

DANUTA SHANZER

Rezensionsaufsatz

Lucio Cristante and Luciano Lenaz (ed., comm., trans.), *Martiani Capellae De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Vol. 1, Libri I/II. Hildesheim: Weidmann 2011. XCIV, 406p. (Bibliotheca Weidmanniana. 15.1.) ISBN 9783615003918

This collaborative edition and commentary with an Italian translation of Martianus Capella's *De Nuptiis* 1/2 started in the 1990's as a translation of Books 1/2 by Lenaz with exoteric annotation.¹ A change of press followed that enabled it to be re-written at greater length. Lenaz's notes on Books 1/2 formed the nucleus, but were updated and expanded by Cristante and his then doctoral advisee I. Filip (attributions are on p. 94). The commentary on Book 2 is presented as a light revision of Lenaz's magisterial work of 1975 (with a more attractive layout than the original).² P. Ferrarino's "La prima, e l'unica, *Reductio omnium artium ad philologiam*, Il *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* di Marziano Capella e l'apoteosi della filologia,"³ plus two unpublished *membra disiecta* of Ferrarino's on "Philosophy and Philology" and on the "Continuity of the Method" that are (re)printed at the end. The volume is considered provisional, and there are plans for a web site of the text and commentary that will enable ongoing updates (IX). Since much of this material has been previously published, I will concentrate on the new material related to Book 1.

This is neither a critical edition with apparatus, nor a 'virtual edition' (where departures from a known standard text are noted in a negative apparatus), but a composite text furnished with a collation of Willis' and Dick's⁴ texts. The hitch: while departures can be clearly seen if one looks at the table on pp. LXXXVI – XCIV, their ontological status is at first unclear. Both manuscript readings and conjectures are reduced to one level, and one cannot discern the

¹ This is a longer and more detailed version of a piece for the Bryn Mawr Classical Review, where space for specifics was limited. I am most grateful to Herbert Bannert for hosting orphaned material and to the editors of the BMCR for permitting parallel publication of a fuller version. Cf. BMCR 2013.05.48.

² Luciano Lenaz, *Martianus Capella: De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber secundus*. Introduzione, traduzione e commento, Padova: Liviana Editrice 1975. There seems to be more than light revision. At 248 Anna Grion and Linda Siben are cited as collaborators for this work.

³ IMU 12 (1969), 1–7.

⁴ Martianus Capella ed. Adolf Dick. Ed. stereotypa correctior anni 1925. Addenda adiecit Jean Préaux (ed.), Stuttgart: Teubner 1969 (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana).

authority behind, or nature of, any given reading without recourse to the notes.⁵ Sometimes even there the source of a conjecture is unclear.⁶

The text is deeply conservative. There are dark hints in the introduction (VII “interventi”; L “peggiori servizi”) about excessively interventionist textual criticism, presumably a criticism of Willis (and perhaps myself). The editors do not find the *paradosis* is as hopeless as previous editors all the way back to *Securus Melior Felix* had suggested it was. (Though there are moments where one wonders whether what is meant by “*stato della tradizione*” is essentially Dick’s edition!⁷) And they rarely saw an emendation they didn’t dislike. Only occasionally is a reading of the archetype labeled “absurd.”⁸ The authors at LXXXIII say that there is no reliable edition or acceptable translation, thinking presumably of Willis,⁹ Stahl - Johnson - Burge¹⁰ and Ramelli.¹¹ The latter, after being reviewed rather summarily,¹² and consigned to outer darkness, here suffers *damnatio memoriae*, banished even from the bibliography;¹³ Zekl’s German translation of 2005 is likewise not listed.¹⁴ There is, we are reminded, no comprehensive commentary. While Books 1 and 2 have, it is true, not yet appeared, the authors do not mention the editions of other books (4: Ferré, 2007; 7: Guillaumin, 2003), appearing in the *Collection des Universités de France*. The implication is clear: Scholarship on Martianus has been going downhill since Kopp in 1836.

This reviewer cowers sheepishly as the author of a previous translation and commentary on Book 1 (1986).¹⁵ But Martianus is difficult, and times have changed. Digital resources have considerably simplified certain sorts of research. This review provides an opportunity to revisit and rethink Martianus more than two decades later. After all, *Wissenschaft*, as Max Weber rightly said, is the profession in which one’s work is meant to be superseded, sur-

⁵ E. g. my conjecture (*virago* for *vertigo* at 2.170) is listed as Willis’ reading with no further clarification (324). The same happened to Grotius’ *cunctamento* at 1.6.

⁶ 2.125 *Platoni[s]*: p. 287 “si propone di leggere ...”. Comparison with L. Lenaz (above, note 2), 196 suggests that McDonough had already chosen this reading (“*lezione*”). But neither Willis’ nor Dick’s apparatus shows any variant in the MSS.

⁷ E. g. the assertion (100) that my *nugales ineptias* is a “*doppia emendazione*”, despite the fact that *ineptias* is a transmitted reading; *nugales* is the emendation. Dick read *nugulas ineptas*.

⁸ 1.37 *limata*, 177.

⁹ J. Willis, *Martianus Capella*, Leipzig: Teubner 1983.

¹⁰ W. H. Stahl, Richard Johnson and E. L. Burge, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts, II: The Marriage of Philology and Mercury, Records of Civilization, New York: Columbia University Press 1977 (Sources & Studies)*.

¹¹ I. Ramelli, *Le nozze di Filologia e Mercurio: testo latino a fronte*, Milano 2001.

¹² Romeo Schievenin, *Trappole e misteri di una traduzione*. *BStudLat* 33.2 (2003), 581 – 590.

¹³ She may be the target at L, n. 14 on “*disconcerting recent attempts to translate.*”

¹⁴ Hans Günter Zekl, *Martianus Capella. Die Hochzeit der Philologia mit Merkur. De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann 2005.

¹⁵ D.R. Shanzer, *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella’s De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii Liber 1*, Berkeley 1986.

passed, and outdated.¹⁶ And we should thank the authors for trying to bring the bibliography on the text up-to-date¹⁷ and working new material into Lenaz's commentary on Book 2.¹⁸

The introduction touches on historical problems, such as dating. It needed to take account of B. G. Hays, *The Date and Identity of the Mythographer Fulgentius*. *JMLat* 13 (2003), 163–252 for a new, and much later, dating of Fulgentius the Mythographer – to the reign of Heraclius. The authors date Securus' subscription early (498) with Cameron rather than to 534 CE, arguing (LIX) that many decades would be needed before the text became *mendosissimus*, thereby presumably seeking to push back Martianus' date to earlier in the 5th C. Plausible-sounding – but, from what one can observe in medieval traditions, where autograph and earliest witnesses are contemporary, not necessarily a “slam dunk.” The issue is not intervening time, but the quality of the first copyings.

On the vexed question of the date of the *De Nuptiis*: in 1986 I argued that Dracontius, Reposianus, the *Aegritudo Perdicae*, and Martianus were contemporary.¹⁹ Since Dracontius has known chronological coordinates, this suggested a date under the Vandals in the later 5th C. The authors fail to discuss or take on these arguments in the appropriate place, namely at LVIII/LIX, and coyly date the work to the 4th/5th centuries (LIII), alluding at p. L to a “presunta età tarda.” Furthermore Cristante passed over my discussion in his *Reposianus* (1999), though he did mention Martianus, as of uncertain date.²⁰ He is, however, inclined to follow his compatriot Gualandri, who argued that Dracontius used Reposianus!²¹ My argumentation is swatted aside in the commentary to 1.1 at p. 97 “non sembrano probanti.” Where is the “because ...” that we regularly exhort our graduate students to include? Instead, the only information about the date that the authors countenance is (LVIII) Schievenin's idea²² that 9.999 *proconsulari vero dantem culmini* refers to the Byrsa. Now the Byrsa is occasio-

¹⁶ “Science as a Profession and Vocation”, in: H.H. Bruun and S. Whimster (edd.), *Max Weber: Collected Methodological Writings*, London 2012, 341.

¹⁷ They are missing the older: V. Fontanella, *Mercurio alla ricerca di Apollo-Sole. La teoria geocentrica di Eraclide Pontico nel De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii di Marziano Capella*, libro I 8–26. *AIVeneto* 135 (1977), 305–322. Likewise the more recent V. Fontanella, *L'apoteosi di Virtù (Mart. Cap. 1, 7–26)*. *Latomus* 51 (1992), 34–51. Also D. R. Shanzer, *Augustine's Disciplines: Silent diutius Musae Varronis?*, in: *Augustine and the Disciplines*, edd. K. Pollmann and M. Vessey, Oxford 2005, 69–112 would have been relevant for LV, LVII–LIX, and 271. At 95/96 I argue that the debate is about whether the liberal arts will be presented by personifications or not. The latter piece had already cited in C. O. Tommasi, *Il De nuptiis di Marziano Capella: da manuale 'privato' a testo canonico*, in: *Aspetti della scuola nel mondo romano*, edd. F. Bellandi-R. Ferri, Amsterdam 2008.

¹⁸ E. g. Turcan on initiation at 251; the material on the *Oracula Chaldaica* in the commentary on 2.202–206, pp. 343/344.

¹⁹ Shanzer, *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary* (above, note 15), 17–21.

²⁰ L. Cristante, *Reposiani Concubitus Martis et Veneris*. *Bollettino dei classici*, Supplemento, Roma 1999, 8/9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 9. “tendo a concordare con Isabella Gualandri nel considerarlo imitato.” I. Gualandri, *Problemi draconziani*. *RISLomb* 108 (1974), 882 traces a line from the *Pervigilium Veneris* to Reposianus and thence to Dracontius.

²² R. Schievenin, *Marziano Capella e il proconsulare culmen*. *Latomus* 45 (1986), 797–815.

nally called an *arx*, but never a *culmen*, *mons*, or *collis*. I would suggest that *proconsulari* ... *culmini* might better be seen within the context of late antique bureaucratic honorifics, where high offices (e.g. prefectures and consulships) are frequently designated as *culmina*.²³ The text is probably corrupt,²⁴ there were proconsuls (Victorinus of Hadrumetum and Pacideius, probably judges) under the Vandals, and one fails to see how a terminus ante quem of 429 follows inevitably. Yet the commentary is multivocal (at 308 Symphosius, Vandalic, is said to be contemporary of, or slightly later than Martianus!). Fortunately the evidence for the date with a full bibliography can now be found in C. O. Tommasi's fine new *Bee Orchid*.²⁵ On a related matter at p. LXXV they sound strangely skeptical about the metrical tractate in Oxford, Bodleian Addit. C. 144 that Mario de Nonno attributed to Martianus, pending the publication of the full text.²⁶

The main emphasis is on literary matters such as the metapoetic mock-quarrels of the muse Satura and the authorial persona. The authors even make an arcane (and obscure) argument about a metapoetic reference to the first pythiambic system in rhymed participles (*personante geminante*) that had been bracketed by Willis (LXXII/LXXIII). Ferrarino's contribution is thus a rather strange bedfellow, given its emphasis on pedagogy, and how it treats Martianus as a serious synthesis on philosophy and philology.

The commentary is annoying to use if one doesn't know the text by heart, because the authors have not provided references for every lemma, only discreet running heads that might

²³ Amm. Marc. 28.4.3 *ex magistro officiorum, ad proconsulatum geminum indeque multo postea ad praefecturae culmen evectus*; Paul. Pell. 34 *illic, ut didici, ter senis mensibus actis/sub genitore meo proconsule rursus ad aequor/expertasque vias revocor, visurus et orbis/inclita culminibus praeclararum moenia Romae*; Ausonius, Praef. 1.35 *cuius ego comes et quaestor et culmen honorum*; Cass. Var. 1.42 *ad praefecturae urbanae culmen erigimus*; Cod. Theod. 6.6.1; 7.4.32; 14.16.1 *a tui culminis indagine*; Ruf. HE 9.1.2 *praefecturae culmen regebat*; Paul. Petr. 2.655 *Arborius, mundi eximio perfunctus honore, /clarus praecelsae qui culmine praefecturae*.

²⁴ Schievenin (above, note 22, 803) notes that *vero* is one of the weakest adversatives and translates "generazioni ignoranti ti hanno visto, rabbioso, soppesare nei processi blateramenti canini e rivolgerli inoltre al culmen proconsulare." I find it hard to take *blateratus* as an object both for *pendere* and for *dantem* (as did Schievenin [above, note 22], 802). The choice seems to be whether to emend *vero* into an object for *dantem* (as in Sundermeyer's *verba dantem*) or else to emend both *vero* and *dantem* (as in Kopp's *perorantem*), so no object is required. Nonetheless we can get this far: "Through the inspiration of Felix (or Capella) whom ignorant generations have seen rabidly repaying doglike blatherings in/to verbal quarrels, giving †*vero*† to the proconsular eminence (i.e. to the lofty person of the proconsul)." So Satura insultingly and ironically describes Martianus as a pettifogger before His Honor the Proconsul.

²⁵ C. O. Tommasi, *The Bee-Orchid: Religione e cultura in Marziano Capella*, ed. C. Moreschini, Napoli 2012 (Storie e Testi), 19–32, supporting the later dating.

²⁶ M. de Nonno, *Un nuovo testo di Marziano Capella: la metrica*. RFIC 118 (1990), 129–144. This skepticism is longstanding. See L. Cristante, *Dal Tardoantico al Medioevo: il De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii di Marziano Capella e la tradizione delle artes nella scuola carolingia*, in: H. Schefers (ed.), *Einhard. Studien zu Leben und Werk dem Gedenken an Helmut Beumann gewidmet*, Darmstadt 1997, 57–66 (64).

easily be taken for page numbers by the unwary. Kopp chapters are too long, and some subsystem of reference, such as sentence-numbers, would have been desirable.

A general point and a problem in scholarly practice: If Position A used to be standard, and a scholar then argued for Position B: Should, or indeed, may Commentator C ignore or dismiss B without refutation? Or has the *onus probandi* shifted with B.'s argumentation, so that C needs to take account of B rather than simply reasserting A? This reviewer believes that once a non-risible argued counter-opinion has been enunciated, it needs to be responded to. One should not just shovel sand over it and hope no one will notice, or dismiss it with “*pace*” or ignore it. There is a considerable amount of the silent treatment here,²⁷ which can only detract from progress. Scholars should be able to find the relevant bibliography in this edition and commentary. They are not. That is one pole. At the other end comes what seems like compulsion to disagree for disagreement’s sake.²⁸

Editions acquire authority. And, if one is working in the wake of an established and authoritative (even if deplored) edition, one arguably needs to explain why one departs from its readings. Profound philosophical differences divide the approach of the Italian team and those of Martian scholars from the Anglo-American tradition. The former tilt against pretty much each and every emendation from Grotius’ to my own. The invariable answer: “*non è necessario*,” or “*né è necessario*.”²⁹ The attitude to hapax legomena is schizophrenic. Some must be normalized;³⁰ some defended even at cost to the relationship between text and translation.³¹ What can one say? Part of the work of the commentator and textual critic is to point to, or discern problems, even if they cannot be solved. Diagnostic conjectures can approach problems tentatively but constructively.³² I have always wanted to invent my own pseudo-Alexandrian sign or emoticon for “a noise of editorial unhappiness”, a sort of low graphic moan. Quite the opposite of the prevailing attitude of this commentary – that little, or nothing, is rotten in the state of Denmark.³³ But the nonchalance of the notes merely displaces problems to the translation.

The latter is sometimes too loose, which may not be ideal, given how much help most readers need with Martianus. Prudent editors use the process of translation to test their text; here instead the translation sometimes papers over problems in the text. The authors defend a reading, only to glide over it or elide it in the translation. Many of these re-assertions of the paradox raise far greater questions than they solve.³⁴ There is often fuzziness and lack of

²⁷ E. g. at XLV: Where are Willis’ many textual critical articles on the *De Nuptiis*?

²⁸ E. g. the note on 1.7 *diadema*: the authors insist that the diadem cannot represent eternity, although Jove took it from the head of Aeternitas.

²⁹ Exceptionally: 2.142, p. 306: an emendation of mine is characterized as “*facilior*”; also 2.157, p. 317 where an interpretative suggestion of mine is argued to be “*inutile*”. At 2.199 a suggestion of Willis’ is partially exploited.

³⁰ 1.6 *luculentas* > *luculentitas*.

³¹ 1.8 *semivulsis*, where the ‘*semi*’-element seems unexplained in relationship to *vello*.

³² D. R. Shanzer and I. N. Wood, *Letters and Selected Prose*, Liverpool: Liverpool University Press 2002 (Translated Texts for Historians 38), 407.

³³ Exception: p. 285 of 2.124 *agentes Stoici*: “*il testo è guasto*”; p. 306 of 2.142 *Phasi senis*.

³⁴ E. g. LVII discussing 9.931 *quia eadem voce nos uti summus Iuppiter statuit* (rejecting Willis’ conjecture *vetuit*, which seems required by the sense: after all it’s called *adquisitus* in Latin, not *proslambanomenos*). The ensuing construction of *statuo* without *ut* is

precision about which word means what and what work it is doing in the sentence. Little words are omitted.³⁵ In one place the translation and the note seem to have been written by different people who had not communicated.³⁶ The following is a sampling of problems.

1.1. *complexu sacro dissona nexa foves*: “con arcani legami alimenti fusioni di opposti”.

1.6. *cuncta merito*: If the authors are construing *alternat cuncta merito longae deliberationis*, then they have omitted *merito*. If one doesn’t take Grotius’ *cunctamento* (which even Dick accepted), what does one do with *longae deliberationis*? The translation of *quam conveniret accipere* (“which one he should take [as his wife]”) is too free.

1.7. *adhaerebat forte*: “veniva a trovarsi” (missing the irony?).

1.10. *monendorum*: “di chi cerca i responsi dell’oraculo”. The problem of the *-nd* form has not gone away.

1.11. *transacti cursus emenso fugientes*: “in fuga dagli spazi già percorsi.” The note clarifies *emensum tempus*, as “the past”, but what of *fugio* with a naked ablative?

1.14. *diversitate ... temperabat*: “si armonizzava nella diversità” (as if about modulation and music rather than about mixing and temperature).

1.16. *Denique Virtus ... quiverunt*: as it stands, the sentence has the air of a “false start” sentence. Syntactic comment?

1.16. *opprimere*: “abbatterla”: Probably “drown” here. Cf. 1.80 *oppressione quaesitas*.

1.19. *prime vestigiis*: “anzitutto ai simboli”.

1.22. *conscia ... sidera*: “le stelle ... che tutto sanno”. The note on p. 146 contradicts by saying “*conscia sidera* is a sort of hypallage to indicate Philology’s complete knowledge of the heavens ...”.

1.31. *tabens*: “tenero”. The Vergilian parallel (Aen. 6.442) cited for *tabens* is in *malam partem*, which creates problems for reading it in *bonam*, as the context demands (p. 66). We

anomalous. Also LXXXI, n. 99, Willis’ excision of *visum* at 6.579 *videbis istic depingi quidquid verbis [visum] non valeas explicare* is rejected. With the excision, the sentence means, “You will see depicted in it (i.e. the geometrical sand-board) whatever you are not able to set out in words.” If one keeps *visum*, the position of *verbis* is awkward for construction with *explicare*. The commentators seem to want to construe *quidquid visum* together as “whatever image produced by the mind that cannot find expression in words”, despite the fact that with that hyperbaton, *verbis* would have to modify *visum* (which is nonsensical). The net meaning of the sentence with Willis’s expunction is the same as what the translators suggest, but without serious problems with the word-order.

³⁵ 1.6 *perindeque* omitted; 1.19 *subdendae tamen*: *tamen* omitted; 1.23 *nomen tamen eius inquiri*: *tamen* omitted; 1.23 *quippe cum*: *quippe* omitted; 1.37 *gracilentia quadam affixione*: *quadam* omitted; 1.66 *quodam velamine*: *quodam* omitted; 1.75 *coruscatus*: omitted.

³⁶ The note on 1.2 *nictantis* problematizes *nictans* as meaning ‘sleepy’ (though the translation reads “mezzo addormentato”) and draws attention to ‘blink’ or ‘wink’. The note cites Porph. Abst. 6.4.7 where Egyptian priests are said to be able to prevent themselves from blinking, even though they have stayed up all night. The point presumably being that Martianus has the unblinkingness of the good Egyptian priests in mind, and that there is contrast-imitation. But the note sounds garbled and could be better reconciled with the translation.

are not talking about the Vergilian or Ausonian Heroides or the Aegritudo Perdicae after all! But the editors reject Morelli's neat solution, *favens*.

1.36. *celebrat*: "realizza" does not work. *Elegantia pingendi*: "grazia della raffigurazione" waffles in, I would guess, intending "depiction" or "representation".

1.36. *elegantia pingendi* (p. 174). The reading of B cannot be archetypal and is unlikely to be right. The note seems very confused. Petersen's emendation *pingendi* (for *pingendi*) recommends itself precisely because *signifex* must mean 'sculptor'. *Pace* the authors, there is no allusion to sculpting and painting.

1.37. *gracilentia quadam affixione*: "con ascetica dedizione". I thought the phrase odd before, and took a guess at it ("ascetic assiduity")³⁷ that is reflected in this translation. *Affixione* (more than "piuttosto raro") looks even odder to me now, since in Late Antiquity it appears only in Christian authors and is used invariably of the nailing to the Cross. The clearly Christian expression makes the force of *quadam* an intriguing problem. *Gracilentia* also appears in 2.40 and must mean "scrawny".

1.37. *inaudita quadam obsecratione*: "con una particolare, inaudita supplica". Must this refer to silent prayer (it normally means 'not yet heard', not 'silent') or does it mean 'strange' ('unerhört') and refer to theurgical compulsion?

1.43. *absque impertinentibus convocandi*: "esclusi i non aventi parte".

1.66. *duo globosos orbes*: "due sfere, cerchi a vedersi", seems overdone; the image is of course three-dimensional; Martianus is (as often) being redundant.

1.67. *assidua perlucens gratia*: "spirante un perpetuo fascino".

1.67. *appulsu*: "riflesso".

1.68. *quadam sphaeram*: "la sfera ben nota" flattens the "Neoplatonic *quidam*".

1.69.8. *sacra vis*: "legge sacra": The printed text is not what is translated. Instead a suggestion in my commentary (153) seems to be followed.

1.82. *ferebatur*: "si vedeva".

1.85. *decernentes feminae*: "donne rivali", perhaps thinking of the primary meaning of *decerno* ("fight, struggle"), but this absolute and unqualified usage, verging an adjective, seems strange.

1.87. *totius mundi ... demorator*: "colui che scende attraverso il cosmo". Though ultimately dependent on a suggestion of Préaux, this fails to render *demorator* convincingly.

1.91. 8 *tristis ... censio*: "la volontà malvagia".

1.92.13. *quantos rapiat margine cardines*: "quanta costa il mare inghiottisca". Here the authors insist on the paradosis *cardines*, citing, the ThLL (= *pars terrae*), which itself wasn't happy with the passage. "*pars terrae*", however, in the ThLL's examples does not mean 'coast' but 'region', 'quarter of the world', all far too broad to fit this passage.

1.93. *virgo placuit*: "la sposa mi piace".

2.170. *triformis etiam discolorque vertigo*: "un vortice triforme e screziato".

2.170. *egestionibus opportuna*: "soggetto a fasi decrecenti".

In Plutarch's De Facie 944 C souls are indeed punished in the Ἐκάτης μυχός, but it seems to be a crevasse or recess, not a *vertigo*, and there is nothing *triformis* about it. – Why would *maiestas* be ascribed to a crevasse? And what is the force of *tamen*, "tuttavia", unless there is some serious contrast between the qualities of "horned" and "harsh" and what follows? *Egestio* really refers exclusively to bodily effluents, usually unpleasant ones from the genitals

³⁷ Shanzer, A Philosophical and Literary Commentary (above, note 15), 127.

and anus. Martianus 2.135 used it of vomit. The connotations seem troublesome to me, unless we envisage Martianus viewing birth as a disgusting pollution. I see no way to read waning phases of the moon into it. *Gestatio* usually means ‘riding’, or ‘carrying’, as in Lact. Inst. 3.22.10 *consequens est ut lanam et telam uiris et infantium gestationes*, but in Mustio’s translation of Soranus 1, p. 10.9 the term is unequivocally used of pregnancy: *Quid est purgatio mulierum? purgatio mulierum, concepti pecoris intra uterum gestatio et partus officia (sunt) sanguinis qui naturaliter per matricem fertur*.

New parallels can be helpful, and there are some fine contributions in this area: e. g. 1.2 Porph. Abst. 4.9.5; 1.10 Symm. Ep. 4.33; 1.11 *Indicus mons*: Apollo allegedly lured to Colophon (Lact. Inst. 1.7), but what of the tone?; 1.17 *risum Iovis* and its possible relation to creation in Hermetic texts; 1.39 *proximo contiguoque* as legal language with parallels from the CTh.; 2.123 *cui panditur ... tonantis*: Citation of CIL 6.1779, the epitaph of Praetextatus; 2.133 *lectica*: information about imperial litters.

Someone sat down at the Library of Latin Texts and went iunctura-hunting, a laudable modern luxury. But the results, about which the reader is incessantly informed (“il nesso non è altrimenti attestato”), fail to meet the ‘So what?’-Test. This iunctura only occurs here³⁸ (or ‘here’ and ‘here’ and ‘here’).³⁹ The information’s function is unclear.⁴⁰ The logic can likewise be unclear as at 1.44, where Dick printed A²’s *universas ... regiones* (“all regions”), and where the editors print *diversas ... regiones* (“far-flung regions”). The notes state what Dick printed and say, “ma il nesso occorre in ...”. What is the implied logic? That anything attested anywhere must be right? Whether the iunctura is attested before is simply not the issue. Both *univ* + regio** and *divers* + regio** are widely attested. *universas* seems to be an emendation in one MS, while *diversas* is the (unexceptionable) paradisis. These iuncturae do not demonstrate anything, but are information for information’s sake or some visible form of due diligence. Occasionally their indiscriminate inclusion undermines the argument in the note.⁴¹ This may be a question of scholarly culture: electronic information repositories seem especially popular in continental European commentaries.⁴²

³⁸ For example at pp. 105 (a plethora of such notes), 116, 141, 143, 153, 154, 162, 175, 213, 295, 307, to name only a few.

³⁹ For example at pp. 107, 113, 115, 118, 146, 174.

⁴⁰ Typical is 1.7, p. 116 *pasci foverique*. Does “ripreso” mean that Verecundus knew Martianus? That Cl. Marius Victor wrote later than Martianus? If so, then these authors’ use of Martianus (if that is right) needs to be taken into account for purposes of dating.

⁴¹ The note on 2.14 *deorum sociari coetibus* lists a few later Christian items that have *angel**, not *deor**. And the note on 2.132 *gesticulationes consonas* contains a random act of information, namely that the “nesso” also occurs in Conradus de Mure. At 1.6 *cuncta merito*, Augustine, Gen. ad litt. 3.16 is cited, which reads in fact *cuncta merito considerata*. At 1.19 the information supplied about *vestigia* (p. 142) in Martianus cuts both ways: both ‘traces’, and ‘feet’. At 1.21 *mansura voluntas* the parallel from Augustine isn’t apposite: *mansura* does not modify *voluntas* in it.

⁴² I am less optimistic about the usefulness of such information than D. P. Fowler, Criticism as commentary and commentary as criticism in the age of electronic media, in: Commentaries - Kommentare, ed. G. W. Most, Göttingen 1999 (Aporemata), 434 on the “infamous cf.” For the essential problem see R. W. Mathisen in BMCR 2011.07.41.

This volume yearns for yesteryear's snows and wars. It beats a dead horse about Martianus' Greek (LV) and also his lowly cultural niveau, speaking (LII) of "pregiudizi duri a morire: l'autore sarebbe troppo tardo e quindi troppo ignorante e maldestro per presentare consapevolezza della propria operazione culturale." Martianus has come a long way. See now J. Henderson reviewing Schievenin in a mass-distribution electronic venue.⁴³

When the author of one commentary reviews another one on the same text, the situation can be uncomfortable or invidious. Commentaries should identify problems, attempt to solve them, present new ideas and future lines of research. Even just raising questions can help. Much of this commentary tells us that there are no problems. Therefore it is hard to pinpoint new solutions in the new material here,⁴⁴ and likewise new and constructive ideas. Immense progress was made by Robert Turcan's sadly unpublished but brilliant dissertation,⁴⁵ by Lenaz's ground-breaking 1975 commentary,⁴⁶ and by James Willis' 1983 Teubner edition.⁴⁷ The same cannot be said for the new material in this commentary.

But it is time to conclude with some (minor) updates and positive suggestions.

(A) 1.19 *caeci poetae Graium versum* Φοῖβος ἀκερσεκόμης λοιμοῦ νεφέλην ἀπερύκει: The hexameter seems to come from Lucian, Alex. 36 Φοῖβος ἀκειρεκόμης λοιμοῦ νεφέλην ἀπερύκει, where it is a Homeric pastiche forgery of the false prophet's. The authors (141/142) suggest a very deliberate allusion to the context in Lucian, "un lusus 'filologico'", where Martianus shows his awareness of the pastiche both here and at Alex. 47 Πυρπολέειν κέλομαι δόξας ἀλαοῖο γέροντος, where Epicurus (not Homer) is the "blind old man". If they are right, then considerable irony, more than *spoudogeloion*, undermines the status of Apollo. This I find hard to hear in the passage. Long ago I had wondered about whether it had an independent transmission, where the line was not signaled as a fraud.⁴⁸ Now, excitingly, a close relative of it has turned up in the western empire on a pewter amulet from Vintry (City of London). See R.S.O. Tomlin, 'Drive away the cloud of plague': a Greek amulet from Roman London, forthcoming in a *Festschrift*.⁴⁹ This new find adds support to older evidence for epigraphic transmission.⁵⁰ Lucian is not the only possible source.

(B) Book 2 of the *De Nuptiis* depicts the apotheosis of a mortal woman. It is wonderful, finally, to have a parallel from the historical early imperial world in a new fragmentary Greek hexameter Apotheosis of Poppaea, recently published in Paul Schubert, *P. Oxy.* 5105: An

⁴³ BMCR 2011.03.84.

⁴⁴ The team were braver men than I and took on the sixteen regions of the heavens and the Liver of Piacenza with the expert guidance of G. Capdeville, *Les dieux de Martianus Capella*. *RHistR* 233, no. 3 (1996), 251–299.

⁴⁵ R. Turcan, *Ésotérisme et néoplatonisme chez Martianus Capella* (1954).

⁴⁶ L. Lenaz, *Martianus Capella: De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber secundus* (above, note 2).

⁴⁷ Willis, *Martianus Capella* (above, note 9).

⁴⁸ Shanzer, *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary* (above, note 15), 104.

⁴⁹ Paper read in Vienna at the Institut für Alte Geschichte, Altertumskunde, Papyrologie und Epigraphik der Universität Wien on Monday, December 10th, 2012. Heartfelt thanks to Roger Tomlin, for allowing me to mention this (as yet) unpublished text.

⁵⁰ P. Perdrizet, *Une inscription d'Antioche qui reproduit un oracle d'Alexandre d'Abonotichos*. *CRAIBL* (1903), 62–66.

Apotheosis in Hexameters. The *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Volume LXXVII, edited by A. Benaissa, London 2011, 59–80.⁵¹ Vv. 40–65 describe her Himmelfahrt including Moon, Sun, Mercury, Venus, Jupiter, Saturn, and the Fixed Stars. A chorus of the Muses is also featured and likewise a *thronosis*.

(C) The authors could have taken more advantage of the space they were allotted not to “morselize”⁵² in tiny units, but to call out larger problems and discuss them at greater length in continuous prose. In tracking down *philyra*, for example, a passage like Dictys Cret. Ep. 1.9 leads one to think of the topic ‘Martianus and the Book’, including fabulous books and forgeries. Passages such as Dig. 32.1 and Paul. Sent. 3.6, both of which seek to define what constitutes a book, might rate a mention in discussing what the juridical and parodic Martianus is doing with 2.136–139, where Philology, a bit like Homer in Aelian,⁵³ vomits tomes of all sizes and shapes. The authors already are part way there with their fascinating discussion (LXXVIII) of the grammatical signs in 2.120 and how books with distinctions also feature in 2.138, and how Martianus at 2.219 seems to be saying that he is using a papyrus roll himself. And might Apc. 10.10, where John eats the book, perhaps be relevant?

(D) Performative sources? Is one permitted to speculate somewhat *in loco*? The *De Nuptiis* looks back to Apuleius in some of its lush set piece ekphrases. But could it be the case that some of the wonderful masque-like tableaux have something to do with contemporary pantomime? After all, that least accessible of arts seems to have survived under the Vandals and even been favored by Huneric.⁵⁴

(E) Sociolinguistics and religion: There are now better tools to pursue lexical studies than were available in the 1970’s to 1980’s. In those days such research had to be done the hard way and was difficult for beginners, such as myself, with limited reading under our belts. Despite Martianus’ very curious attitude to the predominantly Christian world in which he lived (about which I have more to say in another context), there are signs that he used terminology found exclusively in theological authors. How such language crept in, and how it works, is an interesting question, that I have tried to explore in another author, Boethius.⁵⁵ While there are scholars who assume that any allusion to Christian texts or issues makes one a Christian or at least writing for Christians, this is unlikely to be the case here. Important and interesting information about Christian language is often, but not invariably⁵⁶ provided in the notes, but its possible significance is not systematically pursued: e. g. 1.3 *scrutator*; 1.10 *frustra incassumque*; and *contamine*; 1.36 *animator* (where the issue of bringing statues to life is intriguing); 2.145 *uterque sexus* (on gender in the afterlife); 2.15 *potestati* (on Christian parallels for *arcana cogitationum*); 2.206 *existentem ex non existentibus*. To this point should

⁵¹ Warm thanks to Herwig Maehler who drew this to my attention.

⁵² Helpful term from S. Goldhill, *Wipe Your Glosses*, in: *Commentaries - Kommentare*, ed. G. W. Most (above, note 42), 411.

⁵³ VH 13.22 Γαλάτων δὲ ὁ ζωγράφος ἔγραψε τὸν μὲν Ὅμηρον αὐτὸν ἐμοῦντα, τοὺς δὲ ἄλλους ποιητὰς τὰ ἐμημεσμένα ἀρτυμένους.

⁵⁴ Victor of Vita, HP 1.47 for the “archimimus”, *Masculas*. For Luxorius, see also M. Rosenblum, *Luxorius: a Latin Poet among the Vandals*, New York-London 1961, 19.

⁵⁵ See D. R. Shanzer, *Haec quibus uteris verba: the Bible and Boethius’ Christianity*, in: *The Power of Religion in Late Antiquity*, edd. A. J. Cain and N. Lenski, Ashgate 2010, 59/60.

⁵⁶ See above at p. 287 on 1.37 *quadam affixione*.

be added the fact that *ex non existentibus* is attested above all in Cass. Hist. Trip.,⁵⁷ and is the Latin rendition of the usual Greek *ex nihilo* Nicene formula. It would be good to see all the evidence pulled together, tested for focalization and tone, and classified.

The editors (IX) mentioned ideas for a future web site. Will it be a wiki, one wonders? Then a ‘marketplace’ commentary (Like!) or a retaliative (Dislike!) one could evolve, where followers of different schools or scholars of different nationalities exchanged sniper additions and deletions! Maybe somewhere up in the heavens Martianus smiles down upon us all in our rough neighborhood and says: *Qui quidem omnes inter Musarum carmina concinentium audiri, licet perstreperent, nullo potuere rabulatu.*

Danuta R. Shanzer
Institute for Classical Philology, Medieval and Neo-Latin Studies
University of Vienna
Universitätsring 1
1010 Wien

⁵⁷ The reference on p. 308 to the highly interesting material on Symphosius and the Trinity in M. Bergamin, Note a Simposio, in: Atti e Memorie. Accademia Nazionale Virgiliana di Scienze, Lettere ed Arti, Mantova 62 (1994), 57–61 is most welcome.