

## CRITICAL NOTES ON SERVIUS' COMMENTARY ON VIRGIL (SERV. ON *AEN.* 11.741; *ECL.* 2.58; *ECL.* 4.4)\*

### ABSTRACT

*This article discusses three textual problems in Servius' commentary on Virgil (Serv. on Aen. 11.741; Ecl. 2.58; Ecl. 4.4). In two notes a new conjecture is proposed; in one passage a transmitted reading, so far neglected by earlier editors, is supported.*

**Keywords:** Servius; Virgilian exegesis; textual criticism; manuscript traditions

This article discusses three textual and interpretative problems in Servius' commentary on Virgil (Serv. on *Aen.* 11.741; *Ecl.* 2.58; *Ecl.* 4.4).<sup>1</sup> In two notes (*Ecl.* 2.58; *Ecl.* 4.4) a new conjecture is proposed. In the case of the scholia to *Aen.* 11.741 and *Ecl.* 2.58, a new evaluation of the manuscript tradition would give us reason to adopt a different text from what has been printed by editors thus far. Furthermore, the textual problem of Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58 will be contextualized in a discussion of the consistency of the scholium, which is apparently the result of a conflation of different scholia.

### 1. SERV. ON *AEN.* 11.741: *TARCHON MORITVRVS*

Verg. *Aen.* 11.741–2 haec effatus equum in medios moriturus et ipse | concitat et Venulo aduersum se turbidus infert.

So saying, he [*sc.* Tarchon] spurs his horse into the throng, ready himself also to die, and charges like a whirlwind full at Venulus.

As stated by Horsfall, 'in contrast with V(irgil)'s common use of *moriturus* [...], *periturus* [...], T(archon) is not about to die'.<sup>2</sup> This point was already made by Servius, who comments (Murgia's text and apparatus criticus):

\* Parts of this paper were presented at the research seminars organized by Fabio Stok at the University of Roma Tor Vergata and at the *Latin Grammarians Forum* (Trinity College Dublin, 30–31 May 2019) organized by Anna Chahoud and Elena Spangenberg Yanes: I thank all the participants for their comments. Dániel Kiss, Giuseppe Ramires, Alessandro Russo, Ernesto Stagni and Fabio Stok read earlier versions of this paper: I thank them all for their useful comments. Finally, I wish to thank Bruce Gibson and the anonymous referee of *CQ* for their valuable suggestions.

<sup>1</sup> For Serv. on *Aen.* 11.741 we now have C.E. Murgia and R.A. Kaster (edd.), *Serviani in Vergili Aeneidos libros IX–XII commentarii* (Oxford, 2018). For Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58 and 4.4 we must still rely on G. Thilo (ed.), *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica commentarii* (Leipzig, 1887). On Servius' manuscript tradition, see C.E. Murgia, *Prolegomena to Servius 5 — The Manuscripts* (Berkeley, 1975), Murgia and Kaster (this note), xi–xxxviii. On Servius' commentary, see J.E.G. Zetzel, *Critics, Compilers, and Commentators* (Oxford, 2018), 262–3. Where not otherwise specified, I quote Servius from Thilo (using italics only for the *auctus*-text), Virgil from G.B. Conte and S. Ottaviano, *P. Vergilius Maro Bucolica Georgica* (Berlin and Boston, 2013) and G.B. Conte, *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis* (Berlin and Boston, 2019<sup>2</sup>). Translations of Servius are mine. For Virgil I use the translation of H.R. Fairclough and G.P. Goold, *Virgil* (Cambridge, MA, 1999–2000).

<sup>2</sup> N. Horsfall, *Virgil, Aeneid 11. A Commentary* (Leiden and Boston, 2003), ad loc.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

MORITVRVS ET IPSE moriturus animo, nam moriturus non est. quod autem ait 'et ipse', aut ad Camillam aut ad Venulum respicit.

moriturus (animo)] moriturus *F P c γ* morituri *J Q N [Σ]* moritur *θ* morituro *W U* moriturus in *Pa*

The problem at stake here is the subjective or objective interpretation of *moriturus* ('determined/ready to die', 'certain of dying', etc. as opposed to 'about/doomed to die').<sup>3</sup> Servius also deals with the very same topic in another scholium, on Coroebus *periturus* in Book 2 (a passage where the meaning of the participle was debated: *melior sensus est*), and quotes Tarchon's instance as a parallel:<sup>4</sup>

Verg. *Aen.* 2.407–8 non tulit hanc speciem furiata mente Coroebus | et sese medium iniecit periturus in agmen [...]

Serv. PERITVRVS melior sensus est, si ad dimicantis referatur affectum: sicut de Tarchonte, de quo dixit [11.741] 'et medios fertur moriturus in hostes',<sup>5</sup> cum uicerit.

At the beginning of the scholium to *Aen.* 11.741, all editors print *moriturus animo*, apparently taking *animo* as an ablative of respect ('ready to die in his soul'). But other instances of *animo* as an ablative of respect show that the syntagm *moriturus animo* is unexpected and suspect.<sup>6</sup> Equally suspect is the repetition of *moriturus* (**MORITVRVS ET IPSE moriturus** animo [...]). Although Murgia's apparatus criticus indicates that *morituri* is the reading of the Servian archetype ([Σ]), he rejected this reading and followed previous editors in accepting *moriturus* found in the *auctus*-witness (F) and in some manuscripts of Servius.<sup>7</sup> But does *morituri animo* really *not* make any sense?

MORITVRVS ET IPSE morituri animo: nam moriturus non est.

Given the context, *morituri* must be a genitive singular depending on *animo*, and the clear meaning of *morituri animo* effectively glosses *moriturus*: '(he spurs his horse/performs this action) with the mindset of a *moriturus*, of someone who is going/ready/doomed to die'. The syntax of *morituri* might seem rather elliptic, whereas *moriturus* straightforwardly resumes the lemma at the beginning of the scholium. But this is

<sup>3</sup> On the (often debated) meaning of *moriturus/periturus* in Virgil, see now F. Grotto, 'Frustra mori: per l'esegesi di Verg. *Aen.* 4, 415 e Stat. *Theb.* 9, 726–727', *MD* 84 (2020), 173–96.

<sup>4</sup> Servius hints at the 'subjective' connotation of *moriturus/periturus* also when commenting on the words of a character who defines himself/herself as *periturus/moriturus* (Serv. on *Aen.* 4.642 [...] nam moritura nihil timebat, cf. Verg. *Aen.* 4.604 *quem metui moritura?*; Serv. on *Aen.* 10.881), but he recognizes that *moriturus/periturus* has usually an 'objective' meaning: Serv. on *Aen.* 10.341 *quando dico 'moriturus est', uere moriturus est; moribundus autem non uere, sed similis morienti est* (cf. also Serv. on *G.* 4.457, 10.501; Serv. *auctus* on *Aen.* 8.583).

<sup>5</sup> The quotation is imprecise. At Verg. *Aen.* 11.741 the Virgilian manuscripts read *in medios moriturus et ipse (et ipse) in hostis γ* and the Servian scholium ad loc. also discusses *et ipse* (see above). Other similar passages led to the confusion: *Aen.* 2.511, 9.400, 9.554 (cf. Conte [n. 1], ad loc.).

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Serv. on *Aen.* 1.613 **OBSTIPVIT** animo perculsa est; Serv. *auctus* on *Aen.* 10.858 **HAVD DEIECTVS** non deiectus animo.

<sup>7</sup> I agree with Murgia (n. 1) on the archetypal status of *morituri*, which is transmitted in three witnesses belonging to different families. In Murgia's reconstruction, the *moriturus* of some Servian manuscripts is either a conjectural reading or a fortunate mistake or a contamination from Servius *auctus*. Most likely, the reading of Servius *auctus* persuaded Murgia to print *moriturus*. The other transmitted readings are unimportant, but they do suggest that the ending of the participle was 'unstable' in the manuscript tradition.

precisely the reason why *morituri* should be considered a *lectio difficilior*: given the lemma and the subsequent *moriturus non est*, the easy corruption of *morituri* to *moriturus* could well have occurred independently in F, in Pc and in  $\gamma$ . Moreover, *morituri animo* seems to correspond to the structure ‘*affectus* + genitive-singular present participle’, which Servius sometimes uses to define a character’s state of mind, their own ‘subjective perspective’, as in the case of Coroebus’ *dimicantis affectus* (see above).<sup>8</sup> In the Servian corpus there is no further instance of *animus* + future participle, but this is not a serious obstacle. The structure is quite common in Tiberius Claudius Donatus and in Donatus’ commentary on Terence, where *animo* + genitive-singular participle indicates the mindset with which a character performs an action.<sup>9</sup>

The text printed so far, though suspect, is perhaps not unacceptable. However, Murgia’s new evaluation of the manuscript tradition invites us to consider seriously the genitive *morituri*.

## 2. SERV. ON *ECL.* 2.58: CORYDON’S IMAGINATION

In Verg. *Ecl.* 2.56–61 Corydon is alone, lamenting his unrequited love for Alexis: he talks to himself (*rusticus es ...*) and then addresses his beloved (*quem fugis, a, demens?*).

‘rusticus es, Corydon; nec munera curat Alexis,  
nec, si muneribus certes, concedat Iollas.  
heu heu, quid uolui misero mihi? floribus Austrum  
perditus et liquidis immisi fontibus apros.  
quem fugis, a, demens? habitarunt di quoque siluas  
Dardaniusque Paris.’ 60

‘Corydon, you are a clown! Alexis cares naught for gifts, nor if with gifts you were to vie, would Iollas yield. Alas, alas! What hope, poor fool, has been mine? Madman, I have let in the south wind to my flowers, and boars to my crystal springs! Ah, idiot, whom do you flee? Even the gods have dwelt in the woods, and Dardan Paris.’

Here is Servius’ commentary on line 58 as printed in Thilo’s edition (the apparatus criticus is based on a new collation of the witnesses).<sup>10</sup>

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Serv. on *Aen.* 9.445 [sc. ‘placida morte’] ex adfectu pereuntis dictum est. See also *animus* + genitive, typical of Servius *auctus* to express the point of view of a character: Serv. *auctus* on *Aen.* 1.464 [sc. ‘inani’] *ad stupentis animum rettulit* (but *animus* is here in the Virgilian verse); 4.141 *ex animo Didonis*; 9.426; 12.636. On focalization in Virgilian exegesis, see G. Rosati, ‘Punto di vista narrativo e antichi esegeti di Virgilio’, *ASNP* 9 (1979), 539–62, D. Fowler, ‘The Virgil commentary of Servius’, in C. Martindale (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil* (Cambridge, 1997), 73–8, G. Liveley, *Narratology* (Oxford, 2019), 100–3, S. Poletti, ‘Eine Frage der Perspektive. Servius und Servius auctus über Vergils subjektiven Stil’, in U. Tischer, Th. Kuhn-Treichel and S. Poletti (edd.), *Sicut commentatores loquuntur. Authorship and Authority in Ancient Commentaries on Poetry* (Turnhout, forthcoming).

<sup>9</sup> For ‘*animo* (ablative) + participle in genitive singular’, see e.g. Tib. Claud. Donat. on 2.178 *reprehendentis scilicet animo faciebat* [...]; 3.266 [...] *quae tamen ipsa instruentis animo, non arguentis ingerit*. For ‘*animus* + future participle’, see e.g. Donat. on *Hec.* <489> 39.1 *reducturi animum*; Tib. Claud. Don. on *Aen.* 1.131 *animus audituri*.

<sup>10</sup> I thank Prof. Stok and Dr Ramires for kindly sharing with me their collations for the passages of Servius on the *Bucolics* that I quote here and below. Witnesses:  $\theta$  (= G A),  $\tau$  (= Bc Bo H Q Sc Pa Le Pc), B,  $\gamma$  (= E M Pb Y Z),  $\sigma$  (= V W); for the *Bucolics* there are no  $\Delta$ -witnesses. I give the apparatus

Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58 HEV QVID VOLVI MISERO MIHI quomodo eum dicit discedere, quem supra cum eo diximus non fuisse? Nam ait [*Ecl.* 2.4–5] ‘solus montibus et siluis’. sed ratione non caret: Epicurei enim dicunt, quod etiam Cicero tractat [*Cic. Tusc.* 5.96], geminam esse uoluptatem, unam quae percipitur, et alteram imaginariam, scilicet eam quae nascitur ex cogitatione. unde ita debemus accipere, hunc usum per cogitationem illa imaginaria uoluptate, qua et cernere et adloqui uidebatur absentem. sed postquam obiurgatione sua in naturalem prudentiam est reuersus, caruit utique illa imaginaria uoluptate, ubi nunc sibi se offuisse dicit per hanc ratiocinationem: [*Ecl.* 2.56–7] ‘rusticus es, Corydon: nec munera curat Alexis, nec, si m. c. c. Iollas’.

quomodo] quod Y | eum dicit ... ratione non om. Le Pc | dicit discedere] discedere dicit E Pb Y Sc<sup>pc</sup> | nam] nam quod Bc M Pb σ (Guarinus, Masvicius, Burman, Lion) | ratione] sed ratione Bo H (Cennini, Stephanus, Fabricius, Thilo) : ratione cett.

ALAS, ALAS! WHAT HOPE, POOR FOOL, HAS BEEN MINE? How can he [*sc.* Corydon] say that he [*sc.* Alexis] is going away, who [*sc.* Alexis], as we said above, was not with him [*sc.* Corydon]? In fact, the poet says [of Corydon] [*Ecl.* 2.4–5] ‘alone with the mountains and forests’. But there is an explanation. For the Epicureans say, as is also discussed by Cicero [*Cic. Tusc.* 5.96], that pleasure comes in two kinds: one that is due to perception and another due to imagination, which is born from our thinking. Therefore, we must understand that Corydon has experienced this imagined pleasure, thanks to which he seemed to see his absent beloved and talk to him. But after his own reproach had led him to regain his natural clarity of thought, he was certainly deprived of that imagined pleasure, as here he says he has hurt himself by this reasoning: [*Ecl.* 2.56–7] ‘Corydon, you are a clown! Alexis cares naught for gifts, nor if with gifts you were to vie, would Iollas yield.’

Two surrounding scholia are related to this one: the scholium to lines 56–7 on the self-reproach (Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.56 RVSTICVS ES CORYDON arguit se stultitiae, quod eum se sperat placare muneribus, qui potest habere meliora, nam supra ait ‘delicias domini’) and the scholium to line 60 on Corydon’s *phantasia* (QVEM FVGIS A. D. iterum per phantasiam quasi ad praesentem loquitur. [...]).

In the scholium to *Ecl.* 2.58 Servius first points out a seeming contradiction: Corydon says that Alexis is going away, while at the beginning of the *Eclogue* Corydon is presented as being alone.<sup>11</sup> Then the commentator explains that the character is using his *imaginatio*<sup>12</sup> and that, after the self-reproach of lines 56–7, he comes back to

criticus only for the section I analyse (*quomodo ... caret*). I rely on the *sigla* of Murgia (n. 1), 199–207 and Kaster and Murgia (n. 1), 1–2 and on Murgia’s stemma. I add the following *sigla*: Bc = Oxford, Bodleian Library, Auct. T.1.25, saec. XI<sup>1</sup>; Bo = Boulogne-sur-Mer (Pas-de-Calais), Bibliothèque des Annociades, 186 (358), saec. XI; G = Glasgow, University Library, Hunterian Museum, U. 6. 8 (290), saec. IX/X; Le = Leiden, Universitaire Bibliotheken, Voss. lat. F. 25, saec. X. The editors quoted in the apparatus criticus are Guarinus Veronensis, *Servii Commentarii in Vergilii Maronis opera* (Venice, 1471), P. Cennini, *M. Servii Honorati Commentarii in tria Virgilii opera: Bucolica, Georgica et Aeneidem* (Florence, 1471–1472), R. Stephanus, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera* (Paris, 1532), G. Fabricius, *Publii Vergilii Maronis opera* (Basel, 1551), P. Masvicius, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera* (Leeuwarden, 1717), P. Burman, *P. Virgilii Maronis opera* (Amsterdam, 1746), H.A. Lion, *Commentarii in Virgilium Serviani* (Göttingen, 1826). Thilo printed *sed* before *ratione* as a conjecture by Stephanus, but this reading is already found in MSS Bo and H and in Cennini’s edition.

<sup>11</sup> *diximus* indicates that the topic was discussed in Servius’ note on lines 4–5 *solus*, which is unfortunately lost in a lacuna (*Ecl.* 1.37–2.10: see G. Ramires and F. Stok, ‘La lacuna del commento di Servio ad *Ecl.* 1.37–2.10’, *RHT* 12 [2017], 141–60). In the Philargyrian scholium (rec. I) to line 6 *inani*, there is a reference to the loneliness of Corydon: *INANI idest pro ‘nihil sibi procurans contra absentem loquebatur’* (H. Hagen, *Appendix Serviana* [Leipzig, 1902], 33); cf. also the Bern-Scholia (H. Hagen, *Scholia Bernensia* [Leipzig, 1867], 754).

<sup>12</sup> On the reference to the Epicurean doctrine and Cicero, see A. Setaioli, ‘Interpretazioni stoiche ed epicuree in Servio e la tradizione dell’ esegesi filosofica del mito e dei poeti a Roma (Cornuto, Seneca, Filodemo) II’, *IJCT* 11 (2004), 3–46, at 36–7.

his ‘clarity of thought’. The structure of the scholium is very odd indeed. The opening remark (*eum dicit discedere*) refers not to the lemma ‘*heu heu, quid uolui misero mihi?*’ but to line 60 ‘*quem fugis?*’ without any indication of a cross-reference (for example *paulo post*).<sup>13</sup> Only at the end do we find a (relatively) clear reference to the lemma (*nunc sibi se offuisse dicit*: contrast *eum dicit discedere*) and its context (56–7).<sup>14</sup> Apparently some exegetic material related to line 60 was conflated with that relating to lines 56–8, but a transposition of the scholium of line 58 (or also part of it) to line 60 is not possible, since at Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.60 there is already a note on *phantasia* (see above) and *ubi nunc ... dicit* anchors the scholium to line 58 (that is, to the context of Corydon’s ‘rationality’). Hence the most probable hypothesis is that Servius is merging scholia related to different lines in a rather mechanical and clumsy way (as he often does),<sup>15</sup> with the aim of offering a general reflection on this pivotal passage (56–60).<sup>16</sup> In the scholium to line 60, he then presupposes this detailed note on *imaginatio* (*iterum* = ‘again’, that is, after a moment of *naturalis prudentia*).

The textual problem at the opening of Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58 gives further food for thought about this issue. Here is the text transmitted by the majority of our witnesses:

**quomodo** eum dicit discedere, quem supra cum eo diximus non fuisse? nam ait ‘solus montibus et siluis’. ratione non caret: Epicurei enim ...

or, with a different punctuation,

quomodo eum dicit discedere, quem supra cum eo diximus non fuisse (nam ait ‘solus montibus et siluis’)? ratione non caret: Epicurei enim ...

In the Servian corpus (especially in the *auctus*) there are many instances of *quaestiones* introduced by *quomodo* on possible contradictions in the Virgilian text.<sup>17</sup> The addition of *sed* (*sed ratione non caret*), found in MSS Bo H and printed so far in many editions, is not strictly necessary, but highlights very well the editors’ discomfort with the conciseness of *ratione non caret*.

Some manuscripts offer a quite different scenario:

Bc M Pb σ: **quomodo** eum dicit discedere (*discedere dicit Pb*),<sup>18</sup> quem supra cum eo diximus non fuisse? nam **quod** ait ‘solus montibus et siluis’ ratione non caret: Epicurei enim ...

<sup>13</sup> Thilo offers no indication of this, but see already Burman (n. 10), ad loc.: ‘haec nota pertinet ad vs. 60’ (similarly H. Georgii, *Die antike Vergilkritik in den Bucolica und Georgica* [Leipzig, 1904], 226 and Setaioli [n. 12], 36). Cf. also the parallel of Serv. on *Aen.* 6.465 SISTE GRADVM **discedere** eam datur intellegi (at line 466 Aeneas asks Dido precisely ‘*quem fugis?*’).

<sup>14</sup> With ‘*nunc dicit* + quotation’ Servius usually gets back to the lemma, but here the quotation does not go so far as to include the lemma and works only as a cross-reference to the *ratiocinatio/obiurgatio* of lines 56–7.

<sup>15</sup> It is often possible to detect the merging of different scholia in the commentary of Servius by means of comparison with the *auctus*. The conflation in Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58 may also be due (at least partially) to a rearrangement of this section in the transmission of the commentary.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Georgii (n. 13), 226–7.

<sup>17</sup> Serv. on *Aen.* 1.272 *quomodo* trecentos annos dicit, cum eam quadringentis regnasse constet sub Albanis regibus? *sed* cum praescriptione ait ‘tercentum’ [...] (compare the *sed* in MSS Bo H at Serv. on *Ecl.* 2.58); *G.* 2.460. See also Serv. *auctus* on *Aen.* 4.696 *harum rerum ratio sic redditur* in the answer to a *quomodo*-question. On the *quaestiones*, cf. É. Thomas, *Scoliaes de Virgile: Essai sur Servius et son Commentaire sur Virgile* (Paris, 1880), 247–57, P.C. Burns, ‘The Vatican scholia on Virgil’s *Georgics*’ (Diss., Toronto, 1974), 190–9, S. Poletti, ‘Due note testuali (Serv. auct. *Georg.* 2, 148; 434)’, *Hermes* 146 (2018), 373–80, at 376–8.

<sup>18</sup> I do not discuss the variant of word order.

Y: **quod** eum discedere dicit, quem supra cum eo diximus non fuisse (nam ait 'solus montibus et siluis'),<sup>19</sup> ratione non caret: Epicurei enim ...

These readings, though perhaps conjectural, deserve serious consideration.<sup>20</sup> Servius uses this expression (*quod dicit/ait ... ratione non caret*, 'the fact that he says ... has a reason') to clarify seeming inconsistencies in the Virgilian text.<sup>21</sup> In this scholium the *quod*-clause would provide a subject for *ratione non caret*, which otherwise would be hanging in the air—hence also the *sed* added by many editors. While the reading of MSS Bc M Pb σ is not convincing (*nam* must introduce the quotation *solus montibus et siluis*, certainly not the answer to the *quaestio* itself), the reading of MS Y makes perfect sense and is very likely to be the right reading, which was then corrupted in the typical *quomodo* opening many scholia. Following MS Y, I would go a step further, by offering a correction that could better account for the *quomodo* of the other witnesses: *quod modo* ('the fact that **now** he says', in contrast with *supra diximus ... nam ait ...*).<sup>22</sup> Servius uses quite often the expression *quod modo*, also in comparisons of two (seemingly) contradictory passages.<sup>23</sup> Obviously, the presence of *modo* at the beginning of the scholium to *Ecl.* 2.58 seems to clash with *ubi nunc ... dicit* at the end of it: *quod modo dicit* would perfectly fit with *quem fugis?* as a lemma, while it is less suitable to introduce a cross-reference to a nearby passage. But if, as demonstrated above, a scholium from line 60 was conflated by Servius quite mechanically here, *quod modo* could well be the original reading. This is a further element to consider in the issue of the odd structure of the scholium to line 58.

### 3. SERV. ON *ECL.* 4.4: THE CUMAEAN SIBYL

I shall concentrate on the Servian gloss to the famous *Cymaeum carmen* in the fourth *Eclogue* (Verg. *Ecl.* 4.4–5):

<sup>19</sup> For '*nam ait* + quotation' in parentheses, see e.g. Serv. on *Aen.* 9.630 sic Homerus Thersiten a tergo uulneratum **dicit** usque ad praecordia (**nam ait** μετάρρηνα) quia eum stultum induxerat. Even with the *quomodo*-variant, *nam ait solus montibus et siluis* should be printed in parentheses (see the punctuation above).

<sup>20</sup> Possibly *quod* was a correction of *quo(modo)* in the archetype and was then added in different positions in some parts of the tradition. The reading of MS Y can hardly be a conjecture. There is a *varia lectio* (of no value) also in the text of the Reg. Lat. 1495: *quomodo uel cum eum dicit discedere*, etc. (see Thilo's [n. 1] apparatus criticus).

<sup>21</sup> This form is also used in other contexts, e.g. to confute other commentators' opinion: Serv. on *Aen.* 2.7 illud autem quod Asinius Pollio dicit caret ratione (see also 2.557, 9.410, 9.412, 12.183). For instances of *ratione (non) caret* without *quod*-clause as a subject, see Serv. on *Aen.* 1.642, 663; 7.457; 11.721; 12.725; and on *G.* 1 *praef.*

<sup>22</sup> On *modo* = *hic, hoc loco*, vñv (*TLL* 8.1311.61–73), typical of Servius, see Thomas (n. 17), 148, V. Bulhart, 'Textkritisches zu Servius', *Mnemosyne* 6 (1953), 64–5, A. Uhl, *Servius als Sprachlehrer* (Göttingen, 1998), 541 n. 181.

<sup>23</sup> For *quod modo* in Servius, see e.g. Serv. on *Aen.* 2.492 [...] unde est **quod modo dixit** 'me primam'; 10.272. Particularly interesting is the formulation of Serv. on *Aen.* 9.367 (Murgia's edition): VRBE LATINA **non est contrarium** illi loco ubi ait [7.600] 'saepsit se tectis rerumque reliquit habenas' **quod** [quod Δ Pa Pc W : quo F J<sup>1</sup> Γ] **modo** a Latina urbe auxilia uenire **commemorat**. intellegimus **enim** Latinum in principio discordiae et tumultus paululum se abstinuisse. Here the *quo* of F J<sup>1</sup> Γ is obviously rejected by all editors.

ultima Cymaei uenit iam carminis aetas;  
magnus ab integro saeculorum nascitur ordo.

Now is come the last Age of Cumaean song; the great line of the centuries begins anew.

Here is Servius' scholium (Thilo's edition):

Serv. on *Ecl.* 4.4 VLTIMA CYMAEI V. I. C. A. Sibyllini, quae Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit, dixit etiam quis quo saeculo imperaret, et Solem ultimum, id est decimum uoluit: nouimus autem eundem esse Apollinem, unde dicit [4.10] 'tuus iam regnat Apollo'. dixit etiam, finitis omnibus saeculis rursus eadem innouari: quam rem etiam philosophi hac disputatione colligunt, dicentes, completo magno anno omnia sidera in ortus suos redire et ferri rursus eodem motu. quod si est idem siderum motus, necesse est ut omnia quae fuerunt habeant iterationem: uniuersa enim ex astrorum motu pendere manifestum est. hoc secutus Vergilius dicit reuertit aurea saecula et iterari omnia quae fuerunt.

dixit etiam quis ... et iterari omnia quae fuerunt *om. L* (= *auctus*-witness)

Servius is speaking of the prophecy of the Sibyl and the myth of the metals and the Ages,<sup>24</sup> which is alluded to also in the scholium to *Ecl.* 4.10 (mentioned in Serv. on *Ecl.* 4.4): TVVS IAM R. APOLLO et ultimum saeculum ostendit, quod Sibylla Solis esse memorauit [...]. Serv. on *Ecl.* 4.4 is a well-known text, which is often quoted, following Thilo's (dubious) textual arrangement, in many studies on the fourth *Eclogue* as well as on Sibylline literature.<sup>25</sup> The phrasing of the scholium is in itself pretty flat and repetitive (see the repetition of *dixit etiam*), but the weird expression *Sibyllini quae* does deserve attention. Thilo prints the paradosis:

VLTIMA CYMAEI V. I. C. A. Sibyllini, quae Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit, dixit etiam quis quo saeculo imperaret [...]

(CUMAEAN) Sibylline, the one [Sibyl] who was from Cuma and divided the Ages by metals, also prophesied who would rule in which Age [...]<sup>26</sup>

The relative pronoun *quae* clearly refers to an implicit *Sibylla*, but the formulation is particularly awkward and hardly acceptable. If we consider ancient Virgilian exegesis besides Servius, two elements stand out. From an exegetical point of view, Servius is implicitly rejecting the interpretation of *Cymaei* as a reference to the Asian Cyme and Hesiod as a source of the myth of the Ages (*saecula per metalla diuisit*),<sup>27</sup> while also hinting at the existence of different *Sibyllae* defined on a geographical basis

<sup>24</sup> See A. Cucchiarelli, *Publio Virgilio Marone, Bucoliche* (Rome, 2012), ad loc. Further bibliography: G. Radke, 'Vergils Cumaeum carmen', *Gymnasium* 66 (1959), 217–46; A. Wlosok, 'Cumaeum carmen (Verg., *Ecl.* 4, 4): Sibyllenorakel oder Hesiodgedicht?', in A. Wlosok, *Res humanae, res diuinae* (Heidelberg, 1990), 302–19.

<sup>25</sup> See e.g. Radke (n. 24), 234 and 240, M. Irvine, *The Making of Textual Culture* (Cambridge, 2006), 152, O. Waßmuth, *Sibyllinische Orakel 1–2* (Leiden and Boston, 2011), 34.

<sup>26</sup> F. Daspet, *Traduction du Commentaire de Servius aux Bucoliques de Virgile* (Gradignan, 2007), 34 ('[les vers prophétiques] de la Sibylle, qui était de Cumes et qui divisé les siècles selon les métaux; elle a prédit aussi ...') presupposes *Sibyllae quae* and a different punctuation (see below).

<sup>27</sup> This interpretation is present in Philarg., the Bern-Scholia and ps.-Prob. ad loc. and is usually rejected by modern scholars (*contra*, Radke [n. 24], with analysis of the scholia at 239–40).

(*quae Cumana fuit*).<sup>28</sup> From a textual point of view, we have a confirmation that a *Sibylla* before *quae* is needed.<sup>29</sup> The following corrections were proposed:

- *Thilo in app. crit.*: **Sibyllae, quae** Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit. dixit etiam ...; and: Sibyllini **quod** Cumanae fuit **quae** saecula per metalla diuisit. dixit etiam ...<sup>30</sup>
- *Guarinus*: Sibyllini, <**id est Sibyllae**>, quae Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit. dixit etiam ...<sup>31</sup>
- *Corssen*: **Sibylla**, quae Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit, dixit etiam ...<sup>32</sup>

As noted by Guarinus, both the meaningful gloss *CYMAEI Sibyllini* and the transmitted *quae* should be preserved.<sup>33</sup> Guarinus's solution is interesting for two other reasons:

- *dixit etiam* is also found at the beginning of the sentence some lines below (*dixit etiam finitis*, etc.);
- the interpretation of *Sibyllini ... diuisit* as an 'autonomous' sentence is supported by the *auctus*-witness (Leid. Voss. Lat. O. 80), which omits the rest of the note after *diuisit* and provides a text that can be understood only if a genitive *Sibyllae* is added.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>28</sup> See Philarg. ad loc. The existence of different *Sibyllae* is acknowledged by Servius in the commentary on the *Aeneid*: Serv. on *Aen.* 3.445, 6.36, 6.72, 6.98 *CYMAEA SIBYLLA* bene addidit propter discretionem. At *Ecl.* 4.4 he takes the story of the different Sibyls for granted, hence the concise explanation *quae Cumana fuit*.

<sup>29</sup> Philarg. on *Ecl.* 4.4 rec. *Il quidam interpretantur Sibyllam, quae fuerit Cumana, quae praedixit futura*; Bern. Schol. on *Ecl.* 4.4 *Cymaei, Sibylliaci. Cymaei, quia Sibylla quattuor deorum descripsit regna; quae Cymaea dicitur de monte Cymo [...] Alii Sibyllam, quae Cymaea fuit, intellegunt, quae quattuor saecula libris suis digessit. [...]* (see Hagen [n. 11 (1902)]); *Lib. Glos. Sibille, quae quattuor saeculorum ordinem scripsit* (A. Grondeux and F. Cinato [edd.], *Liber glossarum digital* [Paris, 2016]: <http://liber-glossarum.huma-num.fr>). Cf. also the mention of the Sibyl in Serv. on *Ecl.* 4.10 (quoted above). For his correction *quod ... quae* (see below) Thilo is relying on some parallels from Virgilian exegesis as well: Philarg. on *Ecl.* 4.4 rec. *I quidam interpretantur Cymaei Sibyllam quod fuerit illa Cumaea, quae futura praedixit*; see also G. Thilo, 'Beiträge zur Kritik der Scholiasten des Vergilius', *RhM* 15 (1860), 119–54. There is a similar formulation with *quod* in ps.-Prob. on *Ecl.* 4.4.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Thilo's apparatus criticus: '*expectatur vel sibyllae vel sibyllini quod Cumanae fuit quae saecula e.q.s.*'. I believe that Thilo's conjecture *Sibyllae* presupposes the paradoxis *quae Cumana*, etc. (and not *quod Cumanae*). *Sibyllae* in place of *Sibyllini* is already found in some early editions, e.g. in J. de Mareschal, *Opera Vergiliana* (Lyon, 1528) (in the form *Cumaei Sibyllae quae Cumana fuit. haec saecula ... diuisit et dixit quis ...*); after Thilo's edition, in F. Cumont, 'La fin du monde selon les mages occidentaux', *RHR* 103 (1931), 29–96, at 44 n. 2. J. Geffcken, 'Die Hirten auf dem Felde', *Hermes* 49 (1914), 321–51, at 326 and G. Funaioli, *Esegesi virgiliana antica* (Milan, 1930), 21 n. 3, 222 consider the paradoxis corrupt. Funaioli suggests the parallel of Philargyrius to correct Servius' text (see previous note).

<sup>31</sup> Guarinus (n. 10), followed by other editions depending on him.

<sup>32</sup> P. Corssen, 'Die vierte Ekloge Virgils', *Philologus* 81 (1925), 26–71, at 33. While leaving out *Sibyllini*, some scholars quote the scholium only with *Sibylla* (e.g. E. Kraggerud, 'Further problems in Vergil', *Symbolae Osloenses* 65 [1990], 63–77) or *Sibylla* in parentheses (e.g. W. Kraus, 'Vergils vierte Ekloge', *ANRW* 11.31.1 [1980], 604–45, at 610 and H. Cancik, *Gesammelte Aufsätze I* [Heidelberg, 2008], 99).

<sup>33</sup> I would exclude other possible corrections of *Sibyllini* (e.g. *Sibyllae. nam ... : see sibilla [sic] nam*, a correction in MS Pc). Servius uses *Sibyllinus* as a gloss also in Serv. on *Aen.* 6.72 (TVAS SORTES Sibyllina responsa). The gloss *Cumaei-Sibyllini* is already found in August. *Ep.* 258.5 *quod ex Cymaeo, id est ex Sibyllino carmine se fassus est transtulisse Vergilius (Epistulae ad Romanos inchoata expositio 3)*, who is possibly criticizing the interpretation of *Cumaeus* as a reference to Hesiod: see J.-M. Roessli, 'Augustin, les sibylles et les Oracles sibyllins', in P.-Y. Fux, J.-M. Roessli and O. Wermelinger (edd.), *Augustinus Afer* (Fribourg, 2003), 263–86, at 264 n. 5.

<sup>34</sup> If the omission after *diuisit* goes back to the compilation of DS, I see at least two possible



Nevertheless, if we keep the adjective *Sibyllini*, any solution involving the genitive *Sibyllae* is less effective, since the transmitted *quae* most likely refers to the subject of *dixit* (see the syntax in Corsen's solution). Hence the most attractive solution reads as follows:

*Sibyllini*. <*Sibylla*>, *quae Cumana fuit et saecula per metalla diuisit, dixit etiam ...*<sup>35</sup>

*Sibylla* was 'absorbed' by the preceding *Sibyllini* by a sort of haplography.<sup>36</sup>

*Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg*

STEFANO POLETTI  
[stefano.poletti@altphil.uni-freiburg.de](mailto:stefano.poletti@altphil.uni-freiburg.de)

explanations: 1. DS transcribed the first (corrupted) part of the scholium from S and decided to omit the rest, even if it was probably present in his sources, both S and D (the reason of this omission remains unclear); 2. *dixit etiam quis*, etc. is an original expansion by S of a D-gloss ending with *diuisit*, which DS closely reproduces. In this second scenario, it is hard to say how we should consider the corruption *Sibyllini quae* and at which level it may have occurred (perhaps DS copied the first part of the scholium from S and omitted the rest according to D; possibly the omission of a *Sibyllae/Sibylla* after *Sibyllini* occurred polygenetically in the traditions both of DS and of S). On the relation S-D-DS, cf. Kaster and Murgia (n. 1), xi, xx–xxviii.

<sup>35</sup> If DS reflects an original D-gloss with a genitive *Sibyllae* (see previous note) and if this D-gloss was present to S, an S-text such as *Sibyllini. Sibylla quae ...* should then presuppose some original rearrangement of the scholium by Servius. This possible relation D–DS cannot be taken for granted, but it does invite us to take into serious consideration solutions, including the genitive *Sibyllae* as well.

<sup>36</sup> A conjunction (*Sibylla enim; nam Sibylla*), though not strictly necessary, would perhaps make the syntax smoother.