The Date of the Bucolic Poet Martius Valerius*

JUSTIN A. STOVER

ergo, parve liber, patres i posce benignos
affectumque probent iudiciumque tegant.
Martius Valerius, *prologus* 21–2

ABSTRACT

The collection of four Latin bucolics ascribed to one Martius Valerius was only published in the twentieth century; they have been widely considered as twelfth-century compositions. Picking up on suggestions proposed by François Dolbeau, this study presents evidence that Martius drew directly on the bucolics of Theocritus, and that his poems are late antique, not medieval, literary productions, probably written in the sixth century. Such a conclusion will require a revision of the history of post-Virgilian Latin bucolic poetry.

Keywords: bucolic; Martius Valerius; Justinian; Virgil; Theocritus

I 'AN AS-YET ENTIRELY UNKNOWN WORK OF ANTIQUITY IN LATIN VERSE'?

Bucolic poetry is hard to date. Its conventions dictate a setting in a timeless world of shepherds — their loves and joys and quarrels and sorrows — and only rare glimpses of the contemporary world are as a rule permitted. Hence, controversies about dating have dogged much bucolic where the external evidence is thin. We can place some bucolic

poets, such as Theocritus, Virgil, Nemesianus, Moduin, Petrarch, Boccaccio, and Dante with ease. But the dating of the non-Theocritean idylls, the Einsiedeln Eclogues, Calpurnius Siculus, and Theodolus has occasioned much debate, and the possible range for each author often extends over centuries. Did Calpurnius write in the first century or the third?[1] In a recent article, I have argued that the Einsiedeln Eclogues, attributed for the past century to the age of Nero, were in fact written toward the end of the fourth century.[2] Here, I will argue that there is another significant corpus of Latin bucolic poetry from Late Antiquity which has been ignored precisely because it has been misdated.

In 1946, Paul Lehmann brought this corpus to the world's attention for the first time. It contains a prologue and four eclogues, is extant in two manuscripts (one *c.* 1200, from the Biblioteca amploniana, the other its sixteenth-century copy in Erlangen), and is ascribed to the otherwise unknown Martius Valerius.[3] A specialist in *pseudo-antike Literatur des Mittelalters*, Lehmann saw the poems as twelfth-century literary productions in a classicizing mode. He did, however, raise and reject the possibility that they were genuinely ancient:

> Der Reiz, den die Bearbeitung für mich gehabt hat, beruht aber auf noch etwas anderem, auf einem Problem, das ich freilich vorerst nicht endgültig werde lösen können: wann die Poeme gedichtet worden sind; wobei sich sogar die Frage erhebt, ob sie noch in der Antike oder mitten im Mittelalter verfasst wurden. Vielleicht erscheint es dem einen und anderen gerade der Kenner absurd zu sein, auch nur an die Möglichkeit zu denken, dass man aus einer der viel durchforschten Bibliotheken des Abendlandes ein noch völlig unbekanntes Werk des Altertums in lateinischen Versen hervorziehen könnte, hat man doch seit mehr als einem halben Jahrtausend mit heissem Bemühen zusammengesucht, was antik ist, hat man doch nur äusserst selten in neuerer Zeit den Umfang des aus dem antiken Rom Überkommenen zu erweitern das Glück gehabt, haben uns doch sogar die in Ägypten gemachten Papyrusfunde eine verhältnismässig recht geringfügige Ausdehnung unserer Kenntnis der römischen Literatür gebracht. Und trotzdem darf und muss in diesem einen Falle die Möglichkeit erörtert und zur Diskussion gestellt werden, selbst wenn man die Unwahrscheinlichkeit des antiken Ursprungs bald erkennt.[4]

His fundamental argument — to which I will return in the conclusion — reduces to the unlikelihood of an ancient literary work escaping five centuries of antiquarian enthusiasm to come down to the twentieth century unpublished. In our day, that does not seem quite so strange. Three separate finds — by Johannes Divjak, François Dolbeau, and the Vienna trio of Schiller, Weber and Wiedmann — have uncovered sermons and letters of no less a figure than Augustine, and detailed investigation has uncovered the Gospel commentary of Fortunatian and the poetry of Pacatus Drepanius.[5] Indeed, about the time Lehmann was writing, Raymond Klibansky discovered in the

---

[1] Champlin 1978.
[2] Stover 2015.
[3] Lehmann 1946 (available online, www.mgh-bibliothek.de/dokumente/z/zsn2a039130.pdf). Excerpts (about thirty lines in total) had already appeared in print, as early as 1791, by C. Gottlieb von Murr: 112–13, from the Erlangen manuscript (Universitätsbibliothek MS 633), without attracting much attention. The Erlangen manuscript is available online at the *Digitale Sammlungen der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg* (urn: nbn:de:bvb:29-bv042204892-0). Even the poet's name has been a matter of contention: I follow the authoritative manuscript in naming him Martius Valerius (which reads *Incipit prologus bucolicorum Martii Valerii*), and not the external testimonium discussed below which calls him Marcus Valerius (*Marcus Valerius in bucolicis*). The reason is that a *Martii* (*Marti, Marcii, Marci*) *Valerii* could easily be falsely converted to *Marcus Valerius*, but it is very unlikely that a *Marcus* would ever give rise to a form *Martii*.
[4] Lehmann 1946: 58–9.
[5] On Fortunatian, see Dorfbauer 2013; on Drepanius, see Turcan-Verkerk 2003; on Augustine, see conveniently Dolbeau 1996, and I. Schiller, D. Weber and C. Wiedmann 2008 and 2009. For a general survey, up to 1998, see Dolbeau 1988.

Vatican library a new Latin philosophical text from antiquity, which may well have been written by Apuleius, and was edited for the first time last year.[6] The manuscript containing this text was in two even more famous libraries than that of Amplonius: that of Richard of Fournival in the thirteenth century and that of Queen Christina of Sweden in the seventeenth. Hence it is not prima facie impossible for an ancient text to have slipped past half a millennium's worth of eager humanists, be it housed even in a well-known library. Ultimately the strangely mannered prologue proved decisive for Lehmann — its lexical peculiarities convinced him that the poems which follow must be medieval. But when? Lehmann was constrained by the date of the earlier manuscript (Gotha, Forschungs- und Landesbibliothek mbr. II 125).[7] He also believed that Martius alluded to the *Cosmographia* of Bernardus Silvestris, written before 1147. Martius would then find a natural home amid the classical revival of the long twelfth century (conventionally, 1050–1215), which saw a number of neglected ancient genres flower again, elegy with Henry of Settimelo, satire with Sextus Amarcius, epic with Walter of Châtillon, epigram with Godfrey of Winchester, comedy with Vitalis of Blois, indeed even Petronian narrative with Elias of Thriplowe.[8] Classicizing bucolic would certainly find a welcoming home in such a milieu.

This idea was further confirmed in Franco Munari's exemplary editions of 1955 and 1970.[9] Munari went through the evidence thoroughly in his second edition, and identified a number of definitely post-classical features in vocabulary, syntax, and prosody. One particularly interesting aspect of his textual work, however, is the manner in which he handled the paradosis. In general, editors treat ancient texts and medieval texts very differently: the former descend through multiple lost generations to our earliest copies, while the latter often exist in manuscripts dating from just after the lifetime of the author. Hence, many editors of ancient texts (though by no means all) have frequent recourse to conjecture and restoration, whereas editors of medieval texts are often hesitant to correct the reconstructed archetype except in cases of simple or gross error. Munari edited Martius as if he were an ancient author (for which he was gently criticized by Herbert Bloch[10]), and subsequently some of the finest philologists of the twentieth century worked on the text's problems, including Otto Skutsch, Paul Maas, Sebastiano Timpanaro, Scevola Mariotti, and Giuseppe Giangrande.[11] None of them seems to have doubted the medieval origin of the text. Skutsch at least recognized the problem:

> For the classical scholar not specifically concerned with the literature of the Middle Ages the bucolic poems of Martius Valerius … hold a two-fold interest. They show how successfully a mediaeval poet can, in imitation of Virgil and Calpurnius, strike the bucolic note, and the study of the imitative process will inevitably enlarge and refine our literary judgment. More impressive, however, and more important is the lesson to be learned in textual criticism. Less than a century seems to separate the earlier of our two manuscripts from the autograph, and yet the few hundred lines of Martius Valerius are disfigured by countless corruptions, some trivial, a great many of the most serious nature.[12]

---

[6] Stover 2016.
[7] See Schipke 1972: 78–80.
[8] For Henry, see Witt 2012: 440–1; for Sextus Amarcius, see Pepin 2011: vii–xxv; for Godfrey, see Byrne 2001; for Vital and other twelfth-century writers of comedy, see Braun 1985; and on Elias, see Colker 2007.
[9] Munari 1955 and 1970.
[10] Bloch 1957.
[11] Skutsch 1964; Maas 1955 and 1956; Giangrande 1974; for the others, see Munari 1970. See also Salvatore 1989.
[12] Skutsch 1964: 21–2.

Indeed, Skutsch's argument would come to be used to justify a more activist approach to medieval texts in general.[13] This critical interest mostly subsided by 1975. Emending Martius fell out of fashion, and the bucolics settled into their modest place as a representative, if uncharacteristic, text of the twelfth-century Renaissance, with only a few dissensions. One scholar assigned them to the late Carolingian period, and another courageously identified Martius Valerius as M. Valerius Messalla Corvinus, the great Augustan literary patron.[14]

In 1987, François Dolbeau disturbed the placidity of this consensus, asking a simple question: 'les "Bucoliques" de Marcus Valerius sont-elles une œuvre médiévale?'[15] This was no mere hypothetical question, but based on troubling new evidence. There is no specifically medieval content in the poems and all the post-classical features identified by Munari are attested by the fifth or sixth century, he argued. He also brought together for the first time our actual external evidence for the poet (a gloss in a Papias manuscript and a catalogue entry from Thorney near Ely[16]), which seemed to put Martius' activity in the reign of Justinian ('Egloge aliquot Marci exquaestoris qui floruit tempore Justiniani' reads the Thorney entry). Further, turning Skutsch's argument on its head, why is the text so corrupt if the Gotha manuscript was written within decades of its composition?

An answer came five years later from Christine Ratkowitsch, definitively negative.[17] She argued that Dolbeau had misunderstood the external evidence, and presented a detailed interpretation of the work in the context of Christian spirituality and pastoral care. She also suggested that extensive textual corruption can happen in a very short time, adducing the example of Joseph of Exeter.[18] That is a fair point, although the corruption in Joseph's nearly four thousand lines does not occur with anywhere near the density as that found in Martius' five hundred. She also questioned Martius' grasp on prosody, and in particular on the prosody of Greek names, although that question can scarcely be examined without considering the status of the transmitted text. Hence the central question deserves to be reopened: is Martius a medieval poet? Despite Ratkowitsch's best efforts, she still was not able to identify any explicit medieval or Christian elements, only material that was able to withstand a Christian interpretation. In the hands of the most adept commentators of the twelfth century, any pagan poetry was capable of Christian interpretation. Conversely, however, even the most resolutely classicizing work of the eleventh or twelfth century, such as the *Satires* of Sextus Amarcius, the *Alexandreis* of Walter of Châtillon, or the *Cosmographia* of Bernardus Silvestris, was hardly free of Christian or otherwise anachronistic elements. So the fact that the poems are capable of Christian exegesis does not make them medieval, and, if they are medieval, they are more successfully classicizing than virtually any other piece of medieval Latin literature.

But this does not mean we have reached a crux. Dolbeau's question is capable of a definitive answer. In this study, I will demonstrate that the poems of Martius Valerius cannot be medieval (as in from the seventh century or later), and were probably composed in the late fifth or early sixth century. The evidence rests on Martius' relationship to the Greek world — in the setting of his bucolics, in his language, and in his sources — and strongly indicates that his works must be situated before the medieval divorce between the Greek East and the Latin West.

---

[13] Pack 1980.
[14] Baligan 1967, for Valerius Messala, and Cooper 1977: 19, for the ninth or tenth century.
[15] Dolbeau 1987.
[16] For the Papias gloss, see M. D. R. in *T&T* 38l; the annotator of the manuscript was identified as Guido de Grana by Stagni 1995; and for the Thorney entry, see Vernet 1948: 34.
[17] Ratkowitsch 1992.
[18] Ratkowitsch 1992: 176.

II TITYRUS A MOLLI SURREXIT IN ARDUA CLIVO

Martius is deeply indebted to the bucolics of Virgil. By way of an introduction to the collection, here I will show how his first three poems ever so closely mimic the first three of Virgil's eclogues, while his fourth imitates Virgil's sixth. This imitation is profound, extending from the highest level of the construction of the corpus to countless individual words. The first presents Ladon comforting and exhorting Cydnus, just as Virgil's first presents Tityrus and Meliboeus. Its geographic setting is not clearly defined, but both speakers are named after rivers, Ladon in Greece and Cydnus in Cilicia.[19] The imitation begins with the first line, where Ladon addresses Cydnus (*buc.* 1.1–4):

> Cydne, sub algenti recubas dum molliter umbra
> Nec nova mutato perquiris pascua colle,
> Segnis et exesis miserum pecus afficis herbis,
> Nos patimur solem et nullo requiescimus antro,

Cydnus, while you recline under the cool shade and do not seek new pasture on a different hill, and make your poor herd suffer, all the crop and grass eaten bare, I endure the sun and rest in no cave.

> Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi
> silvestrem tenui Musam meditaris avena;
> nos patriae fines et dulcia linquimus arva. (Virg., *ecl.* 1.1–3)

You, Tityrus, lie under the canopy of a spreading beech, wooing the woodland Muse on slender reed, but we are leaving our country's bounds and sweet fields.

The close imitation extends to the very final word 'et extensas ramorum traxerit umbras' ~ 'maioresque cadunt altis de montibus umbrae'. This is Virgil's famed nightfall, the 'programmatic shadow' that marks his distinctive approach to the genre. Calpurnius understood this, and ended his imitation of *Ecl.* 1 with nightfall (*buc.* 4.169): 'iam sol contractas pedibus magis admovet umbras'.

The second bucolic is the lament of Iarbas for his indifferent lover Euphilis; Virgil's second is Corydon's for Alexis. Martius' is clearly set in Africa. The singer's name comes from the king of the Gaetuli who was in love with Dido in *Aen.* 4. He makes references to Father Nile (Pater Nilus) and famous Canopus (traditionally, the boundary of Africa).[20] The fourth line begins 'Euphilin ardebat', an unmistakable nod to the 'ardebat Alexin' of the first line of *Ecl.* 2.

> Euphilin ardebat; contra illa favere Nicotem
> Callida temptabat, nec ut hunc praeponere vellet,
> Sed malus ut miserum livor vexaret Iarbam.
> Hic dum muscosis fessus succederet antris,
> In quibus hesternos resonabat et ante calores,
> Heu male tunc primum victus prodebat amorem,
> Antraque secretis referebant haec procul agris (*buc.* 2.4–10)

He burned for Euphilis, while she tested him deviously, pretending to favour Nicotis, not because she wanted to rank him first, but so that dire envy would torment poor Iarbas. While he wearily came to his mossy caves, in which he sung again the passions of yesterday

---

[19] It is worth noting that the Ladon and the Cydnus are mentioned together in Dio Chrysostom, *Orat.* 33.25: οὐχ ὁ Λάδων διὰ τῆς Ἀρκαδίας ἀναστάτου γενομένης; οὐκ αὐτὸς ὁ Κύδνος ἄνω καθαρώτερος.
[20] See, for example, Pomponius Mela, *De chor.* 1.8.

and before, alas, badly defeated, he poured out then his first love, and these caves echoed them back to the far separated fields.

Both laments then conclude with a self-address, 'Cepit, Iarba, furor quantus te!' and 'a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit!' (*ecl.* 2.74). Virgil's poem is modelled on an *Idyll* of Theocritus (11), and I will discuss its relationship to Martius Valerius further below.

The third bucolic is a singing contest between Mopsus and Moeris, with Lycurgus the judge; Virgil's third is the same, with Damoetas and Menalcas the competitors and Palaemon the judge. Martius sets it generally in Arcadia (3.77–8: 'Me quoque Maenaliis praeponens Pan bonus antris / diligit'), the region of Greece which is one mythical homeland of pastoral. Virgil opens his eclogue with an odd bit of Latinity, 'Dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? An Meliboei?' The adjective *cuius, -a, -um* is certainly rare, possibly rustic, definitely archaic, probably comic. Virgil's critic Numitorius composed a biting parody: 'Dic mihi, Damoeta, "cuium pecus" anne Latinum?'[21] In the same way, Martius' Moeris begins, 'Discute, Mopse, gregem: caper est erratus et hic est'. *Est erratus* is not obviously a medieval formulation; a deponent form of *errari* is only mentioned in the *TLL* as possible in Commodian's *Instructiones*, and in two glossaries, and is not found in the medieval Latin lexica.[22] The point is actually to imitate Virgil: any reader would immediately realize what *est erratus* means, grammatical or not, just as *cuium pecus* presented no bar to understanding. The exchange of insults followed by the challenge and the selection of the judge parallels Virgil ever so closely, as does the competition itself, amoebaean in form, with couplets (specific examples are discussed below).

Understanding the relationship of Martius' third bucolic with Virgil's third helps clarify the preface of the collection. Here Martius is on his own, without a Virgilian precedent — his model is likely the satirist Persius who prefaced his collection of five hexameter poems with a brief metapoetic prologue in a different metre (choliambs). Martius' prologue makes a direct allusion to Persius'.

> Audet ut humanas infringere pica loquelas,
>   Agrestes temptat sic mea musa sonos. (Martius, *prol.* 3–4)

As the magpie dares to usurp human speech, so does my muse attempt rustic strains.

> Heliconidasque pallidamque Pirenen
> illis remitto quorum imagines lambunt
> hederae sequaces; ipse semipaganus
> ad sacra uatum carmen adfero nostrum.
> quis expediuit psittaco suum 'chaere'
> picamque docuit nostra uerba conari? (Persius, *chol.* 4–9)

The Heliconians and pale Pirene I leave to people with their statues licked by clinging ivy. It's as a half-caste that I bring my song to the bards' rites. Who equipped the parrot with his 'Hello' and taught the magpie to attempt human speech? (trans. S. M. Braund)

Martius addresses his prologue to unspecified *patres*, and the general opinion, which interprets the whole collection as a spiritual allegory, has identified these *patres* as members of a religious community. Such an identification is possible, but unlikely. It was only in the late Middle Ages that *patres* became a standard term to refer to clerics; the preferred term would have been *fratres*, particularly if the author was also a member

---

[21] Apud. Don. *Vita Vergilii*, p. 10 Brummer.
[22] cf. *TLL* V 2, 806.65–813.62 (Hey): Gloss. II 408, 43 and II 427, 44.

of a religious community. The vast majority of the instances of the term *patres* up to the thirteenth century refer in the biblical sense to ancestors, and particularly the Church Fathers. Instead, *patres* here means 'senators'; and this is clear from the third bucolic. Where Virgil mentions Pollio in the third eclogue, Martius mentions Auxentius and Faustus. The widespread belief among grammarians in the Late Empire was that Virgil composed the eclogues at the instigation of, and in honour of, Pollio among others. Donatus' life of Virgil notes that Virgil 'moved on to bucolic, principally to celebrate Asinius Pollio, Alfenus, Varus, and Cornelius Gallus'.[23] The Servian *vita* notes that 'Pollio suggested to him to write bucolic poetry'.[24] That of Philargyrius notes how 'Virgil's farm was taken away, but at the command of Caesar Asinius Pollio restored it. In his honour, Virgil wrote the *Bucolics*'.[25]

Now Pollio is mentioned in *ecl.* 3.84–9, a passage where Virgil drops his bucolic mask for a moment and refers to a contemporary by name. It was this passage that likely inspired the grammarians' belief that Pollio was the dedicatee.[26] At precisely the same point, Martius makes reference to two individuals called by the recognizably late Roman names Faustus and Auxentius.

Virg., *ecl.* 3.84–9	Mart. Val., *buc.* 3.107–10
DAMOETAS	MOERIS
Pollio amat nostram, quamvis est rustica, Musam;	Parva, sed excelso placuit mea fistula Fa\<u\>sto:
Pierides, vitulam lectori pascite vestro.	'I, puer, et propriam' dixit 'ne neglige musam!'
MENALCAS	MOPSUS
Pollio et ipse facit nova carmina; pascite taurum,	Nos Auxentius amat vivoque tuetur amore,
iam cornu petat et pedibus qui spargat harenam.	eque suo tenuis mihi nomine crescit avena.
DAMOETAS	
Qui te, Pollio, amat veniat quo te quoque gaudet;	
mella fluant illi, ferat et rubus asper amomum.	

DAM. Pollio loves my Muse, homely though she be: Pierian maids, feed fat a calf for your reader. MEN. Pollio makes new songs himself: feed fat a bull that butts already and spurns the sand with his hooves. DAM. May he who loves you, Pollio, come where he rejoices that you, too, have come! For him may honey flow and the bramble bear spices!

MOER. My reed is slight but it has pleased lofty Faustus. He told me, 'Go boy and do not neglect your own muse!' MOPS. Auxentius loves me, and regards me with a living love; at his name, my slender oat-reed swells.

Faustus is a fairly common Roman name from the third to the sixth century. Auxentius is rarer — not even attested until the third century and modestly represented amongst the Roman élite of the fifth century; the most important people to hold the name were a notorious Arian bishop of the late fourth century, Auxentius of Milan, and two urban prefects of the middle of the fifth, Flavius Olbius Auxentius Draucus and Fonteius Litorius Auxentius.[27] In other words, these names mean almost nothing to us, and

---

[23] Donatus, *Vita Vergilii*: 'mox cum res Romanas inchoasset, offensus materia ad bucolica transiit, maxime ut Asinium Pollionem Alfenum que Varum et Cornelium Gallum celebraret, quia in distributione agrorum, qui post Philippensem victoriam veteranis triumvirorum iussu trans Padum dividebantur indemnem se praestitissent.'
[24] Servius(?), *Vita Vergilii* (p. 2): 'ei proposuit Pollio ut carmen bucolicum scriberet, quod eum constat triennio scripsisse et emendasse.'
[25] Philargyrius, *Vita Vergilii* (*Expl. in buc. Premium*, recension II; p. 7 Thilo/Hagen): 'Inde Virgilii ager ademptus est, quem Asinius Pollio iubente Caesare restituit, in cuius honorem Bucolica scripsit.'
[26] cf. Mayer 1983: 26.
[27] *PLRE* II, Draucus and *PLRE* II, Auxentius 8. On the name Auxentius, see Roda 1994: 131–2 n.

would have meant even less to a twelfth-century audience. The only plausible solution to my mind is that Faustus and Auxentius are real people, the patrons or friends of the poet, just as Pollio was to Virgil.

Hence Martius' prologue makes explicit what grammarians saw as implicit in Virgil. Auxentius and Faustus are to Martius what Pollio was to Virgil, and hence they are the *patres* (note the plural) of the dedication. Whoever they were, their names suggest senatorial rank. Some bearers of these names assumed even higher status. Fl. Anicius Probus Faustus the younger, for example, was consul in 490, *quaestor sacri palatii* from 503 to 505/6, and named *patricius* afterwards, before 507.[28] Likewise, we do not have direct evidence for an Auxentius *patricius*, but Fl. Olbius Auxentius Draucus is called in a dedication *v. c. et inl. patriciae familiae viro*.[29] The other prominent fifth-century bearer of the name, Fonteius Litorius Auxentius, likewise appears in a list of *patricii* and *consules*. Since he does not appear in the *Fasti*, it is reasonable to assign him the patriciate, but textual corruption is also possible and the list itself is of dubious origin.[30]

Lycurgus brings the competition to a halt with 'Parc**ite iam, satis** est; me iudice iurgia cessent'. In Virgil, Palaemon uses a metaphor of a canal: 'claud**ite iam** rivos, pueri; **sat** prata biberunt' (111). The actual phrasing comes from elsewhere in Virgil (*aen.* 12.693): 'parcite iam, Rutuli'.

The fourth eclogue breaks this pattern. It is set during the punishment of Apollo, when he was deprived of his divinity ('humano … labore') for his killing of the Cyclops, and was forced to herd the cattle of Admetus by the river Amphrysos in Thessaly.[31] Pan and a Napaean nymph, a native of the region,[32] are love-making nearby, but pause when they hear the music. Apollo then sings a song for Pan on the pyschogony, or the creation of the soul.

> Namque hominem triplices animae referebat in actus,
> Ut vita sensuque potens ac mente fruatur;
> Hoc herbis illudque feris, canit hoc quoque habere
> Mortales commune deis …

> He recounted man in his threefold act, how he has ready use of life, sensation, and mind: he sings what mortals have in common with plants, with beasts, with gods.

He then sings another song for the nymph, recounting a mythological catalogue, with Hero and Leander, the transformation of Cygnus, the loss of his son Phaeton, and Danae and the golden rain.[33] He concludes with his own pursuit and loss of Daphne, his sadness at which overwhelms him into silence. In the sense that here Martius begins to 'sing things a little greater' ('paulo maiora canamus', *ecl.* 4.1), he is following Virgil's fourth eclogue. But in reality, his model is Virgil's sixth, where Silenus sings a song beginning with the cosmogony and continuing with a mythological catalogue. The parallels between the two poems are extensive: Silenus' audience in *Ecl.* 6 is two boys, Chromis and Mnasylus, with the nymph Aegle; Martius' in *Buc.* 4 is Pan and the nymph Napaea. Silenus proposes a different recompense for the boys and the nymph, a song for the

---

[28] *PLRE* II Faustus 9.
[29] *PLRE* II Draucus.
[30] The list is a late fifth-century account of an abortive 'trial' of Pope Xystus supposedly in 433, which is riddled with anachronisms; see Twyman 1970: 494–7.
[31] See, for example, Servius *ad Aen.* 6.398 (p. 63 Hagen): 'nam Amphrysus fluvius est Thessaliae, circa quem Apollo spoliatus divinitate a Iove irato Admeti regis pavit armenta ideo, quia occiderat Cyclopas, fabricatores fulminum, quibus Aesculapius extinctus est, Apollinis filius, quia Hippolytum ab inferis herbarum potentia revocaverat.'
[32] cf. Columella 10.264–5: 'nymphasque Napaeas / quae colitis nemus Amphrysi.'
[33] There seems to be a lacuna after 4.67, between the end of the story of Hero and Leander and the start of that of Cygnus, which begins too abruptly; other stories may have been included in it.

boys, something obscene for the nymph; Apollo sings one song for Pan and another for Napaea. As Silenus begins, nature itself trembles in anticipation; as Apollo begins, everything becomes still and silent, animals, trees, streams, fields. At the end of Silenus' song, the poet notes that Silenus sang everything which Apollo had sung on the banks of the Eurotas (ecl. 6.82–3); it is presumably this that inspired Martius' own song of Apollo, albeit in the more pastoral environment of the Amphrysos, where Apollo is himself a human shepherd, rather than the Eurotas.

Martius' imitation of Virgil compares well, I believe, with the way that Calpurnius and Nemesianus imitated him, and is not remotely similar to the way Metellus of Tegernsee or Alcuin did. Let it suffice to present the first exchange in Metellus' first:[34]

> MELIBEUS
> Tytire, tu magni recubans in margine stagni,
> Silvestri tenuique fide pete iura peculii:
> Nos patrie fines et dulcia linquimus arva
> Et nostri pecoris tua dura replebimus arva.
> Expectes frustra nos, Tytire, lentus in umbra.
>
> TYTIRUS
> O Melibee, Deus nobis hec otia fecit,
> Qui curas hominum prope nos pecorum quoque fecit.
> Nobis nempe bonus semper fuit ille patronus,
> Votivum munus cui felix adtulit annus.
> Ille boves superare luem permisit et are
> Inscriptam plebem tribuit sperare salutem.

Regardless of any subjective characterization (personally I regard Metellus as a master of his very peculiar craft), there can be no doubt that the difference between his bucolics and Martius' is a distinction of kinds. They are not doing the same thing. Metellus' use of Virgil is more centonic than imitative; he easily slips into Christian vocabulary; he strives for unrelenting internal rhyme and frequent end rhyme.

One observation suffices to sum up the difference: unlike medieval pastoral poets — but like his ancient forebears — Martius situates his poems more or less precisely in actual locations, a pastoral world firmly set in Greece — not in Theocritus' Sicily — but stretching out to include Africa and Asia Minor as well. His imitation goes beyond the repetition of the tropes to the most minute level of detail, inviting his readers to precise observation and comparison.

III RARE SOURCES

The bucolics are extraordinarily allusive to a wide range of Latin poetry beyond Virgil, such as Calpurnius and Nemesianus (both the *Eclogues* and the *Cynegetica*), poets hardly known in the Middle Ages.[35] Martius' debts to Calpurnius are extensive; many of the former's evocative phrases are lifted directly from the latter. For example, *buc.* 1.14 'rapido sub sole' and 1.92 'sol rapidus' come from Calp. 1.10: 'rapidoque soli';

---

[34] Metellus, *buc. Quir.* 1.1–11, p. 305–6 Jacobsen; the text is also available in the *Dante Medieval Archive* cited above, n. *.
[35] The parallels with Nemesianus' eclogues are discussed at length in Magaña Orúe 2001: 123–6; for the *Cyenegetica*, compare *buc.* 2.109 'coeptas vallis include novales' with *cyn.* 181: 'Sed parvae vallis spatio saeptove novali'.

2.56 'Quem crucias? Quem, saeva, foves?' from Calp. 3.61 'quem sequeris? quem, Phylli, fugis?'; 3.40 'timeam quam cerne' from Calp. 6.49 'adspice quam timeam'; 3.70 'sociatas implicat umbras' from Calp. 1.12: 'ramis errantibus implicat umbras'; and 3.116 'trepidae multum crepuere cicadae' from Calp. 5.56 'argutae nemus increpuere cicadae'.[36]

The fourth most alluded to poet is Ovid, including the *Metamorphoses* (e.g. 4.85–6, 'fronde capillos / pulchraque per fragiles tendebat bracchia ramos' ∼ *Met.* 1.550 'in frondem crines, in ramos bracchia crescent', both about Daphne), the *Amores*, the *Tristia*, the *Epistulae ex Ponto*, the *Ars*, the *Remedia*, the *Ibis*, and the *Heroides*, as well as the spurious *Nux*.

In addition to these, Martius has been alleged to know Seneca's tragedies, Horace's *Odes*, *Satires*, *Ars* and *Epistles*, Juvenal, Columella (Book 10), Lucan, Statius' *Thebaid*, possibly Propertius, and Silius Italicus.[37] He also has a deep acquaintance with the late antique poets Ausonius and Claudian.[38] Besides poets, he is probably acquainted with Quintilian and certainly with Hyginus' *Fabulae*. Some of these are more certain than others, such as Seneca, e.g. *buc.* 1.47: 'Quid, quaeso, **repetis curas**que **revolvis** inanes?' ∼ *Oed.* 764: '**Curas revolvit** animus et **repetit** metus' and *buc.* 4.55: 'molli … carmine' ∼ *Agam.* 361: 'carmine molli'; and Columella, e.g. *buc.* 4.1–5: 'Egerat **Amphrysi** … Huc quoque cum tenera lascivus forte **Napea** / Pan aderat' ∼ 10.264–5 'Maenaliosque choros dryadum nymphasque **Napaeas**, / Quae colitis nemus **Amphrysi**', the only two texts that put Napaeae by the Amphrysos, and *buc.* 4.36: 'vivaces non terat herbas' ∼ 10.88 'vivacem cespitis herbam'.

At first glance, this list of sources — with all the due caveats proposed intertexts involve — might not seem unusual. Deeper analysis, however, raises questions. No complete manuscript of Calpurnius and Nemesianus survives which predates the fourteenth century (there is an incomplete manuscript of the first three eclogues of Calpurnius and part of the fourth from the twelfth century). Slight traces of both poets have been detected in the twelfth-century library catalogue of Prüfening and Calpurnius by himself possibly in that of Pfäffers from 1155.[39] Besides that, knowledge of their works was restricted to the bucolic poet Moduin in the ninth century, the compiler of the *Florilegium Gallicum* and Guido de Grana, the annotator of the lexicographer Papias in Berne 276, from around the beginning of the thirteenth century. (Guido, it should be added, also offers one of the only testimonia to Martius' work, as is discussed below.) Hence, it is significant that Martius knows their works so thoroughly: if he is medieval, his acquaintance puts him in a highly select group. A similar pattern emerges with other authors: Silius Italicus probably survived the Middle Ages in a single manuscript, and the number of medieval authors who knew him is vanishingly small. Propertius was known to the author of the mysterious *De septem septenis* in mid-twelfth-century

---

[36] A selection of other parallels culled from Munari 1970: *buc.* 1.52 ∼ Calp. 4.25–6; *buc.* 1.67 ∼ Calp. 4.61; *buc.* 1.73–4 ∼ Calp. 3.96; *buc.* 1.94 ∼ Calp. 4.169; *buc.* 3.9 ∼ Calp. 6.22; *buc.* 3.16 ∼ Calp. 6.25; *buc.* 3.85 ∼ Calp. 4.108; and *buc.* 4.21–3 ∼ Calp. 2.15–16.

[37] What follows is just a selection; for the rest, see the apparatus fontium to Munari's edition. Seneca: Silius: cf. *CTC* II, s.v. *Silius Italicus*. For Propertius, Munari identifies two possible reminiscences, 3.76: 'Carmina nostra colunt' ∼ Prop. 2.26.26: 'carmina tam sancte nulla puella colit' (but cf. *ecl.* 3.61: 'ille colit terras; illi mea carmina curae', which is surely more likely the source), and more convincingly, 3.89: 'iactat convicia divis' ∼ Prop. 3.8.18: 'quae mulier rabida iactat convicia lingua'.

[38] Ausonius: *buc.* 4.56–7: 'Nec mora, Sextiacam recolit miserando puellam / Atque Leandreis narrat freta pervia flammis' ∼ Ausonius, *Cupido cruciatus* 23: 'lumina Sestiaca praeceps de turre puella' (n.b. Ovid does not use this epithet of Hero in telling the story, cf. *her.* 18.4: 'si cadat unda maris, Sesti puella, tibi'; the only other author to use *Sextiacus* (*Sest-*) is Ausonius' source, Statius, *silv.* 1.3.27); *buc.* 2.17: 'Mixtaque flebilibus suspiria longa querelis' ∼ Auson., *Professores* (op. XI) 26.9–10: 'accipite maestum carminis cultum mei / textum querella flebili'; *buc.* 1.67: 'lascivo nunc quoque Fauno' ∼ Auson., *Mosella* (op. XVIII) 177: 'fugit lascivos, paganica numina, Faunos'. (But the source could just as well have been Claud., *carm. min.* 25.20: 'Flammea lascivis intendunt spicula Faunis'.)

[39] See M. D. R. in *T&T* 37–8; and for greater detail Reeve 1978.

England, and then the earliest copy is French, *c.* 1200; he was also known to Guido de Grana. Seneca's tragedies scarcely circulated before the thirteenth century, probably from a single manuscript in Northern Europe.[40] Columella was scarcely known in the Middle Ages to anyone outside of St Gall. Nemesianus' *Cynegetica*, which survived in two medieval manuscripts, one ninth- and one tenth-century, was apparently only known to Hincmar of Reims.[41] Two of the works of Ausonius Martius knows, the *Cupido cruciatus* and the *Professores*, each survived the Middle Ages in a single different manuscript.[42] Hyginus' *Fabulae* survives today for the most part in an edition printed from a manuscript now reduced to fragments written in southern Italy around 900, and taken to Freising sometime later.[43]

   If Martius Valerius were writing around the year 1200, the amount of access he must have enjoyed to rare texts is incredible. Put another way, a sixth-century Martius Valerius would be well-read but not exceptional; a twelfth-century Martius Valerius would vie with John of Salisbury, Guido de Grana or William of Malmesbury for the title of the most well-read scholar in medieval Europe.

IV THE RIDDLES

Martius' use of Hyginus' *Fabulae* sheds considerable light on one of the most widely discussed passages in the collection, the pair of riddles in the third bucolic (3.123–6). Just like in Virgil's third, the two contestants, Moeris and Mopsus, conclude their amoebean duel with an exchange of riddles.

> MOERIS
> En age nec dubito victor, si dixeris, esto,
> Quae prius in planis emittant gramina flores.

> MOPSUS
> Dissere, si poteris, et me quoque doctior ito,
> Virgineum cuius pecudum notat ungula nomen.

> MOERIS There now – I have no doubt you'll be the winner, if you can tell me what plants first produce flowers on the plains.[44] MOPSUS Tell me if you can, and you'll pass as more learned too than I, the one whose virginal name the hooves of herds mark.

Munari thought the riddles had been solved: the first referred to daisies, which in German are called *Marienblumen*, or Mary flowers, while the second (the solution credited to Scevio Mariotti) refers to the fact that some medieval ploughs left an M-shaped furrow — hence the Virgin Mary.[45] This solution is beyond unconvincing. Daisies are not the first flower of spring; in so bookish a poet as Martius, we should find a bookish solution.[46] Pliny the Elder is explicit that the violet is the first flower of spring,

[40] See R. J. T. in *T&T* 379.
[41] See M. D. R. in *T&T* 246.
[42] M. D. R. in *T&T* 26–8.
[43] M. D. R. in *T&T* 189–90; cf. Hays 2008.
[44] See Munari 1970 *ad loc.* for a discussion of the interpretation of this line, which I have used in my translation.
[45] Munari 1970: 16 n. This passage has provoked some discussion, since botanical precision has been thought necessary to work out the location of *Lauri altae*; see Zicari 1957: 258; Guarducci 1970; Orlandi 1971: 223; and Salemme 1979: 335.
[46] This was already realized by the first person to attempt a solution that we have: long before Lehmann, a reader of the Erlangen manuscript attempted to work out the first riddle with a long note in the margin, in a nearly illegible sixteenth-century hand (f. 8v): 'Videtur michi gladiolam. Nam Strabus Fuldensis monachus in Hortulo

specifically the *viola alba*: 'Florum prima ver nuntiat viola alba, tepidioribus vero locis etiam hieme emicat; post ea, quae ion appellatur et purpurea …' (*nat.* 21.64). As for the second riddle, Mopsus is not talking about draught animals, but stock (*pecus*), and he specifically notes the mark left by their hooves, rather than by a plough or whatever they happen to be dragging. Finally, though 'virgineum … nomen' might look like a good Marian tag, I have found no evidence that it is so. In reality, it is Ovid's phrase; he puts it into the mouth of Perimele, lamenting the loss of her 'virgineum nomen' at the hands of Achelous.[47] Hyginus provides the actual source, in wording so close to that of Martius that it can hardly be independent, in the story of Autolycus and Sisyphus, which is transmitted nowhere else. Autolycus, the son of Mercury, was so cunning a thief that he could never be caught, until he stole cattle from Sisyphus. Sisyphus responded by putting a mark on the hooves of his cattle ('pecorum ungulis notam imposuit'), so that he could judge which cattle were his own. The idea is probably that a hoof print looks like a lunate sigma (C), for Sisyphus. Hence the answer to the second riddle ought to be a virgin whose name begins with C. One obvious candidate is Cynthia, or Diana, famed for her virginity. The two answers, then, are *violae* (ἰά in Greek, *ia* in Latin in the line from Pliny above) and *Cynthia* (Κυνθία); take them together and what results is *iacinthus* or *hyacinthus*, hyacinth. This is almost certainly the correct answer since it is related to the answer to the second of Virgil's riddles (*ecl.* 106–7):

> Dic quibus in terris inscripti nomina regum
> nascantur flores, et Phyllida solus habeto

> Tell me in what lands grow flowers inscribed with royal names – and have Phyllis for yourself.

The 'flowers marked with the names of kings' refer to hyacinths, which in antiquity were known to have marks which looked like AIA(I). This led to two aetiologies: that Hyacinthus was turned into the flower by Apollo, who killed him by accident, and the marks are an exclamation of grief, or that they refer to the name of Ajax in whose blood the flowers first sprang up (see, for example, Pliny, *nat.* 21.66).[48] As Servius explains, these two are the kings whose names are inscribed on the flower.[49] Another tradition takes it as referring only to Hyacinthus, with AIA as an injection of grief.[50] The version mentioning Ajax, however, identifies the flowers as *violae* (the *scholia Bernensia*, for example, and the second recension of Philargyrius).[51] On the strength of

---

suo inquit de gladiolis: "Tu mihi purpurei progignis floris honorem/ prima estate gerens viole iocunda nigelle/ Munera" …' (I thank Philipp Nothaft for helping me decipher this). This reader was on the right track that a literary source was required (cf. Walahfrid Strabo, *Hortulus* 219–21).

[47] Ovid, *met.* 8.592: 'huic ego virgineum dilectae nomen ademi.' *Virgineo nomine* is used in the same sense as Ovid by Avitus, *carm.* vi, *De virginitate* 439. I have not found an instance of it applied to the Blessed Virgin, but it is used for the Church by Innocent III, *de sacro altaris meysterio* 1.65, from whom it was taken by Durantus, *Rationale* 3.18.3.

[48] Pliny, *nat.* 21.66: 'hyacinthum comitatur fabula duplex, luctum praeferentis eius, quem Apollo dilexerat, aut ex Aiacis cruore editi, ita discurrentibus venis, ut Graecarum litterarum figura AI legatur inscriptum.'

[49] *ad. ecl.* 3.106, p. 42 Thilo/Hagen: 'hyacinthus enim ubique nascitur flos, qui natus primo est de Hyacinthi sanguine, postea de Aiacis, sicut etiam Ovidius docet. est autem rubrum quasi lilium, designans primam Hyacinthi litteram.'

[50] (ps-)Probus, *ad ecl.* 3.106 (p. 331 Thilo/Hagen): 'INSCRIPTI NOMINA REGVM. Hyacinthus. Hyacinthus ab Apolline adamatus propter nimiam pulchritudinem et ab ipso per ignorantiam occisus disco conversus est in florem, qui in se litteras habet A. I. A., ut sit vox plorantis.'

[51] Philargyrius, *ad. ecl.* 3.106 (p. 70 Thilo/Hagen): 'flores idest nomen Aiacis et Hyacinthi. Hyacinthus dicitur Oebali filius ab Apolline esse disco occisus; ex eo florem natum vocem significantem gemitum habere. Aliter: dicunt esse Aiacis sanguinem; cum se occidisset gladio Hectoris, inscriptum esse <in> florem aeae, hoc est gemendi sonitus Graecus; qua voce autem exclamaverunt Graeci, cum se Aiax percussit, eam dicunt scriptam esse in folio †ietimo, idest aeae. Quidam nomen scriptum ipsum Aiacis esse dicunt.' *Scholia Bernensia* ad

the appearance of this story in Philargyrius and the Berne scholia (ostensibly derived, one must remember, from Philargyrius, Titus Gallus and Gaudentius), we can safely assume its currency in fifth- and sixth-century literary circles.

Further, we also have some evidence of ancient riddles which depend on this kind of word combination. In Petronius, a guest is promised a *muraena*, an eel, as a Saturnalia gift; what he actually receives is 'murem cum rana alligata', a 'mouse with a frog tied to it', since *muraena* is *mus* and *rana* attached together.[52] We can also find these kinds of riddles in the *Greek Anthology* (e.g. XIV.16):

Νῆσος ὅλη, μύκημα βοός, φωνή τε δανειστοῦ

All together an island: the lowing of a cow and the cry of the moneylender.

The answer is Rhodes ('Ρόδος), imaginatively made up of the cow's ῥο and the lender's cry of 'hand it over!' (δός).

In case there is any further doubt, Martius himself seems to confirm the answer in his next poem:

Tunc hyacintheis instaurat floribus annum
Purpureoque novat nitidam sub honore iuventam. (*buc.* 4.75–6)

Then he initiates the year with hyacinthine flowers, and renews its splendid youth with purple honour.

The 'hyacinthine flowers' with which the year begins anew cannot be anything but the first flowers of spring, the violet.[53]

V MARTIUS AND THEOCRITUS

The sophistication of the riddles in *Buc.* 3 should inspire a bit more curiosity about Martius' sources and the audience for whom he was writing. In particular, it should make us wonder about his relationship to the Greek tradition. If he were writing in the sixth century, and had some familiarity with Greek, should he not have read Theocritus, like Virgil, like Calpurnius, like Nemesianus?

Theocritus was hardly forgotten among Latin authors and scholars even in the sixth century. In the second edition of his commentary on Aristotle's *De interpretatione*, Boethius describes Philo's notion of a modal proposition: 'Philo says that <a proposition> is possible which is capable of truth due to the proper nature of what it says, as for example, when I say that today I will reread the *Bucolics* of Theocritus.'[54] This offhand comment is quite remarkable, as if the bucolics were a text that a reader of a Latin commentary on a Latin translation of a Greek philosophical text might not just know about, but casually decide to reread at leisure. The *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*

3.106–7 (p. 143 Daintree): 'INSCRIPTI NOMINA REGUM, Aiacis, Hyacinthi … Aiax cum se interfecit gladio Hectoris, flores violae e terra sanguine concretae litteras habuerant exortae nomen Aiacis exprimentes. habuereunt enim "ae ae".'

[52] Petron., *sat.* 56: '"Muraena et littera": murem cum rana alligata fascemque betae.' See the discussion in Leary 1996: 248.

[53] An interesting coda to this argument is that the riddle seems to imply a spelling *iacinthus*, which is in fact what we find in the next poem, *iacintheus*. It is also very close to Venantius' spelling of the same word; see the passages of Venantius Fortunatus quoted below, with *TLL* VI 3 3126.12–15 (Brandt). Orthographical precision, however, is scarcely needed in this kind of riddle, as the example from Petronius shows.

[54] *Int.* II 3.9 p. 234 Meiser: 'Philo enim dicit possibile esse, quod natura propria enuntiationis suscipiat veritatem, ut cum dico me hodie esse Theocriti Bucolica relecturum.' I benefited from discussion of the meaning of this passage in Bobzien 1998: 108–9.

tells us that Boethius wrote a bucolic poem, 'condidit et carmen bucolicum'; it may well have drawn on Boethius' reading and rereading of Theocritus.

Nor had grammarians neglected him. Comparing Virgil's eclogues with Theocritus was something of a pastime in literary circles from the first century well into the fifth, and perhaps beyond. Gellius describes how at the dinner table one evening he and his companions read Virgil and Theocritus together, not just to find the obvious similarities, but to find particularly striking instances of clever or charming imitation.[55]

It was natural for these loci to make their way into commentaries. Servius' comments on *ecl.* 2.21–3 make an excellent example:

> (*ecl.* 2.21) MILLE MEAE SICVLIS ERRANT I. M. A. Theocritus (XI 34) βοτὰ χίλια βόσκω. 'errant' autem cum securitate pascuntur. et quod ait agnas, et a sexu et ab aetate laudavit. (*ecl.* 2.23) LAC MIHI NON AESTATE NOVVM N. F. D. multo melius quam Theocritus; ille enim ait (XI 36) τυρὸς δ' οὐ λείπει μ' οὔτ' ἐν θέρει οὔτ' ἐν ὀπώρῃ. sed caseus servari potest, nec mirum est, si quovis tempore quis habeat caseum; hoc vero laudabile est, si quis habeat lac novum, id est colustrum. (Thilo/Hagen III.1.21)

Similar notes even occur in commentaries on other texts.[56] Individual manuscripts of Virgil also bear witness to this readerly practice, where lines from Theocritus are noted marginally. A late fifth-century manuscript of Virgil with scholia, the so-called *Scholia veronensia*, attests to this practice. An example, on *ecl.* 3.27:

> STIPVLA DISPERDERE CARMEN. Significanter illud Theocriti translatum locavit: ἀρκεῖ σοι καλάμας αὐλὸν ποππύσδεν | ἔχοντι.[57]

Some of the parallels in the *Scholia veronensia* are also found in the commentaries we have, but not all of them. Hence, they may reflect lost traditions or even the accumulation of interventions by individual readers.

This is one backdrop against which the literary practice of imitative series, or 'window allusion', should be evaluated. A poet can participate in this scholarly tradition, by imitating or referencing a passage of Virgil in which Virgil is drawing on Theocritus, while including elements which draw on Theocritus directly with no Virgilian analogue.[58] In one sense, this kind of poetic nod is the same sort of thing that Gellius' *érudits* and the scholiasts and commentators were doing: finding and comparing parallel passages. Instead of comparing directly (Virgil said *this* better; *that* is so much better in Greek), the poet embeds his commentary into his allusions. In another sense, however, he is inviting his readers to include him in their literary games, to read his poems against those of his predecessors.

This is how Martius Valerius uses Theocritus. As noted above, he nods to Virgil in the opening of his second bucolic with his 'Euphilin ardebat' (2.4). But before that, he speaks of the *calamus* as granting *solacia* to the silent flame, or of poetry as the remedy for love (2.1–2):

> Pastorum calamo iuvenem donarat Iarbam
> Pan bonus et tacitae tulerat solacia flammae.

---

[55] Gellius 9.9.4–11: 'Sicuti nuperrime aput mensam cum legerentur utraque simul Bucolica Theocriti et Vergilii, animadvertimus reliquisse Vergilium, quod Graecum quidem mire quam suave est, verti autem neque debuit neque potuit.'
[56] For example, Donat. in Ter. *Adelph.* 4.537 (III Wessner): 'nam sic Theocritus (*Id.* XIV 22) "οὐ φθέγξῃ? λύκον εἶδες" et Vergilius (*Ecl.* IX 53–54) "uox quoque Moerim iam fugit ipsa, lupi Moerim u(idere) p(riores)".'
[57] Thilo/Hagen III.2.393.
[58] See, for example, Hubbard 1998: 201 for a window allusion in Nemesianus.

Good Pan endowed the young Iarbas with a shepherd's reed-pipe, and brought relief to his secret passion.

This is precisely the point Theocritus is making in *Id.* 11, Virgil's source, from the very first four lines:

> Οὐδὲν ποττὸν ἔρωτα πεφύκει φάρμακον ἄλλο,
> Νικία, οὔτ' ἔγχριστον, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, οὔτ' ἐπίπαστον,
> ἢ ταὶ Πιερίδες· κοῦφον δέ τι τοῦτο καὶ ἀδύ
> γίνετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώποις, εὑρεῖν δ' οὐ ῥᾴδιόν ἐστι.

There is no remedy for love, Nicias — neither an ointment, I believe, nor a powder — other than the Pierian Muses. This remedy is a light and pleasant one for mortals, but it is not easy to find.

The phrase *tulerat solacia* seems to echo *id.* 11.17, ἀλλὰ τὸ φάρμακον εὗρε, 'but he discovered the remedy'.

Iarbas then embarks on a series of *adynata*, or impossibilities to express a lover's incomprehension at his rejection (ll. 30–41).

> Poterunt tunc omnia verti,
> tunc cupient lepores rapidos audire molossos
> atque ursas optet praeferre iuvenca iuvencis,
> tunc simul et platanus moris uvisque rubebit
> culmus et emissis flavescet palmes aristis.
> …
> vertentur cuncta, necesse est.
> Nunc cupiet pardos fugietque iuvenca iuvencos,
> nunc et oves fugiens sectabitur agna leones,
> in nemore hoc pisces, dammae saturantur in undis.

Then all things could be turned around, then the hares would long to hear the Molossian hounds, and the heifer would desire she-bears over yearlings, then the plane tree will grow red with blackberries and the hay with grapes, and the palm yellow with ears of grain … then all things will be reversed, it is necessary. Now the heifer will desire the leopard and flee the yearlings, now the lamb will flee the sheep and follow the lions, in these trees will be fishes, while deer are submerged in the water.

Martius' allusions range across the whole tradition. The first *adynaton* comes from Claudian's *De raptu* (2. pr. 25): 'securum blandi leporem fovere molossi'. The second is his own, while the third and fourth imitate Virgil (*ecl.* 8.52–3): 'aurea durae / mala ferant quercus, narcisso floreat alnus'. In the second set, the first two are his own, while the third neatly combines Virgil (*ecl.* 8.52): 'nunc et ovis ultro fugiat lupus', with Claudian (*rapt.* 2.pr. 26): 'vicinumque lupo praebuit agna latus'. The final *adynaton* is adapted from Horace (*carm.* 1.2.9–12): 'piscium et summa genus haesit ulmo /…/ et superiecto pavidae natarunt / aequore dammae'. What none of these parallel passages contain, however, is a general description of *adynata*. In Theocritus *Id.* 1 (1.132–6), the passage Virgil is imitating here, we find intermingled in the *adynata* a hemistich describing their general nature:

> νῦν δ' ἴα μὲν φορέοιτε βάτοι, φορέοιτε δ' ἄκανθαι,
> ἁ δὲ καλὰ νάρκισσος ἐπ' ἀρκεύθοισι κομάσαι·
> πάντα δ' ἔναλλα γένοιτο, καὶ ἁ πίτυς ὄχνας ἐνείκαι.
> Δάφνις ἐπεὶ θνάσκει· καὶ τὼς κύνας ὤλαφος ἕλκοι,
> κἠξ ὀρέων τοὶ σκῶπες ἀηδόσι γαρύσαιντο.

now you brambles may bear violets, and you thorns may do the same, and the fair narcissus bloom on the juniper, and everything may be changed, and pears can grow on the pine tree, since Daphnis is dying. Let the deer tear apart the hounds, and let the screech owls from the mountains rival nightingales.

'All things are turned upside-down.' The same hemistich is found in Martius Valerius, in both series of *adynata*: 'poterunt tunc omnia verti' and 'vertentur cuncta, necesse est'.

A little later in the lament, Iarbas wonders whether his Euphilis is too proud to love a shepherd. But in an apostrophe to his absent love, he adduces the counter-example of Phoebe, goddess of the Moon, who loved a shepherd (Endymion, though his name is not mentioned).

> sed respice Phoeben:
> linquens nempe polos ad pastoralia lustra
> venit et agresti iacuit dignata cubili.

> But look at Phoebe: leaving behind the heavens she came to haunts of shepherds, and deigned to lie in a rustic bed.

The same *mython* in the same context is adduced in Theocritus(?), *Id.* 20.37–9, where a herdsman laments his rejection by the town-dwelling Eunica:

> Ἐνδυμίων δὲ τίς ἦν; οὐ βουκόλος; ὅν γε Σελάνα
> βουκολέοντα φίλασεν, ἀπ' Οὐλύμπω δὲ μολοῖσα
> Λάτμιον ἂν νάπος ἦλθε, καὶ εἰς ὁμὰ παιδὶ κάθευδε

> What was Endymion? Wasn't he an oxherd? Selene fell in love with him as he herded his cattle; she came from Olympus to the Latmian grove and slept with the lad.

These two passages are far closer to one another than to any of the other ancient tellings of this story in context (that is, as an argument that not even goddesses spurn the love of shepherds), in content, recounting her descent (ἀπ' Οὐλύμπω ~ *linquens … polos*, μολοῖσα ~ *venit*, Λάτμιον ~ *ad pastoralia lustra*) and their concubinage (κάθευδε ~ *iacuit*), in emphasis (for example, βουκολέοντα ~ *pastoralia*, *agresti*), and in omission, that is, neither mention what is usually the most important part of the story, Endymion's enchanted sleep. As if to dispel any lingering doubt, the first two words of the following lines in each are identical, καὶ τύ ~ *tu quoque*. This is similar to how Virgil will translate a couple of insignificant words of Theocritus to signal a looser adaptation, a winking quotation mark.[59]

Finally, at the end of the lament, Iarbas addresses himself directly, just as Corydon does in Virgil, *Ecl.* 2 and Polyphemus does in *Id.* 11:

> Virgil, *ecl.* 2.69–72:
> a, Corydon, Corydon, quae te dementia cepit!
> semiputata tibi frondosa vitis in ulmo.
> quin tu aliquid saltem potius, quorum indiget usus,
> viminibus mollique paras detexere iunco?

> Ah, Corydon, Corydon, what madness has gripped you? Your vine is but half-pruned on the leafy elm. Nay, why not at least set about plaiting some thing your need calls for, with twigs and pliant rushes?

> Theoc., *id.* 11.72–5:
> ὦ Κύκλωψ Κύκλωψ, πᾷ τὰς φρένας ἐκπεπότασαι;

---

[59] See Lipka 2001: 60.

αἴ κ' ἐνθὼν ταλάρως τε πλέκοις καὶ θαλλὸν ἀμάσας
ταῖς ἄρνεσσι φέροις, τάχα κα πολὺ μᾶλλον ἔχοις νῶν.
τὰν παρεοῖσαν ἄμελγε·

O Cyclops, Cyclops where have your wits flown? If you went and plaited wicker baskets and cut down greenery and carried it to your lambs, you would have much more sense. Milk the sheep that's by you.

> Mart. Valer., *buc* 2.106–10:
> Cepit, Iarba, furor quantus te! Nonne relicti
> gramine contempto rumpuntur questibus agni
> teque vocant errando greges – heu non pudet! – omnes?
> quin potius coeptas vallis include novales,
> duc pecus ad mulctram aut viridi lac imprime iunco!

How great a madness has seized you! Don't your abandoned lambs reject the grass and erupt in complaints – alas, you're not ashamed – don't all your flocks call out to you as they wander away? So much better it would be to finish enclosing your fallows with walls, to take your flock to the milking pail, and to press the milk into green wicker baskets?

Theocritus' Polyphemus suggests that he ought to cut down branches for his lambs and milk them. Virgil's Corydon plans on finishing his vine-pruning and weaving something useful out of reeds, not specifying what. A basket for making cheese is probably intended (cf. Nem., *ecl.* 2.33–4), as in Theocritus. Valerius is clearly imitating Virgil, at points quite closely (*cepit ~ cepit, furor ~ dementia, te ~ te, quin potius ~ quin … potius, viridi … iunco ~ molli … iunco*). But he includes three elements found only in Theocritus — the needy lambs, the identification of the basket for cheese making, and the milking. The evidence from *Buc.* 2 is overwhelming: Martius Valerius must have had direct access in some form to Theocritus.

The third bucolic confirms this impression. It is a dialogue between the shepherds Moeris and Mopsus, with Lycurgus as a judge, ever so closely following Virgil's third eclogue. Both Valerius and Virgil use priamels, or linked series of comparisons (3.99–107):

MOERIS
Ut viscum contristat aves, ut grando colonos
et nix multa greges, sic nos Amarillidis irae.

MOPSUS
Ut grata est nox longa feris, ut parva capellis,
ut ros graminibus, nobis amor unus Ianthe.

MOERIS
Optat aper silvas, maturas vinitor uvas,
area trita Nothos, solum mens nostra
                    Coroebum.

MOPSUS
Gaudet apes calathis, sociatis vitibus ulmus,
dulcibus ortus aquis, nostris amplexibus Aegle

Virgil, *ecl.* 3.80–83:

DAMOETAS
Triste lupus stabilis, maturis frugibus
                                imbres,
arboribus venti, nobis Amaryllidos irae.

MENALCAS
Dulce satis umor, depulsis arbutus haedis,
lenta salix feto pecori, mihi solus Amyntas.

MOER. As a snare afflicts birds, as hail the farmers, and much snow the flocks, so does the anger of Amaryllis afflict me. MOPS. As a long night is pleasing to wild beasts, and a short one to the goats, and the dew to the grass, so to me is Ianthe, my only love. MOER. The boar longs for woods, the vine-dresser ripe grapes, the South Wind the harvest, so my mind longs only for

Coroebus. Mops. The bee rejoices in flowers, the elm in the vines joined to it, the spring in the sweet waters, Aegle in our embraces.

Dam. Terrible is the wolf to the folds, the rains to the ripened crop, to the trees the gales, and to me the anger of Amaryllis! Men. Sweet are the showers to the corn, the arbute to the new-weaned kids, to the breeding flock the bending willow, and to me none but Amyntas!

Virgil has in mind a passage in a similar singing contest in Theocritus(?), *id*. 8.57–8, where Daphnis uses a similar priamel:

δένδρεσι μὲν χειμὼν φοβερὸν κακόν, ὕδασι δ' αὐχμός,
ὄρνισιν δ' ὕσπλαγξ, ἀγροτέροις δὲ λίνα,

A gale is a fearsome thing for trees, a drought for water, a snare for birds, nets for wild game.

One element, or syntagm, is identical, δένδρεσι μὲν χειμὼν φοβερὸν κακόν ~ [*triste*] *arboribus venti*, as a deliberate nod toward his source. Martius is imitating that same couplet of Virgil, keeping his entire last hemistich almost intact. Yet at the same time, he directly incorporates a different syntagm from the very same passage, ὄρνισιν δ' ὕσπλαγξ ~ *ut viscum contristat aves*. The following lines include another syntagm from Theocritus, from *id*. 9.34–5, γλυκερώτερον, οὔτε μελίσσαις / ἄνθεα.~ *gaudet apes calathis* (*calathus* here being the calix of a flower).

At the end of the competition, Lycurgus calls the conclusion to a close: 'Parcite, iam satis est; me iudice iurgia cessent.' The *satis* comes from Virgil, where Palaemon ends with 'sat prata biberunt' (3.111). But Palaemon does not seem to interrupt them, whereas Lycurgus cuts the competition short. In the same way, in *Id*. 5, Morson intervenes to stop the contest: παύσασθαι κέλομαι τὸν ποιμένα (138). In both Virgil and Martius, the competition is inconclusive, whereas in Theocritus, Comatas wins. The reason for the inconclusive result in Martius, however, is explained quite differently than in Virgil, 'vincere uterque potest, non cedere uterque iuvatur'. This conclusion instead comes from a different singing contest in Theocritus, *id*. 6.46: νίκη μὲν οὐδάλλος, ἀνήσσατοι δ' ἐγένοντο ('neither was victorious; each was undefeated').

Some of these parallels are more muscular than others, but the two or three which are absolutely certain are sufficient to secure the others and demonstrate beyond question or doubt, that Martius Valerius knew Theocritus. And if he knew Theocritus, he is not a French or German poet of the second half of the twelfth century. To argue that would overturn almost everything we know about Greek studies in the West in the Middle Ages.[60]

<h2 style="text-align:center">VI QUI FLORUIT TEMPORE JUSTINIANI</h2>

The evidence I have brought together has given us warrant to answer Dolbeau's original question in the negative; the bucolics of Martius Valerius are not a production of the Middle Ages. What we have found, however, is consistent with the external evidence Dolbeau brought to bear. We should now examine these two testimonia in detail. Both come from renowned bibliophiles and book hunters, John Leland in the fifteenth century, describing a manuscript he saw at Thorney, and Guido de Grana in the thirteenth, illustrating the word *mens* in Papias' *Elementarium*:

Coll. III, p. 30 Thorney: Eglogae aliquot Marci exquaestoris, qui floruit tempore Justiniani.

---

[60] Berschin 1988.

Guido de Grana, Berne 276, f. 135r (in M. D. R., in *T&T* 38): *Mens* ratio, unde Marcus Valerius consuli [*sic*] in bucolicis: Hinc canit … (4.46–8)

First, Leland. Ratkowitsch's attempt to dismiss the entry is unconvincing. She argues that the entry refers to some otherwise unknown legal text by some otherwise unknown Marcus who took part in Justinian's legal reforms.[61] Interpreting a testimonium which plausibly refers to a known text and author such that it refers to a person for whom we have no other evidence is in itself dubious. But her argument is problematic in another way: she bases it on the fact that *ecloga* does not necessarily refer to an individual bucolic poem until much later. A simple survey of the evidence, however, contradicts this assertion. The vast majority of instances of the term *ecloga* in Latin texts from both antiquity and the Middle Ages refer to poetic works, and the majority from Late Antiquity on refer to Virgil's bucolics. But in the end, that does not even matter, since the entry was composed in the sixteenth century when *ecloga* only had the meaning of bucolic poem. The wording of the entry confirms that it was composed by Leland himself and not simply copied from the Thorney manuscript he saw. Leland is often concerned with dating authors: so, for example, for Llanthony (*Collectanea* III, p. 159), he lists: 'Clemens prior tertius inter Lantonenses super evangelia. Hinc coniectura est floruisse illum tempore Richardi primi vel Joannis.' Or, for Rievaulx, he includes a work by Walter Daniel 'qui floruit circa tempore Stephani & Henrici 2ⁱ' (*Collectanea* III, p. 38). Numerous other examples of such formulations can be found throughout the *Collectanea*. When Leland did not want to actually count the number of discrete works in a collection, he would simply add *aliquot*; compare the listing for Cirencester, where he lists the commentary of Gervase of Chichester's commentary on Malachi, and then follows it with 'eiusdem aliquot omeliae' (*Coll.* III, p. 159). Finally, for Leland, *eglogae* are individual poems in a bucolic collection; witness an entry from Balliol College, 'Bucolica Boccatia continentia 16. Eglogas' (*Coll.* III, p. 66). Nearly every word of the Thorney entry betrays Leland's hand, and must indicate an unspecified number of bucolic poems by somebody named Marcus (or Martius) who was an exquaestor, and who was alive in the time of Justinian.

This curiously exact information must have been deduced from paratextual materials accompanying the poems, a long inscription at least, or perhaps a short *vita*. Sometimes, as in the examples above, Leland would use chronology and registers to establish a floruit for an author. Obviously that would not be possible for a Justinianic author. In other cases, Leland would deduce a notice from a text's prologue. For example, for Malmesbury, Leland lists, 'Sententiae Xysti interprete Rufino qui contendit hunc fuisse Xystum pontificem Romanum' (*Coll.* III, p. 157). These are the *Sentences of Sextus* translated by Rufinus, a neo-Pythagorean ethical collection in a Christian frame. In his prologue, Rufinus notes that 'some people relate that Sextus himself is called Xystus, among you, that is in the city of Rome, honoured with the glory of bishop and martyr'.[62] Jerome showers scorn on Rufinus for this identification (cf. *ep.* 133.3), which at any rate did not originate with him, as it is found in the Armenian version of the text as well. Leland, looking for information to identify this rare text (the *editio princeps*, Lyon 1507, came out in Leland's own lifetime), strengthens this note to suggest that Rufinus definitively identifies the author of the text with Pope Xystus.

Now for Guido: despite the grammatical irregularity, he undoubtedly is suggesting that Martius Valerius was a consul. Again Ratkowitsch attempts to dismiss this evidence by pointing to the hazy status of the title *consul* in the Middle Ages, suggesting that it

---

[61] Ratkowitsch 1992: 176.
[62] Ed. Chadwick (Cambridge, 1959), p. 9: 'Sextum ipsum esse tradunt apud vos id est in urbe Roma Xystus vocatur, episcopi et marytris gloria decoratus.'

could be applied to all sorts of people.[63] While that fact is indeed true, the reason why *consul* is such an ambiguous term is because it was used analogically to describe a person of some importance, whose rôle was parallel to what they imagined a Roman consul's rôle would have been. In other words, the Roman sense of consul remained the primary meaning of the word throughout the Middle Ages. I am aware of a few occurrences of literary figures mentioned with consul attached to their name (I list them below) — in all cases it is because they actually held that office. The other problem with Ratkowitsch's argument is that her explanation requires independent convergent error: as she admits, the two testimonia fit perfectly together. Dismissing them separately entails an extremely heavy burden of proof since they are mutually reinforcing.

The only place he could have gotten such information is from the title in a manuscript. Sometimes manuscripts of late antique authors give titles indicating the office they held. For example, one manuscript of Ausonius, Voss. Lat. F. 111 (*c.* 800), f. 20v, calls him 'Ausonius consul' in the title to the *Ludus septem sapientum*, while another manuscript, Vat. lat. 1611 (fifteenth century), calls him 'Ausonii poetae viri consularis'. Likewise, the catalogue of Saint-Oyan (eleventh century) lists a codex containing 'libri carminum Ausonii consulis'.[64] Even better is the title of the lost manuscript of Helpidius Rusticus' *Historiarum testamenti veteris et novi tristicha* which had been in the hands of Johannes Hartung, who passed it on to Georgius Fabricius to be printed:[65]

> Rustici Helpidii VC exinlustris exquaestoris

The fact that this title contains an absurd error — it should be *v(ir) c(larissimus) et inlustris*, as Seeck realized[66] — guarantees its authenticity, despite the fact that Hartung's manuscript has never been found.

Dozens of examples of even longer inscriptions can be found in Boethius manuscripts. Two representative specimens:

> (Paris lat. 17858, s. xi)
> ANNICII MANLII SEVERINI BOE
> TII. EX CONSULIS ORDINARII
> PATRICII LIBER PRIMUS INCIPIT
> INSTITUTIONUM ARITHMETICE

> (Paris lat. 12961, s. xi)
> ANICII MANLII SEVERINI BOETII EX CONSULIS
> ORDINARII PATRICII PHILOSOPHICAE CONSOLATIONIS
> INCIPIT LIBER PRIMUS FELICITER.

Of course, many authors, Boethius included, were honoured with a *vita* preceding their works. But there is also an intermediate stage between *vita* and inscription, represented by the *anecdoton Holderi*, or the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*, a very short piece transmitted with the *Institutiones* of Cassiodorus which tells us about his career, as well as those of Boethius and Symmachus. It begins with what seems to be a long inscription from the text from which it was derived (Karlsruhe, Aug, 106, f. 53v):

> Excerpta ex libello Cassiodori Senatoris monachi servi dei ex patricio, ex consule ordinario quaestore et magistro officiorum quem scripsit ad Rufium Petronium Nicomachum ex consule ordinario patricium et magistrum officiorum. (ed. Gallonnier 1997, p. 78)

---

[63] Ratkowitsch 1992: 176.
[64] Ed. Turcan-Verkerk 2003: 198, no. 85.
[65] G. Fabricius, *Poetarum veterum ecclesiasticorum opera* (Basel: Oporinus 1564), col. 753, *comm.* p. 117.
[66] See Sallman 1997: 390.

A longer paratext like the *anecdoton* may well have included something about Justinian which would have led to both Leland's deduction and Guido's title. Since the Thorney entry bears all the marks of Leland's own composition, all we can safely conclude is that the manuscript contained some mention of Justinian, be it consular dating of the year 521, Justinian's first consulate, in a subscription (which often included consular dating) or a mention of the emperor under whom he obtained preferment. From Guido, we can surmise that it also included some other title as well, *consul*, *exconsul*, or something else which could have given rise to it.

Unfortunately, Martius Valerius cannot be securely identified with any known fifth- or sixth-century figure. The first potential piece of evidence comes from Sidonius, who mentions an otherwise unknown poet Martius (*carm.* 9.306): 'et nulli modo Martium secundum.'[67] But that poem was probably written no later than 470, which makes it difficult to identify Sidonius' Martius with someone who flourished in the time of Justinian.

One might hope that the titles Martius received would assist us, and indeed in the year 521 there is an ordinary Western consul named Valerius, and his colleague in office is none other than Justinian. But that Valerius' full name might be Iobius Philippus Ymelcho Valerius, although the identification is not entirely certain.[68] It is certainly not impossible that this Valerius had been a *quaestor sacri palatii* sometime earlier. Prosopography gives us all sorts of combinations of quaestorships and consulates. (It bears reminding that both these offices could be held in either East or West.) Cassiodorus was first *quaestor sacri palatii* and then ordinary consul,[69] while one Proculus was first *quaestor sacri palatii* and then an honorary consul.[70] But it can go the other way: Anicius Probus Faustus was ordinary consul in 490 and then made quaestor in 503.[71] But one should be cautious: Priscian's *Institutiones* is addressed to a certain 'Iulianus consul ac patricius'. This Julian, despite his eminence, is entirely unknown.[72] He was evidently not an ordinary consul — not listed in the *Fasti* — but an honorary one. In point of fact, the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, as useful as it is, gives a slightly deceptive illusion of solidity and authority. Had the editors known about the Leland note, they would probably have included the *exquaestor* Marcus, and then of course, we would have an entry in which to slot our poet. The fact is that many individuals in the early sixth century are attested by a single piece of evidence; if anything, our Martius is unusual in that he is attested with two. If the consul of 521 is not Martius Valerius — he probably was not — then his putative consulship was almost certainly honorary, since our consular lists tend to be reliable. Further, if Martius was *quaestor sacri palatii*, he was much more likely to have been in office under Anastasius (491–518) or perhaps even earlier, when our information is much more fragmentary than for the reigns of Justin and Justinian.[73]

But there is another solution to this problem: the title *consuli*, in its bizarre ungrammatical form, may actually be due to confusion on Guido's part. Medieval and

---

[67] As noted in Anderson 1936: 194, ad loc., this Martius is not to be identified with Martius Myro.

[68] As identified by Orlandi 2004: no. 173. The identification, however, requires conjectural restoration.

[69] *PLRE* II Cassiodorus 4.

[70] *PLRE* II Proculus 5.

[71] *PLRE* II Faustus 9.

[72] *PLRE* II Julianus 26. If one were very keen on preserving Guido's testimonium, one could suggest that the dative *consuli* belonged not to the author but the dedicatee. But that seems hard to reconcile with the evidence of the prologue and third eclogue, which seems to imply two dedicatees and not one.

[73] In one manuscript of Priscian (Florence, BML plut. 47.28), the subscription of Theodorus names the *quaestor* for whom he was an assistant as Marcius: 'Flavius Lucilius Theodorus disertissimus vir memorialis sacri scrinii epistolarum et adiutor viri Marci quaestoris sacri palatii scripsi manu mea …' (f. 1r). But that name is not attested in the other Priscian manuscripts, which just have *v. m.* (*vir magnificus*, a normal honorific for quaestors) and the Florence manuscript is suspect, because it elsewhere erroneously expands abbreviations. See Jahn 1851: 356.

Renaissance scribes and scholars were generally baffled by late antique nomenclature and titulature — witness the *exinlustris* of Hartung's Helpidius. They found obscure even the most common honorific of all *VC*, for *vir clarissimus*, and often expanded it to *vir consularis*.[74] One early medieval scribe, copying some excerpts of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* known as the *Disputatio Chori et Praetextati* in Padua, Antonin. 27, f. 66r, even expanded the abbreviation in the author's name to *Vncies* [i.e. quinquies] *consulis*, or 'five-time consul'.[75] So the *Marcus Valerius consuli*[!] may well have been meant by Guido as *consularis* and not *consul*. His source would have read *Marti Valeri VC*, or perhaps, like the Helpidius inscription above, *Marti Valeri VC exquaestoris*. If our Martius was not actually a consul, honorary or otherwise, it would be much less surprising that we do not find him attested elsewhere. Regardless of whether one accepts this reconstruction, the point remains that Guido's title points unmistakably toward late Roman titulature, and would make no sense for a twelfth-century poet.

   We then have one possibility remaining. Orlandi edited for the first time a late fifth- or early sixth-century inscription from the Colosseum, of which all that could be read was [...] *et Martius* [...].[76] She points out that the only person named *Martius* we have among the Roman élite of the period is Sidonius' poet. An *exquaestor* is the sort of person who we might expect to have a seat at the amphitheatre, and the relative rarity of the name makes the identification attractive. An intertext we have not yet discussed may well bind our poems very closely to this milieu. In celebration of his first consulship in 521, the future emperor Justinian distributed diptychs inscribed with a couplet:[77]

> Munera parva quidem pretio sed honoribus alma
>   Patribus ista meis offero consul ego.

Compare the opening of Martius' prologue (*buc. prol.* 1–2):

> **Parva quidem** arbitrio **committo** carmina magno:
>   Spes venit **ista mihi** de pietate **patrum**.

Neither the words nor the sentiment are particularly uncommon, but the conjunction of so many lexical points is unlikely to be coincidence. We do know that these diptychs were widely distributed (we still have three surviving), so Martius may well have been nodding to some lines well known in senatorial circles. But it is possible that Justinian (or whoever wrote the couplet) was reworking a bit of popular poetry. The fact that Justinian's colleague was a Valerius is interesting, although hardly indicative of anything in particular. At the very least, the language of the dedication in Martius is redolent of the language of senatorial dedications in the sixth century.

   If the political context of Martius is unable to be reconstructed with precision, the literary milieu is slightly clearer. Boethius' *carmen bucolicum* has already been mentioned; as I noted above, it very likely drew on the works of Theocritus. We cannot tell whether it was a single bucolic poem, like Endelechius' *De mortibus boum*, which is called simply a *carmen* in the manuscript, or a bucolic series divided into individual *eclogae*, as the Servian *vita* refers to Virgil's *Eclogues*, and as Petrarch and Boccaccio

---

[74] Numerous examples in Renaissance manuscripts of Festus, such as Paris lat. 5791 (written 1468), f. 94r and Ottob. lat. 1795, f. 4r: 'Ruffi festi viri consularis', and of Firmicus, such as London, Harley 2766 f. 45r, 'Iulii Materni Firmici viri consularis', for example.
[75] This is what the manuscript contains, and *quincies* is a plausible spelling of *quinquies*, the medieval variant form of *quinquiens*; the correction to *vicies* suggested by L. Holford-Strevens and printed by Kaster 2010: 105 is unnecessary.
[76] Orlandi 2004: cat. 17.79 D and no. 108, 495.
[77] An image can be seen in Eastmond 2010: 752; cf. Cameron 2016: 127. High resolution images at *Wikimedia Commons* (https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/0/07/Ivory_diptych_Justinian_Met_17.190.52-53.jpg)

would later compose.[78] But we have another 'Christian Virgil' of the sixth century: Severus Episcopus, to whom the Lorsch catalogue attributes twelve books of verse on the Gospels, ten eclogues and four books of georgics (*Metrum Severi episcopi in evangelia, libri XII, eiusdem eglogas X, eiusdem Georgicon, libri IIII*).[79] The twelve books of epic, ten eclogues, and four books of georgics proved too much for earlier scholars such as Becker and Manitius to handle: they assumed that there must have been some confusion with Virgil, since after all the works of Severus did not survive. But then in 1967 the astounding Bischoff managed to conjure up some unnumbered parchment sheets from Trier with several hundred lines of hexameter verses on the Gospels, including an explicit for book nine of Severus Episcopus, and an incipit for book ten.[80] Since this Severus did indeed, it seems, write a twelve-book epic, it seems eminently plausible that he had completed an entire *rota Virgiliana*. Martius offers some unexpected support for this, since even though we only have four of his eclogues, each of them follows a specific Virgilian model so closely that a collection imitating all ten is easy to imagine. (Such a collection in fact exists in the much later and very different *Quirinalia* of Metellus of Tegernsee.) Further, Martius hints in his prologue about continuing his poetic career unto loftier genres (*prol.* 1–10):

> Parva quidem arbitrio committo carmina magno:
>   Spes venit ista mihi de pietate patrum.
> Audet ut humanas infringere pica loquelas,
>   Agrestes temptat sic mea musa sonos.
> Vos, precor, exiguis veniam concedite rebus,
>   Nam quae magna placent, parva fuere prius.
> Tityrus a molli surrexit in ardua clivo,
>   Cuius grandisonas vicit avena tubas.
> Nos tenui labor est stipulas implere susurro
>   Et vix est humili colle tenere gradum.

I entrust songs indeed small to a great judgement, but hope comes to me from the *pietas* of the *patres*. As the magpie dares to usurp human speech, so does my muse attempt rustic strains. I beseech you, grant your pardon to insignificant things, for things which are great were small beforehand. Tityrus arose unto the heights from a gentle slope: his oat-reed pipe outdid the brash-sounding trumpets. For me, it is a task to fill even a grass reed with a gentle breath, and I am scarcely able to hold my footing even on a low-rising hill.

Whether or not Martius himself ever mounted a loftier hill, and composed poetry in other genres, it is certainly possible that a contemporary of his like Severus well may have. Hence, the total bucolic production of the sixth century which we can be fairly certain existed amounts to at least fifteen poems (possibly a deal more) by three different authors, as rich an output as any century saw from the time of Virgil on.

<div align="center">VII SPECIFIC PROBLEMS</div>

The foregoing has been sufficient, I hope, to demonstrate that Martius Valerius was writing no later than the sixth century, and we have no reason whatsoever to doubt the external testimonia. Some scholars, nonetheless, have identified particular features which, they argue, prove that the poems must have a medieval origin.

---

[78] cf. *Vita Virgilii*, vol. 1 p. 2 Thilo/Hagen. For Petrarch, see Bachmann and François 2001 and for Boccacio, see Branca 1964–1998: 5.2.689–1085.
[79] Ed. Häse 2002: 165. I take the characterization of Severus from Stella 1993: 7.
[80] Bischoff *et al.* 1994. The manuscript is available online at *Bibliotheca Laureshamensis – digital* (http://bibliotheca-laureshamensis-digital.de/view/stb-sta-tr_fragmIIIsev).

At the end of the first bucolic, Ladon urges lovelorn Cydnus to accompany him home:

> Et iam sol rapidus totis incanduit agris:
> Cernis ut arboreum crescens subducat apricum
> Phoebus et extensas ramorum traxerit umbras. (*buc.* 1.92–4)[81]

No one is quite sure what these lines mean, that is whether they describe noon or late afternoon, and textual corruption is likely. Nonetheless, there is no justification for assuming that *apricum* conceals a French *abri*. *Apricus* meaning 'cover' is already attested in Late Antiquity, and that is not even the only possible interpretation of these lines.[82]

Zicari has argued that an anecdote in 3.10–11, in which Moeris notes that Mopsus has suffered the punishment due a thief, demonstrates that the poems must be medieval:

> Quid non auderes, nisi te pro fure ligasset
> Thyrsis et eraso signasset vertice crimen

> What would you not dare to do, if Thyrsis hadn't tied you up as a thief, and branded you with your crime after shaving your head?

The analogue of this passage is in Calpurnius, *ecl.* 3.73–4:

> Ut mala nocturni religavit brachia Mopsi
> Tityrus et furem medio suspendit ovili.

> as Tityrus once bound the knavish arms of your night-prowler Mopsus, and strung the thief up inside his sheepfold. (trans. Duff and Duff)

But the punishment of Martius' Mopsus goes beyond that of Calpurnius'. He is not only tied up, but shaved and branded as well. Zicari notes that there seems to be some precedent for judicial shaving in the Middle Ages, and concludes that this is a definitely medieval element.[83] The examples he brings forth (from Du Cange) are not convincing: they relate primarily to the punishment of slaves, which clearly does not fit the context here.

In fact, this punishment does not correspond precisely to known ancient or medieval punishments for theft. It is, however, the punishment decreed in the Lombard kingdom by King Liutprand in 726 (no. 80) for recidivist thieves:

> Et si postea iterum ipse in furto tentus fuerit, decalvit eum … et ponat ei signum in fronte et faciae.[84]

> And if afterwards he is held for theft again, he is shaved … and let a mark be put on his forehead and face.

Where this part of Liutprand's law came from is unknown, but Julia Hillner has argued that the language of rehabilitation embedded in the longer passage harks to a late Roman context.[85] This anecdote makes sense in a post-classical, pre-Carolingian context, but very little either before or after. It cannot be considered a specifically medieval feature.

Another passage which has been seen as definitively medieval is the prologue, where Martius presents four elegiac couplets all consisting of lines of two or three words. Janet

---

[81] Skutsch 1964: 33; Ratkowitsch 1992: 173.
[82] See Geyer 1885: 265; and *TLL* II 318.2–78 (Klotz) s.v. 'apricus'. Cf. Sidon., *carm.* 5.525.
[83] Zicari 1957: 259.
[84] *MGH* LL 4.140–1.
[85] Hillner 2015: 142–3.

Martin has argued that this kind of mannerism is characteristically medieval, in contrast to the classicism of the poems that follow.[86]

> Fortunatorum diffamavere trophaea
>   in delimatis plurima carminibus,
> commemoraverunt praetermittenda frequenter,
>   praetermiserunt commemorabilia,
> decantaverunt inconsummabiliora
>   formidandorum proelia caelicolum.
> Excusabuntur natura pauperiores:
>   dormitaverunt irreprehensibiles. (*buc. prol.* 13–20)

> For they proclaimed many of the trophies of those whom fortune favoured in polished song. They often recounted what should be passed over, and passed over what should be remembered. They sung the endless battles of the fearful gods. Those poorer in nature will be pardoned, for the blameless have gone to sleep.

There is nothing like this extended passage in Latin literature, ancient or medieval. There are occasional isolated hexameter lines of three words, e.g. Lucretius 3.907: 'insatiabiliter deflevimus aeternumque', Horace, *sat.* 1.2.1: 'ambubaiarum collegia pharmacopolae', and Ovid, *fast.* 2.43: 'Amphiareiades Naupactoo Acheloo'. The device is also found in Late Antiquity (e.g. Claudian, *de iv. cons. Hon.* 8.560), and was a particular favourite of Sidonius (e.g. 2.104 and 2.507). Sidonius also indulges in polysyllabism in prose, such as when he closes *ep.* 1.1 with 'volumina numerosiora percopiosis scaturrientia sermocinationibus multiplicabuntur'. Rutilius Namatianus offers a striking example of a two-word pentameter line in an elegiac couplet (1.450): 'Bellerophonteis sollicitudinibus'. In the Middle Ages, such lines are occasionally found as curiosities (later sometimes called *versus macrocoli*[87]); Peter of Isosella in the mid-thirteenth century mentions verses of this sort in his popular *Compendium grammatice*:

> Versus sequentes sunt ex duabus dictionibus:
> Vociferabantur Constantinopolitani
> innumerabilibus sollicitudinibus.[88]

> The following verses consist of two words: The people of Constantinople cried out amid countless worries.

A similar couplet is found in the proverbs of Serlo of Wilton Paris lat. 6765, f. 54v (thirteenth century):

> commemoraverunt incommemorabiliora
> praetermiserunt commemorabilia[89]

> They mentioned things quite unremarkable; they passed over things worth mentioning.

Serlo composed his proverbs freely pillaging other texts. The line that follows in the Paris manuscript, for example, 'saepius obliti quidam dixere tacenda', is taken from Vital of Blois's *Aulularia* 441. Serlo's lines are too close to Martius, *pr.* 15–16 to be independent; *contra* Munari, however, the presumption should certainly be that they are

---

[86] See Martin 1982: 556–7 and Witt 2003: 38–9. Witt changed his position within the next decade on the strength of Dolbeau's argument (2012: 318–19).
[87] In, for example, the *Encyclopedia* of J. H. Alsted X.IV.V.33 (I used ed. Lyon 1649, p. 555).
[88] Edited under the pseudonym Caesar by Fierville 1886: 6. F. Novati first discovered the correct attribution (unknown to Lehmann); see Hunt 1980: 148.
[89] Ed. J. Örberg (Stockholm, 1965): 170.

extracted from Martius (with 'improvements') and not vice versa, considering they represent a remnant of a longer passage of such verses. After all, Martius' couplet occurs in a longer passage in which it makes sense; Serlo's stand-alone version is literally senseless: who are they, what did they say, and what did they neglect to mention? It is almost unthinkable that Martius found this odd couplet in a florilegium and built a coherent passage around it.

We also get a fair number of such verses in the *De trinitate* of Bernard of Cluny (e.g. 616: 'Inconprehensibilis inconmutabilitatis'), but that could as well result from the polysyllabic tendencies of Trinitarian theology (in prose compare Aelred, *serm.* 127, p. 266 Raciti, on the Holy Ghost: 'incircumscriptus incomprehensibilis' and Bonaventure, *itinerarium* 2.9: 'lux veritatis in qua cuncta relucent infallibiliter indelebiliter indubitanter irrefragabiliter indiiudicabiliter incommutabiliter incoarctabiliter interminabiliter indivisibiliter et intellectualiter').

In Greek, three-word hexameter lines are attested early, in both Hesiod (*op.* 383: πληιάδων Ἀτλαγενέων ἐπιτελλομενάων) and Homer (*il.* 11.427: αὐτοκασίγνητον εὐηφενέος Σώκοιο). The feature was pointed out in the old scholia to the line in Homer (p. 206 Erbse): ἐκ τριῶν μερῶν τοῦ λόγου ὅλος ὁ στίχος.[90] If anything, Latin scholiasts were less interested in the phenomenon; the ancient scholia on Horace, for example, make no comment about the feature in *sat.* 1.2.1. In fact, the Greek tradition supplies the only real analogue to this passage, an old Greek epigram about the Sophists quoted by Hegesander of Delphi, according to Athenaeus (*deipn.* 4.53 162ab)

> ὀφρυανασπασίδαι, ῥινεγκαταπηξιγένειοι,
>   σακκογενειοτρόφοι καὶ λοπαδαρπαγίδαι,
> εἱματανωπερίβαλλοι, ἀνηλιποκαιβλεπέλαιοι,
>   νυκτιλαθραιοφάγοι, νυκταπαταμπλάκιοι,
> μειρακιεξαπάται <καὶ> συλλαβοπευσιλαληταί,
>   δοξοματαιόσοφοι, ζηταρετησιάδαι.

> Sons-of-eyebrow-raisers, noses-stuck-into-beards, coarse-beard-growers and sons-of-casserole-dish-snatchers, garments-about-their-face-wrappers, barefoot-and-with-a-lamp-oil-look, nighttime-secret-eaters, nighttime-sidestreet-trodders, boy-deceivers and syllable-question-chatterers, foolish-belief-philosophers, sons-of-virtue-seekers. (trans. S. D. Olson, Cambridge, Mass. 2006, II.277)

Hence, the polysyllabic exuberance of the preface does not answer the question of how to date the poems, nor does the intertext with Serlo provide a *terminus post quem* but rather a *terminus ante quem*. They could be ancient or medieval; they could be relying solely on native Latin traditions, or they could be imitating Greek mannerism. It is quite possible that the real inspiration was Persius. As I argue above, Persius' choliambs are one of the inspirations of Martius' elegiac prologue, and one line of the prologue does indeed consist of only three words (4): 'Heliconidasque pallidamque Pirenen'.

Finally, there has been a deal of discussion regarding a vexed passage in the first bucolic which seems to refer to a real place and which has been regarded (on no particular grounds) as giving some information about Martius' identity (*buc.* 1.50–4)

> Scis, reor, hunc collem, Lauros ubi dicimus Altas,
> unde forum et celsas securi cernimus arces,
> lactea cum turbae portamus dona molestae:
> hoc domus in colle est nostra, puto, non minor urbe …

[90] See Nünlist 2009: 221–3.

You know, I believe, this hill, which we call lofty Daphne, from where I can securely view the forum and the citadel as I bring deliveries of milk to the troublesome crowd. On this hill is my home, and, in my opinion, it is not inferior to the city.

No consensus has been reached about the meaning of these lines: some have suggested Lucerne in Switzerland, Laurana in Istria (*Lovran* in Croatian), Loreto in the Marche, the abbey of Lorsch (*Lauriacum*), and Laurensberg, a town outside of Aachen.[91] It was even suggested that the referent was Rome itself.[92] Everyone has been looking in the wrong part of the world. Cydnus is the speaker of these lines, which suggests in finding his home we might want to begin with Asia Minor. What he tells us in particular is that it is near to a city, and that from it (that is from *Lauri altae*) he can see a forum and a citadel. The obvious answer is Daphne, on a hill, near a large city, Antioch, with a prominent forum and an arx, and which happens to be called Laurel, or Daphne.

Martius intended the reader to see the Greek name behind the Latin rendering. These lines are addressed to a shepherd named Ladon, named after the river who in some accounts was the nymph Daphne's father.[93] Hence there is particular force that the line 'Scis, reor, hunc collem, Lauros ubi dicimus altas', '*You* know, I believe, this hill which we call lofty Daphne', is addressed to Ladon. Ladon, of all people, would be the one familiar with it.

There are other possible reasons for transferring Arcadia to Daphne. First, the name: the programmatic allusion in pastoral is to the Daphnis who invented bucolic song. One explanation of his name connects it with laurel, a confusion encouraged by *ecl.* 8.83: 'Daphnis me malus urit, ego hanc in Daphnide laurum'. Servius notes that Virgil perhaps chose laurel 'propter nominis similitudinem' (*ad loc.* 106 Thilo/Hagen). In Philargyrius, the confusion between Daphnis and Daphne, the nymph beloved of Apollo who was turned into a laurel, is almost complete.[94] Martius implies this same identification by referencing the story of Apollo and Daphne in the final poem (*buc.* 4.83–90), neatly closing the circuit.

Second, the region. Virgil introduced the character Mopsus into bucolic, for reasons that no one has quite been able to grasp.[95] He is also a star of Martius' collection, as one of the singers of the third bucolic. Before Virgil, Mopsus was the name of two different seers, one of whom was regarded as the founder of a number of cities in Cilicia, foremost Mopsuestia (Pliny the Elder calls the city simply Mopsos, *nat.* 5.22.91), just ten miles from modern Adana. By the sixth century, we can see the simple identification of Virgil's character with the seer.[96] If Mopsus the shepherd and Mopsus the seer are the same, there is no reason why bucolic should not be set in Cilicia and bordering Syria. The possible connection between the family of Auxentius and this region also makes the possibility attractive.

Third, the place itself. It was well known as a natural paradise; Ammianus speaks of it as 'amoenum illud et ambitiosum Antiochiae suburbanum' (19.12.19), and the author of the *Historia Augusta* speaks of its *delicia* (*Marcus Aurelius* 8.12). There was a shrine to Apollo

[91] See Munari 1970: xlix; Guarducci 1970; Orlandi 1971: 223; Salemme 1979: 335; and Ratkowitsch 1992: 174.
[92] Verdière 1972.
[93] See, for example, Servius *ad ecl.* 3.63 (p. 38 Thilo/Hagen).
[94] Philargyrius, *ad ecl.* 3.12 excerpta contaminata, rec. I (III.51 Thilo/Hagen): 'Daphnis idest Amyclaei filia ab Apolline adamata, cum fugeret vim amatoris, in laurum arborem versa est. Alii dicunt Daphnin unam de Nymphis ab Apolline vitiatam et proprio pudore, ne apud sorores esset infamis, ab Iove petisse, ut in laurum verteretur. Ex ea arbore Apollinem Deum amoris gratiam sibi parasse. Aut Daphnin idest Neptuni filium dicunt; and ibid. rec. II: Daphnis idest filia Amyclaei ab Apolline adamata, quae, cum fugeret vim amatoris, in arborem idest laurum versa est. Alii Daphnin Neptuni filium.'
[95] See Jones 2011: 97–8.
[96] Philargyrius, *ad ecl.* 8.26 excerpta contaminata, rec. I and II (III.149 Thilo/Hagen): 'Mopsus fuit antiquus vates.'

there, and an oracle. In the fourth century, evidently, there was some belief that the Castalian spring was located in Daphne.[97] Indeed, one late version of the story of Apollo and Daphne transferred the setting of the event itself to Daphne.[98]

Finally, there may be some connection between the place and Martius' patron Auxentius. Martius' collection is not the only place where the river Cydnus and someone named Auxentius are both mentioned. In Adana, next to Tarsus through which the Cydnus flows, there is preserved probably from the fourth century a stone with a poem of twelve lines in elegiac, addressed to an Auxentius, describing a building project (either a bridge or an aqueduct), and mentioning the Cydnus.[99] Whatever the epigram is referring to, we do know that an Auxentius was a local notable of Tarsus, which makes any connection with the Cydnus more than incidental.[100] It is more than strange that the only two places a personage named Auxentius is mentioned along with the river Cydnus are in a Greek poem of eight elegiac couplets found inscribed on a stone being used as an altar at a church in Adana and in a collection of Latin bucolics transmitted in a manuscript written around 1200 in France. Such are the byways of the transmission of the legacy of the late antique world.

In short, there are many possible reasons why the first bucolic refers to *Lauri altae*. Earlier scholarship was perhaps wrong to assume that it would tell us something about the identity of the poet, as if Martius were identifying his own home. Instead, *Lauri altae* is a definite place in the bucolics' literary world, and one that we must presume his audience would have been able to identify.

Hence none of the individual features of the collection which have been identified as definitive evidence of medieval composition withstand close scrutiny, and present no bar to following the internal and external evidence in assigning their date of composition to the sixth century.

---

[97] Rufinus, *Hist. eccl.* 10.36: 'nam cum in Dafnis suburbano Antiochiae iuxta fontem Castalium litaret Apollini et nulla ex his, quae quaerebat, responsa susciperet causas que silentii percontaretur a sacerdotibus daemonis, aiunt: "Babylae martyris sepulchrum propter adsistere et ideo responsa non reddi".'
[98] Philostratus, *Vita Apollonii*, 1.16. Cf. Larson 2001: 211. One might object that if Martius had meant Daphne by Antioch he would have named the character Orontes, for the river flowing through Antioch, and not Cydnus. But in general, Martius has an overwhelming preference for two-syllable names (the only speaking character apart from Apollo without a two-syllable name is Lycurgus, and he is addressed only once in the text of the poems). Besides Orontes would not have allowed Martius to begin his first bucolic with the programmatic vocative address, since its first syllable is short, whereas using Cydnus allows him to closely imitate the 'Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi' of the first eclogue, with 'Cydne, sub algenti recubas dum molliter umbra'. Cydnus is the next closest river to Antioch whose name meets Martius' specifications.
[99] Kaibel 1078. See Merkelbach and Stauber 2002: 19/14, 214–15:

> Ὄντως σῆς ἀρετῆς, Αὐξέντιε, καὶ τόδε θαῦμα,
>   δείμασθαι ποταμοῦ χειμερίοισι δρόμοις
> ἄρρηκτον κρηπῖδα σιδηροδέτοισι θεμείλοις,
>   ὧν ὕπερ εὐρείην ἐξετάνυσσας ὁδόν,
> ἣν πολλοὶ καὶ πρόσθεν ἀπειρίῃσι νόοιο
>   Κυδναίων ῥείθρων τεῦξαν ἀφαυροτέρην.
> Σοὶ δ' ὑπὲρ ἁψίδων αἰώνιος ἐρρίζωται,
>   καὶ ποταμὸς πλήθων πρηΰτερος τελέθει.
> Αὐτὸς τήνδε γέφυραν ἀνασχόμενος τελέσασθαι
>   ἡγεμόνος πειθοῖ τοῦ διασημοτάτου,
> ὄφρα σε καὶ μετόπισθεν ἔχοι κλέος ἶσον ἐκείνοις,
>   οἳ Νείλου προχοὰς ζεῦξαν ἀπειρεσίους.

[100] Libanius, *epist.* 1392 Foerster; *PLRE* I Auxentius 5; cf. Bradbury 2004: 134–5.

VIII THE TRANSMISSION OF THE BUCOLICS

The history of the transmission of Martius must begin in the sixth century. The first sure glimpse we get is in Venantius Fortunatus, who seems to have known the poems: 'aut hyacintheo sudat honore manus'.[101] The word *hyacintheus* is significant, listed in the *TLL* as only occurring here and in one other passage of Venantius. In both cases it refers to stones and not flowers. But it occurs in Martius as we have seen above (*buc.* 4.75–6):

> Tunc iacintheis instaurat floribus annum
> Purpureoque novat nitidam sub honore iuventam.

The shared use of an otherwise unknown word links Martius and Venantius very closely; that both of them also use *honore* in what are otherwise two very different passages confirms it. But the primary sense of all *hyacinth-* root words is the flower, not the stone. This suggests what our chronology requires anyway — that Venantius, who died around the beginning of the seventh century, is the imitator.[102]

To pursue the history of Martius' text further we need next to consider the lost manuscript(s). The Abbey of Thorney must have had a library with unusual holdings. Of the five manuscripts Leland mentions, two contain astounding rarities: our Martius and *Isagoge Porphirii Victorino interprete*. The latter work does not survive anywhere independently, although Boethius made extensive use of it in his translation and commentary on Porphyry. Caution is in order, however: the fact that Victorinus had translated the text was widely known from Isidore (*etym.* 2.25.9), and some manuscripts of the first edition of Boethius' commentary specify Victorinus' name (such as *in Isagogen Porphirii … a Mario Victorino translatum*).[103] Surer are two Carolingian gems from Thorney in Edinburgh, NLS, Adv. 18.6.12 (A.6.4), the third book of Abbo's *Bella Parisiaca* (ff. 36r–v) and an anonymous epic *Gesta Ludovici imperatoris* (ff. 32r–33r), preserved nowhere else.[104] Abbo's third book did achieve a modest circulation mostly in England, but the first two books are exceptionally rare, surviving to this day in a single manuscript, which may well never have left the city of Paris in its twelve centuries. The Thorney manuscript is uniquely linked to the Paris manuscript by the preface which calls it the third book.[105] Around 980, Aethelwold donated a library to Peterborough Abbey, not eight miles from where Thorney would be founded, containing a *Descidia Parisiacae polis*.[106] How much of Abbo's text it contained is unknown, but the fact that he calls it *polis* and not *urbis*, strongly suggests that he had seen the introductory letter or the explicit of the second book, which both use the phrase *Parisiacae polis*.

Interestingly, we can also connect Guido of Grana to England. One manuscript he corrected and annotated with his own hand is now in Edinburgh.[107] He wrote:

> ego magister Guido dictus de Grana correxi diligenter istos duos libros, scilicet perspectivam
> Alhacen et librum de ascensionibus nubium, iuxta exemplar Iohannis Lundoniensis quod

---

[101] Venantius, *carm.* 8.3.270.

[102] I omit here for sake of brevity other possible medieval and Renaissance readers of the poems, an area I intend to pursue in detail elsewhere; in the meantime, see Ratkowitsch 2003.

[103] See S. Brandt, ed. *CSEL* 48 (Vienna, 1906), p. 3.

[104] See Vernet 1948: 40–2. For the manuscript of Abbo, see Adams and Rigg 2004: 3. For an even fuller description of this manuscript, see Baldzuhn 2009: 2.511–13.

[105] The other two manuscripts which have the *Comperias, lector* preface Cambridge, CCC 324 and BL Royal 3 A VI do not have *tertii*. Cf. Lendinari 2010.

[106] See Lapidge 1985: 51.

[107] Smith 2001: 1.clv (Edinburgh, Crawford Library, MS 3.3, f.189r).

ipsemet diligenter correxit ut dicitur. Completa fuit correxio horum librorum anno domini m.
cc.lx. nono. quinto ydus Maii, scilicet in vigilia Penthecostes.

I, Master Guido de Grana, carefully corrected these two books, namely the *Perspectiva* of
Alhacen and the *Liber de ascensionibus nubium*, with the copy of John of London, which,
as it is said, he himself diligently corrected. The correction of these books was completed in
the year of Our Lord 1269, 11 May, that is on the Vigil of Pentecost.

Debate continues about John of London;[108] absent definitive evidence to the contrary,
however, there is no reason not to put him in England. Further, one of our only
external testimonia to Guido's writings are two books in the library of Syon Abbey not
far from London two centuries later.[109] In fact, many of the rare texts Guido knows we
know had been in England — Petronius, Calpurnius and Propertius. In 1423, Poggio
wrote to Niccoli, 'Please send me the bucolic of Calpurnius and the section of Petronius,
which I sent to you from England' (ep. 2.3: 'Mittas ad me oro Bucolicam Calpurnii et
particulam Petronii quas misi tibi ex Brittania', vol. 1. p. 91 Tonelli). Reeve has
suggested that Poggio's manuscript is the source of one branch of the tradition of
Calpurnius, which does not distinguish between the seven eclogues of Calpurnius and
the four of Nemesianus.[110] Guido likewise makes no distinction.[111] Propertius is first
mentioned in the medieval period by the author of the *De septem septenis* who may
have been active around Peterborough in the 1160s. In the same way, Ernesto Stagni
has shown that Guido had seen the first two books of Abbo's *Bella*.[112] Is this because
he saw the Paris manuscript, or because he had seen one in England? The clincher is the
text: Guido's text of Martius is (from the slim evidence we have) not derived from the
Gotha manuscript (G). In the space of the three lines he cites, Guido gives three correct
readings not found in G. More importantly, G does not give Martius any title, whereas
both Guido and the Thorney manuscript do give him late Roman titulature. Both also
give him the incorrect name Marcus, where G gives us the correct Martius. This
strongly suggests that they are both a witness to a tradition of the text that transmitted
the author's name with a string of titles, which wrote out the genitive *Marti* (leading to
Leland's *Marci* and Guido's *Marcus*) instead of *Martii*.

   The outline of Martius' poems grows very clear, descending in two branches, one
represented by the Gotha manuscript, the other by Guido and the Thorney manuscript.
The second cannot be derived from the first, although there is no particular reason why
the Gotha manuscript could not have been a copy of the other.

   The Gotha manuscript's origins are unknown: the first place it is mentioned is in
Amplonius Ratink's library catalogue of 1410–12, listed as *liber 5 bucolicorum Marcii
Valerii Maximi*. (The final word was probably added as a conjecture or a mental lapse,
through confusion with the more famous M. Valerius, the Tiberian paradoxographer.)
There is no doubt that this refers to the same manuscript, and that it had made its way
to Erfurt. A century later, someone went through and annotated the manuscript; around
the same time it was copied, producing manuscript E, now in Erlangen.

   In his 1791 catalogue of Altdorf's manuscripts, Christoph von Murr lists E among the
books of the *bibliotheca vetus academica*, and so presumably including the books held
before the academy became a university in 1622. Von Murr calls the text a *Liber
spurius*: understandably he considered an unknown Latin literary work by an author
with a classicizing name in a fifteenth-century manuscript (so he dates it) to be yet

---

[108] See Knorr 1990.
[109] Könsgen 1990: 1.58.
[110] Reeve 1978: 227.
[111] Reeve 1978: 231.
[112] Stagni 2006: 259.

another specimen of the unimaginably vast roster of neo-Latin literature. Around the same time, the Benedictine monk Jean-Baptiste Maugérard had acquired Amplonius' manuscript from Erfurt, and evidently read it, since his hand can still be seen in the volume.[113] In 1795, he sold it to Duke Ernest II of Gotha-Altenburg.

Forty years later, in 1838, as Friedrich Jacobs was cataloguing the Gotha manuscripts, he could not have recourse to the same theory, since the Gotha manuscript was plainly medieval.[114] Jacobs does not attempt a specific dating, nor does he evaluate the poems beyond suggesting that the dedication to *patres* indicates that the poet was young. Nonetheless, the fact that he catalogued it in the category of *Lateinischer Dichter und Redner des Mittelalters* is argument enough. Likewise, in 1904, Traube and Ehwald in their study of the Maugérard manuscripts had nothing new to say on the possible origin of the text.[115] The trail had gone cold enough by the second decade of the twentieth century that even Sabbadini could be baffled by the entry in Amplonius' catalogue, and assume it referred to a lost manuscript.[116]

What this survey of the pre-Lehmann evidence for Martius reception shows is that at precisely the period in which the canon of minor Latin literature was being crystallized — the first volume of Riese's *Anthologia latina sive Poesis latinae supplementum* was published in 1869 — Martius Valerius remained virtually unknown. The *Einsiedeln Eclogues* were discovered in an era that still believed there was more ancient literature to be found in manuscripts — indeed, Cardinal Mai was dead not fifteen years before Hagen produced the *editio princeps*. Hence there was astonishingly little scepticism attending their swift canonization as Neronian. But Martius' bucolics were born into a very different world, one which set the bar very high indeed for any work to be assigned to antiquity. In other words, there seems to have been a presumption in the nineteenth century and before, that if a work could be either early or late, it was probably early, while today we operate under the Winterbottom rule, that is, if a text could be either early or late, it is probably late.[117] As a scholarly instinct, this is undoubtedly correct. And yet as it turns out, in the case of Martius Valerius, further digging should have been undertaken.

IX A DEBATE CLOSED

Dolbeau was right to characterize the question of the dating of Martius Valerius as 'un débat prématurément clos'.[118] Let us return at last to the facts as they stood five years before Dolbeau's article. Four pieces of evidence — all of them available in print at the time, and three of them in print from the date of the first edition — point to a single possible solution. The name Martius Valerius is a Roman and not a medieval name. The only 'real' people mentioned in the eclogues are Auxentius and Faustus, and they can only be late antique Romans. The only external testimonia for the poems assign Martius offices of the late Roman state, and put his floruit under Justinian. To try to dismantle each piece of evidence separately — to claim that Martius Valerius is a pseudonym, that Auxentius is a pun, and that the two testimonia mean something other than what they plainly state — is nothing other than special pleading. The additional evidence adduced here, that Martius Valerius knows Theocritus, is writing for an

---

[113] Traube and Ehwald 1904: 364.
[114] Jacobs 1838: 28–31.
[115] Traube and Ehwald 1904: 364–5.
[116] Sabbadini 1914: 12, and cf. 257.
[117] I thank Danuta Shanzer for this bit of lore.
[118] Dolbeau so characterized his contribution in 1987.

audience at least conversant in Greek as well as Latin, and that he knew ancient material which was transmitted through the slenderest of lines from the Carolingian period, merely corroborates what Dolbeau already argued in 1987. His question should now be considered ready for timely closure: the bucolics of Martius Valerius are not a medieval production, but a witness to the literary florescence of the fifth and sixth centuries.

Virtually everyone who mentions Martius gives him an epithet denoting bafflement: 'misterioso poeta' (Orlandi), 'l'enigmatico Marco Valerio' (Salemme), 'the mysterious M. Valerius' (Walsh), 'le mystérieux Marcus Valerius' (Dolbeau, Tilliette, Meyers), 'l'énigmatique Marcus Valerius' (Dolbeau).[119] But it is not as if his works are massively obscure; the mystery, rather, arises from the disjunction between his poetry and the supposed context in which he was writing. The reason Martius has absolutely nothing in common with an actually twelfth-century bucolic poet, Metellus of Tegernsee, is because they do not share a similar literary world. Instead, the relation between Martius and Metellus is roughly that of Maximian to Henry of Settimello. Once Martius is restored to the sixth century his milieu is startlingly clear. He is a revivalist poet in a revivalist era. Along with Boethius, he took to bucolic, just as Maximian took to elegy, Dracontius to tragedy (in a fashion), Corippus to historical epic, and Luxorius to epigram.[120] Like Maximian, Priscian, and others, Martius interacted directly with his Greek models.[121] Indeed, he shares much in common with the author(?) of the *Appendix Maximiani* writing under Theodahad (534–36): both of them mention the story of Hero and Leander together with that of Apollo and Daphne, which is not the most natural collocation (*App.* 2.5–6 and 9–10 and Martius, *buc.* 4.56–67 and 83–90), and the *Appendix* poet artfully toys with bucolic conventions in his description of a villa (e.g. 5.5 'hic gelidi fontes hic dulces arboris umbrae' with Virg., *ecl.* 10.42: 'hic gelidi fontes, hic mollia prata, Lycori and Martius', *buc.* 1.85 'nunc dulces umbrae').[122]

More work will undoubtedly shed light on this poet and dispel the lingering enigmas. I hope I have demonstrated that Martius is a sophisticated and sensitive poet, whose works will amply repay close study and attention. A full commentary would uncover further riches, and help situate Martius in the literary world of the sixth century. For now, a few minor suggestions of the implications. If the first bucolic does indeed reference Antioch and its *arx*, it is perverse to think that the poems post-date 540 when the city was sacked. The striking lexical innovations of the bucolics ought to be included in the *Thesaurus linguae latinae*: certainly *indelimatus* and *blandisonus*, and probably *sublangueo* as well (the other two *hapax*, *imposco* and *subpenetro*, are likely textual corruptions).[123] If I am correct as to the inspiration provided by Persius, Martius also provides some indication that the choliambs were transmitted as a preface to the collection, at least in the sixth century. Latin bucolic should now be considered to have a virtually continuous history after Virgil from the third century to the sixth, with three significant bodies of material, Virgil's ten eclogues, the eleven of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, and the combined eight of Olybrius, Endelichius, Pomponius and Martius. The line that runs between them — as the slow work of dating and contextualizing continues — is the outline of the history of one of the most characteristic classical genres in the post-classical world, a history that has yet to be told.

University of Edinburgh
j.anthony.stover@gmail.com

---

[119] Salemme 1981: 24; Walsh 1977: 163; Meyers, preface to Bachmann and François 2001: 12; Dolbeau 1987: 166 and 170; and Tilliette 2000: 28.
[120] Wasyl 2011.
[121] See, for example, Fielding 2016.
[122] See especially Vitiello 2014.
[123] See Skutsch 1964: 22; and Munari 1970: xxix.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, A., and Rigg, A. G. 2004: 'A verse translation of Abbo of St. Germain's *Bella Parisiacae Urbis*', *Journal of Medieval Latin* 14, 1–68

Anderson, W. B. (ed. and trans.) 1936: *Sidonius Apollinaris: Poems and Letters*, Cambridge, MA

Bachmann, P., and François, M. (eds) 2001: *Petrarque. Bucolicum carmen*, Paris

Baldzuhn, M. 2009: *Schulbücher im Trivium des Mittelalters und der frühen Neuzeit: Die Verschriftlichung von Unterricht in der Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte der 'Fabulae' Avians und der deutschen 'Disticha Catonis'* (2 vols), Berlin

Baligan, G. 1967. 'Le "Bucoliche" di Marco Valerio', *Vichiana* 4, 383–98

Berschin, W. 1998: *Greek Letters and the Latin Middle Ages. From Jerome to Nicholas of Cusa*, trans. J. Frakes, Washington DC

Bischoff, B. *et al.* 1994: *Severi Episcopi 'Malacitani(?)' in Evangelia Libri XII: Das Trierer Fragment der Bücher VIII–X*, Munich

Bloch, H. 1957: Review of Munari 1955 in *Speculum* 32, 193–5

Bobzien, S. 1998: *Determinism and Freedom in Stoic Philosophy*, Oxford

Bradbury, S. 2004: *Selected Letters of Libanius from the Age of Constantius and Julian*, Liverpool

Branca, V. (ed.) 1964–1998: *Tutte le opera di Giovanni Boccaccio* (10 vols), Milan

Braun, L. 1985: 'Die "dramatische" Technik des Vitalis von Blois und sein Verhältnis zu seinen Quellen', in H. Braet *et al.* (ed.), *The Theatre in the Middle Ages*, Leuven, 60–83

Byrne, S. N. 2001: 'Martial and three imitators: Luxorius, Godfrey of Winchester, and Henry of Huntingdon', *Classical Bulletin* 77, 61–73

Cameron, A. 2016: *Wandering Poets*, Oxford

Champlin, E. 1978: 'The life and times of Calpurnius Siculus', *Journal of Roman Studies* 68, 95–110

Colker, M. L. 2007: *Petronius redivivus et Helias Tripolanensis*, Leiden

Cooper, H. 1977: *Pastoral: Medieval into Renaissance*, Ipswich, NJ

Dolbeau, F. 1987: 'Les "Bucoliques" de Marcus Valerius sont-elles une œuvre médiévale?', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 22, 166–70

Dolbeau, F. 1996: *Augustin d'Hippone, vingt-six sermons au peuple d'Afrique, retrouvés à Mayence*, Paris

Dolbeau, F. 1998: 'Découvertes récentes d'œuvres latines inconnues (fin iiie–début viiie s.)', *Sacris erudiri* 38, 101–42

Dorfbauer, L. 2013: 'Der Evangelienkommentar des Bischofs Fortunatian von Aquileia (Mitte 4. Jh.). Ein Neufund auf dem Gebiet der patristischen Literatur', *Wiener Studien* 126, 177–98

Eastmond, A. 2010: 'Consular diptychs, rhetoric and the languages of art in sixth-century Constantinople', *Art History* 33, 743–65

Fielding, I. 2016: 'A Greek source for Maximianus' Greek girl: late Latin love elegy and the Greek anthology', in S. McGill and J. M. Pucci (eds), *Classics Renewed: Reception and Innovation in the Latin Poetry of Late Antiquity*, Heidelberg, 323–39

Fierville, G. 1886: *Une Grammaire latine inédite du XIIIe siècle*, Paris

Geyer, P. 1885: '*Die Hisperica Famina*', *Archiv für lateinische lexicographie und Grammatik* 2, 255–66

Giangrande, G. 1974: 'Eine umstrittene Stelle des M. Valerius', *Hermes* 102, 378–80

Guarducci, M. 1970: 'I fiori di Marco Valerio', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 98, 424–33

Häse, A. 2002: *Mittelalterliche Bücherverzeichnisse aus Kloster Lorsch: Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar*, Wiesbaden

Hays, G. 2008: 'Did Chrétien de Troyes know Hyginus' *Fabulae?*', *Romance Philology* 62, 75–81

Hillner, J. 2015: *Prison, Punishment and Penance in Late Antiquity*, Cambridge

Hubbard, T. 1998: *The Pipes of Pan. Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, Ann Arbor, MI

Hunt, R. W. 1980: 'Hugutio and Petrus Helias', in R. W. Hunt, *The History of Grammar in the Middle Ages*, Amsterdam, 145–9

Jacobs, F. 1838: *Beiträge zur ältern Litteratur oder Merkwürdigkeiten der Herzogl. öffentlichen Bibliothek zu Gotha, Bd. 3*, with F. A. Ukert, Leipzig

Jahn, O. 1851: 'Über die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischer Classiker', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der Königlich Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig -Philologisch-Historische Klasse* 3, 327–73

Jones, F. 2011: *Virgil's Garden: The Nature of Bucolic Space*, London

Kaster, R. 2010: *Studies on the Text of Macrobius'* Saturnalia, Oxford

Knorr, W. R. 1990: 'John of Tynemouth alias John of London: emerging portrait of a singular medieval mathematician', *British Journal of the History of Science* 23, 293–330

Könsgen, E. 1990: *Die Gesta Militum des Hugo von Mâcon* (2 vols), Leiden

Kühlmann, W. 2007: 'Neo-Latin literature in early modern Germany', in M. Reinhard (ed.), *Early Modern German Literature 1350–1700*, Camden House History of German Literature 4, Rochester, 281–330

Lapidge, M. 1985: 'Booklists from Anglo-Saxon England', in M. Lapidge and H. Gneuss (eds), *Learning and Literature in Anglo-Saxon England*, Cambridge, 33–90

Larson, J. 2011: *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore*, Oxford

Leary, T. J. 1996: *Martial, Book XIV: The Apophoreta*, London

Lehmann, P. 1946: 'Bukolische Dichtungen', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, Rome, vol. 4, 58–87

Lendinari, P. 2010: 'A storehouse of learned vocabulary: the Abbo Glossaries in Anglo-Saxon England', in R. H. Bremmer, Jr and K. Dekker (eds), *Practice in Learning: The Transfer of Encyclopaedic Knowledge in the Early Middle Ages*, Leuven, 101–32

Lipka, M. 2001: *Language in Vergil's Eclogues*, Berlin

Loffius, K. F. 1917: *Anfang und Fortgang der Reformation*, Gotha

Maas, P. 1955: 'Konjekturen zu den Bucolica des Marcus Valerius', *Philologus* 99, 321, with addition in 100 (1956), 157

Magaña Orúe, E. 2001: *Las 'églogas' de Nemesiano: comentario filológico*, unpub. PhD dissertation, Madrid

Martin, J. 1982: 'Classicism and style', in R. L. Benson, G. Constable and C. D. Lanham (eds), *Renaissance and Renewal in the Twelfth Century*, Cambridge, MA, 537–68

Mayer, R. 1983: 'Missing persons in the *Eclogues*', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 30, 17–30

Merkelbach, R., and Stauber, J. (eds) 2002: *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten IV: Die Südküste Kleinasiens, Syrien und Palaestina*, Leipzig

Munari, F. (ed.) 1955: *Marci Valerii Bucolica*, Florence

Munari, F. (ed.) 1970: *M. Valerio, Bucoliche*, Florence

Nünlist, R. 2009: *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge

Orlandi, G. 1971: Review of Munari 1970 in *La Parola del Passato* 26, 221–32

Orlandi, S. 2004: *Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano VI. Anfiteatre e strutture annesse, con una nuova edizione e commento delle iscrizioni del Colosseo*, Rome

Pack, R. A. 1980: 'Scribal errors in an autograph manuscript', *American Journal of Philology* 101, 459–61

Pepin, R. (ed.) 2011: *Sextus Amarcius. Sermones. Eupolemius*, with J. Ziolkowski, Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library, Cambridge, MA

Ratkowitsch, C. 1992: '*Nec mihi cura gregis superest nec cura salutis*. Interpretation und Datierung der *Bucolica* des M. Valerius', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 27, 169–210

Ratkowitsch, C. 2003: 'Mittelalterliches in der Hirtendichtung des Giovanni Boccaccio', *Wiener Studien* 113, 301–34

Reeve, M. D. 1978: 'The textual tradition of Calpurnius and Nemesianus', *Classical Quarterly* 28, 223–38

Roda, S. 1994: 'L'aristocrazia senatoria occidentale al tempo di Attila: l'ideologia oltre la crisi dell'impero', in S. Blason Scarel (ed.), *Atilla, flagellum Dei?*, Rome, 131–51

Sabbadini, R. 1914: *Le scoperte dei codici latini e greci ne' secoli XIV e XV. Nuove ricerche*, Florence

Salemme, C. 1979: 'Ragguglio su Marco Valerio', *Bolletino di Studi Latini* 9, 333–48

Salemme, C. 1981: 'In margine al "Carmen Apollinis" di Marco Valerio', *Bollettino di studi latini* 11, 22–33

Sallman, K. (ed.) 1997: *Die Literatur des Umbruchs. Von der römischen zur christlichen Literatur 117–283 n. Chr.*, Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike IV, Munich

Salvatore, A. 1989: 'A proposito di "conservatori" e "innovatori" (Note al testo di M. Valerio)', in *Polyanthema. Studi di Letteratura cristiana antica offerti a Salvatore Costanza* (3 vols), Messina, 1.125–40

Schiller, I., Weber, D., and Wiedmann, C. 2008: 'Sechs neue Augustinuspredigten: Teil 1 mit Edition dreier Sermones', *Wiener Studien* 121, 227–84

Schiller, I., Weber, D., and Wiedmann, C. 2009: 'Sechs neue Augustinuspredigten: Teil 2 mit Edition dreier Sermones zum Thema Almosen', *Wiener Studien* 122, 171–213

Schipke, R. 1972: *Die Maugérard-Handschriften der Forschungsbibliothek Gotha*, Gotha

Skutsch, O. 1964: 'Textual studies in the *Bucolics* of Martius Valerius', in C. Henderson, Jr. (ed.), *Classical Mediaeval and Reinassance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman* (2 vols), Rome, 2.21–36

Smith, A. M. 2001: *Alhacen's Theory of Visible Perception* (2 vols), *Transactions of the American Philosophical Assocation* 91.4

Stagni, E. 1995: 'Medioevo francese e classici latini: un nome ritrovato', *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 34, 219–24

Stagni, E. 2006: 'Testi latini e biblioteche tra Parigi e la valle della Loira (secoli XII–XIII): I manoscritti di Guido de Grana', in S. Mazzoni Peruzzi (ed.), *Boccaccio e le letterature romanze tra Medioevo e Rinascimento*, Florence, 221–87

Stella, F. 1993: *La poesia carolingia latina a tema biblico*, Spoleto

Stover, J. A. 2015: 'Olybrius and the Einsiedeln Eclogues', *Journal of Roman Studies* 105, 288–321

Stover, J. A. 2016: *A New Work by Apuleius*, Oxford

Tilliette, J.-Y. 2000: *Des Mots à la parole: une lecture de la Poetria Nova de Geoffroy de Vinsauf*, Geneva

Traube, L., and Ehwald, R. 1904: *Jean-Baptiste Maugérard. Ein Beitrag zur Bibliotheksgeschichte*, Munich

Turcan-Verkerk, A.-M. 1999: 'Mannon de Saint-Oyen dans l'histoire de la transmission des textes', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 29, 169–243

Turcan-Verkerk, A.-M. 2003: *Un Poète latin chrétien redécouverte: Latinius Pacatus Drepanius, panégyriste de Théodose*, Brussels

Twyman, B. L. 1970: 'Aetius and the aristocracy', *Historia* 19, 480–503

Verdière, R. 1972: Review of Munari 1970 in *L'Antiquité Classique* 41, 349

Vernet, A. 1948: 'Notice et extraits d'un manuscrit d'Edimbourg (Adv. Mss. 18.6.12, 18.7.8, 18.7.7)', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 107, 33–51

Vitiello, M. 2014: *Theodahad: A Platonic King at the Collapse of Ostrogothic Italy*, Toronto

von Murr, C. G. 1791: *Memorabilia bibliothecarum publicarum Norimbergensium, pars III*, Nurmberg

Walsh, P. G. 1977: 'Pastor and pastoral in medieval Latin poetry', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 1976, 157–69.

Wasyl, A. M. 2011: *Genres Rediscovered: Studies in Latin Miniature Epic, Love Elegy, and Epigram of the Romano-Barbaric Age*, Krakow

Witt, R. W. 2003: *Footsteps of the Ancients: The Origins of Humanism from Lovato to Bruni*, Leiden

Witt, R. 2012: *Two Latin Cultures and the Foundation of Renaissance Humanism in Medieval Italy*, Cambridge

Zicari, M. 1957: 'Nota a Marco Valerio', *Studi urbinati* 31, 255–9