

the triumviral period, such an error would be appalling; but from the perspective of five centuries, an error of a few years in explaining the background of a poem must have seemed trivial. And this error helps us to understand his explanation of the opening of *Eclogue* 8: it was not that Servius had, or his sources had, any knowledge of Augustus' Illyrian campaign of 35, but that he understood the reference to Illyria as a clear allusion to the war of Actium. And given that interpretation, it is obvious that Augustus was the only person whom Virgil could have been addressing.

The explanation proposed here of Servius' comments on the opening of *Eclogue* 8 is not without its difficulties; in particular, we might wish that he had made an explicit reference to Actium in his note on *Eclogue* 8. 6. Even without that confirmation, however, it may serve to show that Servius, even when he is wrong, is not necessarily inconsistent or perverse. Modern scholars tend to turn to ancient commentaries for assistance in interpreting specific passages of the texts on which they commented, and that is probably as it should be. But rather than singling out for ridicule those particular notes that are, in the light of modern scholarly techniques, false or misguided, it is far more profitable to try to understand a commentary like that of Servius in its own context and by its own standards. By doing so, we may not learn more about Virgil, but we will at least learn to understand the methods and character of a late antique scholar.⁸

JAMES E. G. ZETZEL
Princeton University

8. I am grateful to the anonymous referees and the Editor of *CP* for their improvements of an earlier draft of this article. I am particularly grateful to Professor Kaster for his assistance in matters Servian, both in his letters and in his published articles, to which I owe much.

THREE TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN MARTIANUS CAPELLA

The text of the late fifth-century¹ Carthaginian encyclopedist Martianus Capella is riddled with textual problems. Many of these cannot be solved purely by recourse to the manuscripts, but are best elucidated by identifying what this intentionally obfuscatory author is talking about and altering the text accordingly. In this article I will discuss three textual problems from the notoriously difficult second book of the *De nuptiis*.

"CHALDAEA MIRACULA"

Tunc Philologia ex aromate praeparato acerraque propria Athanasiae primitus supplicavit matrique eius gratiam multa litatione persolvit, quod nec Vedium cum uxore conspexerit, sicut suadebat Etruria,—nec Eumenidas ut Chaldaea miracula formidavit [codd.: *-darit* Kopp],—nec igne usserit, nec lymphæ subluerit, nec animæ simulacrum

1. See D. R. Shanzer, review of *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*: vols. 1 and 2 (New York, 1971 and 1977) by W. H. Stahl and R. Johnson with E. L. Burge, *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 104 (1982): 111.

Syri cuiusdam dogmate verberarit, nec[†] Phasi senis ritu Charontis manibus involutam immortalitatem mortis auspicio consecrarit.

[pp. 61. 20–62. 3 Dick]

This passage is one of the most interesting and difficult in a section replete with obscure religious material. Philologia has just been fed a draught by Athanasia which confers deathless vigor on her limbs: she has finally become immortal and fit to be joined to Mercury. She then gives thanks to Athanasia and to Apotheosis that she has been spared a number of purgatorial torments. The present passage enumerates the trials that have been avoided, and contains numerous *cruces*. No one is yet sure of the identity of the *Syrus quidam*, or of the *Phasi senis*; nor is the meaning of *involutam immortalitatem* certain. These are mysteries which I do not pretend to be able to solve.² One improvement, however, might be made on the most recent analysis of the words *Chaldaea miracula*: a few more texts can be adduced to explain the arcane doctrine alluded to by Martianus. There may be a case for emending the text.

Martianus is talking about trials undergone by the soul after death. He begins with a reference to the rites of the Etruscans (mediated by Cornelius Labeo?)³ which has a clear parallel in the work of Arnobius.⁴ This may well have been a descent to the underworld and an interview with Vedio and the dire Persephone. The second rite involves the Eumenides, and the third terror the more familiar purifications by fire and water. Let us leave the others aside. What does *Chaldaea miracula* mean?

Stahl translates, "Because she herself would not now behold Vedio and his wife, as Etruria used to tell her; nor did she fear the Eumenides, those Chaldaean manifestations."⁵ *Chaldaea miracula* is taken in apposition with *Eumenidas* as the object of the manuscripts' *formidavit*. Lenaz translates, "perché non aveva visto Vedio e sua moglie come avrebbe dovuto, secondo gli Etruschi, né aveva dovuto tremare davanti alle Furie, come affermavano le fantasiose dottrine caldaiche." This second translation, which takes into account Kopp's virtually certain emendation to *formidarit*, is correct: the pattern of the sentence suggests that *ut* should parallel *sicut* from the previous clause, and the sense demands that *Chaldaea miracula* be the name of some person or being that propagates a definite doctrine. It is the second of the series which begins with Etruria, and goes on to the *dogma Syri cuiusdam*, and the *ritus Phasi senis*.

The *TLL* (8. 1054. 58) reads with Stahl, translating *miracula* as "animantia mythica"—wrongly. Martianus does not imply that the various tortures are fabulous. Far from it. They are real, and Philologia is happy to have escaped them. If *miracula* meant "mythical beings," she would have no reason for fear, and so no occasion for relief. Although the meaning of "prodigies" is well attested for *miracula*, the sense "fantasiose dottrine" is not to be found. A *miraculum* is usually a concrete event. Furthermore, the intent of the epithet *Chaldaea* requires some

2. The reader is referred to the excellent discussion in *Martiani Capellae "De Nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii" Liber Secundus*, ed. L. Lenaz (Padua, 1975), pp. 75–77.

3. Summarized, but rejected by P. Mastandrea, *Un Neoplatonico Latino Cornelio Labeone* (Leyden, 1979), pp. 211–13.

4. *Adv. nat.* 2. 62.

5. *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*, 2:49.

clarification. *Chaldaea* is used by Martianus in a purely geographical context at pages 339, 10 and 348, 13. But it is not immediately clear what Chaldaea, or Babylonian mythology, has to do with the Eumenides.

It is worth noting, however, that the Eumenides, or something very close to them, figure in the *Chaldaean Oracles*.⁶ Psellus' *Hypotyposis* places them among the cathartic powers.⁷ They were involved in the purification of the soul after death.⁸ Synesius of Cyrene, an author well known to be strongly influenced by the *Oracula*, mentions chthonic hounds on several occasions in his *Hymns*.⁹ And since the identification of the Eumenides with hounds is a commonplace,¹⁰ Synesius' language poses no problems.

If, as seems likely, one must interpret *Chaldaea* as referring to whoever propagated the doctrine, in parallel with the rest of the passage, I would propose an emendation of *miracula* to *oracula*. Greek authors, particularly the later Neoplatonists, refer to the *Oracula Chaldaica* as simply *λόγια* or *θεολόγια*.¹¹ The Latin method of quotation is different: *oracula* is not sufficient, but must be qualified by the adjective *Chaldaea*.¹²

THE LUNAR ARCHON

In eo sistra Niliaca Eleusinaque lampas arcusque Dictynnae tympanaque Cybeleia videbantur; triformis etiam discolorque vertigo terribili quadam maiestate rutilabat. Quae licet cornigera et aspera crederetur egestionibus opportuna tamen et felem et cervam et conversiones bis binas vultibus praeferebat.

[p. 70. 7 ff. Dick]

During the course of Philologia's journey through the heavenly spheres she encounters various planetary archons. The passage cited is taken from the description of the appearance of the moon. Lenaz has recently commented on this passage and has cleared up many points of interpretation, but one can still make a good case for the text's being corrupt in its present form. I propose two emendations: for *vertigo* read *virago*, and for *egestionibus* read *gestationibus*.

Vertigo, despite textual critics and commentators who have heretofore left it in place, makes no sense. The passage is a clear description of the moon as *virgo triformis*. *Virago* is to be preferred to *virgo*, however, for the following reasons:

6. See H. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles and Theurgy* (Cairo, 1956), pp. 298–99.

7. *Hypotyposis* 13 p. 74. 32 (*Oracula Chaldaica*, ed. Des Places, p. 199): Εἶναι δὲ φασιν ἐν τῷ δημιουργῷ καὶ αἰσθησεως πηγῇ, ἐπειδὴ καὶ αἰσθησιν οὗτος: "ἐπάγει τοῖς κόσμοις" ἔστι δὲ καθαρτηρίαν πηγὴ καὶ κεραννῶν καὶ διοπτρῶν καὶ τελετῶν καὶ χαρακτήρων καὶ Εὐμενίδων καὶ τελεεαρχῶν.

8. Cf. *Or. Chald.* frag. 90 taken from Psellus *Exegesis* 1140b, who explains these dogs as *τιμωροὺς τῶν ψυχῶν*. See also frags. 91 and 161. For the identification of the *Poinai* and the Erinyes, see A. Dieterich, *Nekyia* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1913), pp. 58–60.

9. Cf. W. Theiler, "Die Chaldäischen Orakel und die Hymnen des Synesios," *Forschungen zum Neuplatonismus* (Berlin, 1966), pp. 252–301. Two passages worth special examination are *Hymn* 2. 243 ff. *σεῦε μερίμνας / τὰς ψυχοβόρους / σεῦε δ' ἀναιδῇ / κύνα τὸν χθόνιον / δαίμονα γαίας . . .* and *Hymn* 1. 92 ff. *εἰδωλοχαρεῖς / εὐχαῖς σκύλακας ἐπιθωύσσαν . . . σὺ ψυχοβόρους / ἀτέρυκε κύνας* (ed. Terzaghi).

10. See Aesch. *Cho.* 924 and Soph. *El.* 1388.

11. Cf. Lewy, *Chaldaean Oracles*, pp. 443–47.

12. For a Latin parallel one need go no further than Augustine's discussion of Porphyry's *Philosophy from Oracles* in the *City of God*, precisely in the context of the purgation of the soul: *Et utique se a Chaldaeis oracula divina* (*De civ. D.* 10. 32); *Chaldaei nescio cuius* (*De civ. D.* 10. 9); *benignus ille Chaldaeus* (*De civ. D.* 10. 9); *Conqueritur, inquit, vir in Chaldaea bonus* (*De civ. D.* 10. 9).

the interchange of *e* and *i* is common in the manuscripts of Martianus, and both *a* and *t* and *a* and *ti* are readily confused in various pre-Caroline scripts. Martianus likes to call an intimidating woman a *virago*, and virtually glosses the word in his hymn to Athene (p. 286. 16 Dick): *consultis virum praesis: hinc dicta virago*; compare also *Pallas virago est appellata* (p. 373. 3 Dick). The moon is clearly seen initially as a frightening apparition (*terribili quadam maiestate rutilabat*); and this brings us to the next point.

In the second part of the description we are told that even though the moon might be "horned and harsh," still she is *egestionibus opportuna*. This (*pace* Lenaz, ad loc.) is a clear reference to the moon's function as Diana Lucina, invoked in connection with births (cf. Macrobian *Sat.* 7. 16. 27 and *Orphic Hymn* 36. 3–5 Abel). This is her "gentler" role. The heart of the problem is the word *egestionibus*, which is inappropriate. It is used almost exclusively of the expelling of noxious substances (excrement, menstrual flux, and vomit) and malodorous liquids such as semen (for vomit, see Martianus p. 59. 6 Dick), and is not the right word for births. The manuscripts offer a variant *aggestionibus* (= *incrementis*), which is slightly better than *egestionibus*, but still more useful as a step toward recovery of the original reading: a simple correction of the metathesis would give the right word in *gestationibus*.¹³ The goddess is timely at the bearing of children.

DANUTA SHANZER
University of California,
Berkeley

13. Cf. *TLL* 6, 2–3, 1956, 44 for two Late Latin instances: Lactant. *Div. inst.* 3. 22. 10 *lanam et telam viris et infantum gestationes assignare*; Soranus, p. 10. 10 *concepti pecoris intra uterum gestatio et partus*. The word has a semantic range that extends to the "bearing, or carrying" of the child in the womb—hence pregnancy.

A TALE OF TWO MANUSCRIPTS

The minor works of Tacitus and Suetonius' *De grammaticis et rhetoribus* survive through a codex Hersfeldensis, mentioned by Poggio and described in an inventory of Niccolò Niccoli and in a note by Pier Candido Decembrio.¹ The Hersfeldensis was thought to be lost until in 1902 Cesare Annibaldi discovered codex Aesinas Lat. 8, a manuscript containing the *Bellum Troianum* of Dictys of Crete, the *Agricola*, and the *Germania*.²

1. For the texts, as well as general background, see R. P. Robinson, *The "Germania" of Tacitus: A Critical Edition* (Middletown, Conn., 1935), pp. 1–20; more briefly, but with some additional information and more recent bibliography, D. Schaps, "The Found and Lost Manuscripts of Tacitus' *Agricola*," *CP* 74 (1979): 28–42; and C. E. Murgia, "The Length of the Lacuna in Tacitus' *Dialogus*," *CSCA* 12 (1979): 221–40. The main item unavailable to Robinson is a letter of Poggio's son Jacopo published in N. Rubinstein, "An Unknown Letter by Jacopo di Poggio Bracciolini on Discoveries of Classical Texts," *IMU* 1 (1958): 383–400.

2. The manuscript, owned by Conte Aurelio Guglielmo Balleani of Iesi when Annibaldi examined it, is now in the possession of his great-nephew Conte Balleschi-Balleani, although it has been rumored to be up for sale. We rely on the excellent photographs in the paleography collection of Widener Library. For information and help we are grateful to several Harvard colleagues, especially Professors M. Hammond and J. P. Elder.