The poem *De mundi philosophia*, as yet unpublished, consists of two books with a total of 406 verses, of which all are hexameters except I.15-32, composed in elegiac distichs. In the prologue to his first book the author says that he grew pale with the effort of hammering out his poem and he adds that his name is “olim” in reverse, or Milo. It was suggested many years ago that he might be identical with the well-known Milon de Saint-Amand (saec. IX), but his technique is demonstrably different from that exhibited by the authentic poems of this Milon, and Peter Dronke, one of the few scholars who have studied our text in manuscript, places his floruit plausibly around 1150 and regards him as a disciple of Bernardus Silvestris, author of the *Cosmographia*. However that may be, Milo’s subject is also cosmographical: in his first book he deals chiefly with the universe in time and space and man as the microcosm, and in his second book he treats especially the cosmometrics of the earth, sun, and moon—their relative sizes and the distances between them. Here his principal source, immediate or ultimate, was Macrobius’ commentary on the *Somnium Scipionis* of Cicero, and here his achievement was little more than the versifying of rather intractable material, though perhaps this alone was enough to make him grow pale.

There is one passage, however, in which Milo, or conceivably some unidentified source of his, displays a certain degree of independence or

1 Milo 1.13-14: Palluit inventor dum cuderet ista labore, / cuius habes nomen si versum legeris “olim.”
4 P. Dronke, *Fabula: Explorations into the Uses of Myth in Medieval Platonism*, Leiden-Köl n 1974, 88, 160; idem, *Bernardus Silvestris: Cosmographia*, Leiden 1978, 11. Traube, *op. cit.*, 558, note 8, conjectured that our Milo might be the same as the cardinal and bishop of that name (saec. XI-XII) who wrote a eulogy of Pope Paschalis II, but this poem (PL 163.27) of only nineteen verses is too brief to provide a basis for a stylistic comparison.
originality by taking issue with Macrobius, and I suggest that this is
not without interest for the history of science.

Quod solis globus terre globo non sit octuplus.\textsuperscript{5}
Non valet, ut quidam scribunt, sol octuplus esse
terre collatus sed quincuplus hemiolusque,
unc diametris est horum proportio dupla;
imo super triquarta cadens his est habitudo,
sic ut septem sunt ad quatuor; his cubicatis
arguitur terre numquam sol octuplus esse;
quincuplus hemiolus sunt aut duodenus et unus.
sic ad se spere solis terreque probantur: —
bis triginta duo cubus est de quatuor ortus.
quadraginta tres trecenti sunt cubus alter
de septem natus, cuius vigesima prima
sunt bis octo triens. vigesima prima minoris
alterius tres sunt. decies que multiplicate
corporibus quadratis resecanda superfluai signant.
undecies ducte faciunt speras remainentes,
et minor est numeros tria cum triginta repertas
ast alter centum cum septuaginta novemque.
confer eos, ut que sit eis video habitudo:
quincuplus hemiolus fit maior pene minori. \textsuperscript{(2.109-127)}
\textsuperscript{115} aut ego: ad LDT. \textsuperscript{123} ducta LD.

Milo denies that the sun is 8 times the size of the earth, as certain
writers maintain, and asserts that it is rather 6\frac{1}{2} times (109-110). The
reference is to Macrobius and evidently to one or more of the medieval
authors who had accepted his conclusion on this point: Helpericus
Autissiodorensis, \textit{De computo} 20 (PL 137.35); Honorius Augusto-
dunensis (Guilelmus de Conchis?), \textit{De philosophia mundi} 2.32 (PL
172.74); Honorius, \textit{De solis affectibus} 5 (PL 172.103); Pseudo-Beda
(Guilelmus de Conchis?), \textit{Peri didaxeon sive elementorum philosophiae
libri}, liber 2 (PL 90.1156); and Godefridus de Sancto Victore, \textit{Micro-

\textsuperscript{5} My text is based on the three manuscripts listed by L. Thorndike and P.
Kibre, \textit{A Catalogue of Incipits of Mediaeval Scientific Writings in Latin}, 2nd ed.,
Cambridge, Mass. 1963, 866: L = London, B. L., Add. MS 35.112 (saec. XII-
XIII); D = Douai, B. Municipale 749 (saec. XIII); and T = Tours, B. Munici-
pale 789 (saec. XII). These manuscripts are surprisingly free from the cor-
rupations to which numerals were often exposed when copied and recopied.