

INTRODUCTION

The discovery of a lost post-incunable edition of Pedro Fernández de Villegas's *Flosculus sacramentorum* prompted the composition of the present edition. In 2022, during a review of the collection at the National Spanish Research Council's (CSIC) Tomás Navarro Tomás Library in Madrid, the staff discovered a copy from ca. 1510, printed by Arnao Guillén de Brocar in Logroño (Fernández de Villegas, ca. 1510; del Carmen Maya 2022; Sadurní 2022). When this news came to my attention, I submitted my initial proposal for publishing a bilingual edition. Even though the post-incunable edition prompted the present one, I have chosen neither it nor even the incunable first edition as the principal basis for the Latin text and its English translation. The lightly revised 1521 edition, rather, provides the base text. But first, before entering into detail about editions, I will briefly describe the author's life and his *Flosculus sacramentorum*.

The title *Flosculus*, literally “little flower,” in this context means “florilegium.” Since rather few books bear the title *Flosculus*, and there is no danger of confusion, “Flosculus” will serve in the present edition as shorthand for *Flosculus sacramentorum*. It is a florilegium concerning the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church: baptism, Eucharist, penance, confirmation, holy orders, marriage, and extreme unction.

Pedro Fernández de Villegas was born on March 25, 1453, to a prominent noble family of Burgos, Spain; and died on Dec. 6, 1536 (Andreu Lucas 2011; Mondola 2017, 19-24). His noble upbringing afforded him an excellent education, and his theological studies prepared him for his ecclesiastical duties as priest, abbot, canon, and eventually archdeacon. Let not the latter title confuse the reader of this sacraments manual: although Fernández de Villegas writes the *Flosculus* as an archdeacon at the very end of the fifteenth century, he belongs to the sacramental order of presbyter. That is to say, insofar as sacramental ordination is concerned, he was ordained a priest but not consecrated a bishop. Nevertheless, his title “archdeacon” does have something to do with the manual, for it indicates his leadership

role within the Diocese of Burgos. Fernández de Villegas makes evident his concern for the local clergy and their ongoing formation, especially at the beginning and end of the book.

Fernández de Villegas spent several years in Italy (ca. 1484-1487) before returning to Burgos and assuming his responsibilities as the abbot of Cervatos, a position to which he was appointed no later than 1484 (Mondola 2017, 21). After serving as abbot for a decade, he received his appointment as archdeacon in 1497 (Mondola 2017, 23), not long before the publication of the *Flosculus*. By the time he composed his book, he could speak of making annual visits to the Burgos clergy, his intended readership (*Flos*. 2). The precise year of publication is unknown, but the *Flosculus* is generally dated in the range of 1498 to 1500 (Fernández de Villegas, ca. 1498-1500; GW 9791; ISTC if00099500).¹ Fernández de Villegas would later bring his erudition to bear on a far more ambitious project than the *Flosculus*, his 1515 glossed Spanish translation of Dante's *Inferno* (Alighieri 1515; cf. Hamlin 2019). On pastoral and theological matters, however, we know of only one publication by him, the *Flosculus*.

In twenty-six folios, Fernández de Villegas expounds the basic teachings of his day on the seven sacraments of the Catholic Church, with an emphasis on priestly ministry. This emphasis results in a far more extended treatment of the sacraments of baptism, penance, and Eucharist, than confirmation and holy orders (*ordo*, "order" in Latin); priests routinely celebrate the former, but the latter pertain to episcopal ministry. Marriage and extreme unction, likewise, are treated only briefly.

The *Flosculus* should be understood as just one of many such manuals for pastoral care and the sacrament of confession composed around the turn of the sixteenth century, after a lull in their production for most of the fifteenth century (Michaud-Quantin 1962, 68 and 98). Thomas N. Tentler explains the popularity of such books in these terms:

To begin with, it was a popular literature. In addition, it is illuminating precisely because it intentionally explains more. At the same time, it is practical, conservative, and authoritative. (Tentler 1977, 51; cf. Padberg 1994)

¹ <https://www.gesamtkatalogderwiegendrucke.de/docs/GW09791.htm>; <https://data.cerl.org/istc/if00099500>. Julia Méndez Aparicio (1976) dates it to ca. 1499 (82 [#132]). There are letters contained in the copy of the book held in Madrid at the Palacio de Liria, between the seller, A. Rosenthal, Ltd., of Oxford (Oct. 20, 1949), and the Duke of Alba (Oct. 28, 1949). The seller dates it "ca. 1497-1499" and claims that it is "[p]robably the first edition." The duke responds, "Consultados aquí varios expertos, me dicen que no es seguro sea ese libro un incunable: pero de todos modos es raro y como tal me interesa, y lo adquiriré si Vd. Me hace una rebaja en el precio que me señala en su citada carta." Rosenthal must have lowered the price, for the book now belongs to the Fundación Casa de Alba. Obviously, both seller and buyer had financial interest in the dating of the book.

Fernández de Villegas lists his preferred sources at the start of the work and frequently reasserts his work's brevity, referring the reader to the sources. Most of these are Fernández de Villegas's contemporaries from the late fifteenth century, like Antoninus of Florence, Clemente Sánchez de Vercial, and Nicholas de Plove.²

One citation proved particularly difficult to identify, when Fernández de Villegas provides a definition of the sacrament of confession *secundum Rainaldum* ("according to Rainaldus;" *Flos*. 31). I succeeded in finding a close match in the works of Raymond of Peñafort (1603, 447-448), but such a definition by a *Rainaldus* eluded me. Fernández de Villegas spent ample time in Rome in the years following the publication (probably) there of an edition of Antoninus's *Confessionale: Defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio* (1472a) bound with *Forma initiandi confessionis secundum Raynaldum* preceding it. Could the author of this little work be the same one cited in the *Flosculus*? The formula given by Fernández de Villegas does not appear in this work in particular.³ It is possible that he knows another work by this (or another) *Rainaldus* or that he confused *Rainaldus* with Raymond of Peñafort.

In any case, both Fernández de Villegas and his preferred fifteenth-century writers look to sacred Scripture, church fathers like Augustine, scholastic greats like Thomas Aquinas, and the ecumenical councils of the Church, as their authorities.⁴ The manual, therefore, aims to distill a tradition of sacramental teaching and practice rooted in the person and teachings of Jesus Christ, as transmitted in the Vulgate New Testament, and developed over many centuries in the Latin Church.

Most readers today will find plenty in this book that bewilders, amuses, or even horrifies, for it reflects a long-gone social and ecclesiastical setting. If a priest swallows some water while bathing, has he broken the communion fast? That depends, if he did it knowingly, on how much water he swallowed: yes, if it was much; no, if it was little (*Flos*. 92). Nowadays water does not break the communion fast, so the issue has little resonance, even for Catholics. What if a child is born "partly human and partly beast"? The priest must determine which category better applies, baptizing the more-human-than-beast but denying baptism to the more-beast-than-human (*Flos*. 25). The late-fifteenth-century understanding of birth defects conditions the author's language and thinking; we would not expect it to be

² I have cited these in the same manner as contemporary sources, by the author's surname, date of publication, and page.

³ The copy held by the Bibliothèque municipale de Lyon (catalog entry at <https://catalogue.bm-lyon.fr/ark:/75584/pf0000259848>) is available for digital viewing on Google Books (<https://books.google.com/books?id=y7CeOjOzqblC>).

⁴ The citations of ancient and medieval literature follow the conventions of the *Thesaurus linguae Latinae* (1900-2024). Latin works prior to about the year 600 figure in the same dictionary's *Index librorum scriptorum inscriptionum ex quibus exempla afferuntur* (<https://thesaurus.badw.de/tll-digital/index.html>), which provides bibliographical information for their critical editions.

otherwise. If a pregnant woman dies, and her child may be alive, she must be cut open to extract the child. If, however, the extracted child is already dead, it must not be given Catholic burial (*Flos*. 25). The denial of burial strikes most people today, even Catholics, as cruel. Think of the double trauma to her widower and her other children! It takes some effort to enter into the mentality of the author and his age, for whom it was obvious that only the baptized can be given Catholic burial.

Perhaps the best way to give the author a sympathetic reading is to acknowledge that, for him and most of his contemporaries, the most important goal of one's life was to attain heaven, which could only be done by availing oneself of the sacraments of the Catholic Church. It was a mentality, still shared by Christians today, in which contact with the triune God was both possible and necessary, sins damned to hell but God's forgiveness saved the Christian for eternal glory, and a minister had the solemn duty and privilege of shepherding Christ's flock on the path to salvation. For Fernández de Villegas, everything was at stake in the priest's celebration of the sacraments, for they were the means to avoid hell and reach heaven. He treats with relatively greater length the extent to which errors in the celebration of the Eucharist do, or do not, render it invalid. Here, in fact, the laity would have virtually no control to assure proper celebration of the sacrament, especially considering that the people and priest were facing together toward the altar and God, so that they would not be able to view that part of the altar immediately before the priest. It was precisely the priest's responsibility to properly consecrate the Eucharist, so that ordinary bread and wine would become Christ's Body and Blood, and the faithful would receive that food for eternal life. If, out of ignorance, laziness, or whatever other reason, the priest failed to consecrate the bread and wine, at communion time the faithful would be misled into thinking that they were receiving God himself, when in fact they would be eating ordinary bread.

The Catholic Church has significantly changed its emphasis in eucharistic theology, so that the focus is no longer so heavily on the words of institution and their consecratory effect, but also on Christ's presence, for example, in the proclamation of Scripture (CONC. Vatican. II *Sacr. Conc.*, #7). Even so, the Church continues to this day to insist on the basic points of the *Flosculus* in regard to the valid celebration of the Eucharist: the sacrament's matter, form, and intention are all required for its validity, and the priest must use Jesus's words of institution as contained in the missal.

Fernández de Villegas cites the Bible, according to the Vulgate edition, in the same manner as most of his contemporaries. He considers the sacraments to have been instituted by Jesus Christ himself, and he considers the scriptural basis to be important enough to include it within his brief treatment of each sacrament. Beyond this, he cites other passages throughout the book to support his points. He usually indicates the biblical book that he is citing, but usually not the chapter number (versification would not yet be established for many decades). He often refers to

Saint Paul as “the Apostle,” and the author of the Psalms, which tradition considers to be King David, as “the Psalmist.” He cites prophets like Joel and Hosea, but Isaiah, the prophet *par excellence*, he refers to simply as “the Prophet” (*Flos.* 29, 58, 67). Sometimes his identifications are mistaken, as when he attributes a verse from Psalm 18⁵ to the Prophet (*Flos.* 67), or a passage from Jeremiah 4 to Hosea (*Flos.* 58). Moreover, the citations often paraphrase the Bible. In any case, they are almost invariably brief and frequently followed by “etc.,” indicating that in this short manual the author only wishes to call to mind a passage, not to reproduce it at length. There is virtually no sustained engagement with the biblical text, much less a biblical theology on the Bible’s own terms. That, however, is to be expected from a short, sacraments manual of the late fifteenth century.

Fernández de Villegas’s citation of the Parable of Mustard Seed, “If you have faith like a juniper seed, you will say to the mountains” (*Flos.* 78; cf. Matt 17:19; Luke 17:6), betrays the limitations of his biblical fluency. He conflates the parallels of Matthew 17:19 and Luke 17:6; the former concerns faith like a mustard seed being able to move mountains, and the latter concerns faith like a mustard seed being able to uproot a tree. What is more, he omits all mention of the mustard seed, replacing it with that of a juniper tree! Furthermore, the tree in the Vulgate is a mulberry (*morus*; Luke 17:6), not a juniper. Even if, perhaps, Fernández de Villegas drew the passage from one of his sources, one might expect him to know the Sermon on the Mount well enough to detect and correct these errors.

The book’s vocabulary is the sort that one would expect from a well-educated Catholic clergyman of the late fifteenth century, in a book intended for less learned clergy. Fernández de Villegas employs a somewhat higher literary register in his introduction (*Flos.* 1-2) and conclusion (*Flos.* 101-103). For example, near the beginning he writes *necessitas* to indicate relation or friendship (*Flos.* 2), and near the end the classical turns of phrase *receptui canere* (“to sound the retreat”), *deposito supercilio* (“severity having been set aside”), the double dative *eis molestie et impedimento* (“a bother and a burden to them”) (*Flos.* 101). In the work’s main body, the archdeacon’s Latin stands firmly within the ecclesiastical tradition of the late Middle Ages. Only by way of exception does he depart from that style in Humanist fashion, as when he says that some virtues are “heroic” (*heroice*), which he glosses as “divine” (*divine*) so that his readers will understand (*Flos.* 68). More often, however, he employs the postclassical words that one would expect in such a manual, like *brodium* (“broth;” *Flos.* 17), *certificatus* (“notified,” that is, *certior factus*; *Flos.* 99), *curatus* (i.e., a priest who has the *cura animarum*; *Flos.* 33, 80, 97, and 101), *indispensabilis* (“indispensable;” *Flos.* 55 and 98), *nocumentum* (“injury;” *Flos.* 50), *rancedo* (“rancidity;” *Flos.* 52; cf. Hoven 1994, s.v. *rancedo*),

⁵ Biblical references follow the chapter and verse divisions of Weber, Gryson, et al. 2007.

sacramentaliter (“sacramentally;” *Flos.* 94). There is much jargon, much of which the author defines or explains, and which corresponds to English cognates: sacrament, matter, form, intention, contrition, attrition, etc. In writing *si* instead of *sic* (“yes;” *Flos.* 58), Fernández de Villegas even lapses into the vernacular (Spanish “sí”).

The author writes simple sentences fitting his manual’s brevity and intended audience. His lists can become long and intrude on the prose, but that is not opposed to the genre of a manual. He employs the postclassical *peniteo* (“I repent”) with a personal subject, typical of ecclesiastical Latin, and employs *baptizo* (“I baptize”) with a passive meaning (“I am baptized;” *Flos.* 25).

Fernández de Villegas’s spelling, mediated by his printer, is unexceptional for his day. With reference to the classical standard, he often confuses double consonants (especially in the *editio princeps*), adding them when he should not, and omitting them when they should be employed. For example, he writes: *opportet* (“it is necessary”), *flammen* (“wind;” corrected to *flamen* in 1521), *oppinio* (“opinion;” sometimes corrected to *opinio* in 1521), *diffinitio* (“definition”), *callidus* (for “hot,” not “clever;” corrected to *calidus* in 1521), and *annulus* (for “ring,” not “little year”). Conversely one finds single vowels where classical Latin authors would use double vowels: *atritio* (corrected to *attritio* in 1521), *comunio*, *inititor* (corrected to *innitor* in 1521), and *remito* (corrected to *remitto* in 1521). The spelling often fluctuates within both the *editio princeps* and that of 1521, as one would expect from books printed in that era. Overall, the 1521 edition brings the spelling somewhat closer to the classical standard. It excises many unnecessary instances of *p*, like *solempnitas* (“solemnity”), and *h*, like *Ihesus* (“Jesus”), but it does add an unnecessary *h* to instances of *caritas* (“charity;” *charitas*).

Fadrique de Basilea (Basel, Switzerland), also known as Friedrich Biel, the most prominent printer in Burgos in the late fifteenth century (Martín Abad 2003, 70-74), first printed the *Flosculus* (siglum *F* for Fadrique in the present edition). Having begun his printing career in Basel in the early 1470s, he was an experienced printer participating in the transition from incunable to post-incunable techniques by the time Fernández de Villegas presented his manuscript. Two copies of this *editio princeps*, printed in quarto and dated to about 1498-1500, are known to exist (GW 9791; ISTC if00099500): one in the Biblioteca de Castilla-La Mancha in Toledo (Méndez Aparicio 1976, 132), and the other in Madrid at the Palacio de Liria of the Fundación Casa de Alba. The former has been scanned in black and white, and made available online.⁶ It has survived in good condition and is easily legible, with hand-written folio numbers beginning on the title page. The copy in Madrid has

⁶ For the catalog entry and a link to the scan, see <https://bvvpb.mcu.es/es/consulta/registro.do?id=439354>.

not yet been scanned, but I consulted it on site.⁷ Bound with this copy of the *Flosculus* and preceding it, is a hand-written alphabetized glossary of terms with simple definitions. Curiously, the *Flosculus* title page has been inserted into this 27-page glossary; indeed, it has been written on, and is part of it! The same goes for the first paragraph of the *Flosculus*'s text: the glossary has spilled onto the bottom margin of this page. Understandably, this copy's folios have been numbered beginning with the first page contiguous with the rest of the book; that is to say, having omitted the title page from the count, since that one is embedded within the glossary. Therefore, its hand-numbered folios are all one less in number than the Toledo edition. The Madrid copy has many marginal notes, which, like its glossary, are beyond the scope of the present study.

As I described above, the discovery of a copy of the *Flosculus* at the National Spanish Research Council's (CSIC) Tomás Navarro Tomás Library in Madrid (Fernández de Villegas, ca. 1510) was the impetus for the present edition. The library's staff collaborated with the Catálogo Colectivo del Patrimonio Bibliográfico (CCPB) and identified the book as one that had belonged to Teófilo Ayuso Marazuela, head of the Latin section of the CSIC's polyglot Bible project (del Carmen Maya 2022).⁸ Ayuso Marazuela's library was assumed into the Arias Montano Institute, which in 1985 became part of the Philology Institute. The edition was printed in octavo by Arnao Guillén de Brocar in Logroño ca. 1510 (Norton 1978, 145 [#408]; siglum *L* for Logroño in the present edition). A high-resolution color scan of it is available on the CSIC's digital platform Simurg.⁹ The temporary loss of the book was due to the fact that it had been bound with three other works and was, therefore, incorrectly cataloged.¹⁰ The lack of the title page and initial paragraphs may have also contributed to the book's loss. The copy held by the CSIC in Madrid is the only one of this printing known to exist.

Biel's son-in-law, Alonso de Melgar, took over Biel's business by 1518 (Martín Abad 2003, 74), and he continued his father-in-law's legacy by printing the book yet again that very year (Fernández de Villegas 1518; Norton 1978, 116 [#319]). In 1521 he printed an edition in octavo revised by the author himself (Fernández de Villegas 1521; siglum *M* for Melgar in the present edition). The book follows

⁷ There are letters contained in the book, concerning its sale and purchase; see n. 1.

⁸ The experts correlated the edition to that listed in three reference works: Martín Abad 2001, 687; Norton 1978, 408; Departamento de Bibliografía de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid 1982, 1:2586.

⁹ <http://simurg.csic.es/view/990005839530204201>. A YouTube video incorporates more photographs of the book: Centro de Ciencias Humanas y Sociales del Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas 2022. For the catalog entry of the physical book at the Tomás Navarro Tomás Library, see https://csic-primo.hosted.exlibrisgroup.com/permalink/f/1mmf8dl/34CSIC_ALMA_DS21121090500004201.

¹⁰ The three are: Burchard 1506; de Escobar (?), ca. 1490; de Escobar, ca. 1490.

the *princeps* nearly verbatim, so the revisions mostly concern the print type and formatting, the suppression of paragraph breaks, and the correction of typographical errors. The title was also expanded in such a way as to indicate revision by the author himself. Only one copy of this edition is known to exist, in the University of Seville's Biblioteca Rector Antonio Machado y Núñez. It was scanned in March 2024 at my request and is now freely available online.¹¹

On the one hand, the *Flosculus*'s many reprintings attest to its enduring popularity in the sixteenth century. On the other hand, the work has received so little attention in recent years that even a reference entry on Fernández de Villegas as up to date as that of the *Diccionario biográfico español* (Andreu Lucas 2011) does not make any reference to the work. The copy recently discovered in Madrid (*L*) is closer to the *Flosculus*'s first printing than the last. For the Iberian Peninsula alone, Alexander Wilkinson identifies nineteen editions through 1589 (Wilkinson 2010, 349). Although he lists five printings of the *Flosculus* in Burgos in *Iberian Books*, Biel only printed the first of these. Nevertheless, in 2019 Oliver Duntze of the Gesamtkatalog der Wiegendrucke of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin identified a copy held by the Library of Congress in Washington, DC, as having been printed in Burgos by Biel between the years 1508 and 1515.¹² Virgilio Pinto Crespo (1983) also implies the existence of an edition lacking from Wilkinson's list, a printing from Alcalá in 1569 (184).¹³ The recent identification of another printing by Biel, and Pinto Crespo's reference to the 1569 edition, make one wonder how many other editions have been lost forever, or wait to be discovered or identified.

On June 20, 1570, the Spanish Inquisition's council ("consejo") prohibited the edition of the *Flosculus* printed in Alcalá in 1566 (Fernández de Villegas 1566), a prohibition which apparently did not even encompass editions printed in 1564 and 1569, let alone the myriad other printings of the past seven decades (Pinto Crespo 1983, 184).¹⁴ Unfortunately, no copy of the 1566 edition is known to exist today (Wilkinson 2010, 349 [#8809]). Thus began a prohibition often repeated and greatly expanded. In 1583, Spain's inquisitor general, Archbishop of Toledo Gaspar de Quiroga y Vela, placed the *Flosculus* on the index of prohibited books (de Quiroga y Vela 1583, 28v and 54v). It was one of just thirteen books prohibited (not counting those to be purged of errors) that was not drawn from an already existing list (Bujanda et al. 1993, 86). Manuel Martínez Añibarro y Rives, writing in the late nineteenth century (1889), suggests that it may have been prohibited for

¹¹ <https://archive.org/details/ARes335052/>.

¹² See the notes in the Library of Congress's catalog record, <https://www.loc.gov/resource/rbc0001.2018gen59754/>.

¹³ Cf. the subsequent footnote (n. 14).

¹⁴ Wilkinson (2010) lists the 1564 edition printed in Alcalá as #8808 (349); he lists no edition from 1569. Pinto Crespo (1983) names the author "Hernández" instead of "Fernández" (184 and 327).

“minor errors” (195), from a viewpoint several centuries later. Pope Sixtus V would repeat the prohibition in Rome in 1590 (Reusch 1961, 510). Pope Clement VIII prohibited the book in 1596 but botched the title, banning the non-existent *Flosculus sanctorum* instead (Reusch 1961, 570; Bujanda et al. 1994, 690-691 [#954]). His prohibition does allow the book to be read if first purged of its errors.¹⁵ Six more condemnations would follow through the end of the eighteenth century, in 1612, 1632, 1640, 1707, 1747, and 1790 (Bujanda and Richter 2016, 554). The still-mistitled book on Pope Pius IX’s list of 1878 (Carbonero y Sol 1880, 110) does not inspire confidence in the thoroughness of the Holy See’s examination of the content of the books it prohibited.

The Latin text here transcribed and translated is that of the 1521 revised edition (*M*), with corrections principally based on the incunable *editio princeps* (*F*) and the one recently discovered in Madrid, published ca. 1510 (*L*). The first and last of these (*F*, *M*) have been wholly collated and cited in the apparatus (except for some minor spelling variations), and their page breaks have been documented in the outer margin. The fluctuation between *i* and *y*, and the addition or omission of *h* have been excluded from the apparatus. In those instances in which *F* and *M* figure in the apparatus, *L* has also been consulted and documented (when extant). The original spelling of *M* has mostly been retained, but *v* and *u* (also *V* and *U*) have been regularized according to their consonantal and vocalic values. Likewise, *i* and *y* (also *I* and *Y*) have been regularized, so that the latter appears in loan words from Greek. Doubled consonants, or the lack of them where they should appear, have been left as they appear in *M* unless *F* has a better reading. For example, *alia* (*F*, *L*) corrects *allia* (*M*; *Flos.* 80). Capital letters are few and inconsistent in the sources, so these have been regularized as well, reserving them for the beginnings of sentences, proper nouns and adjectives, words like *Dominus* in reference to the Lord and *Apostolus* in reference to Paul the Apostle. Paragraph marks (¶) have been omitted. The sources’ punctuation is quite inconsistent, and the editions can easily be consulted online. Therefore, the punctuation here has been regularized to provide today’s reader with a more fluid text.

L and *M* almost always follow *F* verbatim; the vast majority of my critical interventions correct typographical errors. Although *M* presents itself as an emended edition, it introduces a substantial number of typographical errors of its own. This reality led me to prepare not a diplomatic, but a critical edition, in the spirit of modest correction already manifested by the author for *M*.

Only in five instances did I conjecture a text not appearing in any of the sources, documented in the apparatus by *scripsi*. The first is *spiritu{m}* (*Flos.* 2), where the

¹⁵ The clause, which also applies to the next book on the alphabetical list, is, “Nisi prius repurgentur, ut de aliis repurgandis dictum est;” Bujanda et al. 1994, 838 [#954]). “Unless they are first purged [of errors], as has been said of other ones to be purged.”

editions have *spū*, with the superscript nasal above the *u*, not the rest of the word. The context requires the ablative. If the superscript line were to extend farther to the left, over the *p*, the abbreviation could be resolved as *spiritu*. Indeed, it is likely that the author, upon closer examination, would have chosen this word. Nevertheless, given the evidence of three editions, including one revised by the author himself, I have chosen to print the *m* within curly brackets as a *littera delenda*. The next conjecture is *compilasse*, where the sources read *copilasse* (*Flos*. 2). In two instances I corrected *conditione* to *condicione* (*Flos*. 25), since the sources fluctuate between *-cio-* and *-tio-*; the two variants are different words. The last conjecture is *anulus* for *annulus* (*Flos*. 99), also different words. The context requires the former, and the sources fluctuate in spelling words with or without doubled consonants.

Of the errors in *F*, *L* corrects some and *M* corrects even more. Although *L* and *M* share many corrections, my research produced no clear evidence that *M* relies on *L*. At least half a dozen printings of the *Flosculus* preceded *M*, and the present study has not collated all these or endeavored to sort out their dependencies. A full collation of *L* and the other early editions would provide the basis to draw such conclusions. Furthermore, it is possible that the author produced *M* by revising his manuscript. To determine dependency (if any) of later editions on *M*, its errors documented in the apparatus will be decisive, like the omission by *homoeoarchton* at the break between fol. 6v and 7r.

In the English translation, I have attempted a balanced approach midway between literalism and fully idiomatic English. The English language has a rich Catholic theological vocabulary including equivalents for almost all the technical terms in the book. In any case, the original text is close at hand in the other column to resolve any doubts. I have also provided annotations for those translations that clearly failed to capture the full sense of the Latin or that I deemed likely to raise questions for the reader.