

MARTIANUS CAPELLA AND HIS NINTH CENTURY COMMENTATORS.

By M. L. W. LAISTNER, M.A.

READER IN ANCIENT HISTORY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

CONSIDERABLE attention has been paid in recent years to the commentaries on Martianus compiled in the Carolingian age.¹ The author's diction and allusions presented considerable difficulty to students, and this, coupled with the fact that the work as a whole formed a useful compendium of the arts, sufficiently explains the motives of more than one scholar in the ninth century in annotating it for the benefit of his pupils. Three such commentaries have been preserved, wholly or in part. Probably the earliest in date is that by Dunchad; it is a fragment as now preserved, since it contains only the notes to books 2, 4, and 5 of Martianus.² Of much the same date is the commentary by John Scotus, though, as a piece of profound exposition, it is infinitely more important.³ Somewhat later, Remigius of Auxerre also composed a lengthy commentary on the same author. He used the work of both his predecessors, and it is his work which enjoyed the most widespread influence in the middle ages. Unfortunately his commentary is still unpublished save for some short extracts.⁴ MSS. of the work are fairly numerous, though, until an edition of the whole work is available, it is impossible to say how far

¹ Cf. Manitius, *Gesch. d. latein. Lit.* 1, 335 ff., 513 ff., 525 ff.; 2, 803-4, 808-9, where further references are given.

² Published by Manitius in *Didaskaleion*, 1, 139 ff. from the Paris MS. 12960 (saec. X.).

³ Partly published from the same MS. by Manitius in *Didask.* 1, 157 ff. and 2, 43 ff. Some extracts were printed a good many years ago by Haureau in *Notices et extraits*, 20.

⁴ Thus, part of the commentary on Martian. 1 is given in *Didask.* 2, 62 ff. Narducci published part of that on book 7 in *Bullet. di bibliogr. e di storia delle sci. matem.* 15, 572-80. The commentary on the second half of book 9 (Eysseh. p. 349, 1-375, 11) is to be found in Migne, *P.L.*, 131, 931-964. See also *Neues Archiv*, 36, 57 and *Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, 7, 502.

they preserve a single version of Remigius' commentary. The evidence of the British Museum MS. Royal 15 A XXXIII, as Esposito has already pointed out,¹ is to the effect that there was no single version, but that additions were made to the commentary; whether by Remigius himself, or by his immediate pupils and successors, must remain doubtful for the present.

In the *Scholica Graecarum Glossarum*, or notes of lectures given by Martin of Laon, there is a solitary reference to Martianus, and, in publishing this work, the present writer suggested tentatively that Martin obtained his knowledge of Martianus through the works of John Scotus.² A perusal of the various commentaries on Martianus, and more particularly that by Remigius, has made it possible to attribute a number of the entries in the *Scholica* to a Martianus commentary. It will, however, become clear in the sequel that Martin of Laon does not seem to have made much use of John Scotus' commentary, but rather that a different explanation is called for. To make the relation of the commentaries to the *Scholica* clear, the passages in question have been set out side by side. In the case of passages from Remigius that are not published, the reference given is to the folio in the Brit. Mus. MS. Royal 15 A XXXIII., which will hereafter be named, for the sake of brevity, *L*.

Martian. (Eyssenh.) p. 1, 11

Scholica Y4: <H>ymen: locus intra viscera puerperii, id est locus conceptionum quem vulgo dicunt matricem. Est autem <H>ymenaeus actus voluptatis, inde deus voluptatis dicitur, quod est Venus.

John Scotus (*Didask.* 1, 158, 25): Membranula autem ventris, in qua puerperia concipiuntur, et feminei sexus proprium est et a Grecis hymen vocatur. Inde Hymenaeus, qui corporalibus praesidet conceptionibus, ut poeticae fabulae fingunt.

¹ *Zeitschr. f. celt. Phil.*, 9, where he describes the MS. at some length. It is, however, incorrect to say that the MS. (apart from fol. 3, which belongs elsewhere and contains a fragment by Dunchad) is written by two scribes. There are at least four hands; e.g. fol. 183*a* (middle) to 183*b* (middle) is in a different hand to that of the two chief copyists. A fourth hand appears on fol. 211*a*. Nor is it right to say 'the seventh book of the commentary of Remigius has been printed in full by Narducci.' In fact, the extract printed by him (*op. cit.*, p. 572 ff.) only reproduces the notes to book 7 as far as p. 260, 20 in Eyssenhardt's edition, not a quarter of the whole, though it may be all that Narducci found in the MS. he used (Vat. Reg. Christ., 1970).

² *Bull. of the J. Rylands Libr.*, 7, 421 ff.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 63, 7): Hymen Grece, Latine dicitur membranula et est proprie muliebris sexus, in qua fiunt puerperia. Inde dictus est Hymenaeus nuptiarum deus.

Martian. 1, 17

Schol. H8: Calliope[a] quasi Calliphone, id est bona vox; signatius tamen derivatur a verbo calli [o] poio Graece composito, quod est bene facio vel compono.

Schol. Misc. 10: Callion phone: bona vox.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 67, 3): M. Calliopea una est ex VIII Musis; interpretatur secundum Fulgentium Callion phone, id est pulchra vox, sive Calliopea dicta pulchrica vel pulchre fatiens, quia callos Grece pulcher, poio fatio, a verbo id est poio, unde et poeta dicitur.¹

Martian. 2, 2

Schol. G3: Gymnus dicitur nudus, gymnasium locus exercitii ubi nudi luctabantur. Gymnosophistae dicuntur philosophi qui nudi philosophabantur tecta pudenda corporis.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 67, 30): Gimnoloyis, id est sermocinaris - - -. Hinc gymnus dicitur nudus et gymnasium, id est locus exercitationis.²

Moreover, in a comment on Phocas (*Gram. Lat.* 5, 411, 6) Remigius gives a fuller explanation, which is almost identical with the entry in the *Scholica*. It reads (*Didask.* 2, 75, 20):

Gymnus dicitur nudus, unde gymnasium locus palestre, ubi nudi milites ad palestram luctabant, vel ubi philosophi nudi philosophabantur, tectis tantum pudendis; vel gymnasium dicitur locus exercituum, gimno enim Grece exerceto.

Martian. 2, 13

Schol. Misc. 13: Praeclues: ³ valde nobiles.

John Scotus (*Didask.* 1, 160, 15): Praeclues, id est valde gloriosi etc.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 68, 4): Praeclues, id est nobiles, generosi et valde gloriosi.

(Cf. also *L.* fol. 104a, last line: Praeclues, id est valde nobiles et illustres.)

Martian. 19, 22

Schol. C4: Chelae: bracchia.

L. fol. 29b (near end): Chelis: Grece lyra a brachiis quae Greci chelas dicunt.

¹ M. *om. L.*; a verbo id est poio *om. L.*

² Gimnologisis id est ratiocinaris *L.*

³ So my emendation, when publishing the *Scholica*, praecleue<n>s, was wrong.

Martian. 24, 17

Schol. C11: Condilomata sunt nodositates quas patiuntur artetrici (arthrit-) digitorum. Felix Capella introducit *τύχην*, id est Fortunam, diversorum capita conterentem complicatis in condilos digitis, hoc est in nodositates.

John Scotus (*Didask.* 1, 172, 21) Condilos Greci dicunt plicatos in pugnam digitos, condilo pugnis caedo, et est verbum condylo las.

Martian. 33, 2

Schol. C37: Choraula: princeps chori ludorum, quo nomine potest dici totus chorus.

L. fol. 47*b*: Coraula¹ proprie est qui cornu canit, sicut bubulcus. (!)

Martian. 44, 19

Schol. S19: Sybilla dicitur quasi syos bule, id est dei consilium vel dei os; nam sios Aeolice dicitur deus, bule consilium.

Dunchad (*Didask.* 1, 139, 13): Sybilla dicitur quasi syos bilin, id est mens dei.

John Scotus (*Didask.* 2, 46, 22): Sibilla sios bole, divinum consilium.

L. fol. 60*a* (top): Sybilla autem interpretatur quasi sios bule, id est Iovis vel dei consilium; nam sios Aeolice deus dicitur.

Doubtless both Dunchad and John Scotus are here indebted to Isidore (*Etym.* 8, 8, 1); the same is true of Martin of Laon, who adheres to his source most faithfully and seems to be copied directly by Remigius.

Martian. 76, 6

Schol. A 69: Agape; caritas; unde pastiones, quae causa caritatis Dei in pauperes aguntur, agapae vocantur.

John Scotus (*Didask.* 2, 52, 1) Agape proprium nomen. Potest etiam et commune et interpretatur caritatis.

Martian. 163, 10

Schol. C 9: Chirographus est manus scriptio, etc.

L. fol. 118*a* (last line) Cyrographum, id est manus scriptum.

Martian. 169, 4

Schol. P 34: Piratae sunt praedones maritimi ab incendio navium dicti. Pyr dicitur ignis, etc.

L. fol. 120*a-b*: Archipirata id est princeps piratarum; pyratae autem sunt praedones maritimi qui igne regiones depopulantur.

Martian. 195, 16

Schol. H 6: Hialin: vitrum.
Schol. P 5: Phiala eo quod fiat ex <h>ialin, hoc est vitro. Hialin enim dicunt Graeci vitrum.

L. fol. 129*a*: Hyalini, id est vitrei glauci vel viridis; hyale apud Grecos vitrum dicitur, unde et phyalae dicuntur quasi hyale, quod ex vitro fiunt.

¹ But the MSS. reading in Martian. is *corollis*, which the corrector of *B(ambergensis)* altered to *coraulis* (cf. Eyssenhardt *ad loc.*).

Martian. 242, 20

Schol. I 3: I[a]ctis Graece dicitur piscis; ictiophagi dicuntur piscium comessores.

L. fol. 141*b* (bottom): Ictis Grece piscis, fage comedere; hinc ictiophagi dicuntur piscium comesores.

Martian. 260, 11

Schol. A 80: Apocatasticus: adstans uno in loco scilicet consistens; sicut manifestum est planetas aliquando anteire solem, nunc retrogradas (-os) esse, nunc stationarias (-os); unde soliti mathematici dicere 'Saturnus apocatasticus est'.

Remig. (Narducci, *op. cit.*, p. 580, 15): Apocatasticus, id est singularis vel retrogradus, id est in se ipsum rediens.

L. fol. 154*b* (bottom): Apocatastasin, id est in se ipsum redeuntem, apocatasticus, id est singularis ut sicut quinque (?) apocatasticus dicitur.

Martian. 260, 19

Schol. D 11: Diametrum: medietas sphaerae, linea illa videlicet quae sphaeram secatur per medium hoc modo, etc.

Remig. (Narducci, *op. cit.* 580, 17): Diametrum, id est linea dividens circulum quia ille dividit denarium, sicut diametrum dividens circulum.

Martian. 274, 11

Schol. E 22: <H>emiolia: sesquialtera seu diapente, semis et tantum (tot-), hoc est tantum (tot-) et medietas tanti (tot-).

L. fol. 163*a*: I HMIOAION quasi semis totum, id est sesquialtera; IHMIC semis, OAON totum. *ib.* 165*b*: de hemiolia, id est sesquialtera quasi semis totum.

Martian. 362, 9

Schol. C 36: Chroma: color.

L. fol. 221*b*: Croma Grece, Latine color.

Martian. 368, 10

Schol. S 21: Senoca: continuatio; inde senoca infirmitas cotidiana, quam corrupte vulgo senecam vocant.

L. fol. 235*a*: (syneches) id est continuus vel continuatus; hinc synecha passio vocatur, id est continua febris. (cf. Migne, *P.L.*, 131, 955D.)

The passages set out above leave no doubt that an important source for the *Scholica* was one, or more, commentaries on Martianus.¹ Furthermore, there are close parallels between the *Scholica* and other commentaries by Remigius. Thus reference has already been made

¹ Before leaving Remigius' commentary on Martianus, one of his glosses (on Martian. 52, 15), though it does not bear on the question under consideration, deserves to be made known:—Papiam et Pop<pa>eam legem: Papias et Pop<pa>eus duo fuerunt consules Romanorum, qui ad Hispanias directi sunt et ibi Romanas leges scripserunt. *L.* fol. 69*b*. The reference to the two *consules suffecti* may come from Isidore (*Etym.*, 5, 15, 1), but what kind of source, or misreading of a source, is responsible for the Spanish legislative activities of Pap. and Pop.?

to one Remigius gloss on Phocas ;¹ it is not an isolated phenomenon, as the following comparison will show.

Gram. Lat. 5, 418, 28

Schol. P 20: Pseudot<h>yrum : [h]ostium remotum a publico.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 82, 28): Postis ostium . . . postica vero penultima producta a quo posticum, quod Grece dicitur pseudotirum, significat ostiolum post ianuam secretum.

Gram. Lat., 5, 425, 17

Schol. E 2: Emblema polisemum nomen est; nam uno sensu dicitur anaglyffum vas, secundo superabundantia, tertio variatio lapillorum, quae fit in pavimento, etc.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 86, 3): Emblema: varietas pavimenti vel superhabundantia, unde embolis maris annus.

Gram. Lat., 5, 436, 6

Schol. T 6: Tropaeum scribendum est per P sine aspiratione ab eo quod est τροπή, quod fugam hostium sonat; nam τροπή cum aspiratione nutricem sonat, unde trophimus dicitur nutritor. Quandocumque enim dux seu princeps fugabat hostem a propriis finibus, non tamen comprehendebat gloriam et pompam quam exinde captabat, appellabatur tropaeum a fuga hostis; triumphus vero captabatur de comprehenso hoste.

Remig. (*Didask.* 2, 88, 3): Ovarē: gaudere tractum ab ove, quia quando antiqui tropheum celebrabant, in Capitolio de alba ove immolabant. Distat autem inter tropheum et triumphum: tropheum erat de fugatis hostibus et non interfectis, ab eo quod est trepo vel tropos, id est conversio; triumphus de interfectis celebrabatur et dicitur triumphus apo tu triabem, id est ab exilitionem.

Two additional parallels come respectively from a commentary by Remigius on Priscian and on Eutyches.

Gram. Lat., 3, 495, 36

Schol. P 17: Philacterium: servatorium legis. Est autem compositum ex duobus corruptis et ex duabus linguis; philaxe siquidem Graece dicitur servatorium sive servare, thorath <H>ebraico vocabulo dicitur lex.

Remig. (*Neues Archiv*, 36, 45): Philaxe servare, philaxium, id est custodia, tora scilicet lex, unde philacteria dicuntur servatoria vel custodia.

From Eutyches

Schol. Misc. 9: Perioch[i]a est circumstantia quae significat personam, locum, tempus, rem, qualitatem, causam et facultatem.

Remig. (*Neues Archiv*, 36, 51): Περιοχή: circumquestio vel circumstantia quae circa rem queritur. In presentis lectionis capitulo locus, tempus, persona.

¹ See above on Gymnus.

A word of caution regarding the *Scholica* entries may not be amiss. It is not in the least necessary that these should all come from commentaries on Phocas, Priscian or Eutyches, for we have already seen that Remigius repeats the same or similar information more than once in the same commentary, or in two commentaries on different authors.¹ In other words he might use information which he found in an earlier commentary on Martianus or Priscian to elucidate a passage in Phocas, and so on.

It is an interesting fact that two of the tenth century glosses on Bede's *De natura rerum* show very close verbal resemblance to two items in the *Scholica*.

Schol. E 27: Elimentum per I scribitur ut quibusdam videtur veniens a verbo quod est elimo, id est formo, ipsumque a nomine trahitur, quod est lima instrumentum fabri; sed melius ab <h>ytle venit quod est Graec <um>et interpretatur materies, et mutatis litteris scribitur elementum, quod Graece dicitur stochium.

Schol. Y 7: <H>ytle[n] dicitur confusa materies unde cuncta procedunt, inde dicitur ylementum.

Incert. auct. on Bede (Migne, *P.L.*, 90, 196B-C): Elementa, quasi elementa eo quod ex elementis omnia constent. Elimenta ab elimo, id est formo, quia inde cuncta sunt formata. Hylementa ab hyle, id est informi materia, de qua facta sunt omnia in species. . . . Elementum secundum Isidorum Graecum est et sonat Latine materies. Secundum Ambrosium vero Latinum nomen est, et derivatur ab eo quod est elimo, id est formo, et quod nos elementum dicimus, Graeci στοιχείον.

(Byrhtferth of Ramsey's comment is similar to the first part of the above; cf. Migne, *ibid.*)

The Ambrose reference is no doubt to *Hexaem.*, 3 (p. 72, 12 in the Vienna *C.S.E.L.*), but it is quite general. Thus the *Incertus auctor* may have found the reference in a secondary source; on the other hand, in other glosses on Bede he quotes the writings of Ambrose verbally at some length.

Schol. P. 38: Parapsis (-ops-): vas quadrilaterum dictum a paribus absidibus et est aptum calidis frigidisque cibis.

Byrhtferth on Bede (Migne, *P.L.*, 90, 213C): Quidam tamen dicunt absiden esse latus, et inde volunt esse dictum parapsiden, a paribus absidis. Sed alli repugnant, dicentes absiden Graecum nomen esse et tertiae declinationis, ideoque non posse ablativum

¹ As with Gymnus above; the gloss on postis appears also in a Priscian commentary. cf. *Didask.*, 2, 82, footnote.

facere absidis. Hi ergo dicunt
parapsiden vile vas, quasi paropsiden,
ab obsonium quod in eo omnes cibi
administrentur.

It is known that the commentaries of Remigius were used by Byrhtferth, for at times he copies them word for word. Whether the *Incertus auctor* can be identified with Remigius, as Manitius suggests, is more doubtful; at any rate the gloss on *elementum* does not appear to come from the Martianus commentary.¹

It remains to consider the Martianus and other glosses in the *Scholica*, and their origin. Manitius, discussing the similarities between Dunchad and John Scotus, points out that there are two possibilities, either that John used Dunchad's commentary, or that both consulted an earlier work now lost.² He thinks that the evidence favours the second alternative. The same writer stresses the fact that Remigius primarily used John's commentary, but not solely.³ He clearly quarried in some other source or sources. Now, in the earlier part of the Paris MS. a large number of Remigius' comments are prefaced by the letter M or G; the two letters even occur in conjunction. The comments so labelled are those which do not go back to either Dunchad or John Scotus.⁴ Manitius hazards the suggestion that M might stand for Martin of Laon, and the evidence of the *Scholica* certainly seems to lend some weight to this hypothesis. The *Scholica* are not of course a commentary on Martianus, or for that matter on any other particular author, but it has been shown that they contain a number of extracts coming from a source of this kind. Clearly the source is not the commentary of Dunchad or John Scotus: on the other hand, many of the parallels between the *Scholica* and

¹ Manitius, *Gesch. d. latein. Lit.* 2, 700. In a rapid survey of *L.* I was unable to find the gloss on *elementum*.

² *Op. cit.*, 1, 513-4.

³ *Ib.* and *Didask.*, 2, 73. Remigius' debt is made clear not merely by verbal parallelisms, but by the fact that he refers to John by name. In *L.* the reference is on fol. 66a—Johannes Scottus Attin puerum vel impetum sive proximum dicit interpretari—(on this point, cf. also Narducci, *op. cit.*, 525-6.) Of course Isidore is much used by Remigius, as by his predecessors, but without mention of name; thus, to give an unpublished instance, Isidore's long explanation of the Amazons (*Etym.*, 9, 2, 64) is repeated almost word for word as a gloss on Martian 347, 7 in *L.* fol. 219b.

⁴ *Didask.*, 2, 61-2 and *Neues Archiv.*, 36, 55-6.

the commentaries of Remigius on Martianus and other authors are very close. If it were certainly demonstrable that the Priscian commentary in Laudun. 444 was composed by Martin—he certainly wrote part of the MS.—it would lend some weight to the supposition that Martin also compiled a commentary on Martianus, of which only some remnants have survived in the *Scholica*. On the other hand Martin may never actually have written down his elucidations of Martianus in a continuous form. His pupils may be the sole transmitters of Martin's learning. In either case, it is natural enough that Remigius should be indebted to Martin. If a commentary by Martin existed in book form, it is obvious that Remigius would consult it, as he consulted the works of Dunchad and John Scotus. His use of the last-named writers shows that he was well acquainted with the work of the Irish scholars resident in N. France ; besides, his chief master, Heiric of Auxerre, had been a pupil of Elias, an Irishman, at Laon.¹ Remigius may even have known Martin himself.

When the commentaries of Remigius have been completely published, a good deal of additional light should be thrown on the activities of his immediate predecessors in the task of annotating suitable text-books for monastic tuition.

¹ Manitius, *Gesch. d. latein. Lit.*, 1, 499, with footnote 3.