

## An ancient theory of interaction between fact and fiction in poetic texts and Zono de' Magnalis' *accessus* to the *Aeneid*<sup>1</sup>

Mikhail V. Shumilin

Russian Presidential Academy of National Economy and Public Administration, School for Actual Research in Humanities  
Russian State University for Humanities, Institute for Oriental and Classical Studies

---

### Abstract

One of the Greco-Roman theories of the relationship between fact and fiction in poetic texts remained quite widespread in the medieval commentary tradition. The unpublished *accessus* to the *Aeneid* by Zono de' Magnalis (early 14th cent.) presents an unusual variant of this theory.

---

### Keywords

Fiction, medieval scholarship, Zono de' Magnalis, Vergil

---

### Contact

mvshumilin@mail.ru

---

## 1. Introduction

Discussions about the relationship between fact and fiction in poetry are probably as old as literary criticism itself (the lies of Homer were discussed by the first critics of Homer (Feeney, Pfeiffer 8-10), and already in Hesiod the Muses proclaim to be able to speak both truth and lies that looks like truth).<sup>2</sup> In the various particular classical and medieval theories of the interaction between fact and fiction in poetic texts, a modern literary theorist might find a lot of suggestive ideas, often buried in deep oblivion (particularly for the reason that many medieval sources have not even been published). In the present paper I will focus on one of these theories, and on the novel and somewhat unexpected form it takes in an unpublished and hitherto overlooked fragment of the commentary to Virgil's *Aeneid*, as written by Zono de' Magnalis the Florentine in the early 14<sup>th</sup> cent.

The original theory in question distinguishes between three types of narrative content:<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The present study was carried out within the project "Objectivity, Certainty and Fact in the Humanities of Early Modern Times: historical reconstruction and reception ways", supported by the Russian Fund for the Humanities (P Г H Ф, 2012-2014, research grant No. 12-03-00482).

<sup>2</sup> Hes. *Theog.* 27-28. The question might have Indo-European origins: see Grintser-Grintser 323-369 (with a summary in English on pp. 420-422).

<sup>3</sup> See Cic. *De inv.* 1.27, *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.13, Quint. *Inst.* 2.4.2, Mar. Vict. *In Rhet. Cic.* 202.32-34 Halm, Isid. *Etym.* 1.44.5, *Schol. in Dion. Thr.* 449.11-14 Hilgard, modified versions in Mart. Cap. 5.550, Nicol. *Progymn.* 12.17-13.13 Felten, [Hermog.] *Progymn.* 2.11-15 Rabe, Serv. *in Aen.* 1.235.

1. *fabula* (in Greek *mythos*), being fiction that does not even resemble the truth («that which has not happened and could not have happened», that is, fantastic content);
2. *historia*, being truth (or «that which has happened»);
3. *argumentum* (in Greek *plasma*), being verisimilar fiction («that which has not happened, but could have happened»).

*Fabula* corresponds to tragedy and epic, *argumentum* to comedy (obviously Greek New Comedy and its Roman counterparts are meant), and *historia* to historiography. I argued at length elsewhere (Shumilin) (and it does not seem to me appropriate to repeat my arguments and replies to possible objections here) that variants of this theory were at the background of:

(1) Horace's statements in *Sat.* 1.4.39–62 that he is not a poet because comedy does not belong to poetry (and Horace regards the genre of satire as a variety of comedy) and because the only difference between comedy and *sermo* («ordinary talk») is metre,<sup>4</sup> but metre is not enough to make something poetry;

(2) the accusations against Lucan that he is not a poet but a historian because he simply versified «what has happened», but metre is not enough to make something poetry.<sup>5</sup>

The central problem with which the theory appears to have been occupied is that of the limits of poetry. The way this problem was treated reminds one strongly of Aristotle's approach, from which this theory in fact probably derives<sup>6</sup> (in *Poetics* 1451a38-b5 Aristotle claimed that versifying Herodotus' History is not enough to make it poetry and that the realm of history is «what has happened» while the realm of poetry is «what could happen»; in *Poetics* 1447b16–20 he protested against considering as poetry such versified medical or scientific material as Empedocles' works).<sup>7</sup> The main opposition seems to be that of 'true poetry' (viz. tragedy and epic) vs. non-poetry (viz. history), with an addition of an intermediate variant that still remained, to judge from Horace, 'not at all' poetry; often only two terms were referred to (poetry vs. history or high poetry vs. comedy). The two bizarre features of this theory is that, first, it presupposes the possibility to versify virtually anything without introducing any other changes (and this image of a poet versifying a pre-existing material appears to have been quite influential);<sup>8</sup> and second, it goes

---

<sup>4</sup> This complex of ideas might well have been present already in Lucilius (cf. Lucil. 1029 Marx; Lucil. 228–229 Marx with Hor. *Sat.* 1.5.87–88; Lucil. 587 Marx with Cic. *De inv.* 1.27; and the tradition of criticising the mythological poetry as remote from real life in Pers. 1 and Juv. 1. (Cf. Marx 43, Leo, Auhagen).

<sup>5</sup> Petr. *Sat.* 118, Mart. *Epigr.* 14.194, Serv. in *Aen.* 1.382, Iord. *Get.* 5.43, Isid. *Etym.* 8.7.10 (cf. Lact. *Inst.* 1.11.25), Com. Bern. in *Luc.* 1.1.

<sup>6</sup> Rostagni (118-124) attributes the original version of this theory to Aristotle's pupil Theophrastes, but cf. the objections of Waszink. The earliest fixation of the theory in question (although in somewhat different terms) is in 2<sup>nd</sup>–1<sup>st</sup> cent. BC philosopher Asclepiades of Myrlea as retold by Sext. Emp. *Math.* 1.252 (see Bietenholz 60-61, Wiseman 129).

<sup>7</sup> The fact that the expositions of our theory tend to speak in terms of dramatic genres (tragedy vs. comedy, and the 'absorption' of the genre of satire by the 'super-genre' of comedy) might also point to their Peripatetic origin, for a similar tendency is evident in Aristotle's *Poetics* too.

<sup>8</sup> See Cameron 89-123 on a similar but different theory that implied that mythographic material used by a poet can also be called his *historia*; of course, two theories can often be found blended. Another series of passages probably reacting to the same Aristotle's statements claims that the best prose writers are in fact poets: Cic. *Or.* 67 (Democritus and Plato are poets, while comedians are not); [Dem.]

further than Aristotles in its absurd implication that fact and truth, and indeed anything but the fantastic, have no place in (true high) poetry at all.

It appears that this second feature did not satisfy some of the ancient readers, for in the form most influential in the Middle Ages, that found in Servius' commentary to Vergil's *Aeneid*, the theory is already modified correspondingly. In *Serv. in Aen.* 1.382, Servius comments on Virgil's statement that Venus showed Aeneas the way, saying:

Hoc loco per transitum tangit historiam, quam per legem artis poeticae aperte non potest ponere. nam Varro in secundo divinarum dicit «ex quo de Troia est egressus Aeneas, Veneris eum per diem cotidie stellam vidisse, donec ad agrum Laurentem veniret, in quo eam non vidit ulterius: qua re terras cognovit esse fatales»: unde Vergilius hoc loco «matre dea monstrante viam» [...] quod autem diximus eum poetica arte prohiberi, ne aperte ponat historiam, certum est. Lucanus namque ideo in numero poetarum esse non meruit, quia videtur historiam composuisse, non poema.

Here he touches on history in passing. He is not allowed by the laws of poetry to expose history openly. For Varro says in the second book of his *Divine matters*: «Since Aeneas left Troy, he observed the star of Venus by day all the time until he came to the land of Laurentis where he could not see it any more; whence he got to know that this was the land preordained by fate». That is why Virgil says here: «And godly mother showed the way» [...] And when I say that the art of poetry does not allow him to openly expose history, it is certain. For Lucan has not deserved to be included in the number of poets for the reason that he seems to have composed a history, not a poem.

The duplicity of Servius' position is evident. He clearly appreciates the *mixture* of oppositions, the inclusion of 'historical' information in poetic text (and that is why he pays attention to this detail of Virgil's text), but at the same time he marks a case of violation of the poetical law, which prohibits putting 'mere history' into verse. Lucan, in Servius' terms, «has not deserved» (*non meruit*) the title of a true poet (see Dietz, Lazzarini, Cameron 187, tracing back the diffusion of this theory in Virgilian commentaries at least to Aelius Donatus). A similar conception of poetic text as a mixture of fiction and truth (here labelled not 'history', but 'philosophy') can be found in the writings of Macrobius, another important influence on medieval commentators.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. *Historia* in the Medieval *Accessus* Tradition

Repeated assessments of the same opposition in medieval commentaries (primarily on Lucan) vacillate between positive attitudes toward 'historicity' and the strict upholding of

---

*Eloc.* 181 (Peripatetics, Plato, Xenophon, Herodotus and Demosthenes please their readers like poets); *Dion. Hal. Comp.* 25-26 (Plato and Demosthenes are like poets); and Heracleodorus in *Philod. Poem.* 1.199.2-25 Janko (what Demosthenes, Xenophon and Herodotus wrote should be called poems). As in the case of Horace, this thread of discussion places emphasis on style over content (this is perhaps the reason why the commentators of Horace failed to connect *Satire* 4 with our theory): not only is the content of high poetry phantastic, i.e. taken from the lives of gods and semi-divine heroes, but its style should also be 'divine' (cf. perhaps Theophrastus *apud* Diom. *GLK* 1.484.1-2 and especially the Peripatetic Aristomenides in *Philod. Poem.* 1.160.15-18 and 1.170.16-19 Janko).

<sup>9</sup> E.g. *Macr. Somn. Scip.* 1.9.8; cf. *Serv. in Aen.* 6 praef., *Macr. Somn. Scip.* 1.2.4-21

the rules of poetry along the lines of Servius' writings (Moos, "Poeta", Quadlbauer, "Lukan", Moos, *Entre* 89-202, Wetherbee 103-106). Without going into detail I shall adduce a couple of vivid examples. On the one hand, medieval commentators tend to rehabilitate poets by finding fiction in apparently 'historical' content. Thus, an interesting means of rehabilitating Lucan is to make an appeal to 'topography', which we find already in the commentary of «master Anselm», attributed to Anselm of Laon (ob. 1117), the teacher of Peter Abelard:<sup>10</sup>

Notandum etiam quod iste non dicitur proprie poeta, cum poesis dicatur fictio, sed tamen<sup>11</sup> quia in topographiis, id est descriptionibus locorum, fingit, inde vocatur<sup>12</sup> poeta, nam in describendo mutat portus ipsos.

It should also be mentioned that he is not called a poet in the proper sense of the word, since it is fiction that is called *poetry*, but due to the fact that in the topographies, that is in the descriptions of places, he makes things up, and because of this he is called poet; since in describing he even changes harbours.

A similar statement is contained in the Monacensis Clm 4593 manuscript of Lucan, also dated to the 12<sup>th</sup> cent.:

Notandum quoque quod iste non proprie dicitur poeta, cum poesis [*sic*] dicatur fictio; sed tantum quia in topographiis fingit, inde vocatur poeta. nam in scribendo mutat portus ipsos.<sup>13</sup>

It should be also mentioned that he is not called a poet in the proper sense of the word, because it is fiction that is called *poetry*; but only since he makes things up in his topographies, that is why he is called a poet. Since when he writes he even changes harbours.

---

<sup>10</sup> Neither the commentary on Lucan from the manuscript Berolinensis lat. 1016, attributed by Valentin Rose to Anselm of Laon on the basis of the phrase, «*hoc dicebat magister Ansellus*» «thus spoke master Anselm», which was found in the commentary on Virgil contained in the same manuscript, nor the hypothesis that all three commentaries in this manuscript—on Lucan, Virgil, and Statius—are notes of the lectures of the same teacher (1306-1307, cf. Manitius 238-239), is yet published; I cite this from Marti 247 and 251 (it must be added that in two different places Berthe Marti cites the same text differently; I mark the discrepancies in the footnotes).

<sup>11</sup> Probably, this should be corrected to *tantum*, cf. the text from Monacensis Clm 4593 cited below. Marti 251 leaves this word out.

<sup>12</sup> Marti 251 reads here *vocatus est*.

<sup>13</sup> Robert Huygens (who missed the continuation of the *accessus* in the end of the manuscript cited) has published a similar text from the manuscript Monacensis Clm. 19475; however, in this version there is only one phrase corresponding to the passage in question: «*Notandum quoque quod iste dicitur proprie poeta*» «It must be noted that he was also called a poet in the proper sense» (Huygens 44; Mark Chinca (65), it seems, presents this modification as more revolutionary than is really the case). Irene Caiazzo (97) makes notice of Huygens' oversight and cites a fragment of the text from fol. 146r in our manuscript, but leaves out the passage cited above. A nearly identical text from another manuscript (Berolinensis lat. 35, proposed dates oscillate between the 11<sup>th</sup> and the 13<sup>th</sup> cent.) was published in Weber 3 («*Notandum etiam, quod iste non dicitur proprie poeta, cum poesis dicatur fictio, sed tamen quia in topographiis i. in descriptionibus locorum fingit, inde vocatus est poeta; nam in describendo mutat ipsos portus*»).

Thus, trying to prove that Lucan is nevertheless a poet, medieval commentators use that fact that he makes geographical mistakes and allows himself liberties in this regard, therefore departing from the truth (= *historia*).<sup>14</sup>

As an example of the other line of reasoning, I shall cite a still unedited and sometimes poorly legible *accessus* («introductory reading») to Lucan's poem from the manuscript Laurentianus Plut. 35.7 (13th cent.), fol. 1r (an asterisk marks one illegible word):

[...] dictus Lucanus quasi lucide canens et alt\*\*\*\* sicut tuba ceteris altisonis instrumentis superponitur, sic vox huius et metrum \*pedale in sermone tragicomico omnibus preferitur historiographis et tragicis. et tam luculenter bella Romana descripsit ut nulla nube fictionis fabularum verisimilium poetria \* fuerit \*. unde extraneus ab aliis poetice scribentibus dicitur, quia de poesi nisi solum metrum exercuit nec falsa vero miscuit, sed seriosa protulit veridica, licet per parentesim usus fuerit in cursu sermonis sui variis digressionibus, ornamentis, quibus sermo ei magis redditur expolitus. itaque his descriptis (potest ?) dici nova poesis, quia servans ordinem naturalem materie et rei geste imposuit nova incidentia ut artificiali pulcritudine variationum suum coloraret eloquium. quare merito princeps tragicomicum dici potest, et talis modi loquendi novissimi poematis adinventor. et itaque si nomen poete assumpserit, novus doctor vel auctor poetice nuncupetur.

[...] he was called Lucanus as if he was *lucide canens* ('clearly singing') and high... just as a trumpet drowns other loud-voiced instruments, thus his voice and his ...-feet metre in the tragic discourse is preferred over all historiographers and tragedians. And he described Roman wars in such a resplendent fashion that the poetry did not find itself... by any fog of fictitious fables. And it is because of this that it is said that he is different from others composing in verse, since of all the poetic devices, he used only poetic metre and he did not mix truth with lies, but spoke only grave truth, using, however, various digressions and ornamentations and thereby making his speech more elegant. Thus, taking this description into consideration (it is possible ?) to call this 'new poetry' as, preserving the natural order of the matter and of the facts, he added new elements in order to adorn his eloquence by means of the artificial beauty of variegating additions. Consequently, by right he may be ranked first among the tragedians and may be called an inventor of a completely new type of poem in this type of speech. Therefore, if he is granted the name of a poet, he should be called a new teacher, or author, of poetics.

On the whole, medieval discussions of the 'historicity' of Lucan and, more broadly, the appropriate relationship between poetry and 'history' tend to vacillate between these two poles: either Lucan should be awarded the title of a poet, regardless of his adherence to *historia*; or the fictitious poetry is considered less valuable, and Lucan is entitled to greatness particularly because of his adherence to *historia*.

---

<sup>14</sup> Precisely which of Lucan's 'errors' is hinted at here is, as far as I know, still not clarified. Perusal of available commentaries may bring something to light. Marti 451, points at a commentary from Bero-linensis lat. 35 and a couple of other commentaries on Luc. 7.451; however, none of these sources mention harbours (Cavajoni 112: «*Quod autem dicit Argos damnatum subitis noctibus, Micenas dicere debuit, sed sciendum est mutuasse illum nomen loci ex vicino, sicut frequentissime apud poetas invenimus*» «And that he says that Argos was fated to a sudden nightfall, that should have been said about Mycenae; but it must be known that he borrowed the name of the place from the neighbour, which is what we frequently see among poets»). Marti also mentions an instance of a similar approach to poets' 'topography' in Serv. *in Aen.* 1.159 (here, it must be noticed, the main topic is especially harbours; speaking of the African Carthage, Virgil, according to Servius, is describing in reality the harbour of the Spanish New Carthage) and 1.273 (I can also add 1.235).

### 3. *Historia* in Zono de' Magnalis

The next stage in the development of this notion which I would like to point out was achieved in the works of a Florentine commentator of the 14th cent., Zono (Ciones) de' Magnalis (da Magnale, de Magnali). Little is known about his life: the time between 1311-1321 he spent in Bologna, in which city he, presumably, first studied (till 1319 at least and maybe even later) and then taught; after which he taught in Montepulciano.<sup>15</sup> The most widely read of his works were the commentaries on Virgil's *Aeneid* (some 20 manuscripts have survived: Stok 144-147, Lord 156, n. 14) and Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (11 manuscripts are known: Rossi 186-187, n. 74). The first of these commentaries is positively known (and it is logical to assume the same for the second one) to be compiled from students' notes, *recollectae* of Zono's lectures (Stok 145). The *recollectae* themselves have survived for the *Aeneid* and (in a couple of manuscripts) for *Georgics* and *Eclogues*; however, Zono, it would seem, did not have time to transform these notes into finished commentaries (although he wanted to do it, as follows from the preface to the commentary on the *Aeneid*: Stok 145-146, 148). P.O. Kristeller states that Zono is the same person as 'Zeno the Florentian', whose commentary on pseudo-Ciceronian *Rhetorica ad Herennium* is preserved in the manuscript Ambrosianus J 87 sup. (vol. 1, 333)<sup>16</sup> Kristeller also cites Latin verses by Zono preserved in one Paduan manuscript (vol. 2, 16, n. 2).<sup>17</sup> We have a *terminus ante quem* for the commentary on the *Aeneid*—the year 1336 when one of the manuscripts was compiled (Stok 147). However, in this manuscript, as in many others, the *accessus*, which will be discussed later in this paper, is lacking, and it may be suggested that it was added by Zono later. Against this it can be said that in the *accessus* there are unmotivated repetitions, characteristic of the *recollectae* style and probably not always eliminated by Zono when working on later redactions of the commentary (Stok 160). Therefore, the most probable date of writing for the passages under consideration lies between 1319–1336.

The attention accorded to Zono in recent years is largely due to F. Stok's edition of his life of Virgil, which appeared in 1991.<sup>18</sup> Other parts of Zono's *accessus* had been

---

<sup>15</sup> References to sources on his biography are collected in Stok 143, n. 2.

<sup>16</sup> Following in the manuscript is a commentary on Cicero's *Pro lege Manilia*, which Kristeller also hypothetically attributed to Zono.

<sup>17</sup> To judge by one of the poems cited in Novati 175, from a manuscript of the commentary on Lucan unavailable to me, these verses are extremely bad even by the standards of grammarians' poetry of the 14<sup>th</sup> cent. In the second verse of the text cited by Novati («*Zonum Romei genuit quem Florentia, motum*» «Zono, son of Romeo, to whom Florence gave birth, moved»), meaning and syntax seem to point that in the original text there was no *quem*, added in the course of transmission and ruining the metrics; however, the fourth verse («*boc quoque Bertus, Regino sanguine cretus*» «and also Berto, raised from the blood of the people of Reggio») seems hardly amenable to a correction that would produce correct hexameter with pertinent meaning. Moreover, the first verse of this hexametrical poem is clearly a pentameter: «*Confer opem famulo, sancta Maria, tuo*» «Give succour, o holy Mary, to your slave». Zono's Latin prose is very bad as well: sometimes he even inserts Italian words in place of Latin ones, for instance, using *guerra* in the sense of «war» and *pertanto* in the sense of «since».

<sup>18</sup> The text of the biography was subsequently reprinted accompanied by J. Halporn's English translation in Ziolkowski-Putnam 293-303.

known to some extent before that time,<sup>19</sup> and Stok retells and discusses them. However, the part of the *accessus* that is of special interest for the present discussion has never been thoroughly analysed, and Stok honours it only with a brief notice (and it is easy to see why): «[S]egue un lungo sommario del poema e degli sviluppi della vicenda eneantica fino alla fondazione di Roma ed oltre» (Stok 152). Indeed, a short retelling of the text in question, quite often supplied by medieval grammarians, does not seem very promising. However, I propose to give this passage some more attention (in the following I use the manuscript of the *accessus* available to me, Laurentianus Plut. 53.25, which is at the same time one of the most ancient).

It can be noted that the passage in question deals with several problems simultaneously. Firstly, we see a synopsis of the text; secondly, a kind of wider ‘historical context’ is introduced; thirdly and finally, there is a discussion of the notion of *historia*. Indeed, Zono evidently mixes several commentators’ genres—synopses are frequent at the beginnings of medieval manuscripts, but they normally stop at the same place as the plot of the text being retold (Opitz, Bozzolo-Jeudy); ‘historical excursions’ are also frequent in the paratexts, especially if the main text demands some historical knowledge on the part of the reader, as is the case with Lucan’s poem, although this is regarded as an independent grammatical genre as well, normally not mingled with synopsis (Sanford 289-290). However, Zono does not stop here. A synopsis of the *Aeneid*, combined with a historical overview, is added inside a full-fledged *accessus ad auctorem* of a type that gained currency in the 13th cent., evidently in the wake of the surge of scholastic interest towards Aristotle. *Accessus* of the high Middle Ages are usually structured as answers to a kind of questionnaire (the author, the title of the text, the style in which it is written, the author’s intention, etc.). A questionnaire of this kind can be found already in Servius; however, *accessus* composed in this fashion became predominant only upon the turn of the 12th and 13th cent. (Gillespie 150). The 13th cent. brought an innovation: four Aristotelean causes started to be used as a questionnaire (restructuring the old one or displacing it) (Minnis 28). In the passage under investigation Zono speaks of the material cause (*causa materialis*) for the *Aeneid*. Here is what he says (fol. 1ra):

Causa materialis est Eneas sive historia Enee Troiani de adventu eius in Ytaliā. Ad cuius evidentiam est notandum, quod destructa civitate Troiana Eneas cum multis qui evaserunt a desolatione Troie devenit Antadrum [sic] [...]

The material cause is Aeneas, or the history of Aeneas the Trojan, about how he came to Italy. That this may be more clear it must be noted that, after the destruction of Troy, Aeneas with numerous refugees from the ravaged Troy came to Antandrus [...]

«*Ad cuius evidentiam est notandum*» is a variant of a stock phrase from the lexicon of scholastic philosophy (cf. «*ad cuius evidentiam sciendum est*», «*ad cuius evidentiam considerandum est*»). Here Zono uses it to introduce his retelling of the story, describing it as «the history (*historia*) of the Trojan Aeneas». The material cause taken from the Aristotelean toolkit was easily combined with non-Aristotelean questionnaires because they too frequently

---

<sup>19</sup> For instance, Comparetti repeatedly cites Zono’s *accessus* from Marcianus XIII 61 (not knowing that this is Zono’s text) while discussing the notion of Virgil as an archsage; Zono’s works are also viewed from the viewpoint of Virgilian reception in Zabughin (*Virgilio* 47-51, cf. also “L’umanesimo”); Eva Sanford repeatedly cites Zono’s *accessus* to Lucan in connection with the general patterns of *accessus* structure.

treated the problem of *materia*.<sup>20</sup> Usually *materia* comprises either the personages of the text or the events described therein (thus, the *materia* of Lucan's poem is usually described as «the civil war between Pompey and Caesar» or «Pompey and Caesar» themselves: Sanford 283);<sup>21</sup> however, the retelling is usually not supplied. This usage presents itself as an interesting case of continuity; the classical notion of *historia*, as well as this element of the *accessus* tradition, are both based on the assumption that the poet takes some ready-made narrative or chain of events (*historia* in the former case, *materia* in the latter) and makes a poetic restructuring of it. Therefore the amalgamation of the two notions is not coincidental; the word *historia* as used with the meaning «synopsis of some text» or «historic overview», of course, can be met with earlier as well.<sup>22</sup> Here we see something not unlike the opposition between «story line» (*fabula*) and «plot» (*syuzhet*), popular in contemporary theory of literature and stemming from V. Shklovsky and B. Tomashevsky (it is remarkable that Shklovsky understood 'story line' in terms of opposition between 'material' and 'form')<sup>23</sup>—the inclusion of a synopsis composed by Zono helps the reader compare the matter being used and the finished product, and thus understand the difference between them.

What can be said of this difference? One thing is evident from the start: the beginning of the synopsis does not match the beginning of the poem. Aeneas' departure from Troy and his coming to Antandrus are described in the 3<sup>rd</sup> book, in the course of Aeneas' narrative of his wanderings addressed to Dido. By arranging his material in this manner Zono restores the natural order of the matter (*ordo naturalis* in medieval terms, as opposed to *ordo artificialis*, «artificial order»: Quadlbauer, "Zur Theorie"). Zono takes the flashback from books 2 and 3 and places it at the beginning of his synopsis (for no apparent reason, the 2nd book is omitted from the synopsis altogether, and, consequently, the departure from Troy turns out to be the starting point from the *chronological* perspective).

---

<sup>20</sup> In the 12<sup>th</sup> cent., this point is already met in the writings of 'master Anselm': Ziolkowski-Putnam 230-231 and Brown, cf. Rose 1307 (in the commentary on the *Thebaid*).

<sup>21</sup> In his commentary on Lucan (Laurentianus Plut. 53.29, fol. 5v, cf. Laurentianus Plut. 35.1, fol. 3v and Laurentianus Plut. 53.26, fol. 8v), Zono writes to the effect that «*Causa materialis Lucani principaliter est illud civile bellum, quod factum est inter Cesarem et Pompeium. licet secundo materia eius sunt alia bella de quibus agit, quae precesserunt et secuta sunt. sive eius materia est historia Romana belli civilis et plus quam civilis, facti inter Iulium Cesarem et Pompeium Magnum sui generum, et aliorum bellorum precedentium et subsequentium*» «Material cause for Lucan's poem is, firstly, the civil war that was waged between Caesar and Pompey. Secondly, though, his matter is other wars about which he speaks, which were before and after; or his matter is the history of the Roman civil, and more than civil, war waged between Julius Caesar and Pompey, his son-in-law, and other wars that were before and after it» (it seems that this repetition is an additional proof that Zono's commentary on Lucan is based on the *recollectae* of his lecture, cf. above).

<sup>22</sup> Cf., for instance, the commentary by Arnulfus of Orléans on Lucan, 12<sup>th</sup>–13<sup>th</sup> cent. (4.13–14 Marti): «*Summa historie cui tractatus huius figmentum innititur talis esse predicatur*» «The historical essence on which the fiction of this work is based is, it is told, as follows». Cf. Sanford 281, 289-290, Cameron ch. 5.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Shklovsky 39 (emphasis mine): «The concept of plot (*syuzhet*) is too often confused with a description of the events in the novel, with what I'd tentatively call the story line (*fabula*). As a matter of fact, though, the story line is nothing more than *material* for plot *formation*. In this way, the plot of *Eugene Onegin* is not the love between Eugene and Tatiana but the appropriation of that story line in the form of digressions that interrupt the text» (tr. by B. Sher). One might also recall Gérard Genette's *histoire* and *recit*.



The second evident point: the synopsis does not end with the *Aeneid* (with the death of Turnus), but continues further. This fact can be hypothetically connected to Zono's doubts as to whether Virgil was going to end his poem with the 12th book,<sup>24</sup> but it is highly improbable that Zono really believed that the *Aeneid* was meant to continue up to the founding of Rome, with which he finishes off his synopsis. Let us look more closely at this fragment (fol. 1va–b):

[...] et interfecit Mezentium regem pulsum a Tuscis<sup>25</sup>, quem Turnus fovebat, et Camillam devicit, et Turnum interfecit, et duxit Laviniam, ex qua natus Silvius postumus. et Ascanius Troianus filius Enee mortuo En. impaciens noverce relicta sibi civitate Laurenti edificavit Albam civitatem, in qua regnavit a .xxx. annis, et tunc, licet haberet filium parvum, reliquit imperium Albe Silvio fratri suo: ita tenerime eum adamavit. et omnes reges Albe postea dicti sunt Silvii ab isto Silvio. et regnavit imperium in Alba .ccc. annis donec deventum est ad Romulum et Remum descendentes per successionem, qui edificaverunt Romanam civitatem; et tunc Alba et Roma equaliter regnaverunt centum annis, sed postea invalescente et multiplicata civitate Romana Alba destructa fuit a quodam Tullo. in qua Alba successive ante conditionem civitatis Romane fuerunt xiiii reges, quos alibi nominabo. et hoc breviter de materia libri Eneydos.

[...] and he killed Mezentius, the king exiled by the Etruscans, who found favour with Turnus <*Aen.* 10.897-908>, and overcame Camilla <*Aen.* 11.801-831>, and killed Turnus <*Aen.* 12.950-952>, and took Lavinia as his wife, who posthumously bore him Silvius <cf. *Aen.* 6.763-764>. And the Trojan Ascanius, Aeneas' son, not willing after the death of Aeneas to deal with his stepmother, left her Laurentis and founded the city of Alba, where he reigned after he had attained thirty years of age, and then, although he had a little son, he bequeathed the rule over Alba to his brother Silvius, so great was his love for him. And all the kings of Alba after that were called Silvii after this Silvius. And this line reigned in Alba for 300 years until the time of Romulus and Remus, the heirs in the direct line, who founded the city of Rome. And then Alba and Rome ruled for 100 years, but after Rome gained momentum and increased, Alba was destroyed by a certain Tullus <cf. Servius in *Aen.* 1.272>. In which Alba, 14 kings reigned one after the other before the founding of Rome, whom I will enumerate in another place. And here is, shortly, the matter of the book *Aeneid*.

<sup>24</sup> *Vita Virgilii* 131–138 Stok: «*Et in componendo hoc opus Virgilius insudavit XII annis et non complevit nec correxit hoc opus, sicut quod multi dicunt. sed Fulgentius vult quod complevit, quia incepit a principio vite et tendit usque ad mortem et post mortem nichil est ultra et, quia liber terminatur in morte Turni, ideo completum est opus. sed hoc non videtur, quia adhuc restat de themate promisso, quia nichil dicit de Lavinia, cum tamen proposuerat se dicturum, tantum dixit: "Laviniaque littora", et non dixit quomodo habuit Laviniam et Laurentum. et dato quod perfecit, morte preventus non emendavit opus*» «In writing this book Virgil worked twelve years and did not complete or correct it, as many say. But Fulgentius maintains that he finished it, because he began at the beginning of life and brought it to death, and after death there is nothing more, and because the book ends with the death of Turnus, so the work is complete. This does not seem correct, because a promised theme still remains to be treated, insofar as he has said nothing of Lavinia; although he had proposed to speak of her, he said only "Lavinian shores," <*Aen.* 1.2> and he did not tell how Aeneas took Lavinia and Laurentum. Granted that he finished it, he did not, prevented by his death, correct his work» (tr. by J. Halporn). Here the author implies Fulgentius' allegory of the *Aeneid*, where various parts of the poem are correlated with different ages of man, with the killing of Turnus, accordingly, representing death. Relationships between Aeneas and Lavinia figure quite prominently in medieval 'sequels' to the *Aeneid*, from the *Roman d'Enéas* (c. 1160) to the 13<sup>th</sup> book of the *Aeneid* by Maffeo Vegio (1428); cf. Wilson-Okamura 233-247.

<sup>25</sup> Tuscis scripsit: Turnis cod.

If all that went before was a synopsis, from which source does Zono obtain the facts from now on? Evidently, this source is not Livy, who mentions that Silvius is Ascanius' son (1.3.6). A very likely source for the bulk of Zono's account is Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid*—cf. the following passages:

*in Aen.* 6.760: Primo bello periit Latinus, secundo pariter Turnus et Aeneas, postea Mezentium interemit Ascanius et Laurolavinium tenuit. cuius Lavinia timens insidias, gravida confugit ad silvas et latuit in casa pastoris Tyrrhi: ad quod adludens ait «Tyrrhusque pater, cui regia parent armenta»: et illic enixa est Silvium. sed cum Ascanius flagraret invidia, evocavit novercam et ei concessit Laurolavinium, sibi vero Albam constituit. qui quoniam sine liberis periit, Silvio, qui et ipse Ascanius dictus est, suum reliquit imperium: unde apud Livium est error, qui Ascanius Albam condiderit. postea Albani omnes reges Silvii dicti sunt ab huius nomine, sicut hodieque Romani imperatores Augusti vocantur, Aegyptii Ptolomaei, Persae Arsacidae [...]

In the first battle, Latinus fell; in the second, together Turnus and Aeneas; then Ascanius killed Mezentius and took Laurolavinium. Lavinia, fearful of his stratagems, fled to the woods (*silvae*) and hid in the house of a shepherd called Tyrrhus; hinting at this, Virgil says, «And Tyrrhus, their sire, controller of the royal herds» (<*Aen.* 7.485-486, tr. by H.R. Fairclough>). And there she gave birth to Silvius. However, as Ascanius was full of hatred towards her, he summoned his stepmother and ceded her Laurolavinium and built Alba for himself. But he, being childless, bequeathed his realm to Silvius, who was also called Ascanius. This is the reason for Livy's error as to which Ascanius founded Alba. After that all the kings of Alba were called Silvii after his name, just as today Roman emperors are called Augusti, Egyptian Ptolomaei, Persian Arsacidae [...]

*in Aen.* 1.269 (Servius auctus): Triginta] vel quod XXX. tantum annos regnavit, vel quod Cato ait, «XXX. annis expletis eum Albam condidisse».

«Thirty»: either because he reigned for 30 years only, or else as Cato says of him, that «he founded Alba when he was 30 years old».

*in Aen.* 1.272: Ter centum] quomodo trecentos annos dicit, cum eam quadringentis regnasse constet sub Albanis regibus? sed cum praescriptione ait «tercentum», scilicet usque ad ortum urbis Romae; ait namque «donec regina sacerdos Marte gravis». et constat in regno Romuli et Numae et Tulli Hostilii, qui evertit Albam, centum annos, quibus pariter Roma et Alba regnarunt, esse consumptos.

«Three hundred»: why does he speak about 300 years when it is known that it <Alba> reigned for 400 years under Alban kings? However, when he says «three hundred» with reservation, clearly it is only up to the founding of Rome: for he says «until a royal priestess is pregnant by Mars» (<*Aen.* 1.273-274, tr. by H. R. Fairclough>). And it is known that the reign of Romulus, Numa, and Tullus Hostilius, destroyer of Alba, lasted for 100 years, and Rome and Alba reigned with equal rights then.

Zono follows Servius in almost every point that does not contradict Virgil (anyway, Mezentius dies before Turnus, as in the *Aeneid*). Minor details that remain without explanation could mean that Zono uses some other source, close to Servius, but independent (deriving from the same Cato that Servius uses in both cases). However, not all deviations warrant this assumption (*Laurens* in place of *Laurolavinium* might be a variant reading, while the statement that Ascanius had a deep affection towards his stepbrother can

be deduced simply from Ascanius' decision to leave his kingdom to Silvius, despite the fact that he too had a son—this fact, however, is clearly an addition to both Servius and Cato from some separate source). Still, one detail is blatantly un-Servian: the number of Albanian kings (in Servius they are 14, not 13—in *Aen.* 6.756). Zono clearly has in mind some certain list taken from an unidentified source. Interestingly, he even refers to the place where detailed account of that list can be found, for his «elsewhere» (*alibi*) sounds transparent enough—we are, of course, to seek for this information in the corresponding passage in Zono's *accessus* to Lucan. And we indeed do find that list there (Laurentianus Plut. 53.29, fol. 1v, cf. Laurentianus Plut. 35.1, fol. 3r, Laurentianus Plut. 53.26, fol. 2r; here, however, Zono counts 15 kings, but the reason for this is probably that in one case he counted Egiptus Athis as two persons and in the other as one):<sup>26</sup>

Ascanius vero moriens regnum Albe in qua regnaverat xxx annis fratri suo Silvio reliquit, a quo reges Albe dicti sunt Silvii. Et hoc pertanto, quia Iulius, filius dicti Ascanii, nondum regno erat ydoneus. Et nota quod infrascripti fuerunt reges Albani, in qua dicitur imperium regnasse ccc annis antequam conderetur Romana urbs. Quorum hec sunt nomina, scilicet: Ascanius, Enee filius, Albam condidit; Silvius postumus Enee successit; Latinus Eneas; Latinus Silvius; Alba Silvius; Egiptus Athis; Capis Silvius Capue conditor; Carpentus; Tiberinus, in flumine Albula suffocatus, propter quod postea dictus est fluvius ille Tiber; Agrippa Aremus; Aventinus; Procas; Amulius filius Proce [...] Amulius Albanorum rex xv.

And Ascanius on his deathbed left his kingdom of Alba, where he had reigned for 30 years<sup>27</sup>, to his brother Silvius, after whose name the kings of Alba were called Silvii. And the reason for that was that Julius, son of that Ascanius, was not yet old enough to reign. And note that the Alban kings were the following (and it is reported that Alba reigned for 300 years before the city of Rome was founded). Here are their names: Ascanius, son of Aeneas, founded Alba; Silvius, posthumous son of Aeneas, succeeded him; Latinus Aeneas; Latinus Silvius; Alba Silvius; Egiptus Athis; Capis Silvius, the founder of Capua; Carpentus; Tiberinus, who drowned in the river Albula for which reason this river was later named Tiber; Agrippa; Aremus; Aventinus; Procas; Amulius, son of Procas [...] Amulius was the fifteenth king of the Albans.

The contents and orthography of the list make it easy to identify its probable source: it is the *Compendium of Roman history* by Riccobaldo of Ferrara (between 1308 and 1318), the text that Zono appears to have used regularly as a reference book on Roman history (Stok 165).<sup>28</sup> But of particular importance for us is the following detail: as it turns out,

---

<sup>26</sup> Alternatively we might suppose that the text is corrupt. MS Laurentianus Plut. 35.1 writes instead of the last phrase of my quotation, «*Amulius Albanorum rex annis xvi regnavit*» «Amulius, king of Albans, reigned for 16 years» (however, sources normally credit Amulius with a much longer reign).

<sup>27</sup> Thus read all three named manuscripts; this might be a corruption of *a xxx annis* «from the age of 30 years», or, *vice versa*, the reading of Virgilian *accessus* might be corrupt and we are to read *xxx annis* «for 30 years» there instead of *a xxx annis* «from the age of 30 years» (cf. the text of Serv. auct. in *Aen.* 1.269 quoted above, allowing both variants). The phrasing of Virgilian *accessus* («*et tunc*» «and then») speaks in favor of the latter interpretation, although it leaves unclear the reason why the preposition was added.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Hankey vol. 1 23: «*De regibus Albanis. Ascanius Enee filius condidit Albam. Silvius postumus Enee filius successit. Latinus Eneas. Latinus Silvius. Alba Silvius. Egiptus Athis. Capis Silvius Capue conditor. Carpentus. Tiberinus. Agrippa. Aremus. Aventinus. Procas. Amulius filius Proce*» «On the Alban kings. Ascanius, son of Aeneas, founded Alba; Silvius, posthumous son of Aeneas, succeeded him; Latinus Aeneas; Latinus

Zono's exposition of *historia* does not finish even with the foundation of Rome, its sequel is simply transferred to a different commentary! While straightening of chronology is common to Zono's *historia* and Shklovsky's *fabula*, this new aspect introduces an important difference between these notions: *historia* is a single series of events that 'forms the backbone' of not only one particular literary text, but all literary texts simultaneously. This is why it is possible to speak in an *accessus* to the *Aeneid* of the events not covered in the poem; the poet's work on his 'material' includes not only changing its inherent order, but also the very choice of the initial and final points of his narrative as against the pre-existing series of events.<sup>29</sup>

It seems worth noting that both features are peculiar to another medieval genre—that of prose translations of classical poetry into vernacular languages.

For instance, translations of Lucan generally tend to cover more or less all of Roman history (this is often clear already from their titles: cf. Old Norse *Romverjasaga*, late 12<sup>th</sup> cent., lit. «Saga of the Romans»; Old French *Li Fet des Romains*, ca. 1213–1214, lit. «Acts of the Romans»; the Middle Irish *In Cath Catharda* (lit. «The civil war», 12<sup>th</sup> cent.) even begins with the rule of the Assyrians). It is sometimes tempting to look at them as simply translations of a given work with the addition of certain historical material from its *accessus* (for example, both the Irish and French versions of Lucan contain catalogues of Roman magistracies (*dignitates*), ultimately deriving from Isid. *Etym.* 9.3, that can be found in the *accessus* tradition of Lucan as well). This would reduce these texts to a repository of information that could be taken from a manuscript of Lucan with «paratexts». But the obstacle this interpretation has to face is that the same versions in vernacular languages often include close translations of long passages from other ancient authors as well (Salust and Suetonius in the case of *Fet des Romains*, Jerome, Caesar and Bede in the case of *In Cath Catharda*), not normally included in the *accessus* texts. Hence, what we have before us is still more of a compilation on Roman history than just a translation of Lucan. Moreover, the Irish *In Cath Catharda* finishes before it reaches the end of Lucan's plot (viz. on the Pharsalian battle). But once we take into account the image of history as it

Silvius; Alba Silvius; Egiptus Athis; Capis Silvius, the founder of Capua; Carpentus; Tiberinus; Agrippa; Aremus; Aventinus; Procas; Amulius, son of Procas». For the story of Tiberinus added by Zono, see Serv. *in Aen.* 3.500. The name of Ascanius' son mentioned in the *accessus* to Lucan (*Iulius*, not *Iulus*, as in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.70. 3-4) makes it possible to look for the exact source of this addition to Servius: it must be some text derived from Jerome's translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle* (2.57a Schoene: «*Ascanius Iulium filium procreavit, a quo familia Iuliorum orta. et propter aetatem parvuli, quia necdum regendis civibus idoneus erat, Silvium Postumum fratrem suum regni reliquit heredem*» «Ascanius fathered Julius, from whom the Julian family originated; and on account of the age of the little one, because he was not old enough to rule over the citizens, he left the kingship as a bequest to his brother Sylvius Posthumus» (tr. by R. Pearse with corrections)). Postulation of this same source in fact accounts for the mention of Ascanius' affection towards Silvius (2.55h Schoene: «*Ascanius derelicto novercae suae regno Lavinii (v. l. Lavinti) Albam Longam condidit, et Silvium Postumum fratrem suum Aeneae ex Lavinia filium summa pietate educavit*» «The kingdom of Lavinium having been left to his stepmother, Ascanius founded Alba Longa, and with the greatest loving piety raised his brother Sylvius Posthumus, son of Aeneas by Lavinia» (tr. by R. Pearse with corrections)). The intermediate can be the most economically identified as the same Riccolbaldo (Hankey vol. 1 46: «*Ascanius Enee filius, relicto noverce Lavinie regno, Albam condidit. Silvium fratrem postumum summa pietate educavit. Iulium genuit, a quo familia Iuliorum orta est. Ascanius moriens regnum fratris reliquit, quia Iulius nondum erat regno idoneus*»).

<sup>29</sup> Additional support for this idea could be derived from the prologue to Statius' *Thebaid* (quite popular throughout Middle Ages), where the poet's work is described as choosing one particular section from the full list of Theban myths (Stat. *Theb.* 1.3-17).

appears distinctly in Zono, the contradiction disappears. What the authors of these translations render into vernacular languages is not really Lucan, but that very *historia* that stands behind his poem, and not only his poem; they can easily incorporate some material from the *accessus* tradition or (Shklovskian) *fabula* of other ancient texts, and there is no necessity for the beginnings and ends of these narratives to coincide with beginnings and ends of their respective classical models.

Another feature common to Zono's *historia* and medieval translations (and, I suggest, confirming connection between them) is straightened chronology. In the Old French *Roman d'Enéas* (ca. 1160), Heinrich von Veldeke's *Eneit* (12<sup>th</sup> cent., dependent on *Roman d'Enéas*) and the Middle Irish *Imtheachta Aeniasa* (12<sup>th</sup> cent., lit. «Wanderings of Aeneas»), Aeneas' account is duplicated by another narrative at the beginning of the text, and the initial points of the plot and of the narrative thus tend to coincide (and while in the French narrative and in Veldeke this point is the capture of Troy, the Irish translator, just like Zono, omits Virgil's book 2 and begins with book 3).<sup>30</sup> One more example can be found in the Irish version of Statius' *Achilleid*,<sup>31</sup> where the 'flashback' from book 2 (the narrative of Achilles' education) is transferred to the beginning. In sum, Zono's conception of *historia* seems quite close to the way medieval translators reworked original texts.

But behind this similarity looms another contradiction, pointing to a feature which is rather specific to Zono's idea of history and which singles it out from the background of medieval tradition. As we remember, originally in Servius, the opposition *historia-fabula* served to dispense with unwanted supernatural material. It means that *historia* must be not simply a story that stands behind the text, but *the truth* that stands behind the text. Normally *historia* preserves this function in the Middle Ages, as is clear, for instance, from the following passage from (pseudo-) Bernard Silvestris' commentary on the *Aeneid* (12<sup>th</sup> cent., Jones-Jones 15):

Quoniam quidam sermo verus, quidam falsus, ideo in hac narratione per hoc quod veritati historie falsitas fabule admiscetur hoc idem figuratur. est enim historia quod Greci Troiam devicerunt; quod vero Enee probitas enarratur fabula est. narrat enim Frigius Dares Eneam civitatem prodidisse.

Since speech is sometimes true and sometimes false, therefore the mixture of the truth of history and the falsity of fables in the narration follows this same pattern. The Greek destruction of Troy is history, but Aeneas's honesty is fiction, for Dares of Phrygia narrates that Aeneas betrayed his city (tr. by E.G. Schreiber and T.E. Maresca).

Dares of Phrygia's *History of the Fall of Troy* appears to be an ideal case of *historia*; it is an unadorned narrative of the events that 'form the backbone' of the *Iliad*, everything supernatural having been discarded. Perhaps, that is why Dares was so popular with medieval translators, on equal terms with the *Aeneid*, Lucan's *Civil war* and Statius' *Thebaid*. From the point of view of (pseudo-) Bernard, as we see, the series of events that forms the basis of the *Aeneid* would differ significantly from the narrative of the *Aeneid* itself.

---

<sup>30</sup> On the influence of the idea of *ordo naturalis* on the order of events in the medieval translations, see Fromm, Kobus 81, Green 96-103. The probable reason for the Irish version to omit Virgil's book 2 was that the destruction of Troy had already been treated in the very influential Irish version of Dares, *Togail Troí* (the earliest extant version dates back to the 11<sup>th</sup> cent.).

<sup>31</sup> Preserved as an insertion in one of the later versions of *Togail Troí* (Ó hAodha).

For instance, according to the ‘facts’ exposed by Dares, Greeks let Aeneas flee from Troy because he was a traitor. Virgil distorts these facts (*historia*). It is interesting to note that *Imtheachta Aeniassa*, a text very close to Zono’s account in the ordering of events, begins as follows (1–6):

Othairnic tra do Grecaib slad 7 inrad 7 dithlaithriugud rig cathrach na Frigia .i. in Trae, cend ordain 7 airechais na huili Aissia isside, tancadar rigraid na nGrec co dind Minerba isin Trae, 7 dorochtadar i n-aen baile uile 7 rofiarfaig Aigmenon, int airdrig dib, ca comairle dobertais do arin forind romairn in cathraig, no in comailfitis friu.

Now when the Greeks had accomplished the plunder, sack, and effacement of Phrygia’s royal city Troy, the head of all Asia in dignity and supremacy, the kings of the Greeks came to the hill of Minerva at Troy; and all being assembled in one place, Agamemnon, the sovereign lord, asked them what counsel they would give him respecting those that had betrayed the city, or whether they should keep faith with them (tr. by G. Calder).

That is, the Greeks decide to let those Trojans who betrayed the city flee, viz. Aeneas and his prospective companions (cf. Harris)—Virgil’s plot is ‘corrected’ in accordance with the very ‘facts’ known from Dares that (pseudo-) Bernard pointed out. It is again not the *Aeneid*, but the truth behind the *Aeneid* that is being retold.

Having accustomed ourselves to this point of view, however, we do not find what we would have expected in Zono’s account. Wherever possible, his *historia* is thoroughly based on Virgil. Contrary to (pseudo-) Bernard’s idea of *historia*, Zono’s Aeneas is no traitor; contrary to Servius’ idea of *historia*, Zono’s Mezentius dies before Turnus. It is in fact this feature that creates the impression of confusion: summaries of texts to be commented upon usually exist separately from the outlines of history exactly because it is supposed that they do not coincide. Zono, however, clearly inserts a text in the genre of summary into a text in the genre of *expositio historiae*, and we can even find traces of his use of *verse* summaries of Virgil. Thus, this is how Zono describes Dido’s death (fol. 1va): «*In discussu En. Dido interfecit se bino vulnere, scilicet amore et gladio*» «When Aeneas left, Dido killed herself with two wounds, namely of love and of a sword». This image is to a certain extent presupposed by Virgil’s own text (cf. *Aen.* 4.1, 4.66-67, 4.689), but becomes completely explicit only in *Anth. Lat.* 634.4 Riese<sup>2</sup>, one of the *verse* summaries of the *Aeneid*<sup>2</sup>: «*Quartus item miserae duo vulnera narrat Elissae*» «Then book four tells about the two wounds of Elissa».

More importantly, if we just retell the plot of a given text in the account of the *historia* behind it, we create a vicious circle. It is only sensible to contrast the events as described in a text (A) with the events behind it (B) if we use some other account different from A as a source of information for B (in Servius’ case this account was Cato’s *Origines*, in (pseudo-) Bernard’s, Dares of Phrygia). Otherwise, if we base narrative B on narrative A it will be impossible to find any difference between them but for the difference we introduce ourselves (in Zono’s case the straightening of chronology fulfils this function in the first place). Consequently, while Servius’ *historia* could serve the commentator as an in-

---

<sup>32</sup> Zono quotes this line himself at fol. 53va, perhaps ascribing it to Ovid following the medieval tradition. Direct quotations from Virgil can be found in Zono’s *historia Enee* as well: cf., e.g., «*habuit Eneas in responsis dum sacra faceret quod fugeret litus avarum*» «When Aeneas was sacrificing, he was told to flee the greedy shore» (fol. 1va) and *Aen.* 3.44: «*fuge litus avarum*» «Flee the greedy shore!» (tr. by H. R. Fairclough).

strument (for separating pagan fictions from facts), *historia* as treated by Zono cannot serve him as an instrument for whatever purpose any more. And curiously, Zono does not even try to remove pagan content from his exposition, as we would expect him to do.<sup>33</sup> This is how he describes the reason of Aeneas' departure from Carthage (fol. 1va): «*Sed de inde discedens monitu deorum et precipue Mercurii venientis et alloquentis En.*»<sup>34</sup> «But he departed thence because of the advice of the gods, and first of all Mercury, who came to Aeneas and addressed him». Does it follow from this that Zono believes in pagan gods? Perhaps not. When he treats Mercury's visit to Aeneas in the commentary itself, he says (fol. 58va): «*Et mittitur Mercurius ad Eneam. hoc potest esse quia bona imaginatio boni consilii venit in mentem ipsius Enee. et sic frequenter Mercurius venit ad nos, scilicet quando cogitamus aliquid boni*» «And Mercury is being sent to Aeneas. This might mean that a good idea of a good counsel went to Aeneas' mind. In the same manner Mercury often visits us, that is, whenever we come up with a good idea».

As we see, Zono does not hesitate to use traditional medieval approaches to pagan content, allegorical or other (when dealing with the descent to the Underworld in book 6, Zono, on the one hand, in a way common in the late Middle Ages (Wilson-Okamura 157-163), treats it as a disguised account of necromancy, and on the other hand, finds in Virgil's Underworld nine circles: should a coincidence with Dante's narrative confirm the veracity of Virgil's account? (Zabughin, *Virgilio*, vol. 1 48). Nevertheless, this problem seems to disappear from his mind altogether when he comes to exposing the *historia*. The veracity of *historia* appears to be of no concern to him whatsoever. However, it is not the same as Shklovskian *fabula*, since it is one and the same for all the classical texts—in a way, it exists independently of them.

It is notable that we find the same approach to constructing historical narrative even in Zono's *Life of Virgil* (following later in the same *accessus*), published by Fabio Stok. The story of the civil war (narrated with much confusion) seems to show the great influence of Lucan and commentaries on Lucan. Note the following passages (*Vita Virgilio* 56-57, 118-119):

1. Et III anno consentiente senatu mortuus est ipse Cesar in Capitolio a Bruto et Cassio XXV vulneribus [...]

Three years later, with the agreement of the Senate, Caesar was killed on the Capitoline Hill by Brutus and Cassius with twenty-five wounds [...]

2. Quibus superatis Cleopatra apposuit aspides ad mammillas et mortua est [...]

When they [Antonus' forces] were conquered, Cleopatra put asps to her breasts and died [...] (tr. by J.W. Halporn)

---

<sup>33</sup> Pagan gods, of course, can figure in translations into vernacular languages (sometimes it would be difficult to preserve a plot without them), but they clearly present a problem for translators: for instance, they can be treated as witches, pagan priests, demons, or elves (Philips).

<sup>34</sup> The phrase containing personal verbal form might have been omitted, but it seems more probable that Zono's loose syntax allows him to attach this participial clause to the previous sentence, where *Eneas* was the subject.

According to ancient sources (Suet. *Iul.* 82, Plut. *Caes.* 66.14 etc.),<sup>35</sup> Caesar gets 23, not 25, wounds and the ambush takes place in the Curia of *Theatrum Pompeii* on *Campus Martius*, not on the Capitoline Hill. It is common for the late Middle Ages to transfer this murder to the Capitoline Hill (even Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar*, act 3, scene 1, follows this tradition—the number of wounds in Shakespeare is 33;<sup>36</sup> perhaps there is some connection with the age of Christ?), the possible reason being the symbolic significance of the place. However, the notion of 25 wounds is very rare. One parallel is in master Anselm's *accessus* to Lucan (fol. 1r, cit. from Hofmann 518): «*Facto bello apud Mundam reversus est Cesar Romam et secundo anno interfectus est in Capitolio .XXV. vulneribus a Bruto et Cassio consentiente senatu*» «After the battle of Munda, Caesar came back to Rome and two years later was killed on the Capitoline with 25 wounds by Brutus and Cassius, with the agreement of the Senate».

In fact there is a number of parallels to this phrasing in the *accessus* tradition of Lucan, but normally with the number of wounds changed to 24; the most notorious of these texts is Arnulfus of Orléans' commentary on Lucan (late 12<sup>th</sup> to early 13<sup>th</sup> cent.), 5.11-14 Marti (cf. also Huygens 40): «*Bello autem apud Mundam confecto, Cesar Romam rediit qui in secundo anno postea a Bruto et Cassio, senatu consenciente, XXIII plagis in Capitolio est confossus*» «After the battle of Munda, Caesar came back to Rome; two years later he was killed by Brutus and Cassius, with the agreement of the Senate, with 24 wounds on the Capitoline Hill». In any case, a couple of additional texts that speak of 25 wounds can be found. The first one is an *accessus* from the famous manuscript Montepessulanus H 362, fol. 141v (according to the catalogue I use here, *Catalogue* 432, the *accessus* is written in the 11<sup>th</sup> cent. hand, with the beginning of the sentence illegible): «\* *apud Mundam reversus est Cesar Romam et in secundo anno interfectus est in Capitolio viginti quinque vulneribus, a Bruto, consentiente senatu*» «[...] after Munda, Caesar came back to Rome and two years later was killed on the Capitoline Hill with twenty-five wounds by Brutus, with the agreement of the Senate». Another is from an unpublished *accessus* of MS Laurentianus Plut. 35.8, fol. 1v (13<sup>th</sup> cent.): «*Cesar vero bello apud Mundam facto Romam rediit et secundo anno in Capitolio .xxv. vulneribus a Bruto et Cassio senatu consentiente interfectus est*» «After the battle of Munda, Caesar came back to Rome and two years later he was killed on the Capitoline Hill with 25 wounds by Brutus and Cassius, with the agreement of the Senate». It is notable that both texts show similarities to master Anselm's text.

Once we take into account these parallels, it becomes possible that the similarity of the descriptions of Cleopatra's death in these commentaries and in Zono is not coincidental (even despite the wide popularity in the 12<sup>th</sup> cent. of the picturesque story of her putting snakes to her breasts—as John of Salisbury explains, the venom is supposed to pass from them straight to the heart);<sup>37</sup> consider the following:<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> The same in Riccobaldo of Ferrara, dependent on Suetonius in the corresponding passage: Hankey vol. 2 447. However, if we judge from another of Riccobaldo's texts, *Pomerium Ravennatis ecclesiae* (3.267), he thinks that the Curia was on the Capitoline Hill.

<sup>36</sup> Act 5, scene 1: «Never, till Cæsar's three-and-thirty wounds / Be well avenged».

<sup>37</sup> *Policraticus* 2.27: «*Per mamillas ad cor venenum aspidum insanabile Cleopatra traūiciat*» «Let Cleopatra pass the incurable venom of asps through breasts to her heart»; cf. also Otto of Freising, *Chronicle* 3.1 («*adpositis ad mamillas serpentibus*»); *Mirabilia urbis Romae*, «the oldest version», 623.27–28 Jordan («*posuit ad mamillas duas ptisanas quod est genus serpentis*» «she put two ptisans to her breasts, which is a genus of serpents»); Godfrey of Viterbo, *Chronicle* 15 («*appositis ad mamillas serpentibus*»); Guibert of Tournai, *Eruditio regum et principum* 12 («*venenum aspidum, quod Cleopatra mamillis adhibens*»). As Prof. Sergey A. Ivanov pointed out to me, a similar story appears in the 12<sup>th</sup> cent. Byzantine historian Michael Glykas (*Chronicle* 112.15-17



1. Montepessulanus H 362, fol. 141v (*Catalogue* 432): Et apositis aspidibus mamillis interfecit se.

And she killed herself by putting asps to her breasts.

2. Laurentianus Plut. 35.8, fol. 1v: Et mamillis aspidibus appositis mortua est.

And she died from putting asps to her breasts.

3. Arnulfus, 5.32-33 Marti: Quo interfecto Cleopatra, suspensis ad mamillas aspidibus, vitam finivit.

When he [Antonius] was killed, Cleopatra put an end to her life by way of suspending asps from her breasts.

In sum, it seems that Zono used some *accessus* to Lucan to describe the historical context of Virgil's life.

#### 4. Conclusion

To sum up, for an average medieval commentator or translator, *historia/materia* is a series of events that forms the basis of a classical poetic text and lacks its adornments (e.g. changes of *ordo*) and distortions. That is why *historia* is one and the same for all the poetic texts and even can be written down as one continuous narrative; it is *truth, facts*, and there is only one truth. *Historia/materia* in Zono is also a series of events that forms the basis of a classical poetic text and lacks its adornments, and it is also one and the same for all the poetic texts, but no possibility of distortion is allowed (this might be Zono's development of the idea of a poet's impeccable wisdom, given much place in his *accessus* to the *Aeneid* (Stok, Comparetti, *passim*), but, as we have seen, sometimes he simply turns a blind eye to the problem of Virgil's veracity, as in the case of Mercury's visit to Aeneas). This *historia* is also the only one, existing independently of the texts, but now it has lost its connection with the *truth* and is aggregated by extracting information from the poetic texts themselves and by filling remaining gaps with the help of commentaries (and occasionally historical treatises as well—in particular, Riccobaldo's *Compedium*). In a way, this *historia* is an *objective* account, but not in the sense of the *true* account: only in the sense of an account existing outside (and before) the texts produced from it. *Historia* is imagined as the material that, say, Virgil had before him, prior to the start of his work on the *Aeneid*. Zono in fact reconstructs this proto-state of the plot from the poems themselves, creating a sort of common back-formed narrative for the classical corpus of ancient narrative poetry. Perhaps we need not wonder too much about this strategy of dealing with

Bekker); Sbordone reconstructs a lost passage by Galenus behind it. Latin authors probably knew it from some Arabian source deriving from Galenus: for instance, the story figures in Patriarch Eutychi-  
us of Alexandria's 10<sup>th</sup> cent. *Nazm al-Jaubar* (967 Migne).

<sup>38</sup> It was in all probability not Arnulfus but some text close to Anselm's that Zono used (it is possible that a similar statement is present in Anselm's own text as well; unfortunately, it still remains unpublished, and I was unable to check the manuscript).

the past. Zono's was the culture so much dominated by literature that if he had wanted to hear a lecture on Roman history in some Florentine or Bolognese school, or in the University of Bologna of the 1310s, he probably would have had to choose one of the classes on Roman poets (the only true historian in the Italian 'curricula' of the 14<sup>th</sup> cent. is Sallust, whose popularity, according to R. Black (200-225), declined dramatically at that moment)<sup>39</sup> and there listen to the same *expositiones historiae*. For the students of Zono, his own account of *historia* probably served as an instruction in history as well. No wonder this literature-based *historia* sometimes occupied the place of *history* in our present sense of word.

## 5. Bibliography

- Auhagen, Ulrike. "Lucilius und die Komödie." *Der Satiriker Lucilius und seine Zeit*. Ed. Gesine Manuwald. Munich: Verlag C.H. Beck, 2001. 9-23. Print.
- Bietenholz, Peter. *Historia and Fabula: Myths and Legends in Historical Thought from Antiquity to the Modern Age*. Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1994. Print.
- Black, Robert. *Humanism and Education in Medieval and Renaissance Italy: Tradition and Innovation in Latin Schools from the Twelfth to the Fifteenth Century*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. Print.
- Bozzolo, Carla, and Colette Jeudy. "Stace et Laurent de Premierfait". *Italia medioevale e umanistica* 22 (1979): 413-447. Print.
- Brown, Victoria. "A Twelfth-Century Virgilian Miscellany-Commentary of German Origin (Vatican Ms. Pal. Lat. 1695)". *Scire litteras. Forschungen zum mittelalterlichen Geistesleben: Bernhard Bischoff gewidmet*. Ed. Sigrid Krämer, Michael Bernhard. Munich: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1988. 73-86. Print.
- Caiazza, Irene. *Lectures médiévales de Macrobie: Les "Glosae Colonienses super Macrobius"*. Paris: Vrin, 2003. Print.
- Cameron, Alan. *Greek Mythography in the Roman World*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Print.
- Catalogue général des manuscrits des bibliothèques publiques des départements...* T. I. Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1849. Print.
- Cavajoni, Giuseppe, ed. *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*. Vol. II. Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica, 1984. Print.
- Chinca, Mark. *History, Fiction, Verisimilitude: Studies in the Poetics of Gottfried's Tristan*. London: Modern Humanities Research Association, 1993. Print.
- Comparetti, Domenico. *Virgilio nel medio evo: Virgilio nella tradizione letteraria fino a Dante*. Vol. 1. Florence: B. Seeber, 1896. Print.
- Dietz, David. "Historia in the Commentary of Servius". *TAPhA* 125 (1995): 61-97. Print.

---

<sup>39</sup> On the absence of professors lecturing on anything resembling history in the University of Bologna, and the professor «of poetry and rhetorics», see Grendler 7-9.

- Feeney, Denis C. *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991. Print.
- Fromm, Hans. "Die mittelalterlichen Eneasromane und die Poetik des *ordo narrandi*". *Erzählungen in Erzählungen. Phänomene der Narration in Mittelalter und Früher Neuzeit*. Ed. Harald Haferland, Michael Mecklenburg. Munich: Fink, 1996. 27-39. Print.
- Gillespie, Vincent. "From the Twelfth Century to c. 1450". *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. 2: The Middle Ages*. Ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 145-238. Print.
- Green, Dennis. *The Beginnings of Medieval Romance: Fact and Fiction, 1150–1220*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004. Print.
- Grendler, Paul. *The Universities of the Italian Renaissance*. Baltimore, London: The John Hopkins University Press, 2001. Print.
- Grintser, Nikolay P., and Pavel A. Grintser. *Stanovlenie literaturnoy teorii v Drevney Gretsii i Indii*. Moscow: RGGU, 2000. Print.
- Hankey, Teresa, ed. *Ricobaldus Ferrariensis, Compendium Romanae historiae*. Roma: Istituto Storico Italiano per il Medio Evo, 1984. Print.
- Harris, John. "Aeneas's Treason and Narrative Consistency in the Mediaeval Irish *Imtheachta Aeniasa*". *Florilegium* 10 (1988/1991): 25-48. Print.
- Hofmann, Dietrich. *Studien zur nordischen and germanischen Philologie*. Hamburg: Helmut Buske Verlag, 1988. Print.
- Huygens, Robert Burchard Constantijn, ed. *Accessus ad auctores; Bernard d'Utrecht; Conrad d'Hirsau, Dialogus super auctores*. Leiden: Latomus, 1970. Print.
- Jones, Julian, and Elizabeth Jones, eds. *Commentum quod dicitur Bernardi Silvestris super sex libros Eneidos Virgilii*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1977. Print.
- Kobus, Isabel. "*Imtheachta Aeniasa*: Aeneis-Rezeption im irischen Mittelalter". *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 47 (1995): 76-86. Print.
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar. *Iter Italicum: A Finding List of Uncatalogued or Incompletely Catalogued Humanistic Manuscripts of the Renaissance in Italian and Other Libraries*. Vol. I. London, Leiden: Brill, 1963-1992. Print.
- Lazzarini, Catarina. "*Historia/fabula*: forme della costruzione poetica virgiliana nel commento di Servio all'*Eneide*". *MD* 12 (1984): 117-144. Print.
- Leo, Friedrich. "Varro und die Satire." *Hermes* 24 (1889): 67-84. Print.
- Lord, Mary Louise. "A Commentary on *Aeneid* 6: Ciones de Magnali, not Nicholas Trevet". *Mediaevalia et Humanistica* 15 (1987): 147-160. Print.
- Manitius, Max. *Geschichte der lateinischen Literatur des Mittelalters*. Bd. 3. Munich: C.H. Beck'sche Verlag, 1931. Print.
- Marti, Berthe. "Literary Criticism in the Mediaeval Commentaries on Lucan". *TAPhA* 72 (1941): 245-254. Print.
- Marx, Friedrich. *Studia Luciliana*. Bonn: Typis Caroli Georgi, 1882. Print.

- Minnis, Alastair. *Medieval Theory of Authorship: Scholastic Literary Attitudes in the Later Middle Ages*. London: Scolar Press, 1984. Print.
- Moos, Peter von. "Poeta und historicus im Mittelalter: Zum Mimesis-Problem am Beispiel einiger Urteile über Lucan". *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur* 98 (1976): 93-130. Print.
- Moos, Peter von. *Entre histoire et littérature: Communication et culture au Moyen Âge*. Florence: SISMEL, Edizioni di Galuzzo, 2005. Print.
- Novati, Francesco. "Ineptissimus ille Ciones". *Il libro e la stampa* 2 (1908): 169-176. Print.
- Ó hAodha, Donncha. "The Irish Version of Statius' *Achilleid*". *PRLA* 79C (1979): 83-138. Print.
- Opitz, Curt Richard. "De argumentorum metricorum Latinorum arte et origine". *Leipziger Studien zur Classischen Philologie* 6 (1883): 195-311. Print.
- Pfeiffer, Rudolf. *History of Classical Scholarship: From the Beginning to the End of the Hellenistic Age*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968. Print.
- Philips, Helen, "Medieval Classical Romances: The Perils of Inheritance". *Christianity and Romance in Medieval England*. Ed. Rosalind Field, Phillipa Hardman, Michelle Sweeney. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 3-25. Print.
- Quadlbauer, Franz. "Lukan im Schema des *ordo artificialis/naturalis*: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Lukanbewerung im lateinischen Mittelalter". *Grazer Beiträge* 6 (1977): 67-105. Print.
- . "Zur Theorie der Komposition in der mittelalterlichen Rhetorik und Poetik". *Rhetoric Revalued: Papers from the International Society for the History of Rhetoric*. Ed. Brian Vickers. Binghamton: Center for Medieval and Early Renaissance Studies, 1982. 115-131. Print.
- Rose, Valentin. *Verzeichniss der lateinischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Bd. II. Abt. 3. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1976. Print.
- Rossi, Luca. "Benvenuto da Imola lettore di Lucano". *Benvenuto da Imola lettore degli antichi e dei moderni: Atti del Convegno Internazionale Imola, 26 e 27 maggio 1989*. Ed. Pantaleo Palmieri, Carlo Paolazzi. Ravenna: Longo Editore, 1991. 162-203. Print.
- Rostagni, Augusto. "Aristotele e aristotelismo nella storia dell'estetica antica." *SIFC* 2 (1922): 1-147. Print.
- Sanford, Eva. "The Manuscripts of Lucan: Accessus and Marginalia". *Speculum* 9 (1934): 278-295. Print.
- Sbordone, Francesco. "La morte di Cleopatra nei medici greci". *Rivista Indo-Greco-Italica* 14 (1930): 3-22. Print.
- Stok, Fabio. "La «*Vita di Virgilio*» di Zono de' Magnalis". *RCCM* 33 (1991): 143-181. Print.
- Shklovsky, Viktor B. "Tristram Shandy" *Sterna i teorija romana*. Moscow: OPOYAZ, 1921. Print.

- Shumilin, Mikhail V. "Rimskaya satira i ideya «metrizatsii» teksta v antichnoy literaturnoy teorii," *Indoevropeyskoe yazykoznanie i klassicheskaya filologiya* 15 (2011): 594-601. Print.
- Waszink, Jan. "Il concetto del  $\mu\upsilon\theta\omicron\varsigma$  nella teoria poetica da Aristotele a Orazio." *Literature comparate; Problemi e metodo: Studi in onore di Ettore Paratore*. Vol. I. Bologna: Pàtron Editore, 1981. 193-203. Print.
- Weber, Carl, ed. *Marci Annaei Lucani Pharsalia. Vol. III: Continens scholiastas*. Leipzig: Gerhard Fleischer, 1831. Print.
- Wetherbee, Winthrop. "From Late Antiquity to the Twelfth Century". *The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism. Vol. 2: The Middle Ages*. Ed. Alastair Minnis and Ian Johnson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. 99-144. Print.
- Wilson-Okamura, David. *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010. 233-247. Print.
- Wiseman, Peter. "Lying Historians: Seven Types of Mendacity." *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Ed. Christopher Gill and Peter Wiseman. Exeter, Austin: Exeter University Press, Texas University Press, 1993. Print.
- Zabughin, Vladimir. "L'umanesimo nella storia della scienza: Il Commento Virgiliano di Zono de' Magnalis". *L'Arcadia* 1 (1917): 1-18; 2 (1918): 87-99. Print.
- . *Virgilio nel Rinascimento Italiano da Dante a Torquato Tasso: Fortuna, studi, imitazioni, traduzioni e parodie, iconografia*. Vol. I. Bologna: Zanichelli, 1921. Print.
- Ziolkowski, Jan, and Michael Putnam, eds. *The Vergilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*.