The intellectual and social world of Martius Valerius*

RUURD NAUTA

ABSTRACT

The bucolic poems of Martius Valerius, first published in 1946, used to be dated to the twelfth century, but thanks to the work of François Dolbeau and Justin Stover, they are now securely dated to the sixth. In this article, I demonstrate that Martius' fourth eclogue draws extensively on two of the logical works of Boethius, the introduction to the second edition of the commentary on Porphyry's Isagoge *and the translation of Aristotle's* Peri hermeneias*, both from the mid 510s. These works were well known in the twelfth century, but I corroborate the sixth-century dating first by connecting Martius Valerius with Martius Novatus Renatus, editor of a corpus of Boethius' logical monographs in the 520s, and secondly by arguing that Martius Valerius belonged to a circle of students in Rome who attached themselves to leading senators, including Boethius. I end by considering Martius' career as quaestor and consul.*

Keywords: bucolic poetry; Martius Valerius; Boethius; Ennodius; Quaestor Sacri Palatii

I INTRODUCTION

The four bucolic eclogues, with a prologue in elegiacs, of Martius Valerius are transmitted in only two manuscripts: a French codex from *c.* 1200, acquired in the decades around 1400 by Amplonius Ratinck and now in Gotha (with the inscription: *Incipit prologus Bucolicorum Martii Valerii*), and a sixteenth-century text in Erlangen which derives from the Gothanus (giving the poet's name as *Marci Valerii Maximi*).[1] The poems were first edited in 1946 by Paul Lehmann, who assigned them, with some hesitation, to the twelfth century.[2] This dating then became the orthodoxy, because it was supported in Franco Munari's two magisterial editions of Marcus Valerius (as he seemed to call the

* I thank the anonymous referees for their helpful suggestions. All translations are my own; they aim at literalness, not elegance.

[1] Forschungsbibliothek Gotha Memb. II 125, from the library of Amplonius Ratinck (https://dhb.thulb.uni-jena.de/receive/ufb_cbu_00028196), dated to the thirteenth century by R. Ehwald in Traube and Ehwald 1906: 364–5, to around 1200 by P. Lehmann (1946: 62); Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen-Nürnberg H62/MS 633 (https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bvb:29-bv042204892-0; s. XVI); see Munari 1970: XXXIII–XXXVII. Orlandi (1971: 226–9), in his review of Munari, argued for the independence of the Erlangensis (E), but he had to make do with apparently rather unsatisfactory photographs of the Gothanus (G); once the variants of E are compared with the digital reproduction, no doubt remains that they are to be explained (when not as simple conjectures) as misreadings of G or as guesses where G had become illegible due to stains.

[2] Lehmann 1946 (62–4 on the date).

JRS 114 (2024), pp. 105–124. © *The Author(s), 2024.*

doi:10.1017/S0075435824000273

poet) of 1955 and 1970.[3] But François Dolbeau, in a short article modestly entitled 'Les "Bucoliques" de Marcus Valerius sont-elles une œuvre médiévale?', pointed out that the materials on language, style, prosody and metre collected by Munari accord well, as Munari himself acknowledged, with a date in Late Antiquity.[4] More decisively, Dolbeau brought to bear on the discussion two important pieces of external evidence. One had already been adduced by Michael Reeve in his survey of the transmission of Calpurnius Siculus, and consists in a note by the annotator of Berne, Burgerbibliothek 276, who has since been identified as Guido de Grana (thirteenth century), quoting a few lines (4.46–8) from *Marc(us) Val(er)ius consul i(n) bucolicis*.[5] This already suggests that the poet was ancient, and the second testimony specifies the precise period: among the manuscripts of Thorney Abbey, near Ely, the early-sixteenth-century antiquary John Leland mentions 'Eglogae aliquot Marci exquaestoris, qui floruit tempore Justiniani'.[6] Although this evidence leaves no doubt that Dolbeau's question should be answered in the negative, an attempt to defend the medieval dating was undertaken by Christine Ratkowitsch.[7] She has been refuted, however, by Justin Stover, who moreover expanded Dolbeau's arguments and added various new ones of his own, so that he could conclude: 'the bucolics of Martius Valerius are not a medieval production, but a witness to the literary florescence of the fifth and sixth centuries'.[8] The aim of the present article is to build on, but also occasionally to suggest alternatives to, Stover's argumentation, and to offer, together with a more precise dating, a first sketch of Martius Valerius' intellectual and social world.[9]

But before I proceed, it is necessary to say a few words about the poet's names. As Munari already remarked, we may immediately discard the *Maximus* of the Erlangensis, which was probably taken from a table of contents at the lost beginning of the Gothanus, the source of Amplonius Ratinck's own table of contents, which reads *liber 5 bucolicorum Marcii* [*sic*] *Valerii Maximi* (counting the prologue as one of the eclogues) — but *Maximi* has no doubt been triggered by the name of the author of the immensely popular *Facta et dicta memorabilia*.[10] *Marcus*, too, cannot be correct, because in the time of Justinian, *praenomina* were no longer used: the last person of whom one is attested is Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus cos. 485, Boethius' father-in-law.[11] Therefore, *Marcus* as written by Leland and probably implied by Guido de Grana must be a corruption of *Marcius*, probably by way of the genitive *Marci(i)* and possibly influenced by the name of

[3] The title page of the first edition of 1955 has 'Marci Valerii', where 'Marci' must have been meant as the genitive of 'Marcius', because Munari then believed that G (which he had not yet seen) had *Marcii* (9, 22–4, 59), as wrongly reported by R. Ehwald, but otherwise he consistently wrote 'M. Valerio'. In the second edition of 1970, when Munari knew the true reading of G (XLV, 3), the title page, too, had 'M. Valerio'. Understandably, both 'Marci' and 'M.' were taken as implying a name 'Marcus', and in the secondary literature the poet is mostly called 'Marcus Valerius' or 'Marco Valerio'.

[4] Dolbeau 1987.

[5] Reeve 1983: 38, n. 4. For the identification, see Stagni 1995. The note was quoted by Reeve and Dolbeau with *consuli* instead of *consul*, but this is apparently a misreading: see Stagni 2017: 1.

[6] On p. 30 of vol. 4 (Book III) of Thomas Hearne's second edition (London 1774) of Leland's *Collectanea*.

[7] Ratkowitsch 1992 (175–6 against Dolbeau).

[8] Stover 2017 (quotation at 332). Bartoli 2019: 159–72 still treats the poems as medieval, but although she discusses both Dolbeau (whom she misrepresents as proposing a third-century date) and Stover, she does not engage with their strongest arguments.

[9] I quote Martius Valerius, unless otherwise noted, from Munari 1970, but, like Stover 2017, I do not reproduce the medieval orthography of the manuscripts. Munari's 1970 text, but unfortunately not his indispensable critical apparatus, is available online at the Dante Medieval Archive: https://dama.dantenetwork.it/index.php?id=17&workSign=Valerio_Bucolica&L=0 (accessed 14 March 2024).

[10] Munari 1970: XLV. That Amplonius' table of contents (quoted by Munari 1970: XXXV) goes back to one in the manuscript is proved by the fact that it ascribes the small verse grammar on syllabic quantities *inc. Regula splendescit qua sillaba prima patescit* to Peter Elias (wrongly; see Hurlbut 1933) under the title *de quantitate sillabarum*, whereas the text itself has *liber uersificandi* without an author's name (f. 12r).

[11] See Salomies 1987: 406–13 (412 on Symmachus).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the well-known Marcus Valerius Martialis. 'Marcius' could conceivably be correct, but since the Gothanus has *Martii*, and since corruption of *Martii* to *Marcii* is easy (we see it happening in Amplonius' catalogue), I assume the name to have been 'Martius'.[12]

'Valerius' likewise needs some thought. Although an old *gentilicium*, we find it used in this period as the diacritic cognomen, e.g. by the consul (West) of 521, whose full name probably was 'Iobius Philippus Ymelcho Valerius'.[13] This may have been the case with our poet, too, but it is not certain that the Gothanus and Guido de Grana have given his full name: he may have been 'Martius Valerius X' or 'Martius Valerius X Y' — and thus, he may even be attested, without our knowing it, as 'X' or 'Y'. I will refrain from speculating on this, but in any case, it is not certain that the poet's diacritic was 'Valerius'. For that reason (and also because 'Valerius' is already firmly associated with other authors), whenever I refer to the poet by one name only, I will use 'Martius'.

II APOLLO'S SONG AND BOETHIUS' LOGICAL WORKS

Whereas Martius' first three eclogues follow the first three of Virgil, his fourth does not follow Virgil's fourth — and it is not hard to think of reasons why — but his sixth.[14] In Virgil, Silenus sings a song which begins with the creation of the cosmos and then continues with various mythological stories; at the end the poet writes: 'omnia, quae Phoebo quondam meditante beatus / audiit Eurotas iussitque ediscere lauros, / ille canit' ('All, that once, while Phoebus practised it, the blessed Eurotas heard and told the laurels to learn by heart, he sings', 82–4). This could be read to mean that Silenus' entire song was a reproduction of an earlier song of Apollo, and indeed in Martius it is Phoebus who sings.[15] But this is of course the bucolic Phoebus, the one who herded Admetus' cattle in Thessaly: 'Egerat Amphrysi pastos ad flumina tauros / Phoebus' ('Phoebus had driven the bulls, after grazing, to the streams of the Amphrysus', 1–2).[16] On that occasion, according to some accounts, Apollo invented bucolic poetry, to which the poet probably alludes in having Apollo compose a 'nouum … carmen' (4).[17] The first part of this 'carmen' consists, as in Virgil, in a philosophical analysis of origins, but

[12] Thus also Stover 2017: 302, n. 3 and 330, who, however, does not consider 'Marcius' (unlike Stagni 2017: 4, n. 14). I will give a further argument for 'Martius' in Section III.

[13] The 'diacritic' is the name chosen when only a single name is used; in Late Antiquity it was uniformly the final cognomen; see Salway 1994. On Iobius Philippus Ymelcho Valerius and the consul of 521, see Stover 2017: 321, n. 68, who rightly notes that 'the identification … requires conjectural restoration'. The inscription in question is EDB 42639: *Iobius [Philippus? Ymel]cho Valerius u(ir) c(larissimus) et inl(ustris), ex com(ite) d(omesticorum), ex co[ns(ule) ord(inario) atque] pa[tr(icius)]*; the supplement providing the consulate proposed by Orlandi 2004: 368, 517–18 is probable, but not quite certain, as one might also think of *ex co[m(ite) r(erum) priu(atarum)* or *ex co[m(ite) sacr(arum) larg(itionum)* or the like, since these functions were sometimes preceded by the conferment of the title of *comes domesticorum* (Delmaire 1989b: 204).

[14] Stover 2017: 323 assumes that Martius imitated all ten Virgilian eclogues, but there were good reasons not only for the omission of the fourth, but also of the fifth (with its apotheosis). The transmitted collection has very effective closure in Apollo's inability to continue his song at the end of the fourth eclogue (4.91–4), and a *libellus* of four eclogues is paralleled in Nemesianus, but nevertheless we cannot be sure that what we have is complete.

[15] Whether this reading is correct or not, is not at issue here; see Knox 1990 (doxography at 185, n. 8); Cucchiarelli 2023: 342–3. Knox, followed by Cucchiarelli, argues that the laurels of the Eurotas refer to Daphne; it is with her that Martius' Apollo closes his song.

[16] 'Amphrysi pastos' alludes to Verg., *G.* 3.2 'pastor ab Amphryso'. Serv. *ad loc.*: 'Amphrysus fluuius est Thessaliae, circa quem Apollo, spoliatus diuinitate [cf. in Martius 'humano defessus membra labore', 2] ob occisos Cyclopas, Admeto regi pauisse armenta dicitur'; similarly *Schol. Bern. ad loc.* (p. 253 Hagen).

[17] See Donatus' introduction to Virgil's *Bucolics* (*Vit. Verg.* 51–3): 'originem autem bucolici carminis alii ob aliam causam ferunt … alii Apollini νομίῳ pastorali scilicet deo, qua tempestate Admeto <b>oues pauerat' (Brummer's 'boues' is to be preferred over the manuscripts' *oues*, because of the parallels in Donatus auctus 86 and Philargyrius p. 11 Hagen (and 'armenta' in Servius, p. 1.12–13 Thilo) and because of the etymological connection between βουκολικά and βοῦς).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in this case not the origins of the cosmos, but of language and poetry (27–52). Apollo takes rather a roundabout way to arrive there: he begins by attributing to the human soul a three-fold 'actus': 'uita', shared with plants; 'sensus', shared also with animals; and 'mens' or 'ratio', shared only with the gods. Reason leads humans to ask 'an', 'quid', 'quale' and 'cur' something is, and to exercise the faculties of 'inuentio' and 'iudicium'. Reason also provides the impulse to give names to absent things, and thus brings language into being, and, when language is bound by the laws of metre, poetry.

This passage has frequently been interpreted as belonging to twelfth-century philosophy,[18] but in fact it almost literally reproduces a text that was indeed well-known in the medieval schools, but is not itself medieval: Boethius' introduction to the second edition of his commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* (the traditional beginning of the study of logic, and thus of philosophy), written on the basis of his own translation (the first edition having been based on the translation of Marius Victorinus).[19] The correspondences will be best brought out by presenting the texts in parallel columns.

Martius Valerius, *Bucolica* 4.27–52

namque **hominem triplices animae** referebat in **actus**,
ut **uita sensuque** potens ac **mente** fruatur;
hoc **herbis** illudque **feris**, canit hoc quoque habere
(30) mortales commune **deis**, rursusque renarrat
singula diuersis a se distantia rebus,
quod **uiuant crescantque** rudes **sine sensibus herbae**,
sensibus utque **ferae uigeant** rationis inertes,[20]
ut **ratione homines**, posito sed limite, uiuant.
(35) at simul et blando solatur singula cantu,
quod labor atque dolor **uiuaces** non terat **herbas**,
muta quod exosis careant **animalia** curis
quodque superba **homines** contingant **numina mente**.
tunc res in triplici disponit tempore cunctas,
(40) ut sint, ut fuerint, ut post **ignota** sequantur.
his **hominum mentem** simul inserit et simul addit
per uarios agitare modos, ut denique quaerat
an quicquam, uel **quid sit**, uel **quale** esse putetur,
curue probet, perque haec **geminos** sese inferat **actus**,
(45) **iudicio** subdens, quaecumque **inuenerit**, alto.
hinc[21] canit ad placitum cunctis ut **nomina rebus**
mens dedit, absentes oculis ut cernere formas

Boethius, *In Isagogen Porphyrii commentorum editio secunda* 1.1–2

(p. 136.2) **triplex** omnino **animae** uis in uegetandis corporibus deprehenditur. quarum una quidem **uitam** corpori subministrat, ut nascendo **crescat** alendoque subsistat, alia uero **sentiendi** iudicium praebet, tertia ui **mentis** et **ratione** subnixa est. quarum quidem primae id officium est, ut creandis, nutriendis alendisque corporibus praesto sit, **nullum** uero **rationis** praestet **sensusue** iudicium. haec autem est **herbarum** … secunda uero …. omne enim **animal** quod **sensu uiget** … (p. 137.4) sed uis animae tertia … tota in **ratione** constituta est eaque uel in rerum praesentium firmissima conceptione uel in **absentium** intellegentia uel in **ignotarum** inquisitione uersatur. haec tantum **humano genere** praesto est … itaque, ut dictum est, huic **diuinae naturae** non ea tantum cognitione sufficiunt quae subiecta **sensibus** comprehendit, uerum etiam et … **absentibus rebus nomina indere** potest et quod intellegentiae **ratione** comprehendit, **uocabulorum** quoque positionibus aperit. illud quoque ei

[18] See Munari 1970: 28–9 with references; Salemme 1981.

[19] On the two versions of the commentary, see Brandt 1906: VII–XXXV. I quote the text from Brandt's edition, giving his page- and line-numbers.

[20] With hesitation I print the conjecture 'rationis inertes' by J. A. Willis ap. Maas 1955: 255 for *erroris ineptę*; it creates a parallel with 'sine sensibus' in the previous line and a contrast with 'sensibus … uigeant'. For 'inertes' with the genitive, cf. Dracontius, *De laudibus Dei* 3.155 'iners animi, rationis egenus' (if one is not willing to admit 'inertes' here, one could also choose 'egenae', as already suggested by Munari in his comment on Willis' conjecture: '*fort. recte, possis etiam de* r. egentes … *uel* egenae … *cogitare*'). Munari prints 'erroris inepti', suggested to him by J. Svennung, taken as a gen. qual. with 'ferae'. If this reading is correct, it must correspond to Boethius p. 136.22–137.1, where it is said of animals that they are able to retain mental images of things even if these things are absent: 'sed eas imaginationes confusas atque ineuidentes sumunt, ut nihil ex earum coniunctione ac compositione efficere possint'; cf. 137.9–10 'sensus imaginationesque … inconditas'. But 'erroris inepti' seems far too strong for this.

[21] Munari reads 'hic' with the manuscripts, but Guido de Grana (whom he did not yet know) quotes the text with *hinc*, which is surely correct (cf. also 49).

possit et **ignotas** ueheret quasi **uoce** figuras;
hinc quoque simplicibus crescens oratio uerbis
(50) nectitur atque animi dissoluit libera motum,
mox etiam uariis cantus astringere certat
legibus et numeris inclusit carmina doctis.

naturae proprium est, ut per ea quae sibi nota sunt **ignota** uestiget et non solum unum quodque **an sit**, sed **quid sit** etiam et **quale sit** nec non **cur sit**, optet agnoscere. quam **triplicis animae** uim sola, ut dictum est, **hominum** natura sortita est. … (1.2; p. 138.4) cum igitur hic **actus** sit **humani animi**, ut semper aut in <rerum> praesentium comprehensione aut in **absentium** intellegentia aut in **ignotarum** inquisitione atque inuentione uersetur … (p. 139.18) huius [scil. ratiocinationis] autem uis **duplex** esse perpenditur, una quidem in **inueniendo**, altera in **iudicando**.

For he related that humans have threefold operations of the soul,[22] to the effect that, being capable of life and sense perception, they also enjoy the use of mind. He sings that mortals have the first in common with plants and the second with beasts, and also the third (30) in common with the gods, and again he recounts the separate kinds differing in various respects, that the plants live and grow though primitive and without senses, and how through their senses the beasts thrive though incapable of reason, how by reason, although there is a limit set to it, humans live. (35) But at the same time, he also consoles the separate kinds with soothing song, that labour and pain do not wear away the lively plants, that the dumb animals are free of hateful cares, and that humans touch the gods with lofty mind.[23] Then he disposes all things in threefold time: (40) how they are, how they have been, how afterwards unknown things follow. To this at the same time he applies the human mind and at the same time adds deliberation in various ways, so that eventually it inquires whether anything is, and what it is, and how it may be believed to be, and examines why it is, and so that this mind goes through twin operations, (45) submitting to its high judgment whatever it has discovered.[24] Hence he sings how by convention the mind has given names to all things, that it may discern forms that are absent to the eyes and might transport, as it were, unknown shapes through spoken sound. Hence also utterance, growing from simple words, (50) is joined together and freely releases the movement of the soul, soon it even strives to bind songs by various laws and it enclosed poems in artful metres.

(p. 136.2) Altogether a threefold power of the soul is discovered to impart vigour to bodies. One of these endows the body with life, so that being born, it grows, and feeding, it subsists, another supplies the judgement of sense perception, the third is based on the power of mind and reason. Of the first of these the function is to provide for the creating, nourishing and feeding of the bodies, but it does not provide any judgement of reason or of sense perception. This applies to the plants … The second, however, …. each animal that thrives through sense perception …. (137.4). But the third power of the soul … consists entirely in reason, and this is engaged equally in the firmest conception of present things and in the understanding of absent things and in the inquiry into unknown things. This is only provided to humankind. … Thus, as has been said, it does not suffice for this divine nature to know only those things which it comprehends as being subject to the senses, but it is also … able to impart names to absent things, and what it comprehends through rational understanding, it discloses through the positing of words. It is a further property of that nature, that through what is known to it, it investigates what is unknown, and wishes to get to know of each thing not only whether it is, but also what it is and how it is, and likewise why it is. And this power of a threefold soul, as has been said, has only fallen to the lot of the nature of humans … (1.2, p. 138.4) When therefore this is the operation of the human soul, that it is always engaged in comprehending present things or in understanding absent things or in inquiring into and discovering unknown things … (p. 139.8) Now the power of this [scil. reasoning] is considered to be twofold: one in discovering, the other in judging.

[22] The Latin is difficult. I take 'referebat' to be used both in the sense of 'related' (cf. 'namque canebat' in the corresponding passage in Virgil, *Buc.* 6.31) and in the sense of 'assigned', 'ascribed' ('he assigned man to threefold operations', meaning 'he ascribed threefold operations to man'). 'actus' does not have its technical meaning ἐντελέχεια (it corresponds to Boethius' 'uis', which renders δύναμις), but is probably inspired by Boethius' use of the word at 138.4, reproduced at 44 (cf. n. 24).

[23] With Munari, I take *superba* as abl., assuming elision of a long syllable before a short one; see LXXI, n. 72 for other examples.

[24] The comparison with Boethius makes it clear that the 'geminos … actus' (44) are those of *inuentio* and *iudicium*, not, as Munari (1970: 29) proposes, '*vivendi et sentiendi*' (the first two of the three 'actus' of 27–34).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

It is obvious without further comment that Boethius' introduction to the second edition of his commentary on Porphyry's *Isagoge* is a major immediate source of this part of Apollo's song. The three-fold division of time (which rather breaks the sequence and might be a secondary insertion) is not to be found in that work, or at most implicitly,[25] but the formulation 'ut sint, ut fuerint, ut post ignota sequantur' (40) is close to that in Boethius' *De consolatione philosophiae*: 'quae sint, quae fuerint ueniantque', 5.m.2.11). However, since both verses derive from Virgil's *Georgics*: 'quae sint, quae fuerint, quae mox uentura trahantur' (4.393), which is quoted with 'sequentur' for 'trahantur' by Macrobius (*Sat.* 1.20.5), it would be rash to conclude that Martius Valerius must have known the *Consolatio*.[26]

It is certain, however, that he knew another work (or set of works) by Boethius — or at least its beginning: the translation of and commentaries on Aristotle's *De interpretatione* (Περὶ ἑρμηνείας), which in the curriculum came after the *Isagoge* and the *Categories*.[27] Apollo's phrase '**ad placitum**' (46), said of the giving of '**nomina**', reproduces a variant in Boethius' translation of the definition of ὄνομα at the beginning of *De interpretatione*: ὄνομα μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φωνὴ σημαντικὴ κατὰ συνθήκην κτλ. (16[a]19) becomes in Boethius: '**nomen** ergo est **uox** significatiua **secundum placitum** eqs.' ('a name is a spoken sound significative by convention', p. 6.4–5). Boethius, when explaining this definition in his commentaries, sometimes uses Martius' phrase '**ad placitum**' by variation for 'secundum placitum' (which in any case would not have fitted into Martius' hexameters).[28] He discusses the definition also in some of his logical monographs, again sometimes using 'ad placitum' alongside 'secundum placitum',[29] but it must be *De interpretatione* which was Martius' source. This appears most clearly from Apollo's statement that human language expresses the movement of the soul: 'oratio … / … **animi** dissoluit libera **motum** (50)'.[30] This corresponds to the second sentence of *De interpretatione*: ἔστι μὲν οὖν τὰ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ τῶν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ παθημάτων σύμβολα (16[a]3–4), which in Boethius becomes: 'sunt ergo quae sunt in **uoce** earum quae sunt **in anima passionum** notae' ('what is in spoken sound is an indication of the passions in the soul', p. 5.4–6); the word 'passio' does not fit into the hexameter, and 'motus' is its synonym.[31] Thus, Martius' imitation is limited to

[25] In discussing the animals, Boethius notes that they not only perceive what is present, but also have memory, although imperfect, yet have no knowledge of the future (136.17–137.4).

[26] There is no reflection in Martius of the rather different treatment of *sensus* and *ratio* in connection with animals, humans and god in *Cons.* 5.5.3–4.

[27] There are two commentaries, the first for beginners, the second for more advanced students (explained in 1st comm., p. 31.6–32.3). I give the page- and line-numbers of Meiser 1877 and 1880. I quote the translation from Minio-Paluello 1965 (where see X–XLI for the relation between the commentaries and the translation).

[28] The definition is quoted with 'secundum placitum' in both the first commentary (p. 45.30–46.1) and the second (p. 52.28–9). In his explanations Boethius usually keeps 'secundum placitum', but he has 'ad placitum' in the first commentary at p. 70.16–18 and in the second commentary at pp. 55.30, 62.20, 93.17, 94.4–5. It should be noted that 'secundum/ad placitum' also has a place in his discussions of *uerbum* and *oratio*, which like *nomen* fall under 'uox significatiua secundum placitum'. On Boethius' usage of 'secundum/ad placitum', which in this technical sense was introduced by him and gained wider currency only later, see Engels 1963, and on the variation between 'secundum' and 'ad' see Thomsen Thörnqvist 2008b: 96.

[29] Thus at the beginning of both *De syllogismo categorico* and *Introductio ad syllogismos categoricos*; in the first work the definition is given with 'ad placitum' (*PL* 64.794d, Thomsen Thörnqvist 2008a: 8.10), and in the sequel both 'ad' and (less frequently) 'secundum placitum' are used; in the second work the definition is given with 'secundum placitum' (762d, Thomsen Thörnqvist 2008b: 7.16), and that is used in the sequel, but for 766c (Thomsen Thörnqvist 2008b: 18.9), which has 'ad placitum'. In *De divisione*, the definition of 'nomen' is given as an example of *diuisio* (886b–887b, Magee 1998: 34–6); here 'secundum placitum' is used throughout (Migne's text has 'ad placitum' at 887a, but Magee has nothing there in either apparatus or commentary).

[30] 'Dissoluit libera' characterises the language as prose, in preparation for the contrast with poetry in the following lines: 'mox etiam uariis cantus astringere certat / legibus et numeris inclusit carmina doctis'. For the vocabulary, see Kißel 1990: 130–1 on Pers. 1.13 'scribimus inclusi, numeros ille, hic pede liber', where already the *Commentum Cornuti* takes 'inclusi' with 'numeros': 'aut certe *inclusi* metri lege coartati.' Because Martius alludes to Persius' prologue (8–9) in his own prologue (3), I would not exclude a reminiscence of Persius here.

[31] For 'motus animi', see *TLL* 8.1536.9–59.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

the beginning of Boethius' translation of *De interpretatione*, just as his imitation of the second commentary on the *Isagoge* is limited to its introduction.

If Martius knew these works, or at least their beginnings, it is possible that he also knew the 'bucolicum carmen' which is attested as a work by Boethius in the so-called *Anecdoton Holderi*, an excerpt from an otherwise lost near-contemporary source, the *Ordo generis Cassiodororum*.[32] Unfortunately, nothing has been preserved of this 'carmen', and circumstantial evidence is limited and uncertain. Boethius doubtless evokes his bucolic poetry in the very first words of the *Consolatio*: 'Carmina qui quondam studio florente peregi' ('I who once in flourishing studies brought poems to completion'), because he there alludes to the mention of Virgil's *Bucolics* both at the end of the *Georgics* (4.564–5 'studiis florentem … / carmina qui lusi') and at the spurious beginning of the *Aeneid* ('Ille ego qui quondam gracili modulatus auena / carmen').[33] The plural 'carmina' confirms what would otherwise already have been a plausible assumption, that the 'carmen bucolicum' was a collection rather than a single poem.[34] Also interesting in this respect is an example adduced by Boethius in the context of the discussion of future contingents in the second commentary on *De interpretatione*: 'cum dico me hodie esse Theocriti Bucolica relecturum' ('when I say that today I am going to re-read Theocritus' *Bucolica*', p. 234.12–13).[35] Boethius is here reporting the theory of Philo ('the Dialectician'), who lived earlier than Theocritus, so the example is likely to be his own.[36] If we combine this with Boethius' activity as a prolific translator from Greek (if only, as far as we know, of prose), we may speculate — but no more — that his 'carmen bucolicum' contained, perhaps even exclusively consisted of, translations or at least close imitations of Theocritus. If that were to be the case, the allusions to Theocritus (and pseudo-Theocritus) that Stover has identified in Martius might in fact be allusions to the Latin versions of Boethius.[37] But this is adding speculation to speculation, and we must be content to admit that we cannot say anything specific about Martius' use of Boethius' 'carmen bucolicum'. His use of two of the logical works, however, is certain.

III BOETHIUS' LOGICAL WORKS AND ANOTHER MARTIUS

Because not only the commentary on the *Isagoge*, but also the translation of and commentaries on *De interpretatione* were widely known in the Middle Ages (and especially in the twelfth century, where Martius Valerius used to be dated), the dependence that I have demonstrated will not at first sight corroborate the sixth-century dating of the poet: a twelfth-century student could very well have been familiar with

[32] The best edition of the *Anecdoton Holderi* is now in Morresi 2022: 219–20 ('condidit et carmen bucolicum' [scil. Boethius] is at l. 16), with commentary in Morresi 2023: 411–35. See also Galonnier 1996.

[33] See Gruber 2006: 19, 55, with references to the earlier literature. I would add that 'gloria felicis olim uiridisque iuuentae' (1.m1.7) continues the allusion to the end of the *Georgics* (4.565 'audaxque iuuenta').

[34] 'Carmen bucolicum' is used to refer to Virgil's *Bucolics* in Donatus' introduction to his commentary on that work (*Vit. Verg.* 69) and in Servius' introduction to his commentary on the *Aeneid* (p. 2.8 Thilo, *Vit. Verg.* p. 152.10 Brugnoli). Stover 2017: 314 speaks of Boethius' work as 'a bucolic poem', but at 322–3 considers the possibility that it was a collection, citing Servius; thus likewise Stover 2020: 136, who there also surmises that 'it may well have been influenced by the Christian bucolic of late antiquity', which to me seems as unlikely as it did to Schmid 1953: 110 = 1976: 54.

[35] This passage was already quoted by Stover 2017: 313 with n. 54 to make the point that Theocritus was known in the early sixth century.

[36] It cannot be completely excluded, however, that it was already present in an intermediate source, as Boethius is here dependent, via Porphyry, on Alexander of Aphrodisias; see Zimmermann 1981: LXXXV.

[37] See Stover 2017: 313–18 (repeated in Stover 2020). The idea is perhaps not as wild as it may appear at first sight, because there is a close imitation of the seventh idyll in Peter of Pisa (nr 17 in Neff 1908), who certainly did not know Greek; see Nauta forthcoming.

these works.[38] But so could a sixth-century student, who might have read the introduction to the second edition of the commentary on the *Isagoge* as soon as it was written (shortly after 510) and the translation of and/or a commentary on *De interpretatione* a few years later (or might have known the texts even earlier from personal teaching).[39] An argument for such a reconstruction is that we know of an editor of the logical works of Boethius, active in the 520s, who shared with our poet the name of 'Martius'. This is Martius Novatus Renatus, a *uir spectabilis*, whose full names are known from a subscription found at the beginning of *De divisione* (and occasionally elsewhere); in a few manuscripts the name is given as *Marcius* or *Marcus* or abbreviated as *M.*, but in most manuscripts, including the oldest and most authoritative, Orléans, Bibl. mun., 267 (X^2, Fleury), as *Martius*.[40] This state of affairs is reminiscent of the transmission of the name of the poet, and here, too, the correct form must have been 'Martius'. Because that name is exceedingly rare in this period (as is 'Marcius'), it is likely that Valerius and Renatus were related, perhaps closely.[41]

Renatus occurs again in the subscription to *De hypotheticis syllogismis*. Here the manuscript Paris, BNL, nouv. acq. lat. 1611, which originally was the second half of the Aurelianensis, has (f. 51r):

> Contra codicem Renati u(iri) s(pectabilis) correxi, qui confectus ab eo est Theodoro antiquario qui nunc palatinus est.
>
> I corrected this against the codex of Renatus, *uir spectabilis*, which was produced by that scribe Theodorus who now is a palatine official.

It is generally accepted that this *codex Renati* contained a corpus of the logical monographs of Boethius, of which a table of contents is found in the Aurelianensis and elsewhere, beginning with *De topicis differentiis* (chronologically the last work, written *c.* 522) and having *De hypotheticis syllogismis* as its last item; this table of contents was in all probability drawn up by the corrector of the *codex Renati*, who has been identified with Cassiodorus or at least someone from his environment, because the codex was used in compiling the ΦΔ-recension of the *Institutiones humanarum litterarum* (book 2 of the *Institutiones*).[42] The corrector, whoever he was, in any case knew that the scribe Theodorus 'now' worked at the palace.[43] This makes it likely that he is to identified

[38] On the medieval reception of Boethius' logical works, see in general Lewry 1981, and specifically on the translation of and commentaries on the *Isagoge*, Marenbon 2018.

[39] On the date of the second commentary on the *Isagoge*, see Asztalos 1993, on that of the commentaries on *De interpretatione*, De Rijk 1964: 142–5, 159. Further bibliography on dating in Magee and Marenbon 2009: 305 and Döpp 2018: 2350–5.

[40] For the readings of the manuscripts, see Magee 1994: 3–4; Pecere 2014: 169–70; Wallenwein 2017: 163–5; and most fully Morresi 2023: 121–2 (where, however, *Marius* in the report of Paris, BNF nouv. acq. lat. 1478 is a misprint for *Martius*). The text in the Orléans manuscript (p. 88) is 'Martius Nouatus Renatus u(ir) c(larissimus) et sp(ectabilis) relegi meum'. Renatus is called 'Marcius' in *PLRE* 2.939 (Renatus 1) and *PCBE* 2.1888–9 (Renatus 3), but in both cases without argument.

[41] In *PLRE* 2 there is one other Martius (and there is another in a late fifth-century inscription in the Colosseum: Orlandi 2004: 386, 495) and one other Marcius; in *PLRE* 3 there is one (uncertain) Martius and no Marcius. There is a slight possibility of kinship with Boethius himself: his father's name is abbreviated as *Nar. Manl. Boethius* on the latter's consular diptych of 487 (Delbrück 1929: 103–6, nr 7; Volbach 1976: 32, nr 6), and Cameron 1981 has argued that *Nar.* must be a carving error for *Mar.* and that the name was 'Marius' — but one might be forgiven for thinking of 'Martius', even though there is no certain parallel for abbreviation within a consonant group. There is one transmitted *Mar.* on consular diptychs (Delbrück 1929: 151–4, nr 34; Volbach 1976: 41, nr 33), and there the abbreviation is usually resolved as 'Marcianus' or 'Marcellus' (*PLRE* 3: 750), but Cameron again proposes 'Marius'.

[42] Within this broad consensus, the precise trajectory of the codex has been variously reconstructed; see, most notably, Obertello 1974: 343–69; Magee 1994: 1–12 and 1998: LVIII–LXV; Pecere 2014; Morresi 2023: 117–41.

[43] At this period the noun *palatinus* usually denoted an official in the service of the *comes sacrarum largitionum* or the *comes rerum priuatarum*, but it might also be used in a more general sense; see Delmaire 1989a: 124–33.

with the Theodorus who was *adiutor* to the *quaestor sacri palatii* in Constantinople and there made a copy of the *Ars grammatica* of his teacher Priscian in the years 525–526, as is apparent from a number of subscriptions.[44] If the word 'now' is pressed, we might conclude that Theodorus was not yet at the palace when he wrote the *codex Renati*. Also, it has been observed that some manuscripts going back to the *codex Renati* (including the Aurelianensis) call Boethius *magister officiorum* (and not, as in some of the manuscripts of the *Consolatio*, *ex mag. off.*), which would date the compilation of the codex to 522–523.[45] Neither argument is very strong, but a date somewhere in the 520s (but not earlier than 522) fits well with our other information about Renatus.

There are only three further attestations of a Renatus in this period, which are all likely to concern the same man.[46] The first is in a letter, written in the years 507/511 by Cassiodorus in the name of Theoderic to Theodagunda, a woman of royal blood, in which it appears that a Renatus has complained to the king about the settling of a legal dispute; this suggests that this Renatus was close to the court at Ravenna.[47] Ravenna is explicitly mentioned in the second attestation, a passage in which Severus of Antioch reports that when he lived in Constantinople (508–511), he debated in Greek about the Theopaschite problem with two men from the West, a Petronius from Rome and a Renatus from Ravenna, who defended the Chalcedonian position.[48] Finally, there is the opening of the letter of John the Deacon on baptism to Senarius, which begins 'Sublimitatis uestrae paginam filio nostro spectabili uiro Renato deferente suscepimus' ('We have received the writing of Your Sublimity, transmitted by our son, the *uir spectabilis* Renatus'); because Senarius had a long career at the court in Ravenna, it is likely that Renatus had brought his letter from there.[49] The Roman 'Iohannes diaconus' writing the letter is with certainty the Roman 'Iohannes diaconus' to whom Boethius dedicated three of his theological treatises and whose spiritual 'filius' he proclaimed himself to be.[50] So we have a Renatus who shared both theological concerns and a

Cassiodorus uses the word adjectivally in connection with various high court offices: *Var.* 5.3.3, 5.41.5, 8.16.7, 11.2.5.

[44] Theodorus 63 in *PLRE* 2.1098 ('perhaps identical' with the Theodorus who wrote the *codex Renati*). For the subscriptions, see Ballaira 1989: 57–64, 67–70 and Pecere 2019 (the texts at 101–2); they are not in Wallenwein 2017. The identification was already made by Jahn 1851: 356–7 and has been generally accepted (in spite of the scepticism of *PLRE*). It should be noted that Priscian dedicated three of his *opuscula* to a Symmachus, almost certainly Q. Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, Boethius' father-in-law: see Passalaqua 1987: 3 for the text of the dedication and XII–XVI for discussion and literature; also Ballaira 1989: 41–53.

[45] Brandt 1906: LXXXIII. The mentions occur in inscriptions and subscriptions to *De topicis differentiis*; see for further evidence the apparatus criticus in Nikitas 1990: 1, 20, 92.

[46] See e.g. Obertello 1974: 344–5; Magee 1994: 8; Pecere 2014: 173–4 (making the suggestion that he is the unnamed dedicatee of *De hypotheticis syllogismis*) and 200, n. 224; Morresi 2023: 123. Pecere 2014: 180, n. 129 rightly remarks that there is no warrant for calling Renatus a *grammaticus* (even though it is not impossible that a *grammaticus* was a *uir spectabilis*, as the case of Deuterius shows: *PLRE* 2.356–7 (Deuterius 3); Kaster 1988: 109–10, 267–9).

[47] Cassiod., *Var.* 4.37. Some doubt is raised by the fact that this Renatus is not called *uir spectabilis*, but he may have acquired that title after the date of the letter. Theodagunda (*PLRE* 2.1067) is not otherwise attested.

[48] *Contra impium grammaticum* 3.29, p. 72.23–73.6 in the Latin translation from the Syriac by Lebon 1933, especially 72.25–7 'nomen primo Petronius, alteri autem Renatus, et illius quidem Romam, huius autem Ravennam civitatem esse dicebant' (as with nearly all works of Severus, the original Greek has not been preserved). Petronius has been identified by Moorhead 1983: 108–9 with Rufius Petronius Nicomachus Cethegus (*PLRE* 2.281–2) and by others (references in Pecere 2014: 172) with that man's father Petronius Probinus (*PLRE* 2.909–10, Probinus 2); both suggestions go against onomastic custom (which would use the last name as the diacritic; see n. 13), but this Petronius doubtless belonged to the same family. The two men may well have been on a diplomatic mission to the emperor Anastasius.

[49] *PL* 59.399–408, re-edited by Wilmart 1933: 170–9. On Senarius, see *PLRE* 2.988–9; he is last attested in 515/516. If John the Deacon is the later Pope John I (as argued most notably by Moorhead 1983: 113, but *PCBE* 2.1074–5 and 1080, Iohannes 26 and 28, is sceptical), the letter is in any case earlier than 13 August 523, the beginning of his papacy.

[50] The works are *Quomodo substantiae in eo quod sint bonae sint cum non sint substantialia bona, Vtrum Pater*

spiritual father with Boethius and who lived in Ravenna, where Boethius worked after his appointment as *magister officiorum* in 522.[51] It is therefore a reasonable hypothesis that this is the same Renatus as the one who was responsible for the *codex Renati*, and that he brought manuscripts of Boethius' works from Ravenna to Constantinople when Boethius came under pressure (in 523) or was already executed (in 524 or 525), or perhaps already earlier, if we admit the date of 522–523 for the *codex Renati*.

It has been suggested that the manuscripts that Renatus caused to be copied included not only the logical monographs, but also the two commentaries on Porphyry's *Isagoge*. The editor of these commentaries, Samuel Brandt, argued that the mention of a 'prima' and a 'secunda editio' in the inscriptions of some manuscripts must go back to an ancient recension in which the two commentaries were combined; he also noticed that in these same manuscripts Boethius is styled 'magister officiorum', as he seems to have been in the *codex Renati*.[52] For these reasons he proposed that here, too, Renatus was responsible, although he also admitted that such a reconstruction could never be more than conjectural. In this context it becomes relevant that the poems of the other Martius may have been transmitted in immediate proximity to the commentaries on the *Isagoge*. When John Leland listed the noteworthy manuscripts that he had seen at Thorney Abbey, he mentioned, immediately following the 'Eglogae aliquot Marci exquaestoris, qui floruit tempore Justiniani', the 'Isagoge Porphirii Victorino interprete'.[53] Victorinus' translation is known only in so far as it was quoted in Boethius' first commentary, but Leland may have seen a manuscript with an inscription like that of Cologne, Erzbischöfliche Diözesan- und Dombibliothek, Cod. 187 (s. XI): *Isagogae Porphyrii translatae de Greco in Latinum a Victorino oratore*; what this manuscript contains, however, is Boethius' translation, but ascribed to Victorinus, and then the first and after that the second commentary.[54] So there is a possibility that not only Martius Novatus Renatus, but also Martius Valerius was associated with the transmission of the two commentaries. The five poems with their 451 verses would nicely fit into a quire (16 pages with around 28 lines to the page), which might have travelled as a stowaway, so to speak, in a manuscript of the commentaries.[55] But it is of course also possible that the two works were combined by someone who recognised the imitation, or even that the juxtaposition in Leland does not go back to juxtaposition in a single codex or corpus, and is due to mere coincidence. But in any case, the association of both Martii with the logical works of Boethius makes it worthwhile to look for Martius Valerius in the same environment as Martius Novatus Renatus. That could be Constantinople, where the *codex Renati* was written, or Ravenna, where Renatus is variously attested, but also Rome, where Boethius lived and worked until he was called to Ravenna to become *magister officiorum* in 522. In the next section I will attempt to show that all the evidence converges on the last-mentioned alternative.

et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus de diuinitate substantialiter praedicentur (in both of which the dedication to John is given only in the incipits, not in the text) and *Contra Eutychen et Nestorium*, which carries the dedication *Domino sancto ac uenerabili patri Iohanni diacono Boethius filius*.

[51] On Boethius' life, see *PLRE* 2.233–7.

[52] Brandt 1906: XXIX–XXXV, LXXXII–LXXXIII.

[53] See p. 31 of vol. 4 (Book III) of Thomas Hearne's second edition (London 1774) of Leland's *Collectanea*.

[54] See https://digital.dombibliothek-koeln.de/hs/urn/urn:nbn:de:hbz:kn28-3-10749 (the misunderstanding of *Isagoge* as a plural is common in the Middle Ages). This manuscript is F/Φ in Brandt 1906, Kg in Minio-Paluello 1966. Cod. 191 in the same library (Γ in Brandt, Kö in Minio-Paluello) has an identical inscription, but contains only the translation, not the commentaries. Victorinus is also mentioned, but specifically in connection with the first commentary, in two other manuscripts (Brandt's G/Σ and T). The false ascription of Boethius' translation to Victorinus may go back to Isid., *Etym.* 2.25.9 or its source Cassiod., *Inst.* 2.3.18 (Ω recension).

[55] On the completeness or otherwise of the collection see above, n. 14.

IV STUDENTS AND THEIR MENTORS IN EARLY-SIXTH-CENTURY ROME

In Martius' first eclogue the herdsman Cydnus is introduced as resting in the shade, but not, like Virgil's Tityrus, happily singing of his love, but on the contrary, being tormented by it. When his interlocutor Ladon asks him about the cause of his 'dolor' (49), he begins (50–4):

> Scis, reor, hunc collem, 'Lauros' ubi dicimus 'Altas',
> unde forum et celsas securi cernimus arces,
> lactea cum turbae portamus dona molestae:
> hoc domus in colle est nostra, puto, non minor urbe,
> et tamen hoc melius, domina quod Xystide[56] gaudet.
>
> You know, I think, this hill, where we speak of the 'High Laurels', whence securely we discern the forum and the high citadels, when we bring our milky gifts to the troublesome crowd: on this hill there is a house not smaller, I believe, than our town,[57] and what is even better: it enjoys Xystis as its mistress.

Many different localisations for this hill were proposed when the poem was still thought to be medieval, and 'it was even suggested that the referent was Rome itself', writes Stover, apparently considering this suggestion to be quite absurd (he himself argues for Daphne near Antioch).[58] Indeed, the scholar who originally proposed Rome gave a misleading reference (Suet., *Galba* 2.1, which is about a laurel grove in the villa of Livia at Primaporta), but a great number of sources attest an area called 'Lauretum' or 'Loretum' in the north-west corner of the Aventine, from where one may indeed see the forum (in any case the Forum Boarium and the Forum Holitorium), as well as the 'celsas … arces', i.e. the Capitol.[59] Admittedly, the nomenclature does not include the word 'altus', although the hill itself is high and modern scholarship has called the

[56] G has *sistite* with a correction above the second *i* which might be *y*. Timpanaro ap. Munari emended to 'Sistide' because of *Sistis* in 55 (*ter*), 56 and 80. I have preferred 'Xystis' ('X' not making position after 'uitaque' at 1.55; cf. Terentianus Maurus 1154–63; Dracontius, *Romulea* 8.75), although Martius may have written 'Syxtis' or 'Systis' (though hardly 'Sixtys' or 'Sistys'; the attempted correction in G looks medieval, just as *Tytirus* in *prol.*9). Ratkowitsch 1992: 184–5 believes *Sistis* to be the original spelling and explains it from σείειν.

[57] Stover 2017: 327 translates 'my home' and 'the city', apparently assuming lengthening at the hephthemimeres. But even lengthening at the penthemimeres is avoided by Martius (Munari 1970: LXXIV–LXXV). In the bucolic fiction the herdsmen of course inhabit a small town, contrasted with the big city (even if in the previous bucolic tradition that is here invoked the latter, not the former, is called 'urbs': Verg., *Buc.* 1.34, Calp. 4.25–6, both noted by Munari).

[58] Stover 2017: 327–8. The forum of Antioch is not visible, however, nor was in the sixth century, from Daphne. For this information I am indebted to Prof. Andrea DeGiorgi of Florida State University, leader of 'The Archaeology of Daphne' project. Stover suggests that the name of the speaker here, 'Cydnus', evokes Antioch, although the river of that name flows through Tarsus in Cilicia, not Antioch in Syria (for my own suggestion of Martius' reason for choosing 'Cydnus' see below, section IV). Stover's argument (328, n. 98) that 'Orontes' would not do to evoke Antioch, because Martius 'has an overwhelming preference for two-syllable names', overlooks 'Iarbas' in the second eclogue, and if Martius needed a name which could begin a hexameter, in analogy with Virgil's 'Tityre', 'Pyrame' would have done, that river being nearer to Antioch than the Cydnus. Stover also mentions an Auxentius attested at the end of the fourth century in an inscription found at Adana on the Sarus, in which the Cydnus is mentioned (*PLRE* 1.142, Auxentius 5 (possibly the same as Auxentius 4); Merkelbach and Stauber 2002: 214–15 (19/14/01)), and suggests that this Auxentius is related to Martius' patron of that name (on whom see below), but the name is not uncommon and is attested at Rome in the mid-fifth century, appreciably closer to the date of Martius' poems (*PLRE* 2.205–6, Auxentius 6 and 9; cf. 2.380, Olbius Auxentius Draucus).

[59] Rome was suggested by Verdière 1972, who confusingly speaks of 'le *lauretum* planté sur l'Aventin (cf. Suet., *Galb.*, 1, 2)'. On the Lauretum on the Aventine, see M. Andreussi s.v. 'Loretum, Lauretum', *LTUR* 3 (1966): 190–1 and D. Bruni in *AAR* 1.391, 396–7 with tab. 159 and 164 and add. tab. 25. The area of the ancient Lauretum is now private property and not accessible to the public, so that the views from there cannot be checked by autopsy.

road leading into the Lauretum the 'Vicus Altus' — unfortunately without ancient warrant.[60] This part of the Aventine was traditionally an affluent residential quarter, but precisely for that reason it was heavily pillaged by the troops of Alaric in 410 and doubtless also by the Vandals in 455 and by Ricimer in 472.[61] Yet we know that Caecina Decius Maximus Basilius cos. 480, one of the leading men of the age, lived there (in what was apparently an ancestral home of the Decii), and by the beginning of the sixth century, the area may still (or again) have been distinguished by large mansions such as the *domus* that so impressed Cydnus.[62]

Rome was the place where the Italian elite sent their sons to study,[63] and it is very likely that Martius Valerius was a youth when he wrote his *Bucolics* (no longer, of course, when the manuscript to which our text goes back was written, because he was then ex-quaestor and consul or ex-consul). Not only was bucolic a young man's genre (as we have seen with Boethius), but such features as the imitation of introductory scholastic matter that I have demonstrated or the alphabetical catalogue of mythological exempla in the fourth eclogue[64] suggest an author who has not long ago quitted the school of the *grammaticus* and may still have been under the tutelage of the *rhetor*.[65] Moreover, he refers to himself as a 'puer' in a passage that is of central importance for situating the poet into his milieu and time. In the third eclogue, in the course of their amoebaeon, the two competing herdsmen address their respective patrons (107–10):

MOERIS Parua, sed excelso placuit mea fistula Fausto:[66]
'i, puer, et propriam' dixit 'ne neglige Musam!'

MOPSUS Nos Auxentius amat uiuoque tuetur amore,
deque suo tenuis mihi nomine crescit auena.

MOERIS Small is my reed pipe, but it has pleased the exalted Faustus: 'Go, boy', he said, 'and don't neglect the Muse you have made your own!'[67]

MOPSUS Me Auxentius loves and regards with lively love, and from his name grows my slender reed.

[60] Coarelli 2001: 415 speaks of the '*vicus Altus* citato da un'iscrizione', but I have not been able to locate such an inscription. There may be some confusion with the parallel *Vicus Armilustri* mentioned on the base of the altar of the *magistri uicorum* (*CIL* 6.795 = *ILS* 6073). The name seems to have been given to the street by Darsy 1968: 75 and *passim*.

[61] For the history of the Aventine in Late Antiquity, see Merlin 1906: 352–61, 430–40; D. Bruni in *AAR* 1.410–11.

[62] A lead pipe, found near the church of SS. Bonifacio ed Alessio (*CIL* 15.7420) gives the full nomenclature; see further *PLRE* 2.217–18 (Basilius 12); F. Guidobaldo s.v. 'Domus: Caecina Decius Albinus Iunior', *LTUR* 2 (1995): 29; Orlandi 2004: 467–8.

[63] On Rome as a centre of education in the early sixth century see Riché 1995: 28–32.

[64] In the fourth eclogue, after the long section on Hero and Leander (56–67), which corresponds to that on Pasiphae in Virgil (*Buc.* 6.45–60), we have Cygnus (68–73), Cypressus and Hyacinthus (74–6), Danae (77–82) and Daphne (83–90). The alphabetical order (in Latin, not Greek, and excepting Hyacinthus, who has perhaps been introduced by association) may be accidental or derive from or be inspired by alphabetical mythological catalogues of the type of *P. Mich.* inv. 1447 (Van Rossum-Steenbeek 1997: 144–5, 335–6, and index s.v. 'alphabetic order'). As in the Michigan papyrus, all stories in Martius are metamorphoses, if we count Jupiter's transformation into golden rain as one (the story is not told in Ov., *Met.*).

[65] Another possibility is that he studied law, which would have been a good preparation for his quaestorate. On the study of law at Rome in this period, see Liebs 1987: 122–6; and on the quaestorate see below, section V.

[66] G (and hence E) has *Fasto*, but as Munari (1970: 24, with references) notes, this is a vulgar form of 'Fausto'.

[67] 'proprius' in this period often functions as the possessive pronoun, but the parallel with Nemesianus (see below) suggests that here it still has its 'proper' meaning.

As is usual with Martius, the passage is a conflation of Virgil with Calpurnius and Nemesianus.[68] Some of the diction is derived from a comparable scene in Calpurnius, where the herdsmen mention that they are loved by the gods Silvanus and Flora respectively; there we find the address to the 'puer' and the idea that the reed pipe 'grows' ('crescit') — although the pun on the patron's name ('deque suo … nomine') is Martius' own.[69] The precise wording of the address to the 'puer', however, is taken from Nemesianus: 'Perge puer, coeptumque tibi ne desere carmen.' ('Go on, boy, and don't abandon the poetry you have begun', 1.81). These parallels might at first sight be taken to show that the 'puer' is a merely conventional figure, but the further parallel with Virgil's third eclogue (which is imitated throughout in Martius' third), where the herdsmen address Virgil's patron Pollio (84–7), strongly suggests that the 'puer' stands for the poet himself. Such an interpretation is consonant with the very first lines of the prologue to the collection:[70]

> Parua quidem arbitrio committo carmina magno:
> spes uenit ista mihi de pietate patrum.
>
> Small though they be, I commit my poems to the judgement of the great: this hope comes to me from the *pietas* of my fathers.

Stover has interpreted the word 'patres' to mean 'senators',[71] but a consideration of the discourse about Roman students in this period may suggest a somewhat different interpretation (and explain my translation 'my fathers' rather than 'the fathers').

In the large archive of the works of Ennodius, dating from his time as a deacon in Milan in the period 503–513, there are a number of letters recommending young Milanese protégés to high-ranking Romans on the occasion of their move to Rome for the benefit of further study.[72] Striking in these letters is the use of 'pater' and 'pietas' to describe the role of both Ennodius himself and that of the prospective mentors with respect to the adolescents entrusted to their care.[73] This is best seen in two passages where both

[68] Noted by Munari 1970: 24, although he misses Nemes. 1.81.

[69] Calp. 2.28–35: 'IDAS Me Siluanus amat … / … / ille etiam paruo dixit mihi non leue carmen: / "iam leuis obliqua crescat tibi fistula canna."/ ASTACUS … / "accipe" dixerunt Nymphae "puer, accipe fontes: / …".'

[70] Martius' model for his elegiac prologue is not, as Stover 2017: 306, 326, 332 thinks, primarily Persius' iambic prologue to his satires (in spite of the echo noted in n. 30), but rather the elegiac *praefationes* of Ausonius, Claudian and Sidonius Apollinaris (and also Sedulius, but not Arator, who wrote only in the 540s), which partly use the same topoi; cf. e.g. Sid. Apoll., *Carm.* 1.24 'post magnos proceres paruula tura damus' with 1 (quoted in the text), and *Carm.* 3.7–9 'si probat, emittit, si damnat carmina, celat / … / i, liber' with 21–2 'liber, … i [reading 'i posce' with Skutsch 1964: 23 for 'imposce'] … / affectumque probent iudiciumque tegant.' The play with polysyllabic words at the end (13–20) likewise finds its closest parallel at the end of a preface of Sidonius, the one (in prose) to his *Epistles* (1.1.4).

[71] Stover 2017: 307–8, 322–3. As Stover notes (322), Martius' first distich is so close to the inscription on a consular diptych issued by Justinian for his first consulship in 521 (Delbrück 1929: 141–3, nrs 26–8; Volbach 1976: 38–9, nrs 25–7) that there seems to be imitation in one direction or the other: 'Munera parua quidem pretio sed honoribus alma / patribus ista meis offero consul ego'. Here 'patribus' apparently means 'senators' (cf. the imitation by Philoxenus cos. 525 (E): Τουτὶ τὸ δῶρον τῇ σοφῇ Γερουσίᾳ / ὕπατος ὑπάρχων προσφέρω Φιλόξενος (Delbrück 1929: 144–6, nr 29; Volbach 1976: 39–40, nr 28)), but it is possible that the meaning of the word was changed from one context to the other. Justinian's language is highly formulaic (cf. Symm., *Ep.* 9.93 and esp. 9.107: 'paruum quidem munusculum est, si aestimatur pretio sui, religiosum, si amore pendatur') and he may have reproduced or closely followed an existing example; if so, that earlier text might have been also among the sources of Martius (who in any case was senatorial and hence would be among the recipients of consular diptychs).

[72] In referring to Ennodius, I use the numbering of Vogel 1885. See 225–8 (and cf. 368) for Parthenius (Ennodius' nephew), 282 for Simplicianus, 409–10 for an unnamed orphan, 416–17 for Beatus, 424–6 for Ambrosius (on whom more below); for the historical contexts, see Sundwall 1919: 36–7, 56, 62–4.

[73] Thus, apart from the passages to be discussed in the text, 225.2 'cui [Parthenius] magnitudinis uestrae [Faustus] suffragia sum paterna pollicitus'; 227.3 'circa memoratum [Parthenius] patrem reddite' (to Luminosus); 369.6 'fili'

terms occur in combination. The first is the only letter of recommendation that is not written to a Roman aristocrat (or pope or future pope) with the request to act as a mentor, but to someone who seems to have been a teacher (425). In the inscription of the letter his name is given (in the dative) as 'Meribaudo', but this is almost certainly a copying error for 'Merobaudi'; the Merobaudes in question may be the 'rhetor' whose work Boethius quotes in his commentary on Cicero's *Topica*.[74] In recommending Ambrosius to him, Ennodius concludes: 'petitioni meae paterna, sicut praeceptores uocauit antiquitas, pietate respondete.' ('Respond to my petition with the *pietas* of a father — as teachers were called of old.'). The words 'uocauit antiquitas' are meant to evoke a famous passage from Juvenal's seventh satire, where in the section on the 'rhetores' the poet writes of the 'maiores' 'qui praeceptorem sancti uoluere parentis / esse loco' ('who wanted the teacher to be in the position of the holy parent', 209–10).[75] This passage is quoted verbatim in the second text to be considered, a long prosimetric letter of instruction to Ambrosius and Beatus, usually called by the name *Paraenesis didascalica* given to it by the early-seventeenth-century editor Sirmond (452). Ennodius glosses the quotation from Juvenal with the *sententia* 'generare etenim et libidinis testimonium est, erudisse pietatis' ('indeed, begetting shows proof also of lust, educating of *pietas*', 4–5).[76] At the end of the letter (18–25) he praises a number of Roman aristocrats, whom the boys, he suggests, should seek out as mentors: Faustus and his son Avienus are at the court in Ravenna, but Rome still has Festus and Symmachus, Probinus and his son Cethegus, Agapitus and Probus, as well as the *matronae* Barbara and Stefania.[77] But not to forget Boethius, 'in quo uix discendi annos respicis et intellegis peritiam sufficere iam docendi' ('in whom you hardly notice the years of learning and understand that he already has sufficient expertise in teaching', 21).[78]

These texts suggest that the 'patres', on whose 'pietas' Martius counts, are precisely such mentors, in any case including Boethius, whom he imitates, and the Auxentius and Faustus he mentions in the third eclogue. Auxentius cannot be identified, but he may well have been Martius' teacher.[79] Faustus, on the other hand, is quite likely to be the Faustus mentioned

(Ennodius to Parthenius); 398.1 'pater tuus' (Ennodius to Beatus); 417.1 'cui [Beatus] parentem beatitudo uestra [Hormisdas, who was already known to be the next pope] inpendat'; 424.3 'pietatem' of Faustus towards Ambrosius; 452.26 'sicci parentis' (Ennodius of Beatus and Ambrosius).

[74] *PL* 64.1109, 1147 (from 520/523; see De Rijk 1964: 151–4). *PLRE* 2.756–8 identifies the 'rhetor' with the mid-fifth-century poet, orator, and military man Merobaudes, but there is no other evidence for him having also written books of rhetorical theory, and the chronology fits Ennodius' Merobaudes just as well. On the name, see Schönfeld 1911: 167.

[75] Juvenal in his turn takes up formulations by Quintilian (*Inst.* 2.2.4, 2.9.1). For the topos in Late Antiquity (applied to both *grammatici* and *rhetores*), see Kaster 1988: 68 with n. 151.

[76] This *sententia* seems inspired by a similar one in Stat., *Silv.* 2.1.87–8 'genuisse necesse est, / elegisse iuuat'. Both Statius (88–9) and Juvenal (210–12) give Achilles and Chiron as an example.

[77] The text of the *Paraenesis*, as addressed to Ambrosius and Beatus, is from the beginning of 512, although the absence of Faustus and Avienus at Ravenna reflects the situation of 510, when the text was first drafted for Beatus only (see 205 and Sundwall 1919: 61–2, 68). Faustus, on whom more below, is Faustus 9 (*PLRE* 2.454–6; Orlandi 2004: 476–8); the others are Avienus 2 (*PLRE* 2.192–3), Festus 5 (*PLRE* 2.467–9; Orlandi 2004: 482–3), Symmachus 9 (*PLRE* 2.1044–6; Orlandi 2004: 512; Boethius' father-in-law), Probinus 2 (*PLRE* 2.909–10), Cethegus (*PLRE* 2.281–2), Agapitus 3 (*PLRE* 2.30–2), Probus 9 (*PLRE* 2.913), Barbara (*PLRE* 2.209–10), Stefania (*PLRE* 2.1028; sister of Faustus). The men were all consulars (with the exception of Agapitus, who was to become consul later) and *patricii* (with the exception of Probus, who was 'merely' *uir illustris*).

[78] In spite of this recommendation, Ennodius' relationship with Boethius was somewhat strained, as appears from the letters directed to him (271, 318, 370 (congratulations on Boethius' consulate in 510), 408, 415, 418), and especially from the mocking epigram 339 (which was doubtless not meant for wider circulation; cf. Di Rienzo 2005: 194–6).

[79] All nine Auxentii in *PLRE* 2.304–9 are too early, but if Martius' Auxentius was his teacher, it is not surprising that he does not appear in the sources. Riché 1995: 30 with n. 79 notes that apart from Merobaudes, Ennodius never mentions the name of a Roman teacher.

by Ennodius, i.e. Anicius Probus Faustus cos. 490.[80] Martius calls him 'excelsus' (3.107, as quoted above), for which the only parallels are in the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*, where the epithet is given to the highest officials of the state, including the *magister officiorum*, the *quaestor sacri palatii* and the *praefectus praetorio*; it would thus well fit Faustus, who held all three offices.[81] Faustus is the addressee of many of the letters of recommendation mentioned above, and on various occasions Ennodius praises his literary output, including poetry; one epigram by Faustus has even been preserved in the Ennodian archive.[82] But there is another reason to connect him with Martius Valerius, and this has to do with a surprising allusion to be found at a prominent place in the eclogues.

The first line of the first eclogue reads: 'Cydne, sub algenti recubas dum molliter umbra' ('Cydnus, while you recline softly under the cool shade'). This of course alludes to the beginning of Virgil's first eclogue 'Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi / … / … lentus in umbra' ('Tityrus, you, reclining under the cover of a spreading beech, … relaxed in the shade'), but the word 'molliter' may evoke another imitation of Virgil's first line, in the pseudo-Virgilian *Catalepton* 9, a panegyric on M. Valerius Messala Corvinus, which among other things praises his bucolic poetry: 'molliter hic uiridi patulae sub tegmine querci / Moeris pastores et Meliboeus erant' ('here, softly under the green cover of a spreading oak, were the herdsmen Moeris and Meliboeus', 17–18).[83] The case for imitation is perhaps not very strong, but it may be reinforced by the similarity between the first line of the prologue 'Parua quidem arbitrio committo carmina magna' with the line in which the poet of *Catalepton* 9 characterises Messala's poetry: 'pauca tua in nostras uenerunt carmina chartas' ('a few of your poems have found a place in my manuscripts', 13), even although here the case for imitation is not very strong either.[84] But the very first word of the first eclogue, 'Cydne' may also be relevant, because the river Cydnus, from which Martius' herdsman takes his name, occurs at the beginning of the list of Messala's eastern victories in Tibullus' birthday poem for his patron: 'an te, Cydne, canam, tacitis qui leniter undis / …?' ('Or Cydnus, shall I sing of you, who gently with your silent waves …?', 1.7.13), and may well have been mentioned in Messala's own poetry.[85] What gives point to all this is not only that Martius bears the name 'Valerius', but also that the family of Faustus traced its descendance to the poet, whose full name was M. Valerius Messal(l)a Corvinus: Faustus called one of his sons Messala, while his father, Gennadius Avienus, was reckoned by

[80] For references, see n. 77. He is sometimes called 'Faustus niger' to distinguish him from 'Faustus albus' cos. 483 (*PLRE* 2.451–2, Faustus 4); see Cameron 1998 for the terminology.

[81] *Vir excelsus* is often said of Tribonian, who at various points was quaestor and *magister officiorum* (*C. Imperatorium* 4; *Inst.* tit., 1.5.3, 2.23.12; *C. Omnem* 6; *C. Tanta* princ., 1, 11; *C. Cordi* 2), but also of the *praefectus urbis Constantinopolitanae* (*C. Omnem* 10; *C. Tanta* 24), the *praefecti praetorio* (*Cod. Iust.* 1.3.53.2 (Justinian), 9.13.1.1c (Justinian); *C. Tanta* 24) and generally of the members of Justinian's first law commission (*C. Cordi* princ.). Already Anastasius used it in 492 for the *magistri militum praesentales* (*Cod. Iust.* 12.35.18.1) and there is an earlier instance in Symm., *Ep.* 4.30.1 (of a quaestor). It was not an official title.

[82] Letters of recommendation (cf. n. 72): 228 (for Parthenius — but *PLRE* 2.450–1 believes the addressee to be Faustus 2), 282 (for Simplicianus), 424 (for Ambrosius). Poetry: 26, 70; cf. 10 on a description of Lake Como, probably in prose. Epigram: 367. There is also an epigram by Faustus' son Messala (371), on whom see below.

[83] The allusion was proposed by Baligan 1967: 391 in the course of an otherwise fanciful argument for the impossible thesis that our poet is Messala Corvinus. Whether the characterisation in *Catal.* 9 may reflect the words of Messala himself depends on whether he wrote his eclogues in Greek (as the text seems to imply) or in Latin, as argued by Baligan (388–91), followed by Ratkowitsch 1992: 171.

[84] This allusion, too, was proposed by Baligan 1967: 391–2, together with a few others, which are in any case not convincing.

[85] That Cydnus is indeed named after the river is made nearly certain by the name of the other herdsman in the poem, Ladon. That name occurs in Calpurnius (1.18), but it is also the name of a river in Arcadia (cf. Scevola Mariotti ap. Munari 1970: XLVIII–XLIX, n. 33), where, according to Ovid (*Met.* 1.701–12), the nymph Syrinx was changed into the homonymous bucolic instrument. If Cydnus was indeed mentioned in Messala's poetry, both Tibullus' 'Cydne … qui leniter undis' and Martius' 'Cydne … dum molliter umbra' may contain an echo of it.

Sidonius Apollinaris to belong to the 'Coruinorum familia' (*Epist.* 1.9.4).[86] So it is possible that Martius Valerius also belonged (or counted himself as belonging) to this family, constructing its reputed ancestor as his predecessor in bucolic poetry. In any case, the letters of Ennodius, and especially those concerning Faustus, even if they date from a few years before the *terminus post quem* provided by Martius' imitation of Boethius, suggest a plausible environment for Martius Valerius. That plausibility is increased when, to conclude this article, the evidence about his career, that he was consul and quaestor, is connected with what has been argued thus far.

V MARTIUS VALERIUS QUAESTOR AND CONSUL

Among the protégés of Ennodius studying in Rome, at least two became quaestor: Ambrosius, already repeatedly mentioned above, in 526–527 and Fidelis as his successor in 527–528.[87] The quaestor was the ghost-writer of the emperor in the East and of the Gothic king in the West, but in the East the stress was strongly on jurisprudence, and the position was filled with eminent jurists, who remained in office over a number of years (and whose hand may often be recognised in the *Corpus Iuris Civilis*).[88] In the West, on the other hand, oratorical reputation took precedence over juridical training, and the men chosen were often young (such as Ambrosius and Fidelis), and usually, it seems, remained in office for one indiction only (i.e. the period from 1 September to 31 August).[89] All of our evidence for this period comes from Cassiodorus' *Variae*, which covers the years 507–511 (when Cassiodorus himself was quaestor, he too at a young age), 523–527 (when he was *magister officiorum*) and 533–537 (when he was praetorian prefect). For most of the years concerned he included the letters of appointment to the candidates and the announcements to the senate of the new incumbents, and thus we know of four western quaestors in 523–527 and one in 534–535.[90] This leaves enough space to fit in Martius Valerius, but it is worthwhile to take a closer look at the year 526. In his letter of appointment to Ambrosius, Cassiodorus intimates that he had already been acting quaestor before September, 'cum sit offensionibus alter expulsus' ('the other having been expelled because of wrongdoings', 8.13.3). Doubtless for that reason, Cassiodorus has not included the appointment letter for the quaestor of 525–526 in the *Variae*, and therefore we do not know his name.[91] But it requires little imagination to suspect that the 'offensiones' had something to do

[86] Faustus' son Messala is Messala 2 (*PLRE* 2.759–60); like his father, he had literary interests and was a correspondent of Ennodius. Note also, doubtless from the same family, Rufius Valerius Messala, *praefectus urbis Romae* in the later fifth century (Messala 4, *PLRE* 2.761), whose probable grandfather was also called Valerius Messala (Messala 3, *PLRE* 2.760–1; Orlandi 2004: 495–6).

[87] On Ambrosius, see *PLRE* 2.69 (Ambrosius 3), on Fidelis *PLRE* 2.469–70. Fidelis is mentioned at the end of a letter to Beatus (362.5) among a number of fellow-students to whom Beatus is asked to give greetings from Ennodius.

[88] See Honoré 1978.

[89] What was expected of a quaestor in the West is articulated in Cassiodorus' letters to the appointees and to the senate (*Var.* 5.3–4, 8.13–14, 8.18–19, 10.6–7), as well as in the 'formula quaesturae' (*Var.* 6.5); cf. also *Var.* 1.12.2. Fidelis seems to have been a competent jurist (8.18.3), but most others were probably dependent on assistants; see Liebs 1987: 70–5.

[90] For a list of quaestors in the West and East until 527, see *PLRE* 2.1259–60. For the period after 527, *PLRE* 3.1482–3 lists the quaestors in the East, but forgets the one known quaestor in the West, Patricius (534–535; see *Var.* 10.6–7). Of Ambrosius it is certain that he officiated for one indiction only; of the other Western quaestors in these years it is at least possible.

[91] It is usually assumed (thus G. Bonamente in Giardina 2016: 212–18) that this quaestor was Honoratus (*PLRE* 2.567–8, Honoratus 2), brother to and successor of Boethius' enemy (*Cons.* 3.4.4) Decoratus (*PLRE* 2.350–1, Decoratus 1). He was appointed quaestor for the third indiction (1 September 524–31 August 525) (*Var.* 5.3–4), but since in any case Ambrosius was in office for one indiction only, this is possible for Honoratus, too

with the disgrace and execution of Boethius and Symmachus in precisely this period, and that the offending quaestor belonged to their camp. It is also perfectly conceivable that a person thus disgraced would move to Constantinople, just as we saw that Martius Novatus Renatus moved there from Ravenna after Boethius' death (or somewhat earlier). It is therefore an attractive hypothesis — if no more than that — that the quaestor whom Cassiodorus nearly blotted out of the record is none other than Martius Valerius, and that his consulate was later awarded to him in Constantinople, where honorary consulates were rather freely distributed — and he cannot have been an ordinary consul, because in our period the fasti are full.[92]

The reconstruction I have proposed assumes that Martius was quaestor in the West, not in the East. In fact, all quaestors in the East in this period are known, and if Martius was an eastern quaestor, he must have been an honorary one. This title was given only to eminent jurists,[93] and there is no evidence that Martius attained to this distinction (in any case he was not on one of Justinian's law commissions, unlike the only known honorary quaestor in the 520s and 530s, Dorotheus[94]). Moreover, there is no known example of someone who was both honorary consul and honorary quaestor.[95] In this context, we should also ask what could have been Leland's source for calling the poet 'Marci exquaestoris, qui floruit tempore Justiniani'. The wording does not need to be his own, but may be that of his manuscript, as we find, in the famous Tours codex of Boethius' *Institutio arithmetica* (*c.* 845), following Boethius' own inscription *domino suo patricio Simmacho Boecius* the explanation *Manilius* [sic] *Seuerinus floruit temporibus Teoderici regis Italorum*.[96] This may go back to a brief biography of Boethius, such as we find in many manuscripts of the *Consolatio*, and something similar may have been the case for Martius.[97] Another possibility is that it goes back to a subscription specifying the date of correcting the copy as one of the consulates of Justinian (521, 528, 533, 534).[98] Whatever Leland's source, a notice *qui floruit tempore Justiniani* would have nothing surprising if, as I have suggested, Martius Valerius, like Martius Novatus Renatus, moved at some point to Constantinople, and there received an honorary consulate.[99]

But in conclusion, it is good to stress the uncertainties surrounding the time, place and even the name of our poet. The dependence on some of Boethius' logical works provides an unassailable *terminus post quem*, but this in itself does not tell us how long after the composition of these works the poet wrote. I have tried to make a case for the

(which would mean that he was not re-appointed for the fourth indiction). Moreover, it seems more likely that a follower rather than an enemy of Boethius would ride for a fall in 526.

[92] See *PLRE* 2.1244–6 and *PLRE* 3.1457–9 for both ordinary and honorary consuls (but see above, n. 13, for the slight chance that Valerius cos. (W) 521 was Martius). Stover 2017: 322 considers the possibility that *consul* in Guido de Grana may derive from a mistaken interpretation of *u.c.* (being ex-quaestor, Martius must have been *u.c. et inl.*) as *uir consularis*, for which he gives parallels (which may be supplemented from Mommsen 1894: XII–XX for Cassiodorus); if that were the case, the evidence for a consulate would evaporate.

[93] An exception, but half a century later, is Evagrius, the author of the *Ecclesiastical History*, who was made an honorary quaestor by the emperor Tiberius (578–582); see *PLRE* 3.452–3.

[94] On Dorotheus, see *PLRE* 3.421–2 (Dorotheus 4).

[95] This may be easily checked by comparing the lists of honorary consuls and honorary quaestors in *PLRE* 2.1246 and 1260 and in *PLRE* 3.1457–9 and 1482–3.

[96] The manuscript is Bamberg Msc.Class.5; see https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:bvb:22-dtl-0000025360. Boethius' full name was, of course, Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius. Stover 2017: 319 looks only at parallels in Leland himself and hence argues that the wording is his.

[97] The *uitae* and *elogia* in the manuscripts of the *Consolatio* were edited in Peiper 1871: XXVIIII–XXXXI, but not in later editions.

[98] Both the possibility of a *uita* and of a subscription as the source for Leland's information are considered by Stover 2017: 319–21.

[99] I should add that a move to Constantinople is quite possible even if my hypothesis about the year 526 should not be true: many Roman aristocrats (Cassiodorus the most famous among them) went there, voluntarily or not, in the course of the Gothic wars of the 530s and 540s.

hypothesis that it was more or less immediately afterwards, in the mid 510s or early 520s, and that Martius belonged to a circle of students at Rome who attached themselves to leading senators, including Boethius. And although I believe that this hypothesis fits all the evidence, I am aware that I cannot at all points exclude alternative reconstructions. At least I hope that this article testifies that 'the slow work of dating and contextualizing', as Stover puts it at the end of his article, 'continues'.[100]

University of Groningen
r.r.nauta@rug.nl

BIBLIOGRAPHY

AAR = A. Carandini with P. Carafa (eds), *The Atlas of Ancient Rome. Biography and Portraits of the City*, 2 vols, corrected and updated from the Italian edition of 2012, Princeton and Oxford 2017.
EDB = Epigraphic Database Bari. Inscriptions by Christians in Rome (3rd–8th cent. CE), https://www.edb.uniba.it
LTUR = E. M. Steinby (ed.), *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, 5 vols, Rome 1993–9.
PCBE 2 = *Prosopographie chrétienne du Bas-Empire* 2: Pietri, C. and Pietri, L. (eds), *Prosopographie de l'Italie chrétienne (313–604)*, 2 vols, Rome 1999–2000.
PL = J.-P. Migne (ed.), *Patrologiae Cursus Completus. Series Latina*, Paris.
PLRE 1 = A. H. M. Jones, J. R. Martindale and J. Morris, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1: *A.D.* 260–395, Cambridge 1971.
PLRE 2 = J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 2: *A.D.* 395–527, Cambridge 1980.
PLRE 3 = J. R. Martindale, *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire*, vol. 3: *A.D.* 527–641, Cambridge 1992.

Asztalos, M. 1993: 'Boethius as a transmitter of Greek logic to the West: the *Categories*', *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 95, 367–407.
Baligan, G. 1967: 'Le *Bucoliche* di Marco Valerio', *Vichiana* 4, 383–98.
Ballaira, G. 1989: *Prisciano e i suoi amici*, Turin.
Bartoli, E. 2019: *Arcadia medievale. La bucolica mediolatina*, Rome.
Brandt, S. 1906: *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii In Isagogen Porphyrii commenta*, CSEL 48, Vienna and Leipzig.
Cameron, A. 1981: 'Boethius' father's name', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 44, 181–3.
Cameron, A. 1998: 'Black and white: a note on ancient nicknames', *American Journal of Philology* 119, 113–17.
Coarelli, F. 2001: *Roma* ('nuova edizione'), Rome and Bari.
Cucchiarelli, A. 2023: *A Commentary on Virgil's Eclogues* (2nd edn; 1st Italian edn Rome 2012), Oxford.
Darsy, F. M. D. 1968: *Recherches archéologiques à Sainte-Sabine sur l'Aventin*, Vatican City.
De Rijk, L. M. 1964: 'On the chronology of Boethius' works on logic', *Vivarium* 2, 1–49, 125–62.
Delbrück, R. 1929: *Die Consulardiptychen und verwandte Denkmäler*, Berlin and Leipzig.
Delmaire, R. 1989a: *Largesses sacrées et res privata. L'aerarium impérial et son administration du IV^e^ au VI^e^ siècle*, Rome.
Delmaire, R. 1989b: *Les responsables des finances impériales au Bas-Empire romain (IV^e^–VI^e^ s.)*, Brussels.
Di Rienzo, D. 2005: *Gli Epigrammi di Magno Felice Ennodio*, Naples.
Dolbeau, F. 1987: 'Les "Bucoliques" de Marcus Valerius sont-elles une œuvre médiévale?', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 22, 166–70.
Döpp, S. 2018: 'Boethius', in C. Riedweg, C. Horn and D. Wyrwa (eds), *Philosophie der Kaiserzeit und der Spätantike*, Die Philosophie der Antike 5.1–3, Basel, 2345–82, 2401–22.
Engels, J. 1963: 'Origine, sens et survie du terme boécien "secundum placitum"', *Vivarium* 1, 87–114.

[100] Stover 2017: 332.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0075435824000273 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Galonnier, A. 1996: '*Anecdoton Holderi ou Ordo generis Cassiodororum*. Introduction, édition, traduction et commentaire', *Antiquité tardive* 4, 299–312.
Giardina, A. (ed.) 2016: *Flavio Magno Aurelio Cassiodoro Senatore. Varie*, vol. 4: *Libri VIII–X*, Rome.
Gruber, J. 2006: *Kommentar zu Boethius, De Consolatione Philosophiae* ('2., erweiterte Auflage'), Berlin and New York.
Honoré, T. 1978: *Tribonian*, London.
Hurlbut, S. A. 1933: 'A forerunner of Alexander de Villa-Dei', *Speculum* 8, 258–63.
Jahn, O. 1851: 'Über die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischer Classiker', *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig, philologisch-historische Classe,* 3, 327–72.
Kaster, R. A. 1988: *Guardians of Language. The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
Kißel, W. 1990: *Aules Persius Flaccus. Satiren. Herausgegeben, übersetzt und kommentiert*, Heidelberg.
Knox, P. E. 1990: 'In pursuit of Daphne', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 120, 183–202.
Lebon, I. 1933: *Severi Antiocheni liber contra impium grammaticum. Orationis tertiae pars posterior*, CSCO 51 (reprinted 1952), Louvain.
Lehmann, P. 1946: 'Bukolische Dichtungen', in *Miscellanea Giovanni Mercati*, vol. 4: *Letteratura classica e umanistica*, Vatican City, 58–87.
Lewry, O. 1981: 'Boethian logic in the Medieval West', in M. Gibson (ed.), *Boethius. His Life, Thought and Influence*, Oxford, 90–134.
Liebs, D. 1987: *Die Jurisprudenz im spätantiken Italien (260–640 n. Chr.)*, Berlin.
Maas, P. 1955: 'Konjekturen zu den Bucolica des Marcus Valerius', *Philologus* 99, 321–2.
Magee, J. 1994: 'The text of Boethius' *De divisione*', *Vivarium* 32, 1–50.
Magee, J. 1998: *Anicii Manlii Severini Boethii De divisione liber. Critical Edition, Translation, Prolegomena, and Commentary*, Leiden, Boston and Cologne.
Magee, J. and Marenbon, J. 2009: 'Appendix: Boethius' works', in J. Marenbon (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Boethius*, Cambridge, 303–10.
Marenbon, J. 2018: 'The *Isagoge* in the Latin tradition until c. 1200', *Medioevo. Rivista di storia della filosofia medievale* 43, 151–88.
Meiser, C. 1877: *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii commentarii in librum Aristotelis Περὶ ἑρμηνείας. Pars prior: versionem continuam et primam editionem continens*, Leipzig.
Meiser, C. 1880: *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii commentarii in librum Aristotelis Περὶ ἑρμηνείας. Pars posterior: secundam editionem et indices continens*, Leipzig.
Merkelbach, R. and Stauber, J. 2002: *Steinepigramme aus dem griechischen Osten*, vol. 4: *Die Südküste Kleinasiens, Syrien und Palaestina*, Leipzig.
Merlin, A. 1906: *L'Aventin dans l'Antiquité*, Paris.
Minio-Paluello, L. 1965: *Aristoteles Latinus* II 1–2*: De interpretatione vel Periermenias*, Bruges and Paris.
Minio-Paluello, L. 1966: *Aristoteles Latinus* I 6–7: *Categoriarum supplementa. Porphyrii Isagoge. Translatio Boethii* etc., Bruges and Paris.
Mommsen, T. 1894: *Cassiodori Senatoris Variae*, MGH Auct. ant. 12, Berlin.
Moorhead, J. 1983: 'The last years of Theoderic', *Historia* 32, 106–20.
Morresi, I. 2022: *Cassiodori Senatoris Institutiones humanarum litterarum. Textus Φ Δ*, CCSL 99A, Turnhout.
Morresi, I. 2023: *Le Institutiones humanarum litterarum di Cassiodoro. Commento alle redazioni interpolate Φ Δ*, Turnhout.
Munari, F. 1955: *Marci Valerii Bucolica*, Florence.
Munari, F. 1970: *M. Valerio. Bucoliche*, Florence.
Nauta, R. forthcoming: 'Calpurnius Siculus am Hof Karls des Großen', in A.-E. Beron and C. Schubert (eds), *Respiciat nostros utinam Fortuna labores! Calpurnius Siculus im Wandel der Zeiten*, Leiden and Boston.
Neff, K. 1908: *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus. Kritische und erklärende Ausgabe*, Munich.
Nikitas, D. Z. 1990: *Boethius, De topicis differentiis καὶ οἱ βυζαντινὲς μεταφράσεις τῶν Μανουὴλ Ὁλοβώλου καὶ Προχόρου Κυδώνη*, Athens, Paris and Brussels.
Obertello, L. 1974: *Severino Boezio*, 2 vols, Genoa.

Orlandi, G. 1971: review of Munari 1970, *La parola del passato* 79, 221–32.
Orlandi, S. 2004: *Roma. Anfiteatri e strutture annesse con una nuova edizione e commento delle iscrizioni del Colosseo* (vol. 6 *of Epigrafia anfiteatrale dell'Occidente Romano*), Rome.
Passalacqua, M. 1987: *Prisciani Caesariensis Opuscula*, vol. 1, Rome.
Pecere, O. 2014: 'Cassiodoro e la protostoria di un *corpus* di scritti di Boezio', *Segno e testo* 12, 149–221.
Pecere, O. 2019: 'La prima edizione dell'*Ars grammatica* di Prisciano: ricostruzione di un idiografo a testualità progressiva', *Segno e testo* 17, 101–42.
Peiper, R. 1871: *Anicii Manlii Severini Boetii Consolationis philosophiae libri quinque* etc., Leipzig.
Ratkowitsch, C. 1992: '*Nec mihi cura gregis superest nec cura salutis*. Interpretation und Datierung der "Bucolica" des M. Valerius', *Mittellateinisches Jahrbuch* 27, 169–210.
Reeve, M. D. 1983: 'Calpurnius and Nemesianus', in L. D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission. A Survey of the Latin Classics*, Oxford, 37–8.
Riché, P. 1995: *Éducation et culture dans l'Occident barbare. VI^e–VIII^e siècle* (4th edn; 1st edn 1962), Paris.
Salemme, C. 1981: 'In margine al *carmen Apollinis* di Marco Valerio', *Bollettino di studi latini* 11, 23–33.
Salomies, O. 1987: *Die römischen Vornamen. Studien zur römischen Namengebung*, Helsinki.
Salway, B. 1994: 'What's in a name? A survey of Roman onomastic practice from *c.* 700 B.C. to A.D. 700', *Journal of Roman Studies* 84, 124–45.
Schmid, W. 1953: 'Tityrus christianus. Probleme religiöser Hirtendichtung an der Wende vom vierten zum fünften Jahrhundert', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* N. F. 96, 101–65 (reprinted with additions in K. Garber (ed.), *Europäische Bukolik und Georgik*, Darmstadt 1976, 44–121).
Schönfeld, M. 1911: *Wörterbuch der altgermanischen Personen- und Völkernamen*, Heidelberg.
Skutsch, O. 1964: 'Textual studies in the *Bucolics* of Martius Valerius', in C. Henderson, Jr (ed.), *Classical Mediaeval and Renaissance Studies in Honor of Berthold Louis Ullman*, 2 vols, Rome, 2.21–36.
Stagni, E. 1995: 'Medioevo francese e classici latini: un nome ritrovato', *Materiali e discussioni* 34, 219–24.
Stagni, E. 2017: 'In margine a *Marcus/Martius Valerius consul*: Guido de Grana, Giovanni di Londra e Abbone di Saint-Germain', https://www.academia.edu/34631171/AGGIORNAMENTI_SU_GUIDO_DE_GRANA_20_9_17_doc (accessed 14 March 2024).
Stover, J. A. 2017: 'The date of the bucolic poet Martius Valerius', *Journal of Roman Studies* 107, 301–35.
Stover, J. A. 2020: 'Window reference in Latin bucolic: the case of Martius Valerius', in C. Burrow, S. J. Harrison, M. L. McLaughlin and E. Tarantino (eds), *Imitation Series and Clusters from Classical to Early Modern Literature*, Berlin and Boston, 121–37.
Sundwall, J. 1919: *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums*, Helsinki.
Thomsen Thörnqvist, C. 2008a: *Anicii Manlii Seuerini Boethii De syllogismo categorico. Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation, Notes, and Indexes*, Gothenburg.
Thomsen Thörnqvist, C. 2008b: *Anicii Manlii Seuerini Boethii Introductio ad syllogismos categoricos. Critical Edition with Introduction, Commentary, and Indexes*, Gothenburg.
Traube, L. and Ehwald, R. 1906: 'Jean-Baptiste Maugérard. Ein Beitrag zur Bibliotheksgeschichte' (= L. Traube, 'Palaeographische Forschungen III'), *Abhandlungen der historischen Klasse der königlich bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 23, 301–86.
Van Rossum-Steenbeek, M. E. 1997: *Greek Readers' Digests? Studies on a Selection of Subliterary Papyri*, Leiden, New York and Cologne.
Verdière, R. 1972: review of Munari 1970, *L'Antiquité classique* 41, 349.
Vogel, F. 1885: *Magni Felicis Ennodi Opera*, MGH Auct. ant. 7, Berlin.
Volbach, W. F. 1976: *Elfenbeinarbeiten der Spätantike und des frühen Mittelalters* (3rd edn), Mainz.
Wallenwein K. 2017: *Corpus subscriptionum. Verzeichnis der Beglaubigungen von spätantiken und frühmittelalterlichen Textabschriften (saec. IV–VIII)*, Stuttgart.
Wilmart, A. 1933: *Analecta Reginensia. Extraits des manuscrits latins de la Reine Christine conservés au Vatican*, Vatican City.
Zimmermann, F. W. 1981: *Al-Farabi's Commentary and Short Treatise on Aristotle's De interpretatione. Translated with Introduction and Notes*, Oxford.