

Olybrius and the *Einsiedeln Eclogues**

JUSTIN STOVER

pluralitas non est ponenda sine necessitate
Guillelmus de Ockam (†1350)

ABSTRACT

Two ancient pastoral poems were published by Hermann Hagen in 1869 from a manuscript at Einsiedeln and were soon dated to the reign of Nero. In this study, I show that these poems are related to the Bucolicon Olybrii listed in a library catalogue of Murbach from around 850, and demonstrate on internal and external grounds that the poems were likely composed around the end of the fourth century by Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius, the consul of 395. This attribution enhances our understanding of the literary culture of the age of Claudian and contributes to the ongoing debate on the extent and import of Neronian literature.

Keywords: Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius; Einsiedeln Eclogues; pastoral; Late Antiquity; Ausonius; manuscripts; Neronian literature

I A CURIOUS SURVIVAL

The *Einsiedeln Eclogues* (EE) are one of the more recent additions to the roster of ancient poetry. The story of their discovery and transmission has been briefly summarized as follows.

Chr. Browerus, head of the Jesuit college at Fulda and author of *Fuldensium antiquitatum libri IIII* (Antwerp, 1612), found in the monastic library there a damaged manuscript that contained a collection of poems by Hrabanus Maurus, which he appended to his second edition of Venantius Fortunatus (Mainz, 1617). Part of this manuscript is now pp. 177–224 of Einsiedeln 266 (s. X), and Browerus turns out to have left the distinction of publishing two pastoral poems of Neronian date on pp. 206–7 to H. Hagen, *Philologus*, 28 (1869), 338–41.

* I would like to thank, first and foremost, David Armstrong for advice and encouragement throughout this whole process, and for reading several drafts; George Woudhuysen for many pleasant hours of conversation on matters of *patricii* and prosopography; and Michael Reeve, Gavin Kelly, Kathy Coleman, Jarrett Welsh, and Christopher Parrot for reading drafts of this study and offering much useful criticism. Evina Steinova generously shared some of her expertise on *notae* and Michael Allen his on the hand of Heiric of Auxerre. I am grateful to them all, as well as to the anonymous readers and editor of this journal.

Einsiedeln 266 is available online at *e-codices – Virtual Manuscript Library of Switzerland* (<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/list/one/sbe/0266>). I have also used Brepols databases: *Library of Latin Texts*, Series A and B, and the *Cross Database Search Tool*.

The abbreviations used are:

CLA – E. Loew 1934–1971: *Codices latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century* (12 vols), Oxford

PLRE – A. Jones et al. (eds) 1971–1992: *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* (3 vols), Cambridge

TLL – *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae*

JRS 105 (2015), pp. 288–321. © The Author(s) 2015.

Published by The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

doi:10.1017/S0075435815000921

So Michael Reeve in *Texts and Transmission*, ‘*Carmina Einsidlensia*’.¹ This is the most comprehensive account of the transmission of the *carmina*, and since, as Reeve notes later, ‘no trace of these *Carmina Einsidlensia* has been found elsewhere’, it has since been assumed that there is nothing more to say on the topic.

The transmission of the *EE*, nonetheless, is highly anomalous. There is no other ancient (that is, pre-sixth-century) material in the ‘Fulda’ manuscript: the rest is a computistic compilation, extracts on weights and measures, a vaguely misogynistic florilegium of *sententiae*, a bit from Cassiodorus, these two poems, and a collection of Hrabanus’ poetry. I will examine these contents more fully below; here, however, one must point out that the situation is otherwise unparalleled. Most ancient texts that survive are precisely that, *texts*; they have a title and an author, both of which aid the integrity of their transmission.² Miscellaneous pieces (usually poems) which do survive tend to do so in collections, such as the *Appendix Vergiliana*, or the *Codex Salmasianus*, or the Ausonian corpus. There are small and infrequent exceptions to this rule, but nowhere else could one find so astounding a collocation as Neronian bucolics with a computus and Cassiodorus. Reeve, however, has already suggested the surest way forward — to examine the other texts in the Einsiedeln manuscript to determine their local and intellectual affiliations — a suggestion, it seems, that nobody has pursued in the thirty years since *Texts and Transmission* was published.

The Einsiedeln manuscript transmits two eclogues: the first is a singing contest between Thamyras and Ladas with Midas as the judge, loosely based on Virgil’s third eclogue; the second has two characters, Glyceranus and Mystes, and is generally speaking inspired by the first and fourth eclogues. The standard interpretation of these poems fits them into a mould of Neronian panegyric. The first can be interpreted as describing an emperor who composed a poem on the destruction of Troy; identifying this emperor as Nero is the obvious next step. The second contains a description of a Golden Age now dawning, and so is usually dated to the early years of Nero’s reign. That said, however, the poems never explicitly refer to any contemporary events or figures, to the chagrin of some editors, who actually attempt to plug lacunae in the poems with the word ‘Nero’ (Bücheler’s universally rejected *dignus utroque <Nero>* at *EE* I.28 is the most egregious example³). The *EE* can, however, be securely placed in the bucolic tradition as related to Calpurnius Siculus. A brief selection:

EE I.1–2 requirunt / iurgia ~ Calp. 6.80 iurgia quaerit; *EE* I.2 da vacuum ... aurem ~ Calp. 4.47–8 daret mihi forsitan aurem / ipse deus vacuum; *EE*.I.21 tu prior ~ Calp. 3.36 tu prior; *EE* I.42 venerat en et ~ Calp. 4.78 venit en et; *EE* II.12 tremula ... umbra ~ Calp. 5.101 tremulas ... umbras.

One significant borrowing confirms Calpurnius’ priority: both *EE* II and Calp. 4 begin with the question *Quid tacitus* followed by the name of the addressee. This is an odd bit of Latinity,⁴ which nonetheless in the case of Calpurnius can at least be grammatically construed with the verb *sedes* of 4.3. *EE* II.1 offers no such possible explanation. Thus, the *EE*’s *Quid tacitus* should be understood as a nod to Calp. 4, and not vice versa.⁵

The first part of this study deals with the transmission of the poems. First, I investigate the real origins of the manuscript, Einsiedeln 266. I then look more closely at its miscellaneous contents to establish whether the texts show any geographical or

¹ Reeve 1983.

² On the function of titles in the transmission of texts, see Sharpe 2003.

³ To this category also belongs Verdière’s speculation (1954: 270) about the seemingly missing conclusion of *EE* II.

⁴ Baldwin 1995: 165n. and Horsfall 1993: 267–8.

⁵ cf. also Courtney 1987: 156–7; Schröder 1991: 70; Horsfall 1997: 192–3; and Amat 1998. The only monograph on the *EE*, Merfeld 1999, also accepts the posteriority of *EE* II to Calpurnius 4.

chronological affiliations. Based on these conclusions, I propose a new theory for the origin of the text, which has radical consequences for its dating and authorship. The second part of this study examines the internal evidence of the poems to determine what we can about their origin, authorship, and date. In 1978, Edward Champlin challenged a long-held orthodoxy when he suggested that Calpurnius Siculus should be dated not to the age of Nero but rather to the third century; thirty-five years later opinions on the question remain unsettled.⁶ In this dispute, the *EE* have been more often than not treated as appendages to Calpurnius, certainly with some degree of justice.⁷ Nonetheless, no one since the time of Hagen has separately pursued the question of the dating of the *EE* alone; what has been done has rested on the dogmatic proposition (in the words of their last editor) that ‘l’attribution neronienne est peu discutable’.⁸

Taken together these two parts will provide a new account of the *EE*’s preservation and transmission, resituate the context in which they were composed, and propose an author for these anonymously transmitted *carmina*.

II THE EINSIEDELN MANUSCRIPT

From Fulda?

Accounts of the origins of these two poems rest upon a mistake. No part of Einsiedeln 266 was ever at Fulda. This mistake arose fifteen years after Hagen discovered the text: Ernst Dümmler was editing Hrabanus Maurus’ poems for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*.⁹ For some of the collection, the only two sources he could find were Christoph Brouwer’s 1617 edition and the Einsiedeln manuscript. What manuscript Brouwer used was unknown, since he explicitly declined to reveal its owner in the prologue to his edition.¹⁰ Dümmler opted for the simplest solution: he identified the manuscript used by Brouwer as a less mutilated version of Einsiedeln 266, then he triangulated Brouwer’s references to his manuscript with other mentions of a *Codex Fuldensis* and assumed that the two were the same.¹¹ Hence, he concluded, Brouwer used the Einsiedeln manuscript, which had been from the time of its writing to Brouwer’s own day at Fulda.

It may be true that Brouwer used a Fulda manuscript in his edition, but this manuscript was not at Fulda during Brouwer’s lifetime. The whole miscellany was bound in the fourteenth century at Einsiedeln and we have the hand of the fourteenth-century librarian of the abbey, Heinrich von Ligerz, in the volume.¹² Hence, the whole codex,

⁶ Champlin 1978. Additional support for ‘late Calpurnius’ was provided by Courtney 1987; Armstrong 1986; Baldwin 1995; and Horsfall 1997. Among those supporting the Neronian date are: Townend 1980; Verdière 1993; and Amat 1998.

⁷ Notable exceptions include the very brief treatments of Armstrong 1986: 131n. and Horsfall 1997: 192–3.

⁸ Amat 1998: 194. To be fair, a number of scholars from Maciejczyk (1907) have discussed the dating of the two poems, but only with regard to where *within the reign of Nero* they should be placed. Hints of doubt regarding the Neronian date can be detected in Armstrong 2014 and 1986, and Baldwin 1995.

⁹ Dümmler 1884.

¹⁰ Brouwer 1617: 2, ‘En tibi, amice Lector, Hrabanus versus ex Vespillonum manibus extorti, quos ex probato et pervetusto MS. cuius tamen Possessor latere voluit, renatos, tanquam a libitina vel inferis reducere et Domino suo restituere visum est’.

¹¹ Dümmler 1884: 157–9.

¹² Meier 1896: 59, referring to Einsiedeln 266, p. 287. Since we only have Heinrich’s hand in one of the codicological units, it is possible that he marked it before it was bound. The binding, however, is clearly fourteenth-century. It is worth pointing out that the back board must originally have had a fly leaf containing the *Satires* of Persius, in perhaps an eleventh-century minuscule, which left its ink on the board after it was ripped off. Remnants of *Sat.* 3.43–9 are still visible in mirrored writing; textually they seem to go with the

including the three quires that interest us, now pp. 177–224, was at Einsiedeln in the fourteenth century, not at Fulda, and has remained there to this day.¹³

Whatever manuscript Brouwer did use, it was not this manuscript. Brouwer explicitly states that his manuscript contained the heading: *Versus Hrabani de diversis XIV. Ord. XIX.*¹⁴ If such a heading had ever been in the Einsiedeln manuscript — there is currently no such inscription — it would have been in the trimmed portion of the top of p. 208. But the folio was trimmed when the manuscript was bound, two centuries before Brouwer, and so there is no way that he can be describing the Einsiedeln manuscript. Further, on p. 212, the words we have from Brouwer's edition (p. 8), 'sic catus et catus attendis', have been lost in that same trimming — there is no way Brouwer could have read these words once the manuscript was bound. Finally, Brouwer tells us explicitly that there is a loss of material of about four folios from the middle of *carm.* XXVIII (XXXIV Dümmler), after the line ending 'rite canendo' (l. 29).¹⁵ Yet the Einsiedeln manuscript, though damaged and hard to read, continues for another twenty-five lines, as Dümmler himself prints (p. 193). Thus, there is no possibility whatsoever that Einsiedeln 266 is the manuscript used by Brouwer.

And indeed, such is the conclusion of palaeographical analysis. Even a cursory glance at the script of our three quires of MS 266 would suffice to disprove an origin at Fulda. (Hereafter, I will refer to this section simply as MS 266, with the understanding that I am only talking about these three gatherings). Bischoff assigns it to the *Bodenseegebiet*, that is the Bodenseeraum or the area around Lake Constance, and dates it to s. IX/X.¹⁶ The script is peculiar, Caroline certainly, but with definite Alemannic and Rhaetian influences, both consistent with an origin somewhere in the Bodenseeraum or a centre in its intellectual/scrival sphere of influence. Bodensee characteristics include most notably the *i* appended below the line to letters such as *m* and *n*, as in *homi_n* for *homini*; the *ri* ligature is also found, but the *i* does not extend below the line; there are also cases of *o* for *con*, as in *stendit* (p. 205) and *cedite* (p. 206). More Caroline features include the looped *g* and the *t* without a loop on the cross-bar. Features suggesting an earlier (as in late ninth-century) date include the use of &-caudata for *aet* and particularly the rendering of *aeterna* as &̄n̄a.¹⁷ In addition, MS 266 has at least three instances of open cc style *a* (pp. 193, 204 and 206). In short the script is obviously related to, but not obviously that of, St Gall, or Reichenau, or Chur; had MS 266 been written in any of those places, it would hardly represent their typical script. Murbach manuscripts are hard to pinpoint, but this combination of influences is precisely what we might expect to see produced there. Further, we need an abbey in this area with the sort of library which might contain unique copies of neglected ancient texts. The obvious candidates are St Gall itself, Reichenau, and Murbach once again, the home of such exquisite rarities as the *codex unicus* of Velleius Paterculus.

main tradition, Clausen's αX. A similar case can be seen on the binding boards of Karlsruhe, Landesbibliothek, Aug. 116 (cf. *CLA* VIII, 1009).

¹³ The only scholar I know of not to repeat the Fulda story is J. Amat in her Budé edition of 1997. Unfortunately she falls into the opposite error when she claims that the manuscript was always at Einsiedeln (p. 149), which was not even properly established until well into the tenth century.

¹⁴ Brouwer 1617: 2.

¹⁵ Brouwer 1617: 27, 'Desunt cetera foliis iv. circiter amissis'.

¹⁶ Bischoff 1998: no. 1125, Bodenseegebiet(?), c. s. IX/X. Nonetheless, on the strength of the Hrabanus poems alone, Bischoff still associated the preservation of the *carmina* with Fulda (see idem 1981: 180).

¹⁷ While this abbreviation can occur in tenth-century manuscripts, it is considered an archaizing feature; cf. Garand 1978: 26. In general, the liberal use of abbreviation employed by the scribe has led scholars to place the manuscript later than the script warrants. Although abbreviation become more common in the tenth and eleventh centuries, one can still find heavily abbreviated manuscripts from the ninth and even the eighth centuries. See Rand 1927.

The Contents of the Manuscript

Once we jettison the link to Fulda, the only way to begin to inquire after the origin of the manuscript is to examine the origins of its other components. The contents of the three quires of Einsiedeln 266 which include the *EE* have never been comprehensively described.

1. 177–96: part of the *Seven-Book Computus*, or the *Handbook of 809* (end of Book IV and all of Book V), with section numbers still attached.
2. 196–202: various pieces *de ponderibus et mensuris*, often found along with the *Computus* (in, for example, the Monza and Madrid manuscripts).¹⁸

These texts have been described as miscellaneous astronomical and philosophical fragments, which they certainly are, but they are more than that. The tell-tale sign is the numbers which precede most of the titles. These are chapter numbers from the so-called *Seven-Book Computus*, or *Handbook of 809*, a high Carolingian production put together by a team of scholars working in Aachen to provide a definitive handbook to computus, that is, the method for determining the date of Easter, for the whole Carolingian world.¹⁹ What we have on pp. 177–96 is the end of Book IV and all of Book V of the *Computus*. Missing entirely is Book VII, which consists solely of Bede's *De rerum natura*. This is crucial, since abbreviated versions of the *Computus* circulated in which this book, as well as large parts of the first three books, were taken out. Ninth-century examples of abbreviated versions of the *Computus* include Montpellier H 334 and Bamberg HJ.IV.22 (class. 55).²⁰ The Montpellier manuscript, just like MS 266, contains the original chapter numbers. The selection of texts found in our manuscript, including both the sections of the *Computus* proper and the 'associated texts' on weight and measures found on pp. 196–202, affiliates our text strongly with the Bamberg manuscript.

That MS 266 originally contained an abbreviation of the *Computus* can be proven another way. We have two gathering numbers extant in our three quires: V in the extreme gutter of p. 192 and VI in that of p. 208 (presumably there was once a VII on p. 224, but that page is far too damaged to make anything out). Now by comparing the relative lengths of identical material between the Einsiedeln manuscript and a complete manuscript of the *Computus* (I used Madrid 3307), we find that, were MS 266 a complete manuscript of the *Computus*, missing only Book VII, it should have roughly 164 pages lost at the beginning, or 82 folios. There is no way that amount of text could possibly have been contained in the four missing quires, or 32 missing folios. Therefore, MS 266 must have been an abbreviated *Computus* very much like the Bamberg text. Unfortunately, we do not have any sure guide to where the Bamberg manuscript was written, although it was probably somewhere in present-day France, and like the other manuscripts of the *Computus* in a centre with close links to the court at Aachen. The Montpellier manuscript was at Troyes in the Middle Ages, and was probably written in the vicinity.

3. 202–3: *Dicta philosophorum* (florilegium)

This text comprises several parts: the *Dicta* proper, which are gleanings from thirteen authorities on the incommunities of matrimony; other unrelated material on grammar; and several mnemonic lists such as the seven punishments of Cain. The exact same

¹⁸ Monza, Archivio Capitolare F.9 (176); cf. Leonardi 1960: no. 115.

¹⁹ On the *Computus*, see Ramírez-Weaver 2008; as well as the remarkably good Oxford B. litt. thesis King 1969, who was the first to identify the excerpts in MS 266. These excerpts could not have been taken from the other Carolingian computus collection, the so-called 'Three-Book Computus', since in MS 266 *de praesagiis*, for example, is listed as no. XII, just as in the 809 Handbook, whereas in the other compilation it is listed as no. VIII; cf. Eastwood 2007: 128.

²⁰ On the Montpellier manuscript, see Leonardi 1960: no. 114 and King 1969: 92–3; on the Bamberg manuscript, see Leonardi 1960: no. 10 and King 1969: 103.

material is found in St Gall MS 899, pp. 172–4, in a much clearer and more formal manuscript layout. This manuscript is probably ninth-century,²¹ and certainly written at St Gall. On textual grounds, it is clear that the Einsiedeln manuscript was not copied from that of St Gall; they both seem to stem from a common exemplar. According to Munk Olsen, this little florilegium is only found in these two manuscripts.²²

4. 204–5: selection from Cassiodorus *inst.* 2.3.6–8²³
5. 206–7: *Carmina einsidlensia*
6. 208–24: Hrabanus Maurus, *Carmina*

One important point about the arrangement of these texts is that all of them, after the *Computus*, begin on an even-numbered page, that is on a folio verso, which suggests that everything after the *Computus* and its associated tracts (which were certainly written all at once) was copied straight through or successively. Because of this, we must assume that the whole production was actually well planned, despite the chaotic and messy appearance of the writing and *mise-en-page*. For example, one might naturally assume that the lists on p. 203, including the seven punishments of Cain, the *propria* of the devil, etc., all crammed together haphazardly on the bottom half of the folio, are random accretions. In fact, in St Gall 899 we can find all these same texts neatly laid out in order. Hence, the scribe of MS 266 knew exactly what he needed to include, and economized as much as possible to fit everything in. It is possible, therefore, to speak of the intellectual profile of the compiler of MS 266: what seems on the surface to be a random collection of textual flotsam was deliberately assembled according to some as-yet-undetected plan, in which our *carmina* play an important rôle.

A Murbach Miscellany

The affiliations of these texts are revealing — on the one hand, the *Dicta philosophorum* shows affiliations with St Gall, while the section from the *Computus* suggests close associations with Lotharingia. We do not otherwise have evidence that the *Computus* was known in this region in the ninth century: a ninth-century codex currently in St Gall, MS 248, which contains material from it, was actually written in Laon.²⁴

Textual arguments thus indicate the same conclusions as palaeography: that the Einsiedeln manuscript was designed by a scholar or scholars influenced by the intellectual cultures of both the Bodensee and the Middle Kingdom. Bischoff suggested that the Madrid manuscript (MS 3307) of the *Computus* was in fact written at Murbach — a place with precisely the intellectual affiliations I have described — although that opinion has fallen out of favour.²⁵

²¹ Not tenth-century, as often claimed; there is no need to assume that the genealogy on pp. 76–7, terminating with the reign of Louis the German (d. 876), was merely copied verbatim from an earlier text. The author says that the year is 866/867, twenty-seven years after the death of Louis the Pious in 840: '[Hludowicus] decessit autem XII k. Iul. in insula Rheni iuxta palatium Ingilnheim. Post quem Hludowicus filius et aequivocus eius in orientali Francia suscepit imperium, qui modo, id est anno incarnationis domini nostri Iesu Christi DCCCLXVII XXVII annos regnare videtur.' The same note is found verbatim in St Gall 397 p. 18, where it was either copied from MS 899 or its archetype; MS 397 belonged to Abbot Grimald (†872).

²² Munk Olsen 1979–1980: no. 89. The *Dicta philosophorum* in Zurich, Zentralbibliothek MS C 150, 19r–36r, curiously from fifteenth-century St Gall, is not the same text.

²³ The tradition of *Inst.* 2 is complicated: it exists in an 'original' version, and two interpolated versions (Mynors's Φ and Δ) which seem to share a common ancestor. All three versions were available in the ninth-century Bodenseeraum. Overall, MS 266 tends to follow the Δ redaction (e.g. *considerat] significat* Δ *Eins.* 266 at p. 111.10 Mynors), but without all of its innovations, such as the compound diagrams in 2.3.4, which are likewise not present in Φ .

²⁴ See A. J. Kleist's description in *Codices electronici Sangallenses*: <<http://www.e-codices.unifr.ch/en/description/csg/0248>>.

²⁵ Ramírez-Weaver 2008: 52–3.

On the basis of the *Computus*, the *Dicta philosophorum* and the poems of Hrabanus, we can date the formation of the miscellany to no earlier than say 850, with absolutely no reason to believe that it predates the writing of the manuscript itself, somewhat later in the century.

So where did the *EE* come from? They are unlikely to have been derived from an earlier miscellany, as there is no trace of them in St Gall 899, and at any rate, they are separated from the *Dicta* by the brief interlude of Cassiodorus. Grouping them with Hrabanus contributes nothing to solving this problem, since it merely pushes the problem back at most several decades. Further, it is very unlikely that Brouwer would not have printed them had he seen them, which implies that they were not transmitted with Hrabanus in his manuscript. It is possible that Hrabanus had seen the poems, as early as 810, but where is wholly unknown.²⁶ The only plausible solution is that they were extracted from a complete manuscript of whatever text they come from — a text whose title may well have originally been written at the top of MS 266 p. 206 before it was trimmed. This must have been a book available to the scribe of the Einsiedeln manuscript, writing at Murbach or a related centre in Alsace or the Bodenseeraum.

Murbach offers us a catalogue from precisely the period that interests us, around 850, and among a good collection of ancient materials — for example, a copy of Lucretius, probably the one rediscovered by Poggio centuries later,²⁷ and the earliest complete collection of the *Appendix Vergiliana* — it lists a *Bucolicon olibrij*.²⁸ This catalogue dates from the middle of the ninth century, although it is only extant now in a copy made in 1464, by Sigismund Meisterlin, better known as the author of the *Nuremberg Chronicle*. The catalogue suggests that the bucolics occurred in a miscellaneous manuscript of poems from the third through the fifth centuries, roughly similar in size to the collection of the *Appendix*: the bucolics (number unspecified), Serenus' *De medicina praecepta*, Avianus' *Fabulae*, and Symphosius' *Aenigmata*. Together the last three items cover about twenty-one hundred lines, compared with the roughly twenty-four hundred of the *Appendix*.

To retread ground covered by others, it is worth pointing out here that we do have an extant poem ascribed to an Olybrius. It is printed in the *Anthologia latina*, but does not come from the *Codex Salmasianus*. Instead its source is a florilegium put together in southern Italy, around Montecassino.²⁹ Amid a wide variety of theological and canonical texts, this florilegium contains a section *De notis* which brings together a number of texts on *notae* — both the *notae iuris* and the Alexandrian critical signs — some of

²⁶ Hrabanus, *In honorem s. crucis* 1.19.13: 'huc huc aegroti volucris concurrere cursu en' is too close to 1.36: 'Huc huc Pierides volucris concedite saltu' to be coincidental. But the *In honorem* is Hrabanus' earliest work, completed in 810, long before the poems in MS 266 were written in the 820s and 30s.

²⁷ See Butterfield 2013: 30.

²⁸ The Murbach catalogue was first discussed by Zarncke 1889. Since Zarncke, scholars have tended to accept the reading *olibrij*, although it is true that the names of authors in library catalogues are often deformed. Two objections can be dealt with briefly: a reading of *Bucolicon [o]libri[j]* is a virtually impossible corruption, turning the most common word in a catalogue to the least common through deformation at both the beginning and the end of the word. Further, Virgil is included elsewhere in the catalogue, so it is not clear what such a title would refer to, nor why it would be plural. The other possibility is *Bucolicon olympii*, as in the bucolics of Aurelius Olympius Nemesianus. *Olimpij* to *olibrii* is a plausible corruption, but very unlikely. The letter sequence *olymp-* is fifty times as common as *olybr-* in Latin literature. Nemesianus is never known as Olympius in the manuscripts of *Cynegeticon* or his eclogues (with the exception of a later title in a fifteenth-century manuscript, Brescia, Biblioteca Queriniana, CVII 1; see Williams 1986: 17). That name is only found in the *Historia Augusta* (Carus 11.2). Nor are Nemesianus' eclogues ever the first item in a manuscript; rather they followed those of Calpurnius in the archetype. For these reasons, and on the basis of the arguments I make below, the catalogue's reading of *olibrij* should stand.

²⁹ Zarncke 1889: 206–7 and Reifferscheid 1868. The florilegium as a whole was studied by Lott 1980 and Motta and Picasso 1997. Evina Steinova is currently composing a doctoral thesis at the University of Utrecht on the transmission of *notae*. I thank her for supplying me with some of her research and for stimulating suggestions.

which are not found elsewhere. Preceding a list of eleven *notae* is a poetic exchange between a Campanianus, *v[ir] i[llustris]*, and a *patricius* Olybrius. After that list comes a *De obelis et asteriscis Platonis* — a list of notes specifically put together for the reading of Plato, which is found in cognate versions in a Greek fragment on papyrus and in Diogenes Laertius.³⁰ Following that is a list of *notae* which was attached to the psalm commentary of Cassiodorus. The last is the most crucial: it is very likely that the *notae Platonis* were transmitted through Vivarium, Cassiodorus' monastic foundation, ultimately to Montecassino. Given the aristocratic lineage of the various Olybrii — they were closely related to the Anicii — and the fact that some of them were active into Cassiodorus' lifetime, it makes perfect sense to assume that Cassiodorus was responsible for the preservation of the Olybrius poem and the list of *notae*.

All of this is relevant to the Murbach catalogue. Murbach, itself styled Vivarium, was deeply influenced as an institution by Cassiodorus' Vivarium, and the library catalogue in particular was composed with a copy of the *Institutiones* at hand. This copy was itself special: there are only three early manuscripts of the *Institutiones* which contain both books together, and all of them are from southern Italy. But the catalogues of both Reichenau and Murbach list copies of the *Institutiones* in two books, a coincidence that can only be explained by direct contact between the abbeys of the Bodenseeraum and southern Italy.³¹ In addition to listing the books that the abbey possessed, unusually the Murbach catalogue also includes books that the abbey wished to acquire, most of them taken straight from Cassiodorus' recommendations in the *Institutiones*.³²

A few entries below the *Bucolicon olibrij* (or, to standardize, *Bucolicon Olybrii*), it is no surprise then when we come across a *Liber notarum*.³³ Between the two entries come several works on medicine, but the *Liber notarum* is separated from these by a paraph, a gamma-shaped mark indicating a new section (no. 335 Milde, p. 48). The cataloguer was proceeding topically, and it seems the *Bucolicon Olybrii* was contained in the same manuscript as Serenus' poetic *De medicina praecepta*. Hence he inserted the few medical works that Murbach possessed between the *Bucolicon* and the *Liber notarum*, which at any rate defied easy categorization.

That the only two known references to texts of a poet named Olybrius are found in close proximity with *notae* cannot be accidental.³⁴ That both of them also occur in contexts associated with Cassiodorus may not be accidental either. Rather, they suggest that the Murbach library, just like Cassiodorus' Vivarium, contained the whole texts from which the Montecassino florilegium took excerpts. Were a new piece transmitted through Cassiodorus to turn up, the Bodenseeraum is precisely where we might expect it to be found. Indeed, the last piece of Cassiodoriana discovered, the *Anecdoton Holderi*, or the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*, was uncovered in Karlsruhe from a Reichenau manuscript by Alfred Holder in the mid-nineteenth century, and was probably preserved in this region.³⁵ The presence of the complete *Institutiones* in Reichenau and Murbach confirms this special link.

Cassiodorus is thus the link between the Einsiedeln manuscript and the *Bucolicon Olybrii*. As shown above, the *Dicta philosophorum* precede the *EE* in MS 266 and Hrabanus follows them. The *EE* accompany neither, on the basis of St Gall 899 and

³⁰ See Schironi 2005 and Pernigotti 2004.

³¹ See Mynors 1937: x–xii.

³² On Murbach and Cassiodorus, Milde 1968: 62–130.

³³ Lapidge 2005: 56 emends this entry to *Liber rotarum*, apparently used later as a title for Isidore's *De naturis rerum*, criticizing McKitterick 1989: 193, who interpreted it as a collection of Tironian notes. The conjunction with Olybrius secures the identification of the text as a book of *notae*, perhaps including, but not limited to, Tironian notes.

³⁴ I exclude literary references in Claudian and Ennodius.

³⁵ See Galonnier 1997. Related pieces have been found in a St Gall manuscript, and two Bern manuscripts.

Brouwer's edition. They belong instead with the little fragment of Cassiodorus. Obviously, one should not push this argument too far. Selections from the second book of the *Institutiones* are by no means rare in *Sammelhandschriften*. Rather, the inclusion of Cassiodorus gives another facet of the intellectual profile of the compiler of MS 266. A late ninth-century copy of the Aachen *Computus* tells us that he was connected to and interested in the intellectual reforms of the Carolingian court. The *Dicta* localize him somewhere not too far from the Bodensee. Hrabanus — the only living author to receive a heading in the Murbach catalogue, and one of only two moderns — and Cassiodorus are two authors the compiler was particularly interested in. Where precisely MS 266 was written may never be definitively known, but this description fits precisely the intellectual, political, and cultural affiliations of the Abbey of Murbach in the ninth century.

So we have a sequence of coincidences: the *Bucolicon Olybrii* are to be found at Murbach in the cultural ambit of the Bodensee, probably thanks to a copy preserved by Cassiodorus, in the middle of the ninth century. The *EE* are bucolics, found in a manuscript from the Bodenseeraum, possibly from Murbach itself, transmitted with a bit from Cassiodorus, written some time after the middle of the ninth century. On principle, one should not needlessly multiply bucolics: the most economical solution is that they are one and the same, or rather, that the latter is part of the former.

Medieval Catalogues and the Economy of Transmission

But there is more to this argument than a mechanical application of Ockham's razor. Medieval library catalogues are remarkably accurate as a minimal guide to the transmission of Latin literature.³⁶ At present, there are only at most three ancient texts (more if we include patristic texts) listed in Carolingian catalogues that do not survive, including the bucolics of Olybrius. The other two are the *Opuscula ruralia* of Serenus Sammonicus, listed in the Bobbio catalogue, and a book of Alchimus' declamations in the booklist of Berlin, Diez B Sant. 66.³⁷ Given the hundreds of ancient authors and texts that do survive which are mentioned in the catalogues (indeed it is only exotic specimens like Ampelius and Julius Obsequens which are not to be found in some medieval library catalogue), these three are the genuine anomalies.³⁸ A cautionary tale: the famous Lorsch catalogue contains an entry (no. 427) *Metrum Severi episcopi in evangelia libri XII*.³⁹ Ever since this entry became known, scholars assumed the work was lost, and even suspected some corruption, since following in the catalogue are ten eclogues and four georgics by the same author (*eiusdem eglogas X, eiusdem Georgicon libri IIII*). In 1967, Bernhard Bischoff found in Trier some unnumbered fragments from a ninth-century codex, containing securely identifiable scraps of this work. Not until 1994 did the bishop Severus finally receive his *editio princeps*.⁴⁰ The lesson of this story is that catalogues deserve a great deal of credence, and hence we should be quite sure that a text with the title *Bucolicon Olybrii* did in fact exist at Murbach in the ninth century, and that, given the tremendous economy of the transmission of classical literature from the Carolingians on, it is much more likely than not to be preserved somewhere. Identifying the *EE* with the *Bucolicon Olybrii* solves two difficulties at a stroke.

³⁶ As Reeve has pointed out (1988: 79–81), the best guide is obviously surviving manuscripts, and relying exclusively on catalogues would lead one to underestimate the diffusion of a text in the Middle Ages by a factor of a hundred or more. Nonetheless, since catalogues tend to understate the diffusion of a text, they are still very useful to determine which texts were known at all.

³⁷ See Reynolds 1983: xxviii–xxix.

³⁸ The most convenient place to peruse the ancient authors in medieval catalogues remains Manitius 1935.

³⁹ See the most recent edition by Häse 2002: 165.

⁴⁰ Bischoff *et al.* 1994.

In terms of the history of the transmission of classical literature, linking the two is all but unavoidable. What indeed are the odds that two different, unrelated ancient collections of bucolic poems circulated in the Bodenseeraum in the ninth century, leaving scarcely a trace anywhere else? Yet according to the widely-accepted account of the *EE*, they could not possibly be in fact by any Olybrius since they were composed under the emperor Nero, sometime in the decade A.D. 55–65. In the second part of this study, I will examine the internal evidence for when the *EE* were composed.

III THE DATE OF THE *EINSIEDELN* ECLOGUES

Determining the date of composition of the *EE* is no simple task. Obviously, if Calpurnius is late, *a fortiori* the *EE* are probably late as well. Beyond that, we have a much more limited set of approaches to establish the date of their composition. It is important to keep in mind the statistical impossibility of proving anything about the author's poetic practice — the sample is simply too small. Two false quantities in the poems may mean one every forty lines or one every thousand lines. We simply do not know because we do not have enough of the author's poetic output.⁴¹

'Of Neronian Date'?

One thing we can examine to get a more precise sense of the dating is the language and usage. All the words contained in the *EE* are classical, but some of the particular usages are found primarily after the first century. In I.44, the white head of the figure whose identity must have been indicated in the line cut away by the binder 'was shining with full honour (*pleno radiabat honore*)'. The sense of *plenus* here must be absolute: there is nothing implied or stated in the context which tells us what it is *full of*. Instead it means *summo honore* (as in Lucr., *DRN* 4.1155: 'summoque in honore vigere'), or *magno honore* (as in Ovid, *Fasti* 6.658: 'magnus et in magno semper honore fuit'), or *multo honore* (as in Virg., *Aen.* 3.474: 'multo compellat honore'). Parallel absolute usages of *plenus* are rare before the fourth century (cf. *TLL* s.v. *plenus*).⁴² Similarly, as Armstrong

⁴¹ Thus far, I have tacitly assumed single authorship of the two poems — I have done this on the basis of their shared transmission, and assigning them to two different authors needlessly makes an already complicated situation even more complicated. As I said above, bucolics should not be unnecessarily multiplied, nor should bucolic poets. Most accounts that attribute the poems to two different authors start from statistical analyses, such as in Duckworth 1967. To his credit, Duckworth was responsible enough to note that the samples are too small to support any meaningful conclusion (81), but then he goes ahead and analyses the poems anyway. The fragility of his analysis can be briefly shown: he makes much of the fact that *EE* I has a narrower range of preferred metrical patterns (85.11 per cent show one of the eight most preferred patterns), while *EE* II is more varied (only 65.79 per cent of these lines show the eight preferred patterns). On the surface, that seems convincing, especially when Duckworth notes that the widest range in Calpurnius (between VI and IV) is a mere 70.65 to 81.65 per cent. But in real number terms, what this means is 40 of the 47 lines of *EE* I are in the first eight patterns, and 25 of the 38 of *EE* II. Given the massive textual corruption, this is beyond insignificant. For example, Duckworth uses Hagen's rewriting of *EE* II.23: 'Saturni rediere dies Astraetaeque virgo' (from Duff's edition). But the MS actually reads 'Saturni rediere dies, redit Astraeta virgo'. Obviously corrupt, but also more obviously like a different metrical pattern (particularly assuming the terrible *Astræa*). Were the metrical pattern of just one line in each poem changed the other way, suddenly the percentages would be 82.98 to 68.42 per cent; if two changed, then we would have 80.85 to 71.05 per cent, an even narrower range than that found in Calpurnius. There are at least five places in *EE* I where the metrical pattern is affected by the choice of readings; in *EE* II there are at least three. That is why it is never responsible to do statistical analysis of small samples, because small changes, small errors, and small variations end up having a large impact on the final result. The problem is exacerbated when analysis descends into individual cases, as in Korzeniewski 1966: 358–60. Once these metrical reasons are eliminated, the similarities between the two become overwhelming; see Amat 1997: 145–8. See also the discussion in Horsfall 1997: 175–6, 192.

⁴² *TLL* X I 2405.72–2426.7 (Reinecke).

has already noted, the *EE* use *totus* where the meaning has to be that of *omnis* or *summus* on no fewer than three occasions (I.31 ‘toto ... amore’, II.24 ‘totaque ... saecula’, and II. 25 ‘tota spe’).⁴³ It is a telling fact that Baehrens and other editors have attempted to emend all three of these passages, as if baleful corruption struck the word *totus* independently in three different places. In the first and last example, they emend the case of *tota* to give it a more regular companion (‘zonas ... totas’ and ‘totas ... aristas’ respectively), and in the second, they read *tutaque* despite the fact that *tutis* itself is transmitted without any trouble just a few lines later (II.36). This can be nothing but obduracy in the face of the obvious: the author of the *EE* has an expansive idea of the semantic range of *totus*. We can observe this shift in the Latin language from Apuleius on all the way to the point that most of the Romance words for universal quantity are derived from *totus*, not *omnis* (*tous*, *todo*, *tutto*, *tot*, etc., but cf. It. *ogni*).⁴⁴ In fact, all three individual phrases can be paralleled by later examples (‘toto ... amore’ ~ Orig., *Cant.* trans. Ruf. 2, p. 170 Baehrens; ‘tota ... saecula’ ~ Tert., *Adv. Marc.* 5, p. 542 Evans; ‘tota ... spe’ ~ Apul., *Met.* 6.5). To suggest that a Neronian author — or even worse, two Neronian authors — deploy such late features repeatedly runs counter to what we know about the development of the Latin language.

The other useful approach is to look at *fontes* and parallels. If there are a large number of small concurrences with post-Neronian poets, it is very likely that the *EE* are later, as it is far more plausible that one later author had a standard literary education which gave him familiarity with both golden and silver poets, than that the major late Neronian and Flavian authors all happened to be acquainted with this one author who has left no other trace of his existence. The evidence here is somewhat ambiguous but worth briefly presenting:

- I.16 palma labori ~ Sil. Ital. 3.327 palmamque ex omni ferre labore
- I.17 sidereo ... ore ~ Val. Flacc. 4.190 sidereo Pollux interritus ore
- I.36 volucris ... saltu ~ Stat., *Theb.* 6.569 volucris ... saltu
- I.38 tu quoque Troia sacros cineres ~ Sil. Ital. 3.565 Troiae extremos cineres sacramque ruinam
- I.46 candida flamenti discinxit tempora vitta ~ Stat., *Achill.* 1.611 cinxit purpureis flamentia tempora vittis
- II.5–6 haud timet hostes / turba canum vigilans ~ *Ilias Latina* 489–90 horrida terret / turba canum⁴⁵
- II.24 totaque in antiquos redierunt saecula mores ~ Sil. Ital. 14.683–4 ergo exstat saeculis stabitque insigne tropaeum / et dabit antiquos ductorum noscere mores
- II.37 mordent frena tigres ~ Sil. Ital. 17.648 egit pampineos frenata tigris currus

These are the all too easily obtained results of database trawling: some of them (though by no means all) a sceptic could dismiss as trivial. Nonetheless, together they suggest it is much more likely that the author of the *EE* wrote after the major late first- and early second-century authors. In other words, sources and parallels suggest the same thing as analysis of the language: they were probably not composed before the end of the second century.

The Bucolic Tradition

We can also situate the *EE* in the bucolic tradition. It is virtually certain that they postdate and respond to Calpurnius, as argued above.⁴⁶ Since Calpurnius is either Neronian or

⁴³ Armstrong 1986: 131.

⁴⁴ See Bertocchi *et al.* 2010: 121–2. A number of late instances are collected in Rönsch 1869: 338. I owe this reference to Bertocchi *et al.*

⁴⁵ For the *Ilias latina*, one may also consult the parallels assembled by Scaffai 1997: 22–6; I do not find them convincing.

⁴⁶ See Horsfall 1997: 192–3 and Amat 1998.

much later, such a conclusion does nothing to clarify their dating. But there is evidence that they make use of Nemesianus (who is securely documented as third-century) as well: *EE* I.9: ‘fistula silvicolae munus memorabile Fauni’ is certainly connected with *Nem.* 1.14: ‘Iam mea ruricolae dependet fistula Fauno’, while *EE* II.37: ‘subeunt iuga saeva leones’ harks back to *Nem.* 4.54: ‘iuga ... coget sua ferre leones’. The first example, where the *EE* gloss the *fistula* as a gift of wood-dwelling Faunus, is very likely a reference to Nemesianus. We also know that Nemesianus’ line about yoked lions gained a certain amount of cachet, being quoted in a poem written in 384, recently attributed to Pope Damasus, *Carmen contra paganos* 103: ‘vidimus argento facto iuga ferre leones’.⁴⁷ So it is likely, but at this point not entirely certain, that the *EE* postdate Nemesianus, who was active in the 280s.

Besides Calpurnius and Nemesianus, another text in the bucolic tradition to which the *EE* relate is the *De mortibus boum* (*DMB*) of Endelechius.⁴⁸ Endelechius taught rhetoric in Rome in the 390s; besides his authorship of this poem, he is mentioned by Paulinus of Nola (*epist.* 28.6) around 400, and more importantly, in the *subscriptio* to the ninth book of Apuleius’ *Metamorphoses*, written in 395 by a certain Sallustius, during the consulship of Olybrius and Probinus: ‘Ego Sallustius legi et emendavi Rome felix Olibrio et Probino v. c. cons. in foro Martis controversiam declamans oratori Endelechio.’⁴⁹ Just like the author of the *EE*, Endelechius was not only a bucolic poet, but possibly a panegyrist as well; it was at his suggestion that Paulinus composed his panegyric for Theodosius. Endelechius’ only surviving literary work is the *DMB*. While deeply Virgilian, this poem is formally innovative, composed in asclepiads rather than hexameters; it is, moreover, explicitly Christian.

There can be little doubt that Endelechius modelled the beginning of the *DMB* on *EE* II.

GL. Quid tacitus, Mystes? MY. curae mea gaudia turbant:

cura dapes sequitur, magis inter pocula surgit,
et gravis anxietas laetis incumbere gaudet.

GL. non satis accipio. MY. nec me iuvat omnia fari.

GL. forsitan imposuit pecori lupus? MY. haud timet hostes

turba canum vigilans. GL. vigiles quoque somnus adumbrat.

MY. Altius est, Glycerane, aliquid, non quod patet: erras.

GL. atquin turbari sine ventis non solet aequor.

MY. quod minime reris, satias mea gaudia vexat.

GL. deliciae somnusque solent adamare querellas.

MY. ergo si causas curarum scire laboras —

GL. ...

tu dic quae sit tibi causa tacendi.

AEG. Quidnam solivagus, Bucule, tristia,

Demissis graviter luminibus, gemis?
Cur manant lacrymis largifluis genae?
Fac, ut norit amans tui.

BUC. Aegon, quaeso, sinas alta silentia

Aegris me penitus condere sensibus:

Nam vulnus reserat qui mala publicat;

Claudit, qui tacitum premit.

AEG. Contra est quam loqueris, recta nec autumas.

Nam divisa minus sarcina fit gravis;
Et quidquid tegitur, saevius incoquit.

Prodest sermo doloribus.

BUC. Scis, Aegon ...

⁴⁷ Cameron 2011: 307–9.

⁴⁸ Spellings of his name differ — I have followed that of the Apuleius subscription. The title of the poem in Pithou is bizarre: *Incipit carmen Severi Sancti, id est Endelechi Rhetoris de mortibus boum*. This inscription has given rise to various implausible interpretations; now, however, with the St-Oyan catalogue, which lists the author simply as Endelechius (*versus Endelici de mortibus boum*), we are in a position to jettison ‘Severus Sanctus’ as a textual interloper; cf. Cock 1971.

⁴⁹ Found in Florence, MS Laur. 68.2, f. 171v; cf. Gaisser 2008: 46–7.

The shared vocabulary of these two passages is immediately apparent: *quid* *EE* I.1 ~ *quidnam* *DMB* 1; *tacitus* *EE* II.1, *tacendi* *EE* II.14 ~ *tacitum* *DMB* 8; *gravis* *EE* II.3 ~ *graviter* *DMB* 2, *gravis* *DMB* 10; *altius* *EE* II.7 ~ *alta* *DMB* 5; *scire* *EE* II.11 ~ *scis* *DMB* 13.⁵⁰ But this jejune list of common words scarcely reveals the extent of the relationship between the two poems. Almost everything the poet of *EE* II says is said by Endecheius *in different words*. So ‘quid tacitus’ (*EE* II.1) becomes ‘quidnam solivagus ... gemis’ (*DMB* 1–2). Glyceranus says, ‘I do not really understand’ (*EE* II.4); Aegon says, ‘Make your friend understand’ (*DMB* 4). Mystes says in response, ‘It does not please me to say everything’ (*EE* II.4); Buculus responds to Aegon, ‘Allow me to keep deep silence in my troubled feelings’ (*DMB* 5–6). After a failed suggestion, Mystes tells Glyceranus he is wrong (*errās*), and then that the problem is what one would least expect (*EE* II.7); so too Aegon tells Buculus, ‘It is the opposite of what you say, your claim is false’ (*DMB* 9). Both poems have an exchange of proverbs, three in each case. *EE* II has ‘the smooth sea does not usually become choppy without winds’, ‘satiety troubles my joys’, and ‘pleasure and sleep are often given to quarrels’ (8–10). Only the first of these is listed in Otto’s *Sprichwörter* (no. 23), although all of them have the sententious flavour of paremiology.⁵¹ ‘Satiās gaudia vexat’, for example, is just a reworking of the old chestnut ‘la satiété engendre le dégoût’ (Montaigne’s formulation), which goes all the way back to Solon (fr. 6.3 West: τίκτει γὰρ κόπος ὕβριν), already very well worn by the fourth century.⁵² Likewise, the *DMB* present Buculus’ apothegm about how silence heals and then Aegon’s version of Prov. 28:13, ‘a burden divided is less heavy’ (compare Sedulius, *carm. Pasch.* 4.76–8), along with some homespun wisdom about a boiling pot (*DMB* 7–11).⁵³ None of these are listed in Otto or Walther, though they are obviously proverbial. Finally, in the *EE*, Mystes gives in, ‘therefore, if you are eager to know the cause of my worries’ (*EE* II.11), which Glyceranus interrupts with an invitation to rest under the shade of the tree, and then says, ‘you, tell what is the cause of your silence’ (*EE* II.14). Likewise, in the *DMB*, Aegon concludes his second proverb with an invitation to speech, ‘talking helps pain’ (*DMB* 12), and Buculus begins ‘you know, Aegon, ...’ (*DMB* 13). From this point on, the two eclogues diverge, Mystes continuing with his song about the Golden Age, and Buculus his lament about the plague.

These two poems are structurally affiliated, and it is simply not possible that of the fifteen post-Virgilian ancient eclogues we possess two of them would display such parallels independently. Since, as it seems, *EE* II is modelled on Calp. 4, including its opening, the *DMB* must be the debtor. The *DMB*’s dependence is also apparent in the way it simplifies the complex dialogic structure of *EE* II. The two dates we have for Endecheius are 395 and 400, although if we consider the *DMB* specifically we can obtain a broader range for his career. It has been suggested that the plague it describes took place around 386⁵⁴ and that Paulinus alludes to it in a poem in honour of St Felix written in January of 406.⁵⁵ Thus we have a fairly firm *terminus ante quem* of 405 for *EE* II. Further, the similarities between them — which are pronounced, striking, and immediately obvious, but, nonetheless, scarcely verbal — hint that these are two poems produced in the same milieu. This sort of imitation is more reflective of deliberate rivalry, of doing the same thing in a strikingly different way, than the imitation of past masters and school authors for literary effect. Thus, the evidence from other bucolics gives us a tentative span of about 290 to 405 in which to place the *EE*, with a weak preference for a date closer to the latter.

⁵⁰ On the *DMB*, see Green 2004.

⁵¹ Otto 1890.

⁵² See, for example, Himerius, *orat.* 19.

⁵³ I owe the Sedulius reference to the old but still valuable commentary, Giles 1838.

⁵⁴ Ambrose, *In Luc.* 10.10; cf. Schmid 1953: 122–3.

⁵⁵ Shanzer 2001: 482.

Ausonius and the EE

One significant allusion I think can locate the writing of the poems more precisely. At *EE* I.32–5, the poet makes a reference to Apollo, Python-slayer:

talis Phoebus erat, cum laetus caede draconis
docta repercusso generavit carmina plectro.
caelestes ulli si sunt, hac voce locuntur!
venerat ad modulus doctarum turba sororum

Such was Phoebus, when rejoicing at the slaughter of the dragon, he produced learned songs by striking his plectrum. If there are any heaven-dwellers, they speak with a voice like this! The throng of learned sisters had come to the music.

The reference here is highly specific: the invention of the paeon at the victory of Apollo over the Python. This story goes back to Callimachus' hymn to Apollo, and in Latin there are two other brief accounts of it. The first is Terentianus Maurus, where it is connected with the invention of the iambic metre (1586–95):

cum puer infestis premeret Pythona sagittis
Apollo, Delphici feruntur accolae
hortantes acuisse animum bellantis, ut illos
metus iubebat aut propinqua adoria.
tendebat geminas pavida exclamatio voces,
‘ἦ παῖάν, ἦ παῖάν, ἦ παῖάν’;
spondeis illum primo natum cernis sex.
ex parte voces concitas laeti dabant:
‘ἦ παῖάν, ἦ παῖάν, ἦ παῖάν’;
et hinc pedum tot ortus est iambicus.

When the boy Apollo defeated the Python with hostile arrows, the residents of Delphi, it is said, sharpened his resolve as he fought, urging him on, as fear or its neighbour glory bid them. Frightful shouting extended twin cries: ‘ἦε Παῖαν, ἦε Παῖαν, ἦε Παῖαν’ — you see that there was made for the first time a line with six spondees — on the other side, they happily replied with excited cries: ‘ἦε Παῖαν, ἦε Παῖαν, ἦε Παῖαν’, and from this, the iambic of this many feet arose.

Terentianus' sources are unknown, although they seem to go back to Callimachus.⁵⁶ He also relies on Latin authors for poetic flair (compare, for example, Ovid, *Met.* 1.457–60 and Luc., *BC* 5.80–1). From Terentianus, the motif was adopted by Ausonius in a poem addressed to Iambus, the iambic foot, and sent to Paulinus, around 380 (*epist.* 19b.10–13 Green):

primus novorum metra iunxisti pedum
idemque Musis concinentibus novem
caedem in draconis concitasti Delium.

You [Iambus] first joined the metres of the new feet, and with the nine Muses singing along, you stirred up the Delian to slaughter the dragon.

The essential connection between Ausonius and Terentianus is the iamb: Ausonius' metapoetic enthusiasm led him to Terentianus' *de metris*, where he looked up or recalled the passage on iambs, and then freely retold it in his own words, adding for example the presence of the Muses. Ausonius completely removes the people of Delphi

⁵⁶ The same idea is found in Athenaeus, *Deipn.* 15.62 Kaibel, where Heraclides Ponticus (fr. 158 Wehrli) is cited as the source.

from the story — the ones who originated the chant according to Callimachus and Terentianus.

There can be no doubt that the accounts in *EE* and Ausonius are linked: the lines ‘Phoebus ... laetus caede draconis’ and ‘caedem in draconis ... Delium’ are remarkably similar, particularly when one takes account of their different metres. Terentianus, Ausonius, and the *EE* (along with Claudian’s preface to the *In Rufinum*, which shows scant similarities with the other three⁵⁷) present the only passages in Latin poetry that discuss the slaying of the Python in conjunction with music.⁵⁸ Ausonius was drawing directly from Terentianus, which suggests strongly that the author of the *EE* was acquainted with Ausonius. Considering the contents of the story in the *EE* strengthens this suspicion. In the versions of this story from Callimachus through to Ausonius, the music is always vocal, not instrumental. For no particular reason, beyond the fact that Ausonius used this anecdote for an etiology (‘primus ... iunxisti’), the *EE* combine this story with Apollo’s invention of lyre-music (cf. *TLL* s.v. *generare*).⁵⁹ The story in the *EE* is no old mythological variant, but a mere fusion of two separate stories, induced probably by Ausonius’ inclusion of the Muses, who indeed are mentioned two lines later in the *EE*.

Possible parallels with some of Ausonius’ contemporaries also deserve consideration. In 1892, Knickenberg drew up without comment a list of eight places in *EE* I that have parallels in later poetry, particularly Claudian.⁶⁰ No one since has pursued this line any further (and to be fair, some of the parallels are weak). To them, I would add the following: the evocative ‘opes Heliconis’ (I.37) are found otherwise only in Claudian, *carm. min.* 31.19–20: ‘tunc opibus totoque Heliconis sedula regno / ornabat propriam Calliopea nurum’. The closest parallel to the *Maenalides* of *EE* II.18 is in Ausonius’ *Technopaegnon*: ‘nec cultor nemorum reticebere, Maenalide – Pan’ (51).⁶¹ Nonetheless, in context, the *Maenalides* have nothing to do with Mt Maenalus in Arcadia; instead, they are followers of Bacchus. The only author in Greek or Latin I know of who substitutes Maenalids for Bacchae or Maenads is Nonnus.⁶² Even more telling, II.14: ‘tu dic quae sit tibi causa tacendi’, is almost identical to the question posed to Christ by Pilate in Juvencus 4.597: ‘Pilatus quaerit quae tum sit causa tacendi’.⁶³

Christian vocabulary, in fact, has left traces on the poems. Glyceranus asks Mystes, ‘forsitan imposuit pecori lupus?’ (II.5). Tricky wolves are not rare — the author almost certainly has Virgil, *Ecl.* 5.60–1 in mind: ‘nec lupus insidias pecori nec retia cervis / ulla dolum meditantur’. But *imposuit* specifies the nature of the trick: the wolf is an impostor (cf. *TLL* s.v. *impono*⁶⁴) among the sheep (*pecus* here is a flock of sheep as in *Ecl.* 5.60). Proverbial as the ‘wolf in sheep’s clothing’ might be to us, its origin is in the Gospels (Mt. 7:15). That we have a wolf using disguise to get access to sheep — this is

⁵⁷ Claudian may have been drawing on Callimachus directly or other Greek sources; see Gualandri 2004: 90–3.

⁵⁸ There are discussions similar to that of Terentianus in the metricians; cf., for example, Aphthonius, *de metris* 1 (VI.50 Keil).

⁵⁹ *TLL* VI 2 1789.73–1798.15 (G. Meyer). *Generare carmina* is itself an odd expression; we find an analogue first used hesitatingly by Suetonius (*Nero* 52: [versus] ‘quasi a cogitante atque generante exaratos’). After that we find it in Ausonius (*Epist.* 14.91: [hendecasyllabi] ‘quos generat puella Sappho’).

⁶⁰ Knickenberg 1892: 151: I.24 ~ *Paneg. Theod.* 253 [for 271?]; I.25 ~ *In Eutr.* 1.11; I.30 ~ *Paneg. Prob. Olyb.* 193, *Stil.* 2.7ff.; I.38 ~ *Stil.* 3.196 [for 3.210?].

⁶¹ It is true that the *EE* and Ausonius are using different lexical forms — *Maenalis*, *-idis* and *Maenalides*, *-ae* — respectively; nonetheless, the only other instances of *Maenalis* (two in Ovid, one in Statius) are not substantive, all nominative singular, and not connected with Pan at all.

⁶² Nonnus, *Dionysiaca* 34.164, 250; 35.232, 260; and 36.145.

⁶³ This parallel is in fact noted without comment by Amat 1997: ad loc.

⁶⁴ *TLL* VII 1 650.29–660.47 (Hofmann).

why dogs are Mystes' only sure defence⁶⁵ — strongly indicates an author well aware of the 'lupi rapaces in vestimentis ovium'.

Pseudo-Octavian and the EE

Ausonius is not our author's only certain source. As Knickenberg first noted, the *EE* share an important half-line (I.36) with a poem in the *AL* (672.35): 'huc huc Pierides'.⁶⁶ Verdière correctly comments that this poem is late antique; he automatically assumes, however, that it is indebted to the *EE*. The poem in question is the famous *Versus Octaviani Caesaris in laudem Maronis*, beginning 'Ergone supremis', a rhetorical set-piece in which Augustus defends his decision to preserve the *Aeneid* against Virgil's dying wishes. Fairly popular in antiquity, it survives in a variety of versions, and with several ancient imitations. One of them is ascribed to the grammarian Phocas — if that ascription is correct, the poem would have been composed before the end of the fourth century.⁶⁷ It is not only this half-line that the two poems share: the broader theme is remarkably similar, the destruction of Troy. 'Octavian' says (24–9):

Iterum sentire ruinas
Troia suas, iterum cogetur reddere †voces⁶⁸
...
Hoc opus aeternum ruet? Et tot bella, tot enses
In cineres dabit hora nocens et perfidus error?
Huc huc Pierides ...

Again Troy will be forced to feel its ruin, again to render its [...] ... Will this everlasting work fall? And will a deadly hour and a treacherous mistake commit so many wars, so many blades, to the ashes? Here, here, Pierides ...

These images of ruin and burning are meant to elide the burning of Troy with the proposed burning of the *Aeneid*, which he refers to as *hoc opus* (27). Likewise, the *EE* continue (I.36–41):

huc huc, Pierides, volucris concedite saltu:
...
tu quoque Troia sacros cineres ad sidera tolle
atque Agamemnoniis opus hoc ostende Mycenis.
iam tanti cecidisse fuit! gaudete, ruinae,
et laudate rogos: vester vos tollit alumnus!

Here, here, Pierides, approach with a flying leap ... You too, Troy, lift your sacred ashes to the stars, and show this work to Agamemnon's Myceneans. Now it is worth it to have fallen! Rejoice, ruins, and praise your pyres: your nursing raises you up!

Commentators have already noted the connection of these lines with the story of Virgil burning the *Aeneid*, preparing readers for the last line of the poem in

⁶⁵ Dogs, interpreted as bishops, guard against wolves in sheep's clothing in Christian texts; cf. Ambrose, *hexam.* 6.4.17; Peter Chrysologus, *serm.* 40; Aug., *serm.* 169 (*PL* 38), col. 919 and 178, col. 965; idem, *enarr. in psalm.* 93.1; and Isid., *Etym.* 1.40.

⁶⁶ Knickenberg 1892: 151; Verdière 1954: 267 independently (?) notes the same borrowing.

⁶⁷ Kaster 1988: 339–41. Mazhuga 2003 argues that Phocas' life of Virgil predates that of Donatus, which would make 'Octavian' substantially earlier, but would not affect the argument presented here.

⁶⁸ Shackleton Bailey 1982: 121 conjectures *fumos* for *voces*, but cf. Zurli 1997: 169.

which Mantua destroys its pages.⁶⁹ The repeated vocabulary is too similar to be coincidental.⁷⁰

Contra Verdrière, however, the relationship almost certainly goes the other way. It is the *EE* which allude to ‘Octavian’, and not vice versa. This can be shown on both external and internal grounds. For the first, the *Versus* were popular in antiquity, from the late fourth century on; from that point they began to become one of the standard pieces transmitted with the Virgilian corpus. The *EE*, however, do not seem to have been so widely known. On that ground alone it is far more likely that the *EE* copy the *Versus*. The contextual case is even stronger. Both passages are discussing the fall of Troy, and both passages include (implicitly at least) a Caesar. But in ‘Octavian’, Caesar intervenes so that Virgil’s *Aeneid* is saved, while in the *EE*, Virgil’s *Aeneid* ends up destroyed as Caesar’s own head is crowned. This irony cannot but be intentional. A reader of the *EE* familiar with ‘Octavian’ would be signalled by the memorable *Huc huc* to call to mind Augustus’ preservation of Virgil’s poetic achievement, only to be shocked (and probably amused) by a Caesar’s triumph causing the destruction of the *Aeneid*. Getting the order wrong completely obscures the force and meaning of Thamyras’ encomium.

Interestingly, there is external evidence for the conjunction of Endeleichius, who was influenced by the *EE*, and ‘Octavian’, who influenced them. The *De mortibus boum* scarcely survives: for a long time, it was thought only to be found in the printed edition of Pithou (1586), until a sixteenth-century manuscript copy turned up, at any rate closely connected with Pithou’s text.⁷¹ Besides that, the only evidence we have is the eleventh-century catalogue of the books given by Mannon to the library of St-Oyan (Besançon, Arch. Dep. 7 H 9).⁷² There we find it in company with Claudian, Nemesianus, miscellaneous poems, Avianus’ *Fabulae*, the *Aenigmata* of Symphosius, and the *Versus Octaviani* (no. 89). The collection in the manuscript of Mannon (possibly from Lyon) is a context in which the *EE* would find themselves perfectly at home. Such also is the context of *Bucolicon Olybrii*, immediately followed in the Murbach catalogue by Serenus’ *De medicina praecepta*, then Avianus and Symphosius (327–330 Milde).

A Grammatical Education

Another feature indicating a later dating is the overwhelming influence of grammatical scholarship. For example, ‘maxime divorum caelique aeterna potestas’ (*EE* I.22) unquestionably comes from Virgil, *Aen.* 10.17: ‘o pater o hominum rerumque aeterna potestas’. But the *EE* are not alluding to this line as it is found in the fourth- and fifth-century manuscripts. Rather, they imitate the version found in Ti. Claudius Donatus and Servius, ‘o pater o hominum divumque aeterna potestas’. In Late Antiquity, this version is not found outside the late fourth- and early fifth-century commentary tradition. Further, the addition of *caeli* suggests the ‘physical’ interpretation of this line Servius ascribes to Probus, wherein Jupiter is ‘aether, qui elementorum possidet principatum’. Servius then adduces the distinction between Jupiter and Apollo (*ad loc.*, II.385 Thilo/Hagen: ‘*Aeterna autem potestas* adiecit propter aliorum numinum discretionem: nam legimus et Apollinem deposuisse divinam potestatem’), just as we find in the following line of the *EE*, ‘seu tibi, Phoebe etc.’. Another example, even more obvious: ‘languescit senio Bacchus’ (*EE* II.26). The phrase is a fine Horatian tag from *Odes* 3.16.34–5, ‘Bacchus in amphora / languescit’. Porphyrio comments: ‘Bacchus in amfora languescit: Belle languescit, quasi senescit, ac per hoc veterescit’ (116 Holder). A

⁶⁹ Hubbard 1998: 142.

⁷⁰ cf. Knickenberg 1892: 151.

⁷¹ Orleans, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 288 (242); see Cock 1971.

⁷² See the superb study by Turcan-Verkerk 1999, with an edition of the catalogue; as well as Vecce 1988: 75–8.

lovely expression, he says, since *languescit* is an elegant way of saying *senescit* or *veterescit*. The pedantry of our author cannot bear to leave so subtle a phrase unexplained. *Senio* is patently a gloss on Horace, which indicates that our author's knowledge of the poets came straight out of the school-room.

EE II.23, where *Mystes* sings 'Saturni rediere dies †redit *Astraea certo*†', presents a special case. This is one of the closest imitations of Virgil in the two poems, following *Ecl.* 4.6: 'iam redit et *Virgo*, redeunt *Saturnia regna*' — whatever the second hemistich actually originally contained (Hagen rewrote it as 'Astraeaque *virgo*'). Unlike Virgil, the author identifies the *Virgo*, calling her *Astraea*. Far from a use of Virgil's source,⁷³ this lack of allusiveness, this straightforward didacticism, smacks of grammatical education. While we do not have an apposite gloss on *Ecl.* 4.6, see for example the ps.-Probus gloss on *Georg.* 1.32: 'Erigonen dicit virginem, quae Iustitia, Astraei filia, quae cum morata esset aureo et argenteo saeculo cum hominibus, ferreo saeculo se recepit in caelum, quia ultra in terris sedem non habuerit nec sustinuerit se hominum miscere sceleribus.' This gloss provides the key to understanding a much-discussed passage that comes just before (*EE* II.19–20):

tibia laeta canit, pendet sacer hircus ab ulmo
et iam nudatis cervicibus exuit exta (MS *extra*).

The happy flute sings, the sacred goat hangs from the elm, and, his neck already bare, removes his entrails.

Commentators agree that the *sacer hircus* is Virgilian, from *Geo.* 2.395–6:⁷⁴

et ductus cornu stabit sacer hircus ad aram,
pinguiaque in veribus torrebimus exta columnis

And, led by the horn, the sacred goat will stand at the altar, and we will roast his rich entrails on hazel spits.

Shackleton Bailey has already pointed out that *exuit ext[r]a*, is almost an impossible reading, even if no one has heeded him (the *TLL* gives this *exuit* its own sub-category).⁷⁵ He tries to solve this difficulty by emending the MS *extra*, but the passage in the *Georgics* gives us sufficient reason to go with Hagen's *exta* — the corruption, if it exists, must lie elsewhere. One perversity of the line (leaving aside the otherwise unattested sense of *exuere*) is that the goat itself must be the subject of *exuit*, and hence the goat divests itself of its own entrails. Under this reading, the much discussed *nudatis cervicibus* is not a bit of precise cultic detail, but an obvious periphrasis for the same idea as the one read into *Geo.* 2.395.⁷⁶ The commentators tell us that the important word in that line is *stabit*, which indicates that the victim is not unwilling, since an unwilling victim was not an appropriate sacrifice (Servius, *ad loc.* 3.255 Thilo/Hagen): 'tunc est enim aptum sacrificium cum dedicatum animal victimae patiens invenitur.' The longer version, probably going back to Donatus, adds: 'inprobant enim aruspices hostiam quae admota altaribus reluctatur.' This is precisely the force of a bared neck from Livy to Christian texts of the fourth century and later, where it is also used in verse.⁷⁷ Paulinus of Périgueux provides a precise parallel with

⁷³ So Hubbard 1998: 146.

⁷⁴ Merfeld 1999: 153.

⁷⁵ Shackleton Bailey 1982: 126; cf. *TLL* V 2 2112.42–2122.24 at 2114.39–40 (Tietze).

⁷⁶ Attempts to explain the sacrificial procedure can be found in Korzeniewski 1973: 501 and Amat 1997: 221, with bibliography of the earlier literature.

⁷⁷ Livy 22.51.6–8 (about the survivors of Cannae): 'adsurgentes quidam ex strage media cruenti, quos stricta matutino frigore excitaverant vulnera, ab hoste oppressi sunt; quosdam et iacentis vivos succisis feminibus

'patet ecce innoxia ceruix / vulneribus nudata tuis'.⁷⁸ Here we have poetic one-upsmanship: whereas Virgil's goat stood there, not resisting the sacrificing knife, the *EE*'s goat almost performs the sacrifice itself (if the poem indeed says 'hircus ... exuit exta'), unbidden like everything else in the Golden Age.

Indeed, the connection between this couplet and the *Georgics* is even stronger when one examines the lines just above in Virgil (2.388–9): 'et te, Bacche, vocant per carmina laeta, tibique / oscilla ex alta suspendunt mollia pinu.'⁷⁹ The *laeta carmina* go along with the *tibia laeta* that *canit*. (Is it going too far to suggest that the sound of *tibique* played a rôle?) The next line also gives something hanging from a tree (*suspendunt* ~ *pendunt*); in Virgil, the tree is a pine, in the *EE*, an elm. This is no symbolic deviation but a learned innovation, since the commentators are clear that the elm as used for training vines is particularly sacred to Bacchus/Liber (Servius on the line-ending *ab ulmo* in *Ecl.* 1.58: 'ulmus lignum est quod sub vinea fit'; cf. Manilius 3.662: 'tunc liber gravida descendit plenus ab ulmo'; and Petronius, *carm.* 33.2: 'uvaque plena mero fecunda pendet ab ulmo').

Further in Virgil, it is not a bare-necked goat that is hung from the tree, but rather *oscilla*.⁸⁰ The Virgil commentators, such as Servius and ps.-Probus, were at pains to identify these *oscilla*: one explanation tied them to the story of Icarus, the father of Erigone, who was killed for distributing Liber's wine by peasants who could not distinguish between intoxicants and toxins. In despair, Erigone hung herself from a tree. A plague arose afflicting the young women of Attica, who went mad and likewise hung themselves from trees; ultimately, the Athenians discovered from the oracle that Icarus' death had to be avenged before the plague of suicidal madness would end. Hence, little dolls called *oscilla* were hung from trees in memory of the dead women. In one version of the story, Icarus, Erigone and his dog were placed among the stars as Boötes, Virgo and Canis minor (sometimes maior), respectively. This is a minor alternative to the usual identification of Virgo with Iustitia, and the resulting confusion is compounded by the fact that the names Astraea and Erigone could be used both for the daughter of Icarus and Iustitia.⁸¹

EE II capitalizes on this confusion. The common thread running through the whole first part of Mystes' song is Bacchus/Liber: from II.17 'spirant templa mero' to 26 'languescit senio Bacchus', we get a collection of Virgilian tags and allusions, all loosely organized around the same theme, completely recombined in a virtuoso display of grammatical education.⁸² Astraea, with her double significance, is thus the connection between the *Georgics*-inspired rites of Bacchus in this half and the Golden Age of *Eclogues* 4 in the second half. A literate audience surely would have appreciated this subtle nod to the

poplitibusque invenerunt, nudantis cervicem et reliquam sanguinem iubentes haurire; inventi quidam sunt mersis in effossam terram capitibus, quos sibi ipsos fecisse foveas obruentisque ora superiecta humo interclusisse spiritum apparebat; Sulpicius Severus, *Vita S. Martini* 15.1: 'Cumque unus audacior ceteris stricto eum gladio peteret rejecto pallio nudam cervicem percussuro praebuit.' This does not seem to be the same as the bared neck in ps.-Quint., *Declam. mai.* 15.14, where the victim is clearly not especially willing, 'an et sequeris, dum carnifex trahit, intereris, dum hos oculos occisura contingit manus, dum haec amplexibus tuis nota cervix ad supremos nudatur ictus?' Only Merkelbach 1988: 72 has picked up on this sense of the idiom in the *EE*.

⁷⁸ Paulinus of Périgueux, *Vita S. Martini* 2.462–3; cf. also 2.440–2: 'et cum reiecto nudatam tegmine gaudens / ceruicem offerret sanctus, nihil ille retractans / alte sublatus surgit furiosus in ense; patet ecce innoxia ceruix / vulneribus nudata tuis', as well as Venantius Fortunatus 1.328–30: 'ex quibus audaci nisu male fortior unus / dum cuperet gladio caput obruncare sacratum, / cui nuda cervice pater sese obtulit ultro.' All of these are verse renditions of Sulpicius Severus.

⁷⁹ See the discussion of the *Georgics* passage in Thibodeau 2011: 93–7.

⁸⁰ Verdière 1954: 268 has noted already that the goat must be taking the place of the *oscilla*.

⁸¹ Servius ad loc. (III.1.253 Hagen); Ps.-Probus, ad loc. (III.2.372 Thilo/Hagen); idem, *ad Geo.* 1.32 (III.2.353 Thilo/Hagen) and 1.217 (III.2.359 Thilo/Hagen); and *Brev. Exp. in Geo.* ad loc. (III.2.210 Thilo/Hagen). Outside of the Virgil commentary tradition, see Ampelius 2.6; Hygin., *Astron.* 2.4 and *fab.* 130; ps.-Acro, *in epod.* 17.40 (p. 459 Keller); and Mart. Cap. 2.174.

⁸² Amat 1997: 220 notes that this whole scene recalls details from the broader passage in the *Georgics* 2.380–97.

grammaticus' art. Far from displaying any genuine cultic knowledge, the author of the *EE* gives us a romp through the commentary tradition to Virgil, combining different elements as he sees fit: hanging the goat from the tree instead of the *oscilla*, reserving Erigone or Astraea for rewriting *Ecl.* 4.6, changing the tree to an elm to reflect its associations with vines. Virgil provides the raw material; *grammatica* provides the glue which makes the passage hang together. It is not possible that this poem was written without recourse to commentary traditions cognate to those which survive today, and which began to take their mature form in the fourth century.

Grammatical training also guided the poet in naming his characters. In fact, the *EE* are the only ancient Latin bucolics which do not use a single Theocritean character.⁸³ The names they do use are suspect: Glyceranus has already been singled out by Courtney as particularly problematic, not just on literary, but also linguistic, grounds.⁸⁴ All the others are chosen from the Latin tradition, and usually for facile reasons. Midas the judge comes from Ovid; Thamyras and Ladas are both associated with competitions, although only the former with poetry.⁸⁵ It becomes clear that the author chose the name Ladas on account of Juvenal's mention of the runner (*sat.* 13.97), when one examines the old scholion, composed probably in the fourth century: 'Ladas fuit inter nobilissimos cursores Olympico certamine, cui aemulus Talaris eandem gloriae palmam tulit, sed apud Elidem coronatus est.'⁸⁶ With that biography, read again the exchange in *EE* I.13–16:

LA. quid iuvat insanis lucem consumere verbis?
iudicis e gremio victoris gloria surgat.
TH. praeda mea est, quia Caesareas me dicere laudes
mens iubet: huic semper debetur palma labori.

LA. Of what worth is it to use up the light with vain words? Let the glory of the winner rise from the breast of the judge. TH. The spoils are mine, since my mind directs me to recite the praises of Caesar; to this labour the palm is always due.

The conceit of two rivals vying for the *gloria* of the *palma* is lifted from the reading of Juvenal under the *grammaticus*' rod. Sometimes the author can be quite clever in this game of literary onomastics: in the same exchange, Ladas says that [Apollo] 'laudatam ... chelyn iussit variare canendo' (I.18). The force of this boast to Thamyras only makes sense in the context of the chapter on the history of music in Pliny the Elder, 'cithara sine voce cecinit Thamyris primus' (7.204). Unlike his rival's namesake, Ladas makes music with both lyre and voice. Mystes has nothing to do with the slave-boy in Horace, and everything to do with *mysteria*. We cannot chalk it up to accident that it is Mystes who says 'nec me iuvat omnia fari' (II.4).⁸⁷

The question of the names in Latin bucolic is complex: by using Theocritean names, Virgil signals that he is writing the kind of poetry Theocritus wrote, and using non-Theocritean names carves out an independent space for his own poetry. Likewise, Calpurnius uses both Virgilian and Theocritean names to establish his place in the pastoral tradition. The school tradition held otherwise. Commentators on the *Eclogues* such as Servius explain in their prefaces the principles behind bucolic onomastics:

⁸³ Hutchinson 2013: 308.

⁸⁴ Courtney 1999: 398.

⁸⁵ Midas was the judge of a singing contest between Apollo and Pan (*Met.* 11.146–93); he unwisely chose Pan. Thamyris competed against the Muses and lost, and as a result was blinded (cf. *Il.* 2.594–600).

⁸⁶ Wessner 1931: 204, ad loc. Alan Cameron has recently argued that the collection as a whole cannot be earlier than c. 450 (Cameron 2010). His claim may be accurate, but there can be no doubt that many of the individual scholia are earlier, and that much of the exegetical material on the classical poets comes from the fourth-century schools. In general on such questions, see Zetzel 2005.

⁸⁷ Henderson 2013 is the only scholar who takes the very literal nomenclature of the characters seriously.

etiam hoc sciendum, et personas huius operis ex maiore parte nomina de rebus rusticis habere conficta, ut Meliboeus, ὅτι μέλει αὐτῷ τῶν βοῶν, id est quia curam gerit boum, et ut Tityrus; nam Laconum lingua tityrus dicitur aries maior, qui gregem anteire consuevit: sicut etiam in comoediis invenimus; nam Pamphilus est totum amans, Glycerium quasi dulcis mulier, Philumena amabilis.⁸⁸

It should also be kept in mind that the characters of this work have names invented for the most part from rural affairs, such as Meliboeus, *oti melei auto ton boon*, that is, since he takes care of the cows, and Tityrus, for in the tongue of the Spartans the *tityrus* is the largest ram, who usually goes in front of the flock. We find the same thing in comedies, for Pamphilus is all-loving, Glycerium, a sweet woman, Philumena, loveable.

Servius' comments tell us all we need to know — it is not only that bucolic names should have something to do with pastoral or bucolic activity, but that *nomina ficta* in general should be created on the basis of their meaning. In fact, this passage of Servius (or that of his source) is very likely where 'Glyceranus' came from.⁸⁹ The easiest way to turn a sweet woman into a sweet man is to add a masculine suffix, here *-anus*, and Glycerium becomes Glyceranus. Precisely the same tendency can be observed in Endecheus, who introduces one non-Virgilian character, one with a large (and ailing) herd of cows, called Buculus.⁹⁰ We might sneer at Endecheus' naiveté in naming his character, but to the mind of the pre-eminent teachers of Virgil in his own day, he was simply following in Virgil's footsteps.

The Centonists

Another late feature of the eclogues is the overwhelming influence of Virgil. Obviously, from his own lifetime, Virgil exercised a potent sorcery over his successors. Nonetheless, it was only from the shadowy third century on that that sorcery began to demand constant, unremitting verbal echoes, as part of a larger shift in Latin poetic practice. The *cento* is only the most extreme form of a poetic tendency observable in poetry of almost every genre.⁹¹ That is also the way that the *EE* use Virgil. The last line of *EE* II is directly lifted from the fourth eclogue: 'casta fave Lucina: tuus iam regnat Apollo!' (= *ecl.* 4.10). If the *EE* were Neronian, they would offer the earliest example by a century at least of a whole line of Virgil being incorporated into an independent piece of poetry.⁹² But that is not the only example of centonizing. We have already seen that *EE* I.22 and II.23 are close reworkings of Virgil (above, preceding section). Similarly, the hemistich 'quod minime reris' (*EE* II.9) is taken directly from Virgil (*Aen.* 6.97). It is found in precisely the same way in the bucolic *cento* of the otherwise unknown Pomponius (*AL* 719a, l. 50; c. 400). Just like the centonists — the best examples are found in Ausonius'

⁸⁸ Servius, *Comm. in Buc.* praef. (p. 4 Hagen); cf. Philagyrus, *Comm.* praef. (p. 14 Hagen) and ad 1.6 (p. 16 Hagen) and ps.-Probus, *Comm.* praef. (328 Hagen).

⁸⁹ All the names here come from Terence's *Andria*, which strongly suggests that Servius was drawing on a commentary on that play. Neither Donatus nor Eugraphius have a cognate passage.

⁹⁰ See Hutchinson 2013: 307–8.

⁹¹ For a brief overview of the genre, see McGill and Tucker 2014.

⁹² One possible exception would be the *Antibucolica* of Virgil's contemporary, Numitorius (fr. 2, apud *Vit. Don.*): 'dic mihi Damoeta "cuium pecus" anne Latinum / non verum Aegonis nostri sic rure loquuntur', parodying *ecl.* 3.1–2; see Stover 2014. But the difference between this kind of parody (cognate to the parodic 'cento' of Ovid mentioned by Quint., *Inst.* 6.3.96) and the centonizing of the *EE* is conspicuous. There are possibly earlier subliterate centonic compositions preserved in inscriptions, and we also have a comic poem of three lines fashioned out of Virgilian material in Petronius (*sat.* 132.11); see McGill 2005: xxi–xxiv. For obvious reasons, this 'centonizing' is much more like the parodies of Numitorius and Ovid than the centos of Late Antiquity. Finally, we have Columella 10.435–6 which is an ever so close rewriting of *Geo.* 2.175–6, but that couplet is more a quotation since it includes explicit reference to Virgil.

racy *Centō nuptialis* — the poet of the *EE* occasionally rips phrases out of their context to repurpose them in bizarre ways. There can be no doubt that I.28 ‘stetit ostro clarus et auro’ comes from Virgil, *Aen.* 4.134–5 ‘ostroque insignis et auro / stat’; the poet evidently does not mind applying Virgil’s description of a horse to a god. Some lines are almost perfect *centos*, such as *EE* II.16: ‘annua vota ferat sollemnesque incohet aras’, which combines *Aen.* 5.53: ‘annua vota tamen sollemnisque ordine pompas’ and 6.252: ‘tum Stygio regi nocturnas incohat aras’.⁹³ Other fourth-century poets employed Virgil in this way; compare, for example, the opening of Paulinus of Nola’s miniature epic on John the Baptist, ‘summe pater rerum caelique aeterna potestas’, with *EE* I.22. The same line of Virgil is found entire in Proba’s *cento* (29, cf. 463).⁹⁴ I am not positing a direct relationship between Proba or Pomponius or any of the centonists and the *EE*; nonetheless, the use of Virgil in the *EE* is centonizing in an analogous sense. It fits well placed after Proba and Ausonius; but placing it earlier, particularly all the way back in the Neronian age, would make its use of Virgil highly anomalous.

Philosophy

One of the more enigmatic passages in the *EE* is the song of Ladas in *EE* I in praise of Apollo, and in particular its cosmogony (29–31):

talis divina potestas,
 quae genuit mundum septemque intexuit oris
 artificis zonas et toto miscet amore.

Such was the divine power which generated the world and surrounded its seven zones with the demiurge’s borders, and mixes it with all love.

Much can be and has been said about these lines. The passage as a whole is inspired by Appius’ visit to the Sibyl in Lucan 5.86–120, although the influence does not extend to verbal echo. Here I would point out the implicit triad of *divina potestas*, *artifex*, and *amor*. This is at once a vulgarization of the Platonic triad of demiurge, ideas, and matter or world soul — connected to the Plotinian hypostases of Good, Mind, and Soul, and Power, Wisdom, and Goodness — and the Christian trinity. It is hard to imagine a cosmogony with an implicit divine triad that is independent of Neo-Platonic or Christian influence. That the details are not precise is itself the point: our poet is no philosopher, and it was exactly this sort of vulgar philosophizing that the *grammatici* considered their particular purview. The same Platonism can be observed in Servius’ comments on *Aen.* 6.724–9, the most famous philosophical passage in Virgil, and one which the *EE* directly echoes (6.727 ‘magno se corpore miscet’ ~ *EE* I.31 ‘toto miscet amore’); these lines are also cited in one scholion on Lucan 5.95–6.⁹⁵ An extremely similar notion can also be found elsewhere in the scholia to Lucan: ‘hunc spiritum summum deum Plato vocat “artificem” permixtum mundo omnibusque quae in eo sint.’⁹⁶ The only element in the *EE* missing in Virgil, Servius, or the Lucan scholiast is *amor*, but this could well have come from another Platonic source. Calcidius, for example, in his commentary on the *Timaieus*, equates *divina providentia* with *caelestium amor* (cap. 254). Hence it should come as no surprise when we find the Christian

⁹³ This relies on Baehrens’ solid emendation of the MS *imbuet* to *incohet*. Even if we accept the MS’s reading (corrected to *imbuat*), the point remains substantially the same, with the exception that the second part would have come from Calp. 2.67: ‘Nec sunt grata minus quam si caper imbuat aras’.

⁹⁴ Trout 2005: 55 has argued that Paulinus is deliberately nodding to Proba, which is certainly possible but hardly capable of proof; cf. Nazzaro 2004: 479.

⁹⁵ *Commenta bernensia* ad 95.5–6 (157 Usener).

⁹⁶ *Comm. bern.* ad 9.578 (305–6 Usener).

centonists producing passages much to the same effect as the *EE*. Compare Pomponius (10–13):

Namque erit ille mihi semper deus atque hominum rex,
 Omnipotens genitor, rerum cui summa potestas;
 Quem qui scire velit, divinum aspiret amorem.
 Haut ignota loquor, totum quae sparsa per orbem.

For he will always be to me a god and king of men, the everlasting father, to whom belongs supreme power over things; whoever would wish to know him would breathe divine love. I speak things not unknown, which are dispersed throughout the whole world.

With this in mind, we can return to the opening of Ladas' song, where the cosmogony begins (*EE* I.22–9):

Maxime divorum caelique aeterna potestas,
 seu tibi, Phoebe, placet temptare loquentia fila
 et citharae modulis primordia iungere mundi.
 carminibus virgo furit et canit ore coacto,
 fas mihi sit vidisse deos, fas prodere mundum,
 seu caeli mens illa fuit seu solis imago,
 dignus utroque < ... > stetit ostro clarus et auro
 intonuitque manu.

You, greatest of the gods and eternal power of heaven, or you, Phoebus, like to pluck the speaking strings, and to join the fundamentals of the world by the music of the cithara. The virgin rages in songs and sings with a forced mouth — may I be sanctioned to have seen the gods, sanctioned to bring forth the world. Whether that was the mind of heaven or the image of the sun, he stood worthy of both < ... >, shining in purple and gold, and cast thunder with his hand.

The first two lines present a near equivalence between the supreme God and Apollo. This is a Middle Platonic notion, defended at length by Plutarch in the *De E apud Delphos* (393b–394c). The further equivalence of this god with the *mens caeli* and the *solis imago* comes ultimately from Cicero's *Dream of Scipio* 17: 'deinde subter mediam fere regionem Sol obtinet, dux et princeps et moderator luminum reliquorum, mens mundi et temperatio, tanta magnitudine ut cuncta sua luce lustret et compleat.' But one can hardly doubt the influence of the philosophical commentators on this text, such as Macrobius (*comm.* 1.20.6): '[sol] mens mundi ita appellatur ut physici eum cor caeli vocaverunt.' Macrobius is drawing on an earlier source; compare cognate passages in Firmicus Maternus (*mat.* 1.10.14): 'Sol optime maxime, qui mediam caeli possides partem, mens mundi atque temperies, dux omnium atque princeps, qui ceterarum stellarum ignes flammifera luminis tui moderatione perpetuas', and especially Ammianus (21.1.11):

Sol enim, ut aiunt physici, mens mundi, nostras mentes ex sese velut scintillas diffunditans, cum eas incenderit vehementius futuri conscias reddit. Unde Sibyllae crebro se dicunt ardere torrente vi magna flammaram. Multa significant super his crepitus vocum et occurrentia signa, tonitrua quin etiam et fulgura et fulmina itidemque siderum sulci.⁹⁷

For the sun, as the *physici* say, the mind of the world, pouring out our minds from itself like sparks, renders them conscious of what is to be when it has kindled them more fiercely. For this reason, the Sybils often say that they burn with the great torrid power of flame. Besides these,

⁹⁷ See the comments of den Boeft *et al.* 1991 ad loc., to which I owe the reference to Maternus.

the shouting of voices and signs that occur, thunder too and lightning bolts and flashes, and the trails of meteors signify many things.

Ammianus provides us with the direct link, since he suggests a connection between the sun, the *mens mundi*, the Sibyls, and thunder, just like the *EE*'s *solis imago, mens caeli*, raving *virgo*, and thundering hand (I.29). Ammianus' passage is in a digression on divination, and the close verbal correspondence between him and Macrobius suggests that they are both drawing on a common source.

It is theoretically possible that Ladas' speech in *EE* I is a complex, syncretistic amalgam of Stoic and Platonic philosophies with Roman, Greek, and Eastern theologies. But it might just as well be representative of the pop philosophy of the later fourth century we find everywhere in the grammarians — in Macrobius, Servius, Favonius Eulogius, and the scholars whose work is preserved in the scholia to Horace, Lucan, and Statius. In either case, however, it is hardly Neronian.

IV OLYBRIUS AND THE *EINSIEDELN* ECLOGUES

Thus far, I have established that the *EE* are likely to be derived from the *Bucolicon Olybrii* of the Murbach catalogue, and that they were composed sometime between 390 and 405. These two conclusions are independent, though mutually reinforcing. Now I shall consider whether and in what sense we can speak of the *EE* as themselves the bucolics of Olybrius.

Ennodius and the EE

In 1986, David Armstrong noted contrary to received opinion on the *EE*: 'Nothing in them gives any indication that the emperor praised in them must be Nero; he might be any pagan emperor to Julian or Eugenius for all we know.'⁹⁸ This would seem to rule out a connection with any Olybrius — since the family, from the first bearer of the name Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius on, was known as staunchly Christian.⁹⁹ Thanks to the work of Alan Cameron, however, we now know that there ought to be no strict line between 'pagan' and 'Christian' literature in the fourth century, nor between pagan and Christian authors and audiences.¹⁰⁰ Christians often had literary tastes just as classicizing as their pagan colleagues, and in many cases were more devoted to ancient literature. Anne-Marie Turcan-Verkerk has brilliantly shown us how a supposedly pagan panegyrist — Pacatus Drepanius — was himself a Christian poet, who exercised his skill on so pious a theme as the Paschal Candle.¹⁰¹ Hence, we have no reason to rule out *a priori* the possibility that the author of the *EE* or the Caesar they mention was a Christian. Indeed, as shown above, we have good evidence that the author was well acquainted with Christian texts and idioms.

The later history of the *EE* is obscure. There is only one secure touchstone: the late fifth- and early sixth-century bishop and poet Ennodius. It is virtually certain that Ennodius knew these poems. I have already quoted the passage on Apollo Python-Slayer above (*EE* I.32–5):

⁹⁸ Armstrong 1986: 131.

⁹⁹ Prud., *Contra Symmachum* 1.554–7: 'Quin et Olybriaci generisque et nominis heres / adiectus fastis palmata insignis abolla / martyris ante fores bruti submittere fasces / ambit et Ausoniam Christo inclinare securem'. Cf. Salzmänn 2002: 102.

¹⁰⁰ Cameron 2011.

¹⁰¹ Turcan-Verkerk 2003.

talis Phoebus erat, cum laetus caede draconis
 docta repercusso generavit carmina plectro.
 caelestes ulli si sunt, hac voce loquuntur!
 venerat ad modulos doctarum turba sororum

Compare Ennodius, *Carm.* 1.3.22–4: ‘eorum Pindareus flumina uicit auus, / docta Camenali cecinit qui carmina plectro / cuius Apollinei nil tacere chori’; as well as *Carm.* 1.2.5–6: ‘docta Camenarum coeat pia turba sororum, / offerat arguto pollice quod loquitur’. These two passages are obviously related; the fact that they are each closely modelled on two lines of the *EE* occurring in the same passage close together cannot be coincidental. The latter is so similar to *EE* I.35, it should be considered a direct rewriting (*doctarum turba sororum* ~ *docta ... turba sororum*, *venerat* ~ *coeat*, *Camenarum* as a gloss); in addition the line following in Ennodius has the same last word as the line preceding in the *EE* (*loquitur* and *loquuntur*).

Likewise, *EE* I.23 contains a striking phrase ‘to pluck the speaking strings’: ‘seu tibi, Phoebae, placet temptare loquentia fila, / Et citharae modulis primordia iungere mundi.’ *Loquor* used in the context of making music is not common (cf. *TLL* s.v. *loquor*¹⁰²), but the collocation with *filum* is only found in three other authors, all fifth- and sixth-century: Paulinus of Petricordia (*Vita S. Mart.* 6.105), Venantius Fortunatus (*carm.* 6.10.3: *fila loquacia*), and twice in Ennodius (27, preface to *carm.* 1.8: *loquacia fila*; and 208, dict. 24, *carm.* 2.90). Paulinus offers no clear evidence either way, and Venantius probably got the idea from Ennodius, but both the instances in Ennodius have clear connections with the larger context in the *EE*.

By itself, the fact that Ennodius possibly had access to the *EE* would hardly be of any interest. But the reference in 27 is interesting for another reason: it is addressed to a figure named Olybrius. The whole of the preface to 1.8 is full of bucolic imagery, recently analysed by G. Vandone, wherein Ennodius presents himself as an *agrestis pastor* playing the pan-pipes and Olybrius as an *inrisor urbanus* with an Apolline lyre.¹⁰³ Similarly, *carm.* 1.2, which contains the most obvious imitation of the *EE*, is addressed to Eugenius, probably the brother of the same Olybrius.¹⁰⁴ Since there is solid evidence for thinking that the *EE* were transmitted as the *Bucolicon Olybrii*, Ennodius’ use of this material begins to make a lot more sense.

The other factor pointing positively to an identification of the author of the *EE* with a poet Olybrius is provided by the Montecassino florilegium mentioned above. One of the correspondents is identified as Olybrius in the manuscript, and seems to have quite a bit in common with the author of the *EE*.

INL. Campanianus. PATR. Olybrio
 Maiorum similis, nostrorum maior, Olybri,
 Stemma poetarum, regula dogmatibus,
 Trade notas quis quaeque nitent bene dicta priorum;
 Dux bonus audentes prisca tropaea doce,
 Clarius auctorum pateant quae pollice laudes,
 Scis bona cunctorum conscius ipse tuis.

PATR. Olybrius INL. Campaniano
 Stigmata cur spectas maiorum infigere dictis,
 Cuius iudicium sufficit ad titulos?
 Censuram spernunt quae per te lauta patescunt;

¹⁰² *TLL* VII 2 1659.22–1675.6 (Plepelits) at 1668.22–49.

¹⁰³ Vandone 2004. On this Olybrius, see also Schröder 2007: 177–81.

¹⁰⁴ See Kennell 2000: 147. See *PLRE* II, 414–16, Eugenius, and 794–5 Olybrius 5.

Sit satis ad laudem complacuisse tibi,
 Omnia doctorum quem sic cinxere tropaea
 Vt cedat titulis lingua diserta tuis.

Campanianus, *v. i.*, to the patrician Olybrius: One like to your forebears and greater than ours, Olybrius, the scion of poets, the standard of teaching, hand down the *notae* by which whatever passages of the ancients were well-phrased may stand out. Good leader, teach those who dare the ancient trophies; may the passages you highlight in the authors with your thumb grow more clear. You know the good qualities of all of them, while conscious of your own.

Patrician Olybrius to Campanianus, *v. i.* Why do you look to inflict marks on the words of our forebears, you whose judgement is sufficient for fame? What is clear after being cleansed by you needs no criticism. Let it be enough for praise to have given you pleasure, you whom all the trophies of the learned have thus crowned that the discerning tongue gives place to your fame.

Stemma has a number of meanings, including the generic meaning of ancestry, but it can be used specifically for the maternal line.¹⁰⁵ Could this be a reference to Proba? That would provide a nice contrast with *maiorum similis* beginning the previous line, probably referring to Petronius Probus and Olybrius' ancestors on the Petronian side. At any rate, just as we have already seen with the *EE*, there can be no doubt that this exchange is deeply dependent on Ausonius. See his dedication of *Ludus septem sapientum* to Pacatus Drepanius (XXVI.1-18 Green):¹⁰⁶

Ignoscenda istaec an cognoscenda rearis,
 adtento, Drepani, perlege iudicio.
 aequanimus fiam te iudice, sive legenda
 sive tegenda putes carmina quae dedimus.
 nam primum est meruisse tuum, Pacate, favorem:
 proxima defensi cura pudoris erit.
 possum ego censuram lectoris ferre severi
 et possum modica laude placere mihi.

...

Maeonio qualem cultum quaesivit Homero
 censor Aristarchus normaue Zenodoti!
 pone obelos igitur, primorum stigmata vatum:
 palmas, non culpas esse putabo meas
 et conrecta magis quam condemnata vocabo,
 adponet docti quae mihi lima viri.
 interea arbitrii subiturus pondera tanti,
 optabo, ut placeam: si minus, ut lateam.

Read these lines through, Drepanius, with careful judgement on whether you hold they should be ignored or studied. I shall be content for you to be my judge, whether you think the poem I give you should be read or tucked away. For the first thing, Pacatus, is to earn your favour; protecting my modesty is my second concern. I can bear a harsh reader's censure, and I can satisfy myself with just a little praise ... What polish did the critic Aristarchus and the rule of Zenodotus require in Maeonian Homer! Put down, therefore, your *obeli*, the marks proper to the foremost poets: I will consider them my trophies, not my faults; and I will call

¹⁰⁵ cf. Stat., *silv.* 4.4.75: 'stemmate materno felix'; and Mart., *Epig.* 5.35.4: 'longumque pulchra stemma repetit a Leda.'

¹⁰⁶ I thank Evina Steinova for drawing my attention to this parallel passage. My translation benefited from the Loeb of H. G. Evelyn-White.

those passages corrected rather than condemned which the refinement of a learned man shall apply to me. Meanwhile, as I am about to bear the weight of such a judgement, I hope to please. If I please less, I hope to pass unnoticed.

The links between this preface of Ausonius and Olybrius extend beyond the clear resonances in the poems. In line 14, Ausonius says he will consider the *obeli* Pacatus applies to his text *palmae*, not *culpae*. Fault, or *culpa*, is what critical marks like the *obelus* are supposed to indicate.¹⁰⁷ This is a sophisticated bit of wordplay: the Greek *lēmnikos* (L. *lemniscus*) can be used both for a crown for poetic achievement (cf. Ausonius, *epist.* 20.6) and as a critical mark. Ausonius is playing here with its Latin analogue *palma*, as both poetic reward and a critical mark. The use of *palma* for a critical mark is found in only one place: the collection *De notis antiquorum*, which follows the exchange between Olybrius and Campanianus, uses *palma* as a translation of the Greek *obelos* or *lēmnikos*. Such a meaning of *palma* is otherwise not found in Latin literature (it is not in the *TLL*).¹⁰⁸ The fact that they both use this meaning of *palma* suggests very strongly that Ausonius and Olybrius are working in the same milieu.

Just as this Olybrius was already a well-known poet (*maiorum similis*), so was the author of the *EE*, following the standard interpretation of ‘laudatam ... chelyn’ of L.18. Olybrius, despite his vertiginously high standing as a *patricius*, was actively working in the grammatical tradition (‘dux bonus ... doce’), just as the author of the *EE* was. Olybrius may have made much of his descent from Proba (‘stemma poetarum’), and the author of the *EE* is working in the same vein as the centonist. Both Olybrius and the author of the *EE* were influenced by Ausonius, who stood for the later fourth century as a model of how to combine scholarship, poetry, political power, social influence, and imperial service. Indeed, Ausonius was himself consul in 379 along with the first Olybrius, Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius, the son of Proba.

Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius, Author of the EE?

I have been able to narrow down the date of the two poems to a span of about fifteen years, from 390 to 405. This span coincides with the youthful prime of Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius, the grandson of Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius; he was probably born around 375, held the consulship in 395, and was dead by 410.¹⁰⁹ According to Claudian, both Olybrius and his brother co-consul, Anicius Probinus, were accomplished poets; ‘Pieriis pollut studiis’, he says in his panegyric for them.¹¹⁰ We have at least one epigram by Probinus extant in the Bobbio collection (no. 65), which demonstrates that Claudian’s praise had some basis in reality.¹¹¹ We also have a poem-letter of Claudian addressed only to Olybrius (*carm. min.* 40), beginning:

Quid rear, adfatus quod non mihi dirigis ullos
nec redit alterno pollice ducta salus?
scribendine labor? sed quae tam prona facultas,
carmina seu fundis seu Cicerone tonas?

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, ps.-Acro ad Hor., *Art. poet.* 447 (p. 376 Keller) and Gellius 17.2.1.

¹⁰⁸ *De notis antiquorum* (from Reifferscheid 1868: 128): ‘oreon [for horaion] cum palma in invincibilibus acutis ... asteriscus cum palma in sententia acuta.’ The pun is built on the word *lēmnikos* which is both a dotted obelus (≡) and a victor’s crown. Unfortunately, *TLL* X 1 141.40–149.13 (Adkin) does not include this sense (and indeed the *TLL* generally neglects the *De notis antiquorum*); however, it does note that in some instances *palma* can be used as a synonym for *virgula*, which is one common rendering of *obelos* (e.g. Isid., *Etym.* 1.21.3). Mondin 2007–8: 331–2 has defended the connection between the exchange and the *De notis*.

¹⁰⁹ See the recent reconstruction of his life by Dunn 2008, 429–44. This is *PLRE* II Olybrius 2, 639–40.

¹¹⁰ *Paneg. Prob. et Olybr.* 150; cf. Cameron 2011: 365.

¹¹¹ *In Faustum staturae brevis. Anicii Probinii* (p. 79 Speyer).

What should I think, that you send no greetings to me, nor does a salutation, produced by your thumb, come back in turn? Is it the labour of writing? But who has comparable ability, whether you produce poetry, or thunder like Cicero?

The conclusion of the poem is particularly interesting (23–4):

dignatus tenui Caesar scripsisse Maroni,
nec tibi dedecori Musa futura. vale.

Caesar deigned to write to humble Virgil, and the muse will never be a source of shame to you. Farewell.

Here we get the same Caesar-Virgil conceit that marks both ‘Octavian’ and *EE* I. A coincidence perhaps, but this is not a common topos in late antique poetry. Claudian audaciously casts Olybrius himself in the rôle of Caesar, and himself in the rôle of Virgil.

Almost every other contemporary reference to Olybrius and Probinus mentions their excellence in the liberal arts. Their *studia liberalia* are prominently featured in the letters of Symmachus addressed to them.¹¹² A rhetor named Arusianus Messius dedicated a book to Olybrius and Probinus on appropriate usage illustrated with lines from Virgil, Cicero, and Sallust.¹¹³ Given the scholastic features and occasional pedantry of the *EE*, it would be no surprise if they were composed with the aid of such handbooks.¹¹⁴ One possible borrowing is particularly interesting: *EE* I.13: ‘quid iuvat insanis lucem consumere verbis’ is definitely reminiscent of Virg., *Aen.* 2.776: ‘quid tantum insano iuvat indulgere dolori’; but Arusianus alone presents a variant of this line much closer to the *EE*, ‘quid iuvat insano tantum indulgere labori’ (no. 260 Della Casa).

One might hope that the Montecassino epigrams would help in identifying our Olybrius. Unfortunately, this Olybrius cannot be identified, while his correspondent Campanianus can be identified but not dated.¹¹⁵ Iulius Felix Campanianus was successively it seems *comes ordinis primi et formarum* as *v[ir] c[larissimus] et spectabilis*, urban prefect of Rome as *v. c.*, and finally styled *v. i.* in the Montecassino poem.¹¹⁶ His successor in the first office was one Tarpeius Anneius Faustus, *v. c. et spectabilis*, also otherwise unknown.¹¹⁷ We do, however, have attested in 384 a procurator of Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius called Tarpeius, also *v. c.*, and these two are the only references to a Tarpeius, *v. c.*, in *PLRE*.¹¹⁸ Accounts which seek to place Campanianus in the middle of the fifth century assume that this Tarpeius must have been a descendant of the older.¹¹⁹ Since, however, both Campanianus and Tarpeius are independently connected to an Olybrius, it seems to better fit the evidence to put them both at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the fifth century, in which

¹¹² Symmachus, *epist.* 67–71.

¹¹³ Edited by A. della Casa (1977); on this handbook see Magallón García 2002. It is uncertain whether the year 395 represents a *terminus post quem* or *terminus ante quem* for the work; della Casa believes that it may have been written earlier, for the two brothers’ adolescent education; cf. Maggiulli 1982: 172–3.

¹¹⁴ *impono* (*EE* I.4, I.21, II.5 ~ 298 della Casa), *impleo* (*EE* I.45 ~ 261 della Casa), *incumbo* (*EE* II.3 ~ 263 della Casa), *spargo* (*EE* II.12 ~ 531 Keil), *resono* (*EE* II.17 ~ 488 Keil), *pendo* (*EE* II.19, II.31 (with two different constructions) ~ 438 Keil), *exuo* (*EE* II.20 ~ 199 della Casa), *condo* (*EE* II.25 ~ 310 della Casa), *erro* (*EE* II.26 ~ 301 della Casa), *despero* (*EE* II.34 ~ 155 della Casa), *subeo* (*EE* II.37 ~ 504 della Casa).

¹¹⁵ *PLRE* III Olybrius 1, 794 and Campanianus 2, 255.

¹¹⁶ *PLRE* III Campanianus 4, p. 256.

¹¹⁷ *PLRE* III Faustus 5, 452.

¹¹⁸ *PLRE* II Tarpeius, 875. The mention occurs in the context of a legal dispute during Symmachus’ term as urban prefect, as narrated in *Relatio* 28. For a recent discussion, with bibliography, see Uhalde 2012: 773–7.

¹¹⁹ Scharf 1992.

case we need no recourse to hypothetical descendants. The extraordinarily close links between Campanianus' poem and Ausonius only strengthen this identification.¹²⁰

Connecting these eclogues with the family of the Olybrii fits well with their origin, reception, and transmission. The line begins from Faltonia Betitia Proba, the mother of Q. Clodius Hermogenianus Olybrius, and (probably) the foremost Christian centonist. The family may have been keen to advertise their relationship; see, for example, the note from the lost *codex Mutinensis* copied by Montfaucon:

Proba uxor Adelphi, mater Olibrii et Aliepii cum Constantii bellum aduersum Magnentium conscripsisset, conscripsit et hunc librum.¹²¹

Proba, the wife of Adelphus, the mother of Olybrius and Alypius, after writing about the war of Constantius against Magnentius, wrote also this book.

Similarly, we have the incipit of the *codex Palatinus*:

Incipiunt indicula Probae, inlustris Romanae, Aniciorum mater, de Maronis, qui et Virgilio, Mantuani vatis libris; praedicta Proba, uxor Adelphii, ex praefecto urbis, hunc centonem religiosa mente amore Christi spiritu ferventi prudenter enucliate defloravit.¹²²

Here begin the *indicula* of Proba, famous Roman woman; mother of the Anicii, this Proba, the wife of Adelphius, the former urban prefect, with a devout mind, the love of Christ, and a fervent spirit, neatly distilled this cento from the books of the poet Maro of Mantua, who is also called Virgil.

The problem of Proba has been wrangled over for decades now; it seems that the traditional identification is still intact.¹²³ All I will point out is that these two inscriptions, which certainly go back to some ancient information, both identify Proba as *uxor* and *mater*. I wonder, however, if the purpose of this biography is not to advertise her illustrious connections (a fact superfluous to the poem), but rather for her family to advertise their connection to her.

The name Olybrius persisted through the fifth century, with an emperor Anicius Olybrius reigning briefly in the West in 472.¹²⁴ Olybrii maintained their prominence under the Ostrogothic kings, with the consul of 491, the emperor's grandson, and the correspondent of Ennodius (whatever their relationship to each other may have been),¹²⁵ and into Cassiodorus' lifetime with Olybrius, cos. 526.¹²⁶ Such a history perfectly matches the *fortuna* of the *EE*: composed under the influence of Ausonius, imitated and alluded to by Ennodius, transmitted with Cassiodorus.

¹²⁰ The titles *inlustris* and *patricius* are more common in the fifth century than the fourth, a fact which weakly suggests that the Montecassino epigrams were composed in the fifth century. We do not have independent evidence that Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius was granted the title *patricius*; he is the sort of person who is likely to have been so honoured, and our sources for the patriciate are extremely patchy. Many of the individuals we know as *patricii* are identified as such in only a single source. My thanks to George Woudhuysen for sharing some of his as-yet-unpublished research on the patriciate with me.

¹²¹ See *CSEL* 16, p. 513 Schenkl; the manuscript read *Constantini* for *Constantii*.

¹²² *ibid.*, 519.

¹²³ Shanzer 1986 proposed that it was actually Faltonia Betitia Proba's grand-daughter, Anicia Faltonia Proba, who composed the cento; following were Sivan 1993, Shanzer 1994, and Barnes 2006. On the other side are Matthews 1992, Green 1995, and most recently Cameron 2011: 327–37. Even if one were to follow Shanzer, Sivan and Barnes, it would hardly alter the conclusions reached here.

¹²⁴ *PLRE* III Olybrius 6, 796–8.

¹²⁵ *PLRE* III Olybrius 3 and 5, 795–6.

¹²⁶ *PLRE* III Olybrius 7, 798.

Conclusion

Heretofore, I have eschewed any interpretation of the poems. This is deliberate — it is imperative that we first get the facts of transmission and relative dating correct before we attempt to describe the cultural and historical context in which the poems were written. The strongest features supporting a Neronian interpretation of the poems are based on precisely such analysis of the contents, and particularly of the Caesar introduced in *EE* I. And yet such analysis can only bear any weight insofar as it arises from an accurate placement of them in Roman literary history. If the poems postdate Ausonius, they simply cannot represent the literary culture of Neronian Rome, and the work of situating these poems historically must begin anew. The only suggestion I make is that the Caesar of *EE* I is as likely to be a literary creation as a political figure, more akin to the ‘Octavian’ of the *Versus in laudem Maronis* and the Caesar of Claudian’s letter to Olybrius, than to any ruler of the Roman Empire.¹²⁷

Thus far I have paid scant attention to the first editor of the *EE*, Hermann Hagen. By way of conclusion, then, let us return to the very beginning. It was the librarian of Einsiedeln, Fr. Gall Morel, who discovered the *carmina* while preparing the catalogue of the library’s holdings in the 1840s. Almost thirty years later, he entrusted their publication to the young Hagen, who had recently arrived at Bern.¹²⁸ Hagen needed to publish them quickly, since the first volume of Alexander Riese’s *Anthologia latina* was nearing completion, and he wanted them to be included. The two poems were thus printed twice in 1869, in *Philologus* and in the *AL*. The following year Rudolf Peiper suggested briefly that the poems were probably Neronian,¹²⁹ and the year after that (1871) Hagen followed the *editio princeps* with a detailed study supporting Peiper’s hypothesis. All of this came on the heels of Haupt’s recent redating of Calpurnius (1854) to that period; in the same year as Hagen’s study, Franz Bücheler made the explicit link.¹³⁰

Some eleven years later, Hagen published another bit of improbable antiquity gleaned from a manuscript, a little epigram transmitted, so he claimed, in a Bern manuscript authentically under the name of Octavianus Augustus.¹³¹ This second identification never gained such universal assent as his earlier placement of the *EE* in the Neronian age, but it was not until the twenty-first century that the phantom epigram of Augustus was finally laid to rest by John Contreni.¹³² Hagen, it turns out, had misexpanded an *Oct. Aug.* into *Octavianus Augustus*. As Contreni demonstrates, it actually should be *Octava Augusta*, or 7 August, the octave of the feast of St Germanus of Auxerre.¹³³

This mistake is illustrative — Hagen failed to pay enough attention to the mechanics of transmission. He never came up with any account, much less a persuasive account, for how an epigram of Augustus could have ended up in the margins of a Priscian manuscript in the company of Augustine and Ambrose. Despite his vast expertise with manuscripts still visible in his catalogue of Bern (1874–75), he nonetheless did not ask the right questions when confronted by a new, previously unknown text. By analogy then, he made a

¹²⁷ One reason why the Neronian dating has been considered beyond question is that *EE* I is thought to describe a Caesar who wrote a poem about Troy, which obviously would be very applicable to Nero. If one rereads the poem with fresh eyes, however, one will find that, although the standard reading is one possible interpretation, it is hardly the only one, and probably not the most compelling. In a future article, I will sketch out an alternate account of the meaning of the two eclogues, considering them as late fourth-century products.

¹²⁸ I am correcting the story told in Henderson 2013: 170.

¹²⁹ Peiper 1870: 27–32.

¹³⁰ Bücheler 1871.

¹³¹ Hagen 1880.

¹³² Contreni 2003.

¹³³ My thanks to Michael Allen for discussing Contreni’s article with me. Contreni’s attribution of the hand to Heiric of Auxerre is not secure.

similar mistake with regard to the *EE*. Overly credulous, he never pursued the question of how two Neronian bucolics could have ended up in Einsiedeln 266. Had he only pursued that question instead, and had the Bodensee origin of the manuscript been established sooner, then once the Murbach catalogue became more widely known in the late nineteenth century, perhaps the identity of the *EE* with the *Bucolicon olibrij* would have been instantly recognized.

Likewise, were these poems printed for the first time today, I find it virtually impossible that a scholar could ever get anyone to believe that they are actually Neronian. But the accumulation of one hundred and fifty years of scholarship which weds them closely to a particular literary-historical interpretation of the cultural activity under Nero is a heavy burden, and few scholars are willing to question the edifice upon which that historiography is based. In that respect, this argument should give new impetus to the debate over the dating of Calpurnius Siculus. If the *EE*, which have been used to anchor Calpurnius in the Neronian age, are certainly not Neronian, there seems even less reason to keep Calpurnius in the company of Persius and Lucan.

All Souls College, Oxford
justin.stover@classics.ox.ac.uk

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amat, J. (ed.) 1997: *Consolation à Livie, Élégies à Mécène, Bucoliques d'Einsiedeln*, Paris
- Amat, J. 1998: 'Humour et ironie dans les *Bucoliques* de Calpurnius Siculus et les *Carmina einsidlensia*', *Revue des Études Latines* 76, 192–9
- Armstrong, D. 1986: 'Stylistics and the date of Calpurnius Siculus', *Philologus* 130, 113–86
- Armstrong, D. 2014: 'Einsiedeln Eclogues', in Thomas and Ziolkowski 2014
- Baldwin, B. 1995: 'Better late than early: reflections on the date of Calpurnius Siculus', *Illinois Classical Studies* 20, 157–67
- Barnes, T. D. 2006: 'An urban prefect and his wife', *Classical Quarterly* 56, 249–56
- Bertocchi, A., Maraldi, M., and Orlandini, A. 2010: 'Quantification', in P. Baldi and P. Cuzzolin (eds), *New Perspectives on Historical Latin Syntax 3. Constituent Syntax: Quantification, Numerals, Possession, Anaphora*, Berlin, 19–174
- Bischoff, B. 1981: 'Das benediktinische Mönchtum und die Überlieferung der klassischen Literatur', *Studien und Mitteilungen zur Geschichte des Benediktinerordens* 92, 165–19
- Bischoff, B. 1998: *Katalog der festländischen Handschriften des neunten Jahrhunderts. Teil I: Aachen-Lambach*, Wiesbaden
- Bischoff, B., Schetter, W., and Zwierlein, O. 1994: *Severi Episcopi "Malacitani (?)" in Evangelia libri XII: Das Trierer Fragment der Bücher VIII–X*, Munich
- Brouwer, C. (ed.) 1617: *Hrabani Mauri ... poemata de diversi: nunc primum vulgata & scholiis illustrata studio R. P. Christophori Brouveri, Soicetatis Iesu Presbyteri*, Mainz
- Bücheler, F. 1871: 'Zur höfischen Poesie unter Nero', *Rheinisches Museum* 26, 235–40
- Butterfield, D. 2013: *The Early Textual History of Lucretius' De rerum natura*, Cambridge
- Cameron, A. 2010: 'The date of the Scholia Vetustiora on Juvenal', *Classical Quarterly* 60, 569–76
- Cameron, A. 2011: *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Oxford
- Champlin, E. 1978: 'The life and times of Calpurnius Siculus', *Journal of Roman Studies* 68, 95–110
- Cock, M. 1971: 'À propos de la tradition manuscrite du *Carmen de mortibus boum* d'Endéléchius', *Latomus* 30, 156–60
- Contreni, J. 2003: 'What was the emperor Augustus doing at a Carolingian banquet (Anth. Lat.² 719^f)?', *Rheinisches Museum* 146, 372–94
- Courtney, E. 1987: 'Imitation, chronologie littéraire et Calpurnius Siculus', *Revue des Études Latines* 65, 148–57
- Courtney, E. 1999: Review of Amat 1997 in *Classical Review* 49, 397–9
- della Casa, A. (ed.) 1977: *Arusianus Messius, Exempla Elocutionum*, Milan
- den Boeft, J., den Hengst, D., and Teitler, H. C. 1991: *Philological and Historical Commentary on Ammianus Marcellinus XXI*, Groningen

- Duckworth, G. 1967: 'Five centuries of Latin poetry: Silver Age and Late Empire', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98, 77–150
- Dümmmler, E. (ed.) 1884: *Hrabani Mauri Carmina*, Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Poetae Latini Aevi Carolini 2, Berlin
- Dunn, G. 2008: 'Anicius Hermogenianus Olybrius', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History XIV*, Collection Latomus 315, Brussels, 429–44
- Eastwood, B. 2007: *Ordering the Heavens: Roman Astronomy and Cosmology in the Carolingian Renaissance*, Leiden
- Gaisser, J. 2008: *The Fortunes of Apuleius and the Golden Ass: A Study in Transmission and Reception*, Princeton
- Galonnier, A. 1997: *Anecdote Holderi ou Ordo generis Cassiodororum: éléments pour une étude de l'authenticité boécienne des Opuscula sacra*, Leuven
- Garand, M.-C. 1978: 'Copistes de Cluny au temps de saint Maieul (948–994)', *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* 136, 5–36
- Giles, J. (ed.) 1838: *Severi Sancti <Endeleichi> rhetoris et poetæ christiani, De mortibus boum*, London
- Green, R. 1995: 'Proba's cento: its date, purpose, and reception', *Classical Quarterly* 45, 551–63
- Green, R. 2004: 'Refinement and reappraisal in Vergilian pastoral', in R. Rees (ed.), *Romane, Memento: Vergil in the Fourth Century*, London, 17–32
- Gualandri, I. 2004: 'Claudian's Greek world: Callimachus', in W.-W. Ehlers et al. (eds), *Aetas Claudiana. Eine Tagung an der Freien Universität Berlin vom 28. bis 30. Juni 2002*, Munich, 78–95
- Hagen, H. 1869: 'Zur lateinischen Anthologie. Nachtrag zu den analecta Einsidlensia', *Philologus* 28, 338–41
- Hagen, H. 1871: 'Zur Erklärung und Kritik der beiden bukolischen Novitäten aus Einsiedeln', *Jahrbücher für Classische Philologie* 17, 139–52
- Hagen, H. 1880: 'Über ein neues Epigramm mit der Aufschrift: Octaviani Augusti', *Rheinisches Museum* 35, 569–77
- Häse, A. 2002: *Mittelalterliche Bücherverzeichnisse aus Kloster Lorsch: Einleitung, Edition und Kommentar*, Wiesbaden
- Henderson, J. 2013: 'The *Carmina Einsidlensia* and Calpurnius Siculus' eclogues', in E. Buckley and M. T. Dinter (eds), *A Companion to the Neronian Age*, Oxford, 170–87
- Horsfall, N. 1993: Review of J. Amat (ed.), *Calpurnius Siculus, Bucoliques, Pseudo-Calpurnius, Éloge de Pison* (1991) in *Classical Review* 43, 267–70
- Horsfall, N. 1997: 'Criteria for the dating of Calpurnius Siculus', *Rivista di filologia e di istruzione classica* 125, 166–96
- Hubbard, T. 1998: *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation in the Pastoral Tradition from Theocritus to Milton*, Ann Arbor
- Hutchinson, G. O. 2013: *Greek to Latin: Frameworks and Contexts for Intertextuality*, Oxford
- Kaster, R. 1988: *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley
- Kennell, S. 2000: *Magnus Felix Ennodius: A Gentleman of the Church*, Ann Arbor
- King, V. 1969: *An Investigation of Some Astronomical Excerpts from Pliny's Natural History Found in Manuscripts of the Earlier Middle Ages*, unpub. B.Litt. thesis, University of Oxford
- Knickenberg, F. 1892: 'Zur Anthologia Latina. Über das erste der beiden Hirtengedichte der Einsiedler Handschrift Nr. 266 S. 206', *Hermes* 27, 144–51
- Korzeniewski, D. 1966: 'Die "Panegyrische Tendenz" in den Carmina Einsidlensia', *Hermes* 94, 344–60
- Korzeniewski, D. 1973: 'Zwei bukolische Probleme', *Hermes* 53, 499–501
- Lapidge, M. 2005: *The Anglo-Saxon Library*, Oxford
- Leonardi, C. 1960: 'I codici di Marziano Capella', *Aevum* 34, 1–99 and 411–524
- Lott, E. 1980: *The Florilegium of Cava 3, Madrid 19 and Paris 7418*, unpub. PhD diss., Harvard
- Maciejczyk, A. 1907: *De carminum Einsidlensium tempore et auctore*, Greifswald
- Magallón García, A.-I. 2002: 'Arusiano Mesio y su "Diccionario de construcciones"', *Fa ventia* 24, 157–74
- Maggiulli, G. 1982: 'Nonio Marcello e Arusiano Messio', in *Studi noniani* 7, Genoa, 123–76
- Manitius, M. 1935: *Handschriften antiker Autoren in mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen*, Leipzig

- Matthews, J. 1992: 'The poetess Proba and fourth-century Rome', in M. Christol *et al.* (eds), *Institution, société et vie politique dans l'empire romain au IVe siècle ap. J.-C., Actes de la table ronde autour de l'oeuvre d' Andre Chastagnol*, Rome, 277–304
- Mazhuga, V. 2003: 'À quelle époque vivait le grammairien Phocas?', *Revue de philologie, de littérature et d'histoire anciennes* 77, 67–77
- McGill, S. 2005: *Virgil Recomposed: The Mythological and Secular Centos in Antiquity*, Oxford
- McGill, S., and Tucker, G. 2014: 'Cento', in Thomas and Ziolkowski 2014
- McKitterick, R. 1989: *The Carolingians and the Written Word*, Cambridge
- Meier, G. 1896: *Heinrich von Ligerz: Bibliothekar von Einsiedeln im 14. Jahrhundert*, Beihefte zum Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen 17, Leipzig
- Merfeld, B. 1999: *Panegyrik – Paränese – Parodie? Die Einsiedler Gedichte und Herrscherlob in neronischer Zeit*, Trier
- Merkelbach, R. 1988: *Die Hirten des Dionysos: die Dionysos-Mysterien der römischen Kaiserzeit und der bukolische Roman des Longus*, Stuttgart
- Milde, W. 1968: *Der Bibliothekskatalog des Klosters Murbach aus dem 9. Jahrhundert. Ausgabe und Untersuchung von Beziehungen zu Cassiodors Institutiones*, Heidelberg
- Mondin, L. 2007–8: 'Foca, Marziale e la poetica dell'epitome: la prefazione all' *Ars de nomine et uerbo*', *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 7, 329–54
- Motta, G., and Picasso, G. 1997: 'Un florilegio patristico tra teologia e canonistica', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Kanonistische Abteilung* 83, 113–45
- Munk Olsen, B. 1979–1980: 'Les classiques latins dans les florilèges médiévaux antérieurs au XIIIe siècle', *Revue d'histoire des textes* 9, 47–121, and 10, 151–64
- Mynors, R. (ed.) 1937: *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones*, Oxford
- Nazzaro, A. 2004: 'Il proemio della *Laus sancti Iohannis (carm. VI)* di Paolino di Nola', in G. Gasparro (ed.), *Ad contemplandam sapientiam. Studi di filologia, letteratura, storia in memoria di Sandro Leanza*, Soveria Mannelli, 475–90
- Otto, A. 1890: *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Leipzig
- Peiper, R. 1870: *Praefationis in Senecae tragoedias supplementum*, Wrocław
- Pernigotti, C. 2004: 'La tradizione greco-latino di segni critici platonici', in S. Bruno *et al.* (eds), *Archaeologica pisana. Scritti per Orlanda Pancrazzi*, Pisa, 327–35
- Ramírez-Weaver, E. 2008: *Carolingian Innovation and Observation in the Paintings and Star Catalogs of Madrid*, *Bibliotheca Nacional*, Ms. 3307, unpub. PhD thesis, New York University
- Rand, E. K. 1927: 'A nest of ancient notae', *Speculum* 2, 160–76
- Reeve, M. 1983: 'Carmina Einsidlensia', in Reynolds 1983, 39
- Reeve, M. 1988: 'Codici tedeschi di Cicerone', *Ciceroniana* n.s. 6, 76–86
- Reifferscheid, A. 1868: 'Mittheilungen aus Handschriften. 1: Anecdotum Cavense de notis antiquorum', *Rheinisches Museum* 23, 127–33
- Reynolds, L. D. (ed.) 1983: *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford
- Rönsch, H. 1869: *Itala und Vulgata: Das Sprachidion der urchristlichen Itala und der katholischen Vulgata*, Marburg/Leipzig
- Salzmann, M. 2002: *The Making of a Christian Aristocracy: Social and Religious Change in the Western Roman Empire*, Cambridge, MA
- Scaffai, M. (ed.) 1997: *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina* (2nd edn), Bologna
- Scharf, R. 1992: 'Der Stadtpräfekt Iulius Felix Campanianus', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 94, 274–8
- Schironi, F. 2005: 'Plato at Alexandria: Aristophanes, Aristarchus, and the "philological tradition" of a philosopher', *Classical Quarterly* 55, 423–34
- Schmid, W. 1953: 'Tityrus Christianus. Probleme religiöser Hirtendichtung an der Wende vom vierten zum fünften Jahrhundert', *Rheinisches Museum* 96, 101–65
- Schröder, B. 1991: *Carmina non quae nemorale resultent*, Studien zur Klassischen Philologie 61, Frankfurt am Main
- Schröder, B.-J. 2007: *Bildung und Briefe im 6. Jahrhundert: Studien zum Mailänder Diakon Magnus Felix Ennodius*, Berlin
- Shackleton Bailey, D. 1982: 'Notes on Riese's *Anthologia Latina* (Vol. 2)', *Classical Philology* 77, 113–32
- Shanzer, D. 1986: 'The anonymous *Carmen contra paganos* and the date and identity of the centonist Proba', *Revue des Études Augustiniennes* 32, 232–48

- Shanzer, D. 1994: 'The date and identity of the centonist Proba', *Recherches Augustiniennes* 27, 74–96
- Shanzer, D. 2001: Review of D. Trout, *Paulinus of Nola: Life, Letters, and Poems* (1999) in *Catholic Historical Review* 87, 481–83
- Sharpe, R. 2003: *Titulus: Identifying Medieval Latin Texts: An Evidence-Based Approach*, Turnhout
- Sivan, H. 1993: 'Anician women, the cento of Proba, and aristocratic conversion in the fourth century', *Vigiliae Christianae* 47, 140–57
- Stover, J. 2014: 'Numitorius', in Thomas and Ziolkowski 2014
- Thibodeau, P. 2011: *Playing the Farmer: Representations of Rural Life in Vergil's Georgics*, Berkeley
- Thomas, R., and Ziolkowski, J. (eds) 2014: *The Virgil Encyclopedia*, Malden, MA
- Townend, G. B. 1980: 'Calpurnius Siculus and the *Munus Neronis*', *Journal of Roman Studies* 70, 166–74
- Trout, D. 2005: 'Latin Christian epics of Late Antiquity', in J. Foley (ed.), *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford, 550–61
- 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 redécouvert: Latinus Pacatus Drepanius, panégyriste de Théodose*, Brussels
- Uhalde, K. 2012: 'Justice and equality', in S. Johnson (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*, Oxford, 764–88
- Vandone, G. 2004: *Appunti su una poetica tarodoantica: Ennodio, carm. 1,7-8 = 26-27V: introduzione, traduzione e commento*, Pisa
- Vecce, C. 1988: *Iacopo Sannazaro in Francia: scoperte di codici all'inizio del XVI secolo*, Padua
- Verdière, R. (ed.) 1954: *T. Calpurnii Siculi De laude Pisonis et Bucolica et M. Annaei Lucani De laude Caesaris Einsiedlensia Quae Dicuntur Carmina*, Brussels
- Verdière, R. 1993: 'Calpurnius, en fin d'analyse ...', *Helmantica* 44, 349–98
- Wessner, P. (ed.) 1931: *Scholia in Iuvenalem vetustiora*, Leipzig
- Williams, H. J. 1986: *The Eclogues and Cynegetica of Nemesianus*, Leiden
- Zarncke, E. 1889: 'Aus Murbachs Klosterbibliothek Anno 1464', in *Commentationes in honorem Guilelmi Studemund*, Strasbourg, 181–209
- Zetzel, J. 2005: *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentum Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*, London
- Zurli, L. 1997: 'Intorno ad alcuni carmi dell' *Anthologia Latina*', *Giornale italiano di filologia* 49, 141–76