The crucible of medieval classicism was the schoolroom. Even in the earliest, proto-monastic schools, the poetry of pagan authors as well as late-antiquity’s early Christians was presented as a model of the mechanics, and artistry, of Latin writing. Just as the church reforms of the eighth and the tenth centuries institutionalised the religious life, they also secured the place of Golden and Silver Age *auctores* in a syllabus recognised as the standard across Western Europe. The transfer of this pattern of pedagogy first into secular schools and then, from there, into universities, did not displace the pagans or diminish their magisterial status, despite the increasing identification of Christian theology as the ultimate end of education in the art(s) of language. In fact the techniques and the topics of the high-medieval schools extended the breadth and the critical depth of readings in classical poetry, creating a new apparatus – the *accessus*, the gloss – on which could be raised systematic criticism of a whole canon of works. The effect of the rapidly evolving environment of the schools on the knowledge and reception of the best-known pagans – Ovid, Virgil – has been sharply focused in recent decades through the painstaking codicological and textual analysis of such scholars as Ralph Hexter, Frank Coulson and Christopher Baswell. Yet the experience of another of the Augustans, Horace, although recognised to have been prominent among the medieval student’s pagan masters has been left largely in the shadows of little known, still unedited manuscripts. Over the course of a productive career devoted to material of this kind, Karsten Friis-Jensen was able to pinpoint some of the important moments in Horace’s passage through this fast developing critical environment. An exemplary editor, he also provided for further study critical texts of the cribs, glosses and fully-formed commentaries which framed his works for generations of students and their masters from the Twelfth-Century Renaissance to the coming of print. Now, to mark his untimely passing, these representative examples of his meticulous craft are republished under a title which should bring both his scholarship and his theme to wider attention.

Perhaps the most significant contribution here is Friis-Jensen’s challenge to the established view that the generation, in the course of the thirteenth century, of new manuals on the art of poetry represented a break away from, even a rejection of, the classical *auctores*, and their long dominance of the
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schoolroom. He makes the case that an anonymous commentary on Horace's *Ars poetica*, dated to the twelfth century, which he names the 'Materia' commentary for its *incipit*, 'Materia huius auctoris...', and edits in full for the first time, in fact is the 'missing link' between the reception of *Ars* itself and of the *artes* of the contemporary masters, such as Geoffrey of Vinsauf and Matthew of Vendôme. Its transmission of Horatian lore to the new manuals ensured that the shade of the pagan master still presided over the teaching and practice of the *ars versificatoria* even as the new manuals themselves secured the status of syllabus staple.

Tracing the *accessus* tradition that followed Horace through high-medieval manuscripts, Friis-Jensen finds that the study of his poetic art was commonly accompanied by some exploration of the *auctor* himself and the context, as it was perceived, for his body of work. Students were taught that Horace wrote for each of the four ages of man. This framed the Odes, in particular, as an appropriate diet for youth since they would nourish not only their mental but also their moral formation. The mantle of Moral Horace, guardian and mentor of impressionable youth, Friis-Jensen suggests emerged as a seam in the expanding apparatus of introductions, glosses and fully-formed commentaries. Although in these essays he does not reach towards any comparative perspective with this or any other insight, there is an obvious point-of-contact here with the critical tradition that is built around Ovid – especially *Metamorphoses* – between c.1200 and c.1400 and it must be hoped that re-publication will catalyse others to progress the train of thought.

In a synoptic sequence of essays that complete the collection, Friis-Jensen demonstrates that with his status renewed rather than replaced by the thirteenth-century *artes poeticae*, Horace entered the early renaissance as the subject and object of those that aspired to neo-classical Latinity. Petrarch’s determination to imitate Horace, Friis-Jensen argues, extended to the formulation of his *Canzoniere* as a counterpart to the Odes. While the outcome may have been unique, the Florentine’s interest was not unusual even as fresh, broad currents of classicism washed across Latin Christendom, and Friis-Jensen draws attention to the continued promotion of the *Ars* through a new generation of commentaries through the transition from script to print.

There is much of value here for medievalists and classicists and perhaps especially for those whose studies in medieval reception have, at least implicitly, tended towards claiming an Ovidian exceptionalism in the status and sustained influence of the Augustan auctor. It is marred only by the poignancy that now it will fall to others to profit from what this fine scholar achieved.
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