

IRENE VILLARROEL FERNÁNDEZ, *Flores philosophorum et poetarum: tras la huella del Speculum doctrinale de Vicente de Beauvais*, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 95, Basel: FIDEM, 2020, xii+754 pp., ISBN 978-2-503-59067-7.

The florilegium existed in Antiquity. The Middle Ages knew three types. The epitome preserves excerpts from individual authors in the order in which they appear in the original. Examples are known as early as the ninth century. The *Florilegium gallicum* and *Florilegium angelicum* were produced in northern France in the twelfth century. This is the structure of the *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (not exclusively drawn from his works).

The second type of florilegium preserves material in alphabetical order: an example is the *Sententiae* of Publilius Syrus, excerpted in the first century from his now lost *Mimes*. Indebted to Publilius are the *Proverbia Senecae*, which added sayings from the genuine and spurious works of Seneca.

The third type is the sayings of the philosophers and/or poets by subject. These are closest to classical florilegia. One of the earliest medieval collections of this type is by Hadoardus of Neustria (ninth century). A notable and influential example is the *Moralium dogma philosophorum*, modelled on the ramifications of the virtues and vices in Cicero.

Vincent of Beauvais (d. 1264) was influenced by two of these structures. In the *Speculum doctrinale* he used subject order (preserved in the text under discussion) and in the *Speculum historiale* he presented lives of the *auctores* in their chronological context and followed them with anthologies of their works in the order of the originals.

Like many medieval texts, their manuscript context shows that florilegia composed for one purpose were re-purposed over time. The *Florilegium gallicum* is found with dictionaries, with grammatical treatises and material on versification. With the rise of the preaching orders (and the rise of the index) in the thirteenth century, florilegia were turned in the direction of the preacher.

One problem faced by the researcher is that such texts often have generic titles and are therefore poorly catalogued in libraries.

The editing of florilegia began in the nineteenth century: Caecilius Balbus, ed. E. Woefflin (Basel 1855); Publilius Syrus, ed. O. Friedrich (Berlin 1880); the *St Omer florilegium*, ed. E. Voigt (1888-91). It continued in the twentieth: the *Moralium dogma philosophorum*, ed. J. Holmberg (Uppsala 1929), *Florilegium morale oxoniense*, ed. P. Delhaye (Louvain 1955); the *Auctoritates Aristotelis*, ed. J. Hamesse (Louvain 1974); the *Florilegium gallicum* ed. R. Burton (Frankfurt 1983). Such editions are of course crucial

to the study of the subject. Irene Villarroel's is a worthy successor to this tradition.

One use to which modern scholars have put florilegia is their value as indirect witnesses to rare authors, such as Tibullus, Petronius or Pliny the Younger. There is also a rich bibliography on the use of florilegia as sources for literary works in Latin and the vernacular. Curiously, the study of the use of such reference works was pioneered not in medieval studies but Renaissance literature by D.T. Starnes and E.W. Talbert, *Classical Myth and Legend in Renaissance Dictionaries* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1955).

In more recent years, scholars at the Universidad Complutense, led by María José Muñoz Jiménez and the late Ana María Aldama Roy, have published *El florilegio: espacio de encuentro de los autores antiguos y medievales*, ed. María José Muñoz Jiménez, Textes et Études du Moyen Âge 58, Porto: FIDEM, 2011. This is the school to which Irene Villarroel Fernández belongs.

In her introduction the author describes the textual history of the *Flores*. It has its origin in the *Speculum doctrinale* of that giant of compilation, Vincent of Beauvais. The huge bulk of the *Speculum doctrinale* encouraged the separate and early transmission of individual books. Books 5–6 circulated as a pair 'desde época temprana, pocos años después de la publicación en 1259 de la edición trifaria del *Speculum maius*' (p. 27), to feed the new interest in preaching (p. 26). Villarroel identifies seven witnesses, of which three have alphabetical indexes (pp. 29f.). Books 5–6 were then further reduced as the present text, the *Flores philosophorum et poetarum*. The *Flores* eliminates 560 entries and 305 fragments (p. 44).

The editor identifies six manuscripts: Avignon, BM, 228 (13th–14th century) from the Dominicans of Avignon; Milan, Braidense AD._XIV.38 (mid-15th century) from the Augustinian houses of Santa Maria Bianca and Santa Maria de la Passione (Casoretto, Milan); Munich, BS, Clm. 23797 (15th century) copied in Germany; Shrewsbury, Shrewsbury School, MS. 5 (2nd half 15th century); Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, HB III 35 (13th–14th centuries) from the Benedictine house at Weingarten (this omits the poets); and Tarragona, BP, MS 94 (15th century), from the Cistercian house of Santes Creus; illustrated on the cover of the present edition.

The original libraries are monastic, and only one belonged to the Dominicans. However, Milan, Munich and Shrewsbury have alphabetical indexes. The generic title of the *Flores* (if indeed it had a title at all: see below) makes it impossible to identify in inventories.

The author does not hazard a date or place for the *Flores*, but her earliest manuscript (and base text) is Avignon.

The arrangement of the *Flores* is in two books, derived from Cicero, *De inventione*, 2. Book 1 deals with things which are honourable for their own

sake (*De inu.* 2.159-65): *prudentia, iustitia, fortitudo, temperantia*; with their corresponding vices. Book 2 with of things which are honourable with advantage (*De inu.* 2.166-69): *gloria, dignitas, amplitudo, amicitia*; with their corresponding vices. This book includes the formation of the prince. Each chapter gathers about ten quotations, ranging from one to ten lines. Philosophers (understood in the broadest sense) and poets are quoted in both books. Verse texts are, to judge from the present edition, laid out as prose. (We might also note that there was also a florilegium of the *Speculum doctrinale* in alphabetical order.)

In her apparatus, the editor notes in one section the original sources on which Vincent drew. This shows that Vincent's Greek extracts were culled from Latin sources. (Vincent admitted to using florilegia, pp. 7, 23). A certain number of the Greek philosophers are copied from the collection attributed to Caecilius Balbus. Aristotle is sometimes quoted from Boethius (p. 129). 'Ex proverbii sapientie' is a reference to Publilius Syrus. 'Ovidius sine titulo' is the *Amores*. One of the authors extracted is Vincent himself, cited as 'Auctor'. The second notes variant readings in the *Flores*. The third collates variants in the immediate source of the *Flores*, books 5-6 of the *Speculum doctrinale*, of which she has identified seven witnesses.

A curious feature of layout is that the heading for the first quotation precedes the title of the chapter itself. Thus: 'SENECA AD LUCILIIUM EPISTULA LXIII. DE FICTIS LACRIMIS. CAPITULUM CXXXIX'. This, the editor assures us, reflects the manuscripts: 'en gran parte de los testimonios esta referencia aparece destacada de la misma manera que el título' (p. 71).

Based on these collations, the author notes that the redactor of *Flores* treats books 5-6 conservatively. He sometimes merges chapters and sometimes splits them, but the order of chapters is unchanged. There are however some adjustments of order within the chapters. As Vincent had done before him (p. 24), he occasionally slightly edits his texts so that they are grammatically correct when read out of their original context (p. 47).

The system of cross-references is different in *Flores*. Where the *Speculum doctrinale* directs the reader 'see the chapter on ...', *Flores* says 'see book ... and chapter ...' (although the numbers are sometimes wrong, p. 42).

The title of the text in hand is problematic. It cannot be deduced from the descriptions of the manuscripts (pp. 49-55). The title chosen by the editor is found only in Shrewsbury and Tarragona (p. 39). It would have been a good idea to include the title (with variants) in the edition.

With six manuscripts, these *Flores* enjoyed nothing like the circulation of the mighty *Auctoritates Aristotelis* (with nearly 400).

The author quite rightly concentrates on the establishment of the text, and in this she succeeds brilliantly. She has made available for the first time a valuable witness to the knowledge of Vincent of Beauvais, even though he

is uncredited in the manuscripts, and reminded us of the Protean nature of medieval texts, from compilation to abbreviation.

BARRY TAYLOR
The British Library
Barry.Taylor@bl.uk