

Six Notes on the Commentary on Vergil's *Eclogues*
Attributed to Hilary of Orléans

Vittorio Remo Danovi*

University of Oxford

<https://doi.org/10.6018/myrtia.588551>

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'.¹

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'.² 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

* **Dirección para correspondencia:** University of Oxford. Lincoln College. Turl Street. OX1 3DR. Oxford (GB). Correo electrónico: vittorio.danovi@classics.ox.ac.uk. ORCID: 0000-0002-9712-6931

¹ On the genesis and the main features of the commentary, see V. de Angelis, 1997, pp. 112-136; F. Bognini, 2005; C. Baswell, 2008; and P. Pellegatta, 2014, pp. 20-23 and *passim*. On its manuscript tradition, see C. Baswell, 1986 and 1995, pp. 339-340 n. 101; V. Brown, 1988, p. 82 n. 25; and B. Munk Olsen, 2009, pp. 119-120. The attribution of the commentary to the early-twelfth-century poet Hilary of Orléans, proposed by de Angelis in the aforementioned article, has not won unanimous acceptance (cf., e.g., the reservations expressed by A.B. Kraebel, 2016).

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).

Staatsbibliothek, Ms. CLM 19484 (M)–, which are said to descend autonomously from a lost archetype.³

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 †Ilio ant† 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 Phacelitidis 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 sequentur: 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.: inf[...]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 praeferat ille ueretur*), 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, hoc clamarem, 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*).⁵ The paradosis does not seem

⁵ Vv. 8-9 are summarised in the commentary as follows: *nouimus qui te corruerunt oculis retortis in hirquos ... et nouimus quo, id est in quo loco, corruerunt te, scilicet in sacello, sed nymphe que profuerunt 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 dicat †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 dicat* 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 dicat: non curamus.*

6. *ad ecl.* 3.92-93: *QVI LEGITIS incipit Dameta. isti uersus, secundum Seruium, sensum litterarum quas⁶ Virgilius †ideo existens [rome existens A et, ut uid., B: nihil M] rerum suarum procuratoribus misit, continent, et possunt ad seruos suos et ceteros Mantuanos referri.*

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 paradosis 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 euasit 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 mandavit ne Arrium in aliquo offenderent.

Bibliography

- C. Baswell, 1986, "A High Medieval Commentary on the *Aeneid*", in *Sixty Bokes Olde and Newe. Manuscripts and Early Printed Books from Libraries in and near Philadelphia Illustrating Chaucer's Sources, His Works and Their Influence*, D. Anderson (ed.), Knoxville, pp. 60-63.
- C. Baswell, 1995, *Virgil in Medieval England. Figuring the Aeneid from the Twelfth Century to Chaucer*, Cambridge.
- C. Baswell, 2008, "Master Anselm", in *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*, J.M. Ziolkowski – M.C.J. Putnam (eds.), New Haven - London, pp. 717-721.
- F. Bognini, 2005, "Per il commento virgiliano ascritto a Ilario di Orléans: a proposito delle *glose* al sesto libro dell'*Eneide*", *ACME* 58, pp. 129-173.
- V. Brown, 1988, "A Twelfth-Century Miscellany-Commentary of German Origin (Vatican MS Pal. Lat. 1695)", in *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben*, S. Krämer – M. Bernhard (eds.), München, pp. 73-86.
- V. de Angelis, 1997, "I commenti medievali alla *Tebaide* di Stazio: Anselmo di Laon, Goffredo Babione, Ilario d'Orléans", in *Medieval and Renaissance Scholarship*, N. Mann – B. Munk Olsen (eds.), Leiden – New York – Köln, pp. 75-136.
- A.B. Kraebel, 2016, "Biblical Exegesis and the Twelfth-century Expansion of Servius", in *Classical Commentaries. Explorations in a Scholarly Genre*, C.S. Kraus – C. Stray (eds.), Oxford, pp. 419-434.
- B. Munk Olsen, 2009, *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI^e et XII^e siècles*, vol. 4.1: *La réception de la littérature classique. Travaux philologiques*, Paris.
- P. Pellegatta, 2014, *Edizione critica del commento Testatur Servius alle Bucoliche di Virgilio attribuito a Ilario d'Orléans*, diss. Università di Venezia 'Ca' Foscari'.