

MARÍA JOSÉ MUÑOZ JIMÉNEZ (ed.), *El florilegio: espacio de encuentro de los autores antiguos y medievales*, Porto: Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'études médiévales, 2011, pp. xxx + 259, ISBN 978-2-503-53596-8.

In 1527 Sichardus published all 261 verses of *Laus Pisonis*. Had he not done so, modern acquaintance with the poem might have been limited to the 190 verses included in the 12th-century *Florilegium Gallicum*. The same compilation includes snippets of Petronius's novel that might otherwise have perished, and not only the 11th-century *Florilegium Frisingense* but also the Verona *Flores* of 1329 include otherwise unknown verses of Publilius. Another florilegium connected with the Verona *Flores* has now been described by G. Bottari, *Fili della cultura veronese del Trecento*, Verona 2010, 45-102. How much classical material survives only in medieval florilegia depends partly on one's definition of 'florilegium'. Most people who use the term probably take it to mean a collection of passages excerpted from different authors, and that definition fits most of the things that Bruce Barker-Benfield assembled under 'florilegia' in his index to L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and transmission*, Oxford 1983, 480. Even when they do not offer unique or rare material, they may be uneliminable witnesses to a classical text or at least shed light on its circulation.

Work on florilegia of classical authors was opened up 80 years ago by B. L. Ullman, who as Ana María Aldama Roy puts it in the volume under review, p. 45, «ha señalado que la importancia del estudio de los florilegios no reside tanto en su aportación para el establecimiento del texto original como en que son muestra de la cultura literaria de la época en la que fueron elaborados». Valuable contributions to delineating the contexts in which some of them were compiled have since come from R. H. & M. A. Rouse, and B. Munk Olsen in various works has kept classicists abreast of the latest research.

The volume under review combines articles by ten members of the Grupo de Investigación de la Universidad Complutense «La literatura latina en extractos: florilegios y antologías de la Edad Media y el Renacimiento», some of them given as papers at a congress held in 2009 at Palermo. As it happens, all the contributors are female. Many of them say that they are contributing specifically to a nationally financed project, «Los florilegios latinos conservados en España IV», and indeed all but two of the articles discuss manuscripts preserved in Spain, though the «Índice de manuscritos», pp. 249-50, lists others from Arras, Berlin, Bern, Darmstadt, Douai, Durham, Copenhagen, St Petersburg, Milan, Paris, Valenciennes, and Würzburg. Six of the articles illustrate manuscripts discussed. At the end come an «Índice

de autores y obras antiguos, medievales y renacentistas» and an «Índice de autores modernos».

As the footnotes often refer to the same works, space would have been saved by the American system of reference: a comprehensive bibliography at the end and in the notes just author, year, and page. Such a bibliography would also have been kinder to readers outside Spain, because several of the authors had already published related articles, usually in Spanish journals or miscellanies not always easy to find outside Spain; it would also have revealed more quickly how much recycling has gone into the present volume.

The articles range from the 12th century to the 17th and deal with compilations in Latin or an Iberian vernacular that may be arranged by author or topic, may or may not give the name of the author quoted, may be more or less faithful to the original context, and may put on the same footing authors who wrote in verse or prose, authors secular and Christian, and authors classical and medieval or even humanistic – Petrarch in *Montserrat 981*, discussed by Marta Cruz Trujillo, and Bruni in *Madrid Nac. 4515*, discussed by Montserrat Jiménez San Cristóbal. As I am reviewing the volume for a classical journal, I feel bound to say at once that it can safely be ignored by editors of classical texts unless they are bent on listing every witness however remote or insignificant. If not in intention, in results it belongs under ‘reception’, and there too the results are often disappointingly vague, as when Irene Villarroel Fernández, p. 210, concludes of *Tarragona 94* that «la finalidad de este florilegio ... es proporcionar reglas generales dirigidas a la acción».

A recurrent question, answered on p. 17 by the editor about passages of Jerome and raised for instance on p. 77 by María Teresa Callejas Berdonés about passages of Juvenal, concerns the immediate source: was it the classical author or an earlier florilegium? If the earlier florilegium is not attested but merely notional, one would have welcomed some discussion of how the question can be answered. Some answers are given in passing, when a marked-up source is identified (162, 201), the compiler’s hand found in a copy of the author concerned (102), or the compiler at least shown to have had available a copy of the author concerned (135). Villarroel, however, discusses *Tarragona 94*, a 15th-century manuscript that draws on Books IV–V of the *Speculum doctrinale* compiled in the mid 13th century by Vincent of Beauvais, without even asking whether these excerpts were made from Vincent by the scribe of the manuscript or by someone else at an earlier date, or whether the manuscript was written in Spain or France.

If a florilegium compiled from more than one author survives in more than one manuscript, it makes possible a stream of articles entitled “The text of X in *Ms. 000*”, and some of the contributors have yielded to the temptation of writing such articles on Claudian, Horace, Juvenal, Ovid. María Dolores Castro Jiménez, pp. 61–2, gives a nice example of a compiler’s re-interpretation: *Ars*

*poetica* 191-2 *nec deus intersit nisi dignus vindice nodus / incidere*, about the *deus ex machina* of tragedy, is quoted in the *Florilegium Gallicum* under the heading *De modo iurandi*. Beatriz Fernández de la Cuesta González, pp. 106-12, discusses passages of Ovid in *Douai* 749 where the excerptor supplies the context or adds parallels from elsewhere in Ovid. In general, though, I found these articles unrewardingly descriptive.

Of the rest, the two that I most enjoyed both concern the first Conde de Haro, Fernández de Velasco. Patricia Cañizares Ferriz writes an informative, focused, and orderly piece on the excerpts from *Ad Herennium* in his *Vademecum*; she mentions that the inventory drawn up for the Conde in 1455, hitherto known from a copy in *Madrid Nac. Res. 141*, has recently been discovered in the original at Medina de Pomar (124 n. 3). María Felisa del Barrio Vega discusses his military compilation in *Madrid Nac. 9608* and its relationship to the *Vademecum* and *Madrid Nac. 6526*, which includes the only other copy of a *Libro de la Guerra* recently shown to be a set of excerpts from Books I-III of Vegetius in the Castilian translation made by Alfonso de San Cristóbal. The composition of *Madrid Nac. 9608* poses delicate problems, which del Barrio tackles with full attention to scripts and watermarks. She illustrates (in black and white, but see p. 177 n. 16) an exemplar that picks out names in red and a copy that picks them out by writing them larger.

Some random observations:

pp. 12-17: This section of the first piece and then the next two pieces concern manuscripts of the *Florilegium Gallicum*, for a full treatment of which all three authors cite a monograph of 2008 by Fernández de la Cuesta. She takes no account of *The Hague 70 E 9*, apparently written in the 1440s, to which I drew attention in an article unlikely, I admit, to be read by fans of florilegia, "The transmission of Florus and the *Periochae* again", *C. Q.* 85, 1991, 453-83, at 454 n. 8.

pp. 54-5: Folio numbers are not given either here for the three illustrations or in the text for the excerpts from Claudian, which Aldama discusses. One learns, however, that she was seriously ill when the congress at Palermo took place and has since died (8).

pp. 68-9: These two illustrations of *Esc. Q I 14* cannot both show f. 61r. It is also hard to believe that they show the same hand as the illustration of f. 91r on p. 31, but nowhere in the volume do I find any mention of different hands. Cañizares, p. 134 n. 15, assigns the manuscript to the mid 13th century, presumably because Fernández de la Cuesta did so in her monograph, p. 150; but in *R. H. T.* n. s. 7, 2012, she says «ss. XIII-XIV» on p. 225 and «fin s. XIII» on p. 239, and other contributors assign it to the 14th, surely too late for the hand illustrated on pp. 68-9.

p. 166 n. 9: Del Barrio says that the *Notabilia Vegeci* in *Madrid Nac. 9522*, three passages from Book I, present variants attested in unabridged

manuscripts. Why does she not cite Callejas's edition of Books I-II and disclose which manuscripts they are?

p. 171: Del Barrio either does not know or does not accept that in all probability Alfonso de San Cristóbal dedicated his translation of Vegetius not to Enrique IV of Castile and León (1454-74) but to Enrique III (1390-1406). P. E. Russell announced this conclusion in 1985 and twice set out his case, most recently in T. Martínez Romero - R. Recio (ed.), *Essays on medieval translation in the Iberian peninsula*, Castellón de la Plana 2001, 325-40. He made the further point that the earlier date removes the chronological impediment to crediting Enrique de Villena with the *Libro* as well as the *Trabajos de Hércules*, which precede it in *Madrid Nac.* 6526. Also in favour of Enrique III is J. D. Rodríguez Velasco, *El debate sobre la caballería en el siglo XV*, Salamanca 1996, 38 n. 24.

p. 181 n. 18: This note, one of the longest in the volume and the only polemical one, is directed at an article by María Elvira Roca Barea, *Anuario de Estudios Medievales* 37, 2007, 267-304. The article is indeed unsatisfactory in many ways, but it is not true that she fails to cite «alguna de las ediciones críticas del texto del *Epitomæ*»: see p. 271 n. 13, p. 273 n. 20.

pp. 192, 202: *Montserrat 981* (s. xv) includes *Auctoritates et summe Parvi Urbani*. Without citing any of the excerpts or providing any bibliography, Cruz attributes *Parvus Urbanus* to Daniel of Beccles, but Olivar's *Catàleg* gives the opening of the excerpts, *Cum nichil utilius*, which shows that they come from one of the two works sometimes known as *Facetus*, the one edited by C. Schroeder, *Der deutsche Facetus*, Berlin 1911, 3-28, and J. Morawski, *Le Facet en françoys*, Poznan 1923, 3-19. It has the subscription *Liber Parvi Urbani* in *Dublin Trin.* 97, where it precedes *Liber Urbani Danielis Becclesiensis*.

p. 194: M. J. Muñoz, the editor of the volume, is said to have demonstrated in a forthcoming article that the *Flores sumpte a magistro Patrarcha laureato* in *Montserrat 981* were copied from *Madrid Nac.* 19358. That they were copied «de este manuscrito o de otro similar» was already the opinion of M. Villar, *Códices petrarquescos en España*, Padua 1995, 198.

pp. 214, 220: The compilation in *Tarragona 94* ends with two sections not taken from Vincent of Beauvais, *Proverbia ex sententiis Ciceronis* and *Proverbia ex preceptis Pittagore*. Villarroel gives no details of either set but reports that the manuscript can be viewed on line, where the former turns out to begin with *Nulle sunt occultiores insidie*, the latter with *Fuganda sunt omnibus modis*. I imagine they both came directly or indirectly from the *Florilegium Angelicum*, where they occur together, for instance in *Vat. Pal. Lat.* 957 (s. xii), f. 158; but the transmission of each is too complex to pursue here.

There are a few misprints in various languages, none of them distracting except *aud<i>endi* on p. 60 and variants on pp. 151 and 155 no different

from the lemma. The standard of presentation is high without being at all fussy. I wish authors and typesetters would recognize, however, that a new paragraph may not be wanted after an indented quotation. Three of the four on p. 169, for instance, break up a tight argument. Computer programmes start a new paragraph automatically after anything indented, but they do obey orders to the contrary.

MICHAEL D. REEVE  
University of Cambridge  
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk

