

MICHIEL VERWEIJ

## Florus and his *Vergilius orator an poeta* The Brussels manuscript revisited

*Summary* – The treatise “Vergilius orator an poeta”, attributed to P. Annius Florus (who often is identified with the historian Florus) is known only from a fragment in one single manuscript, Brussels, Royal Library of Belgium, MS 10615-729. After its discovery in the 1830s, this fragment has often been edited, with ever more emendations. The present article proposes a new edition, returning to the manuscript itself, and weighing and discussing all preceding corrections.

Somewhere in the 1830s Th. Oehler discovered in a manuscript kept at the Royal Library of Belgium in Brussels an unknown fragment of an otherwise lost dialogue, attributed to a certain Florus, on the question whether Vergil rather was an orator or a poet. This text was first edited by F. Ritschl in 1842.<sup>1</sup> Since then, the fragment has been added to the major editions of the work of the second-century historian Florus, such as those in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana (by Otto Rossbach, 1896)<sup>2</sup> and in the Budé series (by P. Jal, 1967).<sup>3</sup> In this article I intend to offer yet another edition of this text, based on a new transcription of the only manuscript in which it has come down to us, and, at the same time, reconsidering all conjectures that have been proposed so far. The result is an entirely new edition, which is far closer to the manuscript itself.

Most scholars seem to agree to identify the author of the dialogue with the historian of the same name and with the poet Florus, known from ten poems.<sup>4</sup> The differences regarding the *praenomen* and the *nomen gentilicium*

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. F. Ritschl, ‘Der Dichter Florus’, Rheinisches Museum, 1 (1842), 302–314.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. L. Annaei Flori Epitomae libri II et P. Annii Flori Fragmentum de Vergilio oratore an poeta, edidit O. Rossbach, Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana (Lipsiae, 1896), XLVI/XLVII (on the manuscript) and 183–187.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Florus, Oeuvres, texte établi et traduit par P. Jal, Collection des universités de France, (Paris, 1967), tome II, 95–120 (with introduction, translation and commentary).

<sup>4</sup> See on the biography of Florus (and specifically on the Vergilius orator an poeta) RE, I, 2, cols. 2266–2268 (nr. 47); M. Schanz, Geschichte der römischen Litteratur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian, III: Die Zeit von Hadrian 117 bis auf Constantin

encountered in the manuscripts for the different genres of Florus's literary activity generally are explained away quite easily. Once arrived at this stage, most authors have found the Brussels text a convenient source for the biography of the otherwise elusive historian about whom not many details are known. In fact, the Brussels fragment seems to offer an autobiography of the author of the dialogue, and, hence, by identification, of the historian Florus. This interpretation should, however, I think, be tempered by the fact that the fragment as we have it is the introduction to a literary dialogue, the primary function of which was not to give the biography of the author (whoever he was), but to set the atmosphere for the dialogue.

The text as we have it starts when the author, after a night without much sleep (for whatever reason), refreshes his spirit in the domain of a temple in Tarragona (as it turns out). He, then, sees a group of inhabitants of Baetica who had been visiting Rome but had been forced to make a detour by a stubborn wind. One of them, a man without a name, but who is characterised as a *litteris pereruditus* asks for the author's name as he thinks his countenance is vaguely familiar. The author identifies himself as *Florus* and refers to the possibility that the other man may have heard him in a gathering in Rome during the reign of Domitian. The other, in fact, recognises him and asks if he is the same person whom the audience had claimed as the victor of the

---

324, *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, VIII, 3, (München, <sup>2</sup>1905), 67–77; P. Courtois, *L'Épitomé de Florus, le Virgilius orator an poeta, leurs relations réciproques* (Bruxelles, 1936/1937); E. Bickel, 'Zum Homonymenproblem Florus', *Rheinisches Museum*, 93 (1950), 188/189; H. Dahlmann, 'Florus' Preis der *Professio litterarum*', *Mittelateinisches Jahrbuch*, 2 (1965), 9–21; Florus, *Oeuvres, texte établi et traduit par P. Jal*, vol. 1, CXI–CXIV; P. Steinmetz, 'Lyrische Dichtung im 2. Jahrhundert n. Chr.', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 33, 1 (Berlin-New York, 1982), 274–277; L. Bessone, 'Floro: un retore storico e poeta', *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 2, 34, 1 (Berlin-New York, 1993), 80–117; L. Bessone, *La storia epitomata. Introduzione a Floro* (Roma, 1996), 150–161; R. Herzog-P. Lebrecht Schmidt (edd.), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike: IV K. Salzmänn (ed.)*, *Die Literatur des Umbruchs. Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur 117–284 n. Chr.* (München, 1997), 327–335; M. von Albrecht, *A history of Roman literature*, 2 (Leiden, 1997), 1411–1420; Der neue Pauly. *Enzyklopädie der Antike*, herausgegeben von H. Cancik und H. Schneider, Band 4 (Stuttgart, 1998), cols. 566/567, s. v. 'P. Annius F[lorus]'; J. S. Richardson, 'Tarraco in the age of Trajan: the testimony of Florus the poet', in: J. González (ed.), *Trajano emperador de Roma. Actas del congreso internacional 14–17 septiembre 1998* (Roma, 2000), 427–450; J. M. Ziolkowski-M. C. J. Putnam, *The Virgilian tradition. The first fifteen hundred years* (New Haven-London, 2008), 60/61; M. Verweij, 'Florus, Virgilius orator an poeta. Een uniek handschrift in de Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België te Brussel', *Kleio. Tijdschrift voor oude talen en antieke cultuur*, 43 (2013/2014), 98–132.

competition, but to whom victory was denied by Domitian himself. Florus then describes how he travelled widely in the empire after this incident, until he arrived in Tarragona where he settled down. When asked how he made his living, he answers that he is a teacher of literature. The man from Baetica is greatly astonished (and not overwhelmingly enthusiastic) at this, but Florus defends education as a noble profession. In the middle of this defence, *immo* in the middle of a word, the text breaks off.

As I said, the data in this text have been used almost uncritically in order to establish a biography for the historian (and poet) Florus who is identified with the Florus of this dialogue. Autobiography, however, is not the strongest side of classical literature. Moreover, there are some elements, which demand explanation. An allusion to a triumph over the Dacians (II, 6: *et in foro omni clarissimus ille de Dacia triumphus exultat*) seems to set the 'original' dialogue at some point in the first decade of Trajan's reign. A strong antipathy towards Domitian as found in the suggestive way Florus tells about his lost contest as well as in the contrast created between Domitian and Trajan, between then and now, may perhaps help to date the writing of the text itself into Trajan's reign as well. If the Dacian campaign might have been used later as an element of locating the story in the first two decades of the second century, chances are that the strong anti-Domitian sentiment would have escaped a later author. This sentiment is, however, characteristic of other authors from the reign of Trajan as well. If this may suggest a rough date (viz. ca. 105–120) for the writing of the text (and not only for the setting of the dialogue), the argument can be turned another way too. The negative way in which Domitian figures in this text can be attributed (at least partially) to the 'obligatory' way an author was expected to speak of him at that time, thereby stressing this negative role more than (perhaps) necessary.

Another feature of Florus's 'autobiography' is his making a living as a teacher. Whether the historical Florus actually was a teacher at some point of his career or not, is difficult to make out with certainty, but a reader (and interpreter) of the Brussels fragment should bear in mind the fact that the subject of the dialogue required a specialist in both rhetoric and poetry. A poet who earned his living as a *grammaticus* was, therefore, a first-class candidate for the role of a protagonist in such a dialogue. The setting in an idyllic Tarragona not only underlines the opposition with Rome, dominated by the tyrannical Domitian, but offers at the same time the convenient possibilities of a localisation on the countryside as an alternative of the classical *villa* which figures so often in Cicero's dialogues. A parallel with Tacitus's

Dialogus de oratoribus is not hard to find. Furthermore, the description of Tarragona and its environs recalls some aspects of the Praise of Italy in Vergil's *Georgics* (*Georg.*, 2, 136–176), especially with regard to the climate and the agricultural products. In a dialogue on Vergil, this does not seem out of place, but this connection seems to have escaped most commentators.

In view of the absence of other sources, it is impossible to judge about the factual information provided by the introduction to this dialogue, but above all it should be borne in mind that the purpose of this passage was not to furnish the biography of the author, but to provide a setting for the dialogue on Vergil. In other words, we have the version of the author's life (if at all) as he wanted us to think of it, and we should be careful not to take this text at face value, but always remember that this is the construction of a biography within the framework of the setting for a dialogue on a literary subject.

Another part of this problem is the fact that some features of Florus's life, such as his participation at the Certamen Capitolinum of 86, 90 or 94 (the precise date is a matter of dispute between the various scholars) are based on or at least strengthened by modern conjectures. In this particular case, the central phrase is *fortasse et audieris, si tamen in illo orbis terrarum conciliabulo sub Domitiano principe certamini nostro adfuisti* (I, 3, quoted here from the edition by P. Jal): 'maybe you even heard me if you were present at my contest at that gathering of the entire world during the reign of Domitian'. The manuscript, however, does not read *certamini*, but *crimini*. I think the original reading of the manuscript should be maintained. In the *certamini* version there are two localisations (*conciliabulo* and *certamini*), and the characterisation of *certamini* as *nostro* seems a bit odd. When *crimini* is maintained, both problems disappear, and the man from Baetica may have been present at his (Florus's) crime or his guilt. At the same time, no reader of classical literature can miss the parallel with Ovid's exile for *carmen* and *crimen*. If the audience really favoured Florus against Domitian's wish, this might be sufficient to be considered a *crimen* with a tyrannical emperor like Domitian (according to his reputation). When the original reading of the manuscript is preserved, *conciliabulo* becomes the indication of the event. This might still be the Certamen Capitolinum (and in fact there is nothing against this), but this interpretation should not be based on a hypothetical reading *certamini*.

More than 180 years of scholarship have led to a relatively great amount of conjectures, some of which have been rejected afterwards, whereas other proposals have been repeated ever since they were created. In the process,

the manuscript itself, the one and only source for the establishment of the text, tends to disappear gradually out of sight. Moreover, our ideas of how to make a critical edition have changed vastly over the last decades. 19<sup>th</sup> century philologists, followed by their successors from the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, felt far more free to propose a conjecture than we do nowadays. When in Florus's text (III, 4) the phrase seems lightly opposed or in contrast with the preceding one, the editors did not hesitate to change *et* from the manuscript into *sed*. But as *et* is certainly acceptable, I have preserved the reading of the manuscript. Imposing a strict logic does not seem the right way to edit texts.

In the following, I will first turn to the manuscript itself. Then I will give a new edition of the fragment with its critical apparatus. Leading maxim for this edition is that the text as given in the manuscript is followed as long as it has a meaning. In this case, the fact that this particular text has come down to us in one single manuscript, has both advantages and disadvantages. The main advantage is, of course, that an editor never has to choose between two equally sensible readings. On the other side, when an error actually crept into the tradition, but the text continues to be intelligible, the *locus corruptus* will remain undiscovered. In an appendix follows a complete and accurate transcription of the text in the manuscript, which may be the starting point for any future textual criticism on this text.

### The manuscript

Brussels, Royal Library of Belgium (Koninklijke Bibliotheek van België / Bibliothèque royale de Belgique), MS 10615–729 is a complex manuscript. Its shelfmark mirrors the early 19<sup>th</sup>-century tradition according to which the number did not correspond to a volume, but to a text or section of the manuscript.<sup>5</sup> With more than 100 different texts, no one has ever dared to undertake a correct and complete description. In fact, the only full list of the contents is to be found in the *Inventaire général* of 1842. Here, the Florus fragment appears as no. 10677: 7: *P. Annii Flori – Vergilius orator an poeta?* '10677' is the number of the text according to the system of the *Inventaire*, but it never was the number of a separate manuscript. '7' indicates a grouping of nine texts which make out a section within this volume with its vast amount of text. I readily admit the complexity of this system, and the

<sup>5</sup> Cf. [P. Marchal], *Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque royale des ducs de Bourgogne*, publié par ordre du ministre de l'intérieur, tome premier *Résumé historique*. *Inventaire N° 1 – 18000* (Bruxelles - Leipzig, 1842), 213–215.

Library abandoned this way of numbering its manuscripts already around 1850, but that does not change the fact that a reference to a MS 10677 (as found in most editions) is not correct.<sup>6</sup> In the late 19<sup>th</sup> century the first catalogues of certain classes of Brussels manuscripts made their appearance. In 1896, Paul Thomas published a catalogue of the manuscripts of classical Latin authors.<sup>7</sup> In these catalogues, the manuscripts were listed according to their shelfmarks, but also with a number of appearance in the catalogue. The Florus fragment, thus, was described as no. 212 in the catalogue of Thomas. This did not, however, affect in any way the official inventory number of the entire volume, as P. Jal apparently assumed in his edition.<sup>8</sup> Once again, the Brussels signatures may be confusing sometimes, but that does not change the fact that the only correct reference for the Florus fragment remains: MS 10615–729, f. 73v.

MS 10615–729 is an important volume from the third quarter of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, written in Trier mainly by two or three hands.<sup>9</sup> It contains a wide variety of texts, often of scientific or grammatical contents, and is the only

---

<sup>6</sup> It is not easy to find the signature of this manuscript in scholarly literature. The editions of Florus's *Epitoma* and of his poems in the Loeb series, simply refer to 'a MS. at Brussels' (Lucius Annaeus Florus, *Epitome of Roman history*, with an English translation by E. Seymour Forster, The Loeb Classical Library 231 (Cambridge, Mass. -London, 1984, vii) or 'a Brussels manuscript' (Minor Latin poets, vol. II, with an English translation by J. Wight Duff and A. M. Duff, The Loeb Classical Library 434 (Cambridge, Mass. -London, 1982, 423), both without any shelfmark. The *Real-Encyclopädie*, I, 2, col. 2266, equally avoids any signature and speaks of 'in einer Brüsseler Hs.'. Recent scholarly studies of the Vergilius orator an poeta, such as J.S. Richardson, 'Tarraco in the age of Trajan: the testimony of Florus the poet', in: J. González (ed.), *Trajano emperador de Roma. Actas del congreso internacional 14–17 septiembre 1998* (Roma, 2000), 427–450, also refrain from giving any number. The only correct reference is found in B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI<sup>e</sup> et XII<sup>e</sup> siècles*, Tome I: *Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copiés du IX<sup>e</sup> au XII<sup>e</sup> siècle Apicius – Juvénal* (Paris, 1982), 388.

<sup>7</sup> P. Thomas, *Catalogue des manuscrits de classiques latins de la Bibliothèque royale de Bruxelles*, Université de Gand, Recueil de travaux publiés par la Faculté de philosophie et lettres, 18<sup>me</sup> fascicule (Gand, 1896).

<sup>8</sup> Jal gives as number for this manuscript: 'le Codex Bruxellensis 10677 (aujourd'hui 212)'; cf. Florus, *Oeuvres*, tome II, texte établi et traduit par P. Jal, Collection des universités de France (Paris, 1967), 97.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Catalogus codicum hagiographicorum Bibliothecae Regiae Bruxellensis*, pars I: *Codices Latini membranei*, tomus 2 (Bruxellis, 1889), 394–396, nr. 169; Thomas, *Catalogue*, 65–74, nrs. 207–218; R. Calcoen, *Inventaire des manuscrits scientifiques de la Bibliothèque Royale Albert I<sup>er</sup>*, tome 3 (Bruxelles, 1975), 37–39, nr. 303; L.J. Engels, 'The Carmen de Hastings proelio', in: R. Allen Brown (ed.), *Proceedings of the Battle Abbey Conference 1979* (Woodbridge, 1980), 1–20 (14–17).

manuscript to have the text of Gillo's poem on the Battle of Hastings, and one of only two or three with the *Ecbasis captivi* and the *Flores epytaphii sanctorum* by Thiofried of Echternach, one of the major authors of that abbey. It is, however, all but homogeneous. In fact, not less than nineteen different sections consisting of separate (groups of) quires can be distinguished, which all have their tiny differences regarding layout and their production (colour of ink etc.), and many of which end with a few blank leaves. Probably the best way to present this manuscript is in a table (with only a hint at its contents):

I	quires i–iii	ff. 1–21	i. a. Thiofridus Epternacensis, <i>Flores epytaphii sanctorum</i> (ff. 13r–21r)
II	quires iv/v	ff. 22–35	
III	quires vi–viii	ff. 36–57	extracts from the <i>agrimensores</i> (ff. 36r–55v)
IV	quires ix/x	ff. 58–73 <sup>10</sup>	i. a. Notker Labeo, <i>De natura</i> (ff. 62v–63r); excerpts from Seneca, <i>Controversiae</i> (ff. 66r–68r); fragments from the <i>Appendix Vergiliana</i> (ff. 71v–72v); Florus, <i>Vergilius orator an poeta</i> (f. 73v)
V	quires xi/xii	ff. 79–92	with i. a. Wandalbert von Prüm, <i>De mensium duodecim nominibus</i> (ff. 83v–84v), <i>Horologium</i> (ff. 84v–85r), <i>De horarum metis</i> (f. 85r) and <i>De creatione mundi</i> (f. 85r–v).
VI	quire xiii	ff. 93–98	Polemius Silvius, <i>Laterculus</i> (ff. 93r–96r)
VII	quire xiv	ff. 99–106	Aratus, <i>Phaenomena</i> (with commentary, Latin version; ff. 99r–105r)
VIII	quires xv/xvi	ff. 107–122	Manilius, <i>Astronomica</i> (ff. 107r–122r)
IX	quire xvii	ff. 123–129	
X	quire xviii	ff. 130–137	
XI	quires xix–xxi	ff. 138–156	i. a. Ausonius, <i>Epistulae ad Paulinum</i> (ff. 138v–140r)
XII	quire xxii	ff. 157–164	
XIII	quire xxiii	ff. 165–172	
XIV	quire xxiv	ff. 173–174	
XV	quire xxv	ff. 175–178	
XVI	quire xxvi	ff. 179–186	i. a. Diederik of Sint-Truiden, <i>Collectanea rerum memorabilium</i> (ff. 179r–183v); extracts from Vitruvius, <i>De architectura</i> (f. 183v)
XVII	quires xxvii/xxviii	ff. 187–200	i. a. <i>Ecbasis captivi</i> (ff. 187r–191v)
XVIII	quires xxix–xxxi	ff. 201–223	
XIX	quire xxxii	ff. 224–231	i. a. Gillo, <i>Carmen de Hastingae proelio</i> (ff. 227v–230v)

<sup>10</sup> After quire x the structure has been disturbed (ff. 74–78).

The parchment of the volume is of mediocre, not to say often of bad quality. It measures 27.5 x 18.6 cm, and counts (x) + 231 (immo: 233) + (iii) ff.<sup>11</sup> Originally it was part of the library of St Eucharius and Matthias abbey in Trier. Afterwards it belonged to cardinal Nicolaus Cusanus, who bequeathed it to his hospital in Kues on the Mosel (f. Dr: *Iste e(st) liber hospi(ta)l(is) s(an)c(t)i Nicolaij p(ro)[pe Kues]*). In the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Antwerp Bollandists, searching for hagiographical material, were able to take it: often they made just copies of saints' lives, but sometimes they got hold of the original documents (f. 1r: ancient shelfmark + *ms. 120a*). In 1794 it was confiscated by the French revolutionary troops (stamp of the Paris Bibliothèque Nationale on f. 1r and 231v), but returned to Belgium in 1815. It was kept in the abbey of Tongerlo, where the Bollandists' collection was housed, until 1827, when the government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands (then both present-day Belgium and the Netherlands) bought a large part of the collection. The manuscript now came to Brussels, to the Library of Burgundy, which, in 1837, became part of the present-day Royal Library of Belgium. The volume is far from beautiful and the writing is small, if not tiny. The general idea seems to have been to put as much text as possible on a small surface, which gives a cramped impression.

Section IV concerns us in a more direct way. This section consists of two parts, ff. 58ra–69rb and ff. 69vb–73vb. The second part (which has nothing in common with the first section grouping i.a. passages about angels) begins only in the lower right angle of f. 69vb, thus leaving a large empty space which separates both parts. This second part begins with some satirical poems against the Pope and the court of Rome (ff. 69vb–71rb, inc.: 'anul(us) (et) bacul(us) duo'),<sup>12</sup> then proceeds with some poems from the

<sup>11</sup> The structure of the quires is as follows: i/ii<sup>8</sup> iii<sup>5(6-1)</sup> iv<sup>8</sup> v<sup>6</sup> vi-vii<sup>8</sup> viii<sup>7(8-1)</sup> ix-xi<sup>8</sup> xii<sup>6(8-2)</sup> xiii<sup>6</sup> xiv-xvi<sup>8</sup> xvii<sup>7(8-1)</sup> xviii-xx<sup>8</sup> xxi<sup>3</sup> xxii-xxiii<sup>8</sup> xxiv<sup>2</sup> xxv<sup>4</sup> xxvi<sup>8</sup> xxvii<sup>10</sup> xxviii<sup>4</sup> xxix-xxxii<sup>8</sup>.

<sup>12</sup> F. 69vb–70ra: inc.: 'anul(us) (et) bacul(us) duo s(unt) i(n)signia p(er) quę'; f. 70ra–vb: inc.: 'Certam(en) regi(s) cu(m) papa musa canam(us)' (Hugo Metellus, *Certamen papae et regis*; cf. H. Walther, *Initia carminum*, nr. 2648); f. 70vb–71ra: inc.: 'Gens romano(rum) subdola antiq(ua) colit hydola' (cf. H. Walther, *Initia carminum*, nr. 7159); f. 71ra-b: 'hacten(us) ex uetito peccata fuere timore' (Hunaldus, *Carmen de anulo et baculo*; cf. H. Walther, *Initia carminum*, nr. 7454); f. 71rb: 'fert genit(ri)x natu(m) stephano restante beatu(m)' (cf. D. Schaller - E. Könsgen - J. Tagliabue - Th. Klein, *Initia carminum Latinorum saeculo undecimo antiquiorum. Bibliographisches Repertorium für die lateinische Dichtung der Antike und des frühen Mittelalters. Supplementband* (Göttingen, 2005), nr. 5051a). These texts are found also in another Brussels manuscript, equally from St Eucharius and Matthias abbey in Trier and partially in one of the hands responsible for MS 10615-729 (MS 9799–809, ff. 122ra–123rb).



pseudo-Vergilian tradition: a fragment from *Ciris* (ll. 454–541; f. 71va-b), the three *priapea* from the *Appendix Vergiliana* and the entire *Catalepton* (ff. 71vb–72vb), a *priapeum* attributed to Tibullus (f. 72vb; inc.: ‘Quid h(oc) noui e(st)’) and the so-called *Elegiae in Maecenatem* (ff. 72vb–73va; inc.: ‘Deflera(m) iuuenis tristi modo carmine fata’; expl.: ‘te uenus in patrio colloce(t) ipsa sinu?’).<sup>13</sup> These *Elegiae* are followed by the fragment from Florus’s dialogue (f. 73va–b). Then, several folia, possibly an entire quire seem to be missing. F. 74ra starts in the middle of a still unidentified grammatical treatise (f. 74ra–vb; inc. ‘dici Na(m)q(ue) sic(ut) fili(us)’); the chapter on the *possessiva* begins in l. 4 (f. 74ra; inc. ‘Possessiu(a) diuersas habent t(er)minationes q(ue) numerande s(unt)’). The texts on ff. 69vb–73vb are in two hands. The first hand, very small, copied the medieval poems on ff. 69vb–71rb. The second hand, slightly larger, starts at f. 71rb with the poem ‘Fert genetrix’ and continues until f. 73vb, including the Florus text. From this context, it is clear that the Florus fragment belongs to a group of texts that might have served as some kind of appendix to the works of Vergil.

That Florus’s text was incomplete has been known from a quite early date. In the margin, next to the beginning of the fragment, a slightly later hand (perhaps 13<sup>th</sup>-century), noted: *i(n) alio / [q](ua)t(er)nione / [e]x i(n)tegro / hanc / [s]cript(ur)am / [h]abeo*, whereas a hand of the 16<sup>th</sup> or possibly 17<sup>th</sup> century noted after the last words, in the lower margin: *hic aliq(uid) desideratur*. These remarks, together with the loss of the quire originally following f. 73, and the diversity of the contents of this manuscript, many sections of which end with some blank folia, suggest that this volume groups in fact a series of totally independent quires of text, which had remained unbound for some time. This grouping may have occurred in the 13<sup>th</sup> century. Except for the period when these texts were written and their origin (as most are in the same two or three hands), the different sections in this volume have nothing in common.

The same hand that copied the Florus fragment in MS 10615–729 appears in a second Brussels manuscript, viz. MS 9799–809, equally from St Eucharius and Matthias abbey in Trier. On ff. 122ra–123rb he copied the same medieval Latin satirical poems found on ff. 69vb–71rb of MS 10615–729. MS 9799–809 has a similar history as MS 10615–729: like this volume it belonged to the hospice at Kues. The period, which saw the

<sup>13</sup> See the edition of the *Poetae Latini minores* by E. Baehrens, vol. 1 (Lipsiae, 1879), 122–136. MS 10615–729 is among the manuscripts quoted in the critical apparatus (referred to as ‘Codex Bruxellensis 10675–76’).

writing of these two manuscripts was a time of great flourishing for the abbey in Trier. In 1127 the relics of St Matthias were discovered during reconstruction works at the church. The new building, inaugurated in 1148, drew a large amount of pilgrims to this abbey. Apparently, this must have corresponded to a new intellectual flourishing as well.

MS 10615–729 certainly is not a beautiful manuscript. Quite on the contrary, it is stained, it has an ugly cramped layout with almost no margin and a writing that competes with the smallest in existence. It evidently was not the purpose to produce a ‘normal’ library copy: most of these have larger writing and some kind of decorated initial, if not as a thing of beauty, at any rate for the structuring of the text. MS. 10615–729 does not offer its reader the slightest help to find his way. The only thing that apparently interested the scribes was to have the largest amount of text in a minimal number of folios. Perhaps this has something to do with the secular contents of most works included, but that would not explain the presence of various hagiographical texts. Another possibility could be that the quires united to form this manuscript served in fact as some kind of draft or perhaps the scribes just wanted to copy as many texts for another institution. Whatever the explanation may be, it must be stressed that the layout and the writing of this manuscript do not correspond to the normal type of this period.

#### The edition

The edition I am about to offer was based on a new transcription of the text in the manuscript. Only afterwards I consulted preceding editions. I weighed and considered all proposals and conjectures in these editions. Some have been maintained, others have been rejected. Among these are some widely accepted conjectures as *certamini* for *crimini* in I, 3 or *professio litterarum* for *possessio litterarum* in III, 2. In two cases I have proposed a new conjecture: in II, 3 I read *mediterraneum* for *mediterraneam* in the manuscript (mostly *mediterranea* in the editions according to a conjecture by Mommsen), and I suspect that *id est centum homines regendos* in III, 5 is a gloss that somehow crept into the text. I will discuss some of my decisions in a brief commentary. I have maintained the division in chapters and paragraphs found in most editions. The spelling has been classicised as is usual with texts from classical Antiquity. These respellings normally have not been mentioned in the apparatus.

## P. Annii Flori Vergilius orator an poeta

I. 1. Capienti<sup>14</sup> mihi in templo et saucium uigilia caput plurimarum arborum amoenitate, euriporum frigore, aeris libertate<sup>15</sup> recreanti obuiam subito quidam fuere quos ab Urbis spectaculo Baeticam reuertentes sinister Africae uentus in hoc litus excusserat. 2. Quorum unus uir – ut postea apparuit – litteris pereruditus subito ad me conuenit et ‘salue’ inquit ‘hospes. Nisi molestum est, dic nomen tuum. Nam nescioquid oculi mei ammonent et quasi per nubilum<sup>16</sup> recognosco.’ 3. ‘Quid istic?’<sup>17</sup> inquam, ‘Florum uides; fortasse et audieris si tamen in illo orbis terrarum conciliabulo sub Domitiano principe crimini<sup>18</sup> nostro adfuisti.’ 4. Et Baeticus:<sup>19</sup> ‘Tunc es’ inquit ‘ex<sup>20</sup> Africa, quem summo consensu poposcimus? Inuito quidem Caesare et resistente, non quod tibi puero inuideret sed ne †Africae corona magni Iouis attingeret†.’<sup>21</sup> 5. Quae cum me uideret uerecunde[[...]]<sup>22</sup> agnoscentem, in amplexum effunditur et ‘ama’ inquit ‘igitur fautorem tuum.’ ‘Quid ni amem?’ Et manum<sup>23</sup> alterutrum<sup>24</sup> tenentes audissime nascentem amicitiam foederabamus. 6. Cum ille interim breui interuallo usus, ‘Et quid tu’ inquit ‘tam diu in hac prouincia nec in nostram Baeticam excurris nec Urbem illam reuisis ubi uersus tui a lectoribus concinuntur et in foro omni<sup>25</sup> clarissimus ille de Dacia triumphus exultat? 7. Potesne [[hoc]]<sup>26</sup> cum hoc singulari ingenio tantaque natura prouincialem latebram pati? Nihil te caritas Urbis, nihil ille [[ge]]<sup>27</sup> <uictor><sup>28</sup> gentium populus, nihil senatus mouet? Nihil denique lux et fulgor felicitis imperii qui in se rapit atque conuertit omnium oculos hominum ac

<sup>14</sup> Capienti cod.: spatiantii Mommsen, Cap. I. Enti Elter, latenti Rossbach, incedenti Sinko, otium add. ante capienti Helmreich otium add. post templo Damsté, leuamen add. post mihi Walter, quietem ibidem Schopen, Iouis temperiem add. post templo Eussner.

<sup>15</sup> libertate cod.: salubritate Schopen.

<sup>16</sup> nubilum cod.: nebulam te Schopen.

<sup>17</sup> hic add. Mommsen.

<sup>18</sup> crimini cod.: certamini Schopen specimini Eussner.

<sup>19</sup> Baeticus: heticus cod.

<sup>20</sup> ex cod.: ille add. Halm ante ex.

<sup>21</sup> Affrice corona cod.: Africa coronam Ritschl Africae corona Malcovati; attingeret cod.: obtingeret Baehrens. Fortasse Africae corrigendum in Africam vel accingeret legendum pro attingeret.

<sup>22</sup> [[...]]: rasura pro loco expuncto.

<sup>23</sup> manum cod.: manu Rossbach.

<sup>24</sup> alterutrum cod.: alter alterum Haupt.

<sup>25</sup> omni cod.: omnium ? in apparatu critico Rossbach.

<sup>26</sup> [[hoc?]]: rasura.

<sup>27</sup> [[ge?]]: rasura.

<sup>28</sup> uictor Ritschl rex Baehrens princeps Malcovati et Alfonsi arbiter Richardson.

deorum?’ 8. Atque<sup>29</sup> ego uarie perturbatus ‘quid nunc uis ego respondeam, o quisquis es? Mihi quoque ipsi hoc idem mirum uideri solet quod non Romae morer.’<sup>30</sup> Sed nihil est difficilius quam rationem reddere actus<sup>31</sup> tui. Quare desine me in memoriam priorem<sup>32</sup> reducendo uulnus dolorum meorum rescindere. Propitia sit illa ciuitas et fruatur illa quibus fortuna permittit. 9. Quod ad<sup>33</sup> me pertinet ex illo die cuius [quo]<sup>34</sup> tu mihi testis es, postquam<sup>35</sup> ereptam manibus et capiti coronam meo uidi, tota mens, totus animus resiliit atque abhorruit ab illa ciuitate adeoque sum percussus et consternatus illo dolore, ut patriae quoque meae oblitus (et)<sup>36</sup> parentum carissimorum similis furenti huc et illuc uager<sup>37</sup> per diuersa terrarum.’ Et ille ‘Quae tamen<sup>38</sup> loca quasue regiones peragrasti?’

II. 1. ‘Si ita<sup>39</sup> indulges otio, plane<sup>40</sup> quam breuiter exponam nec inuitus<sup>41</sup> priorum recordabor. Primum Siciliam<sup>42</sup> nobilem uidi domesticam Cereris, secundam<sup>43</sup> deinde (*f. 73vb*) Creten patriam Tonantis et a latere uicinas Cycladas salutauit. 2. Inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium<sup>44</sup> pelagus,<sup>45</sup> ut ora Nili uiderem et populum semper in templis otiosum peregrinae deae sinistra pulsantem. 3. Inde rursus Italiam redii.<sup>46</sup> Et taedio maris cum mediter-

<sup>29</sup> atque cod.: ad quae ? in apparatu critico Rossbach.

<sup>30</sup> morer cod.: moror Ritschl.

<sup>31</sup> actus cod.: reatus Freudenberg.

<sup>32</sup> priorem cod.: priorum Mommsen.

<sup>33</sup> ad: a cod.

<sup>34</sup> quo cod.: del. Ritschl de quo Halm quod Baehrens.

<sup>35</sup> postquam cod.: palmam *add.* Mommsen.

<sup>36</sup> et *add.* Ritschl.

<sup>37</sup> uager cod.: uagarer Ritschl.

<sup>38</sup> tamen cod.: tandem Schopen.

<sup>39</sup> ita cod.: tu Schopen.

<sup>40</sup> plane cod.: sane Georges.

<sup>41</sup> post ‘inuitus’ ut *add.* Eussner.

<sup>42</sup> Siciliam: ante corr. sisciliam

<sup>43</sup> secundam cod.: fecundam Rossbach sedem Schopen.

<sup>44</sup> Aegyptium: ante corr. (a priore manu) egiptu(m).

<sup>45</sup> Inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus cod.: Invitavit inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus Freudenberg Inde Rhodon et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus Schopen Inde me Rhodos habuit ingressum Aegyptium pelagus Mommsen Inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus allexit Ritschl Inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus pellexit Haupt Inde me Rhodos et ab regressu Aegyptium pelagus attraxit Baehrens Inde me Rhodos et ab hac regressum Aegyptium excepit (vel tenuit) pelagus ? in apparatu critico Rossbach.

<sup>46</sup> redii: ante corr. (a priore manu) vdii (?).

raneum<sup>47</sup> concupissem<sup>48</sup> secutus<sup>49</sup> Gallicas Alpes et<sup>50</sup> lustris populos aquilone pallentes. Inde sol occidens placuit; flecto cursum. Sed statim par horrore, par uertice, par ille niuibus Alpinis, Pyrenaeus excepit. 4. Vides, hospes, quae spatia caeli peragrauerim, quae maris quaeue terrarum. Non aliter,<sup>51</sup> mehercules, si conferre paruis magna licet, sacer ille iuuenis terras peruolitauit, cui terra<sup>52</sup> mater capaces onerauerat frugibus amictus. Et cum alite serpente cursum<sup>53</sup> ipsa iunxisset nisi toto orbe peragrato uetuit suas redire serpentes. 5. Liceat ergo tandem fatigato hic aliquando<sup>54</sup> subcumbere.<sup>55</sup> Si Scythes<sup>56</sup> essem, iam plaustra soluisssem; si uagus<sup>57</sup> gubernator, iam dicata pelagi deae prora penderet. Quo usque uagabimur? An semper hospites erimus? Ferae cubile prospiciunt et aues senescunt in nido. 6. Si fata Romam negant patriam, saltem hic manere contingat. Quid quod consuetudo res fortis est? Et ecce iam familiaritate continua ciuitas nobis ipsa blanditur. Quae, si quid credis mihi qui multa cognoui, omnium rerum<sup>58</sup> quae ad quietem eliguntur gratissima est. 7. Populum uides, o hospes et amice, probum, frugi, quietum, tarde[m]<sup>59</sup> quidem sed iudicio hospitalem. Caelum peculiariter<sup>60</sup> temperatum miscet uices et notam ueris totus annus imitatur. 8. Terra fertilis campis et magis collibus, nam Italiae<sup>61</sup> uites affectat et comparat areas: serotino non<sup>62</sup> erubescit autumno. Si quid ad rem pertinet, ciuitas ipsa generosissimis auspiciis instituta. Nam praeter Caesaris uexilla quae portat,<sup>63</sup> triumphos, unde nomen accepit, adest etiam peregrina nobilitas. 9. Quippe si

<sup>47</sup> mediterraneum corr.: mediterraneam cod. mediterranea Mommsen mediterraneam plagam noscere Ritschl.

<sup>48</sup> concupissem: ante corr. (a priore manu) concupissem.

<sup>49</sup> secutus cod.: sum add. Ritschl.

<sup>50</sup> et cod.: del. Mommsen et Iahn.

<sup>51</sup> aliter cod.: ultra Mommsen.

<sup>52</sup> terra cod.: errans Baehrens.

<sup>53</sup> alite serpente cursum cod.: alites serpentes curru Freudenberg.

<sup>54</sup> aliquando: ante corr. (ab altera manu) aliquando ut videtur; (edd. : aliquanto, at in codice aliquando, non aliquanto).

<sup>55</sup> subcumbere cod.: sub umbra recumbere Freudenberg.

<sup>56</sup> scythes Welcker: cithes cod.

<sup>57</sup> uagus cod.: nauis Schopen.

<sup>58</sup> rerum cod.: del. Rossbach earum Mommsen.

<sup>59</sup> tarde Schopen: tardem cod.

<sup>60</sup> peculiariter: ante corr. (ab altera manu?) peculiariter.

<sup>61</sup> Italiae Ritschl: italia cod.

<sup>62</sup> serotino non cod.: non serotino Mommsen.

<sup>63</sup> portat cod.: portant Ritschl portendunt Schopen.

uetera<sup>64</sup> templa respicias, hic ille colitur corniger praedo, qui Tyriam uirginem portans, dum per tota<sup>65</sup> maria lasciuit, hic amisit et substitit et eius quam ferebat oblitus subito nostrum litus adamauit.’

III. 1. Hic cum ego respirassem statim Baeticus<sup>66</sup> ‘o’ inquit ‘beatam ciuitatem, quae in te fatigatum incidit! Quem ad modum tamen te prosequitur et quid hic<sup>67</sup> agitur? Unde subuenit reditus? An pater ab Africa subministrat?’ 2. ‘Inde nequaquam,<sup>68</sup> cum<sup>69</sup> hac ipsa peregrinatione offenderim. In reditu<sup>70</sup> est mihi possessio<sup>71</sup> litterarum.’ ‘O rem indignissimam et quam aequo fers istud<sup>72</sup> animo! Sedere in scholis et pueris praecipere!’ 3. Ad<sup>73</sup> quam illius interrogationem in hunc modum respondi: ‘Non miror<sup>74</sup> eius <te> nunc esse persuasionis qua et ipse quoque aliquando<sup>75</sup> diu laboraui. Toto<sup>76</sup> enim quod<sup>77</sup> egimus quinquennio isto [isto]<sup>78</sup> mihi pertaesum erat huius professionis ut nusquam uiuere putarem hominem miseriorem.’<sup>79</sup> 4. Et<sup>80</sup> subinde retractanti<sup>81</sup> sortemque meam cum fortunis et ceteris uitae laboribus conferenti, tandem<sup>82</sup> aliquando pulchritudo suscepti operis apparuit. 5. Scire te ergo nunc oportet nullum maius praedium,<sup>83</sup> nullam procurationem, nullum honorem decerni quantus hic sit nostrae professionis. Nempe si mihi maximus imperator

<sup>64</sup> uetera: ante corr. (a priore manu) uera litteris ‘te’ supra lineam scriptis.

<sup>65</sup> tota cod.: tot ? in apparatu critico Rossbach.

<sup>66</sup> Baeticus: beaticus cod.

<sup>67</sup> hic cod.: a te add. Ritschl.

<sup>68</sup> inde nequaquam Mommsen: unde nequaquam cod. unde tu putas, nequaquam Schopen unde tu putas? a patre quidem nequaquam Ritschl [unde] nequaquam Haupt.

<sup>69</sup> cum cod.: cum eum *vel* quem Ritschl.

<sup>70</sup> reditu: ante corr. (a priore manu) reddito altera ‘d’ expuncta.

<sup>71</sup> possessio cod.: professio Schopen.

<sup>72</sup> istud: ante corr. illud.

<sup>73</sup> ad: at cod.

<sup>74</sup> te add. hic Ritschl, at ego credo melius positum post eius.

<sup>75</sup> aliquando cod.: aliquamdiu Schopen.

<sup>76</sup> toto Iahn: totum cod.

<sup>77</sup> quod cod.: hic add. Schopen ab initio add. Ritschl.

<sup>78</sup> isto: isto isto cod. isto ita Rossbach istoc ita Mommsen ita Ritschl.

<sup>79</sup> miseriorem: ante corr. (a priore manu) miscriorem ‘c’ rasa, e supra lineam scripta.

<sup>80</sup> et cod.: sed Ritschl.

<sup>81</sup> retractanti Ritschl: retractant cod.

<sup>82</sup> tandem: ante corr. (a priore manu) tanta.

<sup>83</sup> maius praedium Oehler: magis praedium cod. magisterium Haupt manus pretium Rossbach.

uitem,<sup>84</sup> [id est centum homines regendos],<sup>85</sup> tradidisset, non mediocris honor<sup>86</sup> habitus mihi uideretur. Cedo si praefecturam, si tribunatum, nempe idem honos nisi quod merces amplior. 6. Si ergo non Caesar, sed fortuna hoc genus stationis iniunxit uti pueris ingenuis atque honestis praesiderem, nonne tibi pulchrum<sup>87</sup> atque magnificum consecutus officium? 7. Quaeso enim propius intuere utrum praeclarius sit sagulatis an praetextatis<sup>88</sup> imperare, barbaris efferatisque pectoribus an mitibus et innoxiiis. 8. Bone Iuppiter quam imperatorium, quam regium [[...]]<sup>89</sup> est sedere a<sup>90</sup> suggestu praecipientem bonos mores et sacrarum studia litterarum, iam carmina praelegentem quibus ora mentesque formantur, iam sententiis uariis sensus excitantur,<sup>91</sup> iam exemplis ro(manae historiae<sup>92</sup> ...) <sup>93</sup>

#### Brief discussion of some editorial choices

**I, 3 crimini:** All editions read: *certamini* against the manuscript: *crimini*. However, reading *certamini* involves a double indication of the place and/or occasion (after *conciliabulo*). Moreover, it is less easy to understand the accompanying *nostro*. I think that the reading of the manuscript should be preserved. The word refers to the result of the contest (which, as such, is only hinted at): the fact that Florus was proclaimed victorious against the will of the emperor Domitian. With a tyrannical emperor, that alone would already be sufficient to be called a ‘crime’. Apart from that, Florus evokes a parallel with Ovid whose exile was said to originate in a *crimen* consisting in a *carmen* (Trist., 2, 207: *perdiderint cum me duo crimina, carmen et error*). Another advantage of this allusive word is that it strengthens Domitian’s image as a tyrant (typical for Roman literature of Trajan’s age) and changes Florus’ journey into a form of (self-imposed) exile rather than something undertaken by a spoilt youth who cannot stand losing.

<sup>84</sup> imperator uitem Iahn: inputem cod. imperator centuriatum Schopen imperator mille vel Ritschl.

<sup>85</sup> id est centum homines regendos cod.: interpolatio ut suspicor.

<sup>86</sup> honor cod.: honos Ritschl.

<sup>87</sup> pulchrum cod.: uideor pulchrum Ritschl pulchrum uideor Iahn pulchrum <sum> ? in apparatu critico Rossbach.

<sup>88</sup> praetextatis: pretexiatis cod.

<sup>89</sup> [[...]]: rasura.

<sup>90</sup> a cod.: in Schopen.

<sup>91</sup> excitantur cod.: excitantem Ritschl.

<sup>92</sup> ro(manae historiae) Rossbach: Romanae eloquentiae Ritschl.

<sup>93</sup> Manu XVI saec. add.: hic aliquid desideratur.

**I, 4: Africae corona:** the reading in the manuscript (*affrice corona magni iouis attingeret*) is problematic. *Attingere* usually has an object, not a dative. Ritschl (followed by the editors in Teubner and Budé) read a nominative *Africa* and an accusative *coronam*, thus accepting two corrections. Baehrens suggested to read *obtingeret* instead of *attingeret*, which requires only one correction and seems to be less problematic regarding the actual meaning of the phrase. As *attingere* is ‘to touch, reach, afflict, affect’ (Oxford Latin Dictionary [Oxford, 2012], 221) and *obtingere* means ‘to fall (to) as one’s lot, occur to the benefit or disadvantage (of)’ (Oxford Latin Dictionary, 1352), the latter seems to correspond more to the apparently intended meaning in this locus. Moreover, *obtingere* is constructed with a dative, which means that only one change is required. The delicacy of the problem is illustrated by the fact that the Thesaurus linguae Latinae, vol. 2, cols. 1143–1146, s. v. *attingo*, sub IV, 2 (col. 1145) quotes *Africa coronam ... iouis attingeret* for the meaning *pervenire ad (in) aliquem*, 2, *translate*, without any allusion to the fact that the construction of the sentence is, in fact, a conjecture. Moreover, it is not so much *Africa* that *pervenit* as *corona*, so somehow the given explanation seems unlucky. Of course, it could have been the other way round: the expression might have been *Africam corona attingeret*, parallel to Cic., Quint., 1, 8, 24: *ut primum Asiam attigisti*, but then *translate*. That would be correct both regarding to grammar and to the sense, but not easy to be explained from a palaeographical point of view. Another theoretical possibility could be to read an accusative *coronam* and correct *attingeret* to *accingeret*, which would even be closer to the manuscript. The latter verb can be constructed with an accusative and a dative (cf. Stat., Theb., 1, 428/429: *accinctos lateri (sic ira ferebat) / nudassent enses*). The mistaken reading of t for c can easily be made in some scripts (notably that of the Brussels scribe) and the somewhat artificial expression is not inconsistent with Florus’s style, but it involves, again, two corrections and still is not entirely satisfying with regard to its meaning. In view of all this, I finally decided to consider this passage as a *crux* without offering a definite solution.

**I, 5 manum:** most editions have *manu* against the manuscript: *manum*. If *alterutrum* is taken as an *accusativus obiecti*, *manu* seems to be correct as it avoids a double object. However, in later Latin *alterutrum* seems also to have been used as an adverb ‘each other’ (e. g. Tert., Ux., 2, 8, 7; Hier., Gal., 3, 6, 5). If that applies here, the accusative *manum* can be maintained. See A. Blaise, Dictionnaire Latin-Français des auteurs chrétiens (Turnhout, 1954), 74 s. v. *alteruter*.



**II,1 secundam:** Since Rossbach most editions read *fecundam* against the manuscript: *secundam*. At first sight, *fecundam* seems to have more meaning and as a confusion between *f* and *s* is easy in some scripts (although on this spot in the manuscript the *s* is a capital, not a minuscule), Rossbach's conjecture seems acceptable. Notwithstanding all this, I have opted for the reading in the manuscript as it seems simpler. In my view Florus just enumerates his destinations: first he went to Sicily (*primum Siciliam nobilem uidi*), then, as second island, he visited Crete (*secundam deinde Creten*) with a double indication: an attributive adjective *secundam* and an adverb *deinde*. The parallel in place between *primum* and *secundam* equally argues, I think, in favour of the reading in the manuscript, although this could also be turned against it as it could be an adaptation by the scribe. I admit that in this way *Creten* has no adjective that parallels *nobilem* for Sicily. The most frequent epitheton ornans that goes with Crete in Latin literature refers to the hundred cities of the island (cf. Ov., Her., 10, 67; Hor., Carm., 3, 27, 34; Mela, 2, 98). At first sight, the only attestation for *fecunda Crete* to be found is this locus in Florus, which is, actually, a conjecture.

**II,3 mediterraneum:** in post-Augustan Latin two substantives based on the adjective *mediterraneus* are used, viz. the neuter singular *mediterraneum* and the neuter plural *mediterranea*. The form as found in the manuscript (*mediterraneam*) can only be accepted when assuming an ellipsis for *partem* etc. The final *m* in the manuscript is quite explicit and not an abbreviation. Mommsen's reading *mediterranea* certainly is acceptable, but in view of the explicit *m* in the manuscript and the *lectio difficilior* principle I would suggest to read *mediterraneum*.

**III,2 possessio litterarum:** most editions have the conjecture *professio litterarum*, which at first sight seems more probable than the *possessio litterarum* of the manuscript. From the next phrases, it is clear that Florus is a teacher, which seems to become even more so when the reading *professio* is adopted than when *possessio* is maintained. The word *professio*, however, is found already twice in the following sentences, where it has the meaning 'profession, job': three times the same (unusual) word seems too much from a stylistic angle. Contrary to what Le Grand Gaffiot. Dictionnaire Latin – Français, nouvelle édition revue et augmentée sous la direction de P. Flobert (Paris, 2000), 1263 says, the word *professio* has not the meaning 'education in rhetoric' in Cic., de Or., 1, 21: '*professio bene dicendi*'. In fact, *professio* has here its original meaning 'declaration'. Suet., Gram., 8, 1 seems closer: '*in professione grammatica*', but, here, the idea of 'instruction' is rather in

*grammatica* than in *professione*. There seems to exist no attestation for the meaning ‘education’. Assuming that in Florus’s text a reading *professio* would mean ‘instruction, education’ seems, therefore, not correct. It could, of course, have the meaning ‘profession, job’ without specifying that education is involved. But then the word *possessio* may equally be maintained. *Possessio* means ‘possession’ as by someone who actually uses the object, not necessarily in the sense of ‘ownership’, and it has a meaning which mirrors French *maîtrise*: cf. Oxford Latin Dictionary (Oxford, 1968-1980), 1410: ‘1. Occupancy ...; c. possession, enjoyment (of immaterial advantages)’. Florus, who has a predilection for somewhat vague and abstruse paraphrases, could have used this formula to indicate that he uses literature as a source of income. In practical life, there would have been only two options in that case: education at school or living as an independent *rhetor*. That Florus actually teaches, is clear from the following. As, in this way, *possessio* has a significant meaning, whereas *professio* does not necessarily add something and occurs already twice in this paragraph, I have preferred to maintain the reading of the manuscript.

**III,5 maius praedium:** this reading proposed by Oehler is replaced in other editions by *magisterium* (proposed by Haupt) or by *manus pretium* (suggested by Rossbach). The manuscript has *magis praedium*. Apart from the fact that Oehler’s reading is the one closest to the manuscript as it involves only the change of *magis* into *maius* (*praedium* / *praedium* is, after all, a question of orthography), whereas the other conjectures require more far reaching interventions, his suggestion seems to be nearer to the general idea as well: Florus states that teaching is better than any property (*praedium*), office (*procuracionem*) or honour (*honorem*).

**III,5 imperator uitem [id est centum homines regendos]:** *imperator uitem* is an ingenuous conjecture by Jahn for an otherwise unintelligible *inputem* in the manuscript. In this form Jahn recognised the abbreviation *imp* for *imperator* and the word *uitem* (with the loss of a single stroke). *Vites* is also used to indicate the staff of a centurion. Undoubtedly, Jahn based his suggestion on the phrase that follows *inputem*. Admittedly, the use of *uitem* is learned. There is, however, no reason why Florus, if he wanted to show off using rare words, immediately should have spoiled the effect by explaining his meaning. Earlier he wrote obscure references to Triptolemus and Jupiter with Europa without any explanation. I therefore suspect that the phrase *id est centum homines regendos* is, in fact, a gloss that found its way into the

text, and that, therefore, it should be considered an interpolation and consequently be removed.

**III,8 sacrarum studia litterarum:** the expression *sacrae litterae* seems essentially Christian and I strongly suspect that somewhere in the tradition a scribe wrote *sacrarum litterarum* instead of *sacra studia*, which is less clearly Christian. However, as the phrase is correct and has a clear meaning, I have maintained the reading as found in the manuscript. The previous editors never hinted at a mistake or an interpolation for this passage.

**III,8 excitantur:** Ritschl suggested to replace the reading in the manuscript by *excitantem*, which, at first sight, seems alluring. The main problem is, of course, the fact that the text breaks off in the following line, so that the general structure of the phrase remains unknown. The subject of the sentence *sedere a suggestu* is complemented by the participles *praecipientem* and *praelegantem*. The question is whether the other two sections beginning with *iam* are at the same level as these two participles or as the relative clause *quibus ora mentesque formantur*. In principle there is nothing against considering *excitantur* the equivalent of *formantur*, thus assuming a tripartite structure depending on *praelegantem* (the third part now being incomplete). As the section starting with *iam praelegantem* seems a further development of the section with *praecipientem*, such a reading seems to deserve even a preference. The clause *iam sentiis uariis sensus excitantur* would, then, amplify *ora formantur*, whereas the clause beginning with *iam exemplis ro{...}* takes on *mentes formantur*. The repetitive *iam* may point at such a tripartite structure.

## Appendix

In this appendix I offer a literal transcription of the text as it is in the manuscript, with the orthography, punctuation and disposition as found in MS 10615–729. There is one exception: when a word breaks off at the end of a line, I have used a ‘–’ as modern usage has it. In the manuscript there is no sign whatsoever that the word continues on the following line. This habit would develop only slightly later. The incipit is in a larger character. The first initial C equally is larger, but has remained without any decoration, just like the other initials in this volume.

(f. 73va)<sup>94</sup>

Pannii Flori Virgilius orator an  
poeta incipit.

Capienti mihi in templo (et) sauciu(m) uigilia cap(u)d  
plurimaru(m) arboru(m) amenitate euripo(rum) frigore aeris  
lib(er)tate recreanti obuia(m) subito quidam fuere quos  
ab urbis spectaculo beticam reuertentes sinister  
affrice uentus in hoc litus excusserat. Quoru(m) un(us)  
uir ut postea apparuit literis p(er)eruditus su-  
bito ad me conuenit. Et salue inquit hospes.  
Nisi molestum est dic nomen tuum. Nam nescio  
quid oculi mei ammonent (et) quasi p(er) nubilu(m)  
recognosco. Quid istic inquam. Floru(m) uides  
fortasse (et) audieris si tam(en) in illo orbis t(er)raru(m)  
conciliabulo sub domiciano principe crimini  
n(ost)ro adfuisti. (et) heticus, tu ne es inquit ex  
affrica. que(m) su(m)mo consensu poposcimus. Inuito  
quidem cesare (et) resistente n(on) q(uo)d tibi puero in-  
uider(et)<sup>95</sup> (sed) ne affrice corona magni iouis attin-  
ger(et). Que cu(m) me uider(et) uerecunde[[...]]agnos-  
centem. in amplexum effundit(ur). Et ama in-  
quid igitur fautore(m) tuum. Quid ni amem?  
Et manu(m) alterutru(m) tenentes auidissime nas-  
centem amicitiam federabamus. cu(m) ille interim bre-  
ui interuallo usus. Et quid tu inquit tam diu in  
hac p(ro)uincia nec in n(ost)ram beticam excurris. nec  
urbem illam reuisis ubi uersus tui a lectorib(us) conci-  
nuntur. (et) in foro om(n)i clarissimus ille de dacia tri-  
umphus exultat. Potes ne [[hoc]] cu(m) hoc singulari  
ingenio tantaq(ue) natura p(ro)uinciale(m) latebram pati?  
Nihil te caritas urbis. nihil ille [[ge]] gencium popul(us)  
nihil senatus mouet? Nihil deniq(ue) lux (et) fulgor  
felicis inp(er)i qui in se rapit atq(ue) conuertit om(n)iu(m)  
oculos hominu(m) ac d(e)orum). atq(ue) ego uarie p(er)turbatus

<sup>94</sup> *In marg. (manu paulum recentiore):* i(n) alio / [q](ua)ter(n)ione / [e]x i(n)tegra / [h]anc / [s]cript(ur)am / [h]abeo.

<sup>95</sup> uider(et): u correctio videtur ab altera manu (eadem ac in margine) nigriore atramento utente. Ante fortasse 'iider(et)' aut 'uder(et)' legebatur.

quid n(un)c uis ego respondeam. o quisquis es. mihi q(uo)q(ue)  
 ipsi hoc ide(m) mirum uideri sol(et). q(uo)d n(on) rome morer.  
 S(ed) nihil e(st) difficili(us) qua(m) rationem redde(re) actus tui.  
 Quare desine me in memoriam priore(m) reducendo.  
 uulnus dolo(rum) meo(rum) rescindere. P(ro)picia sit illa  
 ciuitas (et) fruuntur illa quib(us) fortuna p(er)mittit.  
 q(uo)d a me p(er)tin(et) ex illo die cuius quo tu mihi  
 testis es, postqua(m) ereptam manib(us) (et) capiti coro-  
 nam meo uidi, tota mens totus animus re-  
 siliit atq(ue) abhorruit. ab illa ciuitate. Adeoq(ue)  
 sum p(er)cussus (et) consternatus illo dolore, ut patrie  
 quoq(ue) mee oblitus parentum carissimorum.  
 similis furenti huc (et) illuc uager p(er) diuersa  
 terrarum. Et ille. Que tamen loca. quasue  
 regiones peragrasti? Si ita indulges ocio  
 plane quam breuit(er) exponam, nec inuitus  
 prioru(m) recordabor. Primu(m) siciliam<sup>96</sup> nobi-  
 lem uidi domesticam cereris. Se(cun)dam deinde.

(f. 73vb)

creten patriam tonantis (et) a latere uicinas cicladas sa-  
 lutauit. Inde me rhodos (et) ab regressu egiptiu(m)<sup>97</sup> pelagus,  
 ut ora nili uiderem (et) pop(u)l(u)m semper in templis ociosu(m)  
 peregrine dee sinistra pulsantem. Inde rursus italia(m)  
 redii.<sup>98</sup> Et tedio maris cu(m) mediterraneam concupis-  
 sem<sup>99</sup> secutus gallicas alpes (et) lustru(m) pop(u)los aquilone  
 pallentes. Inde sol occidens placuit. flecto cursum. s(et)  
 statim par horrore. par uertice. par ille niuib(us)  
 alpinis. pireneus excepit. uides hospes que spacia celi  
 p(er)agrauerim que maris que ue terrarum. Non alit(er)  
 me hercules si conferre paruis magna lic(et) sacer ille  
 iuuenis terras p(er)uolitauit. Cui terra mater capaces  
 onerauerat frugib(us) amictus. Et cum alite serpente  
 currum ipsa iunxiss(et) nisi toto orbe peragrato ue-  
 tuit suas redire serpentes. Liceat ergo tandem fa-

<sup>96</sup> siciliam: ante corr. (a priore manu?) sisciliam altera s expuncta.

<sup>97</sup> egiptiu(m): ante corr. (a priore manu) egiptu(m).

<sup>98</sup> redii: ante corr. (a priore manu) (?)dii.

<sup>99</sup> concupissem: ante corr. (a priore manu) concupissem.

tigrato hic aliquando<sup>100</sup> subcumbere. Si cithes e(ss)em ia(m)  
 plaustra soluissem. Si uagus gubernator iam dicata  
 pelagi dee p(ro)ra pender(et). Quo usq(ue) uagabimur? An se(m)p(er)  
 hospites erimus? Fere cubile p(ro)spiciunt (et) aues senes-  
 cunt in nido. Si fata romam negant patria(m) saltem  
 hic manere contingat. Quid q(uo)d consuetudo res fortis  
 est. Et ecce iam familiaritate continua ciuitas nobis ipsa  
 blanditur. Que siquid credis mihi qui multa cognoui.  
 om(n)ium reru(m) que ad quiete(m) eliguntur gratissima e(st)  
 populu(m) uides o hospes (et) amice. p(ro)bum frugi quietum.  
 tardem quidem s(et) iudicio hospitale(m) Celum pecu-  
 liariter<sup>101</sup> temperatu(m). Miscet uices. (et) nota(m) ueris tot(us)  
 annus imitatur. Terra fertilis campis. (et) magis  
 collib(us). Na(m) italia uites affectat (et) comparat areas. se-  
 rotino non erubescit autumnus. Si quid ad rem p(er)ti-  
 n(et) ciuitas ipsa generosissimis auspiciis instituta.  
 Na(m) p(re)ter cesaris uexilla que portat triumphos  
 unde nom(en) accepit. ad est etiam peregrina nobilitas.  
 Quippe si uetera<sup>102</sup> templa respicias. hic ille colitur  
 corniger predo, qui tiriam uirgine(m) portans. du(m)  
 p(er) tota maria lasciuit. hic amisit (et) substitit. (et) ei(us)  
 qua(m) ferebat oblitus. subito n(ost)r(u)m litus adamauit  
 Hic cum ego respirassem statim beaticus. o inquit  
 beatam ciuitatem. que in te fatigatu(m) incidit. Que(m)  
 ad modum tam(en) te p(ro)sequitur. (et) q(ui)d hic agit(ur). unde  
 subuenit reditus. An pater ab affrica sub ministrat.  
 unde nequaquam cum hac ipsa peregrinatione offen-  
 derim. In reditu<sup>103</sup> est mihi possessio litt(er)arum. O re(m)  
 indignissimam (et) qua(m) equo fers istud<sup>104</sup> animo. Sede(re)  
 in scolis. (et) pueris p(re)cipere. At qua(m) illius int(er)roga-  
 tionem in hunc modum respondi. Non miror eius  
 n(un)c e(ss)e p(er)suasionis qua (et) ipse q(uo)q(ue) aliquando diu la-  
 borauit. Totu(m) enim q(uo)d egimus. quinquennio isto  
 isto mihi p(er)tesum erat huius p(ro)fessionis ut nusqua(m)

<sup>100</sup> aliquando: ante corr. (ab altera manu) aliquanno.

<sup>101</sup> peculiariter: ante corr. (ab altera manu?) peculiariter.

<sup>102</sup> uetera: ante corr. (a priore manu) uera litteris 'te' supra lineam scriptis.

<sup>103</sup> reditu: ante corr. (a priore manu) reddito altera 'd' expuncta.

<sup>104</sup> istud: ante corr. illud.

uiuere putarem hominem miseriorem.<sup>105</sup> Et sub-  
 inde retractant sortemq(ue) meam cu(m) fortunis (et) ce-  
 teris uite laboribus conferenti. tande(m)<sup>106</sup> aliquando pul-  
 critudo suscepti operis apparuit. Scire te ergo  
 n(un)c oport(et) nullu(m) magis predium. nulla(m) p(ro)curacio(n)em  
 nullum honorem. decerni quantus hic sit. n(ost)re  
 p(ro)fessionis. Nempe si mihi maximus inputem. id e(st)  
 centu(m) homines regendos tradidiss(et). non mediocris  
 honor habitus m(ihi) uideretur. Cedo si p(re)fecturam.  
 si tribunatu(m) ne(m)pe idem honos nisi q(uo)d merces am-  
 plior. Si ergo non cesar. s(ed) fortuna hoc genus sta-  
 tionis iniunxit uti pueris ingenuis atq(ue) honestis  
 presiderem. Nonne tibi pulcrum atq(ue) magnificum  
 consecutus officium? Queso enim p(ro)pius intuere  
 utrum preclarus sit sagulatis. an pretexiatis in-  
 perare Barbaris efferatisq(ue) pectorib(us) an mitib(us) (et)  
 innoxiiis. Bone iupiter quam inp(er)atorium quam  
 regium [[...]]est sedere a suggestu p(re)cipientem bonos  
 mores (et) sacraru(m) studia litteraru(m). ia(m) carmina  
 p(re)legentem quib(us) ora mentesq(ue) formantur. Iam  
 sentenciis uariis sensus excitantur, ia(m) exemplis ro-

*(manu XVI saeculi) hic aliq(ui)d desideratur*

Michiel Verweij  
 Department of Manuscripts  
 Royal Library of Belgium  
 Brussels

<sup>105</sup> miseriorem: ante corr. (a priore manu) miseriorem 'c' rasa, e supra lineam scripta.

<sup>106</sup> tand(em): ante corr. (a priore manu) tanta.

