

XIX. Tibullus in Two Grammatical *Florilegia* of the Middle Ages

FRANCIS L. NEWTON

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY

The study of the mediaeval *florilegia*, or anthologies, that contain classical authors seeks to throw light in three areas. Of prime interest for the classicist is, of course, the aid furnished by these selections in the establishment of the text of a classical author. We may particularly hope for help from the *florilegia* in the case of Tibullus, since both types of *florilegia* which survive today antedate the oldest complete manuscript (s. xiv) by from one to three centuries. For this reason, excerpt manuscripts—at least some of them—have been cited by editors since the time of the Renaissance. Since one of the manuscripts to be discussed here has never been completely reported, the present investigation may render help in this area, though the help is limited severely by the scrappiness of the selections and the particular interests of the excerptor. The *florilegia*, furthermore, throw considerable light upon education and the extent of knowledge of the classics in the Middle Ages. Of the many extant excerpt manuscripts, the two that form the subject of this investigation cannot claim to be typical—for one thing, the very inclusion of Tibullus among their selections sets them apart in their period—but they reveal under close observation their place in mediaeval instruction, at least in two educational centers; and thus their purpose, which has not been clearly understood before, is clarified. Finally, in any account of the transmission of a classical author in the mediaeval period, the *florilegia* play their part: tracing, in so far as possible, the origins of these *florilegia* to particular library collections may enable us to learn which center or centers preserved in the text of Tibullus in the centuries when he was little read and seldom mentioned. Some conclusions, though limited, are drawn here. The present paper will focus attention solely upon the two earliest *florilegia* containing Tibullus. Students of the Latin elegy must hope that B. L. Ullman will soon give a full

account of the text-transmission of Tibullus, as he has recently done for Catullus.¹

It was Professor Ullman who, more than thirty years ago, presented the first full assessment of the *florilegia* containing Tibullus and of their influence upon mediaeval culture.² He distinguished two classes of anthologies and gave a full text of the Tibullus excerpts in the manuscripts that belong to the second class. The archetype of this second class was produced in northern France, probably in the twelfth century. The selections were chosen for their moral tone; and the excerptor felt no qualms about changing the text in order to render it more edifying to the reader. As Ullman pointed out, the excerpts of the first class, as seen in the Freising manuscript, have no connection with those of the second; they differ from them in being earlier and in being free from arbitrary textual changes and represent perhaps "the activity of some teacher in his schoolroom."³ The present investigation derives from Ullman's suggestion that a study be made of the excerptor's aims through consideration of the whole of the Freising manuscript; it has been broadened to include the other manuscript of this class, now in Venice, and the latter has been found most helpful in interpreting the former.

The earlier of the two extant *florilegia* of this class is found in clm 6292, from Freising, an early eleventh century manuscript, which is well known for its text of Publilius Syrus, as well as for its Tibullus excerpts. From Alcuin's tract *Ad Widonem Comitem*, beginning on f. 1, to Publilius and the *Voces animalium* with which it ends, the book gives the impression of being a school reader.⁴

¹ "The Transmission of the Text of Catullus," *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* (Florence 1960) 1027-57.

² *CP* 23 (1928) 128-74.

³ *Ibid.* (above, note 2) 129.

⁴ The contents are listed and the MS. briefly described in C. Halm, *Catalogus codicum Latinorum Bibl. reg. Monacensis*, Tom. 1 Pars 3 (Munich 1873) 86. Collations of the texts of the several authors, aside from Tibullus, who appear in the *florilegium* are given, for Persius by Wotke and Hosius in *Rh. Mus.* 43 (1888) 501-2, for Juvenal by Hosius in *Apparatus criticus ad Iuvenalem* (Bonn 1888), for Lucan and Martial by Hosius in *Rh. Mus.* 46 (1891) 294-98, for Claudian by L. Jeep in *Rh. Mus.* 29 (1874) 78-80 (some corrections by Hosius in *Rh. Mus.* 46 (1891) 296-97) and by Birt in his edition in *MGH Auct. Ant.* Tom. x (Berlin 1892) clxxv, and for Horace by Klug in *De florilegiis codicis Monacensis 6292 et codicis Trevirensis 1092* (Diss., Greifswald 1902). An examination of the manuscript reveals that Hosius' reports, especially of the Juvenal excerpts, are faulty. Two errors that affect the discussion below (p. 255) may be mentioned here: the report on Juvenal 6.41 is incorrect (there are no single words

Whether or not it originated in Freising, the manuscript already lay there in the twelfth century, as the typical *ex libris* shows. The grammatical aspect of the *florilegium*, to be considered in this paper, is consistent with the great interest in grammar shown by mediaeval Freising.

The *florilegium* with which we are concerned is on ff. 91–143 of the manuscript and contains Persius, Juvenal, Lucan, Claudian, Tibullus, Martial, and Horace. Klug has shown in regard to the Horace selections that this is not the original of the *florilegium* but a copy.⁵ Two alternating hands are distinguishable in this part of the manuscript, the first responsible for ff. 91^v–113^r and 124^r–143^r, the second for ff. 113^v–123^v.

Within the *florilegium* there are differences of treatment with the result that the authors seem to fall into two groups. In the first place, the excerpts from Persius, Juvenal, and Horace, consisting, roughly, of seven, fifteen, and twenty-four leaves respectively, are much more extensive than those from the other four authors, who have, Lucan three leaves, Claudian one, Tibullus one, and Martial two. The evidence of space by itself would not be distinctive, but the *flosculi* from the four poets differ in other ways from the extensive excerpts from the three satirists. They contain many citations of single words (nine in Lucan, twenty-four in Claudian, eighteen in Tibullus, and forty-three in Martial). In contrast, there are no single words cited from Persius or Juvenal, and there is only one in the Horace selections (*AP* 246 *iuveneretur*). Furthermore, the selections from the satirists present very little or no disorder, whereas the selections from the other four are considerably out of order. Finally, in Persius, Juvenal, and Horace, there are no marks of quantity, but the excerptor of the brief selections was interested in prosody and marked quantities, particularly in Claudian and Martial; there is one word so marked in Lucan, and perhaps two in Tibullus, though the interpretation of these is debated. These differences in treatment may lead us to suspect that there are in reality two different *florilegia*. But this is probably not the case, for in one critical respect—the arbitrary changes in text made by the

in the Juvenal portion of the *Frisingensia*) and a single word in Lucan (*Lito*, from 1.632) is omitted in the collation. For the widespread use of Alcuin's tract *Ad Widonem Comitem*, see L. Wallach, *Alcuin and Charlemagne* (Ithaca 1959) 247–51.

⁵ *Op. cit.* (above, note 4) 16.

excerptor—the distinction does not hold good. We should rather think of a single excerptor whose method changed somewhat in handling the several authors.

Hosius and Klug have pointed out the textual changes made by the excerptor in the Juvenal and Horace selections to enable the excerpts to stand as independent *sententiae*.⁶ But the same type of change can be observed in Lucan as well; examples are 1.125, 1.129, and 8.396, where these excerpts read *Non* for *Nec*, a change found also at Juvenal 13.8 and Horace, *Carm.* 3.10.17. There are fewer of these changes in Lucan than in Horace and Juvenal, and apparently none in Claudian, Tibullus, and Martial; but these three instances of change are sufficient to blur the distinction between the three satirists and the four other poets.

From this consideration of the *florilegium* as a whole, certain conclusions can be drawn. The selection was probably made by a single excerptor, whose interest included both moral and linguistic areas. The satirists offered him both, but when he came to the less popular poets, and probably, in his view, the less trustworthy ethical guides, Lucan, Claudian, Tibullus, and Martial, he restricted his interests largely to the rhetorical and grammatical. For this reason he no longer found it desirable always to quote entire *sententiae* or even whole phrases. This explains the inverse correspondence between the total length of excerpts and the number of single words. But, since the prosody of the single word, once removed from its line, was no longer clear, the excerptor added marks of quantity to those whose prosody he was interested in. Hence the greater number of quantity marks in the briefer excerpts. The introduction of the single words is largely, though not wholly, responsible for the disorder, for the disorder is also a mark of the excerptor's reduced interest in these texts. Finally, whereas the excerptor permitted greater disorder in the brief selections, he here tampered less with the text of his authors. Here, the number of arbitrary changes in the text is in direct proportion to the length of the excerpts—fewer in Lucan than in the satirists, and seemingly none in Claudian, Tibullus, and Martial. For the modern, as compared with the mediaeval, student, the briefer selections hold greater interest

⁶ Hosius, *App. Crit.* (above, note 4) 111, and Klug (above, note 4) 15–16. Hosius in *Rh. Mus.* 46 (1891) 296 also observed this in the case of Lucan, but he did not cite examples.

precisely because they have suffered fewer changes at the hands of the excerptor.

Among these the most important from every point of view are the Tibullus selections. They have been published in an accurate collation; I give them in full here only for the sake of comparison with the Venice selections and for the discussion which follows.⁷ In the manuscript, the separate excerpts are set apart by paragraph marks, and these are particularly helpful, since the text of the four poets is written continuously and not as poetry. This is true also of part of the Horace selections. The care with which the form of the original text was preserved may be noted also in the use of capitals, which appear regularly at the beginning of excerpts (including single words), except where the quotation begins in the middle of a line and continues through the next. In these latter cases, there is no capital at the beginning. These features, together with the orthography, give the impression of a conscientious and careful excerptor.

F.117r: ALBII TIBULLI.

Divicias alius fulvo sibi congerat auro. Et teneat culti iugera multa soli (1.1.1–2). Me mea paupertas vita traducat inerti. Dum meum assiduo luceat igne focus (1.1.5–6). ¶ Ruber (1.1.17). ¶ At vos exiguo pecori furesque lupique Parcite. de magno praeda petenda grege (1.1.33–34). ¶ Illa docet molli furtim derepere lecto (1.2.19) ¶ Iam subrepet iners aetas nec amare decebit (1.1.71). ¶ Celari vult sua furta venus (1.2.36). ¶ Flebis non tua sunt duro praecordia ferro Vincita neque in tenero stat tibi corde silex (1.1.63–64) ¶ Nam fuerit quicumque loquax is sanguine natam. Is venerem e rapido sentiet esse mari (1.2.41–42). ¶ O fugite tenerae puerorum credere turbae (1.4.9). ¶ Versatur celeri fors levis orbe rotae (1.5.70). ¶ Vidi iam iuvenem premeret cum ferior aetas Merentem stultos praeteriisse dies (1.4.33–34). tua si bona nescis Servare frustra clavis inest foribus (1.6.33–34). ¶ Statque latus praefixa veru (1.6.49). ¶ Testis arar rhodanusque celer magnusque garonna Carnutis et flavi caerula limpha liger

⁷ My collation is based upon photographs, for which I am grateful to the Staatsbibliothek in Munich. I also have microfilms of the entire MS. Some palaeographical details may be found in Klug, *op. cit.* (above, note 4) 3–4. His “first hand” in the Horace excerpts also copied the Lucan, Claudian, Tibullus, and Martial selections. There are some misprints in the identification of lines from the *Frisingensia* in the *apparatus* of Lenz’s edition (Leiden 1959) of Tibullus; the correct identifications may be found on his chart (30–34).

(1.7.11–12). ¶ Bachus et afflictis requiem mortalibus affer (1.7.41) ¶ Sepe solent auro. multa subesse mala (1.9.18). ¶ O miser interii stulte confixus amari Nam poteram ad laqueos cautior esse tuos (1.9.45–46). ¶ Spes alit agricolas spes sulcis credita ratis Semina quae magno fœnore reddit ager (2.6.21–22). ¶ Qui primus caram iuveni carumque puellae Eripuit iuvenem ferreus ille fuit (3.2.1–2). ¶ Sontica (1.8.51). ¶ Non opibus mentes hominum curaeque levantur Nec fortuna sua tempora lege gerit (3.3.21–22). ¶ Lidius aurifer amnis (3.3.29). ¶ Luridus orcus (3.3.38). ¶ Sopierat (3.4.19). ¶ Sopitae (2.6.38). ¶ Vocales (2.5.3 or 78). ¶ Linter (2.5.34). ¶ Somnia fallaci ludunt temeraria nocte Et pavidas mentes falsa timere iubent (3.4.7–8). ¶ Sevus amor docuit verbera posse pati (3.4.66). ¶ Quid fraudare iuvat vitem crescentibus uvis. Et modo nata mala vellere poma manu (3.5.19–20). ¶ Et mihi difficile est imitari gaudia falsa Difficile est tristi fingere mente iocum (3.6.33–34). ¶ Nec bene mendaci risus componitur ore. Nec bene sollicitis ebria verba sonant (3.6.35–36). ¶ felix quicumque dolore Alterius disces posse cavere tuo (3.6.43–44). ¶ Conqueror ite a me seria verba precor (3.6.52). ¶ tu violente caveto. Ne tibi miranti turpiter arma cadant (3.8.3–4). ¶ Parma (3.7.95). ¶ Edera (3.6.2). ¶ Hāmatis (3.9.10). ¶ Nunc ego te surdis auribus esse velim (3.20.2). ¶ Vertunus (3.8.13). ¶ Gipsatos (2.3.60). ¶ Sero (2.3.16). ¶ Pussula (2.3.10). ¶ Sciphus (1.10.8). ¶ Colu (1.3.86). ¶ Stamina (1.3.86, 1.6.78, or 1.7.2). ¶ Litia telis (1.6.79). ¶ Aquitanas (1.7.3). ¶ Iocundos (1.7.35). ¶ Redimita corimbis (1.7.45).

Heading: Tibullii *Fris.*, *corr. Fris.*² 1.1.64: nec *Fris.* neque *Fris.*¹ 1.4.9
fugite: f *corr. ex ? Fris.*¹ 1.7.11: geronna *Fris.* garonna *Fris.*² 3.3.21
levantur: levan *corr. ex ? Fris.*¹ 3.3.21: nidius *Fris.* Lidius *Fris.*² 3.4.7
somnia: nia *in ras.* 3.4.66 docuit: c *corr. ex t Fris.*¹ 3.5.19: vivis *Fris.*
uvis *Fris.*¹ 3.6.34: locum *Fris.* iocum *Fris.*²

The correct readings, and the errors, of these selections need not detain us, for they are well known and have been used by editors since Mueller. Nor is it necessary to discuss the divergences between these and the later class of *florilegia*: it is clear that the Freising excerpts have not been subjected to arbitrary textual changes, either to allow the quotations to stand independently of their context or to improve the moral tone. The *Frisingensia*, so far as we can determine, represent faithfully the text and orthography of the complete Tibullus from which they are ultimately derived. This practice extends even to the single

words, which have been left in the form in which they appeared in the text.

It is impossible to decide conclusively whether the marks found in the words *Hāmatis* and *Vertūnus* are intended as the *m*-stroke or as indications of length, the reason being that the scribe does not distinguish between the two. Mueller called them long marks, whereas Protzen considered them abbreviation strokes.⁸ I see no reason to assume that they are the same; we may concede with Protzen that *Vertumnus* is the usual spelling and the more likely, in view of the careful orthographical practice of the excerptor, while at the same time we may view the sign as a mark of quantity in the other case. Marks of quantity are common in the Claudian selections which precede Tibullus, and the Martial selections which follow. The word *hamatus* appears nowhere else in the *florilegium*, but the selections from Persius, Martial, and Horace all include citations of full lines with the word *hamus*, spelled with the single *m*. These citations have no long marks, for none were needed, but in the Tibullus excerpts it seems likely that the excerptor, spelling as elsewhere, indicated by this device the quantity, which, in a word removed from its line, was no longer clear.

The disorder also has occasioned considerable discussion. It cannot be due to dislocation of leaves, but rather to the caprice of the excerptor or his scribe. We may agree with Protzen that, disregarding the single words, the selections proceed in reasonable order, and this is true, not only of Tibullus, but of Martial and Claudian as well.⁹ By and large, the excerptor tended to place single words at the end of the selections, but the Martial excerpts indicate that this was not an invariable rule.

A second *florilegium* containing Tibullus is found in a Venice MS. (Marc. Z. L. 497), written in ordinary minuscule of the eleventh century.¹⁰ The MS. has received little attention; one of its three sets of Tibullus selections was reported by Goetz on the authority of Loewe,¹¹ but no editor has examined the contents.

⁸ L. Mueller, *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 15 (1869) 63–77, and E. Protzen, *De excerptis Tibullianis* (Diss., Greifswald 1899) 1–20.

⁹ *Op. cit.* (above, note 8) 5. Protzen's reconstruction of the archetype (6–7) cannot be regarded as proved. A glance at the published collations of the other excerpts reveals that the excerptor handled the placing and order of the single words somewhat differently in each case.

¹⁰ For a more precise date, see below, 278–79.

¹¹ *Rh. Mus.* 37 (1882) 145.

This is surprising, in view of the fact that, for all their brevity, these fragments constitute, after the *Frisingensia*, the oldest manuscript witness to the text of Tibullus. Both Baehrens and Vollmer made use of the MS. for the text of the *Ilias Latina*;¹² more recently, Lacombe and his collaborators have given a brief general description and an analysis of the Aristotle portion, calling it a codex "permagni momenti."¹³

Such evidence as there is for the history of the MS. points to its having been in Italy throughout its existence, or most of it. On f. 65^r col. 2, a later hand has added the text entitled here, "Nomina et Laudes Balneorum quae Sunt Puteolis," ascribed to Alcadinus or to Peter of Eboli,¹⁴ and, on f. 58^v col. 2, among several prayers is one in Italian by a fourteenth century hand. The manuscript belonged to Bessarion and was among the group of his books that went to form the nucleus of the Marciana.

Palaeographical evidence enables us to be yet more precise, for it seems to point specifically to a South Italian exemplar for this manuscript. There is no example of Beneventan writing in the book, a fact which may suggest that it never lay in a center where Beneventan was the prevailing script, but the scribe, by his use of certain peculiarly South Italian abbreviations, ligatures, and punctuation signs, betrays the nature of his archetype.

The most distinctive of Beneventan abbreviations, that for *eius*—*ei* in ligature with stroke through the descender of the *i*—is found frequently (*e.g.* ff. 32^r, col. 2, line 18; 37^v col. 1, line 7; 41^r col. 1, line 21).¹⁵ Among the ligatures, the most striking is the *ti* ligature for the assimilated sound, formed much as the Beneventan scribe wrote it, and used as the Beneventan scribe used it, *i.e.*

¹² Baehrens, *Poetae Latini minores* 3 (Leipzig 1881) and Vollmer, *Poetae Latini minores* 2.3 (Leipzig 1913).

¹³ *Corpus philosophorum mediæ ævi: Aristoteles Latinus, codices descripsit G. Lacombe. Pars posterior* (Cambridge 1955) 1123–24.

¹⁴ The text in Ven. seems to differ considerably from the only one I have seen, published among the *Scriptores de balneis* (Venice 1553) 203^r ff. For the authorship of Peter of Eboli, see G. Sarton, *Introduction to the History of Science* 2.1 (Baltimore 1931) 438.

¹⁵ On this abbreviation of *eius*, E. A. Lowe, *The Beneventan Script* (Oxford 1914) 199, says, "... its presence in a non-Beneventan MS. after the 9th century warrants the presumption that the archetype of that MS. was Beneventan." Lest it be supposed that the archetype of Ven. was written in one of the pre-Caroline minuscules that share some of the features I am here discussing, it may be mentioned that Ven. contains excerpts from, and works of, writers of the ninth and tenth centuries, and that, in these portions also, the Beneventan features occur.

only for the soft sound. The scribe does not have the other *ti* ligature, that for the hard sound.¹⁶ The ligature which he does use is clumsily and variously made, as though he had difficulty in admitting this ligature to his normal stock. An example of his obedience to the South Italian rule is found on f. 32^r col. 1, line 28, where *stultitia* has the first *ti* written separately, the second written in ligature, in the Beneventan form. Some idea of the frequency of the use of the ligature may be gained from these figures: on this same f. 32^r, out of eleven occurrences of assimilated *ti*, the ligature is used six times, always correctly; on f. 50^v, however, the ligature appears only once in six opportunities open to the scribe.

The most noteworthy aspect of the Beneventan system of punctuation is its pointing of the interrogative sentence: that practice is faithfully followed in our manuscript, with but few exceptions. The texts represented in the MS. include a number which utilize that venerable educational device, the question and answer. At the beginning stands Donatus, and here the punctuation catches the eye at once. Alcuin's *Rhetoric* is found at f. 96. On f. 164 begin the arithmetical *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes*, and, on f. 184^v, an astronomical treatise here entitled *Interrogatio Eugenii*. An examination of these parts of the MS. shows that the scribe not only regularly uses the 2-shaped Beneventan interrogation sign, in addition to his normal end punctuation, but also uses it in accordance with the Beneventan rules. The opening sentences of the first and last of these treatises may be used to illustrate the practice:

Partes orationis quōt sunt? (f. 1^r col. 1); Pūtas in gyrando sidera
aliquem perpeti laborem? (f. 184^v col. 1).

Here the distinction between the predicate and nominal questions, as set forth by Lowe, is maintained.¹⁷ This is the

¹⁶ For the formation of the ligature and the rules governing its use, see Lowe, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 148 and 303–7. An example of the Beneventan *ti* ligature for the hard sound may be said to occur in the Greek word *esti* on f. 106^v col. 2, but the *t* in that case does not have the Beneventan form. In contrast, wherever the *ti* ligature for the soft sound occurs, it is, though crude, an easily recognizable imitation of the Beneventan form. The impression it gives on a page of ordinary minuscule is remarkable and only a little less noticeable than it would be if set down on this printed page.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.* (above, note 15) 236–70, especially, on this distinction, 237–38. Of the distinctively Beneventan nature of this interrogation sign, Lowe says in the same

regular practice in these treatises; in the case of the so-called *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes*, the scribe's use is not altogether consistent, perhaps because he was confused as to the practice for indirect questions. What is true of the catechetical treatises holds good generally also for other parts of the manuscript, including the *flores* with which we are concerned.¹⁸

Any one of these features by itself would make us suspect Beneventan influence in this manuscript, but the presence of three (the most distinctive abbreviation, ligature, and punctuation sign) seems to point conclusively to a Beneventan exemplar.

There are other signs that point the same way, though they either are not as distinctively Beneventan or occur less frequently than those mentioned above. I have noted two instances of the Beneventan period (f. 143^v). The other forms of Beneventan punctuation appear more frequently.¹⁹ Ligatures of *mi* and *ni* are quite common in the manuscript; from the appearance of the passages in which these occur, I would judge that the scribe adopted these from his exemplar when he was pressed for space (examples on f. 24^r, e.g. col. 1, line 26; frequent use in crowding, ff. 124^v col. 2, 141^r col. 2). Typically Italian and especially Beneventan is the use of *i*-longa as it is usually found here: for initial *i* except where this might be confused with the consonantal *i*, and for consonantal *i* anywhere; modifications are made for reasons of calligraphy.²⁰

discussion (241), "A careful examination of the punctuation in a large number of Latin MSS. representing the various schools of minuscule goes to show that the suprascript 2-shaped sign is a Beneventan feature *par excellence*. So much so that its presence in a non-Beneventan MS. may at once be regarded as an index of some connexion, direct or indirect, with Beneventan centres." The evidence of the interrogation sign is not to be considered as possessing as great weight as the other points I have adduced, since I have not had the opportunity to examine the MS. (cf. Lowe, *op. cit.* 242). In this connection it may be noted that the *eius* abbreviation and the *ti* ligature are the work of the first hand, or rather hands, where they occur, and also that one of the scribes also served as technical corrector, as, for example, the marginal notes on ff. 106^v and 161^r and the corrections *passim* show.

¹⁸ For instance, the opening quotation of the *florilegium*, from Boethius; two other examples may be adduced: on f. 52^v col. 2, "Quis minor est autem quam tacuisse labor?" (Ovid, *Amores* 2.2.28) and on f. 32^r col. 2, where the frog in the fable says, "num tanto" (Horace, *Serm.* 2.3.318). This last example shows the placing of the interrogation sign as reflecting the spoken sentence, and also shows, as occasionally elsewhere, the lack of final interrogation sign (so also, e.g., the question on the first three lines of f. 44^r col. 1).

¹⁹ That is, the point, the semicolon, and the point and hook.

²⁰ Lowe, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 302.

It must be noted that there is one sign that points in another direction. In the Isidore treatise, *De natura rerum*, which stands near the end of the codex, the spelling *quur* is rather frequently found. This indication I would regard as substratum evidence for an earlier stage of the text here included, a not unimportant sign that the Isidore portions go back to a Visigothic archetype. Aside from this interesting but minor point, the great preponderance of our evidence shows clearly that the Venice manuscript is a copy of an exemplar written in the Beneventan script.

The *florilegium* with which we are concerned begins on f. 19^r of the manuscript, following some grammatical materials, of which Donatus is the first, and "Priscian," *De accentibus* the last. There is no heading for the *florilegium* as a whole, nor is there any *explicit* or other material to identify the excerptor or to state his purpose. The name of the author of the first set of selections ("BOETII") is placed in the first line of text, which also is capitalized according to the practice throughout the manuscript for the opening of a new work. Unfortunately, however, the scribe, or the original excerptor of the *flores* is, from this point on, extraordinarily erratic in identifying the texts from which selections are drawn. Sometimes the author's name is written without capitals, as if it were part of the text; frequently it is omitted altogether. In the case of Tibullus, the poet's name is given in two of the three sets of selections, while in the third, the beginning is marked by the first two words being written in capitals. Sometimes the authors' names or the capitals are misplaced; it is possible that an ancestor of Ven. had the authors' names in the margin, thus facilitating the confusion. The scribe, it would seem, is responsible for writing some proper names in capitals within the text. Other words also appear capitalized; "SALOMONIA DICTA" on f. 36^v col. 2 is not a title, as the scribe apparently thought, and as the editors of *Aristoteles Latinus* followed him in believing, but only a wrong reading from Prudentius (*Apoth.* 512), standing in place in a series of selections from that poet.²¹

The excerptor drew upon a wide variety of sources, for the

²¹ Lacombe's description (above, note 13) is also misleading in ascribing the entire MS. to a single scribe. A more deliberate and artificial hand copied the last three-quarters of col. 2 on f. 24^v and reappears much later in the sections devoted to music, medicine, and geometry. In contrast to the other hand, this one is characterized by the dotted *y*, the *et* ligature, and a flat-topped *t*, among a number of differences in letter-forms.

number of authors, with some mediaeval fragments yet unidentified, is around fifty. He was not concerned with the arrangement of his material, and the result is a monumental disorder, for which no simple theory of displacement of leaves or gatherings could possibly account. The majority of the writers are represented by more than one set of selections; Prudentius selections, to take an extreme example, occur in nine or ten places in the *florilegium*, varying from extensive collections of whole lines to scraps of two or three words and phrases. Unlike the *Frisingsia*, and unlike the later anthologies that contain Tibullus, these selections are not divided into prose and poetry or distinguished by genre. For the purpose of the discussion, however, I shall divide the authors into poetry and prose. The poets represented, though most of them were widely known in the Middle Ages, nevertheless constitute a broad range. They are: Alcuin, Aldhelm, Arator, Avianus, Bede (*Versus de die iudicii*), Columban, Dracontius, Fortunatus, Horace, *Ilias Latina*, Juvenal, Juvencus, Lucan, Lucretius, Ovid, Paulus Diaconus, Persius, Petrus Pisanus, Priscian (*Perieg.*), Prosper, Prudentius, Rabanus, Sedulius, Sidonius, Statius, Terence, Theodulf, Tibullus, and Vergil. Other excerpts are from the "Versus Vergiliani," a poem beginning *Uncia fit dragmis*, the *De ave phoenice*, and, almost at the end of the *florilegium*, the verse containing all the letters of the alphabet, which Baehrens edited from this MS.²² The appearance of scrappy quotations from the *Poema ad coniugem*, ascribed to Prosper or to Paulinus, is of particular interest in relation to Tibullus.²³

The range of prose is much more restricted: Augustine, Bede (*HE*), Boethius (*Cons.*, *Trin.*, *Eut.*, *Comm. in Is. ed. pr.*, *Comm. in Cic. Top.*, *Fid.*), Cassianus (*Coll.*), Cassiodorus (*Orth.*), Eutyches, Gregory (*Mor.*), Hegesippus, Hilary (*Trin.*), Jerome (*Comm. in Ep. ad Gal.*, &c., *Epist.*), Josephus, Landolphus Sagax, Macrobius (*Sat.*, *Comm. in Som. Scip.*), Martianus Capella, Orosius, Phocas, Priscian, Rabanus, Rufinus, and Solinus. The excerptor also

²² "Versus Vergiliani" in Baehrens, *Poetae Latini minores* 4 (Leipzig 1882) 156; *De ave phoenice* and the verse using all the letters of the alphabet in the same collection, 3 (Leipzig 1881) 253-62 and 169. In this last, Baehrens' correction is actually the reading of the MS.

²³ Printed in Migne, *PL* 51 col. 611-16, among the works of Prosper; also in the appendix to the edition of Paulinus of Nola by Hartel, *Corp. script. eccl. Lat.* 30 (Vienna 1894) 344-48.

drew on an extensive glossary and an anonymous life of St. Severus, Bishop of Ravenna.²⁴

The earliest work represented is Terence; the latest, the *Vita S. Severi*, which may date from the eleventh century, and Landolphus Sagax. The most striking feature of the list is the contrast between the richness of the pagan Latin poets and the absence of the corresponding prose writers. Cicero and Seneca are notable by their absence, but seven pagan poets are granted each a total of more than a column of excerpts. Furthermore, if we may judge of the popularity of the authors by the extent of the excerpts, these same poets rank high among the first ten poets. Vergil takes precedence in length of excerpts over all others; after him, Horace is slightly above, Juvenal slightly below, Prudentius. Aldhelm is fifth in order, followed by Ovid, Lucan, Juvencus, Terence, and Persius. The prose writers are dominated by Priscian first and foremost; excerpts from the *Institutiones*, in fact, form a framework at irregular intervals for the other authors and reveal the grammatical nature of the excerptor's interests throughout. There follow, in order of extent: Boethius, Orosius, Jerome, Martianus, and Macrobius. The interest in history is noteworthy, for, in addition to the prominence given Orosius, Bede and Solinus are well represented. The Carolingian writers, of prose and poetry alike, stand out, in number, if not in bulk.

Omitted from the list which I have given are a number of authors whose works can be shown to be quoted indirectly, either through the form of the text or through the context. The Publilius Syrus quotations on f. 53^r col. 1 are clearly part of the Macrobius selections which precede and follow, and the text confirms this conclusion. So also with a line of Juvenal derived from Priscian (f. 22^r col. 1), an Ambrose reference which is part of the comments on Hilary (f. 24^r col. 2), a Terence quotation from Augustine (f. 25^r col. 1), and another, from Priscian (f. 36^r col. 2). Yet all these excerpts were given a heading of some kind by the scribe. These facts point inescapably to a further conclusion familiar to students of the culture of the Middle Ages: that a number of the authors named among the poets and prose writers in the lists above most probably were known only at second-hand to the excerptor. They were known in two ways: through quotations in other writers, and through fuller *florilegia*.

²⁴ Migne, *PL* 106 col. 754-63; also in *Act. sanct.* Febr. Tom. 1 (Paris 1863) 82-87.

The former is almost certainly the case with Lucretius, from whose poem only one genuine line occurs.²⁵ The latter is true of certain Ovid selections, as will be shown below.

Although it is impossible to learn in every case what source the excerptor used, the fact that the excerpts from a single author often occur in more than one place makes possible another deduction: there were certain identifiable combinations in the complete manuscripts or in the *florilegia* on which the excerptor drew. Some of the combinations were clearly based on genre, as Lucan seems to have stood beside Vergil in whatever predecessor there was. Aldhelm (*Lib. de sept.*) was associated with Prudentius. Others are not so clear: Boethius (*Cons.*) is followed by Juvenal. The longest sequence, and most striking, is found on ff. 27^v–30^r: Rabanus (*Rer. nat.*, as also in what follows), Boethius (*Comm. in Cic. Top.*, as also in what follows), Rabanus, Boethius, glossary, Vergilian verses, and Terence. This sequence is almost precisely reversed on ff. 33^v–35^v: Terence, “Virgiliani Versus,” continuation of the glossary, Boethius, Rabanus, Boethius. Another sequence which may have some significance in indicating an earlier combination is: Macrobius (*Sat.*), Horace, Ovid (*Met.*) on ff. 52^v–53^r; this seems to be echoed on 57^r–58^v by: Ovid (*Met.*), Macrobius (*Comm. in Som. Scip.*), and Horace. Finally, Tibullus selections are on two occasions accompanied by selections from the poem *Ad coniugem*. This last is certainly not accidental.

The majority of the authors are accompanied by notes, glosses, or excerpts from commentaries, Persius, for example, by the “*Commentum Cornuti*,” Martianus at least sometimes by Remigius, and Juvenal by scholia of the vulgate class. The influence of the ninth century is again to be noticed. I have noted some resemblances, in the case of other authors, to published mediaeval commentaries, but the paucity of the selections and the fact that many other commentaries yet remain unpublished prevents positive identifications. Some notes may well have originated with the excerptor himself.

The selections from Tibullus are found on ff. 23^v col. 2–24^r col. 1,

²⁵ 1.155 on f. 45^r col. 1, with the heading, “Lucretius.” The line was known to Ermenrich of Ellwangen (cf. Manitius, *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters* 1 (Munich 1911) 296). Another line is assigned to Lucretius on f. 49^v col. 1: “Nec labor est ullus mulierem sternere turpem.” This is drawn from a prosodiacal *florilegium*, for almost the same line appears in that published by Riese from a Paris MS. (*Rh. Mus.* 26 (1871) 336.)

37^v col. 2, and 41^r col. 1. I have given the full text of these three sets of brief selections, with notes below each set. As regards punctuation, a period represents the point of the MS., a comma the point and hook.²⁶

F. 23^v col. 2–24^r col. 1: TIBULLI. Spicea corona (1.1.16–15). pomosis hortis (1.1.17). estivos ortus canonis (1.1.27) assitis divi (1.1.37) ianitor (1.1.56). dites. .i. divites (1.1.78). huius serenae noctis (1.2.63). loetheas aquas (1.3.80). Longa dies molli saxa peredit aqua (1.4.18). Annus in apricis maturat collibus uvas (1.4.19). Garrulus verna (1.5.26). versatur celeri fors levis orbe rotae (1.5.70). Servatur. frustra. clavis inest foribus (1.6.34). Hunc cecinere diem parce fatalia nentes (1.7.1).

1.5.26 verna *ex venna corr. Ven.*

F. 37^v col. 2: TIBULLI. O quantum est auri pereat potiusque smaragdi (1.1.51). Fluminis hec rapidi carmine vertit iter (1.2.46). Iam iam poturi. deserit unda sitim .s. tantali (1.3.78). Sērior etas (1.4.33). prodest (1.8.9? 1.2.78?). qui consultant me (1.4.77–78). Excreat (1.5.74). parce fatalia nentes (1.7.1). Qui furor est atram bellis arcessere gentem (1.10.33). Turba vernarum (2.1.23), festis dapibus (2.1.81). Abdita quae senis fata canit pedibus (2.5.16). Oscula compressis oribus eripiet (2.5.92). At sine te regum munera nulla volo (3.3.24). Vivite felices memores et vivite nostri (3.5.31). Conqueror ite a me seria verba precor (3.6.52). Mutus assit amor (3.11.7),

1.2.46 Fluminis–1.3.78 poturi *om. Ven., verbis Deserit–gentem erasis corr. Ven.*¹

2.5.16 canit *corr. ex cabit Ven.*¹ *statim.*

F. 41^r col. 1: FESTA LUGE (2.1.29), verno flore (2.1.59). gentis aquitanae celebrer messala triumpho (2.1.33). festi dapibus (2.1.81). Illa cava pretium flagitat usque manu (2.4.14). et niveam tirio murice tingit ovem (2.4.28). Cautes obnoxia ventis (2.4.9) exiguus pulsa per vada linter Aqua (2.5.34) nefanda (2.6.18), castaliamque umbram. pyriosque lacos (3.1.16). O mihi felicem terque quaterque diem (3.3.26). Nec me regna iuvant nec lidius aurifer amnis (3.3.29). Vincuntur mollia pectora dura prece (3.4.76). Ore cymera fero (3.4.86), nec venit tardo curva senecta pede (3.5.16). rugosa senecta (3.5.25). Vivite felices memores et vivite nostri (3.5.31). Te manet invictus romano marte britannus (3.7.149).

2.1.33 aquitaniae *Ven. aquitanae Ven.*² 3.7.149 victus *Ven. invictus Ven.*².

²⁶ My collation is based on photographs; I also have microfilms of the entire MS. For both I hereby express my gratitude to the Marciana Library.

These fragmentary excerpts offer very little of value for the text of Tibullus. At 3.3.24 *At*, the reading of modern editors and of late MSS., contrasts with *Et* of the Ambrosian. Ven. preserves the correct reading *serior* in 1.4.33, against the *ferior* of Fris.; the original reading in the Ambrosian is uncertain. On the other hand, it stands with these in reading *precor* in 3.6.52. At 2.5.34 Ven. offers *pulsa*, the reading only of late MSS., where it is presumably an emendation, and of modern editors. Again, we find these excerpts preserving the correct, if obvious, *umbram* at 3.1.16, where the Ambrosian has the unmetrical *umbrosam*. To balance these good readings, Ven. has many errors of its own. In 2.5.92 *compressis oribus* is an extension of the corruption *compressis auribus*, found in the complete manuscripts, including A. Inversions are common, as in 1.1.16–15, and 1.2.63. For this reason, it would be unwise to put much reliance on the word order *festis dapibus* (2.1.81) against all the other evidence, even though the fact that Ven. gives the phrase twice in this order seems to prove clearly that the exemplar had this reading. An obvious scribal error produced *canonis* for *canis* in 1.1.27, for the word *canonis* appears in a verse of Bede only five lines above. Less certain is the case of 1.6.34 *Servatur*, a much-discussed passage in which the complete MSS. and the Freising excerpts read *servare*; Ven.'s reading is presumably due to the influence of *versatur* with which the line immediately preceding begins.²⁷

Brief as these selections are, they are sufficient to prove that they were not taken from a *florilegium* of the type of *ne p a*, which are characterized by arbitrary changes in the text.²⁸ The proof is in these passages:

1.1.37 assitis divi Ven. A Vos quoque adeste dei *n e p a*

1.5.70 rotae Ven. Fris. flor. breviores A cito *n e cibo p a*

3.3.29 Nec Ven. A Non *n e p a*

3.5.16 tardo Ven. A tacito *n e p a*.

According to Ullman, the ancestor of *ne p a* originated in the twelfth century, whereas the exemplar from which Ven. was copied is, in all likelihood, to be assigned to the eleventh.²⁹

²⁷ Alternatively, a question mark may have been read as the *ur* abbreviation, but this is not palaeographically likely, for it leaves unexplained how *re* was read as *t*.

²⁸ The readings of *n e p a* are taken from Ullman (above, note 2) 135–46 and the one reading of the briefer excerpts from the same article, 166–67.

²⁹ *Ibid.* (above, note 28) 130–31. On the date of Ven., see below, pp. 278–79.

In addition to the chronological improbability of Ven.'s being dependent on a *florilegium* of that type, these readings afford definite proof. In assessing the textual value of Ven., it is useful to observe that its excerpts, so far as we can determine, have not been subject to the arbitrary changes characteristic of the other class.

The principles of selection guiding the excerptor of the Freising *flores* have received some consideration by those who examined the selections from the several authors, but their comments have generally been vague and unsatisfactory.^{29a} The study of the later, almost unknown, Venice selections throws considerable light upon the earlier manuscript. The interpretation of the excerptor's purpose in Ven. is rendered easier by two factors: the excerptor selected from grammatical texts comments upon the points which particularly interested him, and, furthermore, his selections from a large number of authors tend to repeat and re-enforce the same points by example. Therefore an analysis of the principles of selection will reverse the order of presentation by concentrating first upon the later manuscript and then using it as a means of interpreting the earlier.

Because only a single set of the Venice selections has been known up to this time, it has generally been thought that the excerptor intended that single words and phrases should stand first, followed by complete lines; that this is not the case is proven by the form of all three sets.³⁰ It is interesting to note that the Tibullus selections are never longer than a single line. With but few exceptions, the same holds good for the other poets of the *florilegium*. Some of the lines are complete sentences, or may stand as such, but a number are not, for example, 2.5.16, 3.1.16, and 3.5.16. As has already been stated, no changes have been

^{29a} Klug's analysis (above, note 3, page 16) accounts satisfactorily for the Horace excerpts, but not for the briefer ones in Fris. Birt's account of the principles of selection in the Claudian excerpts (above, note 4, page CLXXV, note 3) is of interest: "Multa enim et maxime in fine vocabularii vel glossarii speciem habent; praeterea Ruf. I 29-36 afferre solitum esse propter adiectivorum observationem infra videbimus (item Ruf. II 85); et a quo tales flosculi exscribi poterant velut iam regale tumens aut prodigiale caput aut rimosam patriam ex Ruf. II 344 et 434 et 464 nisi a phraseologo et rari sermonis curioso. Rhetorico studio placuit ille locus Eutr. I 350-355 qui in nullis aliis excerptis occurrit." In some ways the remark anticipates the conclusions of the present study; the adjectives in the phrases that Birt cites are formations like the ones found to be frequent in the Venice excerpts (see below, 270-71).

³⁰ Ullman, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 129-30; Lenz' edition of Tibullus (above, note 7) 11.

made to make these complete *sententiae*. Furthermore, not a single selection from Tibullus can be said to reveal a moral tone; there are much better lines for such purposes in the text of Tibullus than any used here. Moral considerations may be rejected as playing any part in the excerptor's principles of selection, except perhaps a negative one. This conclusion also is confirmed by a consideration of the whole *florilegium*.

It is in the language and style of his authors that we must look for the interests of the excerptor responsible for the Venice *flores*. On the most elementary level, he concerned himself with spelling. The question of assimilation in compounds, for example, is dealt with in a grammatical excerpt on f. 19^v col. 1, and *compressis* in the Tibullus excerpts illustrates the rule given there; *assitis* and *assit* are other instances.³¹ The distinction between words spelled with *b* and those with *v* had given trouble since the time of Cassiodorus; his pronouncement on *verna* is given on f. 37^r col. 1, and this accounts for the two occurrences of the word in the brief Tibullus excerpts. *Servatur*, *clavis*, and *verno* reflect the same interest.³² The appearance of *triumpho* and *loetheas* seems due to the excerptor's desire, stressed throughout, to inculcate firmly the correct spelling of words containing *h*.³³ The citation of *dites* explains itself.³⁴

Perhaps equally elementary are the words chosen to demonstrate correct declension and conjugation. The accusative in *-im* is mentioned on f. 52^r col. 1, and *sitim* is the illustration in Tibullus. The ablative form *prece* and the nominative *fors* had both been the subject of grammatical observations, and both are noted in these selections.³⁵ On f. 48, *celeber* is mentioned no less than three times as a nominative form, and this form is one reason for the inclusion of 2.1.33. Two other adjectives which appear in the Tibullus excerpts, *felix* and *serius*, had been given grammatical notes.³⁶ There are, however, a number of types of adjectives

³¹ The word *assis* also appears, with gloss, in the Vergil selections.

³² *Servatur* also appears in the glossary.

³³ The etymology also of *triumphus* is found on f. 36^r col. 2.

³⁴ The two forms, *dito* and *divito*, with gloss, appear on f. 29^v col. 1.

³⁵ *Prece* as being the only form in the singular (f. 43^r col. 1) and *fors* as the nominative form (f. 26^v col. 1). Other words cited because of an interest in the nominative form include *linter*, *murex*, and *ortus*, though all do not appear in the nominative in the Tibullus selections.

³⁶ *Felix* on f. 51^v col. 1 and *serius* on f. 53^v col. 1.

that are not given such separate notice, but which appear frequently in selections from the other authors as well as in Tibullus: those ending in *-eus* (*Spicea*, *niveam*), in *-fer* (*aurifer*), in *-osus* (*pomosis*, *rugosa*), in *-alis* (*fatalia* twice), in *-ndus* (*nefanda*), in *-idus* (*rapidi*), and in *-ulus* (*garrulus*).

Yet, if the excerptor had been content to illustrate only correct spelling and endings, he might well have cited no more than a list of single words. Other principles of selection were at work at the same time, and these made it desirable to include phrases or whole lines. Among these principles was a concern with demonstrating the gender of nouns. Rules regarding gender are frequent in the grammatical excerpts; among the nouns mentioned specifically are *clavis*, *collis*, *dapes*, *fors*, *linter*, *murex*, and *verna*. These nouns appear in the Tibullus excerpts, as also in the other authors, and the Tibullus citations show, by the adjective, the gender of the last three.³⁷ That the varying gender of *dies* was of interest is proved by the first set of selections. Besides illustrating the gender of nouns, phrases and whole lines were adduced to illustrate points of construction. The line 3.5.31, cited twice, shows the genitive with *memor*: the rule had appeared on f. 30^r col. 1; and the rule for the accusative with *iuvat* is given two leaves before the citation of 3.3.29. The dative with *eripio* is noted on f. 29^v col. 2, and the excerptor probably thought of Tibullus 2.5.92 as an illustration.³⁸

On a more advanced level, the excerpts give examples of words whose etymology or precise meaning was of interest. The choice of *excreat* is explained by the definition of *screo* given on f. 33^r col. 2. *Tingere* and *apricus* are analyzed etymologically elsewhere, and *arcessere*, *flagitare*, *maturare*, *murex*, and *verna* are glossed; most of these are cited from other authors also.³⁹ Prosody appears to have been of minor interest, to judge from the fact that only one word (*Sēr̃tor*) is marked. This may, however, be an accident and ascribable to the copyist's failure to include all the marks in

³⁷ Rules for *clavis* on f. 33^r col. 2, for *fors* on f. 26^v col. 1, and for the others on ff. 47^r col. 1–49^v col. 1.

³⁸ Other points of construction that interested the excerptor include: the accusative with *consulo*, similar to the citation from Tibullus 1.4.77–78 (f. 22^r col. 1), and the accusative with *maneo* (an example glossed in the Vergil selections).

³⁹ *Tingere* on f. 35^r col. 2 and in Ovid, *apricus* on f. 28^r col. 2 and in Horace, *arcessere* on f. 52^v col. 1 and in Vergil, *flagitare* on f. 32^r col. 2 and in Vergil with marks of quantity, *maturare* on f. 56^r col. 1, *murex* on f. 49^r col. 1 and in Ovid, and *verna* on f. 37^r col. 1 and in Aldhelm.

his exemplar, for the selections from most of the other poets include numerous marks of quantity.

Finally, it may be noted that the excerptor of Ven. took some slight interest in the subject matter of his selections. In Tibullus and in other authors, he shows a definite choice of mythological items, particularly those connected with the underworld, as the line concerning Tantalus and the phrases mentioning Lethe and the chimaera indicate. Only the third phrase of the first set in Tibullus demonstrates an interest in astronomy; it is more marked in other poets. Geographical interests of a limited and suggestive kind are shown by the lines containing the words *aquitanae* and *britannus*: the latter is cited also in selections from Vergil and Lucan.

A comparison of the principles of selection in the *Frisingensia* with those in the Venice MS. must begin with a remark on some differences. The excerptor of the Freising collection made his selections from Horace, Persius, and Juvenal in part, at least, on grounds of their moral tone. It was not to be expected that his interest in this principle should disappear altogether in his handling of the other poets. Such verses of Tibullus as 1.1.25, 1.4.33-34, 1.9.18, and 3.6.43-44 seem to reflect this moral concern. In this respect, Fris. stands apart from Ven. This same concern with the author's meaning produces another difference in Fris. In his desire to give complete *sententiae*, the excerptor frequently quotes couplets, or, in one case, four continuous lines of the text, in contrast to Ven., which has no selection of more than a single line.⁴⁰

Such differences apart, the excerptors of the two had very similar aims, as a brief comparison will indicate. There are six cases in which the selections overlap at least in part. Three of these are complete lines: 1.5.70, chosen in both instances to indicate the nominative form *fors*,⁴¹ 1.6.34, for the spelling of

⁴⁰ The contrast between Ven. and Fris. in concern for sense is made even clearer by a consideration of other authors; to give but a single example out of many, in Horace, Ven. quotes *AP* 180-81, including, pointlessly, *et quae* at the end of the second line, whereas Fris. more sensibly stops with *fidelibus*.

⁴¹ Also chosen to illustrate the nominative form of a noun of the third declension is 1.1.64, for *silex*, mentioned in a grammatical excerpt in Ven. f. 48^v col. 2. The word *igne* illustrates the rule in Ven. f. 51^v col. 1. Other forms of third declension nouns include: *fures*, *pecori* (these two nouns are also referred to in grammatical selections in Ven.), *foenore*, *verbera*, *vitem*, and, of mixed declension, *iugera*. 1.1.1 may be

clavis,⁴² and 3.6.52, for the declension of the adjective *seria*.⁴³ In the other three instances, Fris. has 1.4.33 complete, while Ven. has only *Serior aetas*, to show the comparative and its quantity;⁴⁴ Ven., on the other hand, has the whole lines 3.3.29, from which Fris. has the phrase containing the adjective *aurifer*, and 2.5.34, from which Fris. takes the word of most interest, *Linter*. From 1.1.17 Ven. has *pomosis hortis*, in accordance with his interest in adjectives in *-osus*, while Fris. cites *Ruber* for the same reason that Ven. had cited *celeber*.⁴⁵

In regard to construction, the excerptor of Fris. shared some of the interests shown in the Tibullus selections in Ven. The dative with *eripio* was mentioned in grammatical excerpts in Ven. and was illustrated by the Tibullus selections there; the couplet 3.2.1–2 in Fris. is chosen largely for the same reason. But these exact correspondences are not the most interesting examples of ways in which Ven. explains the purpose of Fris. Since the Tibullus selections in Ven. are considerably shorter than those in Fris., the latter illustrates a larger number of grammatical and linguistic points than the former; most of these points are dealt with in the grammatical or other excerpts in Ven., though not illustrated in its Tibullus excerpts. A good example is the clause quoted from 1.2.36 in Fris., *Celari vult sua furta venus*; it is an instance of the passive infinitive with *volo*, discussed in grammatical comments in Ven., ff. 21^v col. 1 and 49^v col. 2. The perfect passive participle of *vincio* is commented upon in excerpts in Ven. (f. 44^v col. 1), and the same interest accounts, in part, for the selection of 1.1.64 in Fris. Vertumnus, cited from Tibullus in Fris., but not in Ven.,

chosen for *Divicius*, an example of a noun having no singular (cited in Ven., f. 29^v col. 1). *Dies* in the masculine is shown by 1.4.34, recalling the same interest in Ven.

⁴² Other lines, e.g. 3.5.19, may have been chosen to mark the *b/v* distinction. The interest in assimilation is reflected in the words *assiduo*, *afflictis*, and *affer*. *Sciphus* and, perhaps, *Edera* seem to be selected to illustrate spelling with or without *h*. *Pussula* probably reflects the interest in orthography also.

⁴³ As with *serius*, so also with the adjective *felix*, the reason for the inclusion of 3.6.43. The excerptor of Fris. is interested in many of the same types of adjectives as the excerptor of Ven. (see above, page 271): those in *-eus* (*ferreus*), in *-alis* (*Vocales*), in *-ndus* (*Iocundos*), in *-idus* (*rapido*, *Luridus*, *pavidas*), and in *-ulus* (*caerulea*). In addition, the *Frisingensia* indicate an interest in adjectives in *-ax* (*loquax*, *fallaci*, *mendaci*), and in *-atus* (*Hāmatis*, *Gipsatos*). These two types of adjectives appear frequently in selections from other authors in Ven. but happen not to occur in the Tibullus selections.

⁴⁴ The comparative also appears in *cautior*.

⁴⁵ A particular interest in adjectives in *-er* is shown, not only by the citation of *Ruber*, but also by the selection of lines including *tenero*, *tenerae*, *celeri*, and *celer*.

is, however, the subject of a comment which appears among the Horace excerpts in Ven. In short, virtually all the excerpts found in Fris. are easily explained by reference to the grammatical excerpts or to the glosses and comments on authors found in Ven.⁴⁶

It would seem that, as in Ven., the excerptor of Fris. took but little interest in the subject matter. It is therefore the more remarkable to note that such interests as he did have fell in the same areas. The mythological creatures of the underworld are here represented by the phrase *Luridus orcus*. The concern with geography is stronger: it is found in the word *Aquitanas*, which had appeared also in the Venice selections, and in the couplet (1.7.11–12) listing the rivers of France. It is noteworthy that a consideration of the geographical references in the Lucan, Claudian, and Martial excerpts in Fris. generally confirms this interest in the region of Gaul, for the greater part of the references are to the area extending from the Rhine region to the Pyrenees.⁴⁷

I have focussed attention upon the contents of the Venice and Munich *florilegia* in order to demonstrate that, for all their very great differences, the two reveal a common educational purpose. But the investigation can be pursued further, for a consideration of the Venice MS. in its entirety shows the place of such *florilegia* in the whole educational scheme. In this connection, it also furnishes important clues to the identity of the assembler of the

⁴⁶ Other examples, chosen because of the form and meaning, are: *veru* (glossed in Ven., f. 28^v col. 2), *Redimita* (cited from Martianus, cited and glossed from Vergil), *caerula* and *Parma* (glossed from Vergil), and *Colu* (Ven., ff. 47^r col. 1 and 42^v col. 2). *Sopitae* is chosen because of interest in its form alone (cf. *Redimita*), as was *Sopierat*. Selected because of the interest in the declension alone is *iocum*, which appears in the glossary in Ven. (f. 29^v col. 2). Interest in the meaning of the word accounts for the choice of the line containing *surdus*; it interested the excerptor of Ven. also, for it appears in selections from Juvenal and Jerome.

⁴⁷ Taking into account only Western Europe, and excluding Greece, the evidence is as follows: Lucan: "Rubicon gallica certus Limes ab ausoniis," "Sassones," "Optima gens flexis in gyrum sequana frenis," "Apulus hadriacas exit garganus in undas;" Claudian: "Quosque rigat retro pernitiur unda garunnae," "Militet ut nostris detonsa sicambria signis," "Ante pedes humili franco tristisque suevo," "Teutonicus vomer pireneique iuenci, Adveniat germania cuncta feratur Navibus. et socia comitentur classe sicambri." "Pallida translatus iam sentiat affrica rhenum," "ligurum," "Norica," "Saxone;" Martial: "Ostrea tu sumis stagno saturata lucrino," "Bononia." I am inclined to think that in the last instance the excerptor had in mind Gallic Bononia, i.e., Boulogne. The names that were chosen twice are, of course, the most significant.

book as it stands. Since there is, so far as I know, no full description of the Venice MS., I shall note the major items in describing the organization.

The general design of the book is clear: it is founded upon the traditional arrangement of the liberal arts, with some adjustments and additions. The adherence to tradition is quite close in the *trivium*: ff. 1–95 include Donatus (*Ars minor*, and selections from the greater), Diomedes, “Priscian” (*De accentibus*), the *florilegium*, *Ilias Latina*, Smaragdus (*Liber in partibus Donati*, now mutilated),⁴⁸ and Servius (*De finalibus*); ff. 96–106^v col. 1 contain Alcuin (*Rhetoric*), and “Glose” on Cicero, *De inventione*, based in part upon Marius Victorinus; and ff. 106^v col. 2–140 have the logical works already described by Lacombe, i.e., the *Isagoge* of Porphyrius, *Predicamenta* (in the translation of Boethius), *Perihermeneias* (incomplete), the *Categoriae X* of Ps.-Augustine, Boethius’ *In perihermeneias ed. sec.* (incomplete), and *De divisione diffinitionum*. The remainder of the twenty-first gathering (through f. 143) contains a variety of brief passages which are of no importance for the general scheme.

An expanded and rearranged version of the *quadrivium* is evident in the rest of the MS. Medicine is represented on ff. 144–46 by the so-called *Sapientia artis medicinae*^{48a} and by selections from Isidore *Etym. IV*. Music, which follows, is given more space: ff. 147–156^r contain excerpts from, among others, Cassiodorus, *Musica enchiriadis*, and Boethius.⁴⁹ Next among the liberal arts in the general plan is geometry, broadly speaking.⁵⁰ It covers ff. 157^r col. 2–164^v col. 2 and includes many brief selections in addition to the treatise *De minutiis*.⁵¹ Arithmetic is represented chiefly by the problems entitled *De coniecturis diligenter oppositis* (otherwise known as the *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes*) and by

⁴⁸ The text of the treatise begins in the ninth book; the gap is due to the loss of some twenty-five leaves between ff. 65 and 66 (modern numbering). The last leaf of the eighth gathering and the entire ninth, tenth, and eleventh gatherings are missing.

^{48a} Edited by M. Wlaschky in *Kyklos* 1 (1928) 104–10, who did not use the Venice MS. See also P. Giacosa, *Magistri Salernitani nondum editi* (Turin 1901) 360–63.

⁴⁹ Mr. Calvin Bower, a graduate student at George Peabody College, is engaged in a study of the contents of this section of the MS.

⁵⁰ An unidentified passage, entitled *DE ARITHMETICA*, on ff. 156^v–157^r col. 2, may be misplaced, since the arithmetical works generally follow the geometrical, or, as seems more likely, may be intended as a bridge between the music section and the mathematical.

⁵¹ *Gerberti Opera mathematica*, ed. Bubnov (Berlin 1899) 225–44. Bubnov did not use the Venice MS. for his edition.

selections from Bede's *De arithmetice propositionibus*, on ff. 164^v col. 2–170^r. The remainder of the codex as it stands today (it is incomplete at the end) concerns principally astronomy. It includes such tables as are found frequently in a *computus*, a great number of short poems and extracts of a similar character, and Isidore's *De natura rerum*. The manuscript breaks off after the first few words of an astrological treatise.⁵² That there probably were, in the complete book, other works of this kind, and that someone (the copyist?) thought the subject undeserving of inclusion among the noble *artes*, is clearly indicated by the superscription on f. 202^r col. 1.⁵³

The Venice manuscript, in short, reveals a scheme of learning that reflects, in part, the tradition of the liberal arts, and, in part, a particular individual's handling of that tradition. It reveals, specifically, that our *florilegium* was a collection of illustrations for the teaching of grammar, studied, like the *Ilias Latina* which follows, in the relatively early stages of the subject. This much is true also of the Freising *florilegium*. There are, however, two noteworthy differences between the two books. First, the Freising book is only a reader, and the student studied his grammar from other texts. Its complete text (Alcuin's *Ad Widonem Comitem*, selections from Gregory's *Moralia* and John Cassian, the *sententie* published by Woelfflin under the name of "Caecilius Balbus",⁵⁴ our *florilegium*, Publilius Syrus, and the *Voces animalium*) is the equivalent, educationally speaking, of ff. 19–65^r of the Venice MS. (the *florilegium* and *Ilias Latina*) as elementary reading, and the Freising MS. should be viewed in this light. Secondly, the Freising *flores* do not contain grammatical excerpts, as do the Venice selections, and this fact has obscured the grammatical interests of the excerptor, as this paper has tried to show. Granting these two major differences, the Venice MS. is, nevertheless, of great value for a proper understanding of the Freising one.

It has been pointed out that the arrangement of the Venice

⁵² The work, ascribed to "*Phtholomei regis*," begins, "Quia omnia verissimae prescientiae." It is listed in Lynn Thorndike and Pearl Kibre, *A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin* (Cambridge 1937) col. 570.

⁵³ "HAEC OMNIA QUAE SEQUUNTUR. ET HIS SIMILIA. UT ARBITROR IN SUPERSTITIOSA PARTE ASTRONOMIAE ARTIS REPUTANDA SUNT."

⁵⁴ *Caecilii Balbi De nugis philosophorum quae supersunt*, ed. E. Woelfflin (Basel 1855), an edition making full use of the Freising MS. For the subsequent controversy, see *RE* 3 (1899) s.v. "Caecilius" 35, 1196–98.

codex is not only traditional but also individual: it will, I think, be granted that a single individual is responsible for the scheme and for the selection of the contents. The identity of this compiler may never be known, but there is some evidence which helps us to place him historically. The palaeographical evidence points to an exemplar written in a South Italian center. The contents confirm the evidence of the writing; the best illustration is found in the medical selections. According to Beccaria's excellent descriptions, two of the four MSS. that contain these two medical works together (the *Sapientia artis medicinae* and selections from Isidore, *Etym.* iv) are in Beneventan script and a third is partially in Beneventan.⁵⁵ Ven., in addition to having the same order, resembles the two Beneventan MSS. particularly in having for the first work the title "Epistula Ypocratis." One of these Beneventan MSS. is now in Monte Cassino (v. 225) and is thought to have been written there.^{55a} It may be added that Baehrens considered the text of the *Ilias Latina* in Ven. as belonging to an Italian group.^{55b}

The best clue to the compiler's identity is found in an unnoticed superscription on f. 160^r col. 2. Standing above an unidentified mathematical treatise,⁵⁶ it reads: QUICQUID (c *add.* Ven.²) TEXTUS ISTE CONTINET. LAURENTIUS ARCHIEPISCOPALIS ABIECTIO PRECIBUS QUORUNDAM COHACTUS EXPOSUIT (suit *add.* Ven.²).⁵⁷ The evidence points very strongly to the identification of this Archbishop Lawrence as the archbishop of Amalfi chiefly known as the teacher of Hildebrand, later Gregory VII. Both place and time fit Lawrence of Amalfi, who died in 1048, for the script and contents of the MS. indicate a South Italian origin, and the archetype, in view of the contents, could not have been compiled before the eleventh century. The mathematical nature of the treatise

⁵⁵ Beccaria, *I codici di medicina del periodo presalernitano* (Rome 1956). The MSS. are Beccaria's Nos. 73 (in Beneventan), 84, 96 (in Beneventan), and 108 (not in Beneventan for this text but for another part).

^{55a} Beccaria (above, note 55) 303. Another Monte Cassino MS. (v. 97; Beccaria No. 95) contains the same two texts, but separated by other material; the beginning is lost, so that the title cannot be checked, but the first treatise ends at the same point as the Venice MS. text. Cas. 225 ends at a different point from Ven.

^{55b} *Op. cit.* (above, note 12) 6.

⁵⁶ It is not in Thorndike-Kibre (above, note 52).

⁵⁷ The line below the superscription has been erased and *suit*, which originally stood on that line, added on the line above by the second hand, which wrote a large part of the MS. and served as corrector throughout. So far as I can determine, there has been no change in the text of the superscription.

below the superscription also confirms the identification, since this Lawrence was famed especially for his mathematical pursuits. Finally, the style of the treatise is not at all inconsistent with the style of the signed and published work of Lawrence of Amalfi, the *Vita S. Zenobii*.⁵⁸

The superscription must have reference to the work which stands below it, in indicating that Archbishop Lawrence was the author, or, at the very least, that the treatise was somehow used in his teaching. It may seem unlikely at first glance that we should interpret *textus* to refer to the entire book as it stands. Yet there is another part of the MS. which seems to link it with the same man. On f. 143 there are four brief letters, which remain, so far as I know, unpublished. Two headings, inserted in the text, read "LAU. F." and "LAU. FEC." That these are connected with southern Italy seems indicated by the fact that the text of the second mentions a Guarunpotus as the addressee; this name is associated particularly with Salerno, and the man probably should be identified with the Guarimpotus mentioned by Peter Damian.⁵⁹ The elaborate style and its peculiarities, in the letters, coupled with the heading, make it probable that we have here a bit of the correspondence of the same Lawrence, Archbishop of Amalfi.

One or two other aspects of the Venice MS. point the same way. It is said that Lawrence of Amalfi was a student of the renowned Gerbert of Rheims.^{59a} Long ago, Bubnov pointed out that some MSS. of the *Propositiones ad acuendos iuvenes* reflect a working-over and use by followers of Gerbert; in particular, these MSS. introduce the term "Girbercista" in the text of one of the problems, and this, with the evidence of order, title, and some textual differences, seems to indicate a "Gerbertian" recension.⁶⁰ In Ven., the text and title of these *Propositiones* correspond to that of the two MSS. cited by Bubnov, and the term "Girbertista" likewise appears.⁶¹ In this respect, the MS. reflects in some

⁵⁸ Printed in *Act. sanct.* Mai Tom. VI (Paris 1866) 57–62; also in Ughelli, *Italia sacra*², 3 (Venice 1718) cols. 10–18.

⁵⁹ Migne, *PL* 145 col. 671.

^{59a} By a very hostile witness, Beno; the statement is found in *MGH, Libelli de lite* 2.376–78.

⁶⁰ *Op. cit.* (above, note 51) LXXX and 291.

⁶¹ The spelling is better in Ven., nor is this surprising, since South Italian MSS. preserved the *ci/ti* distinction more carefully than others; cf. Lowe, *op. cit.* (above, note 15) 306.

measure a Gerbertian connection.⁶² In addition to this, evidence of a different kind is to be found in another section of the manuscript, to give a more precise date to the book and thus, by implication, to support the conclusion concerning the compiler. The *computus* includes, on f. 177r, a table for the third Great Paschal Cycle, beginning in the year 1064, and this would, by itself, imply a date for the manuscript as in or after that year.⁶³ The first hand, however, added, to the left of the table and in a line with the last nineteen-year period (beginning in 1577), the date 1045. In so doing, he indicated that the information for the last nineteen-year period of the third Great Cycle (1577–95) could be used equally well for the last nineteen-year period of the second Great Cycle (1045–63). This addition, which is not an integral part of the table, would not have been made after 1063, nor, assuming that it stood in the exemplar, is it likely that it would have been copied after that date, when it ceased to be relevant. The date of the manuscript or, conceivably, of its exemplar therefore falls in the years 1045–63, that is, either during the last four years of Lawrence's life, or within, at the outside, fifteen years of his death.⁶⁴

It is my conclusion that the archetype of Ven. was a manuscript compiled probably by Lawrence of Amalfi, or by one of his students, and that, in either case, it reflects his teaching. The personal tone of the superscription on f. 160 shows that these are the words of the teacher himself; the presence of the letters connects him with more of the MS. than merely the one treatise; the place and the contents support the identification; and the finding of a more precise date lends further confirmation. So far as I can see, the book offers no other evidence of a personal connection of this kind, whereas the evidence I have noted seems to connect this MS. clearly with the teaching of Lawrence of Amalfi. That teaching cannot be without historical interest,

⁶² In the division of dialectic, the Venice MS. does not give all the logical works that, according to Richer (*MGH, Script.* 3, 617), were used by Gerbert: indeed, the chief glory of the logical works in Ven. is that they preserve the true text of Boethius' translation of the *Categories*, as Minio-Paluello discovered (*Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies* 1.2 (London 1943) 151–77). In this respect, the MS. does not exactly reflect the Gerbertian teaching.

⁶³ It would, of course, not prove it.

⁶⁴ The MS. has generally been dated *s.* xi–xii, as, for example, Lacombe, *loc. cit.* (above, note 13) did.

since it is the work of one who is said to have been taught by Gerbert and to have lived to teach the youthful Hildebrand.⁶⁵

It remains to consider what may be learned of the origins of the two *florilegia* that may help us determine where Tibullus was preserved and known in the Middle Ages. The most recent editor of Tibullus doubts that the answer to this question can be found,⁶⁶ but some limited conclusions can be drawn concerning these *florilegia*. First, the *Frisingensia*: the MS. containing these Tibullus selections seems to have been in Freising from an early time, but, because of an aspect that has passed unnoticed, we must suppose that the original of the *florilegium* was compiled elsewhere. Only a single library catalogue from before the time of our *florilegia* mentions Tibullus, and it dates from long before, since it is of the eighth century. It is found in Berlin Diez B. Sant. 66,⁶⁷ and is a document of great importance for the study of the survival of classical authors in the early Middle Ages. In addition to Tibullus, this catalogue lists a volume containing the major works of Claudian in an order that is virtually unknown elsewhere: *Ruf.*, *Eutrop.*, *Pollent.* (here called *De bello Gothico*), and *Gildon*. Only one complete MS. listed by Birt in his edition of Claudian contains these works in this order, a Brussels MS. from Gembloux.⁶⁸ Turning to the Freising *florilegium*, we note that in addition to the Tibullus selections it contains selections from these works of Claudian *in this order*. Birt noted the similarity, in connection with Claudian, but he did not draw the obvious conclusion with regard to the two poets: when, after seeing a manuscript of the extremely rare Tibullus mentioned in the same library catalogue with a manuscript containing a very unusual order of the major works of Claudian, we find this same combination recurring side by side in an excerpt MS., there can be no question of coincidence. We must conclude that the *florilegium* ultimately derives, at least in the case of these two poets, from the

⁶⁵ Lawrence's closeness to the papal circle seems to be proven by the vehemence of the attacks made on him by Beno, *loc. cit.* (above, note 59a). There is a full discussion of the career of Archbishop Lawrence by W. Holtzmann in *Studi Gregoriani* 1 (Rome 1947) 207–36; his thesis, that Lawrence of Amalfi is identical with the monk of Monte Cassino, is interesting in connection with the medical contents of Ven. Marc. Z. L. 497 (see above, 277).

⁶⁶ Lenz, *op. cit.* (above, note 7) 7.

⁶⁷ G. Becker, *Catalogi bibliothecarum antiqui* (Bonn 1885) No. 20. Corrected and fuller text printed by B. L. Ullman, *Scriptorium* 8 (1954) 24–25.

⁶⁸ *Op. cit.* (above, note 4) xcvi.

library represented by the catalogue of books. It may be that our *florilegium* was actually compiled in that library, for all but one of the authors (Persius) found in the *florilegium* are mentioned also in the catalogue. Or it may be that the excerpts from Tibullus and Claudian in the *Frisingensia* were themselves taken from a more extensive excerpt MS., which in turn derived from the complete MSS. mentioned in the catalogue.

On the basis of a careful analysis of the library catalogue in the Berlin MS., Ullman concluded that the evidence of the contents decidedly favored the view that the catalogue represented "part of the collection at Corbie or of one of the monks there; if not, of a center in close relation with Corbie."⁶⁹ It seems clear that the Freising Tibullus excerpts are dependent on the manuscript listed in that library catalogue; therefore the *florilegium* does not give any reason for supposing the existence of a complete Tibullus in Germany. There is, instead, but a single tradition here, whose home was almost certainly on French soil and perhaps at Corbie.

It is more difficult to draw conclusions concerning the Venice selections from Tibullus. It has been argued that the manuscript is a copy of a Beneventan archetype compiled in the eleventh century by Archbishop Lawrence of Amalfi, or by one of his students.⁷⁰ The question remains, whether this compiler was also responsible for the excerpting of the *flores*. This cannot be proven to be the case. About all that can be said is that the anthology was compiled in the eleventh century and probably in Italy, since the two most recent authors included, it seems, belong to this period and are both Italians. This brings the origin of the *florilegium* close indeed in time and place to the compilation of the entire book.⁷¹

Although the Venice *florilegium* as a whole seems to have been assembled in a South Italian center, it does not necessarily follow that Monte Cassino, for example, held, among its other treasures, that exceedingly rare possession, a complete text of Tibullus. Indeed, such evidence as there is appears to give slight support to another conclusion: that the Venice *flores* were drawn themselves from an excerpt MS. In comparing the three sets of Tibullus

⁶⁹ *Op. cit.* (above, note 67) 30.

⁷⁰ Pages 278–80 above.

⁷¹ An exact statement on this point might be possible, on the basis of a study of the textual connections of the authors represented in Ven.

selections in Ven., we may use the second as a basis, since the first set contains only selections from Book 1 and the third set begins with selections from Book 2. Of the seventeen lines or part-lines in the second set, three are found in one of the other sets (containing together thirty-two lines or part-lines). If the choice was made from a complete manuscript, it contained over nineteen hundred lines. Furthermore, it has been stated that the Tibullus selections are, in two of the three sets, accompanied by selections from the *Poema ad coniugem* printed in the works of Prosper and Paulinus of Nola. This fact proves that the two were associated in the book from which the selections were taken. The excerpts from the *Poema ad coniugem* consist merely of a single line on one occasion, and of a line and a phrase on the other. That the line is the same in both instances (out of a total text of more than a hundred lines) points again, though not conclusively, toward a *florilegium* as the source, a *florilegium* containing Tibullus and the *Poema ad coniugem* side by side. If this was the case, there must, of course, have been other poets represented; possibly Bede was one, for excerpts from his poetry precede the "Prosper" and Tibullus selections on one occasion.⁷²

This possibility of the use of a *florilegium* is strengthened by a consideration of another group of excerpts, those from Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. There are two sets of selections in the *florilegium*, the one, which begins on f. 53^r col. 1, consisting of forty-five lines or part-lines, and the other, on f. 57^r col. 1, consisting of thirty lines or part-lines. The reader is at once struck by the fact that both sets end with the same two lines, 8.636 and 8.681. There are other resemblances as well; in fact, the two sets share twelve lines or part-lines, that is, more than one-quarter of the total number of lines in the first set and more than one-third of the total in the second. This proportion of agreement in selection cannot be accidental, especially in view of the fact that the full text of these books of the *Metamorphoses* would have offered an excerptor more than six thousand lines to choose from. In the case of the *Metamorphoses*, therefore, the excerptor almost certainly drew upon an earlier and more extensive *florilegium*. Under these circumstances, the supposition that the Tibullus selections also were drawn from a *florilegium* becomes more likely.

⁷² On f. 23^v col. 2.

The belief expressed above, that the Venice *florilegium* was probably assembled in southern Italy, does not, of course, imply that the Tibullus selections⁷³ were taken from a manuscript, whether complete or containing excerpts, that was produced in Italy. The texts of many of the authors represented in the *florilegium*, such as Alcuin, Rabanus, and Remigius, came ultimately from transalpine lands. The fact that Hartel used a Cassinese manuscript (No. 226) for his edition of the *Poema ad coniugem*⁷⁴ proves nothing, since his other, and older, manuscript is from Fleury, and there are still older ones from other French libraries. It is possible that a comparison of the text of the Tibullus selections in Ven. with that of the complete manuscripts, which is beyond the scope of this investigation, may shed some light on the place of Ven. in the Tibullus tradition.

Considered together as the first class of Tibullus excerpt MSS., the Freising and Venice *florilegia* present many differences. Neither Claudian nor Martial, who are given as much space as Tibullus in Fris., may be found among the authors represented in Ven.; Ven., on the other hand, has a host of authors who find no place in Fris. Even in the case of those who appear in both, Tibullus, Lucan, Juvenal, Horace, and Persius, there seems to be no connection textually. In treatment there are differences also. The similarity lies in the purpose of the excerptors. That this underlying similarity of interest should exist in books assembled in different places proves that the educational purpose was not restricted to a single center; only an investigation of other books of this kind will show exactly how widespread these methods were in the teaching of grammar, in the period before the twelfth century.

The distinctive qualities of the Venice and Freising selections from Tibullus become most readily apparent when they are contrasted with the second class of *florilegia*. In the first place, the position of Tibullus in the later class of *florilegia*—between the two divisions of Ovid selections—indicates that interest in Tibullus was aroused by the popularity of Ovid, and the extensive selections from Ovid prove that popularity.⁷⁵ In contrast, in the

⁷³ There is considerable repetition in other authors, as well, though in none so clearly as in Ovid.

⁷⁴ *Op. cit.* (above, note 23).

⁷⁵ Ullman, *op. cit.* (above, note 2) 131, 133.

earlier class of *florilegia*, Tibullus is introduced on his own merits, for the Ovid selections are both limited and totally unconnected with Tibullus. If the popularity of Ovid was not so great in the eleventh century, the other elegiac poets, Catullus and Propertius, were hardly known at all. Thus it becomes a matter of interest to note the authors who do stand beside Tibullus in our *florilegia*. Of the four briefly excerpted authors in the Freising *florilegium*, it is clear that Lucan and Claudian are thought of as going together, and Tibullus is followed by Martial. In the Venice excerpts, Tibullus is obviously connected with a poem that generally went under the name of Prosper.⁷⁶ In short, the mediaeval teachers, not knowing the poems of the other classical elegiac writers, associated Tibullus with those poets who had used the elegiac couplet and whom they knew—the pagan and Christian epigrammatists.

A second point of difference between the earlier and the later classes of *florilegia* concerns their purpose: the latter, which are believed to have been produced in the twelfth century, were chosen for their proverbial and moral qualities, while the examples of the earlier class, as this paper has attempted to demonstrate, were chosen to illustrate grammatical points. In this respect the Freising MS., with its concern for sense and, in other authors, its interest in moral *sententiae*, is more advanced than the Venice MS. and may be said to represent a point intermediate between Ven. and the later *florilegia*. In its Tibullus selections, however, Fris. is characterized predominantly by linguistic interests. That Tibullus was regarded as a worthy model of style in the Middle Ages is indicated by a much earlier reference in the well-known exchange between Peter of Pisa and Paul the Deacon; the name of Tibullus is there associated with *eloquium*.⁷⁷ It has been doubted that either of the writers knew Tibullus.⁷⁸ The interest of the reference for the student of the *florilegia* is of another kind, since we find that, in these excerpts of some two centuries later, Tibullus is introduced as a model of grammatical and linguistic correctness. It may be that the presence of Tibullus in the eleventh-century grammatical *florilegia* is due to the com-

⁷⁶ There was the authority of Bede for this ascription (in Migne, *PL* 90 col. 173). Hartel's two MSS. have the poem in connection with Prosper.

⁷⁷ *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus*, ed. K. Neff (Munich 1908) 61, 65.

⁷⁸ R. Ehwald, *Philologus* 46 (1888) 639–40.

mendation, however uninformed it may have been, of the two Carolingian writers. In the case of Ven., at least, the selections prove the excerptor to have been acquainted with some of the verse exchanges of Peter and Paul. Yet the production of such collections as the eleventh-century *florilegia* should not be viewed as mere antiquarianism; they served a useful purpose in the educational scheme of their age. The tendency of these excerpts to include unusual words has been remarked on by many; it is not therefore surprising if we find a fondness for these words in the elaborate style of certain writers of the period. The work of Archbishop Lawrence found in the Venice MS. is a case in point, as is that of Peter Damian; we may suppose that the style of these writers was nourished by the study of such collections of excerpts from the authors as those in Fris. and Ven.

Finally, this grammatical purpose, which lies behind the production of the Freising and Venice *florilegia*, results in a weakness and a strength that contrast curiously with the character of the later excerpt books. Had the complete text of Tibullus been destroyed after the time of the production of these *florilegia* but before the time of the appearance of the second class, our texts of Tibullus today would bear a close resemblance to those of other lost classical writers whose fragments are painstakingly gathered from the grammarians of the Roman Empire: mere shreds of text, notable chiefly for syntactical and morphological peculiarities. The observation serves to emphasize what is well known, that the schools of the period that produced the Venice and Freising anthologies worked closely within the traditions of the great Roman grammarians. It also emphasizes, by contrast, the revival of classical interests as an achievement of the twelfth century, for the extant *florilegia* that seem to stem from that century, because of the nature of their interests, present a much clearer picture of Tibullus in offering many continuous and more extensive excerpts. On the other hand, the text of Tibullus in these later *florilegia* is marred by arbitrary changes that render them of little value in establishing a sound text of the poet, whereas the earlier class of excerpts, being free from such changes, may be trusted to reflect a genuine tradition.

While the eleventh-century *florilegia*, because of the lack of early manuscripts, have a particular value in the study of the text of Tibullus, they are not without interest in the case of other

authors as well. Especially the Venice manuscript, which, if I am not mistaken, can be considered as placed historically, offers room for investigation, since its classical excerpts have received no attention. This, and such other manuscripts of the kind as may be found in the libraries of Europe, deserve study, as an index to mediaeval culture in general and, specifically, as a reflection of the continuing classical tradition.