Assembled in northern France at the beginning of the twelfth century, the Vergilian commentary starting with the words testatur Seruius and sometimes attributed to Hilary of Orléans seems to have enjoyed a remarkably wide circulation throughout the Late Middle Ages, being preserved by more extant witnesses than any other Vergilian commentary except for Servius’.

Pietro Pellegatta (henceforth P.) deserves credit for producing the first critical edition of this commentary as his doctoral thesis at the Università di Venezia ‘Ca’ Foscari’. The edition in question, which covers the first six eclogues, is mainly based on three continuous witnesses –namely Berlin, Staatsbibliothek, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Ms. Lat. Fol. 34 (B), London, British Library, Ms. Add. 33220 (A), and München, Bayerische

---


2. P. Pellegatta, 2014. The edition has been made available in open access in the online research repository of the ‘Ca’ Foscari’: http://dspace.unive.it/handle/10579/4622 (accessed on the 10th of January 2023).
P. chose to follow a relatively conservative approach, confining the adoption of conjectures to the only cases where he judged the paradosis as blatantly corrupt; in six passages, however, he resorted to daggers to indicate that the paradosis was so corrupt that no sufficiently plausible solution could be proposed. This paper aims to re-examine the six passages at issue.4

1. praef. 8: quidam enim dicunt quia quo tempore Horestes cum Effigenia sorore sua, scilicet †Illo ante† occiso [scilicet ilioante occiso uel scilicet thoante occiso B: occiso rege th[...]]e A: to anima scilicet occiso M] de Taurica regione simulacrum Fatilide Diane asportaret, tempestate compulsus est in Siciliam.

In B, the word recorded by P. as ilioante is difficult to read, but I suspect that its first letters should be identified with th, rather than with ili. Be it as it may, the proper name Thoante is clearly concealed by A’s th[...]e and by M’s to anima as well. The commentary follows the version of the myth according to which the king of the Taurians was killed by Orestes before he fled away together with his sister. The same version of the myth is recorded in Servius’ commentary: occiso Thoante simulacrum sustulit absconditum fasce lignorum, unde et Phacelitis dicitur (ad Aen. 2.116) and Orestes post occisum regem Thoantem in regione Taurica cum sorore Iphigenia ... fugit (ad Aen. 6.136).

2. ad ecl. 2.63-68: ostendit per simile utile sibi fore et singula utilia sibi sequuntur: torua leena sequitur lupum ut deuoret, lupus autem sequitur capellam ut deuoret similiter eam; ego autem sequor te, o Alexi, non ut deuorem sed ut te †foueam† [te futuam A: mihi faueas B: sch. om. M].

The conjecture te foueam, hesitantly proposed by P., can hardly be right. The initial section of the excerpt makes clear that Corydon is seeking Alexis in order to receive a benefit for himself, and a similar idea is also

3 Pellegatta also collated a Vergilian manuscript which contains some notes drawn from the commentary in question: Stockholm, Kungliga Biblioteket, Ms. Va 31. According to the editor, this manuscript could be judged as depending either on A itself or on a witness strictly related to A.

4 The extracts are drawn from Pellegatta’s edition. The three manuscripts have been collated afresh; for this reason, some of the readings recorded here in square brackets differ from those recorded in Pellegatta’s apparatus.
expressed in the preface to the eclogue in question: *intendit enim Virgilius Augustum Cesarem ad carmina sua consideranda flectere ut, illis inspectis et complacitis, agrorum suorum mereatur restitutionem.* Although the B reading does not pose this problem, it does not appear completely persuasive either: granted, Vergil may be described as seeking Augustus in order to be supported by him, but the same idea is less immediately applicable to Corydon. By contrast, A’s *ut te futuam* seems suitable to express the benefit that Corydon wants to receive from Alexis. One is led to hypothesise that this should be identified with the reading of the archetype and that the B reading resulted either from an unconscious misunderstanding or even from a ‘moralistic’ correction made by a scribe who wished to suppress the explicit sexual explanation offered for the Vergilian comparison.

3. *ad ecl. 3.3-5:* *IPSE NEERAM quasi dicat Egon tradidit tibi pecus ut foueret et frequentaret Neeram, quia timet ne me sibi preferat; maioris enim illa me facit quam ipsum, et ideo illam fouet ut eam captet et hoc est ‘ipse Neeram’ et cetera† dum inquam [*inquam A et B, ut uid.: int[...]pta et M] hoc est†. *HIC ALIENVS CVSTOS...*

The AB reading makes sense: it should be rendered as ‘while, as I say, this is happening’ and taken as a summary of v. 4 (*dum fouet ac ne me sibi praefaret ille veretur*), meant to introduce the following lemma. This formula occurs with the same function, for instance, in the scholium *ad ecl. 3.16-20:* *et cum clamarem de Dameta hoc –scilicet ‘quo nunc se proripit ille caper; Tytire coge pecus’–, dum, inquam,* TV POST CARECTA LATEBAS.

4. *ad ecl. 3.7-11:* *TAMEN CREDO rustice et naturaliter respondet Menalcas. non enim obiecta purgat, sed alia obicit et dicit sub persona sua quod ille fecit et hoc est tamen credo. † corruptus sum†: yronia est. CVM HOMINES VIDERE ME idest te.*

The words *tamen, credo, corruptus sum cum homines uidere me* are simply to be taken as a paraphrasis of v. 10, where the verb *corruptus sum* is supplied on the basis of the accusation raised by Damoetas against Menalcas in his previous utterance (vv. 8-9: *nouimus et qui te transuersa tuentibus hircis / et quo –sed faciles Nymphae risere– sacello*). The paradoxis does not seem

---

*Vv. 8-9 are summarised in the commentary as follows: *nouimus qui te corruperunt oculis retortis in hirquos ... et nouimus quo, id est in quo loco, corruperunt te, scilicet in sacello, sed nymphe que profuerant illi templo faciles ..., id est mites et exorabiles, riserunt, id est indulserunt.*
corrupt, but a couple of minor changes should be made to the punctuation adopted by P.: *dicit sub persona sua quod ille fecit, et hoc est: tamen, credo, corruptus sum* –yronia est– *cum homines uidere me, id est te.*

5. *ad ecl. 3.25-27:* *AVT VMQVAM FVIT TIBI FISTVLA IVNCTA CERA quasi dicit †non aut† [non aut M: non A: nihil B].

The scholium clarifies the rhetorical nature of the interrogative question of vv. 25-26 (*aut umquam tibi fistula cera / iuncta fuit?*). M’s *non aut* might be suspected of standing for *non fuit.* Paraphrases introduced by *quasi dicit* are relatively frequent in the commentary; a precise parallel can be found, for instance, in the scholium *ad ecl.* 7.51: *CVRAMVS FRIGORA BOREE TANTVM QVANTVM LVPVS et cetera. quasi dicit: non curamus.*


The A and the B reading, which are recorded by P. as *ideo existens* and [...] *existens*, are difficult to read, but I believe that, in both codices, the word preceding *existens* should be identified with *rome.* If this were the case, the paradox would pose no problem. In the commentary, *existens* is frequently used as a substitute for the participle of *sum:* cf., e.g., the scholia *ad ecl.* 1.56: *in aere existens,* 2.25-27: *ego existens in littore,* and 8.56: *Arion existens inter delphinas.* A similar account of the instructions sent by Vergil from Rome to the managers of his goods can be found in the preface to *ecl.* 9: *qui [i.e. Arrius] cognito quod Virgilius agros suos recuperasset hasta fremebundus erecta impetum in ipsum fecit; Virgilius uero cum Meri famulo suo in Mincium flumen se precipitando easit et Mantuam ire non audens Romam Augusto questurus reuersus est. Augustus autem Arrium tantum uirum in bellico tumultu offendere nolens rogauit Virgilium donec res in pacis*

---

6 In Pellegatta’s edition, the relative pronoun *quas* is misprinted as *quos.*
tranquillitate constituta esset ut sustineret. unde Virgilius Meri et aliis rerum suarum procuratoribus mandauit ne Arrium in aliquo offenderent.

Bibliography


