The revision of a 15th-century Portuguese manuscript and its importance to the textual tradition of *Espelho da Cruz*

Maria Inês BICO
University of Lisbon
mariainesb1@campus.ul.pt

Abstract: This paper offers insight into the method and reasons for the revision of the Portuguese text of Domenico Cavalca's 14th-century work *Specchio di Croce*, specific to the ALC 89 manuscript, one of the two known manuscripts of the Portuguese tradition. The revision of this manuscript distinguishes itself in its bold, subsequent second-hand corrective interventions. Given their quantity and quality of these interventions, they stand as a crucial element to define the textual affinity between both Portuguese manuscripts. To better understand the importance of the revision, it is first needed to know how the reviewer performed it, how he intervened in the text, what different methods he used and if there was a pattern to his actions. Going forward and beyond the methods employed, this paper explores some of the reasons for the revision, namely the unique multilingualism of the text, as suggested by Martin (1956), Cornagliotti and Piccat (1991) and Cambraia and Santos (2019), but also the coherence and affinity with other traditions and the completion of the text. Ultimately, this paper will explore this intermediate status of both the revision and the ALC 89 manuscript itself and how they stand as evidence of the mobile nature of the text.
Keywords: *textual criticism, revision, manuscript tradition, textual transmission.*

There are only two known manuscripts of the Portuguese tradition of the 14th-century Italian text *Specchio di Croce* (in Portuguese, *Espelho da Cruz*), but one is not like the other. Both manuscripts – the ALC 89 and the ALC 221 – come from the Monastery of Santa Maria de Alcobaça's *scriptorium*, and, despite their conjectural dates, both are chronologically close. The ALC 89, which is dated between 1476 and 1525 by the National Portuguese Library (BNP – Biblioteca Nacional de Portugal), and between 1480 and 1520 by the *Bibliografia de Textos Antigos Galegos e Portugueses* (BITAGAP), precedes the ALC 221 manuscript, which is given the earlier 16th-century dates: the BNP dates it between 1501 and 1525 (BNP); the BITAGAP, between 1501 and 1510.

Another, more substantial difference comes into play as soon as one lays their eyes on the manuscripts themselves, even if from a digital reproduction: the quantity and the quality of second-hand corrective interventions. The ALC 221 manuscript, like so many other medieval manuscripts, bears the subtly made marks

of corrective posterior interventions, sparse and made to not draw attention. Conversely, throughout the whole text, the ALC 89 manuscript has bold, coarse corrective interventions made by a second hand.

This feature makes the ALC 89 manuscript one of a kind, for it is not everyday that a medieval manuscript carries the evidence of its textual production. This thorough revision – for it is what those bold secondhand interventions are – is evidence of the mobile nature of a text that hasn't reached its final form and, specifically, of the production of a text in translation as *Espelho da Cruz* is. First written in Italian and with a vast manuscript and printed tradition [Troiano, 2019: 16], the text was translated into Catalan in the first half of the 15ᵗʰ century and, from this language, translated into Portuguese in the second half of the 15ᵗʰ century [Cambraia and Santos, 2019: 51]. Though there has been an ever-constant advance in technology, the creative process of writing must not have changed radically over the centuries. Like nowadays, medieval authors and medieval texts went through several phases of composition, from rough drafts and notes to a nearly finished form, culminating in the publication of the text. And yet, before Guttenberg, medieval books were not printed, so it is possible to assume that before reaching its final form on a *codex* for the first time, a text went through these various compositional levels.

Making use of the typology for genetic documents suggested by De Biasi [1996: 34-5], and considering any needed adaptations for a medieval non-printed text, the ALC 89 manuscript presents itself as a manuscript in the pre-publishing phase, where finishing touches are made. The text is in its almost definite form is subject to slight alterations and corrections. Though an anachronic comparison, the ALC 89 manuscript almost stands as a corrected proof, in which the corrections are not made by the author nor by the scribe that copied it, but by a second hand – the hand of the reviewer. The ALC 89 manuscript, because of the revisional mark it bears, stands out as a manuscript that has the text in its almost final form, but not yet meant to be read by others. The revision makes it stand out, for though these materials are known for modern authors, not many preparatory documents of medieval texts reach our times. Stretching De Biasi's typology, this text only reaches the publication phase with the ALC 221 manuscript, albeit the falls and edges of textual transmission.

Although there are two manuscripts and, even without this revision phase, a comparison between the two is also possible, the revision is of most importance to determine the history of this text. Not only does it provide crucial elements to justify the provisional, temporary character of the ALC 89 manuscript – as will later be discussed –, but it also ensures the stemmatic relation between the manuscripts of the Portuguese tradition. In a previous, exhaustive comparison between the manuscripts, done for my master's thesis [2021, unpublished], it was possible to observe how more than 90% of the reviewer's interventions on the ALC 89 manuscript were accepted and introduced in the ALC 221 manuscript and how, in certain cases, the choices made by the ALC 221 scribe were dependent on the

quality of the revision. Grace to the revision it is possible to affirm that the ALC 89 was used as a model for the ALC 221 manuscript.

Previous studies focused on establishing the relation between the Portuguese manuscripts and used the revision and the reviewer's interventions as a link to determine such a relation. Though acknowledged, there is a need to understand and explain the revision itself, how the reviewer performed on the text, and if there was a method to his actions.

Cornagliotti and Piccat [1991] were the first to consider the reviewer's actions and to assort them into three different categories. According to these authors, the reviewer can thus fill in blank spaces previously created by the scribe; interlineally add a new variant after canceling that of the scribe; or total or partially overlap the primitive – or the scribe's – lesson with his own [1991: 335]. While the two last actions belong to the reviewer, a closer look at the first action, that of eliminating blank spaces, shows a different sequence or order of movements that do not necessarily belong to this agent.

Without expanding on blank spaces, despite their interesting features, it should be said that, when first writing or copying the text, the scribe of the ALC 89 manuscript had sparse moments of hesitation. Without being able to overcome them, the scribe continued writing or copying the text, without first creating a gap on the line to stand for the word or words he couldn't decipher or translate. At a later moment, but not too distant from the scribe's action, the blank spaces were filled in with words or phrases suitable to their size and context. The overall revision of the text only took place after all the blank spaces were filled in and, in some cases, it corrected or altered what was inserted on those spaces. Furthermore, in these instances of coexistence of these two actions – filled in blank spaces and revision – on the same segment, the intervention of the reviewer prevails over the other one, as it is the lesson that is presented in the ALC 221 manuscript. The sequence of actions to have happened in the ALC 89 manuscript is, then, the copy of the text – with the occasional creation of blank spaces –, the filling of those blank spaces, and the full revision of the text. These two last actions could have been performed by the same agent or two individuals, but it is almost certain that they happened at different times.

Thus, from the three categories proposed by Cornagliotti and Piccat [1991], only two belong clearly to the revision phase, that is, to the hand of the reviewer. Yet, other reviewer's actions are lacking from this typology: the simple cancellation of the text, the addition of words or letters on the line, in between the lines or in the margins, and the subtle nuance of an interlineally addition of a variant with or without the concurrent cancellation of the scribe's lesson. Hence, the reviewer can act in five different ways: (i) he can overlap his lesson on that of the scribe, making use of part of the word; (ii) he can total or partially cancel the scribe's lesson; (iii) he can add a word or a group of words to the text; (iv) he can cancel the lesson of the scribe and add his own between the lines or in the margins; (v) or he can simply add his own variant, without any form of elimination of the scribe's lesson. The

difference between (iii) and (v) resides in the fact that the former doesn't have an equal or similar lesson in the scribe's text, whereas the latter, taking the form of a synonym or related word, can often act as a substitution of the scribe's lesson.

In the case of overlapping, the reviewer often substitutes suffixes (e.g.: *servitude>servidom*) or single letters (*per >por*). There's also the case of the word *segunt* to which the reviewer overlaps the <t> with a <d> and adds an <o> to make it *segundo*. In the case of single letters, the revision of the digraph <lh> stands out, not only because of how often it occurs but mostly because of how it is done. Take for example the pronoun *ele* (he). The scribe almost always writes it as *elhe,* and the reviewer almost always corrects it to *elle.* To make such a change, the reviewer erases only the limb of the letter <h> and leaves the remaining vertical stroke to represent the letter <l>. In other words, instead of a real overlap of letters, there is a recycling of the strokes of one letter to form the other. Nevertheless, most often, the reviewer writes on top of the scribe's words.

Between elimination of a word or a group of letters, the reviewer more frequently does the latter, though it is also possible to find cases of the former. In the first instance, there is, for example, the cancellation of the Catalan word *nafras* (wound) or the adverb *ne* (in/at). Once canceled by the reviewer of the ALC 89 manuscript, these lessons do not appear on the ALC 221 manuscript, even if at times there is prejudice to the continuity of the text. The elimination of single letters often dwells on the linguistic characteristics of the Portuguese language. For example, there is an abundance of elimination of the intervocalic consonants <l> and <n> in words such as *dolor > door* (pain), *mano > maao* (hand). Out of all Romanic languages, the Portuguese is the only one to have gone through this process and it stands as a distinguishing feature [Baldinger, 1972: 21 *apud* Castro, 2011: 53; Castro, 2011: 59]. It also possible to find, through the cancellation of the intervocalic consonant <d>, the change from an archaic to a modern form in the conjugation of the plural 2nd person, transition which was in place during the 15th century [Cardeira, 2005: 200-1]: *fazedes >fazees* or *sodes>soes.*

The opposite action – the addition of a letter or word – can too be motivated by the Portuguese language, but it can also derive from the need to supply extra information on the text. There are multiple instances in which the reviewer adds <u> after <o>, in order to visibly mark the diphthong [ow], in words such as *outro* ou *cousa.* Nevertheless, from the textual point of view, the addition of words can answer questions related to the *stemma codicum* of the work. That is, through the comparison with other manuscripts, it is possible to better understand the scribe's motivations: whether they were compelled by the text or the model used, or they were an idiosyncrasy of the scribe. For example, in a segment referring to Moses and the golden calf made by the Hebrews, the scribe writes, in the ALC 89 manuscript, *que adorarom o bezerro* and the reviewer interlineally adds *fezeram e,* to make the segment be read as *que fezeram e adorarom o bezerro* [fl. 17]. In the ALC 221 manuscript, this segment is lacking the first verb and reads as *que fezeram o bezerro* and this difference is useful to highlight the importance

of the revision as a link between the Portuguese manuscripts. Nevertheless, looking at other traditions of the text, namely the Catalan and the Italian, it is possible to see that the reviewer's action mimics the pair of verbs found in the Catalan text, which expanded the Italian original [Centi, 1992: 66]: *fet et adorat* [Gallina, 1967: 59]. This addition to the text in the ALC 89 manuscript is motivated, then, by a need to complete the meaning of the text according to its predecessor.

More complex than these three previous actions of the reviewer is the interlineally addition of a variant to the one already present in the text. As aforementioned, this addition can, though not always, be preceded by a cancellation of the scribe's lesson. When canceled the scribe's lesson, the reviewer's intention is unambiguous. There's an automatic substitution of one lesson for the other. For example, when the reviewer cancels the word *iniquidade* and adds *maldade*, there's no doubt that the reviewer's addition aims to substitute the scribe's lesson. The complexity, then, arises when there's no visible sign of cancellation or elimination of the scribe's lesson. Whenever this happens, the reviewer's intentions are rather uncertain. This particular method of revision is the most frequent when compared to cancellation followed by an addition. Is it possible to assume that, even without the visible signal of cancellation, the reviewer had meant to substitute the lesson? The comparison with the ALC 221 manuscript supplies some answers, namely in the number of times these types of interventions are accepted and introduced in the text. The ALC 221 scribe, as said before, accepts 90% of the ALC 89 reviewer's interventions, including these cases of addition with no previous cancellation. For the ALC 221, these additions are seen as substitutions, even without visible evidence of elimination or cancellation.

There is a question that is common to all kinds of types of interventions by the reviewer and that is particularly meaningful to segments constituted by a word or a group of words. If an alteration of single letters or a group of letters could derive from phonological, phonetic, or even morpho-syntactic characteristics not related to the text itself but the language it was being translated into, the addition or substitution of words can be more closely dependent on the model in use. In other words, through these actions it is possible, to a certain degree, to understand whether the reviewer was following a model on which to base his choices or not. Were the reviewer's actions preceded by a need to bring the text closer to its model, completing it where it was lacking, or was he influenced by his taste and sense?

The large quantity of posterior corrective interventions seems to suggest that the text ALC 89 manuscript needed revision. These interventions in their multiple forms highlight the unfinished state of the text and its consequent variation. Notwithstanding how the revision was made, this state brings about a pressing question that needs answering, namely why the revision was deemed necessary and what principles the reviewer followed. The last question stands to reason in order to understand the underlying motivations of all this process.

The already given few examples can make a rough draft of a reason, which is enriched by Cornagliotti and Piccat's first observations. The authors give three possibilities or motivations for the revision:

a) il primo caso, più comune, è quello in cui la seconda mano (o mano B) ha inteso correggere le forme ritenute o sentite come ispanismi in lusitanismi, operando prevalentemente sulla grafia e sulla fonetica.

b) una seconda possibilità è che la medesinma mano abia modificato il lusitanismo precedente in un altro, alla ricerca di una forma più popolare, più moderna o meno condizionata dalla fonte, vale a dire dei passi biblici e patristici citati nel trattato.

c) un'ultima situazione può essere creata per l'intervento, sempre della mano B, teso a correggere una lezione che a noi pare oggi essere attestata e in ambito castigliano e in ambito portoghese con pari o quasi uguale ricchezza di documentazioni, ma che doveva suonare al corretore con buona probabiblità più diffusa o più propria della lingua portoghese letteraria o meno connotata dal punto di vista dialettale. [Cornagliotti and Piccat, 1991: 335-6]

In other words, Cornagliotti and Piccat suggest that the revision was made either to eliminate any traces of other languages that were not Portuguese (namely Castilian), to substitute a Portuguese word for another more popular or modern, or even to substitute the scribe's lesson, even though it is attested in Portuguese, for another which the reviewer possibly considered more literary or more widely known.

Indeed, there is an effort to eliminate traces of other languages, not only just Castilian as suggested by the Italian authors but also Catalan. The history of the transmission of this text is seen through the multiple layers it gathered during its transmission. As suggested by Castillo Lluch, a text of a manuscript is a "mezcla lingüistica", made by multiple linguistic layers and an inevitable tension between the predecessor documents and the scribe himself [Castillo Lluch, 2006: 498]. In the Portuguese tradition of *Specchio di Croce* and in the ALC 89 manuscript there at least three languages in play (Portuguese, Castilian, and Catalan), not only because it is a text in translation but also, as suggested by Cambraia and Santos [2019: 52-3], because of the linguistic profile of the translator and/or the scribe. Likewise, there's the layer created by the reviewer with his interventions and even the existence of the blank spaces can be another source of tension. Then, there's the inevitable existence of the unknown model of the ALC 89 manuscript. Going forward to the ALC 221, it is possible to regard it as a combination of all these forces with the additional force of the scribe, his linguistic features, and his own alterations to the text. Patrícia Cañizares sums up the challenges of working with a medieval translated text and the multiple layers it gathers in itself:

> "[e]nfrentarse al establecimiento de un texto de traducción significa tener present la obviedad de que el autor ésta tuvo entre sus manus determinado ejemplar de la obra a traducir, pero (...) además hay que contar com que ese ejemplar que manejó el traductor

era una copia manuscrita, con todas las infidelidades textuales con respecto a su original (...). También habrá que considerar las dificuldades a las que enfrenta el autor de la traducción a la hora de interpretar la copia que maneja y los posibles «errores» (...), que se multiplicariam si los unimos a los que se originarian en las sucesivas copias del texto romance" [Cañizares, 2000: 293-4].

Perhaps because it is a text in translation and the multilingualism is so prominent, the focus of interest on *Espelho da Cruz* throughout the years has been in regard to the linguistic influences the text bears testimony to. Starting in 1956, Martins was the first to suggest a relation with the Castilian translation, given the presence of words such as *ilusiones*, *dolores*, *generalmente* [Martins, 1956: 138]. In 1991, Cornagliotti and Piccat didn't deny the presence of this language, yet Martin's thesis was refuted [1991: 346]. Only in 2019 did this theme receive new attention, with Cambraia and Santos defending the dependency of the Portuguese translation to the Catalan translation. Through the extended comparison started by Damonte [1997: 222], the two authors found more similiarities between the Portuguese and the Catalan traditions than with the Italian or Castilian traditions. Additionally, with Cornagliotti and Piccat's work as a starting point, Cambraia and Santos added what the other authors seemed to have disregarded: the presence of Catalan words or hybrid Portuguese-Catalan words in the text. The two authors neither subdued nor elevated the Castilian influence on the text but suggested that the mixture of these three languages was probably due to the linguistic profile of the Portuguese translator. Moreover, some common characteristics between Castilian and Catalan – such as the maintenance of the intervocalic <l> and <n> – prove to be an obstacle concerning the level of influence these two languages have on the Portuguese text [Cambraia and Santos, 2019: 53].

Therefore, given this intricate relation between the Iberic traditions of *Specchio di Croce*, and the textual traces left on the Portuguese text, the reviewer makes an effort to dissipate these forms. As mentioned before, the intervocalic consonants <n> and <l> are frequently eliminated, but other words also suffered change. For example, the forms *tengo* and *pongo* are partially overlapped with *tenho* and *ponho*, respectively; *nombre* has its last syllable canceled, and its substitute – the syllable <me> – appears in between the lines to form the Portuguese *nome*. The word *cridar* is often substituted by *bradar* and it's an example of how there doesn't seem to exist a particular method to the reviewer's actions: it is canceled twice, but four times it is not. More importantly, as noted by Cambraia and Santos [2019: 44], the reviewer also replaces Catalan-influenced words, that is, hybrid forms that blend both Catalan and Portuguese. Take for example the word *trameteu*: it has the Catalan root – the verb *trametre* – but the Portuguese conjugation for the singular 1ˢᵗ or 3ʳᵈ person. The reviewer canceled it and interlineally added *enbiou*.

It can also be said that the revision tries to level the language or to update the language. It has already been mentioned the update of more archaic forms of the plural 2ⁿᵈ person (cf. *sodes>soes*; *fazedes>fazees*), but often the reviewer provides synonyms to the scribe's lesson. This alternative diminishes the lexical variety of

the text. For example, to express the idea of pleasure, the scribe of the ALC 89 manuscript varies between at least three words: *prazer*, *deleite*, or *gozo*. Not all occurrences of these words suffer any change through the reviewer, but there seems to be an effort to regularize all to the word *prazer*. In one instance, the reviewer adds *prazer* above the word *gozo*; twice it happens to the word *deleite* and two other times the word *prazer* is added next to *deleite* in word to form a pair (*deleite e prazer* or *deleite ou prazer*). In these numbers are not accounted the times either of these words were substituted for another in the ALC 221 manuscript, for that change is not due to the reviewer but to the scribe of that manuscript. However, looking into that, it is visible an effort to either subdue all these multiples forms to one – *prazer* – or to add it to create a pair of synonyms. A similar pattern can be found in the pair *mundificar – limpar*, though with less interference by the reviewer.

In this instance of concurrent variants, the reviewer's intentions are uncertain, though there seems to be a pattern to his actions. On one hand, the correction of these segments could be due to the change to a more appropriate word in that context and more closely related to the model and the translation; on the other hand, the reviewer could be doing what Cornagliotti and Piccat suggested [1991: 336]: intentionally reducing the lexical variety of the text by presenting a more widely know or popular word.

Cornagliotti and Piccat didn't mention it, but the reviewer's actions, despite all the lexical variants and linguistic particularities, also serve to correct the errors made by the scribe during the copy. There's the mentioned episode of Moses and the golden calf, in which the reviewer adds a missing verb in accordance with the other traditions, but there's another occurrence that stands out not only because of the correction *per se* but, more importantly, because of the connection the revision makes between the ALC 89 and the ALC 221 manuscripts.

It happens at the beginning of the 3ʳᵈ chapter: the scribe creates the space for the capital letter of the chapter, and continues the text as followed: *Segundo nobre codiçom e propiedade do amor de deus he que he pura*. The only change the reviewer does in this segment is the interlineally addition of *a* between *Segundo* and *nobre*. Without any sign of cancellation or intended substitution, the scribe of the ALC 221 manuscript reads it as *Segundo a nobre condiçom e propiedade do amor de deus he que he pura*, and even goes as far as elevating the *S* in *Segundo* to the capital letter that initiates the chapter. However, this reading, though apparently consonant with the reviewer's intervention, proves to be incorrect, given the general context of the chapter and its general objective. In the first chapter, the author makes it clear his intention to explain the proprieties of God's love and, consequently, in the second chapter, the first propriety – its gratuity – is presented. Following this train of logic, the third chapter was meant to introduce the second propriety of God's love – its purity. Without this context, the word *segundo* can be understood in two different ways, though only one stands correct within the context. As the ALC 221 manuscript's scribe reads it – with the help of the reviewer's intervention – the word is being interpreted as *according to*. This reading and interpretation are, however, incorrect, and its consequences are the

ungrammaticality of the phrase. How can, then, we interpret the reviewer's intervention? It isn't much a preposition as it is the change of the gender of the word *segundo* to *segunda*, to make it concordant with the feminine noun *condição*. The reviewer corrects this segment to eliminate an error of concordance between noun and adjective. The error of the ALC 221 manuscript's scribe arises from the combination of the lack of the capital letter in the ALC 89 manuscript and the fact that the reviewer, though adding a substitution, forgets to cancel what was to be eliminated. In this, it is possible to see the link the revision makes between both manuscripts because it is evidence of what might have influenced the ALC 221 manuscript's scribe when copying the text.

Nevertheless, and contrarily, the reviewer also introduces errors on the manuscript, which can be – and have been – transposed to the ALC 221 manuscript. The maintenance of these errors in the ALC 221 manuscript once again stands as evidence of the relation between the Portuguese manuscripts, but it can also shed insight into the functioning of a medieval religious *scriptorium*, namely the hierarchy of the different roles and tasks assigned. In the specific case of these two manuscripts of the Portuguese translation of *Specchio di Croce*, the fact that the errors introduced by the reviewer in the text of the ALC 89 manuscript were preserved in a later copy – the ALC 221 manuscript – shows the superior position of the reviewer, whose choices were not questioned, but, instead, followed. That is not to say that the ALC 221 manuscript's scribe does not reject some interventions made by the reviewer, but these are a sparse quantity when compared to the times when such interventions were accepted into the manuscript.

There are two distinct cases of errors introduced in the text by the reviewer. The first is an example of particularization or specification of the scribe's lesson and it happens in the context of the description of the Passion of Christ. Without the reviewer's intervention, the segment reads as follows: *E as pernas e toda a perssooa* [Jesus] *ajnda depois dos traballos fforõ açoutados* (And the legs and all the person even after the works were flogged). This version is confirmed by the Catalan text, the first, apart from the Portuguese, to present such phrase: "les cames e tota la persona, aprés los grans affanys, foren flagellades" [Gallina, 1967: 163-4]. The focal point in this segment is *a pessoa* which the reviewer corrects to *o corpo*, by adding the segment in between the lines, without canceling the scribe's lesson. With the adjusted concordance between all elements, the ALC 221 manuscript fixes the reviewer's lesson to the text, eliminating any trace of the previous lesson. Without even taking into account the relation between the Portuguese manuscripts and the consequences of the revision in it, it is clear to see the substitution of *a pessoa* to *o corpo* as an intentional deviation from the source-text. As it was said, the reviewer departs from the closest lesson to the Catalan translation (pt. *pessoa*; cat. *persona*) and chooses a similar word to express, perhaps more emphatically and particularly, the intended idea. Through the creation of this concurrent lesson, the text is intentionally altered by the reviewer. This is not, therefore, a case of revision

derived from the need to approximate the text to its model, but instead, a change derived from the sensitivity of the reviewer and his own choices.

The second error introduced by the reviewer goes beyond textual affinity. It meddles with canonical and biblical Christian tradition. In a chapter concerning the seven words of Christ at the cross, the author makes reference to the words directed to the Penitent Thief. The author continues by telling the Penitent Thief's reward: he would be rewarded the Heaven, but he wouldn't ascend *ata passadas quara͡ta dias co͡ jhu͡ xo e co͡ os sto͡s padre.* Indeed, the Christian calendar celebrates the Ascension of Jesus forty days after Easter Sunday, and there's an explicit reference to this temporal frame in the Book of Acts (At 1, 3). Alongside this version of the ALC 89, the Italian and the Catalan texts also provide this time measurement: "quaranta dì" [Centi, 1992: 260] and "xxxx jorns" [Gallina, 1967b: 53]. In spite of the text of the ALC 89 manuscript agreeing with the other textual traditions and the Christian tradition, the reviewer cancels *dias* and substitutes it with *horas*, put in between the lines. It is not possible to know why the reviewer decided to change what is canonically established and correct in the text, but this change – clearly intentional given the cancellation of the segment *dias* – was not due to the manuscript's model or a need to eliminate any errors of the scribe. The fact that the ALC 221 manuscript presents the segment as *quarenta horas* is even further evidence of the relationship between both manuscripts, of the importance of the revision to know this relation, and of the hierarchical superiority of the reviewer in the chain of command.

The revision can, then, have different motivations and objectives. First and foremost, as noted by Cornagliotti and Piccat [1991], the reviewer makes an effort to eliminate any traces of multilingualism, replacing words that were foreign to the Portuguese reader. The revision can too provide more popular, widespread, or modern lexical alternatives. This second motive is, probably, not as dependent on the source-text as it is on the spatial and chronological context. Nonetheless, only a closer comparison between the Portuguese text and the Catalan text – as it is established that the former comes from the latter – can determine whether the creation of concurrent variants by the reviewer in certain cases is prompted by the text and the translator or by other unrelated motives. Entirely dependent on the text are those interventions related to its completion and correctness. In these cases, the reviewer dissipates any lapses or errors made by the scribe, bringing the Portuguese text closer to its model, and, consequently, avoiding divergences between traditions. Likewise, only through the comparison with other testimonies is it possible to discern whether these interventions were textually motivated. As there isn't known a third Portuguese manuscript, this comparison must be done with other known traditions, namely the Catalan, as it was from this tradition the Portuguese tradition came into being.

However, concurrent with this desire to complete the text, the reviewer introduces errors that are later preserved in the ALC 221, the intended final version of the Portuguese text. While in some cases it is possible to see a clear intended deviation – though not always the reason behind it – in others the reviewer's

actions take the form of a hypercorrection. As such lessons were reviewer induced, they are a substantial element to the comparison and analysis of the differences between the Portuguese manuscripts.

Having seen how and why the revision was made, a further question remains unanswered: with what finality was the revision deemed necessary and done the way it was done? As said before, there were multiple causes for the review, either coming from linguistic or textual reasons, but those don't necessarily explain the ultimate finality of the revision itself. Not only that, but there's also the way the revision was made, without particular care, the reviewer's interventions being coarse, bold, and undisguised. Comparing the revision of the ALC 89 manuscript with the ALC 221 manuscript, the difference is evident, and though the latter too has posterior interventions, they are not, by large, in the same degree nor scale of the interventions of the former manuscript.

In order to understand the revision's ultimate purpose, it is necessary to link with other material characteristics of the ALC 89 manuscript, namely the fact that it was written on paper (instead of *vellum*, like the ALC 221) and without the regular, constant care and attention one comes across when thinking of manuscripts as a product of effort, time, and patience. The writing is semi-cursive and oscillates in size – sometimes small and tightly packed together, other large and spacious; the scribe doesn't take into consideration the margins, often coming either short or too long, the result being an indented right margin, among other specific characteristics of this manuscript. When combined with the revision and, ultimately, set side by side with the ALC 221 manuscript, these aspects of the ALC 89 manuscript indicate its provisory nature as a document. As said in the beginning, the ALC 89 manuscript isn't a codex meant to be used as a reading or studyinginstrument. It is, instead, a preparatory document of the Portuguese translation of *Specchio di Croce*, a text still needing refinement and correction despite its high textualization. The revision is, then, the final step before the text reaches its final form, though relative, because, as almost as an ever-changing living being, it suffers further change in the ALC 221 manuscript. In its multiple forms and reasons, the revision in the ALC 89 manuscript has the main purpose of concluding the text, or, following De Biasi's typology, of finishing the pre-publishing phase.

The revision stands as evidence of the mobile nature of the text, this somewhat unstable and developing dynamic in which a text, though apparently finished, can go through more intervention, not necessarily – especially in the Middle Ages – made by the author. The Portuguese tradition of *Specchio di Croce* and its relation with other written traditions illustrates this. Before Portuguese, it was Catalan and prior to that, Italian. The text was bond to change as it was transmitted and translated into other languages and cultures, adapted where it needed to be, though without losing track of the original text. As a translation, a new text was created and, through its multiple stages of composition, it suffered change and new tensions and forces were brought to the scene, being the final text the result of a combination and blend of all these forces. Castillo Lluch calls these forces linguistic

layers, which form the diasystem [2006: 498]. Perhaps because the (medieval) text during its transmission gathers all these layers, Cerquiligni says that

> "[m]edieval philology is the mourning for a text (...) It is the quest for an anterior perfection that is always bygone, that unique moment in which the presumed voice of the author (...) will disintegrate in the hands of all the numerous, careless individuals copying a literature in the vernacular" [Cerquiligni, 1989: 34].

The revision of the ALC 89 has an inherent duality: while it makes the text go forward, it also provides the means to go back. By going forward, it presents the alterations to be introduced in the following manuscript, the ALC 221. In a sense, it is the last touch before the text is "finished", though this word, as ever, needs to be taken with care and caution. But the revision also makes it possible to go back, that is, to make the inverse path of the transmission of the text, as it is an intermediate stage between the ALC 89 manuscript and the ALC 221 manuscript. As such, the revision is both a crucial and auxiliary feature to determine the relationship between the two Portuguese manuscripts. Though a comparison between both texts is possible, the revision provides answers to questions that otherwise would never have been questioned. Some changes particular to the ALC 221 manuscript and its scribe, but through the revision, it is possible to know which are only due to the scribe and which are due to the reviewer of the ALC 89 manuscript. Without the revision, *quarenta horas* would be considered a separative error and would open the hypothesis of these two manuscripts not being related. However, the existence of the revision on the ALC 89 proves otherwise, not only by being the origin of the deviation but also by the reviewer's clear intention of substitution. The same could be said about the opening of the 3rd chapter: even though it takes into consideration other material aspects, the revision of the ALC 89 manuscript determines how the text is presented in the ALC 221 manuscript.

Thus, it is like this that the revision of the ALC 89 makes it a manuscript unlike any other. It stands as proof of the composition and production of the Portuguese text of *Specchio di Croce*, its mutability, and variation. As seen, though the reviewer of the ALC 89 manuscript disposed of multiple forms of intervention, there wasn't a method to his actions as he often varied between them in similar cases. Perhaps more important than how the reviewer performed is why he intervened in the text and, once again, multiple reasons arise. First and foremost and attesting to the multilingual nature of the Portuguese tradition of *Specchio di Croce*, the reviewer made an effort to eliminate all foreign forms. There was also a necessity to dissipate any textual lacunae left by the scribe, often small segments that, despite not always causing any disruption on the text, were significant in meaning. Other interventions are not so easily justified, namely those that present variants and seem to be motivated either by the taste of the scribe or, at least, the taste of his time and place. Likewise, the reviewer doesn't always contribute to the most faithful transmission, as seen in both intentional and non-intentional interventions. All these interventions and their underlying motives had the ultimate

end of honing the text before its final, fixed form in the ALC 221 manuscript. The revision further enhances the nature of the ALC 89, a working document that is proof of this *continuum* of the text, its mutability by several hands. In short, it is a document that is transitory, perhaps never meant to be displayed at a library, yet time thought otherwise.

By presenting this feature of the ALC 89, how it was done, and its reasons, it was our aim to offer insight on the revision itself and discourse its importance not only for the ALC 89 manuscript itself but also to its contribution to the construction of the *stemma codicum* of the Portuguese tradition of *Specchio di Croce*. As it is a unique and interesting manuscript, the ALC 89 still unveils other questions about its production and the translation itself, but hopefully, this can be one more step towards that knowledge.

REFERENCES

Bitagap, 1988: Arthur Askins, Harvey Sharrer, Martha Schaffer (eds.), *Bibliografia de Textos Antigos Galegos e Portugueses* (BITAGAP), University of California, 1988, availabe at: http://bancroft.berkeley.edu/philobiblon/bitagap_po.html

Baldinger, 1958: Kurt Baldinger, *La formación de los domínios lingüísticos en la Península Ibérica* (2nd edition, 1972). Madrid, 1958.

Bico, 2021: Maria Inês Bico, *Espelho da Cruz: tradição, transmissão e tradução*, [unpublished master thesis, Faculty of Letters, University of Lisbon].

Cambraia and Santos, 2019: César Nardelli Cambraia, Marcos Alexandre dos Santos, "O Multilinguismo na tradução medieval portuguesa do Espelho da Cruz: a presença do catalão" in *Confluência*, 1 (57), 2019, pp. 36-58, available at: http://llp.bibliopolis.info/confluencia/rc/index.php/rc/article/view/319

Cañizares, 2000: Patricia Cañizares, "Los «errores» de una traducción medieval: la versión castellana de la Historia de septem sapientibus" in *Cuadernos de Filologia Clássica,* Estudios Latinos, 18, 2000, pp. 293-302.

Cardeira, 2005: Esperança Cardeira, *Entre o Português Antigo e o Português Clássico*, Lisboa, Imprensa Nacional-Casa da Moeda, 2005.

Castillo Lluch, 2006: Mónica Castillo Lluch, "La impostura lingüística: intervención de copistas, editores y gramáticos en los textos medievales" in *Cahiers d'études hispaniques médiévales*, 29, 2006, pp. 497-508, available at https://www.persee.fr/doc/cehm_0396-9045_2006_num_29_1_1981

Castro, 2011: Ivo Castro, *Introdução à História do Português*, 2nd edition, Lisboa, Edições Colibri, 2011.

Centi, 1992: Tito Sante Centi (ed.), *Lo Specchio della Croce*, testo originale e versione in italiano corrente a cura di P. Tito Sante Centi (ed.), Bolonha, Edizioni Studio Domenicano, 1992.

Cerquiligni, 1999: Bernard Cerquiligni, *In Praise of the Variant: a critical history of philology*, transl. Betsy Wing, Maryland, The John Hopkins University Press, 1999.

Cornagliotti and Piccat, 1991: Anna Cornagliotti, Marco Piccat, "Interferenze Linguistiche in un manoscritto di area iberica" in *La Filologia Romanza e i Codici: Atti del Convegno*, 2. Messina, Università degli studi – Facoltà di lettere e filosofia, 1991, pp. 333-355.

Cruz, 1956: Mário Cruz, "O «Espelho da Cruz» de Frei Domingos Cavalca" in *Estudos de Literatura Medieval*, Braga, Livraria Cruz, 1956, pp. 157-158.

Damonte, 1977: Mario Damonte, "Una tradizione spagnola quattrocentesca dello Specchio di Croce de fra Domenico Cavalca" in *Atti della Accademia Ligure di Scienze e Lettere XXXIII*, Genoa, Accademia Ligure di Scienze e Lettere, 1977, pp. 215-222.

Gallina, 1967: Annamaria Gallina (ed.), *Mirall de la Creu. Versió catalana del segle XV*, per Pere Busquets, a cura d'Annamaria Gallina (ed.), 2 vols., Barcelona, Editorial Barcino, 1967.

Troiano, 2019: Alfredo Troiano, *Specchio di Croce di Domenico Cavalca: Tradizione Manoscritta,* Roma, Aracne Editrice, 2019.