

KATARINA PETROVIĆOVÁ

## MARTIANUS CAPELLA'S INTERPRETATION OF JUNO

**Summary:** The goddess Juno is traditionally represented as a very powerful entity in Roman literature, caring for stable human relationships, especially between men and women; and, at the same time, she is often depicted as a jealous, furious, even a vengeful goddess. The aim of the paper is to illustrate how Martianus Capella depicts the goddess Juno, to what extent his portrait conforms to the literary tradition, in what points and for what reasons he differs from it when compared with other authors across particular genres and gods.

**Key words:** Martianus Capella, the goddess Juno, mythological (*Pronuba*) versus cosmological (*aer*) interpretation, literary tradition and inspiration

Everyone would agree that the literary world is to some extent also a world where one escapes the everyday reality, it is a world of fantasy which, in fact, often denies reality, a world enabling the characters to demonstrate the power which would normally be destructive in the ordinary life. This applies to the literary life of the goddess Juno, too. She is revengeful, jealous, up to the point of mercilessness, harshly persecuting her husband's affairs as well as his victims. However, Martianus Capella's depiction of the goddess in his *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* is completely different from the aforesaid image, while, at the same time, it remains multifarious and open to a multitude of interpretations. This is certainly no surprise for all those who are, at least marginally, acquainted with Martianus' literary work, which is, indeed, one of the most disputable and questionable works of Late Roman literature. The reason why any simple interpretation seems difficult is related to the unusual form of *De nuptiis*. On the one hand, it is an encyclopaedic work presenting *septem artes liberales*; on the other, it is a fairy-tale story about the quest for a suitable bride for the God Mercury and finding of the learned but mortal Philology, as well as a narrative about the bride's journey towards immortality and to the wedding feasts. Regarding the formal aspect of

the work, accurate descriptions are combined with modes of allegory and satire. Such satirical and novelistic features, including copious and more or less obvious intertextual ties, have provided for several (and even disparate) interpretations of *De nuptiis*.<sup>1</sup>

For the purpose of this paper, let me suggest that neither satire, nor novelistic features, nor mysterious allegories can be the central issue which seems to convey the final unity and sense of Martianus' work; what is central are rather Martianus' educational aims. These aims range beyond entertainment, humour, adventure, even beyond an insight into the secrets of a cult, and lead Martianus infallibly to the introduction of the entire ancient knowledge, both divine and human (probably following the footsteps of Varro's lost work about human and divine antiquities and his other compendium-like publications), climaxing in the maidens represented by liberal arts. Thus, the aim of this paper is to illustrate the assertion presented above exclusively in terms of the depiction of goddess Juno. In other words, I am persuaded that Martianus' picture of Juno is fully correspondent with his general aims; therefore, it surpasses the traditional literary image of Juno.

Before I describe and comment on occurrences of Juno in the text, let me briefly introduce the plot of *De nuptiis*.

The narration is framed as a father's story, told by personified Satire and retold to his son Martianus. In this story, Mercury, the last old bachelor god and a handsome man of athletic shape, decides to marry after all, both under the influence of the happily married couples among gods and his mother's pressure deriding his half-naked promenading in heaven in front of Venus; besides, his mother worries that the two could conceive another Hermaphroditus. Mercury ponders on Sophia, Mantike or Psyche, but none of them is accessible to him. Virtue suggests that he should ask his brother Apollo for help. He recommends the most appropriate bride straight away, a most learned virgin named Philology. As soon as his father Jupiter agrees (persuaded by Juno), the assembly of gods is summoned to deliver the final decision. General agreement initiates wedding preparations, while Juno becomes their administrator.

Philology feels honoured but, at the same time, scared; therefore, she first tries to find out the arithmetic appropriateness of her marriage and prepares a protective treatment against the effects of the heavenly blaze on her mortal body. Her maidens, Periergia and Agrypnia, together with her mother Phronesis, prepare her for the wedding suite. However, before being able to ascend to heaven, she must overcome the last obstacle, she must get rid of her mundane knowledge, and thus she vomits a huge amount of books, which are counted and sacrificed by Apotheosis and then sorted out by Arts. After that, she is prepared to drink the cup of immortality and undergo a tiring journey to the gods. In heaven, she meets Juno who shows her the hierarchy of celestial spheres, including the highest point of heaven. Finally, Philology descends to Galaxy and there, she and Mercury get married.

<sup>1</sup> My intention is not to discuss these interpretations thoroughly in the paper; for a brief summary, see PETROVIČOVÁ 2010b, 123; for an even more detailed analysis, see PETROVIČOVÁ 2010a. I also strongly recommend the exhaustive and well-arranged analysis of GERTH 2013, 120–141.

Herewith, the author himself closes Book Two and the first part of his work. He wants to continue in a more serious manner and to present Mercury's dowry, seven beautiful maidens, i.e. seven liberal arts in a bald exposition. In a vivid confrontation (which repeats itself later in Books Six, Eight and Nine<sup>2</sup>), Satire persuades the author to focus not only on the didactic, but also on the entertaining side of the text.<sup>3</sup> Thereafter, the particular Arts (Grammar, Dialectic, Rhetoric; Geometry, Arithmetic, Astronomy and Harmony) perform in a clear hierarchy respected by gods, too, from the lowest to the most exquisite, and introduce their knowledge. The last one, Harmony, provides for the right atmosphere to finish the wedding feast and accompany the young couple to the conjugal bed. At the end, the authorial seal sums up, though, also questions the whole work.

Before analyzing the issue, I would like to remark that I omit all places where the term Juno is involved as a grammatical category (3. 237; 3. 292<sup>4</sup>), as a rhetorical example of a stylistic vice (5. 514<sup>5</sup>), as a geographic name (6. 702<sup>6</sup>), or as an arithmological calculation (7. 732<sup>7</sup>).

I also set aside the places where the name Juno is used in a metaphorical sense and does not refer to the goddess Juno herself. For example, in the famous catalogue of the sixteen celestial spheres in Book One, the term Juno is used twice as a metaphor for "wife" (in 1. 54 for the wife of Neptunus; in 1. 58 for the wife of Saturnus<sup>8</sup>). In another

<sup>2</sup> Mart. Cap. 6. 576–579; 8. 806–809; 9. 997–1000.

<sup>3</sup> Mart. Cap. 2. 219 – 3. 222. Martianus calls her Camena; however, she is mostly identified with Satire: see RELIHAN 1987, 60; 1993, 138; PABST 1994, 119; GREBE 1999, 853; and DÖPP 2009, 213. For a contrary opinion, see e.g. LEMOINE 1972, 115, and BOVEY 2003, 23. The content of Camena's utterance as well as the phrases she uses refer to Martianus' other debates with Satire; moreover, there is another "satiric" intertext which cannot be overlooked. The reference to Camena's mimic, namely that she laughs in her sleeve, *iocante rictu*, is a literary bond to Horace's programmatic satire (Hor. *Sat.* 1. 10. 7). Thus, it unequivocally conveys the satiric context, notwithstanding the fact that Horace's satire is written in verse, i.e. in a different genre. What is of importance here is that both contain the typical features Horace himself names: interchange of seriousness and humour which makes bitter issues sweeter.

<sup>4</sup> Mart. Cap. 3. 237: *finit* (i.e. *o littera*) ... *nomina* ... *feminina*, ut Iuno... 3. 292: *o littera nullum nomen in neutro finit; nam aut masculina sunt... aut feminina*, ut Iuno, hirundo...

<sup>5</sup> Mart. Cap. 5. 514: *Iam compositionis praecepta percurram, cui vitium maximum est hiulcas... iotacismos... non vitare... iotacismus* (i.e. *est*), *ut si dicas: ,Iunio Iuno Iovis iure irascitur'*.

<sup>6</sup> Mart. Cap. 6. 702: *Fortunatas autem insulas in laeva Mauretaniae constitutas inter meridiem occasumque non dubium est; quarum ... secunda Iunonia* (i.e. *dicitur*)...

<sup>7</sup> Mart. Cap. 7. 732: ... *dyas, quod sit prima procreatio, a nonnullis genesis dicta. Quod autem inter eam ac monadem prima coniunctio est consortiumque consimile, Iuno perhibetur, vel coniunx vel germana praecedentis* (i.e. *monadis / Iovis*).

<sup>8</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 53: *Iunonis vero Hospitae Genius accitus ex nona* (i.e. *regione caeli*). 1. 58: *bis septena* (i.e. *ex bis septena regione*) *Saturnus eiusque caelestis Iuno consequenter acciti*. Both identifications were proposed by WEINSTOCK 1946, 105 and 107, and especially his note on 127. SHANZER 1986, 138 does not comment on this part of Book One herself, she only refers to the analysis of Weinstock. CAPDEVILLE 1996, 290, n. 147 questions Weinstock's identification of Juno in 1. 53 as a wife of Neptune, although in 1. 58 he accepts the interpretation of Juno as a wife (CAPDEVILLE 1996, 291).

catalogue in Book Two, it is used quite commonly as a female equivalent of Genius: here, as a Juno of Philology (2. 168<sup>9</sup>).

All such “false Junos” having been eliminated, it can be assumed that the goddess Juno occurs in about ten different contexts in *De nuptiis*.

The first reference to Juno (1. 3<sup>10</sup>) is a bit parodic – Martianus pictures Juno subtly as a decisive woman to explain why and how Mercury came to the idea of getting married. Juno is put aside here, the description focuses on an unconditional and, perhaps a little blind, love of Jupiter to his wife; however, right after, Juno is given a very important label of a matron (*matrona*) and a convincing wife (*uxorium propositum*), which was the most valued virtue in women among Romans.<sup>11</sup>

Also the second note (1. 7<sup>12</sup>) is very brief and applies to Psyche, not Philology. However, it introduces the nuptial characteristics of Juno as a power bonding the couples, especially the future divine couple of Philology and Mercury. This is clear from the repeating of the word *vinculum* or *vinculum* in the sense of a long-term relationship, or marriage, which is constantly emphasized by Martianus in his work.<sup>13</sup>

The third reference (1. 17<sup>14</sup>) is a brief example of another traditional figuring of Juno. Here, Juno represents the cosmological principle of air, once again almost as if incidentally, in a playful picture of Apollo taking the seeds out from four little boxes (i.e. the four well-known cosmological principles) and pouring them on earth.

Although all the aforementioned references to Juno seem to be quite redundant, they somehow prefigure the two main perspectives of depicting the goddess Juno in *De nuptiis*. First, as an anthropomorphised being, a mighty goddess, both leading and serving; second, as a physical allegory of an essential cosmological part and principle, the so-called classical element (στουχείον or *elementum*). From the narrative point of view, they smoothly prepare the reader for the three roles of Juno in the upcoming pas-

<sup>9</sup> Mart. Cap. 2. 168: *Inter priores igitur Genius tua adhuc mortalis virginis diva consistet. Nam ec-cam tibi aetheria Juno seu Vesta est.* This is documented in several literary pieces of evidence, see e.g. Tibull. (pseudo) 4. 6. 1; Plin. *NH* 2. 16; Sen. *Epist.* 110. 1; Lact. Pl. *Stat. Theb.* 3. 689 (for the comprehensive overview of the cult of Genius and Juno, see IHM 1890–1897, col. 615 ff., s.v. “Iunones I [Frauengeni]”).

<sup>10</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 3: ... *cum quid Iuppiter hominum votis trepida curarum ambage suspensis multa implacabilis hostia denegaret, exorata eius matrona provenire* (the construction of Acc+I: add the subject: *id provenire*), *et quicquid ille exprompta sententia, Parcarum pugillo asservante, dictaverit, delentum suadae coniugis amplexibus iussuque remove; nec solum superum regem attestabatur uxorium ...propositum...*

<sup>11</sup> TOMASSI 2012, 89f. points out the Roman context of this first significant remark on the epithets of divine couple.

<sup>12</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 7: *Voluit* (i.e. *Mercurius*) *saltem Entelechia ac Solis filiam postulare, quod speciosa quam maxime magnaue deorum sit educata cura; nam ipsi Ψυχῆ natali die dii ad convivium corrogati multa, contulerant, Iuppiter quippe diadema ...capiti eius apposuit. Iuno quoque ex purgatoris auri splendente vena addiderat crinibus* (i.e. *Psychae*) *sociale vinculum.*

<sup>13</sup> See Mart. Cap. 1. 1 (*arcana vincla*); 1. 33 (*perpes vinculum*); 1. 37 (*vinculum*); 1. 40 (*vincla*); 7. 732 (*vinculum*); 9. 912 (*perpes vinculum*). Half of the occurrences mentioned above point to a direct relation between the firmness and stability of marriage and the exertion of the goddess Juno.

<sup>14</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 17: ... *Singulae* (i.e. *urnulae*) *autem rerum quaedam semina elementaque gestabant. ... At vero sali resplendentis atque ad ipsius dei* (i.e. *Apollinis*) *dexteram sita* (i.e. *urnula*), *aeris totius seminibus erat referta; hanc Iunonis ubera memorabant.*

sages, in which the goddess becomes crucial, as *Pronuba* and *uxor* (these two roles are interconnected, so I will treat them side-by-side in my paper), as well as *aer*.

The first situation of a particular importance occurs when Apollo wants to speak with Jupiter for the sake of his brother and wants to ask him for Philosophy's hand (1. 30–39). As soon as Apollo sees that Jupiter is accompanied by Juno (*vidit... consortio patrem Iunonis haerentem*), he feels a great hope for success, because Juno holds the will of her husband (*in cuius arbitrio positam mariti noverat voluntatem*).<sup>15</sup> Thus, he addresses his speech much more to Juno than to Jupiter.<sup>16</sup> After the speech, Jupiter asks for Juno's opinion<sup>17</sup> and lets her repel all his doubts about the bad influence of the "honeymoon" on Mercury's duties.<sup>18</sup>

Here, we can clearly see what Martianus expects from Juno as a literary figure. She does not only favour the wedding but also secures that Jupiter is well-disposed towards it. The strength of Juno's nuptial power is expressed both via the large amount of terms referring to deep and firm relationship: *foedus*, *iugata consortia*, *nexio*, *thalami* (twice), *conubium* (twice), *nuptiae*, *perpes vinclum*,<sup>19</sup> and by addressing Juno as *futura Pronuba*. She is not only the one who bonds the others but she also serves as an exemplary wife. She constantly stands by her husband and is very close to him, so that he can rely on her.<sup>20</sup> Apparently, Jupiter does rely on Juno even more than would be expected: his decision is based on her will (*conversus ad coniugem Iuppiter, quid eius voluntas haberet, inquiri*).

<sup>15</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 30: ... *qui postquam ingressi et coram data copia fandi, ut vidit Clarius consortio patrem Iunonis haerentem, quam noverat suffragari plurimum ac favere conubiis, laetus primo omine ipsamque concilians, in cuius arbitrio positam mariti noverat voluntatem, ita mitis affatur: ...*

<sup>16</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 30: *laetus primo omine ipsamque concilians ... ita mitis affatur... 1. 31: "Iunone thalamos quis rogare conscia / nollet deorum, cum futura Pronuba / eadem profecto quaeque suffragabitur? / iugalis ergo blanda nutus praestruere / nostrisque suade quo allubescat nisibus. / ... ..."* Apollo focuses on Jupiter only in the second part of his utterance.

<sup>17</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 34: *Hic postquam Delius conquivit, conversus ad coniugem Iuppiter, quid eius voluntas haberet, inquiri. verum illa multa ratione permulsa ... .faciendum profecto accelerandumque persuadet, ...*

<sup>18</sup> Juno builds her argumentation on the list of Philology's virtues which culminates in her statement that Philology is going to guarantee that Mercurius never gets lazy (see especially note 36 of this paper).

<sup>19</sup> Martianus employs many expressive words to intensify the nuptial atmosphere of the passages connected with Juno and marriage and his wordplay goes even further. He almost always puts several of them side-by-side to emphasize the fact: nouns: *amor* (1. 1, 3, 5: *alternis amoribus*; 1. 36: *amore torreri*; *amore mutuo colligatos*; 7. 725: *optati... amoris*; 9. 903 etc.), *fides* (1. 1), *affectio* (1. 5; 1. 36), *complexus* (1. 1; 1. 3; 9. 903), *amplexus* (1. 3), *fotus* (1. 35); verbs as: *annuere* (1. 1), *conciliare* (1. 1; 1. 30), *complacere* (1. 1; 1. 36; 7. 725), *componere* 1. 1), *consonare* (1. 3), *fovere* (1. 1), *ligare* (1. 1; 9. 917), *permulcere* (1. 3; 1. 34; 9. 913, 920), *placere* (1. 1; 1. 36; 9. 902), *probare* (1. 1; 9. 915), *sociare* (1. 1; 9. 902); or adjectives: *suaviloquus* (1. 3), *dulcis* (1. 3; 9. 902), *decens* (1. 1; 9. 903).

<sup>20</sup> As we can see first in 1. 30 (*vidit Clarius consortio patrem Iunonis haerentem*), and later on in 1. 39; 2. 209; or 9. 902. The physical closeness of Juno and Jupiter demonstrates the ideal harmony of their physical and mental relationship, albeit spiced with the subtly comical use of female persuasive strategies (see further). They perform together and decide together, they are an ideal couple which finally functions to free the bride from the fear of marriage (here, we are reminded of the fact that the reigning divine couple are siblings, and that there is also something "sweeter than that among them", see 9. 902: ... *ne thalamus metuas; eris hoc, quod Iuno Tonanti est, quae nunc sorore dulcior*).

Correspondingly, at the end of Book One, Juno determines the date and the place of the wedding ceremony (1. 97<sup>21</sup>), and in Book Two, she receives Philology in her home, leading and accompanying her throughout the whole universe to the Galactic palace (2. 147–208<sup>22</sup>) where the wedding is supposed to take place. In the second part of *De nuptiis*, during the presentations of arts, it is Juno who is responsible for the worthy course of the celebration and has to react to the complaints of Voluptas, the one of Venus' suite, and Venus herself (6. 705; 9. 888<sup>23</sup>). Finally, she is addressed by Hymen to help Philology throw away her shame and confirm the marriage in the conjugal bed (9. 903<sup>24</sup>).

These have been the depictions of Juno as the goddess of wedding and marriage. Now, it is necessary to compare Martianus' literary picture with the traditional view presented in other genres, especially those connected with the genre of *De nuptiis*.

First, I would like to mention the epic, though it is not the direct referential genre. If we look at the most important epos of Roman literature, Vergil's *Aeneis*, we find that Juno is pictured as a furious goddess.<sup>25</sup> Juno remains unsatisfied, even though Aeneas lost his home, wife, father, and, eventually, also his love. She only stops intriguing upon him because she is, even if unwillingly and resentfully, obedient to her husband.<sup>26</sup> The only one being reasonable in Aeneid is always Jupiter, never Juno.<sup>27</sup> Martianus does not follow epic narratives directly (although we may presume it was of a great importance to him), his inspiration reaches far beyond, all the way to Menippean satire and novel (these are the genres Martianus himself admits to be inspired by<sup>28</sup>), both of

<sup>21</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 97: *Tunc Juno condicit propter praedictorum thalamum iuvenum et nuptialia peragenda, uti postridie omnis ille deorum senatus in palatia, quae in Galaxia Iovis arbitri habitationem potissimam faciunt, diluculo convenirent.*

<sup>22</sup> See especially Mart. Cap. 2. 149f.: *Et ecce advenire subito deorum pronuba nuntiatur (to Philology), ante quam Concordia, Fides Pudicitiaque praecurrunt... Hic Juno conscendentis precibus non repugnans eam secum in arces ducit aeras atque exhinc multarum diversitates edocet potestatum.*

<sup>23</sup> She is clearly called *Pronuba* in both situations, with the focus on her dignity; see Juno's witty, yet decisive reaction in 7. 705 (*Verum Pronuba propter assidens "nihil mirum" inquit, "si propere Venus cum deliciis famulatioque tam comi appulsa est lascivire; nam et nuptialiter laeta est et blanda semper arridente Cyllenio"*); see also Venus' unexpectedly solemn and official diction in 9. 888 (*"Pronuba, si volupe est haec seria carpere, Iuno, nec cura astriferi te stimulat thalami, ast ego succubui, lepidisque assueta choreis non valeo tristes cernere Cecropidas."*).

<sup>24</sup> Mart. Cap. 9. 903: *"Flammea virgineum quae obnubere sueta pudorem regina deme Pronuba."*

<sup>25</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 1. 3f.: *iactatus... saevae memorem Iunonis ob iram; 1. 36, 42f.: ... Iuno, aeternum servans sub pectore vulnus... Iovis rapidum iaculata e nubibus ignem, disiecitque rates evertitque aequora...* (Juno in her wrath appeals to the fact that she is Jupiter's sister as well as his wife, *soror et coniunx*: cf. Martianus' idealization in 9. 902: note 20 in this paper). The unjust wrath is typical of Juno in the whole *Aeneis* (see 1. 130, 279f., 662, 668; 2. 612; 5. 608; 5. 781; 7. 287; 8. 292; 10. 62 f.).

<sup>26</sup> Verg. *Aen.* 12. 793–842. Jupiter begins his plead to Juno with a series of emotional questions: *"Qua iam finis erit? Quid denique restat? ... Quid struis...?"* Then, he asks Juno to stop her persecution: *"Desine iam tandem precibusque inflectere nostris... ulterius temptare (i.e. Troianos) veto."* Juno agrees only after she enforces another condition upon Jupiter. However, it is disputable whether her consent means a real reconciliation, or it is just a temporal ceasefire; see e.g. FEENEY 1984, 179–194. Cf. also TOMASSI 2012, 88 who considers the reconciliation to be real and sees the idyllic relationship of the two as a Roman deployment of Greek mythology.

<sup>27</sup> See esp. Verg. *Aen.* 1. 254–300; 10. 104–113; 10. 622–627; 12. 830–840.

<sup>28</sup> Martianus refers to the genre of Menippean satire by using *Satire* as a reader's guide throughout the story (Mart. Cap. 1. 2) as well as by applying its many typical features (see n. 33); as to novel, esp. the

which build on the epic art of depiction, combining it with adventurous, comical and/or ironical elements.

In *Menippea*, Juno is depicted as extremely jealous, always complaining about Jupiter's escapades, harmful and punishing, even as the murderer of Jupiter's lovers and children. Jupiter does not take her seriously and often ridicules her for her feminine behaviour. Let me sum up just a few illustrative examples of this from Lucian of Samosata.<sup>29</sup> In *Tragic Zeus*, Hera fiercely presumes that the only reason why Zeus could be so tragically sad, is another possible mistress (§2<sup>30</sup>), and, in the same breath, she proclaims that she does not mind Zeus' mistresses anymore, because she is already used to his affairs (however, she does so very unconvincingly; thus, it is clear that she is worried about the fact). Zeus answers that his problems are much more important this time than such insignificant affairs (ὦ μακαρία, ἥτις ἐν ἔρωτι καὶ ταῖς τοιαύταις παιδιαῖς οἶει τὰ πράγματατήμιν εἶναι.). In *Dialogues of the Gods*, the topic of Juno's jealousy is one of the most common. In *Dialogue of Hermes and Zeus* (*Dial. Deor.* 3), Zeus asks Hermes to solve the situation caused by Hera, i.e. her change of a girl named Io into the heifer and imprisoning her under the control of many eyed Argus Panoptes (this is exactly the Lucian's version of the myth<sup>31</sup>). Hermes is supposed to go and pick up Io, to bring her to Egypt, and make Isis of her. In *Dialogue of Poseidon and Hermes* (*Dial. Deor.* 9), Hera is described as the one who killed Semele because she wanted to hinder her from giving birth to Zeus' child, i.e. the little Dionysos.<sup>32</sup> In *Dialogue of Hera and Leto* (*Dial. Deor.* 16), Hera hatefully characterizes Leto's one child, Diana, as a wild masculinist (ἡ μὲν αὐτῶν ἀρρενικητέρα τοῦ μετρίου καὶ ὄρειος) and another, Apollo, as a pretended thinker (ὁ δὲ Ἀπόλλων προσποιεῖται μὲν πάντα εἰδέναι).

---

one of Apuleius, he owes to *Metamorphoses* in his expression of plot's linkup (Mart. Cap. 1. 7 builds on the story of Amor and Psyche: *Met.* 4. 28 – 6. 24 which, more generally, also serves as a background of Martianus' main plot of searching, wandering, and wedding), and in verbal allusions (e.g. Mart. Cap. 2. 100 versus Apul. *Met.* 1. 1; Mart. Cap. 2. 110 versus Apul. *Met.* 2. 5; Mart. Cap. 9. 997 versus Apul. *Met.* 4. 27).

<sup>29</sup> *De nuptiis* cannot, however, be compared with the only Latin Menippean satire, the *Apocolocyntosis* by Seneca, as Juno does not perform in this at all. Juno is mentioned only once (Sen. *Apocol.* 8) as a metaphor for woman (i.e. like in Martianus 1. 53 and 58, see also n. 8).

<sup>30</sup> Lukian. *Iupp. Trag.* 2: οἶδα τὸ κεφάλαιον αὐτὸ ὃν πάσχεις ὅτι ἐρωτικὸν ἐστὶν οὐ μὴν κωκυῶ γε ὑπὸ ἔθους, ἥδη πολλάκις ὑβρισθεῖσα ὑπὸ σοῦ τὰ τοιαῦτα. εἰκὸς γοῦν ἢ τοι Δανάην τινὰ ἢ Σεμέλην ἢ Εὐρώπην αὐθις εὐρόντα σε ἀνιάσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔρωτος, εἴτα βουλευέσθαι ταῦρον ἢ σάτυρον ἢ χρυσὸν γενόμενον ῥυῆναι διὰ τοῦ ὀρόφου εἰς τὸν κόλπον τῆς ἀγαπωμένης: τὰ σημεῖα γὰρ ταῦτα, οἱ στεναγμοὶ καὶ τὰ δάκρυα καὶ τὸ ὠχρὸν εἶναι, οὐκ ἄλλου τοῦ ἢ ἐρωτός ἐστιν.

<sup>31</sup> Lukian. *Dial. Deor.* 3: ζηλοτυπήσασα ἡ Ἥρα μετέβαλεν αὐτήν. ἀλλὰ καὶ καινὸν ἄλλο τι δεινὸν ἐπιμεμηγάνηται τῇ κακοδαίμονι: βουκόλον τινὰ πολυόμματον Ἄργον τοῦνομα ἐπέστησεν, ὃς νέμει τὴν δάμαλιν ἄυπνος ὄν. Hermes, i.e. Mercurius, does not definitely act as Hera's foster-child (protégé) or her nursing here.

<sup>32</sup> Lukian. *Dial. Deor.* 9: ... τὴν μὲν γὰρ Σεμέλην ὑπελθοῦσα ἡ Ἥρα – οἶσθα ὡς ζηλότυπὸς ἐστὶ – πείθει αἰτήσαι παρὰ τοῦ Διὸς μετὰ βροντῶν καὶ ἀστραπῶν ἡκειν παρ' αὐτήν: ὡς δὲ ἐπέστηκαὶ ἤμεν ἔγον καὶ τὸν κεραυνόν, ἀνεφλέγη ὁ ὄροφος, καὶ ἡ Σεμέλη μὲν διαφθείρεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρός, ἐμὲ δὲ κελεύει ἀνατεμόντα τὴν γαστέρα τῆς γυναικὸς ἀνακομίσει ἀτελεῖς ἔτι αὐτῷ τὸ ἔμβρυον ἐπάμηνον...

Martianus seems to employ particular satirical elements, too.<sup>33</sup> Juno uses women's weapons when talking to Jupiter, whispering to him intimately (*Juno affixa, ut adhaerebat elatiori plurimum Iovi, acclinatis eius auribus intimaret*<sup>34</sup>), sometimes she also seems to practice the method of "sugar and scourge" (Zucker und Peitche, see e.g. 1. 3: n. 10), while Jupiter meets her expectations and follows her will. The main Juno's motivation for the wedding of Mercury and Philology seems to be both the fear of another Hermaphroditus, if Mercury remains unmarried (1. 34<sup>35</sup>), and the persuasion that Mercury needs a strenuous wife because he needs to be controlled (1. 37f.<sup>36</sup>). Later, in Book Six, she jokes with Venus neatly in the same fashion, recalling her affair with Mercury (6. 705: *nam et nuptialiter laeta est et blanda semper arridente Cyllenio*). But, in spite of the irony there, the whole picture is quite different. Juno is really caring for the union (*suffragari plurimum ac favere conubiis*: 1. 30), offering her service to the young couple (*nuptiis... non solita refragari*: 1. 34), even patronizing Philology. She leads her to gods and explains to her every piece of knowledge important for her future life in heaven. Finally, and most strikingly, she forgives Jupiter his affairs and plays the role of a loving stepmother to her stepchild Mercury, even breeding him (*Cyllenium diligebat, quod uberibus educatus poculum immortalitatis exhauserat*: 1. 33). This is a picture of Juno fundamentally different from the one depicted in the abovementioned references of Lucian (cf. note 31), as well as in another source, namely Hyginus, who drew on the traditional interpretation of Juno's myth even more explicitly.<sup>37</sup>

<sup>33</sup> Although this paper analyzes only the depictions of the goddess Juno, there are certainly several other parallels revealing the imitation of genre or, conversely, the self-determination from it. To name just the most significant ones: prosimetry converted into a joke (e.g. Sen. *Apocol.* 5. 4; Petron. 55. 3, 6, 68, 89, 119–124; Lucian. *Symp.* 17. 9 ff.; cf. Mart. Cap. 2. 221; 6. 704; 7. 725; 8. 804f.; 9. 888); journey to heaven (Lucian. *Icar.*; Sen. *Apocol.* cf. Mart. Cap. 1. 9–16; 2. 143–209; 6. 588–703; but 1. 94); assembly of gods (Lucian. *Deor. Cons., Iupp. Trag., Icar.*; cf. Mart. Cap. 1. 41–62, 1. 70–89); post-mortal fate (Lucian. *Necyom., dial. mort.* cf. Mart. Cap. 2. 212); parody, also on philosophers (Lucian *Lex.* 21; cf. Mart. Cap. 2. 135f.; Lucian *Symp., Vit. auct.*; cf. Mart. Cap. 2. 142; 2. 172; 6. 578; and all the comments on Satire: 2. 221f.; 6. 576; 8. 806 ff.; 9. 999 f.).

<sup>34</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 39. Thus, Juno charmingly secures that Jupiter consents to her arguments explaining why Philology is the right choice for Mercury, similar to the situation in Verg. *Aen.* 71–75, when she persuades Aeolus to attack Aeneas in exchange for a beautiful wife. However, there is a significant difference between the two: Martianus' Juno is much more rational and her arguments are persuasive *per se*, while Vergil's Juno bases her request entirely on her hostility (*gens inimica mihi*: v. 67).

<sup>35</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 34: ... *faciendum profecto accelerandumque persuadet, ne itidem Cyllenius Cyp-ridis lactatus illecebris Hermaphrodito fratrem gignere succensus optaret.*

<sup>36</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 37 f.: *Tunc Iuno "atquin" ait "eiusdem convenit virginis (ie. Philologiae) subire vinclum, quae illum etiam quiescere cupientem convivere non perferat. An vero quisquam est, qui Philologiae se asserat pervigilia laborata et lubricationum perennium nescire pallorem? Quae autem noctibus universis caelum, freta Tartarumque discutere ac deorum omnium sedes curiosae indagis perscrutatione transire, quae textum mundi circulatorumque volumina vel orbiculata parallela vel obliqua, decusata, polos, climata axiumque vertigines cum ipsorum puto siderum multitudine numerare, nisi haec Philologia, gracilitate quadam affixione consuevit? Quotiens deos super eiusdem coactione instantiae conquestos, cum eos concubiae aut intempestae noctis silentio quiescentes ad se venire inaudita quadam obscuratione compelleret. Tam vero abest ut sub hac possit pigrescere intricarique Cyllenius, ut commotis ab eadem suscitatisque pinnis extramundanas petere latitudines urgeatur."*

<sup>37</sup> Hyg. *Astr.* 2. 43: *Eratosthenes enim dicit Mercurio infanti puero insciam Iunonem dedisse lacta; sed postquam rescierit eum Maiaie filium esse, reiecisit eum ab se.*



The comparison to Apuleius and his novel *Metamorphoses*, another highly important source, gives very similar results. Here – in the inserted fairy-tale about Amor and Psyche, crucial not only for interpretation of the whole Apuleius' novel, but for the narrative frame of Martianus' work, too (cf. n. 28) – Juno, like Ceres, is rather passive and does not try to help Psyche (Apul. *Met.* 6. 4<sup>38</sup>), even though Psyche herself addresses her as the goddess *Lucina* and *Sospita* and Juno knows about Psyche's pregnancy. This is because Venus jealously decided to punish Psyche for her beauty, as well as the fact that her son Amor fell in love with her.<sup>39</sup> Juno does not try to oppose Venus, as if she would not be the most important goddess, far above Venus (who, in contrast, adopts Juno's characteristics). And Juno even refers to human law (particularly the *Lex Fabia de Plagiariis*; *Met.* 6. 4: *legibus, quae servos alienos perfugas invitis dominis vetant suscipi, prohibeor*) when speaking to Psyche – she hypocritically pretends her obedience to it which is something unprecedented for a goddess. Furthermore, during the staging of the Judgement of Paris (Apul. *Met.* 10. 30ff) a girl in the role of Juno reacts too calmly and inactively when compared to Venus; thus, she cannot win. The only comparable moment is the final assembly of gods on the marriage of Psyche and Amor, particularly the presence of Jupiter *cum sua Junone* (Apul. *Met.* 6. 24<sup>40</sup>). Only here, Juno may be seen as a nuptial goddess, except for the fact that she neither organizes the marriage, nor guarantees for it.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, the hasty way of sealing the marriage betrays all too strikingly that Jupiter just tried, not very successfully it must be said, to mask his son's inappropriate affair.<sup>42</sup>

In contrast with the examples mentioned above, Juno in *De nuptiis* is a very active and confident person and her demeanour, as already said, is always favouring the wedding. In the remembrance of the moment of Psyche's birth, a passage which for the first time ties Martianus' story with that of Apuleius, Juno gives her a ribbon or a band (a wedding symbol) to tie up her hair (1. 7).<sup>43</sup> Her other occurrences are then always

<sup>38</sup> Apul. *Met.* 6. 4: (Juno to Psyche:) ... "*Quam vellem... per fidem nutum meum precibus tuis accommodare. Sed contra uoluntatem Veneris, nurus meae, quam filiae semper dilexi loco, praestare me pudor non sinit. ...*"

<sup>39</sup> Apul. *Met.* 4. 30: (Venus to Psyche:) "... *quaecumque est, meos honores usurpabit: iam faxo <eam> huius // etiam ipsius inclitae formositatis paeniteat.*" 5. 30: (Venus to Amor:) "*Sed iam faxo te lusus huius paeniteat et sentias acidas et amaras istas nuptias.*"

<sup>40</sup> Apul. *Met.* 6. 24: "*Nec mora, cum cena nuptialis affluens ex<h>ibetur. Accumbebat summum torum maritus, Psychen gremio suo complexus. Sic et cum sua Iunone Iuppiter ac deinde per ordinem toti dei.*"

<sup>41</sup> Amor arranges for the wedding directly with Jupiter who becomes the warrantor of the marriage and, consequently, sees to Psyche's ascent to heavens, as well as the wedding itself (*Met.* 6. 23). Furthermore, Juno remains to lie beside her husband, while the other gods get actively involved in the preparations for the celebration, each of them in accordance with his/her competences.

<sup>42</sup> Apul. *Met.* 6. 23: (Jupiter:) "*Puellam elegit et uirginitate priuauit: teneat, possideat, amplexus Psychen semper suis amoribus perfruatur.*" The hastiness is also formally expressed by brevity and the asyndetic accumulation of verbs. The continuation of Jupiter's speech addressed to Venus reveals his effort to blind the trail (especially the final alliteration of "m"): "*Nec tu, inquit, "filia, quicquam contristere nec prosapiae tantae tuae statuque de matrimonio mortali metuas. Iam faxo nuptias non impares, sed legitimas et iure ciuili congruas..."*"

<sup>43</sup> Citation, see n. 12. SHANZER 1986, 204 translates and interprets the gift (*sociale vinclum*) in the same way (i.e. as "a wedding band"). Contrariwise, STAHL-JOHNSON-BURGE 1977, 7 choose a more

related to Philology, whom she by no means abandons to her fate, unlike Apuleius' Juno who does so when dealing with Psyche. She is responsible for Philology, her safe ascent to the heavens, as well as the worthiness of her marriage (2. 147–208: n. 22). In the plot, she further secures for the organizing (see 1. 97: n. 21) and providing an appropriate celebration, for the sake of which she defends virtues and knowledge against the temptations of Venus and her suite (see 6. 705; 9. 888: n. 23).

As to Juno as the cosmological element mentioned above, it seems to be a non-literary part of argumentation at the first sight; however, it becomes clear after further investigation that the literary context cannot be left out either.

In her cosmological, i.e. aerial representation, Juno appears soon after she has persuaded Jupiter about the quality of Philology as the right bride for the rampant bachelor Mercury: in the series of the catalogues of gods presented in Book One, and then in the longest "pilgrimage-catalogue" in Book Two.<sup>44</sup>

The first catalogue is very brief and imprecise: it lists the gods called to the assembly by Jupiter's scribe as well as Jupiter himself (1. 41–43), the deities summoned are: *penates* (almost secretly), *Vulcanus* (though he never descends), twelve *collegae Iovis*, named according to Ennius' distich,<sup>45</sup> seven remaining "bigger gods",<sup>46</sup> and the rest of the *populus deorum*. Another catalogue follows immediately, which seems to specify the previous one from the point of view of astrological houses (1. 44–60). Jupiter's soldiers are ordered to visit the sixteen regions of heaven and invite their inhabitants to the divine assembly. What follows is the most disputed and clumsiest list of divinities, which has not yet been explained successfully. After the bronze liver of Piacenza was found in 1877 (an Etruscan haruspical instrument), some scholars thought it could clarify Martianus' description or vice versa.<sup>47</sup> Thus, both catalogues were identified as of Etruscan origin.<sup>48</sup> The Etruscan influence of Martianus' list is recognizable but it is not the only inspiration and there are also the particular differences between the sixteen regions in *De nuptiis* and the bronze liver.<sup>49</sup> Furthermore (1. 61f.), "azonoi" and other more generally named deities (e.g. *omnisque populus potestatum*) follow.

As expected, Juno is mentioned both in the catalogue based on Ennius (1. 42), and in the catalogue of celestial regions, where she is located in the zone two, next to

---

neutral translation ("a band for her hair"). Finally, RAMELLI 2001, 9 translates the passage "una fascia a raccogliere i suoi capelli", i.e. she expresses the adjective *sociale* through the verb which does not have such a strong connotation of marriage.

<sup>44</sup> Citing the whole catalogues would be of no benefit to the argumentation; therefore, I refer only to the relevant parts.

<sup>45</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 42: *Tunc etiam ut inter alios potissimi rogarentur ipsius collegae Iovis, qui bis seni cum eodem Tonante numerantur, quosque distichum complectitur Ennium: Iuno Vesta Minerva Ceresque Diana Venus Mars / Mercurius Iovis Neptunus Vulcanus Apollo.*

<sup>46</sup> SHANZER 1986, 132 takes into account "extensive corruption" and accepts the correction to number eight (based on Aug. *Civ. Dei* 7. 2).

<sup>47</sup> THULIN 1906, 85–89 was the first one who supposed so. He assumed that Martianus attained his knowledge from Nigidius Figulus.

<sup>48</sup> Especially WEINSTOCK 1946, 101–129; SHANZER 1986, 138 gives up on his own interpretation and accepts the conclusions of Weinstock.

<sup>49</sup> See CAPDEVILLE 1996, 254. TOMASSI 2012, 96 suggests the intrusion of foreign elements because of Martianus' antiquarianism, as well.

other deities, in the neighbourhood of her husband who inhabits the first zone (1. 45f.). The reader is here confronted more with the antiquarian theological lists than with the cosmographical ones. These combine Etruscan, Greek, Roman, and perhaps even some other tradition, either Punic or Eastern,<sup>50</sup> and are deliberately adapted in agreement with Martianus' literary plans. It is not, I think, necessary to confirm this analysing the above mentioned catalogues in a complex way (such attempts are doomed to fail due to the lack of information crucial for the interpretation). However, I would like to comment on one detail, which is important to decide how the whole story should be taken into account. Two inhabitants of the third zone, *Discordia* and *Seditio*, are not invited because they have always been inimical to Philology (1. 47<sup>51</sup>). It is no doubt that the exclusion of the deities of disorder and disagreement is associated with Plato's tiny note in the dialogue *Phaedrus*. Its message is that there is no place for envy in the assembly of the gods (*Phaedr.* 247 a).<sup>52</sup> This note is incorporated into the allegorical image of the peregrination of souls in heavens. Plato depicts the harmony between the twelve Olympian gods on their heavenly paths and those who follow them. Martianus further elaborates the image: he skilfully involves the bride (who replaces the "gods' assembly") as well as the groom (thanks to whom Fraud, his loyal servant, is finally invited in 1. 51, despite some doubts<sup>53</sup>). Moreover, both spouses exchange their roles (Martianus does this, beyond doubt, deliberately to make the two closer to each other and to erase their significant difference in descent). He also assigns the divine concord to human Philology, whereas Mercurius is provided with a typically human feature, which is common among men, but would be unacceptable in the world of gods. Martianus' decision is entirely literary; it follows the logical coherence of the plot. It is symptomatic that from the third zone onwards Martianus does not state which gods inhabit the particular zones; he only mentions those gods chosen and invited, or not invited, by Jupiter. That means that he deliberately deprives his catalogue of informative liability (although not of the information itself – this, of course, remains). Thus, the catalogue adapted in this way can only be interpreted as a literary means which reflects Martianus' intention to create the image of a purely harmonious divine world to serve as an example for the harmonious bond of the human and divine knowledge sanctioned by the wedding between the two. As for the depiction of Juno, it is important that she is one of "the twelve", close to her husband Jupiter, i.e. she does not step out of her literary image.

<sup>50</sup> CAPDEVILLE 1996, *passim*; see esp. 265, 269, 295f.

<sup>51</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 47: *Discordiam vero ac Seditiōnem quis ad sacras nuptias corrogaret, praesertimque cum ipsi Philologiae fuerint semper inimicae?*

<sup>52</sup> Plat. *Phaedr.* 247 a: πολλὰ μὲν οὖν καὶ μακάριαι θεαὶ τε καὶ διέξοδοι ἐντὸς οὐρανοῦ, ἅς θεῶν γένους εὐδαιμόνων ἐπιστρέφεται πρῶτων ἕκαστος αὐτῶν τὸ αὐτοῦ, ἔπειτα δὲ ὁ αἰεὶ ἐθέλων τε καὶ δυνάμενος: φθόνος γὰρ ἔξω θείου χοροῦ ἴσταται. WEINSTOCK 1946, 106, n. 32 noticed the parallel.

<sup>53</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 51: *Fraudem quoque ex eadem post longam deliberationem placuit adhiberi, quod crebro ipsi Cyllenio fuerit obsecuta*. A similar doubt can be implied in case of Pluto from the third sphere; here, too, his relationship and kinship to Mercurius work in favour of his invitation (*patrius sponsi*).

There still remain two other catalogues, the god's hierarchical entering to the assembly (1. 63–88), and the Philology's tour to heaven guided by Juno (2. 147–168). These differ from the previous ones in so far that they do not merely enumerate the deities, but rather offer a lengthy comprehensive commentary on them. The first of these catalogues is also special in its literary conception. Some of the gods are already present in the assembly palace (1. 63–69: apart from Jupiter and Juno, e.g. Fates, Fama, and Ianus), and the main group is about to enter. They do so in the following order: Saturn, Ops-Kybele, Vesta, Sun (see below), and Luna (Diana comes only later), Jupiter's brothers Neptune and Pluto, their wives Tethys and Proserpina, Jupiter's children Mars and Liber, Castor and Pollux, Hercules, Diana, as well as Venus, followed by Ceres, Vulcan, Fortuna, and *vulgo ceteri* (1. 70–89). Most of the deities are introduced enigmatically, as a task for the reader,<sup>54</sup> with the help of their astrologic-astronomical characteristics hidden beneath their physical appearance, similarly to idols. Their clothes, shoes, face, behaviour, to put it shortly, everything has its own informative power. The clearly hierarchical order is confirmed also by the literary depiction. While much attention is given to the divine royal couple, their appearance being described in a broader context, the description gradually gets briefer, which is certainly also due to Martianus' efforts to accelerate the plot and to avoid discouraging the reader. The hierarchical description is based on the Neo-Platonic teaching,<sup>55</sup> but it is – again – adapted to Martianus' literary aims. Thus, the Neo-Platonic background of the catalogue raises Jupiter's son Apollo (depicted deliberately as an astronomic Sun) to a more prominent position than that of his mythologically more significant brothers; nevertheless, the most prominent position is reserved for (except for Jupiter and Juno who are already present) the parents of the divine couple and Vesta, the representatives of the previous divine generation and the old order. To compensate this, the Sun is then accorded a primary role, which is confirmed by its very exhaustive and detailed depiction.

As to Juno's celestial characteristics (1. 67) starting with the remarkable detail of the subordination and, at the same time, the flamboyance of her throne comparable to the one of her husband,<sup>56</sup> Juno stands as a representative of the beautifully clear air wearing a "milky" veil with a gem crown shining as a rainbow (since offered by Iris,

<sup>54</sup> Most of them remain unnamed and addressed only by a characteristic epithet which is later specified: Saturn as *sator* (1. 70), Ops-Kybele as *eius coniunx grandaeva* (1. 71), Neptune as *alter maritima semper inundatione viridior* (1.78), Pluto as *alius lucifuga inumbratione pallescens* (1. 78), Tethys as *omnium nutrix deorumque hospita* (1. 81: this identification is unclear, Amphitrite, or Tethys, is concerned here; SHANZER 1986, 172 votes for the latter one), Proserpina as *puella accessibus gratulans*, Mars as *ruber iuvenis* (1. 81), etc.

<sup>55</sup> SHANZER 1986, 133–137 successfully detects the origin of this text and interprets it as a description of the so-called *ἰδωλὰ* (idols), inspired by Porphyrius and Iamblichus (i.e. Neo-Platonic) and paralleled in *Macr. Sat.* 1. 17–24. She also comments on Martianus' significant diversion from these, namely the lack of explication, which she explains as a deliberate concealment (she interprets the whole work as a pagan self-determining statement against the dominant Christianity: SHANZER 1986, 43). However, she does not take into account a literary interpretation.

<sup>56</sup> *Mart. Cap. 1. 67: Huius (i.e. Iovis) suggestui subditus Iunonis consessus haud indecenter ornatus.*

the goddess of rainbow).<sup>57</sup> However, when compared to the always radiant Jupiter, she gets unpredictably cloudy (her cloak being like this). She can be rainy and gloomy, as well as relucant afresh; the Sun, in particular, and its light make her shining brightly.<sup>58</sup> She is holding flashes and thunders, and under them she sprinkles the earth with rain.<sup>59</sup> She wears dark shoes on her feet and a strange belt or a band around her knees.<sup>60</sup> Martianus here metaphorically depicts the vicissitude of air in comparison with the higher sphere (ruled by Jupiter), the splendour of the skies illuminated by the sun, as well as the night sky shaded by the phases of the moon. But the atmospheric depiction is not the only one. Even here, the literary arrangement play significant role. Juno's mutability, depicted as the counterpart of Jupiter's stable radiance, is certainly also a tactful allusion to Juno's bad temper caused by her gallant husband. In addition, Martianus' literary intention is doubtlessly reflected in the fact that he does not immediately continue with the list of other deities but changes his point of view for a while (l. 68). He looks at the whole visible world, as well as its Platonic model (*idea*), with the eyes of the divine couple. Jupiter interferes into this space and controls the fates of all as he wishes; this adumbrates his rule in the assembly.<sup>61</sup> Then, the focus goes back on the couple (*uterque consurgunt*). The cosmological aspect is intentionally suppressed for the sake of narrative unity so that the reader does not lose the sight of it at any moment.<sup>62</sup>

Juno becomes the centre of attention twice more during the defile of gods: first, when she lights up in the Sun (see n. 57), second, when she adverts from Hercules (l. 84<sup>63</sup>). The latter moment represents another striking example of the impossibility to interpret the cosmological description only in terms of allegory, as it is an exclusively

<sup>57</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 67: *Ipsa (i.e. Juno) vero tecto capite lacteo quodam calymmate praenitebat, cui gemmis insitum diadema pretiosis; nam neque scythidis virecta nec ceraunorum vibrans fulgoransque lumen nec flucticolor hyacinthi credebatur abesse profunditas, sed totum illud sertum capitis fulgorantis Thaumantias obtulisse reginae caelitem ferebatur.* For *calymma* as both a *hapax legomenon* and an allusion to the Milky Way, see SHANZER 1986, 148. This unique Graecism can be understood as Martianus' spontaneous hint at his advancement from the Roman wife Juno to the Greek celestial Hera (which is matched by the indication of jealousy, too).

<sup>58</sup> Mart. Cap. 1.67: *Ipsius vero divae vultus assidua perlucens gratia fratri consimilis, nisi quod ille immutabili laetitia renidebat, haec commutationum assiduarum nubilo crebrius turbidabatur; nam vestis eius hyalina, sed peplum fuerat caligosum, quod tamen, si appulsu cuiusque luminis tangeretur, inter obumbrantes nebulas sudae perspicuitatis gratia praeniteret.* Martianus places clearly a particular emphasis on the sunshine, as he repeats it soon again during the description of Sun. (l. 73 f.: *Ast ubi primos honorati capitis radios ingressurus immisit... Iuno autem diversis coloribus illustris ornatibus ac varia ... gemmarum luce resplendens candentibus serenit enituit.*)

<sup>59</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 67: *Haec fulmen dextera, laeva sonorum bombis terrentibus tympanum sustinens, sub quibus plurimum sudans ima subiecta roscidis videbatur inundare fluoribus.*

<sup>60</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 67: *Huius vero calcei admodum furvi, quorum maxime solea atrae noctis nigredine coloratur. nam eiusdem genua zona quidem diversicolor ambiebat, quae nunc perfulgido resplendebat orbe, nunc vanescentis gratiae tenuata varietas ita penitus ablegabat, tanquam nihil habuisset ante discolorum.*

<sup>61</sup> TOMASSI 2012, 114 assesses the digression differently.

<sup>62</sup> The literary aim can possibly be detected also in the greater emphasis on married couples in the list (four of them are referred to).

<sup>63</sup> Mart. Cap. 1. 84: *Dehinc quidam roboris inauditi et exstirpandis semper adversitatibus praeparatus; sed eius miros lacertos rictusque Cleonaeos limis Iuno cernebat.*

literary depiction without any perceptible background.<sup>64</sup> As soon as Hercules appears, Juno looks askance at him. Here, even the celestial image of Juno as a woman, a persona, and a goddess, betrays her indignation about the stepson. From the mythological point of view, the hatred that Juno feels against Hercules is traditionally described as endless,<sup>65</sup> so there is no doubt that she hardly keeps her temper and does so only out of respect for the festive assembly and its harmonious atmosphere.

The last catalogue and, at the same time, the last disputed occurrence of Juno in *De Nuptiis* begins when Juno comes to pick up Philology for the heavenly voyage (2. 149). Here, she is given the most important part of her role in the whole text, to bring Philology to her bridegroom. She comes as *Pronuba* but is asked by Philology to be understood as Hera – *aer* (*hic ego te Heram potius ab aeris regno nuncupatam voco*), i.e. her Greek alter ego. Juno agrees and shows to Philology the order of the spheres and deities, based on the combination of the cosmological order and – this time ascending – hierarchy. However, though Juno is addressed as a cosmological principle, she does not forget to behave literally like a goddess, too. She lets Philology venerate her with the help of the well-arranged overview of all her religious attributes,<sup>66</sup> even to sacrifice an ointment as an offering to her (*litavit aromatis*). During the tiring voyage, Juno shows not only the planetary spheres and their inhabitants to her, but also explains the *haruspicia* and augural signs (2. 151 f.), introduces the gods as the teachers of various human skills (2. 157), and helps her to climb the tiresome spherical intervals (apart from the last one, since it is only a half-tone: *neque enim labor fuerat hemitonii interiecta transcurrere*; once again a lovely literary detail: 2. 196). The whole journey is conceived as a highly informative and substantial tour; besides, Martianus does not, unlike the previous narrative, use any allegories or riddles here. It seems as if, upon the coming of Philology, the diligent study, her biggest virtue, overwhelmed the plot and made even Juno adapt to it (*Iuno conscendentis* [i.e. *Philologiae*] *precibus non repugnans*). The abovementioned prayer in the very beginning of the passage demonstrates this clearly. Such lists of attributes are normal parts of prayers; however, they do not usually contain any philological notes – these, including several exact details (distances, dimensions, etc.), accompany the whole celestial tour.<sup>67</sup> Taking into account its

<sup>64</sup> SHANZER 1986, 175 states that Hercules' solar significance does not appear to be relevant in *De nuptiis*; instead, he is probably present as a son of Zeus, who was immortalised previously and, above all, as a Stoic hero, something perhaps hinted at by the use of the word "*praeparatus*".

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 2. 20; Verg. *Aen.* 8. 288–293; Hyg. *Fab.* 30. 1; 32. 2; 102. 1; etc.

<sup>66</sup> Mart. Cap. 2. 149: "*Iuno pulchra, licet aliud nomen tibi consortium caeleste tribuerit, et nos a iuvando Iunonem, unde et Iovem dicimus, nominemus, sive te Lucinam, quod lucem nascentibus tribuas, ac Lucetiam convenit nuncupare (nam Fluvioniam Februalemque ac Februum mihi poscere non necesse est, cum nihil contagionis corporeae sexu intemerata pertulerim), Iterducam et Domiducam, Vnxiam, Cinctiam mortales puellae debent in nuptias convocare, ut earum et itinera protegas et in optatas domos ducas et, cum postes unguent, faustum omen affigas, et cingulum ponentes in thalamis non relinquo, Popigenam te, quas vel in partus discrimine vel in bello protexeris, praecabuntur, Poplonam plebes, Curitim debent memorare bellantes; hic ego te Heram potius ab aeris regno nuncupatam voco, da nosse poscenti, quid haec aeria latitudo atque atomis perlucentes concurrentibus campi animantum gerant, quidve hic dicatur numinum subvolare.*"

<sup>67</sup> For the philological glosses in the narrative of *De nuptiis*, see CRISTANTE 2010, 69–87. The concluding overview of all glosses present in the narrative parts of *De nuptiis* (CRISTANTE 2010, 77–86) suggests that most of these can be found in Book Two.

divergence from the rest of the narrative, this can only be explained as a sophisticated literary adjustment which formally underlines the content of the narrative.

The climax of the catalogue and, simultaneously, of the story has often been seen in the moment when Philology reaches the border of the knowable universe and kneels to worship an unknown paternal deity (2. 200–206). The eternal God and the paternal bosom, the hierarchy of the worlds, and a source-maiden (Hekate) occur, as well as the forces “once and twice” (ἅπαξ καὶ δις ἐπέκεινα), perhaps even a triadic monad, and the so-called *flos ignis*, the highest component of reason. This part of the text reminds us of a mysterious exposé of the teachings of the Chaldean Oracles<sup>68</sup> which, in many respects, were in accordance with Gnosticism, and, in late Antiquity, became also a part of the Neo-Platonist, especially Iamblichus', teaching. Thus, it seems to be the most allegorical part of the whole text, which points to the deepest truth of the universe.<sup>69</sup> Philology accepts the picture of the highest sphere of the universe as the most elevated, albeit not the only one, among many pieces of knowledge; later, she does not hesitate to return to the Olympians, get married and accept her dowry. Consequently, her relationship to this deepest truth may indeed be questioned.<sup>70</sup> (And Martianus does so, too, through the judgement of Astronomy who states at the very beginning of her speech that *fabulosisque commentis Grai complevere caelum, ego praecepta potius edisseram disciplinae*: 8. 817). While the knowable part of the universe is the subject of arts, the highest sphere becomes a part of the *fabula*, which is, in my opinion, the most beautiful fable of the Late Antiquity. Juno has succeeded as *Pronuba*, Philology has fulfilled her journey. Once again, the reader can clearly recognize the literary arrangement of Martianus' text as an elaborate fable and his own task to understand the proper meaning of the presented knowledge.

To sum up, I am convinced that any attempt at a merely allegorical interpretation of *De nuptiis* cannot succeed, despite the fact that it still remains the prevailing frame for the story. Both appearances of Juno mingle in the plot in a way which excludes the chance. Martianus intentionally built up the plot as a balanced conflation of mythological and cosmological, Greek and Roman, antiquarian and philosophical, old and new, so that everyone can find what is interesting and important for himself (in agreement with the tradition of didactic literature), and comprehend the whole universe as

<sup>68</sup> For the detailed analysis of the influence of the Chaldean Oracles on *De nuptiis*, see TOMMASI 2012, 149–187.

<sup>69</sup> For an overview of the different interpretations of the allegory and their own interpretation, see LENAZ 1975, 101–114 and SHANZER 1986, 65–71. Turcan (see LENAZ 1975, 108f.) and RELIHAN 1993, 143 consider the journey of Philology to be a Neo-Platonic return of the soul. Cf. VOLFING 2008, 329–350 who supposes that the allegory serves as a “delimitation” of rationality (however, she is strongly influenced by Christian allegories and the conclusions of Shanzer). Based especially on this allegory, LENAZ 1975, 119; 1980, 726–735, SHANZER 1986, 43, 67, and others have come to the conclusion that Martianus intended this allegory as a “veil” concealing the polemic reflexion of Christian disputations that took place in the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> centuries. KUPKE 1998, 145–160 thoroughly scrutinizes especially the interpretation of Lenaz. TOMMASI 2012 too, perceives Martianus in a more sober way (“intellectualised paganism”, 85ff.), although she in many aspects agrees with the allegorical interpretations of the abovementioned scholars.

<sup>70</sup> Most recently, GERTH 2013, 129 has asked this question.

an organized complex, in accordance to the nuptial couple and their desired marital harmony.

Katarina Petrovičová  
Faculty of Arts  
Department of the Classical Studies  
Masaryk University  
Czech Republic

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- BOVEY, M. 2003: *Disciplinae cyclicae: L'organisation du savoir dans l'oeuvre de Martianus Capella*. Trieste
- CAPDEVILLE, G. 1996: Les dieux de Martianus Capella. *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 213.3, pp. 251–299.
- CRISTANTE, L. 2010: Glosse come forma del testo nel *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* di Marziano Capella. *Voces* 21, pp. 69–87.
- DÖPP, S. 2009: Narrative Metalepsen und andere Illusionsdurchbrechungen: Das spätantike Beispiel Martianus Capella. In Brandes, W. – Demandt, A. – Leppin, H. – Krasser, H. – von Möllendorff, P. (Hrsg.): *Millenium: Jahrbuch zu Kultur und Geschichte des ersten Jahrtausends n. Chr.* Bd. 6. Berlin–New York, pp. 203–221.
- FEENEY, D. C. 1984: The Reconciliations of Juno. *The Classical Quarterly* 34.1, pp. 179–194.
- GERTH, M. 2013: *Bildungsvorstellungen in 5. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Macrobius, Martianus Capella und Sidonius Apollinaris*. Berlin–Boston
- GREBE, S. 1999: *Martianus Capella, De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii*. *Darstellung der Sieben Freien Künste und ihrer Beziehungen zueinander*. Stuttgart–Leipzig
- IHM, M. 1890–1897, s.v. Iunones I (Frauengenie). In Röscher, K. (Hrsg.): *Ausführliches Lexikon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. Erster Band, Zweite Abteilung, col. 615ff.
- KUPKE, T. 1998: Wissenssystematisierung als enzyklopädische Intertextualität bei Martianus Capella. In Westra, H. – Kupke, T. (eds): *The Berlin Commentary on Martianus Capella's De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book II*. Leiden–New York–Köln, pp. 145–160.
- LEMOINE, F. 1972: *Martianus Capella. A Literary Re-evaluation*. München
- LENAZ, L. 1975: *Martiani Capellae De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii liber secundus: introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Padova
- LENAZ, L. 1980: Nota a Mart. Cap., II, 145 (ut uterque sexus caelum posset ascendere). *Latomus* 39, pp. 726–735.
- NUCHELMANS, G. 1957: Philologia et son mariage avec Mercure jusqu'à la fin du XII<sup>e</sup> siècle. *Latomus* 16, pp. 84–107.
- PABST, B. 1994: *Prosimetrum. Tradition und Wandel einer Literaturform zwischen Spätantike und Spätmittelalter*. Teil 1. Köln–Weimar–Wien



- PETROVIČOVÁ, K. 2010a: *Martianus Capella: Nauky „na cestě“ mezi antikou a středověkem* [Martianus Capella: Arts “on the Way” between Antiquity and the Middle Ages]. Brno
- PETROVIČOVÁ, K. 2010b: Seven Arts – Seven Maidens. The Liberal Arts in *De nuptiis* by Martianus Capella. *Invigilata Lucernis* 32, pp. 123–131.
- RAMELLI, I. 2001: *Marziano Capella: Le nozze di Filologia e Mercurio*. Milano
- RAMELLI, I. 2006: *Scoto Eriugena, Remigio di Auxerre, Bernardo Silvestre e Anonimi. Tutti i commenti a Marziano Capella. Testo latino a fronte*. Milano
- RELIHAN, J. C. 1987: Martianus Capella, the Good Teacher. *Pacific Coast Philology* 22, pp. 59–70.
- RELIHAN, J. C. 1993: *Ancient Menippean Satire*. Baltimore–London
- SHANZER, D. 1986: *A Philosophical and Literary Commentary on Martianus Capella's De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii, Book I*. Berkeley–Los Angeles–London
- STAHL, W. H. – JOHNSON, R. – BURGE, E. 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
- STAHL, W. H. – JOHNSON, R. – BURGE, E. L. 1977: *Martianus Capella and the Seven Liberal Arts. Volume II: The Marriage of Philology and Mercury*. New York
- THULIN, K. 1906: *Die Götter des Martianus Capella und der Bronzeleber von Piacenza*. Gießen
- TOMMASI, C. O. 2012: *The Bee-Orchid: Religione e cultura in Marziano Capella*. Napoli
- TURCAN, R. 1958: Martianus Capella et Jamblique. *Revue des Études Latines* 36, pp. 235–254.
- VOLFING, A. 2008: Der sin was âne sinne. Zum Verhältnis von Rationalität und Allegorie in philosophischen und mystischen Texten. In Ridder, K. (Hrsg.): *Reflexion und Inszenierung von Rationalität in der mittelalterlichen Literatur: Blaubeurer Kolloquium 2006*. Berlin
- WEINSTOCK, S. 1946: Martianus Capella and the Cosmic Systems of the Etruscans. *The Journal of Roman Studies* 36, pp. 101–129.

