Chapter 1. Introduction

As I gather, Bartholomaeus Glanville took his name from the most noble family of the earls of Suffolk. As a youth he faithfully observed the Franciscan way of life. When older he frequented the Vale of Isis, Paris, and even, if the surmise is correct, Rome herself. A wise man, he spent the first parts of his studies acquiring skill in philosophy and, equally, theology: in the former, so that he might investigate more precisely the causes of material things; in the latter, so that he might, so to speak, illumine his mind with a divine radiance. Aristotle, Plato and Pliny were his companions in that situation; distinguished by his mastery of them, he elegantly composed and put forth the book of Properties of Things: which the hand of time constantly tended, so that its fame has justly grown to greatness.¹

Historians have been interested in the De proprietatibus rerum of Bartholomew the Englishman since the sixteenth century, when John Leland (d.1552) included the compiler in his catalogue of esteemed English writers and planted the notion of Bartholomew’s Glanville origins. Successive ages and literary cultures have found their own uses for the work and its compiler and their own reasons to investigate him and the image of creation that he helped to perpetuate. The present age is no exception — Bartholomew’s identity, career, philosophy and achievement have all been examined and re-assessed since Leland’s time. It is not the intention here to enter into the debate about Bartholomew’s identity but, rather, to draw conclusions about the ways in which later cultures perceived and represented him. We do have sufficient evidence to be able to introduce him as a not-too-shadowy figure, and to follow traces of some of the personae he acquired over time. These traces, in the form of written responses and attitudes to him and his work, invite the historian’s scrutiny as testimony to changes in medieval people’s ideas about things and their properties. The work becomes a point of reference by which we can judge adherences to, or departures from, orthodox medieval representations of the world and society.

Who was Bartholomew the Englishman?

Bartholomew is known today from his single large compilation of knowledge referred to throughout the Middle Ages as De proprietatibus rerum, ‘On the properties of things’. There have been debates about his nationality and background: when he lived; whether he was an Englishman, Frenchman or Burgundian, or in the English ‘nation’ at Paris; whether he was educated at Oxford or Chartres. In the nineteenth century Léopold Delisle questioned the accepted notion, illustrated above, that Bartholomew was a fourteenth-century member of the Glanville family of Suffolk and identified him as a French compiler.
of the thirteenth century. Michael Seymour has suggested that Johannes Anglicus and Bartholomaeus Anglicus, both of whom were sent to Magdeburg, may have been members of the natio anglicana in Paris after studying at Oxford. Seymour tentatively identifies him with Bartholomew of Prague, minister provincial of newly-converted Bohemia in 1255–56. Gerald Se Boyar argues that he was educated at Chartres. It is generally agreed, however, that Bartholomew completed ‘Properties’ in Saxony in about 1240, that he was extremely well read, but that he might not have had with him in Magdeburg all the books he draws on — in other words, he cites from memory.

For a contemporary account of him we must rely on a few mentions by early Franciscan writers. Giordano of Giano (professed c.1217 and a member of the second mission to Germany in 1221) supplies the few contemporary glimpses we have of Bartholomew’s career. According to Giordano, brother Bartholomaeus Anglicus was one of two friars then in France sent to organise the new Franciscan province of Saxonia; he himself arranged to conduct them thither in 1231. According to the Franciscan chronicler Thomas of Eccleston, writing in the following century, the Englishman Haymo of Faversham and ‘three other professors’ were admitted to the Order at St Denys in Paris in about 1223. One of these others may have been Bartholomew. He became the sixth minister provincial of Saxonia in 1262 and held the office for almost 10 years. The date of his death may have been 1272, since another brother was elected in his place at the provincial chapter held at Magdeburg that year. A younger Franciscan, Salimbene of Parma, looking back from the vantage point of the 1280s, recalls that Bartholomew had gained a reputation over the years as a great master of the Scriptures in Paris and refers to ‘his book on the properties of things, which volume is divided into nineteen separate books’.

Evidence suggests that Magdeburg had been a site of violent conversion to Christianity. According to Giordano, the Franciscans had settled at Magdeburg as recently as 1223, and his account indicates that in the middle years of the century the church was still involved in efforts to extend its control eastwards. It also reveals that at that time Saxony still had a reputation (if only from a Parisian perspective) as a dangerous frontier of Christendom. Bartholomew may have compiled ‘Properties’ to provide instruction, spiritual and practical guidance, and moral encouragement to recruits in the studium, since he tells us that his compilation brings together simply the words of wise and holy men for simple and humble brethren who might not otherwise have access to them. This was a conventional statement of a compiler’s intent, but Bartholomew’s clear language style and accessible imagery do seem to take into account the comprehension levels of educated and less-educated students; while he himself was clearly a scholar, his language and content appear to cater for a spectrum of readers from the scholarly to the earthy.
The early membership of the Order was made up of laymen and laywomen, but clerics began to fill its offices during Francis’ lifetime. As Lawrence Landini shows, coercive popes, able ministers and sympathetic bishops were all factors in the Order’s growth and social integration but also in its inexorable clericalisation.\textsuperscript{11} The date of the completion of ‘Properties’ coincided with events of great significance for the Order, as Juris Lidaka points out, because the dismissal of Elias as Minister General in 1239 turned recruitment policy away from laity and towards those with a clerical education.\textsuperscript{12} This hastened the clericalisation process but worsened controversy over the possession of books and other material goods. After difficult years of division, papal support resumed under Nicholas III, who issued the Bull \textit{Exiit qui seminat} in 1279, formalising the right of Friars Minor to have the use not only of food, clothes and office books but also ‘necessary material for the pursuit of wisdom’.\textsuperscript{13}

Bartholomew’s work is often referred to as the most popular medieval encyclopaedia, and grouped with other large-scale compilations of the late twelfth to thirteenth centuries, in particular \textit{De naturis rerum} of Alexander Neckam (1156–1217); \textit{De natura rerum} of Thomas de Cantimpré (1201–80); \textit{Speculum naturale} of Vincent de Beauvais (1187–1264); and the interpretations of Aristotle of Albert the Great (1193–1280).\textsuperscript{14} These compilers were close contemporaries who all produced their major works in the 1230s to 1250s. They did not necessarily come into contact with each other, and they differ in the degree to which each incorporates the liberal arts curriculum, in the empiricism or otherwise of their approaches to nature, and in the way they organise their material. The works have in common that their compilers were clerics and mendicant scholars who drew upon the writings of the church fathers and of the classical philosophers, their commentators and translators. While the group as a whole has in the past been described as innovative, it has now been convincingly identified with a much earlier-established genre of medieval \textit{compilatio}, or ‘world book’, following early-medieval models such as Isidore of Seville’s \textit{Etymologiae} and Honorius of Autun’s \textit{Imago mundi}. Bartholomew is the only Franciscan compiler among them whose work is accessible to English-speaking readers.\textsuperscript{15} ‘Properties’ can then be considered as one of a peer-group of compilations of knowledge made in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries that arose from the church’s immediate need but that gained lasting prestige during the Middle Ages. The works of Bartholomew’s near contemporaries Neckam, de Cantimpré, Albert the Great and Vincent de Beauvais also have histories of reception during the later Middle Ages but, while their traces can be found in the work of later writers (for example, Ranulph Higden made much use of Vincent’s \textit{Speculum maius} in his fourteenth-century universal history \textit{Polychronicon}, and Geoffrey Chaucer also evidently knew Vincent's work), they were not translated into English or printed in England.\textsuperscript{16}
Michael Twomey, discussing how one might approach a reception history of medieval encyclopaedias, has proposed three phases in the history of the genre: the earliest phase from the seventh century, when encyclopaedias were used as pedagogical aids in the schools, both setting and ownership being institutional and the user a teacher; a later phase when encyclopaedias were used as raw material for sermons and the chief users were preachers; and the still-later period when the encyclopaedia might be part of a private library, a possession with monetary value figuring in inheritances and bequests. In this phase production might be by professional scribe, possibly in the vernacular, and users might be educated laymen together with regular and secular clergy. The reception history of Bartholomew’s work exemplifies and firms these suggested phases. Twomey concludes that ‘Properties’ became ‘the pearl of great price’ for book owners and for writers in later-medieval England: ‘For literary authors, both religious and secular, Bartholomaeus’ encyclopaedia is far and away the encyclopaedia of choice — at least, as far as current research suggests — with Vincent’s Speculum a distant second.’ Moreover it continues after 1500, into the era of print and Protestantism. Twomey warns, however, that, although there might be evidence to identify individuals and intellectual communities who owned and used the book, the motives of users are extremely difficult to reconstruct and any reception history must necessarily be tentative. While individual use and ownership can only occasionally be substantiated within the life story of ‘Properties’, the hope is that we may learn from such a long span of use something about the successive cultures that found it significant.

Evidence for the travels and longevity of ‘Properties’

First, a note on nomenclature used in this book: since we have no definitive version of the Latin text of De proprietatibus rerum and no copy extant from Bartholomew’s time, I have chosen to use an abbreviated name, ‘Properties’, for his work. This is intended to distinguish what we might call the notional compilation, known to us only through a variable array of manuscript material, from the concrete and complete versions of it that are available between hard covers. A printed edition of the Latin text produced in Germany in 1601 is available in facsimile edition and I abbreviate this to ‘DrP’ in citations. The Oxford critical edition of John Trevisa’s English-dialect translation completed in 1398, On the Properties of Things, is abbreviated to Properties. Bartholomew’s compilation is extant in about 100 Latin manuscripts and fragments; a complete manuscript runs to about 400 folios. The layout, running headings, tabula and marginalia of the earliest extant manuscripts of ‘Properties’ testify that scribes were reproducing the work in scholarly format by the end of the thirteenth century, consistent with the view that it was promoted as a handy reference work for preachers. Lidaka concludes that Bartholomew compiled ‘Properties’ as a useful manual for the evangelising German friars in
the 1230s: ‘As a general introduction, De proprietatibus rerum aided those who needed help in finding material: this made it useful for libraries and for the less advanced, but it would not be of much value to the well educated.’ He adduces evidence for its reception in the thirteenth century that ‘places it squarely at such a lower level of readership’. Nevertheless, research into the ownership of ‘Properties’ manuscripts suggests that the work’s readership soon came to extend beyond the boundaries of the Franciscan Order, and that the text was used by scholars of other Orders who required moralised compendia of knowledge as an aid to sermon writing and biblical exegesis. In 1297 the Dominican Master General Boccasini (later Pope Benedict XI) may have given the book to a Dominican convent, and Pope John XXII may have bought a copy in 1329. Charles Samaran suggests that the copy owned by the Avignon Cardinal Pierre de Prés was the one acknowledged by his protégé, the Benedictine Pierre Bersuire, to be a main source for his Reductorium morale of c.1343.

A vernacular translation of ‘Properties’ appeared in 1309 when Vivaldo Belcalzar made an abridged version in the dialect of Mantua for his lay patron, Guido Buonalcosi. Later manuscripts and printed editions testify that ‘Properties’ was subsequently translated into several European languages, including English, during the fourteenth century, and that translation and original were copied, adapted and mined for material over the next two centuries. It was printed in Germany and France as soon as presses were active in the 1470s. In 1398 John Trevisa completed the English translation, On the Properties of Things, for his patron Lord Thomas Berkeley IV (d.1417). Of this version, Seymour lists eight manuscripts and three fragments extant in England, the United States and Japan, dating from the early to the late fifteenth century. In 1495 Wynkyn de Worde made the first printed edition of the English version, followed by the editions of Thomas Berthelet in 1535, and Stephen Batman in 1582. There are in existence, therefore, incunables and early printed editions of the work, in both the Latin and the vernacular versions, dating from the 1470s to about 1600. After the early 1600s it ceased to be reprinted but remained of interest to antiquarians and to modern historians.

The Franciscan Order was an international mendicant brotherhood whose members travelled widely to study, preach and evangelise. The wide distribution of Bartholomew’s work reflects its rapid spread across Europe and across social milieux. Of the Latin text, Seymour lists nearly 100 manuscripts of English, French, German and Italian provenance, now found in collections in western and eastern Europe and the United States, dating from the late-thirteenth to the sixteenth centuries. From the fourteenth century, vernacular versions — Italian, French, English, Provençal, Spanish and Dutch — add to this number. As a result ‘Properties’ was absorbed into separate continental cultures and has other reception histories, and other bodies of literature, beyond the scope of this book.
Tracing the journey

It will be seen that the materials present a wide array of possible avenues for the scholar to explore: in the manuscript and printed material available across countries and continents; through the work’s association with the growth-years of an international religious order; and in the range of questions raised by existing studies. It is also hard to separate the functions of the continental and English translations made at a time when France and England were closely engaged through war and also through a shared chivalric culture. Here, a cross-section of available manuscripts and printed materials, testifying to the work’s status and function at key points in that story, form a longitudinal sample of the compilation’s English reception. These key points are: the time of its composition in the 1240s; of its translation into English in the 1390s and of subsequent manuscript production; and the era of change accompanying the Protestant Reformation and the growth of printing, from the 1490s to the 1580s. Such focal points allow us to examine how far it can be of use to the historian in defining the mental horizons of past readers; and to ask whether, as an account of the significance of things that fed into later-medieval and early-modern literature, it might help us to understand those cultures better. Different medieval readerships produced changes in content, dissemination and modes of production: for how long could ‘Properties’ remain valid as a library substitute, repository of knowledge and guide to salvation? During the English Reformation, why did this Catholic work find favour with sponsors and censors at a time of so much controversy about the English church and its doctrine? What continuities emerge to account for its survival?

The present book includes a survey of the modern literature on Bartholomew and his work, and outlines changes that have taken place in historians’ assessments of the character and worth of ‘Properties’. New light is still being thrown on the medieval literary compilatio, and on the place of Bartholomew within it. Chapter 2 points to significant recent and ongoing projects and locates the present study with reference to them. The aim has been to bring together English-language scholarship on and surrounding the subject, but some of the most significant work at the time of writing is being carried out in Belgium, Germany and France, and is gratefully acknowledged.
The context of the early years of the Franciscan Order provides the starting-point for the story of ‘Properties’ and its journey through time. Chapter 3 sets the reader in the world of the book at a mundane level of household, vineyard and rural domain. It explores the notion that the reader may access Bartholomew’s work through more than one mode of interpretation, and not only by starting at the beginning. The first level of organisation apparent to the reader is the text’s ordered sequence of 19 Books, comprising headed chapters on topics from the esoteric to the mundane (see Figure 2). At this level, the headings and sequence of the 19 Books and their chapters signal the linear ordering of the compilation and reflect the hierarchy of the universe from God down to the humblest of earthly things. However, at another level Bartholomew creates a web-like structure, accessible at many points, based on relationships between people and objects through their biblical, symbolic and affective associations. Many of the topics are earthy and practical, and (it is argued) could be dipped-into and cross-referenced for subjects on which to reflect or prepare a sermon. This exploration is preparatory to an examination in Chapter 4 of ways in which the text could have functioned for thirteenth-century readers, especially the new Orders of friars, as world-book and library substitute in both spiritual and practical senses. These chapters explore the possibility that, while the work can be read sequentially or even piecemeal, an underlying complexity of content, connotation and levels of discourse amplifies the range of meaning available to contemplative readers. Bartholomew was writing for members of an innovative and controversial Order while being answerable to the highest authorities of the

### Figure 2: The 19 Books of *De proprietatibus rerum*.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Subject</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>De Deo</td>
<td>On God and the names of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>De proprietatibus angelorum</td>
<td>On angels, good and bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>De anima</td>
<td>On the soul and reason</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>De humani corporis</td>
<td>On the bodily humours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>De hominis corpore</td>
<td>On the parts of the body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>De etate hominis</td>
<td>On daily life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>De infirmitatibus</td>
<td>On diseases and poisons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>De mundo</td>
<td>On earth and the heavenly bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>De temporibus</td>
<td>On time and motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>De materia et forma</td>
<td>On matter, form and fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>De aere</td>
<td>On the air and weather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>De avibus</td>
<td>On birds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>De aqua</td>
<td>On water and fishes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>De terra</td>
<td>On the earth and its surface</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>De regionibus et provinciis</td>
<td>On regions and places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>De lapidibus et metallis</td>
<td>On rocks, gems and minerals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>De herbis et plantis</td>
<td>On plants and trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>De animalibus</td>
<td>On land animals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>De accidentibus</td>
<td>On colours, smells and tastes, substances, measurements, numbers and music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
established church. It is arguable that the church’s campaign to teach and train orthodox preachers affects the way Bartholomew presents, to recruits of varying levels of education, Francis’ unconventional teaching on the properties of the created world, and prepares them for a form of religious life that pushes at the boundaries of accepted clerical practice.

The marginal glosses

At this point mention must be made of a manuscript feature that is used in this study to support the notion of underlying meaning. At some stage in the thirteenth century a reader recorded interpretations of the column text in the margins of a manuscript. The earliest glossed Latin manuscripts have been dated close to the time of Bartholomew’s death in about 1270. These interpretations were accepted and copied (with some anomalies) along with the rest of the work, forming an integral part of it for readers and copiers of thirteenth-century manuscripts. The marginal commentary constitutes an essential aspect of the early reception of the work, dating as it might from the lifetime of the author, but even if the glosses are contemporary with Bartholomew we cannot, of course, infer authorial intentions from them. All the glosses can do is tell us something about the work’s reception by a generation of readers close to him in time.

Meyer considers that although we cannot dismiss the possibility that the glosses originated with Bartholomew, they may reflect interpretations most useful to preachers. According to Lidaka, Bartholomew ‘is cited in sermons and sermon aids more often than in any other kind of work’. While we do not have an accompanying gloss for the whole work (and none, for example, in Book 15), there are sufficient to support the theory that for readers of the later thirteenth century the ‘hidden meanings’ related to the tasks of preaching and to the correct interpretations of biblical texts. Overall, the glosses strongly suggest that ‘Properties’ could be and was read by some as a vocational guide for prelates and preachers, whether within or outside the Franciscan Order, who could find in the work subject matter for sermons to strengthen orthodoxy at a time when the church was combatting heresy.

The glosses are quite dense in the Books where they have survived but elsewhere we have none. The vernacular translators discarded them, effectively freeing non-clerical readers from prescribed responses to the main text. Manifestations of the text or parts of it made in later centuries demonstrate very different readings. Given the nature of the glosses as a disseminated body they must, however, be taken into account as significant for at least those readers who treated them as a necessary accompaniment to the text, whether these were early readers close to Bartholomew in time or much later readers with access to Latin manuscripts preserved in libraries. This is not to suggest that the glosses show us a ‘correct’ reading of ‘Properties’, or even the one that Bartholomew expected or intended: they do show us one possible reading, meaningful in a certain time
and place. It must also be acknowledged that such a work might contain a great many allusions and nuances of meaning that are no longer available to the historian. While the glosses give us clues to the sub-textual lessons that could be construed or reinforced at the time they were written, they do not make those lessons fully explicit to us today.

The focus in subsequent chapters is upon the lively presence of ‘Properties’ in the world of English letters during the later-Plantagenet and Tudor reigns. Chapter 5 examines changes wrought upon ‘Properties’ under the patronage of noble secular bibliophiles and scholars in late-medieval England. The English translation of 1398 provides a focal point for the work’s reception in a particular cultural context — one in which ‘Properties’ retains authority while undergoing changes to its language, content and presentation. Chapter 6 uses manuscript examples to show that ‘Properties’ not only survives but increases its readership over the late Middle Ages, while re-writers invoke the compiler as ‘master’ of received knowledge about the properties of the created world. It also discusses the first English printed version of ‘Properties’. Chapter 7 examines Bartholomew’s status as a supposedly English writer, and the late-Elizabethan printed version made by Stephen Batman at a time when much new knowledge was becoming available from various sources. A sample of Batman’s responses helps us to measure the distance — long in some respects but surprisingly short in others — between his image of the world and his conception of ‘property’, and those of Bartholomew.

**Approach and method**

An early motivation for this study was the sense that Bartholomew’s work should not be described, as it has been in the past, as an early encyclopaedia — with consequent emphasis on its apparent failures of logic, objectivity and consistency. A modern response to it may involve pleasure and a sense of participation in glimpses of narratives and scenes from everyday life; a panorama that a reader could enter at any point, pull apart into separate Books, or re-read many times — one tempered to the needs of readers with close links to a rural community or accustomed to monastic reading practices. Remarkably, the modern Canadian poet David Solway has found inspiration in Bartholomew; finding ‘a growing sense of delight with … the language of both the Latin original and of Trevisa’s translation. … It was the earthy and material quality of the language, its floral exuberance, rather than the encyclopaedia of often abstract subjects, which I found compelling, almost irresistible.’ A historian too may appreciate the vitality and narrative colour that Bartholomew infuses into a morally useful compilation of knowledge.

The approach taken here follows pointers from the work of educationists of the 1970s based upon Wolfgang Iser’s theories of reading. These theories produced empirical models of the reading process and literacy acquisition that are arguably
relevant to the study of medieval readers. Presumably, as we do, medieval readers decoded written symbols and, as they did so, constructed meaning from them with varying degrees of competence. If we can assume that the physiological/phenomenological processes involved in reading were the same in the thirteenth-century reader as they are in us, and also that good teachers of that time knew from experience how to help students to learn and remember, then Iser's notion of 'active reading' may tend to support the idea that Bartholomew constructed 'Properties' with students' learning needs in mind.

We have no information on, or concrete evidence about, the text of 'Properties' as Bartholomew first presented it for students at Magdeburg. For later readers, including ourselves, it has come mediated by the responses of many others; yet much of the existing literature on 'Properties' has focused on attempts to pin down the 'authentic' text, as an idealised abstraction or exemplar. There has been little attention paid to the individuals who commissioned, produced and read such books, then as now, in response to a desire or need specific to their own lives. Carl Reiter offers another useful approach to the responses of medieval readers who copied and amended earlier works; they can, he argues, be regarded in a sense as that work's re-writers or re-creators. What they pass on to the next reader is something new to some extent, but the work's authority remains. He invokes Iser's theory of the active nature of the reading process to support his view of manuscripts as concrete, battered objects behind which lurk actual historical readers. Whether produced in professional scriptoria or owner-produced in the home for here-and-now purposes, we can see the books they re-created as 'artifacts of the reading process' rather than, or as well as, carriers of an established text. It must be acknowledged, however, that historical hindsight requires a complementary approach that does treat works as entities (for example Chaucer's Canterbury Tales or the Bible). Nor can it be denied that scholarly and painstaking studies of manuscript affiliations provide vital evidence about a work's transmission over time. They are a valued prerequisite for longitudinal studies such as this one.

The text of 'Properties' is long and dense, even in Trevisa's English translation, so the approach taken here is to limit detailed examinations and close readings to a sample of the Books and to examples from the work’s themes as they emerge, and as the referential and multi-stranded nature of the text reveals itself. The study does not pretend to be a comprehensive explanation of the range of things and properties that Bartholomew treats: rather, it aims to highlight parts of the textual landscape and the possible relationships between them, to indicate the way the whole may have worked for its medieval readers as they roamed within the text or stopped to ruminate at particular points.
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