous common readings found exclusively in these MSS, e.g., I.4.9 **Fr.** *mere*, **M³** *maniere*, **Cat.** *manera*, **G** *manera* (10va30); I.55.1 **Fr.** *om.*, **M³** *parloient de la foi de Dieu hautement*, **Cat.** *parlaven altament de la fe de Déu*, **G** *e faulauan de la fe de Dios altament* (26r29–30); I.63.2 **Fr.** *le marit Marie*, **M³R** *virum Marie*, **Cat.** *vir de Maria*, **G** *vir marie* (27rb34).

The rubrics of all three peninsular codices share elaborations which are not documented in either *Tresor* edition, again hinting at a solid affinity.⁷ I.59 **Fr.** *De Judith, reine et prophete*, **M³** *De Judith, la vailant dame*, **Cat.** *De Judich, la valent dona*, **G** *De Judich, la valjente Reyna* (1va30); I.60 **Fr.** *De Saint Jehan Baptiste*, **M³** *De Eliçabet, mere Joan Batiste*, **Cat.** *De Elisabet, Mare de sant Johan Babtista*, **G** *De Elisabet, madre de Sant Johan Babtista* (2ra3); I.123 **Fr.** *De Europe*, **M³** *[D]e Europe & de cez contreez*, **Cat.** *De Europa e de ses encontrades*, **G** *De Europa e de sus encontradas* (2va27). Also characteristic of these three manuscripts are descriptive phrases added to the rubrics of the bestiary chapters (I.133 **Fr.** *De coquille*, **M³** *[D]e coqelle, qui maint el font de la mer*, **Cat.** *De coquilla, qui jau al fons de la mar*, **G** *De coquile, quj masca el fierro de la mar* [2va37]; and also I.131, I.132, I.134, I.138, I.175). These similarities in the index are particularly surprising if we recall that **M³** is a second-version text – despite being a member of first-recension family Δ (Baldwin 1986, 1989) – which includes the corresponding added rubrics in its table of contents, while **G** belongs to Brunetto's first recension.

In some instances, **M³** provides the source for an erroneous reading in **G** and **Cat.** by offering a form easily confused by the individuals producing these translations, or an error of its own. These common errors are of utmost consequence, since they cannot be regarded as coincidental, e.g., I.1.2 **Fr.** profite, **M³** profitement, **Cat.** profitosa, **G** perfectamente (8vb4); I.8.2 **Fr.** son verai pere, **M³** Souuerain Pere, **Cat.** Sobiran Pare, **G** Soberano Padre (11vb16–17); I.17.1 **Fr.** as athenes, Ligurgus astroiens, **M³** asatañez, Ligurgur astroiens, **Cat.** et Satenes, et Ligurus als troyans, **G** e Satanas, el goloso, alos troyanos (15ra20–21); I.90.1 **Fr.** Lotiers, **M³** le tierz, **Cat.** lo segon, **G** el tercero (33va13).

In general, **M³** comprises an integral version of the *Tresor*, with few gaps in the body of the text. Despite the elevated number of similarities, however, **M³** does not appear to be the prototype used by Copons and his Aragonese counterpart, since it contains certain errors not shared by the peninsular translations: I.39.4 **Fr.** car Sains Remis le baptiza. Il meismes, **M³** car sanz lebaia il meimez, **Cat.** car sent Remigi li batejà. E ell mateix, **G** por que sant Remj lo babtizo. Esti mjsmo (22vb24–26); I.39.4 **Fr.** Carlemaine, ki fu rois de France et empereres de Rome, selonc, **M³** Karle magne [...] selonc, **Cat.** Carles Maynes, qui fon rey de França e emperador e Roma, segons, **G** Carlos Magnes, qui fue rey de Francia e enperador de Roma, segun (23ra1–3).

Nor are the majority of omissions in **G** and **Cat.** shared by the Escorial codex. A few shared omissions or homeoteleuta might very well be coincidental or inherited from the larger family to which all three MSS belong, e.g., I.4.6 **Fr.** et sont en *iii* manieres, sor qui sunt establies *iii* sciences, **M³** & ce sont en .iij. [...] esciensez, **Cat.** e son *iii* [...] sciènces, **G** e son en tres [...] sciencias (10va10–11); I.118.9 **Fr.** an. Ensi dois tu maintenir les riules, **M³** an. [...] lez nullez, **Cat.** any. [...] Les milles, **G** anyo [...] las nulas (46ra25); I.177.4 **Fr.** coe longue *et* grandesime *et* petites ongles, **M³** coe longue [...] & petitez onglez, **Cat.** coa longa [...] e xiques ungles, **G** coha luenga [...] e chicas vnglas (70rb31).

Although there is little doubt that **G**, **M³ORV**, and **Cat.** all belong to the same family, other evidence nevertheless points to contamination among the families established by Carmody's stemma. Some readings appear to unite **G** to other branches of the stemma, for example to first-version MS **K** and second-version MSS **DSW**: I.177.4 **D** courtes, **G** ciertas (70rb32), **Cat.** curtes, **Fr.** briés.; I.168.2 **DRS** es piès, **G** enlos pïedes (67vb31), **Fr.** om.; I.137 **DS** De toutes manieres de serpens, **G** De todas maneras de serpientes (59vb21), **Fr.** Des serpens; I.88.1 **W** vraie crois, **G** vera cruz (32va28); I.122.4 **Fr.** crois, **W** pluseur, **G** los mas (49ra29); I.23.5 **W** Palestrine, **G** Palestina (52ra7), **Fr.** Penestraine; I.123.4 **BDKORS** aussi comme envers terre, **G** asi como enla tierra (51vb34), **Fr.** om.; I.174.5 **K** contre, **G** contra (69rb11), **Fr.** ne touche; I.140.1 **KR** et de s'odour, **G** e de su olor (60va23), **Fr.** om.

Conclusion

An interesting pattern emerges from this examination of the various manuscript branches and foreign language translations of Brunetto's *Tresor*: branch Δ surfaces as a cohesive set of interpolated French codices that includes the complete and very old witness M^3 . This branch ultimately served as model for the Aragonese, Catalan, and Italian translations, and may even have enjoyed the personal approval of Brunetto himself, if he indeed sanctioned the interpolated M^3 as a gift to Alfonso X, and if he based his Italian *Tresor* on a Δ codex.

Textual evidence suggests that it is unrealistic—even anachronistic—to search for a definitive version of this medieval work. Scholars should, therefore, turn their attention to providing modern readers with access to the widely disseminated Δ tradition, which clearly enjoyed the favor of a diverse and influential reading public.

NOTES

1. Holloway (1986) offers the most recent listing of French *Tresor* MSS. More detailed descriptions of codices are found in Chabaille (1863) and Carmody (1948). Several descriptive accounts of individual MSS have been published: Constantinowa (1937) on miniatures found in MS L^2 , Minckwitz (1909) on rubrication in MSS FF^3F^4 , Gathercole (1950) on miniatures in $A^4FJKLNPQRR^2STVZ^2$.

2. Only four other MSS can be reliably dated to the late thirteenth century: B^6 , which contains only *Li livres du gouvernement des rois*; L ; M^3 ; and Y , into which an Aristotelian text is incorporated.

3. All citations from ORV are taken from Chabaille (1863).

4. The holdings of Jean de Berry's library collection are detailed in Delisle (1907, 2: 218–331).

5. Amador de los Ríos (1863, 4: 19 n. 2) professes to cite from M^3 ("Bibl. Escur. códice ij L.3"), but a comparison between M^3 and his source show them to be distinct:

Amador de los Ríos

Se ancuns demandoit
pourquoi chis livre
est escrit en roumans,
selon la *raison* de France,
pour chou que
nous sommes ytalien,
je diroie que ch'est
pour chou
que nous sommes en France
l'autre pour chou que
la parleur en est
plus délitabile et
plus commune á toutes *gens*.

M^3

Se aucunz demandoit
porquoi ceste liure
est escrit en romanz
selonc le *patroiz* de France
puiz que
nous somes ytalienz
ie diroie ce est
por deuz raisonz: l'une
que noz somez en France
l'autre porce que
la parleure est
plus delitablez &
pluz comunez a touz *lingages*.

If Amador de los Ríos extracted his passage from an Escorial MS, then it was from a French MS other than the one whose siglum is now M^3 .

6. Readings from the unedited M^3 are my own based on a microfilm copy of the MS.

7. While the rubrics of Bk. III coincide in G and M^3 , those of Bk. II are substantially different. This appears to be due to some type of confusion on the part of the scribe who put together M^3 : the two parts making up the second book, the *Ethics* and a treatise on

vice and virtue, are given in inverted order, both in the rubrics and in the text. In addition, the rubrics found in the table of contents do not accurately correspond to the rubrics found in the body of the text. Those of Bk. III, nevertheless, do correspond.

REFERENCES

- Amador de los Ríos, José. 1861-65. *Historia crítica de la literatura española*. 7 vols. Madrid: Imp. de J. Rodríguez. Repr. Hildesheim; New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 1970.
- Baldwin, Spurgeon. 1986. "Brunetto Latini's *Tresor*: Approaching the End of an Era." *C* 14: 177-93.
- , ed. 1989. *El libro del tesoro*. Madison, Wisconsin: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.
- Barrois, Jean Baptiste Joseph. 1830. *Bibliothèque protypographique*. Paris: Treuttel et Wurtz.
- Carmody, Francis J. 1936. "Brunetto Latini's *Tresor*: A Genealogy of 43 MSS." *ZRPh* 56: 93-99.
- . 1939. "The Revised Version of Brunetto Latini's *Tresor*." *ZRPh* 60: 78-81.
- , ed. 1948. *Li Livres dou Tresor de Brunetto Latini*. University of California Publications in Modern Philology, 22. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Carrer, Luigi, ed. 1839. *Il 'Tesoro' volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni*. Biblioteca Classica Italiana, 1-2. Venice: Gondoliere.
- Cerquiglioni, Bernard. 1989. *Éloge de la variante. Histoire critique de la philologie*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Chabaille, Polycarpe, ed. 1863. *Li Livres dou Tresor par Brunetto Latini*. Paris: Imprimerie Impériale.
- Constantinowa, Alexandra. 1937. "Li *Tresors* of Brunetto Latini." *Art Bulletin* 19: 203-19.
- Delisle, Léopold V. 1907. *Recherches sur la librairie de Charles V*. 2 vols. Paris: Honoré Champion.
- Fábrega Grau, Angel. 1965. *Inventario de manuscritos de la Biblioteca Arzobispal del Seminario conciliar de Barcelona*. Anlecta Sacra Tarraconensia, vol. 37. Barcelona: Biblioteca Balmes.
- Faulhaber, Charles B. 1973. "Retóricas clásicas y medievales en bibliotecas castellanas." *Abaco* 4: 151-300.
- Faulhaber, Charles B., Ángel Gómez Moreno, David Mackenzie, John J. Nitti, and Brian Dutton. 1984. *Bibliography of Old Spanish Texts*. With the assistance of Jean Lentz. 3d ed. Madison, Wisconsin: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies.
- Gaiter, Luigi, ed. 1878. *Il Tesoro volgarizzato da Bono Giamboni*. 4 vols. Bologna: Gaetano Romagnoli.
- Gathercole, Patricia. 1966. "Illuminations in the MSS of Brunetto Latini." *It* 43: 345-52.
- Holloway, Julia Bolton. 1986. *Brunetto Latini: An Analytic Bibliography*. Research Bibliographies and Checklists, 44. London; Wolfeboro, New Hampshire: Grant and Cutler, Ltd.
- . 1990. "The Road Through Roncesvalles: Alfonsine Formation of Brunetto Latini and Dante — Diplomacy and Literature." *Emperor of Culture: Alfonso X the Learned of Castile and His Thirteenth-Century Renaissance*, ed. Robert I. Burns, S.J., 109-23. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Langlois, Charles Victor. 1911. *La connaissance de la nature et du monde au moyen âge d'après quelques écrits français à l'usage des laïcs*. Paris: Hachette.
- . 1927. *La vie en France au Moyen Age du XII^e au milieu du XIV^e siècle*, Vol. 3. Paris: Hachette.
- López Estrada, Francisco. 1960. "Sobre la difusión del *Tesoro* de Brunetto Latini en España." *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens* 16: 137-52.
- Lénormant, Charles, ed. 1840. "Traité de l'office du Podestà dans les républiques municipales de l'Italie." *Bibliothèque de l'école des Chartes* 2: 313-49. — A partial critical edition of Brunetto Latini, *Li livres dou tresor*: the section on government of Book III.

- Mascheroni, Carla. 1969. "I codici del volgarizzamento italiano del *Tresor* di Brunetto Latini." *Aevum* 43: 485-510.
- Minckwitz, Marie Helene Johanna. 1909. "Notice de quelques manuscrits du *Tresor* de Brunet Latin." *R* 38: 111-19.
- Minnis, A. J. 1988. *Medieval Theory of Authorship. Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. 2d. ed. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Muñoz Sendino, José, ed. 1949. *La escala de Mahoma*. Madrid: Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores.
- Prince, Dawn E., ed. 1990a. *Text and Concordance of the Aragonese Translation of Brunetto Latini's 'Li livres dou tresor' Gerona Cathedral, MS 20,a,5*. Dialect Series, 11. Madison, Wisconsin: Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies. — Microfiche.
- . 1990b. "A Critical Edition of Book One of the Unique Aragonese Translation of Brunetto Latini's 'Li livres dou tresor.'" Ph.D. Diss. University of California, Berkeley.
- Schiff, Mario. 1905. *La bibliothèque du Marquis de Santillane*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, Sciences historiques et philologiques, 153. Paris: E. Bouillon. Repr. Amsterdam: G. T. van Heusden, 1970.
- Segre, Cesare, ed. 1959. "Arti del dittare, epistolare e prosa d'arte." *Prosa del Duecento*. Vol. I, *Retorica*, 133-70. Milan: Picciardi.
- Sorio, Bartolomeo, ed. 1857. *Volgarizzamento del primo libro del 'Tesoro' di ser Brunetto Latini fatto per Bono Giamboni*. Trieste: Tipografia del Lloyd.
- Speer, Mary B. 1991. "Editing Old French Texts in the 80's: Theory and Practice." *RPh* 45: 7-43.
- Visani, Roberto de, ed. 1869. *Del 'Tesoro' volgarizzato di Brunetto Latini*. Scelta di Curiosità Letterarie Inedite o Rare, 104. Bologna: Romagnoli.
- Wittlin, Curt J., ed. 1971-89. *Llibre del tresor: versió catalana de Guillem de Copons*. 4 vols. Barcelona: Barcino.
- . 1988. "Una traducció catalana parcial del *Tresor* de Brunetto Latini conservada a l'Arxiu Històric de la ciutat de Barcelona." In *Miscel·lània Joan Gili*, a cura d'Albert Manent i Josep Massot i Muntaner . . . , 625-37. [Montserrat]: Associació Internacional de Llengua i Literatura Catalanes, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat.