Jean-Frédéric CHEVALIER, *Martianus Capella, Les noces de Philologie et de Mercure*. Tome I : *Livre I*. Texte établi et traduit par J.-Fr. C. Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 2014. CXIV + 183 p. en partie doubles (COLLECTION DES UNIVERSITÉS DE FRANCE. SÉRIE LATINE, 407). Prix : 65 €. ISBN 978-2-251-01467-8.

A rich introduction, a long section of which is devoted to textual criticism, opens the volume. Unlike Danuta Shanzer, who proposed a much later dating, Chevalier sticks to a dating between 420 and 430 CE for the composition of *De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii* (p. VII). He postulates two types of public for this work: one interested in the technical details of the liberal arts, and the other interested in allegory (p. viii). The latter, I think, was the more philosophically minded –and could well share also an interest in the liberal arts in turn–; indeed, from Ancient Stoicism to Neoplatonism allegoresis was part and parcel of philosophy, as I argued in "The Philosophical Stance of Allegory in Stoicism and its Reception in Platonism", *IJCT* 18,3 (2011), p. 335-371; "Valuing Antiquity in Antiquity by Means of Allegoresis", in *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, Proceedings of the Penn-Leiden Colloquium on Ancient Values VII, Leiden 14-16 June 2012, eds. James Ker and Christoph Pieper, Leiden, Brill, 2014, p. 485-507; and "Stoic Cosmo-Theology Disguised as Zoroastrianism in Dio's *Borystheniticus*? The Philosophical Role of Allegoresis as a Mediator between *Physikē* and *Theologia*", *JRPh* 12 (2013), p. 9-26. In particular, allegoresis helped to detect philosophical tenets in traditional theologico-mythological texts. Martianus, as a good Neoplatonist, applied allegory to traditional religious mythology in order to extract philosophical truths from it. However, he did not limit himself to applying allegoresis to already existing theological texts, but he created an allegorical narrative, which, relying on traditional mythology, expresses philosophical truths symbolically. Chevalier suggests that « les arts libéraux se substituent à la philosophie dans le *De nuptiis* » (p. IX). I suspect that for Martianus the liberal arts did not so much replace philosophy as constitute the basis for it. The progression from liberal arts to philosophy and theology –seen not as different from philosophy, but as the culmination of philosophy– represents the same ascent as delineated by Origen, a Christian Neoplatonist, who regarded philosophy as the crowning of the liberal arts and theology as the crowning of philosophy –and later by Eriugena, another Christian Neoplatonist, who knew Martianus very well and commented on his works (see for Origen, e.g., my "The Relevance of Patristic Exegesis to Contemporary Biblical Hermeneutics", *RTh* 22 [2015], p. 100-132, and for Eriugena my *Tutti i commenti a Marziano Capella: Scoto Eriugena, Remigio di Auxerre, Bernardo Silvestre e anonimi*, Milan, Bompiani – Istituto Italiano per gli Studi Filosofici, 2006). Eriugena insightfully caught this progression, embedded in Martianus' œuvre, from liberal arts to philosophy to theology, and appropriated it to the point of declaring that theological errors may derive from ignorance of the liberal arts (see my "Eriugena's Commentary on Martianus in the Framework of his Thought and the Philosophical Debate of his Time", in *Carolingian Scholarship and Martianus Capella*, eds. Sinead O'Sullivan and Mariken Teeuwen, Cultural Encounters in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages, 12, Turnhout, Brepols, 2012, p. 245-272). Chevalier himself recognises (p. XIX-XXIII) that the very inaugural hymn of *De nuptiis* is squarely situated within the Platonic tradition –and this, I would add,

offers a programmatic philosophical allegiance. I think that Martianus here, by insisting on Hymenaeus' unifying function, refers to Neoplatonic henology, with One-ἕν as metaphysical apex– for which see my "Harmony between arkhē and telos in Patristic Platonism and the Imagery of Astronomical Harmony Applied to the Apokatastasis Theory", *IJPT* 7,1 [2013], p. 1-49. And it is on the basis of Plato's definition of time, his myth of Er, and his Cave myth that Martianus describes the elevation of the soul in its return to the divinity, as Chevalier acknowledges (p. XXXI-XXXIII). This return is indeed a restoration –apokatastasis, a theory that in the time of Martianus was shared by both Christian and "pagan" Neoplatonists, such as Macrobius (see my "The Debate on Apokatastasis in 'Pagan' and Christian Platonists: Martianus, Macrobius, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and Augustine", *ICS* 33-34 [2008-2009], p. 201-234; much more work has to be done on 'pagan' philosophical apokatastasis and the interface between this and Christian patristic notions of apokatastasis). Chevalier is probably correct that Pallas-Athena-Minerva symbolises the Neoplatonic Nous-Intellect and that the pure light from which she comes refers to the world of the superior hypostases (p. XLI). This exegesis, I note, is justified in light of Eriugena's interpretation. In his *Adnotationes in Marcianum* 39.15, 181 Ramelli, he identifies Hermes-Mercury, too, with Nous-Intellect, but especially in 24.13, 151-152 Ramelli, Eriugena reads the luminous, superior place from which Pallas descends in *Nupt.* 1.39 as the highest place, the seat of immortal virginity (since the first principle produces nothing), purest, luminous, and brightest, the most splendid ethereal region: *a superioribus mundi partibus... de vertice mundi immortalis virginitas... purgatioris vibratiorisque luminis loco, hoc est splendidioris aetheris loco*. For this reason, the throne of Pallas is even imagined by Martianus to be higher than that of Jupiter (the second, productive principle), just as Jupiter's throne is higher than that of Juno and the others, since Pallas has the remotest and purest of the spheres (24.15, 152 Ramelli). Even the list of the twelve major divinities provided by Martianus is shaped by Neoplatonism and its "sacred text", the *Chaldaean Oracles* (p. XLIII-XLIV). The image of the sphere contemplated by Jupiter as Demiurge in 1.68 obviously symbolises the Platonic Ideas, paradigms for the Demiurge in his creative activity in Plato's *Timaeus*. The clear references to Etruscan religion in Martianus's theology resonate well with haruspicine being the stronghold of "paganism" in late antiquity (see my *Cultura e religione etrusca nel mondo romano. La cultura etrusca alla fine dell'indipendenza*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso, 2003). And Martianus appears to have been a supporter of "paganism", a nostalgic not only of Rome's power, but also of Rome's religion. This religion, however, he interpreted in philosophical Neoplatonic terms (not so differently from Origen, who interpreted Christianity in philosophical Middle/Neoplatonic terms!). Indeed, Chevalier himself realises that the first two books of *De nuptiis* provide a spiritual progression from the *prisca theologia* to Neoplatonism (p. XLVIII). But the latter is both philosophy and theology together. The edition and translation are sufficiently accurate, and the commentary, although I disagree on a few minor points, is often informative and helpful. It is frequently found in dialogue with my own 2001 commentary on Martianus (*Marziano Capella: Nozze di Filologia e di Mercurio*, essay, edition and translation, commentary, appendixes, and bibliography. Milan, Bompiani, 2001), albeit my more recent edition, with essays and commentary, of the commentators on Martianus, cited above and listed in

Chevalier's bibliography, could also have been fruitfully employed. Much more could have been said from the philosophical viewpoint, and ancient and mediaeval commentaries such as those by Eriugena, Remigius of Auxerre, and the School of Chartres could have been deployed much more consistently and profitably (in the introduction and the commentary Chevalier does use at least Eriugena's and Remigius of Auxerre's commentaries on Martianus, although very sparsely), but one must realise that choices had of course to be made. All in all, this volume will be very useful to readers. Ilaria L.E. RAMELLI

Johannes A. VAN WAARDEN & Gavin KELLY (Ed.), *New Approaches to Sidonius Apollinaris.* With indices on Helga KÖHLER, C. Sollius Apollinaris Sidonius: *Briefe Buch I.* Louvain – Paris – Walpole, Peeters, 2013. 1 vol. 397 p. (LATE ANTIQUE HISTORY AND RELIGION, 7). Prix : 89 €. ISBN 978-90-429-2928-9.

L'idée de composer un « commentaire complet » (p. 3), qui prenne en compte l'ensemble de la prose et de la poésie de Sidoine Apollinaire afin d'aboutir à une compréhension globale de son œuvre, constitue l'objectif initial du projet SAxxi, « Sidonius Apollinaris for the 21st century ». Pour estimer quels chantiers étaient à mener en priorité, un colloque a été organisé à Wassenaar entre le 26 et le 30 janvier 2011. Ce sont les communications de ce colloque qui sont présentées dans cet ouvrage composé d'une introduction, de trois parties et d'un appendice contenant les index correspondant au commentaire du livre I des lettres de Sidoine publié par H. Köhler. Dès l'introduction, les particularités de ce projet, s'adressant aussi bien à un public universitaire qu'à un lectorat moins spécialisé, sont exposées. Une équipe internationale transdisciplinaire est ainsi mobilisée pour travailler sur les aspects littéraires, philologiques et historiques de ce commentaire des œuvres de Sidoine qui sera accompagné d'une nouvelle traduction anglaise, d'une introduction, d'une liste des monographies et d'index. Dans la première partie de l'ouvrage, trois chercheurs, D. Amherdt, H. Köhler et S. Santelia, font état de la tradition de la recherche sur l'œuvre de Sidoine en France, en Allemagne et en Italie. Ces trois articles mettent en évidence l'ampleur des différences entre ces traditions érudites nationales qui, en fonction des époques, ont chacune privilégié une approche plutôt qu'une autre. De légères divergences entre les auteurs peuvent cependant être relevées. Par exemple, H. Köhler défend l'idée selon laquelle la traduction doit rester au plus près du texte, celle-ci ne devant en aucun cas le simplifier, ni l'adapter aux goûts du lecteur (p. 44-46). Un tel postulat peut paraître éloigné des propos de D. Amherdt qui défend la nécessité de produire des traductions accessibles à un large public et agréables à lire (p. 35-36). Étant donné qu'aucune conclusion ne figure à la fin de l'ouvrage ou de chaque partie, il est difficile pour le lecteur de connaître les positions retenues pour le futur commentaire. Dans la deuxième partie de l'ouvrage, ce sont les poèmes de Sidoine qui sont analysés. Les auteurs adoptent des perspectives très différentes. P. Gerbrandy est l'auteur qui porte le jugement le plus sévère sur le style de Sidoine : « As for me, I believe Sidonius to be an extremely bad poet, but the very badness of his poems triggers my interest in his cultural environment » (p. 65). Il déprécie en particulier le goût de Sidoine pour les énumérations qu'il considère comme étant le