

MARTIANUS AND HIS FIRST EDITOR

I

Widely differing dates have been proposed for the *De nuptiis Mercurii et Philologiae* of Martianus Capella, ranging from the early fourth to the late fifth century. The one secure fact is the precisely dated revision of the text by a professor called Felix, attested by the following subscription:¹

Securus Melior Felix, v(ir) sp(ectabilis) com(es) consist(orianus), rhetor Urbis R(omae), ex mendosissimis exemplaribus emendabam contra legente Deuterio scolastico, discipulo meo, Romae, ad portam Capenam, cons(ulatu) Paulini, v(iri) c(larissimi), sub V nonarum Martiarum, Christo adiuvante.

But even here the precision is less secure than might appear. Four different consuls called Paulinus come into the reckoning; and though the absence of a second consular name and the Christian reference suffice to eliminate the Paulini of 325 and 334, that still leaves a choice between 498 and 534.

It was Otto Jahn who first decided in favor of 534,² not from a study of the consular formula, but on the basis of another *scriptio*, that of Mavortius, cos. 527, to the *Epodes* of Horace:

Vettius Agorius Basilius Mavortius, v(iri) c(larissimus) et in(l)ustris, ex com(ite) dom(esticorum), ex cons(ule) or(dinario), legi et ut potui emendavi, conferente mihi magistro Felice, oratore urbis Romae.

Since Mavortius styles himself ex-consul, he cannot have been writing before 528 at earliest, and perhaps several years later. If we make the usual assumption that both *subscriptions* refer to the same Felix, then 534 might seem a more likely date than 498 for his work on Martianus. 498 would require a career of at least thirty years. Furthermore, while in the Horace *scriptio* Felix is described simply as *orator urbis Romae*, in the Martianus *scriptio* he is also styled *vir spectabilis* and *comes consistoriarum*. Now according to an eastern law of 425 (*Cod. Theod.* 6. 21. 1), professors of rhetoric at Constantinople might be promoted to the rank of count after twenty years of satisfactory service. Jahn and (more emphatically) H.-I. Marrou³ inferred that Felix received such a promotion in the interval between the two *subscriptions*,⁴ that is to say, in or after 528. If so, then Paulinus would have to be the consul of 534.

But there is an internal consideration which has been generally overlooked. By the Ostrogothic age it had become standard usage to date by the western consul

1. See now the firmly based edition of J. Préaux, "Securus Melior Felix, l'ultime Orator Urbis Romae," in *Corona Gratiarum: Miscellanea . . . E. Dekkers*, vol. 2 (Bruges, 1975), p. 104.

2. "Über die Subscriptionen in den Handschriften römischer Classiker," *Berichte der königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, phil.-hist. Classe 3 (1851): 351-54 (in fact by oversight writing 535); followed by J. Sundwall, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des ausgehenden Römertums* (Helsinki, 1919), p. 120—and implicitly by J. R. Martindale, *PLRE* 2:737, who defers his entry until vol. 3.

3. "Autour de la bibliothèque du pape Agapit," *MEFR* 48 (1931): 157-61 = *Christiana Tempora* (Paris, 1978), pp. 200-204. Oddly enough, Marrou seems to have thought that he was contradicting Jahn, whose argument and conclusion were in fact identical to his own ("Subscriptionen," p. 354).

4. So, too, Préaux: "Felix est entretemps devenu un personnage considérable" (*Corona Gratiarum* 2:105).

alone, regardless of whether he had an eastern colleague. So here the name of Paulinus alone, although the consuls of both 498 and 534 had eastern colleagues. How then were the not infrequent homonyms distinguished as consular dates? It might have seemed the obvious solution to add the name of the eastern colleague at any rate to the second bearer of a given name. In fact this is virtually never done. Instead the second bearer is styled *iunior* in consular formulae—regardless of whether or not he was actually related to his homonym.⁵ Some fifteen western inscriptions and papal letters bear the date *Paulino v. c. consule*, i.e., 498; and about thirty *Paulino iuniore v. c. consule*, or 534. Almost all the ancient consular lists likewise distinguish the two consuls as Paulinus and Paulinus *iunior*.⁶

Of course there are one or two doubtful cases, especially where inscriptions are damaged, but of all the documents definitely referable to 534, only one omits the *iunior*: an inscription from Lecco (*CIL* 5. 5214 = *ILCV* 1155). But even here the indiction number (xiii) removes any possibility of confusion between the two dates. Interestingly enough there is also a letter of Pope Symmachus which must belong in 498 (he died in 514), although the manuscripts offer *Paulino iuniore*, obviously a slip by a copyist writing later than 534.

The Martianus *scriptio* is in all other respects set out with no little formality. Felix gives both his names and his titles in full, and he styles the consul Paulinus, after the current archaizing affectation, simply *v(ir) c(larissimus)* rather than *v(ir) in(lustris)*, the higher title to which his rank entitled him.⁷ And he even gives the day and place where he completed his labors. If he had been writing in 534 it would be very surprising if he had omitted the *iunioris*. Nor should we postulate an omission by a later copyist, seeing how faithfully all the other details have been preserved.

We cannot be absolutely certain. There is always the possibility that a man dating a personal rather than a public document in 534 might have been less careful than usual, confident that he himself was not likely to confuse the date with 498. But then he was not likely to forget his full name and titles either. The formality and completeness of the *scriptio* as a whole surely make it virtually certain that Felix was writing in 498 rather than 534.

What then of the objections that have been raised to so early a date? According to Jahn and Marrou (who took the identification of the two Felixes for granted), the Mavortius *scriptio*, which does not style Felix *v. sp. et com. consist.*, must be earlier than the Martianus *scriptio*, which does. Therefore, since the Mavortius *scriptio* is securely dated to 528 (or later), a date as early as 498 for the Martianus *scriptio* would make Felix at least fifty by 528—and at least seventy if he already had twenty years service as a professor behind him by 498.

The three arguments might seem to mesh together neatly enough, but taken by themselves they add up to very little. Even assuming the identification of the two Felixes, an interval of thirty years between the two known stages in a man's career

5. See Alan Cameron, "Junior Consuls," *ZPE* 56 (1984): 159–72. It was on this ground that G. B. De Rossi in passing rejected Jahn's dating of the Martianus *scriptio* (*Inscriptiones Christianae Urbis Romae*, vol. 1 [Rome, 1857], p. 476).

6. All the evidence is collected by R. S. Bagnall, Alan Cameron, S. R. Schwartz, and K. A. Worp, *The Consuls of the Later Roman Empire* (forthcoming).

7. The evidence on this point is assembled by Alan Cameron and Diane Schauer, "The Last Consul: Basilios and his Diptych," *JRS* 72 (1982): 135.

is not in itself problematic. Nor is there any real problem in supposing a man still active in his seventies. Yet the argument about Felix's alleged promotion between the two *subscriptions* on which this last inference rests is far from cogent in any case.

In the first place, the absence of titles in the Mavortius *scriptio* proves nothing. It is Mavortius, not Felix, who is here the *scriptor*. Naturally, therefore, he writes his own name and titles out in full. Felix, his assistant, he gives his professional title *orator urbis Romae* to indicate the authority of the assistance he has received. Felix's *academic* standing was not significantly enhanced by the information that he had been awarded what in Mavortius' eyes must have seemed the altogether insignificant courtesy title of count with the rank of *vir spectabilis*. In the Martianus *scriptio*, on the other hand, it is Felix who is the *scriptor*. Not surprisingly, he records in full the only official titles (perhaps newly awarded) that, as a professor, he was ever likely to win.

There is a nice parallel in two other linked *subscriptions* of the same period. First, one to several books of Priscian's *Institutiones grammaticae*:

Fl. Theodorus Dionysii v(ir) d(e)votus) memorialis sacri scrinii epistularum et adiutor
v(iri) m(agnifici) quaestoris sacri palatii scripsi artem Prisciani eloquentissimi grammatici
doctoris mei manu mea . . .

With this we may compare the following from a copy of Boethius' translation of Aristotle's *Categories*:

contra codicem Renati v(iri) s(pectabilis) correxì qui confectus ab eo est Theodoro
antiquario qui nunc *palatinus* est.

In all probability it is the same Theodorus who is mentioned in connection with these two eastern texts. It is sometimes alleged that he "edited" Priscian,⁸ but Theodorus himself only claims to have written the text (*scripsi*, underlined by *manu mea*). He was therefore a copyist, which is what *antiquarius* means in the usage of the age. *Palatinus* means "palace official" or "bureaucrat," an accurate enough generic description of the titles listed in the Priscian *scriptio*.

As in the case of Felix, when Theodorus himself was the *scriptor*, he proudly listed his very modest titles in full. The second *scriptor* was content to sum them all up in the one word *palatinus*, and that (we may guess) only to distinguish Theodorus from the many other bearers of this (after John) commonest of all Byzantine names. In this case there is certainly no cause to infer promotion between the two *subscriptions*, since *qui nunc palatinus est* reveals the writer (evidently a contemporary) well aware that Theodorus was no longer a free-lance copyist but a full time civil servant.⁹

In the same way and for the same reason, there need be no chronological significance in the two different styles accorded Felix in the two *subscriptions*. It is perfectly possible that the Mavortius *scriptio* is later than the Martianus *scriptio*.

8. E.g., *PLRE* 2:1098 (quoting the sources).

9. He no doubt continued to earn his living as a copyist. We know from *CJ* 12. 19. 10 that the *scrinium memoriae* employed at least four *antiquarii* in the time of the Emperor Leo.

As for the twenty years' service that is supposed to have preceded Felix's promotion, it must be emphasized that this is a condition laid down in a law issued by Theodosius II in Constantinople. Although (like all imperial laws) the law in question (*Cod. Theod.* 6. 21. 1) also carries the name of the western emperor, Valentinian III, it would not have been valid (or even promulgated) in the domains of Valentinian. As A. H. M. Jones put it, "in the ordinary way the courts of one emperor ignored the legislation of his colleague or colleagues."¹⁰ This particular law was one of a series concerned with the reorganization of higher education in Constantinople, where there were evidently problems in attracting qualified professors.¹¹ There may well have been provisions for the rewarding of professors in the West, too, but there would have been no need to specify twenty years' service to attract the best professors to Rome.¹² A man like Felix with connections in the highest ranks of the aristocracy might easily secure much earlier promotion. If recently promoted in 498, perhaps around his thirtieth year, Felix need have been no more than about sixty in 528. That is to say, none of the arguments advanced by Jahn and Marrou outweighs the clear *prima facie* implication of the consular formula in the Martianus *subscriptio*: Felix finished his task at the Porta Capena in Rome on 3 March 498.

There remains one minor detail: the identification of the *scholasticus* Deuterius who helped Felix with his labors on the text of Martianus. Jahn considered but finally rejected the possibility of identification with the grammarian Deuterius mentioned several times by Ennodius during the period 503–6.¹³ 503–6 might seem to suit activity in 498 rather well. Yet it must be conceded that there is a problem. *Discipulus* would normally seem to imply a young man, whereas Ennodius' Deuterius was a balding man with poor eyesight.¹⁴ The possibility of a middle-aged former student assistant should not be entirely excluded, but on balance it is probably prudent to decide in favor of two different Deuterii.

Building on Jahn and Marrou, Préaux has recently given us a vivid sketch of the cultural and political background to Felix's work on the text of Martianus, on the eve (he supposes) of Justinian's invasion of the divided Ostrogothic kingdom in 535. The work of this professor of Rome on the text of an African author is linked to the renewal of cultural relations between Rome and Carthage after Belisarius' destruction of the Vandal kingdom in Africa. And Felix himself is claimed to be the professor to whom the regent Amalasuntha entrusted the education of the new Gothic king, Theoderic's young grandson Athalaric.

10. *Later Roman Empire*, vol. 1 (Oxford, 1964), pp. 472–73; see, too, my discussion in *AJA* 86 (1982): 126–27.

11. See the discussion and bibliography in my study, "The Empress and the Poet," *YCS* 27 (1982): 285–87.

12. Marrou inferred ("La bibliothèque," p. 159 = p. 202) from the Roman inscription *CIL* 6. 9868 = *ILS* 2951, recording the award of some honor to a professor called Magnus on the recommendation of the senate, that the eastern law of 425 was indeed "applied in the West." But the honor is not here specified, there is no mention of 20 years' service, and (since Magnus was already *orator urbis Romae* by 397: cf. *PLRE* 1:535) the inscription probably antedates the eastern law anyway.

13. Marrou was more emphatic in his rejection: "la ressemblance de nom ne suffit pas" ("La bibliothèque," p. 160 = p. 203). But Deuterius is a much less common name than (say) Felix.

14. For the sources, see *PLRE* 2:356–57, or (more fully) R. A. Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1987), part 2, no. 44.

All in vain. Felix did his work on Martianus in 498, not long after Theoderic's establishment of the Ostrogothic kingdom, while the Vandals were still in firm control of Africa. He may well still have been alive thirty years later to help Mavortius with the very Roman poet Horace, but nothing now remains to warrant casting him in the role of cultural middleman between Rome and Africa.

II

The main significance of Felix's activity, once dated correctly, is to provide a secure, earlier terminus for Martianus himself.

Now that it is established that the Vandals did not after all (as once thought) abolish the office of proconsul in Africa¹⁵ (apparently mentioned in *De nupt.* 999, p. 385. 14 Willis), Martianus tends to be dated later and later. Danuta Shanzer has recently descended as late as the 470s.¹⁶ But we now know that it was not in 534 but as early as 498 that Felix was complaining of the corrupt state of all the manuscripts he could lay his hands on. We must surely allow several decades for such deterioration: hardly later than ca. 450.

The writer now generally miscalled Martianus was known in full as Martianus Minneius Felix Capella. He refers to himself twice, once as Felix and once as Felix Capella; Fulgentius calls him Felix Capella.¹⁷ The professor we have been considering in these pages was known in full as Securus Melior Felix. No one seems to have drawn attention to the fact that both author and editor were called Felix. The name is not uncommon, but it is perhaps worth just considering the possibility that the editor was a descendant of the author, spurred on in his labors as much by *pietas* as by scholarship. There is a close contemporary parallel to hand: the well-known *subscriptio* to the commentary on Cicero's *Somnium Scipionis* by Macrobius (in full, Macrobius Ambrosius Theodosius) was signed by Aurelius Memmius Symmachus, cos. 485, and his friend Macrobius Plotinus Eudoxius, a descendant, probably (as a newly found inscription confirms)¹⁸ a grandson, of the author. The *De nuptiis* is addressed to a son called Martianus, presumably the only son of an author who repeatedly refers to himself as an old man. Felix would have to be placed at least one generation later in the family. Even so, we might expect a grandson to have access to an authoritative text, if not the writer's autograph; perhaps yet another generation needs to be intercalated. The hypothesis of kinship between editor and author is only speculation, but if accepted it would seem to place Martianus no later than the first half of the fifth century.

There is only one passage of Martianus that provides a handle for dating, and perhaps there is still something new to be said about it. In the course of a geographical list in Book 6 (637, p. 221. 7–8 W.), Martianus mentions

15. See *PLRE* 2:259, 1274.

16. In her review of W. H. Stahl and R. Johnson, *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts*, vols. 1–2 (New York, 1971–77), in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 104 (1982): 110–11.

17. For the common modern error of calling polyonymous late-antique writers by the first rather than last of their names, see my paper, "Polyonymy in the Late Roman Aristocracy: The Case of Petronius Probus," *JRS* 75 (1985): 164–82.

18. S. Panciera, *Tituli* 4 (1982): 658–60, with discussion and bibliography.

ipsa caput gentium Roma, armis viris sacrisque quamdiu viguit caeliferis laudibus conferenda.

On the most natural interpretation this passage seems to imply that Rome no longer *viguit*: hence the usual inference that Martianus was writing after Alaric's sack of 410. But A. Dick took *viguit* as a true perfect, "so long as Rome has been powerful," arguing for a date *before* 410.¹⁹ Yet why add the ominous qualification *armis viris sacrisque* (see below) if writing before 410? And surely the present tense (*viget*) would have been more natural Latin if this is what Martianus had intended to say.

Nor is this the only modern misinterpretation. Stahl and Johnson translate as follows, taking *quamdiu viguit* absolutely:²⁰

the capital of the nations, Rome herself, as long as she was in her prime, a city to be extolled to the skies for her military prowess, men and religious worship.

But *conferenda* can hardly be taken both with *armis viris sacrisque* and *caeliferis laudibus*. The word-order makes it clear that the correct rendering is:

Rome herself, to be praised to the skies *so long as she excelled in arms, men, and religion*.

Taken thus, it is hard to doubt the allusion to the sack of 410. But too little attention has been paid to the very precise threefold qualification: "so long as Rome excelled in arms, men, and religion." The reference to arms would be straightforward enough: Roman arms failed to protect the city from the invader. So too the reference to *sacra*: as we know from Augustine's *City of God*, pagans protested that it was precisely the abandonment of the old *sacra* that had laid the city open to the Goths. Such an allusion would be perfectly understandable in the *De nuptiis*, a work which Shanzer herself, with some exaggeration, calls "blatantly pagan."²¹

But what of *viris*? At first sight it might seem natural to see here an allusion to the "manpower shortage" that it used to be fashionable to invoke in explanation of the fall of the western Empire.²² But this was not a contemporary explanation, and in any case Martianus is not speaking of anything so grand as the fall of the Empire as a whole. As the context makes clear, he is speaking very precisely of the city of Rome. The juxtaposition of *viris sacrisque* is surely best explained by reference to the drastic depopulation of the city of Rome in the immediate aftermath of the Gothic sack. Many texts document the dispersal of refugees in all directions, in particular to Martianus' home city, Carthage.²³ But before long the refugees began to return. We should not rely too much on Orosius' claim that by his day (417) the population of Rome was back to normal (*Adv. pag.* 7. 40. 1), since it was his avowed purpose to rebut the pagan thesis by minimizing the consequences of the sack of Rome by the Christian (if heretic) Goths. But the

19. In his Teubner edition (Leipzig, 1925), p. xxv.

20. *Martianus Capella*, 1:14; 2:235.

21. *Beiträge*, p. 112.

22. See, e.g., A. E. R. Boak, *Manpower Shortage and the Fall of the Roman Empire in the West* (Ann Arbor, 1955), with the devastating critique of M. I. Finley in *JRS* 48 (1958): 156–64.

23. See P. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire des grands invasions germaniques* (Paris, 1964), pp. 56–67.

De reditu of the pagan Rutilius Namatianus, written in the same year 417, breathes the same spirit of optimism about the recovery of Rome.²⁴ And we do know that as early as 414 the corn allotment had to be increased by (it seems) 14,000 portions over the level set immediately after the sack in 410.²⁵ Documents relating to the distribution of free pork suggest a sharp increase in the number of recipients between 419 and 452.²⁶ This latter increase is probably to be explained, in part at least, by the reversal of the process of emigration after the Vandal conquest of Africa in 439:²⁷ indeed, the influx of African Manichaeans into Rome at this time was soon to prove a thorn in the side of Pope Leo.²⁸ There was also a very considerable amount of ecclesiastical building at Rome throughout the twenties and thirties,²⁹ which implies a substantial growth not only of the construction industry but also of all its supporting trades and service industries.

So Rome on the eve of Odoacer's conquest, Shanzer's date for the writing of the *De nuptiis*, was a relatively prosperous and populous city once more; and above all, an ever more obviously Christian city. It is true that in June 455, entering the city without resistance, Gaiseric and his Vandals once more pillaged it, taking back many captives with them to Carthage. But there was no destruction or loss of life—and no hint that neglect of the old gods was invoked again in explanation. It would hardly have been an appropriate explanation this time. Indeed, we possess a most interesting sermon by Pope Leo which has been generally associated with Gaiseric's sack.³⁰ In it Leo reproaches his congregation for having abandoned the commemoration of Rome's deliverance from the Goths. It was the mercy of God that softened the barbarian's heart, he goes on, not the influence of the stars. That is to say, he is alluding to a *pagan* explanation of the *deliverance* of Rome from the Goths. As time passed and Rome recovered, even pagans switched to the more promising and also more venerable theme of Rome's resilience in the face of disaster. As Rutilius was proclaiming as early as 417 (*De red.* 1. 139–40),

illud te reparat quod cetera regna resolvit;
ordo renascendi est crescere posse malis.

Following their own isolation of *viguit* from its context in Martianus, Stahl and Johnson tried to play down the significance of the passage, on the grounds that "it does not imply that Rome was vigorous right up to the fall."³¹ But Rome had not

24. See J. F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court A.D. 364–425* (Oxford, 1975), p. 327.

25. Olympiodorus frag. 25 (*FHG* 4:62), with A. Chastagnol, *La préfecture urbaine à Rome sous le Bas-Empire* (Paris, 1960), pp. 292–93.

26. See the recent discussion and calculations by R. Hodges and D. Whitehouse, *Mohammed, Charlemagne and the Origins of Europe* (Ithaca, 1983), pp. 48–52.

27. Courcelle, *Histoire littéraire*³, pp. 134–35.

28. See T. Jalland, *The Life and Times of St. Leo the Great* (London, 1941), pp. 43–63.

29. For the details and chronology, see C. Pietri, *Roma Christiana: Recherches sur l'Église de Rome, son organisation, sa politique, son idéologie de Miltiade à Sixte III (311–440)*, vol. 1 (Paris, 1976), pp. 491–573.

30. *PL* 54:433–34; cf. Jalland, *St. Leo the Great*, p. 408.

31. *Martianus Capella*, 1:14.

(of course) been truly “vigorous”—that is to say, effective administrative capital of its Empire—for more than a century even before 410. And not long after 410 men were boasting—not without some justification—of the rapidity and completeness of Rome’s recovery. It is not Rome’s vigor in and of itself that is in question here. The key fact is Martianus’ qualification of *viguit* in precisely these three ways, ways that fit Alaric’s sack to perfection and Gaiseric’s sack not at all.

If I am right about the allusion to the temporary depopulation of Rome, it looks as if Martianus was probably writing only a year or two after 410, and in any case not much later than (say) 415. We may perhaps picture him speaking in person to Roman refugees at Carthage and listening to their tales of the dire consequences of neglect of the old *sacra*.

It has often been observed (correctly enough) that St. Augustine shows no knowledge of the *De nuptiis*, whence it has been inferred (less securely) that Martianus must have been writing after Augustine’s death (430). But while we might well expect Augustine to have glanced at such a treasure house of pagan lore if it had appeared before or while he wrote the anti-pagan books (1–9) of the *City of God* (413–15), it is not particularly likely that he would have bothered after then. An important recent article by J. J. O’Donnell has shown that, though Augustine did much fresh reading in the classics while working on the *City of God*, he did little more thereafter.³²

According to Shanzer, “the *De nuptiis* makes most sense as a late work from the 470s A.D.: it may reflect a revival of interest in pagan philosophy under the influence of the School of Athens and the teaching of Proclus, as well as greater tolerance for theurgy, theosophy and ‘Hellenismos’ in general under Anthemius.”³³ But even if we accept Courcelle’s notion of a “Greek revival” ca. 470, its effect must surely be limited to Gaul.³⁴ Courcelle tried to link this movement in Gaul with “the nomination of Anthemius as emperor in the West”;³⁵ but while it is no doubt significant that Anthemius should promote cultivated Gauls to high office,³⁶ it is difficult to see any connection between his arrival in Italy as late as 467 and the cultural formation of these Gauls several decades earlier. Not even Courcelle could find any trace of a similar Greek revival in Italy itself during Anthemius’ brief reign, and it is surely incredible that he should have exercised any influence in Vandal Africa. Nor does there seem much likelihood of contact between Vandal Africa and either the school of Proclus in Athens or the circle of Sidonius in Gaul. It is worth recalling that Courcelle himself placed Martianus in the age of Augustine, arguing (surely correctly) that Africa was “suddenly cut off from Rome and Constantinople” by the Vandal conquest.³⁷ It only remains to add that a date as late as the 470s for the composition of the *De nuptiis* is virtually impossible to reconcile with the gross deterioration of the text complained of by Felix in (as we now know) 498.

32. “Augustine’s Classical Readings,” *RecAug* 15 (1980): 144–75.

33. *Beiträge*, p. 111.

34. *Late Latin Writers and their Greek Sources* (Cambridge, Mass., 1969), pp. 236–62.

35. *Ibid.*, p. 261.

36. *Ibid.*, p. 262.

37. *Ibid.*, p. 219.

If these arguments have any validity, then the *De nuptiis* makes most sense in the second or third decade of the fifth century, the age of Rutilius Namatianus, Servius, and Macrobius.³⁸

ALAN CAMERON
Columbia University

38. The fact that Martianus knew Iamblichus while Augustine did not hardly proves that "a text of Iamblichus had found its way to North Africa" after Augustine's lifetime (Shanzer, *Beiträge*, p. 111). If Martianus had a copy of his own, why should Augustine have known—or cared? The best parallel for an African writer of this period with a wide education in the Neoplatonists is (of course) Macrobius, now generally dated to the early fifth century (see n. 18, above).

I am grateful to M. T. Davis, D. Shanzer, and the Editor for commenting on a draft of this paper.

A NOTE ON *DE CONSOLATIONE PHILOSOPHIAE*

In Book 4, prose 6 of *De consolazione philosophiae*, Lady Philosophy discusses the difference between *providentia* and *fatum*: the latter is the temporal unfolding of events as seen by men, while the former is this same temporal sequence as perceived instantaneously by the divine mind. This distinction between the temporal, earthly sequence and the unified, divine moment is central to Lady Philosophy's argument, as her illustrative example indicates; the relationship between *providentia* and *fatum* is like that between a craftsman's initial, instantaneous conception of what he will make and the chronological sequence through which he produces the object:

sicut enim artifex faciendae rei formam mente praecipiens mouet operis effectum et quod simpliciter praesentarietque prospexerat per temporales ordines ducit, ita deus prouidentia quidem singulariter stabiliterque facienda disponit, fato uero haec ipsa quae disposuit multipliciter ac temporaliter amministrat.¹

This stress on the sequential quality of *fatum* is already apparent when Lady Philosophy uses the word *generatio* to begin the discussion of *fatum* and *providentia* (4p6. 18–21):

omnium generatio rerum cunctusque mutabilium naturarum progressus et quicquid aliquo mouetur modo causas, ordinem, formas ex diuinae mentis stabilitate sortitur.

She then continues: "haec [i.e., mens diuina] in suae simplicitatis arce composita multiplicem rebus gerendis modum statuit" (4p6. 21–23). A good deal of manuscript variation surrounds *rebus gerendis*; some manuscripts omit *rebus*, while others have, in place of *gerendis*, *gerendi*, *regendis*, and *regerendis*.² Weinberger, as well as Bieler, reads *rebus gerendis*, Stewart reads *rebus regendis*, and Peiper emends to *regendi*. One manuscript of the early fifteenth century, Cambridge

1. L. Bieler, ed., *Philosophiae Consolatio*, CCSL 94 (Turnhout, 1957), 4p6. 39–44. All quotations from the *Consolatio* are from this edition.

2. See the variants in Bieler, p. 79.