

KATARINA PETROVIČOVÁ (MASARYK UNIVERSITY, BRNO)

***NESCIOQUID INOPINUM INTACTUMQUE MOLIENS CANO...***  
**COMPOSITIONAL AIMS OF *DE NUPTIIS PHILOLOGIAE***  
***ET MERCURII* BY MARTIANUS CAPELLA<sup>1</sup>**

*In this paper, the composition of a unique educational work 'De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii', written by Martianus Capella probably in the fifth-century Vandal Carthage, is analysed in terms of the author's direct entries into the plot. The main aim of the paper is to show that Martianus' commentaries, which are put forward in the form of dialogues with diverse characters (the reader, the son, Muse, and the personified Satire; Mart. Cap. §1f., §219–222, §575–579, §806–809, §997–1000), do not only serve as a justification of the composition in which a satiric narration presents a serious education matter, but that the commentaries also comply with and highlight his hierarchical understanding of an advanced educational conception aiming at harmony.*

Classical literary tradition distinguished a number of indicators to classify writings within a particular genre. In the case of poetry, the characteristics were mainly given by manifold meters and initially also by dialects. Even more significant was, however, a system of *topoi*, the so called “commonplaces” (*loci communes*<sup>2</sup>) – as denoted by the Romans – representing certain common and expected themes in the work. In addition, classical authors were likely to add further commentaries, often at the beginning or at the end of their work, to express their personal motivations and theoretical viewpoints. Also, they may have included an evaluation and elaboration of the genre<sup>3</sup> in order to support an understanding

<sup>1</sup> This paper was written under the auspices of GA ČR 405/07/P202 “Genre Characteristics of Ancient Scholarly Writings in Relation to the Educational System of Seven Liberal Arts and its Development”. References to Martianus' text follow Willis' edition (*Bibliotheca Teubneriana*, 1983) in using paragraphs and line numbers; however the author of this paper realizes the problems that may arise from this way of quoting.

<sup>2</sup> For a definition of the term *locus*, drawing upon Aristotle's theory of rhetoric, see Cic. *Top.* 8 (*Itaque licet definire locum esse argumenti sedem, argumentum autem rationem, quae rei dubiae faciat fidem.*). *Locus communis*: see Cic. *Inv.* 2,15,48. Cf. LANHAM, RICHARD A. 1991. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 152f. and 169f.

<sup>3</sup> An indication of such a commentary can be found as early as in Euripides, who suggested the necessity of a divine entry into the plot (cf. Eur. *Andr.* 1284–88; *Bacch.* 1388–92; *Hel.* 1688–92). In the new comedy, a prologue introduced the plot and even anticipated its dis-

of their literary aims in the reader and perhaps a favourable attitude towards the text. Although there were many writings in which these commentaries happened to be a purposeless part of *topoi*, some authors did find the external entries into the text important, and as a result, paid special attention to them. Martianus Capella can be viewed as one of these accurate ‘guides’ via his texts. His commentaries are unique in terms of the frequency of their occurrences, a creative form of his dialogues – be it between real or symbolic partners – and the formal elaboration of his verse and prose.<sup>4</sup> The literary interpretation of his commentaries may thus be at once challenging and exciting.

### The main genre characterization of the writing: Dialogue One (Martianus – the son). Introduction.

Martianus discusses the genre of his work in the very introductory dialogue with his son (§2), which, together with the rhymed hymn invoking the God of marriage, Hymen (§1), forms an introduction to the writing.<sup>5</sup> Despite its relative shortness, Martianus’ introduction wittily covers the expected *topoi* in the dialogue and equips the reader with all the essentials. By dedicating the passage to his son (the context is provided by the addressing *mi pater*: §2,8), expressed by Martianus’ verbal proposal to tell his son the story hinted at in the previous verses (§2,15f.: *fabellam tibi... explicabo*), Martianus enters the genre of educational literature. This can be further seen in the references to tiresome vigilance during long winter nights when lamplight is dimming (§2,15f.: *hiemali pervigilio marcescentes... lucernas*) and to the size of the story (§2,16: *prolixitas*), as well as in the use of a number of verbs

---

entanglement: CONTE, GIAN B. 2003. *Dějiny římské literatury*. Praha: KLP, 103. An understanding of commentaries was changed in the prologues of Terence. Presented by an actor, i.e. in the 3rd person sg., his commentaries always comprised the author’s literary viewpoints as well (presenting models, explaining and justifying the methods of composition, see Ter. *Andr.* 1–27, where Terence argues for a ‘method of contamination’).

4 In total, there are five parts in which the author enters the plot via a ‘compositional’ dialogue (§2: in the introduction; §219–222: at the turn of Books Two and Three, i.e. in the transition from the narrative to the descriptive, educational parts; §575–579: at the beginning of Book Six before the description of quadrivium; §806–809: at the beginning of Book Eight on astronomy; and §997–1000: in the author’s ‘seal’: σφραγίς). Their content was analysed by ZAFFAGNO, ELENA. 1996. „La ‘persona’ di Marziano Capella del *De nuptiis*.“ *Giornale italiano di filologia*, 48, 223–251 (especially in terms of the *topos* focusing on the introduction and the conclusion), by GREBE, SABINE. 1999. *Martianus Capella, De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. *Darstellung der Sieben Freien Künste und ihrer Beziehungen zueinander*. Stuttgart – Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 848–857 (concerning the relationship between Martianus and Satire), and by CRISTANTE, LUCIO. 1978. „La σφραγίς di Marziano Capella (σπουδογέλιον: autobiografia e autoironia).“ *Latomus*, 37, 684–688 (focusing on the analysis of σφραγίς, the other parts were rather descriptive only).

5 See SCHIEVENIN, ROMEO. 2005–2006. „Il prologo di Marziano Capella.“ *Incontri triestini di filologia classica*, 5, 133–153, who analyzes the prologue in terms of a religious confrontation with Christianity.

invoking cognitive processes (§2 passim: *perspicere, noscere, sapere, inquirere, edocere, comminiscere, explicare*).<sup>6</sup> Further, Martianus relates educational literature to another tradition, that of satire, when he denotes the personified Satire as the original story-teller (§2,15: *fabellam..., quam Saturata comminiscens... mecum edocuit*). Overall, the dialogue is set in a ‘light’ tone, in which Martianus allows the reader to see him through the eyes of his son and his own verses as a prattle of inept foolishness (§2,7: *nugulas ineptas agarrire*).<sup>7</sup> The moment prose replaces verse, the reader can suspect, as shown only at a later stage, that the satirical tone actually acts within Menippean satire,<sup>8</sup> which in Roman literature was related to Martianus Terentius Varro.<sup>9</sup> In addition, Martianus indicates that he was also

<sup>6</sup> In other words, in the introduction he extensively employs the topos of hard work, i.e. a topos used especially in educational texts. Cf. JANSON, TORE. 1964. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Convention*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 117 – dedication to the son; 97f. and 148 – the topos of the night studies). Regarding literary and social aspects of the topos of night studies in the writings from the era of Roman Empire, see also KER, JAMES. 2004. „Nocturnal writers in imperial Rome.“ *Classical Philology*, 99 (3), 209–242.

<sup>7</sup> Diminutives are characteristic of another type of topos, the topos of modesty, viz T. JANSON (1964: 145). In Martianus, diminutives can be found in the majority of his compositional scenes (e.g. in §2,5: *versiculi*; §222,20: *libellus*; §576,24: *lepidula*; §999,15: *flosculus*), however, they may be read as a sign of satiric hyperbole, or, as part of Martianus’ common vocabulary corresponding to the frequency of occurrences of diminutives in late Latin; cf. E. ZAFFAGNO (1996: 227f.).

<sup>8</sup> In Latin literary tradition satire was viewed as an autonomous poetic genre (see Quint. 10,1,93: *satura quidem tota nostra est*). Originally, it was very broad thematically, but later comprised primarily, but not necessarily, verse with a critical content written in a particular meter. Menippean satire, a story with critical as well as didactic undertones in which prose mingles with verse, comes back to the Greek setting, in which it represented a Cynic protest against high genres, i.e. an intentional violation of traditional characteristics; cf. SHANZER, DANUTA. 1986. *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella’s De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Book 1. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press, 30; on Menippean satire in general see FRYE, NORTHROP. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 309–312 – Frye denotes satire as “anatomy”, see *ibid.*: 365; and esp. BACHTIN, MICHAEL MICHAJLOVIČ. 1971. *Dostojevskij umělec. K poetice prózy*. Praha: Československý spisovatel, 145–165.

<sup>9</sup> Varro was apparently the first Roman to employ satire in its Cynic form, and may have denoted the term (cf. Cic. *Ac.* 1,8: [Varro:] “...in illis veteribus nostris, quae Menippum imitati non interpretati quadam hilaritate conspersimus, multa admixta ex intima philosophia, multa dicta dialectice, quae quo facilius minus docti intellexerent, iucunditate quadam ad legendum invitati...”; and Gell. *N. A.* 2,18,7: *quas [tj. satiras] alii Cynicas, ipse [Varro] appellat Menippeas*). Unfortunately, only fragments of his satiric work have been preserved. According to Martianus, Varro is the one who brings the arts of ancient Greece to the Romans (viz §335, 578, 817 or 928), however, the cross-reference may also be interpreted in formal terms (cf. footnotes 35 and 60 of this paper). LEMOINE, FANNY. 1972. *Martianus Capella. A Literary Re-evaluation*. München: Arbeo-Gesellschaft, 42, suggests that Martianus’ attribute *comminiscens* can be viewed as an introductory allusion to Menippean satire (§2,15: according to her, there is an association between this expression and the verb *commiscere*), however, such an interpretation may not be tenable; cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 695). Although there is another parallel in the introduction – between the verb forms of *respersus* (i.e. *vertex* §2,6) and *consersimus* (Cic. see above), the contexts do not support such an identification of the genre. In

inspired by Apuleius' *Metamorphoses* when he designs the plot as if behind the scene of the dialogue where subconscious singing of the elegiac distich glorifies Hymen (§1). In the hymn, the god is characterized as a "sacred divine link" (§1,5: *copula sacra deum*) supporting unequal relationships (§1,7: *dissona nexa foves*) and incorporating divine as well as human dimensions. As a son of a Muse<sup>10</sup> and Apollo, he represents a creative principle uniting heterogeneous elements and keeping order (§1,4–11), while as a son of Aphrodite and Bacchus, he also burns with desire, dances, sings wedding songs at the newly-weds' bedrooms and scatters flowers (§1,12–15/1–2).<sup>11</sup> As far back as the hymn-singing, Hymen's double role awakes the feeling that the theme of marriage will be discussed in the book and that inequality will be its main feature, analogically to the relationship between Amor and Psyche, whose story forms the essence of *Metamorphoses* (*Met.* 4,28–6,24).<sup>12</sup> The literary significance and direct relation to Apuleius' novel in terms of Hymen's characteristics are given in the last two verses of the hymn (§1,4–5) where

---

contrast, the analysis of the topos of content within Menippean satire by D. SHANZER (1986: 29–44), points to Martianus' text as belonging to the genre most succinctly.

- <sup>10</sup> Martianus uses a rare expression *Camena* here, which he might have derived from both classical authors, such as Horace (*Carm.* 1,12,37 and *Epist.* 1,1,1: here, however, the term represents a metonymical appellative for a poem), Varro (*Ling.* 6,7,75 and 7,3,27), and (more likely) from later authors: Persius (*Sat.* 5,21), Silius Italicus (*Pun.* 14,27 and 232) and Apuleius (*Flor.* 20,41,15) and Ausonius (*Epist.* 20,11). Johannes Scotus Eriugena and Remigio of Auxerre identify Muse with Venus – RAMELLI, ILARIA. 2006. *Scoto Eriugena, Remigio di Auxerre, Bernardo Silvestre e Anonimi. Tutti i commenti a Marziano Capella. Testo latino a fronte.* Milano: Bompiani, 95 and 868, however, the described occurrences of the expression in *Bibliotheca Teubneriana* database challenge this interpretation.
- <sup>11</sup> In this passage, Martianus invokes Hymen; it is, however, plausible to suppose that the real addressee of the hymn is Eros. The main argument for this assumption is the difference between Hymen's duties in the first (§1,4–11) and the second part of the hymn (§1,12–15/1–2), including disparate designations of love (§1,11: *Amor*, versus §1,13: *Cupido*). As becomes evident from other occurrences of Eros in the story, Martianus here refers to the Platonic tradition of the dual identity of Eros (Plat. *Symp.* 185e6–188e4). 'Common' Eros, the mentioned lover of Psyche (§7,11–14), is always invoked as Cupido (see esp. §148,2f.: ...*Cupido, corporeae voluptatis illex, ..., Philologiae occursibus non ausus est*), while 'Heavenly' Eros is seen as a "philosophical" servant of Philology and is called Amor (see §144,14ff.: *Quippe consociato sibi [ie. Labori] quodam puero reidenti, qui nec voluptariae Veneris filius erat, et tamen Amor a sapientibus ferebatur...*). (Cf. also the commentary by Shanzer 1986, 45ff., who, on the basis of correspondences between the discussed hymn and similar hymnic compositions, also identifies Hymen as Eros, though exclusively as the 'Heavenly' one; consequently, she has to provide an explanation for the presence of sexual motives in this philosophical hymn).
- <sup>12</sup> Amor and Psyche, as well as Mercury and Philologia, formed an unequal couple of a god and a mortal. Psyche needed to succeed in a difficult path of life before she could be enthroned into the divine position and marry Amor. In essence, the marriage cannot be fulfilled until the divinization of the mortal partner. Apuleius' work includes this story in an extensive and compact form to mirror the whole plot of *Metamorphoses* (the significance of the story in Apuleius' work can be further implied from the fact that in a similar text by Pseudo-Lucian, *Lucius or the Ass*, this *fabula* is not included at all).

Hymen becomes a patron of Calliope's<sup>13</sup> song about the marriage of the celestials (*conubium divum*). The suggestion of the theme is so sophisticated that his son (and also a lay reader) cannot recognize it and Martianus needs to formulate the wedding theme explicitly<sup>14</sup> (§2,11–13), alluding to Apuleius again when asking his son about his interest in the theme by verbally evoking the atmosphere of search in the depth of hidden knowledge (§2,13f.: *si vero concepta cuius scaturriginis vena proflexerit properus scrutator inquiris...*). The choice of his next expressions points to the fact that like in the case of Apuleius, the path towards knowledge will involve a religious message (§2,9f.: *antistes; adytum*; perhaps even *nictans*<sup>15</sup>),<sup>16</sup> as well as creative imagination, realized via an allegoric depiction of the story (*fabella*: §2,15<sup>17</sup>).<sup>18</sup>

- 
- 13 Here certain, perhaps illusive, discrepancy in terms of Martianus' 'authorities' occurs. Like Satire, Calliope is assigned a role of a story-teller, however, this may be explained by Calliope, in fact, representing the Muse of heroic poetry and thus properly introducing the next passage. Furthermore, BOVEY, MURIEL. 2003. *Disciplinae cyclicae: L'organisation du savoir dans l'œuvre de Martianus Capella*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste, 27, understands the role of Calliope in this part of the text as a symbolic expression of cosmic harmony.
- 14 Martianus reveals only the theme at this stage and does not in fact admit Apuleius' influence until Paragraph 7, Book One, when the relationship between Amor and Psyche is mentioned explicitly. A further reference to Apuleius is present in §100 ("Milesian tales": cf. *Apul. Met.* 1,1).
- 15 D. SHANZER (1986: 53) believes that 'winking' and 'blinking' have got a mystical significance in the work, like in Plato *Pol.* 515e1–4 (also in *Phaedr.* 250c1–6, and Plotinos' *Enn.* 1,6,7 and 9). She interprets 'blinking' as a reaction to the confrontation with truth, certain providence (the argument may be supported by a parallel in another part of Martianus' text – §184,20: Philologia is *paululum convens oculis*, when having to watch the sun). This interpretation may be seen as troublesome, though, since Martianus returns to the picture of 'winking' towards the end of his work as well (§999,20: cf. footnote 67 of this paper), and there it does not appear to involve any religious dimensions.
- 16 The journey of Apuleius' Lucius transformed into an ass is a journey towards knowledge which completes with his initiation into the mystery cult of Isis.
- 17 The expression *fabella* also occurs in §576,24, and its synonymous form *fabula* can be found also in other parts of the text (e.g. in §219,15 and §997,19); cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 685, footnote 13). Both expressions link to Apuleius (*fabella* to *Met.* 6,25; *fabula* mainly to *Met.* 4,27: here Martianus uses the expressions within a whole phrase: *narrationibus lepidis anilibusque fabulis*, see *Mart.* §576,24; § 807,15; and mainly §997,19). It is noteworthy to notice the position of the use of both the expressions in Apuleius' work: they form the beginning and the end of the fairy tale about Amor and Psyche.
- 18 The use of allegory must be viewed as part of the topos of Menippean satire. The characteristics of allegory advanced by N. FRYE (1957: 89–92) have become well-established; nevertheless, his understanding of the relation between allegory and irony (an essential relation for Menippean satire) was appropriately extended by FLETCHER, ANGUS. 1964. *Allegory. The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press, 229–241 (Fletcher understands irony as "collapsed", or "condensed allegories": *ibid.* 230, rather than a counterpart to allegory). The constant presence of allegory until the end of the plot can be further seen in the repetition of the opposites of revealing and obscuring (§2,11: *revelato, perspicuum opus, creperum*; §219,18: *crepusculum*; §221,11: *amicus*; §222,9: *nudus*; §998,4: *fanda, tacenda*). For combining the mode of allegory and irony in the plot cf. also WESTRA, HAIJO J. 1981. „The juxtaposition of the ridiculous and the sublime in Martianus Capella.“ *Flori-*

The enigmatic linking of several genres does promise a unique experience to the reader, and since Martianus is aware of it (§2,5: *nescioquid inopinum intactumque*), he does not further test the reader's wit and patience.

**“Dialogue” Two (Martianus – the reader): the end of a fairy tale and the beginning of an encyclopaedia.**

Martianus returns to the level of metatext at the end of Book Two, where he addresses the reader (*lector*) in iambic trimeters<sup>19</sup> and prepares him/her for a change in genre (§219–220). The chosen expressions purposefully link with the introductory dialogue and remind the reader of the presence of both satiric and fictitious elements in the text, i.e. of Satire's endurance, which surpassed even the capacity of the lamplight (§219,17: *tenui lucernam palpitare lumine*, cf. §2,15f.) and threatened with an endless development of the story (§219,16: *tam morosis implicata ductibus...*, and 22f.: *...adhuc iugata compararet pagina quocumque ducta largiorem circumum*), and of the Apuleian story (§219,15: *fabula*). The current literary composition is to be kept further on (§220,4: *nec vetabunt ludicra*), however, the fictitious story has been abandoned (§220,2: *omne fictum*,<sup>20</sup> §220,24: *mythos terminatur*).<sup>21</sup> Instead, serious disciplines step into play (§220, 3: *sobriae disciplinae*), being presented in a given order and without surprising excursions and plot twists (§220,1: *artes libelli... sequentes asserent*). The promise of change

---

*legium* (Carleton University Annual Papers on Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages), 3, 198–214; esp. 199f. Further, cf. M. M. BACHTIN (1971: 156), who does not speak about allegory in a particular connection to Menippean satire, but defines the subject of the latter analogically as “adventure of the idea or truth in the world”.

19 Martianus' iambic trimeter is not entirely regular, hence sometimes interpreted more generally as a iambic senar, cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 690, note 32). For the metrical analysis of Martianus' work, see STANGE, FRIEDRICH O. 1882. *De re metrica*. Diss. Leipzig; SUNDERMEYER, ALBRECHT. 1910. *De re metrica et rhythmica*. Diss. Marburg; or later McDONOUGH, CHRISTOPHER. 1968. *The Verse of Martianus Capella. Text, Translation, and Commentary of the Poetry in Book 1 – 5*. Diss. Toronto (Book One to Five); for the specifics of Martianus' prosimetrum, see BARTOŇKOVÁ, DAGMAR. 1977. „Prosimetrum v dile Martiana Capelly De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii.“ *SPFFBU*, E 22–23, 205–220.

20 *Omne fictum* also holds the ‘topos dimension’ of the author's modesty, which, based on Janson's typology, can be viewed as a confession of one's own incompetence: cf. T. JANSON (1964: 124–141). According to LENAZ, LUCIANO. 1975. *Martiani Capellae De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber secundus: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Padova: Liviana Editrice, 233, this topos reappears at the end of Book Nine through the use of a Greek synonym (§998,6: *agreste plasma*). However, cf. L. CRISTANTE'S note (1978: 686, footnote 20) about a possible variation: whereas *fictum* denotes “improbable”, *plasma* denotes “probable” (lat. *argumentum*), i.e. by using the Greek term, Martianus concluded with a summary of the whole text, including the educational part.

21 The terms *fabula* and *mythos* are not used as complete synonyms by Martianus, and therefore the end of the fairy tale does not indicate an end of the story; cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 685, footnote 18).

is further evoked by a symbolic completion of the motive of hard night studies in an image of a dimming lamplight<sup>22</sup> and replaced by a picture of a rising Daystar (§219,20f.: *Aurora surgens*). Even though the following part is going to be completely different, Martianus does not lose his literary ambition since he asks the Muses for support; an intellectual dimension of this educational part is equally important to him and therefore he calls Apollo for patronage as well (§220,6: *faveant... Musae et chelys Latoia*). The link between the image of an oncoming dawn and the god Apollo opens a neoplatonic metaphor of knowledge as enlightenment and approximation to truth, meant as encouragement of the reader to a further study. The Graecism used in relation to Apollo and the arts (i.e. denoting the lyre as *chelys*) is among other sophisticated techniques of Martianus' reminding of the Greek origin of the arts.<sup>23</sup> In comparison to the introduction, Martianus uses a clear and, most importantly, uncompromising speech here, which is very fittingly expressed through the mentioned iambic metrical scheme.

### Dialogue Three: reaction to Martianus' plan (Martianus – *Camena*).

The more unquestionable the acceptance of the end of Book Two, where Martianus appears to abandon the myths and Mennippean satire, the greater the surprise at the beginning of the next Book (§221–222). The reader finds him/herself in the midst of a conceptual battle of 'two authors', or more precisely Martianus and his patroness, the Muse<sup>24</sup> (according to some, personified Satire<sup>25</sup>). The argumentation of the Muse, first mediated via a third person description (§221) and followed by a direct speech of each of the figures (§222), shows elements of an inner battle, suggestive of the required change of the narrative practice. The

<sup>22</sup> In connection with repetition of the topos from the introduction in this part, L. LENAZ (1975: 232) speaks about "Ringkomposition". A more accurate description may nevertheless be that of a spiral since the theme reappears two more times (§576,3 and §997,20 / §999,20). Lenaz's note, however, is very relevant in terms of one of the main characteristic features of Martianus' text, i.e. 'hermeneutic' returns to the same themes through the same and synonymous expressions. Cf. also S. GREBE (1999: esp. 856f.).

<sup>23</sup> The use of Graecisms is characteristic of Martianus; the parallels in §567–574 indicate, however, that in this part they are employed designedly (see p. 214 in this paper).

<sup>24</sup> Like in the introduction, Martianus chooses the address of *Camena* (cf. footnote 10 in this paper). The part is versed in a rapid iambic dimeter.

<sup>25</sup> Remigius suggests that Martianus has either Satire or Muse in mind: I. RAMELLI (2006: 1102). However, RELIHAN, JOEL C. 1987. „Martianus Capella, the good teacher.“ *Pacific Coast Philology*, 22, 60, and S. GREBE (1999: 853) are inclined to suggest Muse's identification with Satire. An opposing view was expressed by, for example, F. LEMOINE (1972: 115) or M. BOVEY (2003: 23). It may not be important to actually identify Muse with Satire, but rather to acknowledge that Muse acts as an advocate of Satire here, which is shown not only in her speech but in her mimicry as well (§222,5: *iocante rictu*). (Cf. also M. BOVEY, 2003: 28 and her idea of the use of the word *Camena* instead of Satire as a purposeful expression of the opposition between "l'érudition grecque et la pédagogie latine". The author of this paper cannot share this view, taking especially the satirical utterances of Muse into consideration.)

move from a neutral depiction<sup>26</sup> (§221,9–15: *Camena... parat... vult... vitio dat poetae...*) to a personal dialogue (§222,8f.: “*An tu... dabis?*”; *ibid.*,18f.: “*Haec nempe ficta vox est, et devius promissi es...*”) in fact corresponds to the replacement of apparently rational arguments (§221,13f.: *...frigente vero nil posse comere usum...*; §221,16: *vitio... dat poetae infracta ferre certa*) with an emotionally-shaded appeal (§222,8–11: “*An tu gregem sororum nudum*<sup>27</sup> *dabis iugandis, et sic petent Tonantis et caelitem senatum?*”). First, Martianus defends himself against the Muse by calling to the end of the previous Book and to the failure to fulfil the readers’ expectations (§222,20f. and 1–4: “*Atquin prioris ille titulus*<sup>28</sup> *monet libelli mythos ab ore pulsos Artesque vera fantes voluminum sequentum praecepta comparare.*”). Then he strives to change the format of the oncoming at least partially (§222,14–17: “*Certe loquentur illae quicquid fuat docendum, habitusque consequentur asomato in profatu.*”), but surrenders in the end (§222,23: *His me Camena vicit.*). As a result, he accepts the previously used literary forms, i.e. the elements of both fiction and allegory, and the hyperbole of satire.<sup>29</sup> An ostentatious expression of this return can be found in the ‘vicious’ attitude of the Muse who blackmails Martianus brazenly and does not hesitate to admit this in a fairly triumphal exclamation at the end (§222,24: “*Fugis?*”<sup>30</sup>). She is not interested in truth, even though she misuses it against Martianus when blaming him for deception, and thus using his own argument against him (§222,18). What she is aiming at is victory, which she does celebrate in the end. Nevertheless, Martianus must not feel defeated either, since in return he gains the Muse’s as well as the reader’s further support. He/She is able to identify with the form of the interpretation of the arts and gets deservedly curious. From a literary point of view, the author again poetologically justifies the unusual and light approach to the follow-

<sup>26</sup> It is the author’s opinion that on the basis of the third person description, Remigius inferred that the son was a witness of the argument, and therefore misunderstood the final verse §222 as Martianus’ speech to his son (see footnote 30 in this paper).

<sup>27</sup> See footnote 18 in this paper for an analysis of depicting allegory.

<sup>28</sup> Medieval commentators interpret *titulus* as the end of the previous Book: I. RAMELLI (2006: 231 and 1102), however, it may also refer to a title here, of the second part specifically: *Artes*, as suggested in verse §220,1 and in the names of individual books on the liberal arts, such as *De arte grammatica* – WILLIS, JAMES [ED.]. 1983. *Martianus Capella*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 58, *De arte dialectica* – *ibid.* (105), etc.

<sup>29</sup> The return is symbolically mirrored also in the repetition of the key terms from the end of Book Two: *libelli, mythoi, artes* (§222,24f. a §222,21ff.), cf. S. GREBE (1999: 852).

<sup>30</sup> According to Remigius: I. RAMELLI (2006: 1104), the last two rejoinders are addressed to Martianus as well as his son: such a reading may not make sense though, also in respect to the introduction in which Martianus passes knowledge, which he himself has already acquired, onto his son (§2,15: *Satura... edocuit*). In fact, the end represents a disentanglement of Martianus’ dialogue with the Muse; cf. J. RELIHAN (1987: 66, footnote 10) or ZEKL, HANS G. [TRANSL.]. 2005. *Martianus Capella, Die Hochzeit der Philologia mit Merkur (De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii)*. Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen & Neumann, 90.



ing somewhat serious passage;<sup>31</sup> together with the end of Book Two, this dialogue becomes the ‘second introduction’ to the next part.<sup>32</sup>

### Dialogue Four (Martianus – Athena – Satire): the value of theory and Satire?

Another dialogue, which steps out of the main plot, is introduced at the beginning of Book Six (§567–579). Martianus invokes the goddess Pallas Athena (§567–574) and by means of hexametric hymn he glorifies her as a representation of rationality among both gods and people (§567,7: *rerum sapientia*; *ibid.* 8: *ingenium mundi*; *ibid.* 12: *rationis apex divumque hominumque sacer nus*, etc.). Martianus asks her to take up a role accordant with her qualities (§574,16: *ad proprium dignata illabere munus*) and ‘to enliven’ his Latin interpretation of the Greek arts (§574,17: *inspirans nobis Graias Latiariter artes*). Athena’s invocation escalates in the last epithet where Martianus bows to her talents surpassing all those of other Muses (§574,15: *sola novem complens, Musis mens omnibus una*). Including a hymn for Athena is most appropriate here because it adumbrates the changeover to theoretical arts, the most highly-positioned in the hierarchy,<sup>33</sup> later termed *quadrivium*. These arts deserve the most distinguished patronage, which Athena does represent for Martianus.<sup>34</sup> For their purely theoretical character, the arts were regarded within the domain of ancient Greece (the Romans gave attention to them only marginally, which is noted explicitly in the next part written in prose: §578,18f.: *...si Marcum Terentium*<sup>35</sup> *paucosque*

<sup>31</sup> This explanation was inspired by Lenaz’s note – L. LENAZ (1975: 27, footnote 63), in which ancient authorities are cited in relation to myths (i.e. made-up stories). Although Martianus draws on the Platonic tradition which accepts mythos as a regular expressive means of philosophy (cf. *Macr. Somn.* 1,2 *passim*), the involvement of mythos with the liberal arts, which usually do with argumentation only, may not have been obvious and therefore he might have felt the need to defend himself (cf. §997,21f.).

<sup>32</sup> L. LENAZ (1975: 234) views only the end of Book Two as „zweites Exordium“ (using Lausberg’s terminology). The author of this paper argues, however, that it cannot be separated from the beginning of the next Book since only both talks as a whole fulfill Martianus’ compositional aim.

<sup>33</sup> A hierarchy of arts is introduced already in Plato’s *Republic* (*Plat. Pol.* 509d1–511e5), where existence is divided into four types. Mathematical sciences are positioned onto the second highest place, accessible via mind and helping with the education of philosophers (*ibid.* 521c–531c4/8/; in Plato’s model these were arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, stereometry and harmony). The highest position is occupied by dialectic (*ibid.* 531c9–534e6).

<sup>34</sup> GASPAROTTO, GIOVANNI. 1983. *Marziano Capella. Geometria. De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber sextus. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Verona: Libreria universitaria editrice, 18f., interprets the introductory hymn of Book Six in more general terms, as a ‘compressed’ celebration of the intellectual legacy of the Ancient times. (Cf. also his detailed commentary on the hymn: *ibid.*, 139–144.)

<sup>35</sup> The appreciation of Varro in the author’s commentary can be undoubtedly interpreted as

*Romuleos excipias consulares*,<sup>36</sup> *nullus prorsus erit, cuius ista* [i.e. *Philosophia*<sup>37</sup>] *limen intrarit*), and also for this reason Martianus emphasises Athena's position within a Greek context (i.e. using expressions of a Greek origin and referencing to the ancient Greece world: the very salutation of *Pallas, Athena; nus, ἐπτάς*,<sup>38</sup> *agalmata, glauca*, and *glaukopis*). The Greek context is then well-engaged in the service to Latin towards the very end of the hymn (§574,17: see above).

The content of the hymn is serious and therefore the reader could easily expect a corresponding storyline to come. However, Martianus initiates another turning point here when asking Athena about the identity of the Art's courtiers who are about to come forward the celestials (§575,19: *...quae istae* [i.e. *electissimae feminarum, quae ad medium superi senatus locum fiducia promptiore procedunt*] *sint quidve gestitent, gerendorum inconsciis non adverto*). The point is that no matter how politely Martianus asks, he dispirits Athena to the level of an equal partner in the dialogue and humanizes the divine story, as is the case in Menippean satire; however, what is even more important, he changes his own position from being a listener to becoming a witness of a wedding feast (§575,18: *nosco venerorque, quod vidi*).<sup>39</sup> In other – literary – words, the arts will require careful attention, and spontaneous and transparent presentation of information (§579,4f.: *videbis istic* [i.e. on the board] *depingi, quicquid verbis non valeas explicare*).<sup>40</sup>

---

Martianus' identification with Varro's legacy – not only in terms of content, but form as well (see footnote 60 in this paper).

36 L. CRISTANTE (1978: 688, footnote 27) interprets this cross-reference as an allusion to Pliny the Elder (with the justification of extensive geographic descriptions in the following Book); FERRÉ, BARBARA [ED., TRANSL., COM.]. 2007. *Martianus Capella. Les noces de Philologie et de Mercure. Tome VI, Livre VI, La Géométrie*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 83, footnote 38, suggests that Martianus has Cicero in mind here (as an author of philosophical texts which he obviously composed at the time of not holding a position of a consul any more). Both the main medieval commentators – I. RAMELLI (2006: 380 and 1320) – mention univocally the Gracchi brothers and Cicero.

37 In the text Martianus names Philosophy and her sister Paedia. However, they are mentioned as the courtiers of Geometry, i.e. the first of the 'higher' arts, and therefore it is possible to generally see the whole picture as including those arts as well. Philosophy can be understood in representative terms also thanks to the fact that all the other arts actually formed parts of philosophy in ancient Greece.

38 On significance of number seven in the ancient-Greece symbolism see Eriugena: I. RAMELLI (2006: 373f.), Remigius (ibid.: 1306ff.) and STAHL, WILLIAM H. – JOHNSON, RICHARD – BURGE, EVAN. L. 1977. *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*. Volume II. The Marriage of Philology and Mercury. New York: Columbia University Press, 282, footnote 54. The uniqueness of the number is explained by Martianus himself in Book Seven, §738f. (as a prime number, which as the only one cannot be divided or multiplied within the first ten numbers, it symbolizes the goddess Athena who was not procreated and did not give birth; number seven has got a meaning for life cycles as well). Cf. Gell. *N. A.* 3,10; Macr. *Sonn.* 1,6,34–82; etc.

39 Martianus' presence in the plot is noted also by L. CRISTANTE (1978: 687), however, he does not analyse it further.

40 Mentioning a board and its function can be viewed as a didactic instruction to the reader to visualize the descriptions included in the text.

Nevertheless, the turning point coming through the unexpected participation of Martianus in the plot is not at its end yet. Satire suddenly gets engaged as well and accuses Martianus of a failure to do what he himself expects from the reader (§576). According to her, he could have recognized at least one of the courtiers of Geometry, Philosophy, since she has already acted in the story.<sup>41</sup> In this respect, she finds Martianus' speech, and perhaps even his whole paraphrasing, unnecessarily broad (§576,2f.: *plurimum affatimque olivi... superfluo perdidisti, ...*) and in addition, not corresponding to the context as well as being inappropriate, which she suggests through a reappearing picture of the lamplight at night, this time wasted (§576,3f.: *dispendiaque lini perflagrata cassum devorante Mulcibero*). What can this admonishment mean? The story did not fulfil its purpose, Martianus was not taught a lesson that would allow him to understand Satire's prompts in the plot, and his journey towards knowledge, personified by the courtiers, i.e. Philosophy and Paedia, has not been completed yet. And for this reason Satire (without losing her comical dimension: §576,24: *lepidula*; *ibid.*,1: *iocabunda*) does not, despite her previous acting, refuse the serious task – as shown in the innovation of her description (§576,24/1: *totam fabellam... susceperit*) – and explains who is the second courtier and what characterizes both of them (§578ff.). She does not forbear a sarcastic note ironizing Martianus' wit though (§577,8: *...nunc Arcadium<sup>42</sup> ac Midinum<sup>43</sup> sapis*) and while explaining, she teaches him a little moral lesson because it seems to her that Martianus distanced himself from the "ladies" due to his busy pace of life and lack of interest in deep knowledge (§577,9f.: *... desudatio curaque districtior tibi forensis rabulationis<sup>44</sup> partibus illigata aciem industriae melioris obtudit, amississe mihi videris et huius matronae [i. e. Philosophiae] memoriam<sup>45</sup> et iam eiusdem germanam [i. e. Paediam] voluisse nescire*). By not demeaning for the first time Martianus' focus on education, but rather

41 In §96, §131 and by means of her 'lovers', i.e. the philosophers among the celestials, also in §213.

42 That is, the stupid man; for an explanation see W. H. STAHL – R. JOHNSON – E. L. BURGE (1977: 217, footnote 12).

43 D. SHANZER (1986b: 275f.) relates the comparison of the king with ass ears to Bias' saying about an ass playing the lyre in §807,14f., and in this way proves Martianus' inspiration with Varro's Menippean satire *Ἵνος λύρας* (in frg. 349f., see *ibid.*: 278–280).

44 Translated as: *while shouting in the forum*. In another translation: *at noisy law suits*. The latter is suggested by STAHL, WILLIAM H. – JOHNSON, RICHARD – BURGE, EVAN L. 1971. *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*. Volume I. The Quadrivium of Martianus Capella: Latin Traditions in Mathematical Sciences 50 B. C. – A. D. 1250 (Stahl). The Allegory and the Trivium (Johnson, Burge). New York: Columbia University Press, 17, among others; however, he notices that it is: "...impossible to determine from Martianus' statements whether he was a lawyer, advocate, pleader, or merely a practitioner of the rhetorician's art." Among later proponents of the profession of a lawyer are e.g. F. LEMOINE (1972: 212f.); SCHIEVENIN, ROMEO. 1986. „Marziano Capella e il *proconsulare culmen*.“ *Latomus*, 45, 807; and in Czech accessible B. G. CONTE (2003: 617).

45 Martianus chooses those expressions which evoke Plato's theory of knowledge as a recollection of the forgotten, cf. Plat. *Phaid.* 72e–76d.

stressing the serious content hidden in the ‘light’ story and calling indirectly for greater vigilance and return to a real intellectual life, Satire introduces herself in a completely different light from the previous parts, possibly in a ‘ridiculously’ serious manner, letting the whole dialogue result in a satire of herself, i.e. a satire of Satire.

### **Dialogue Five (Martianus – Satire): an argument over the gods’ behaviour or an appropriate genre? Enthronement of harmony.**

The most appropriate one-word characterization of the next dialogue, which steps out of the main plot, may in fact be the expression ‘embroilment’. The argument between Martianus and Satire becomes bitter and heated, which is a tone that the reader has not previously encountered.

All begins at the outset of Book Eight. The celestials are amazed at the speech of Arithmetic and a respectful silence befalls the assembly (§803,17: *sacrum paululum fuit reverendumque silentium*). Apollo keeps this moment also for the next art not to feel disadvantaged because of the brilliant previous speaker. A sudden snore of a tipsy old Silenos disturbs this special atmosphere (§804,4: *stertens ranae sonitum desorbentis increpuit*). The gods burst into wild laughter which is magnified by the jokes made by Cupid and the old man’s behaviour after his awakening (this is expressed via a rapid iambic dimeter [catalectic] with a high number of verb forms, exceeding by a third the numbers of verses: §805<sup>46</sup>). The peak of exhilaration is reached when Silenos falls down, being unable to stand up on his own, and having to be carried on Satyr’s shoulders as a bag away (§805,1ff.: *...tumidumque hiatimembrem colloque complicatum utribus parem reportat*). The reader does not enjoy this comic scene too long, though, because Satire suddenly steps into the plot (§806f.). She reproaches Martianus bitterly (including a comparison of his intellect to a herd of goats: §806,6: *non minus sensus quam nominis pecudalis*), indicating the following conclusion. Martianus ridiculed the gods by an inappropriate comical scene (§806,6: *incongruus risus*, 8: *cachinnus*), which cannot be excused even by a wedding feast (§806,13: *nec... nugales ausus lege hymeneia et culpae velamine licentis obnuberis*), although this excuse was used in connection with Silenos’ behaviour earlier (§804,8: *iocos nuptialis licentia non vetare*) and Satire herself in fact inspired and continuously supported such a development of the story from the onset.<sup>47</sup> The unpleasant scene is finished by Satire citing a proverb by Bias, one of the Seven Sages of Greece (choosing him in particular perhaps

<sup>46</sup> Mart. Cap. § 805: *reclusis, videns, circumspicit ridentes, suscitante, dolens tuetur, madidata tergit, increpante, rapit, movere... cupit, avocante, recepta, videt, percellitur, nutans, temptat ciere, negatis, astat, abeunt, titubans moliensque, haeret, redit, recurrit, victa, palpitans, turgens cadit, fit, nescit, iubente, rapit iacentem, dat, complicatum, reportat.*

<sup>47</sup> A logical connection is created by a choice of identical expressions by Martianus. While they were originally understood as positive characteristics, in this passage they are presented in a negative light: cf. §806f., the introduction §2: *desipere (desipis), garrientem (aggarrire), nu-*

for a greater educational effect), expressing that the one who is not a fool can see what kind of behaviour is appropriate.<sup>48</sup> Here she explicitly evaluates the situation, one which was indicated already at the beginning of Book Six (when addressing Athena §575, cf. p. 214 in this paper). There Satire reacted sharply as well, but directed her anger to the content (i.e. Martianus' ignorance), and thus did not notice the 'humanization' of Athena. Similarly, Martianus did not notice her seriousness, i.e. a behaviour deviating from her role. Now Satire's whirlwind affects Martianus severely (see the following expressions printed in bold) and thus he attempts to find a reasonable excuse (§807,15f.: *tam **tristibus et asperisque Saturae alioquin lepidulae** verberibus demulcatus, ... excusamentis admissi velut procacis involvor* [bold print added]). In the end he prefers to change the theme and turns to Satire with a question about the next stage (§807,17: *tandem, quae puellarum intromittenda pararetur, inquirō*). At this point the discrepancy between the development of both protagonists' viewpoints indeed culminates: Satire answers with a serious hymn for Astronomy (§808) without reference to her previous commentaries<sup>49</sup> and sighs resignedly (§808,13f.: *tu fingere ludicra perstas viliaque astriloquae praefers commenta puellae*). Martianus, in return, urges Satire to pull together and to return to her identity (§809). He concludes his laughter-filled speech (§809,15: *vetitus ille ac durissime castigatus denuo me risus invasit*; i.e. in a manner that used to be characteristic of Satire) by citing an epigram by Martialis (Mart. 2,41,1),<sup>50</sup> which both serves as a reprimand symmetric to the two Satire's rejoinders, and, in line with the whole speech, involves a large amount of hyperbolism (§809,4: *ride, si sapis, o puella, ride*).

How can this change of positions between the author and his Muse be understood? What else may be involved in their emotional speech? One of the possible levels is obviously the hidden situational humour which is triggered by the scene of unpredictable behaviour. This may be seen at a level of the god's human behaviour, but also at a level of the 'creators' of the story, that is 'satire of Satire' from Book Six and Satire-initiated conscious 'metamorphoses' of Martianus. In other words, Martianus accepts the form of the composition which Satire initiated while she abandons it, because she considers the form inappropriate for the

---

*gales (nugulas)*; §806f. and both entries into the plot (§221ff. and §576): *iocularis (iocante, iocabunda)*; *alioquin lepidulae (lepori, lepidula)*.

48 The proverb *ὄνος λύρας* (ass playing the lyre) has been known since Menander – e.g. W. H. STAHL – R. JOHNSON – E. L. BURGE (1977: 316, footnote 7); LE BŒUFFLE, ANDRÉ. 1998. *Un précurseur de Copernic et Galilée Martianus Capella: Astronomie*. Vannes: Burillier, 108, footnote 14 – and Machon (cf. other rich occurrences in TLG database). According to Shanzer, Martianus was inspired by Varro's Mennipean satire of the same name (see footnote 43 in this paper; the proverb also occurs in a fragment form in another satire by Varro – *Testamentum*: Gell. *N. A.* 3,16,13). Neither of the occurrences of the proverb is related to Bias.

49 Including the part from Book Six, where she reproaches Martianus for similar "quibbles" and "decorations", which she herself uses.

50 The part is presented in the same context as Martialis' epigram, i.e. as a citation of a Paelignian poet; Ovid; see W. H. STAHL – R. JOHNSON – E. L. BURGE (1977: 317, footnote 11).

subject.<sup>51</sup> However, there is more to be explored besides this relatively obvious message. First, the text as a whole is of an educational nature and develops hierarchically, i.e. from easier and lower arts into the more difficult, theoretical, in the hierarchy higher and therefore more respectful arts. As early as the occurrence of Geometry, the shift upwards is obvious (in the need to address Athena: see p. 213f.), and a level higher is the impression left by Arithmetic (viz. the sacred silence mentioned in §803,17). Even more promising is the arrival of Astronomy (§807: *virgo... pulchrior dotalium*). Second, Martianus is aware that the educational content is set in the framework of a feast, and what is more, at a wedding of gods, and therefore it is to represent a model example of symposial *topoi*, including a number of humoristic and satiric motifs which gradually intensify. Further, individual comic scenes and symposial images fulfil a didactic purpose – the reader can rest and whet his/ her appetite for further reading and study (which Martianus points at when speaking to Satire in §809,1f.: *nihil leporis iocique permixti taedium auscultantium recreabit?*). The argument between the author and his ‘Muse’ attracts the reader’s attention to their opposing tendencies and thus he/she is able to become involved even more with the plot while enjoying the relaxing literary imagination. The balance is preserved and the reader can move on to the very climax of the text, the description of heaven and cosmic harmony.<sup>52</sup>

### Conclusion: a dialogue in a dialogue (Martianus – the son – ‘Satire’)

The concluding verses present the author’s symbolic return to the beginning and also final statement, the so called “seal”.<sup>53</sup> Using iambic senars,<sup>54</sup> Martianus

<sup>51</sup> S. GREBE (1999: 856) also notices the “change of perspective”, however, she maintains the interpretative level of Martianus’ self-defence in the use of a satirical genre for a scholarly content (ibid.: 855f.); sic also PABST, BERNHARD. 1994. *Prosimetrum. Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter*. Teil 1. Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag, 122.

<sup>52</sup> The contrast between a jolly wedding feast and seriousness of the arts reappears at the beginning of the last book, Book Nine. Venus herself complains about the dullness of the feast and asks the Muses to get involved in the scene in order to beautify it (§888,5–10). Other celestials agree with the proposal and thus influence the next story development: the last art at the feast is to be Harmony (Medicine and Architecture are kept silent: §891,3–10; the presentation of the wedding gift for the bride is postponed: §898). This narrative devise further supports the suggested analysis of the dialogue, i.e. the importance of a balance between entertainment and education in the composition of a text.

<sup>53</sup> A great characterization of a literary seal (σφραγίς) is given by FANTHAM, ELAINE. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 66f.: “Such a personal sealing of the poem would include the poet’s name, his family or birthplace, and perhaps the circumstances under which he was working on his writing.” Cf. a publication on the form of literary seals across genres: ROBERTS, DEBORAH H. – DUNN, FRANCIS M. – FOWLER, DON [EDS.]. 1997. *Classical Closure. Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

<sup>54</sup> Even though irregularities in Martianus’ iambic trimeter are common (cf. note 19 in this

composes a dialogue with his son into which he inserts the last, completely fictitious, speech by Satire.<sup>55</sup>

In the first part (§997f.), Martianus reminds his son of the motifs on which the story by Satire was based, and in this way provides him with an interpretative key to an understanding of the work. He formulates parallels to the introduction and individual entries (a number of expressions and pictures is repeated: addressing of the son, fiction, education and entertainment),<sup>56</sup> but instead of a shortcut and indication, he uses clear and concrete expressions (within a poetic atmosphere of the versed part, though). From this speech, it can be implied that the main feature of the text is the composition of *miscillo flamine* (mixed tones: §997,20) both in terms of the content and the form, i.e. a satiric diffusion of diverse contrasts:<sup>57</sup> of seriousness and comic (*lusit...*, *dum docere nititur* – §997,20f.; *docta indoctis aggerans*<sup>58</sup> – §998,3), of clarity and the hidden, and perhaps even of divine and human (*fandis tacenda farcinat*,<sup>59</sup> *immiscuit Musas deosque* – §998,4f.), of erudition and story-telling, and verse and prose (*disciplinas cyclicas garrire agresti cruda finxit plasmate* – §998,5f.).<sup>60</sup> Martianus identifies the form of the composition as distant from the ancient Greek approach to arts (§997,21f.: *Satura, Pelasgos dum docere nititur artes cathedris*<sup>61</sup> *vix amicas Atticis*), in which way he revives and clarifies the moment of the unknown and the new from the intro-

---

paper), their occurrence in the final lines is so frequent that it may seem more appropriate to speak about iambic senars here, cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 682).

55 Similar interpretations of σφραγίς were offered by L. CRISTANTE (1978: 679–704) and R. SCHIEVENIN (1986: 797–815; his interest is mainly historical though).

56 Cf. several allusions: §997,19: *Martiane* (§2,8), *fabulam* (§2,15; §219,15); 20: *lucernis* (§2,16; §219,17); 21: *docere* (§2,16; §222,15); §998, 6: *garrire* (§2,7), *plasmate* (§221,11). It may be worth adding to the list an expression from the last verse as well, when the speech returns to Martianus: §1000,4: *nugis* (§2,7; §807,13).

57 RAMELLI, ILARIA. 2001. *Le nozze di Filologia e Mercurio: Testo latino a fronte. Introduzione, traduzione, commento e appendici*. Milano: Bompiani, 1007f., footnote 85f., completes the picture of a satirical context by referring to a terminological agreement between Martianus, Persius and Juvenal. Martianus' text complies with the terminology as well and can be related to Martianus' reading of the satirists, as well as their general popularity in Late Antiquity.

58 J. WILLIS (1983: 385) reads *docta doctis*, in which case the contrast gets lost.

59 This contrast obviously includes a genre dimension; cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 695), who interprets *fanda* as the content of individual disciplines, while *tacenda* is a supporting mythos, in his view), but also corresponds to the picture of depth and clarity of knowledge elicited in the introduction (cf. footnote 18 in this paper).

60 The relation between the verbs *aggerans*, *farcinat*, *immiscuit* (as well as the adjective *miscillo*) and the compositional principles of satire is obvious; cf. F. LEMOINE (1972: 211). It can be further supported with a note by L. CRISTANTE (1978: 691; an agreement in language with Varro's definition of satire in Diomedes' *Ars Grammatica* 3 [Keil, 485]: ... *a quodam genere farciminis quod multis refertum saturam dicit Varro vocitatum. Est autem hoc positum in secundo libro Plautinorum quaestionum "satura est uva passa et polenta et nuclei pini ex mulso consarsi."*)

61 The text is corrupted here and its emendations vary. The meaning of the part may not change even when read as *creagris*: meaning a hook for meat, metaphorically thus understood as

duction (cf. §2,5).<sup>62</sup> A note on the formal aspects of the work is included (§997,2: *sic in novena decidit volumina*) as well as indication of the topos of modesty is shown (§998,6: *agreste plasma*<sup>63</sup>).<sup>64</sup>

After the final unfolding of the rather hidden background of Satire's work to his son, Martianus lets Satire herself complete the information by mediating her bitter (§999,8: *turgensque felle ac bili*) commentary to the just completed work (§999–1000,2). Satire accuses Martianus of the sole responsibility for the final form of the work and describes herself as a victim of Martianus' creativity (§999,11: *Felicis... sed Capellae flamine*).<sup>65</sup> And since according to Satire, Martianus never enjoyed a high professional and social status (§999,12f.: *...quem videre saecula iurgis caninos blateratus pendere proconsulari verba dantem culmini*<sup>66</sup>) or wealth (§999,19: *parvo obsidentem vixque respersum lucro*<sup>67</sup>), and what he managed to attain is forgotten (§999,15: *dudum*; 20: *iam canescens*), it was not possible for her to keep face, which would correspond to the content and origin of the arts.<sup>68</sup>

---

“poignancy” – see Remigius' text: I. RAMELLI (2006: 1714) – and possibly referring to *sobrietatis* of the arts (cf. §220, 3).

62 Martianus' reference may more generally refer to satire as a Roman innovation (cf. Quint. in footnote 8 in this paper, as well as footnote 60), but perhaps more likely, it highlights the unusual and new connection of a particular educational content with a 'satiric cover'.

63 See footnote 20 in this paper.

64 In contrast, Martianus does not return to the plot in the final part anymore since the story has been obviously completed.

65 L. CRISTANTE (1978: 683) interprets Satire's transfer of responsibility to Martianus as an expression of the opposition between the oral (what Satire said) and the written (what Martianus wrote down).

66 *The one who was seen by ages to passionately revenge upon the foolishness of the naive and to belaud the proconsular heights.* The part can also be translated as: *the one who was seen by ages to passionately react to the barking of the dogs, and who spoke to the very proconsul.* Willis's edition includes a variety of readings and additions to this part, see J. WILLIS (1983: 385). It is especially noteworthy to mention various conjectures of Verse 14: *vero dantem* (sic Dick) / *perorantem* (Kopp) / *desudantem* (Boettger) / *iura dantem* (Scaliger) / *verba dantem* (Sundermeyer and Willis), including an ambiguous phrase *proconsulare culmen* – PARKER, H. 1890. „The Seven Liberal Arts.“ *The English Historical Review*, 5, 442, and F. LEMOINE (1972: 213) interpret topographically as a Carthaginian seat of the proconsul; this interpretation is rejected without further elaboration by W. H. STAHL – R. JOHNSON – E. L. BURGE (1971: 15, footnote 32); as a purposeful play of Martianus' with a topographical and institutional significance is accepted and explained in detail by R. SCHIEVENIN (1986: 803–807). For a detailed summary of possible interpretations, cf. L. CRISTANTE (1978: 698ff.). Finally, a tradition of Cynic diatribes is suggested in this respect by D. SHANZER (1986: 40, footnote 71).

67 Martianus' difficult life may also be referred to in §999,20: *nictante cura somnolentum lucibus*.

68 Satire returns to the origin of the arts via a reference to areopagus (*Martis curia*: §999,10). The improper formal aspect is suggested in the last picture of the Fountain of Pegasus (i.e. a high literary inspiration: §1000,1f.; this theme is repeated several times in Martianus / §119,19 and §908,3f./; his source may draw on the satirists: see parallels in Persius and Juvenal cited by L. CRISTANTE (1978: 702).



Satire's view is used here to present Martianus to the reader (the son represents only a substitute addressee). Using hyperbole and a large amount of self-irony worth the satiric guide, Martianus creates a literary self-portrait whose core is not a historical, but personal testimonial about a witty Carthaginian, be it a lawyer or a rhetorician, who attempted to connect the seemingly incompatible: in the world of the story about a woman and the god, in the literary sphere of fiction and education, and in the philosophical level of mythos and logos in order to show to the next generations not only the one-sided rationality of the Ancient World, but also its general cultural variety. Although Martianus based his text on a broad literary tradition of several genres headed by satire, he understood the final form of his text as innovative, taking full responsibility for the form (§1000,3f.: *testem ergo nostrum quae veternum prodidit / secute nugis, nate, ignosce lectitans*) despite all the uncertainty (expressed via the topos of self-irony and modesty). There is no argument about his decision having been understood and accepted by the reader, as further fate of Martianus' writing clearly indicates.

Martianus created, in his view, an unusual piece of work, surely "something *inopinum intactumque*", which might have been easily misunderstood and therefore, he was adding running instructions to the text. While doing so, he crystallized the reader's attention through the use of references, word-plays, and metaphors, which added to the entertaining aspect of the work and at the same time, advanced his abilities in terms of literary presentation. In fact, his commentaries faithfully mirror the fundamental compositional principle of the text itself.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BACHTIN, MICHAEL MICHAJLOVIČ. 1971. *Dostojevskij umělec. K poetice prózy*. Praha: Československý spisovatel. (Překlad ruského orig. *Problemy poetiky Dostojevskogo*. Moskva: Sovětskij pisatel', 1963.)
- BARTOŇKOVÁ, DAGMAR. 1977. „Prosimetrum v díle Martiana Capella De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii.“ *SPFFBU*, E 22–23, 205–220.
- BOVEY, MURIEL. 2003. *Disciplinae cyclicae: L'organisation du savoir dans l'œuvre de Martianus Capella*. Trieste: Edizioni Università di Trieste.
- CRISTANTE, LUCIO. 1978. „La σφραγίς di Marziano Capella (σπουδογέλοιον: autobiografia e autoironia).“ *Latomus*, 37, 679–704.
- FANTHAM, ELAINE. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.
- FERRÉ, BARBARA [ED., TRANSL., COMM.]. 2007. *Martianus Capella. Les noces de Philologie et de Mercure*. Tome VI, Livre VI, *La Géométrie*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- FLETCHER, ANGUS. 1964. *Allegory. The Theory of a Symbolic Mode*. Ithaca – London: Cornell University Press.
- FRYE, NORTHROP. 1957. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- GASPAROTTO, GIOVANNI. 1983. *Marziano Capella. Geometria. De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber sextus. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Verona: Libreria universitaria editrice.
- GREBE, SABINE. 1999. *Martianus Capella ‚De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii‘. Darstellung der Sieben Freien Künste und ihrer Beziehungen zueinander*. Stuttgart – Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.

- JANSON, TORE. 1964. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Convention*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- KER, JAMES. 2004. „Nocturnal writers in imperial Rome.“ *Classical Philology*, 99 (3), 209–242.
- LANHAM, RICHARD A. 1991. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.
- LE BŒUFFLE, ANDRÉ. 1998. *Un précurseur de Copernic et Galilée Martianus Capella: Astronomie*. Vannes: Burillier.
- LEMOINE, FANNY. 1972. *Martianus Capella. A Literary Re-evaluation*. München: Arbo-Gesellschaft.
- LENAZ, LUCIANO. 1975. *Martiani Capellae De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber secundus: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Padova: Liviana Editrice.
- MCDONOUGH, CHRISTOPHER. 1968. *The Verse of Martianus Capella. Text, Translation, and Commentary of the Poetry in Book 1 – 5*. Diss. Toronto.
- PABST, BERNHARD. 1994. *Prosimetrum. Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter*. Teil 1. Köln – Weimar – Wien: Böhlau Verlag.
- PARKER, H. 1890. „The Seven Liberal Arts.“ *The English Historical Review*, 5, 417–461.
- RAMELLI, ILARIA. 2001. *Le nozze di Filologia e Mercurio: Testo latino a fronte. Introduzione, traduzione, commento e appendici*. Milano: Bompiani.
- RAMELLI, ILARIA. 2006. *Scoto Eriugena, Remigio di Auxerre, Bernardo Silvestre e Anonimi. Tutti i commenti a Marziano Capella. Testo latino a fronte*. Milano: Bompiani.
- RELIHAN, JOEL C. 1987. „Martianus Capella, the good teacher.“ *Pacific Coast Philology*, 22, 59–70.
- ROBERTS, DEBORAH H. – DUNN, FRANCIS M. – FOWLER, DON [EDS.]. 1997. *Classical Closure. Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- SHANZER, DANUTA. 1986. *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella's De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. Book 1. Berkeley – Los Angeles – London: University of California Press.
- SHANZER, DANUTA. 1986b. „The late antique tradition of Varro's *onos lyras*.“ *Rheinisches Museum*, 129, 272–285.
- SCHIEVENIN, ROMEO. 1986. „Marziano Capella e il *proconsulare culmen*.“ *Latomus*, 45, 797–815.
- SCHIEVENIN, ROMEO. 2005–2006. „Il prologo di Marziano Capella.“ *Incontri triestini di filologia classica*, 5, 133–153.
- STAHL, WILLIAM H. – JOHNSON, RICHARD – BURGE, EVAN L. 1971. *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*. Volume I. The Quadrivium of Martianus Capella: Latin Traditions in Mathematical Sciences 50 B. C. – A. D. 1250 (Stahl). The Allegory and the Trivium (Johnson, Burge). New York: Columbia University Press.
- STAHL, WILLIAM H. – JOHNSON, RICHARD – BURGE, EVAN L. 1977. *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*. Volume II. The Marriage of Philology and Mercury. New York: Columbia University Press.
- STANGE, FRIEDRICH O. 1882. *De re metrica*. Diss. Leipzig.
- SUNDERMEYER, ALBRECHT. 1910. *De re metrica et rhythmica*. Diss. Marburg.
- WESTRA, HAIJO J. 1981. „The juxtaposition of the ridiculous and the sublime in Martianus Capella.“ *Florilegium (Carleton University Annual Papers on Classical Antiquity and the Middle Ages)*, 3, 198–214.
- WILLIS, JAMES [ED.]. 1983. *Martianus Capella*. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- ZAFFAGNO, ELENA. 1996. „La ‘persona’ di Marziano Capella del *De nuptiis*.“ *Giornale italiano di filologia*, 48, 223–251.
- ZEKL, HANS G. [TRANSL.]. 2005. *Martianus Capella, Die Hochzeit der Philologia mit Merkur (De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii)*. Würzburg: Verlag Königshausen & Neumann.

## RESUMÉ

V příspěvku autorka analyzuje metatextové vstupy autora do děje, přítomné v půvabné a jedinečné vzdělávací práci *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*, sepsané Martianem Capellou někdy ve druhé polovině 5. století po Kr. v africkém prostředí Vandaly dobytého Kartága. Cílem studie je ukázat, že autorské komentáře, bez výjimky probíhající formou dialogu s různými postavami (čtenářem, synem, Múzou, personifikovanou Satirou; Mart. Cap. §1n., §219–222, §575–579, §806–809, §997–1000), neslouží pouze jako kompoziční obhajoba využití satirického narativního rámce pro prezentaci závažného naukového obsahu, ale kopíruje a umocňuje hierarchické pojetí hlubší vzdělávací koncepce směřující k naplnění harmonie.

