

LITERATURA MEDIEVAL

Volume I

ACTAS DO IV CONGRESSO
DA
ASSOCIAÇÃO HISPÂNICA DE LITERATURA MEDIEVAL
(Lisboa, 1-5 Outubro 1991)

Organização de
AIRES A. NASCIMENTO
e
CRISTINA ALMEIDA RIBEIRO

EDIÇÕES COSMOS

Lisboa
1993

IV CONGRESSO DA AHLM
COMISSÃO ORGANIZADORA

PRESIDENTE

AIRES A. NASCIMENTO
(Universidade de Lisboa)

VICE-PRESIDENTES

CRISTINA ALMEIDA RIBEIRO
(Universidade de Lisboa)

TERESA AMADO
(Universidade de Lisboa)

VOGAIS

ANA MORAIS
(Universidade Nova de Lisboa)

ARNALDO ESPÍRITO SANTO
(Universidade de Lisboa)

LEONOR CURADO NEVES
(Universidade de Lisboa)

MARGARIDA MADUREIRA
(Universidade de Lisboa)

MÁRIO REIS
(Edições Cosmos)

SECRETARIADO

AURORA ALVES
ELSA SIMÕES
LUÍSA ANTUNES
MARIA DA CONCEIÇÃO SILVA
TERESA OLIVEIRA

CATARINA FONSECA
ISABEL FERREIRA
MADALENA TAVARES
PAULO MILITÃO
VÍTOR GOMES

© 1993, EDIÇÕES COSMOS e ASSOCIAÇÃO HISPÁNICA
DE LITERATURA MEDIEVAL

Reservados todos os direitos
de acordo com a legislação em vigor

Capa

Concepção: Henrique Cayatte
Impressão: Litografia Amorim

Composição e Impressão: EDIÇÕES COSMOS

2ª edição: Maio de 1993
Depósito Legal: 63838/93
ISBN: 972-8081-04-9

Difusão

LIVRARIA ARCO-ÍRIS

Av. Júlio Dinis, 6-A Lojas 23 e 30 — P 1000 Lisboa
Telefones: 795 51 40 (6 linhas)
Fax: 796 97 13 • Telex: 62393 VERSUS-P

Distribuição

EDIÇÕES COSMOS

Rua da Emenda, 111-1ª — 1200 Lisboa
Telefones: 342 20 50 • 346 82 01
Fax: 347 82 55

The *Cancioneiro da Bancroft Library* (previously, the *Cancioneiro de um Grande d'Hespanha*): a copy, ca. 1600, of the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana*

Arthur L-F. Askins

Universidade da Califórnia - Berkeley

When the Brazilian diplomat Francisco A. de Varnhagen had the opportunity to visit Rome in April of 1858, one of his immediate concerns was to see the now well-known manuscript of early Galician-Portuguese lyric poetry held by the Vatican Library, the *Cancioneiro da Vaticana* — Lat. 4803. His interest in the texts and in the field, attested initially by his publication of selected poems from the *Cancioneiro da Ajuda*¹, was sparked by the similarities and presumed contrasts between that Vatican codex, as described and partially published by Caetano Lopes de Moura in 1847², and a previously unknown but very closely related manuscript *cancioneiro* he had found in Madrid in 1857 among the books of a «Grande d'Hespanha.»

His initial impression of the Madrid volume was that it constituted a copy, with Italianate textual corruptions, of the Vatican manuscript, which he supposed «mui correcto e de toda autoridade.» A copy was therefore made of the Madrid text, «tirada pagina por pagina, linha por linha, e letra por letra,» against the day when he would be able to consult the source he presumed authoritative. For him, the Vatican codex would resolve the apparent problems in the Madrid volume and would allow him to publish yet another sampler of early lyric poetry of the Peninsula.

Once in Rome, however, he discovered, much to his surprise, that the Vatican manuscript was equally problematical. Done, in his view, by a «copista italiano pouco destro,» it showed many of the supposed transcriptional defects he had thought limited to the Madrid codex. Even so, he decided as early as 1858 to publish a number of the pieces; he was in the midst of «trabalhos preparatorios» when the Brazilian government posted him to Paraguay and a variety of later diplomatic assignments further delayed the planned edition. In any event, a selection of fifty sometimes arbitrarily revised poems, with an introduction and notes, eventually appeared in 1870³; from the 32 page introduction — «Noticia Critica» — come the narration of the events we have outlined above along with the preceding and following quotations.

The Vatican manuscript itself was clearly the main point of interest in Varnhagen's commentary, but he included scattered comments on the enigmatic Madrid volume, basic among which are: a) «Um e outro manuscripto são incorrectos» (p. 5); b) «Começam ambas as copias mui ex abrupto, sem nenhum titulo ou prologo, com a trova de Fernão Gonçalves» (p. 11); c) «No alto da pagina do principio, à margem da mencionada primeira trova, vê-se escripto '103'; do mesmo modo que ao lado da 3a mencionada trova se lê em romano 'Lxxxvj'.» (pp. 12-13); and d) «O exemplar de Madrid, de letra e papel mais modernos [than those of the Vatican codex] é em tudo o mais como este. Consta porém de 272 folhas escriptas, além da 111, que vem repetida duas vezes na numeração.» (p. 14).

As far as we are aware, Varnhagen's working copy has left no trace, and critical studies have in effect been silent, since Carolina Michaëlis de Vasconcellos' dismissive evaluation in 1904⁴, on the possible nature and fate of the Madrid manuscript itself.

In 1983, the Bancroft Library of the University of California, Berkeley, acquired a substantial group of manuscripts from the now scattered remains of the archive, variously

lotted and widely offered, of the important Spanish family of the Gutiérrez de los Ríos, Counts and Dukes of Fernán Núñez². Among the items came a folio-size volume in a now rather tattered binding, the spine title of which reads, in two lines on an added label, «VERSOS PORTUGUE» [*sic*; there is no room left for more letters]. The manuscript is, without question, that seen by and copied for Varnhagen in 1857, as well as the basic source for the texts he eventually printed⁶. Our purpose here is the simple one of announcing the reappearance of the «Grande d'Hespanha» *cancioneiro* and of providing, as initial orientation to its future use, a summary description of its contents⁷.

The manuscript is held in the Bancroft Library under the call number 2 MS DP3 F3, (MS UCB 143), Vol. 131. Two guard leaves, of newer paper and unnumbered, precede 273 leaves of text. Originally unfoliated, those 273 leaves were later numbered 1-272, with duplication of n. 191 (not n. 111, as misprinted in Varnhagen's comments). Three further leaves of the same paper as the codex corpus follow, blank and unnumbered, and one additional newer-paper guard leaf then comes at the end. The paper of the 273 leaves of text and of the final three blank leaves is of one stock, bearing the watermark of a bird perched on the uppermost of three mountains all within a circle (a minor variant form of that illustrated by Briquet as n. 12250, which he attests in use in Rome between 1566 and 1600)⁸. The size of the manuscript is 335 x 230 mm. Gatherings are generally of four sheets, giving eight folios, but some variation is apparent. The text appears in two columns and has been copied out by three scribes. The scripts are cursive and typical of styles current throughout the second half of the sixteenth century and the early seventeenth. No indications appear as to when the manuscript entered the Fernán Núñez archive, but a registry number, «C.21 c.5» (typical of the catalogue system of that library), appears on the recto of the second of the two guard leaves at the beginning, along with an earlier such number, now heavily inked out. We note in passing that a noticeable amount of the Fernán Núñez archive of this early period acquired by the Bancroft had passed to that collection from the holdings of Juan Fernandez de Velasco, Duke of Frías and Count of Haro, who was the Spanish governor of Milan from 1592 to 1612 and also held diplomatic posts in Rome. In view of his well-documented poetic and collecting interests, one might suspect that our manuscript, if not simply acquired by him during that period, was prepared specifically at his behest.

Varnhagen had described the volume he saw in Madrid as an «espelho» of the Vatican manuscript 4803. The description is certainly valid, though, as we shall see, it masks a number of differences, aside from period, between the two transcriptions. While we need not enter here into the complex question of what collections of Portuguese poetry were available in Italy in the period between 1475 and 1550 and in what form⁹; for our present purposes the following points concerning Vatican 4803 are of importance. It is now generally acknowledged as a copy made, in the early sixteenth century by a single Italian-speaking scribe, from a Portuguese original, at the behest of the Italian humanist Angelo Colocci (d. 1549), whose marginalia appear throughout. The latter consist of the addition of a considerable quantity of authorship indications derived from yet another collection, together with a scatter of annotations on folio locations and sequence numbers of the texts in that other source as well as numerous general corrections. Current thought also accepts the Vatican *cancioneiro* as a credible reflection of the Portuguese codex it copied (transcription and foliation problems apart), though Colocci's added notations early led to the view that a large initial portion of poems was lacking and that there were other scattered losses within the body of the collection. As edited by Monaci in 1875, the collection was composed of 1205 texts, which were copied out on 210 leaves; some 17 of these were left blank on their recto or verso, either in part or in full¹⁰.

The Bancroft manuscript dates, as noted, by paper and by script from a later period — late in the sixteenth century or early in the seventeenth. Whatever its source and despite the deviations and anomalies noted below, it repeats the collection of early Galician-Portuguese

poetry found in the Vatican codex, beginning and ending with the same poems (Monaci nn. 1 and 1205; for facility we cite his numbering in the following comments). Importantly, however, the Colocci marginalia of the Vatican codex (be they simply authorship indications or more expanded commentaries, at times in Italian, in the margins or as cramped interlinear insertions) are incorporated naturally and spaciouly as part of the running text in the Bancroft codex, making it, as it were, a clean and continuous-running copy that ignores the blank pages and other spacing peculiarities of the original.

The first scribe has done poem n. 1 through the 1st strophe of n. 297 (ff. 1-68v)¹¹. While his copying is generally straightforward, he is not above omitting an occasional verse or an entire strophe, as well as emending (both for good and ill)¹². Misled twice, furthermore, by the placement of Colocci's marginalia, he has broken texts nn. 17 and 41 into two poems each.

The second copyist, beginning his work on the first leaf of a new quire, picked up with the 2nd strophe of poem n. 297 (f. 69r) and continued through the first two lines of the 1st strophe of n. 658 (f. 152v — ending a gathering).

His work is generally more faithful to the original than that of the first scribe, yet other traits individualize his transcription. He has omitted poem n. 510, which was lined out in the original. In n. 585 (f. 135v), he has restored the refrains to the ends of the strophes (if only partially), where they do not appear in the source. And finally, he became distracted in the final three folios of his work, ff. 150-152. Following transcription of poem n. 646 on f. 149v, he began f. 150r with text n. 650 and continued immediately with the sequence 653-657, 647-649, 651-652. He then incorporated texts nn. 1161-1162, before doing the partial transcription of n. 658 with which he ended his work.

Though beginning carefully, the third copyist was, of the three, the least diligent. He began with line 3 of the first strophe of n. 658 (f. 153r — a new quire) and worked properly through the second strophe of text n. 927 (f. 207v, including the now duplicate-numbered folio 191). In the process he became momentarily confused in the transcription of n. 726 (ff. 167v-168r, producing a garbled text, left uncorrected, that incorporated lines from text n. 698) and was, like the first scribe, misled by a Colocci marginal note and set poem n. 826 (f. 187r-v) as two pieces, the first three strophes of which he attributed to «Pedren Solaz» and the final four to «Joham Baveza.» He did, however, avoid transcription of the supposed final strophe of n. 802, again lined out in the original.

The first scribe resumed work at this point, beginning with the third strophe of poem n. 927 (f. 208r, again, the start of a new quire). He then proceeded straight through text n. 1082 (f. 252v), following which he inserted poems nn. 1149-1151 (f. 253r-v).

Here the third copyist again took up the transcription on a new quire (f. 254r) with text n. 1083 and continued properly through the first two strophes of poem n. 1147 (f. 269v); he failed to copy strophes 3 and 4. From this point forward, he is apparently governed more and more by whim in his work. Fol. 270r begins, surprisingly, with poem n. 1186 — n. 1148 was skipped, nn. 1149-1151 had been transcribed by the first copyist (f. 253r-v), nn. 1152-1185 were omitted (though nn. 1161-62 had been copied earlier by the second scribe on f. 152v). Despite that interruption, all continues again correctly from poem n. 1186 (f. 270r) through n. 1189 (f. 270v, which, in a misreading of the intentions of Colocci's added note, is assigned to a «Pereda»); n. 1190 (f. 271r) lacks the second strophe. The final two folios (271-272), as they stand, contain only a murky reflection of the original. Following the noted partial transcription of n. 1190, the copyist gathered only poems nn. 1193, 1201, and 1203-1205.

The sum of these scribal relocations and lapses has left 43 poems missing from the Bancroft manuscript, beyond the previously rejected n. 510: nn. 1148, 1152-60, 1163-85, 1191-92, 1194-1200, and 1202 — suspiciously heavy losses as the transcription neared its end.

Unfortunately, the manuscript therefore fails to offer the additional, independent witness that one might have wished to the collections of early Galician-Portuguese lyric poetry available in Italy in the XVth century. While its readings (later and derivative though they be)

can indeed aid, as Varnhagen originally suggested, in clarifying a number of the «difficult moments» in the Vatican codex, the volume must stand primarily as a valuable testament to the growing antiquarian and critical interests of its own period. What creative influence it may have had as such in the cultured milieu of the Peninsula in the early-seventeenth century (if, as we suspect, it in fact returned there shortly following its preparation) only close study of the works of the increasingly interrelated circles of Spanish and Portuguese poets of the period centered in Madrid will eventually reveal.

Notes

¹ [F. A. de Varnhagen, ed.]. *Trovas e cantares de um codice do XIV seculo*. Madrid: Impr. de A. Gomes Fuentenebro, 1849 (though a brief *Postscriptum* bears the date 1850). The publication improved on the initial edition of selected pieces from the manuscript: Carlos Stuart, ed. [= Charles, Baron Stuart de Rothesay]. *Fragmentos de hum cancionero inedito que se acha na Livraria do Real Collegio dos Nobres de Lisboa*. Paris, 1823.

² Caetano Lopes de Moura, ed. *Cancioneiro d'elrei D. Diniz, pela primeira vez impresso*. Paris: J. P. Aillaud, 1847.

³ [F. A. de Varnhagen, ed.]. *Cancioneirinho de trovas antigas colligidas de um grande cancionero da Bibliotheca do Vaticano*. Vienna: Typographia I. e R. do E. e da Corte, 1870. A 2nd, slightly improved edition was issued by the same press in 1872.

He had also contracted in 1861 for a printing in Brazil, which the additional diplomatic postings elsewhere in South America interrupted.

⁴ Michaëlis de Vasconcellos devoted a brief paragraph to the manuscript in vol. 2 (pp. 269-70) of her Halle, 1904, edition of the *Cancioneiro da Ajuda*. She was most unhappy with the readings Varnhagen had presented, and viewed the Madrid manuscript itself, as far as she could tell without seeing it, as no more than a poor copy of the Vatican codex, «de fins do seculo XVIII, ou antes, da primeira metade do XIX.»

⁵ For an overview of the contents of the collection acquired by the Bancroft, see Charles B. Faulhaber, «The Fernán Núñez Collection,» *Bancroftiana*, n. 88 (1985), 1-4. The initial assessment of the present manuscript offered therein is revised here, following a closer examination.

⁶ In addition to other traits commented later in the text, the following are indicative. In his printing of the first poem of the collection, Varnhagen gives «Muytos uei'eu que con gran mengua de sem» (n. 42, p. 116), the reading of the Madrid/Bancroft codex, in contrast to the metrically preferable «Muytos uei'eu que con mengua de sem» found in all other known attestations. He has reproduced its uniquely confused reading of text n. 726 (his n. 21) and has followed its immediately distinctive «creation» of a poet «Pereda» as author of text n. 1189 (his text n. 34, pp. 94-96), both of which caused Monaci to correct, explain, and question in the introduction to his 1875 edition of the Vatican manuscript (p. xv, see below, note 10). He reproduces faithfully its distinctive colophon «Finis, Laus Deo semper.»

⁷ We have seen to the preparation of a master negative microfilm, copies of which are available by writing to the attention of the Head of the Microfilm Department, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. Berkeley, CA 94720.

⁸ Briquet, C. M. *Les Filigranes*. 4 vols. Paris: Alphonse Picard & Fils, 1907. See, in vol. 3, n. 12250.

⁹ Evolution of recent thought on the question is best and most quickly found in: 1) Giuseppe Tavani's chapter «La tradizione manoscritta,» pp. 77-179 in his *Poesia del Duecento nella Penisola Iberica. Problemi della lirica galego-portoghese*. Rome: Edizioni dell'Ateneo, 1969; 2) the important introduction by Luis F. Lindley Cintra (pp. vii-xviii) to the modern facsimile edition of Vatican manuscript 4803: — *Cancioneiro Português da Biblioteca Vaticana (Cód. 4803) Reprodução facsimilada*. Lisbon: Centro de Estudos Filológicos - Instituto de Alta Cultura, 1973; 3) the variant views of Jean-Marie d'Heur as published in his article «Sur la tradition manuscrite des Chansonniers galiciens-portugais. Contributions à la Bibliographie générale et au Corpus des Troubadours,» in the *Arquivos do Centro Cultural Português*, 8 (1974), 3-43; 4) the «riposte» of Giuseppe Tavani, «A proposito della tradizione manoscritta della lirica galego-portoghese,» *Medioevo Romano*, 6 (1979), 372-418; and 5) the new summation and further considerations by the same author under the title (as translated by Rosario Alvarez Blanco and Henrique Monteagudo) «A xénese da tradición manuscrita,» pp. 63-82 in his *A poesia lirica galego-portuguesa*. Vigo: Editorial Galaxia, 1986.

¹⁰ Ernesto Monaci, ed. *Il canzoniere portoghese della Biblioteca Vaticana, messo a stampa*. Halle a.S: Max Niemeyer Editore, 1875. Of interest are the rectifications suggested by Salvatore Frascino, «Per il canzoniere portoghese della Biblioteca Vaticana,» *ZRPh*, 50 (1930), 98-100. Both are still necessary companions to the recent facsimile of the manuscript cited in note 8, item 2. Monaci's printing of the collection as composed of 1205 texts (including duplications: for example; 4/569, 29/38, 116/174, 241/413, 378/817, 613/639, 634/638) has been subject to correction. Modern views, for example, would have both Monaci nn. 768 and 1149 divided into two distinct pieces each, though they would combine several others (nn. 31/32, 263/264, 363/364, 459/460/461, 592/593, 651/652, 928/929, 1155/1156). The original foliation of the manuscript ran 1-10, 1-200.

¹¹ The present folio 46 was mis-located before the manuscript was bound (and later foliated). For correct and uninterrupted reading of the texts, it should be restored to its proper place between the present folios 48 and 49.

¹² His «variant» transcriptions range, for example, from the egregious addition of «gran» to the first verse of the first poem (see above, note 6) through the «correction» (?) of possible lapses (line 29 of n. 209 is changed from «... soler cogias» to a more satisfying «...coger solias»). He has, however, transcribed with care the patent garble of the first verse of n. 39 («Araha senhor ia lh'eu muyro neguey» > «A mha senhor ja lh'eu muyto neguey»).