THE EXPOSITION
OF THE CONTENT OF VIRGIL
ACCORDING TO MORAL PHILOSOPHY
The full traditional title for the second, and in some respects most notorious, work of Fulgentius the mythographer is perhaps unlikely to be the author's title, but nonetheless serves as a reasonable index of its character. It is an *exposiatio* because it gives a connected rather than a scholastic treatment of its subject, *exponere* becoming in it a favorite verb on the lips of Virgil, who is summoned from the shades to expose or lay bare the hidden truths of his *Aeneid* in similar fashion to the *expositiones* of Ambrose and others on the books of Scripture. The *continentia*, or inner substance of Virgil, is concentrated on to the exclusion of any concern for grammar, rhetoric, narrative skill, topical allusions, use of language, or prosody. And the work is based on moral philosophy in the rather inclusive sense that term acquired in the Middle Ages: this is Virgil *moralisé*, that is, dressed up in a motley of ethical and didactic precepts. It is also something of a medley of notions and commonplaces, particularly on the teaching and interpretation of literature, a medley which nonetheless includes a number of attitudes and motifs typical of its time and later to become formalized and schematized and perhaps more respectable. Modern comment on Fulgentius's *Content* has often stressed its eccentricity, its wild and freakish aspects. The work is certainly an unweeded garden, but it is also, to use a Fulgentian term, a *seminarium*, a seedbed of devices and techniques which later grew and flourished in transplanted form. There, especially, lies its importance as a literary document.

The *Content* is preserved in a number of manuscripts which range from the ninth to the sixteenth centuries and are particularly plentiful from the tenth to the earlier twelfth. Of the eleven superior copies (the majority of which are now housed in the Vatican Library) drawn upon by Helm for his edition of 1898, two early ones, P = Vat. Palatinus 1578 (9th century) and R = Vat. Reginensis 1462 (11th), appear to descend from a lost archetype which may well have belonged to the eighth century, the Carolingian age. P, R, and seven others also contain Fulgentius’s *Mythologies*; P, R, and one other have his *Explanation of Obsolete Words*. P, R, and four others assign to the *Content*, with minor variants, the title adopted by Helm and for the
present translation, namely *Expositio continentiae Virgilianae secundum philosophos moralis*; manuscript E = Vat. Reginensis 1567 (11th century) has *Libellus de allegoria librorum Virgilii*; such titles are, of course, unlikely to have originated with the author. Nearly all copies name the author as Fabius Planciades Fulgentius. Several manuscripts of the *Mythologies* are addressed to a Catus, priest (*presbiter*) of Carthage, E alone varying this with Cantia, priest of Carthage. In this same manuscript the *Content* is addressed to a Calcidius *grammaticus*, and to the same person is addressed in P, R, and other copies, the *Explanation of Obsolete Words*; if this is a piece of literary fiction, one thinks immediately of the fourth-century Calcidius or Chalcidius who translated and commented on Plato’s *Timaeus*, but there is nothing to substantiate the link.

As we have it, the *Content* begins formally and elaborately but ends lamely and abruptly, covering the last six books of the *Aeneid* in a sketchy fashion and doing nothing to resolve the situation created by the appearance of Virgil’s shade. Nothing in the manuscripts, however, warrants assuming that any loss of text is involved or that the weak finish has to do with anything but the fading of the author’s inspiration. So with the Latinity: aside from the Greek quotations and etymologies, for which there are many signs of scribal struggles, we have a text not much younger than two centuries after the author’s probable lifetime, and one which can scarcely be more distorted than the state in which the author left it.

One of the most evident features of the *Content* is its pedagogic character, its resemblance to the attitudes and tones of the schoolmaster teaching literature and life through literature; this aspect of the work has already been considered, in the general introduction above, against the background of St. Augustine. We begin with a run-through of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* from which Virgil emerges as the master of a wide range of arts and sciences, exemplifying the tradition of omniscience and infallibility which Macrobius in particular had cultivated for the poet in his *Saturnalia*, where Virgil’s *profunda scientia* is repeatedly stressed. Then the bard himself appears, in a sort of dream convention or fictional vision of the kind justified by Macrobius in his *Commentary on the Dream of Scipio* as a means of promoting virtuous behavior. Virgil has come to Fulgentius in response to his verse invocation of the Muses, another traditional touch. Virgil conducts his interview very much in the manner of a dialogue between master and pupil, essentially in the style established by Plato, Cicero, Tacitus’s *Dialogue on Orators*, and once again Macrobius’s *Saturnalia*, but perhaps more closely
akin to the *De magistro* of St. Augustine, the dialogue on the use of words between himself and a boy of fifteen.

The quotation from a play of Plautus in para. 24, and the extensive use made of the same author in the *Explanation of Obsolete Words*, may help explain why Fulgentius allows his dialogue some novelty, drama, and occasional touches, unconscious or not, of comedy. Having begun by apologizing, it would seem, for his great age and poor memory, he rather incongruously assumes the role of a boy to whom Virgil can be both condescending and downright insulting. Virgil twice calls him *homunculus*, little man, which appears to mean, not a kind of Lilliputian or microcosm, but plain "boy."* Virgil castigates his obtuseness, calling him "more dense than a clod of earth" (para. 4), remarks on his "fatheadedness" (6), says he has little hope of opening up his weightier matters (4), tells the *homunculus* to keep his ears open (6) and pay close attention (10), talks of "infants to whom my material is being handed on" (10), and quickly snubs the persona of Fulgentius when he ventures to add to what Virgil is explaining a word in season from the Bible (19, 20, 24). The fact that Fulgentius's persona is not merely smug and obsequious but rather bumptious also adds a nice touch of conflict. On four occasions he gets his own back on the stern master: in para. 9 he cites "the wisdom of God, far higher than your senses"; in 13 he cuts short Virgil's offer of a further explanation; in 21 he comes up with a sly equation of Virgil's "Gentile speech" with Old Testament "abomination"; and in 23 the pupil turns the tables on the master for what he calls a piece of Epicurean folly.

These fairly lively exchanges may even suggest that Fulgentius's central notion, of the *Aeneid* as an allegory of life, is after all not meant to be taken with complete seriousness. But the moralizing is serious enough. As Virgil runs through his poem, it is the *sententiae*, the moral precepts and didactic lessons, that he stresses—the ignorance, wildness, and conceit of youth, the dangers of pride, lust, flattery, greed, gluttony, envy, sloth, impiety, and anger, almost a catalogue or procession of the deadly sins. Although Fulgentius sets out proclaiming that the adventures of Aeneas stand for "the full range of human life" (para. 6), he works out the allegory only from birth to full manhood. Aeneas is first the baby, then the child who begins by being headstrong but settles to serious study, overcomes temptation and irresponsibility, learns humility, and eventually gets on in the world. The emphasis is on material prosperity, on making good, not on reaching a wise old age or a final sanctity. When Aeneas wishes to marry Lavinia, not very
flatteringly traced to laborum uia, the road of hard work, Virgil is made to explain (para. 24) that “at this stage of life Everyman learns the value of toil in furthering his worldly possessions”; in the following paragraph he says sententiously, “To do well is to sow the seeds of future goodness, and he who does well may be confident of laying up good things for himself.” In Fulgentius’s view of things, the Red Cross Knight does not become St. George: he merely joins the executive ranks.

The didactic lessons are driven home, as in the Mythologies, with remorseless ingenuity by the wildest of etymologies of personal and place names which caused Comparetti, for instance, to doubt the author’s sanity, but which are only of the kind taken quite seriously, and sometimes schematized, in such popular works as the Etymologies of Isidore, the Moralia on Job by Gregory the Great, and the many discussions of the nomina Christi. The didactic potential of Virgil is exploited to the extent that Fulgentius is prepared to manipulate the complete epic into, not so much a religious pilgrim’s progress from this world to the next, as the development of what Spenser was to call “a gentleman or noble person in virtuous and gentle discipline” and “a good governor and a virtuous man,” but something to be disentangled from “continued allegory or dark conceit”—a fiction “cloudily enwrapped in allegorical devices,” and turned into a “good discipline delivered plainly in way of precepts.” In many ways Spenser’s ideas about the Faerie Queene, like Torquato Tasso’s on his Gerusalemme Liberata, are thoroughly Fulgentian, though of course they reverse the formula and fit epic to theory. Spenser in his explanation passes from Homer and Virgil to Xenophon’s prose epic, the Cyropaedia, in which history and biography are deliberately manipulated and romanticized to suit a moral and educational purpose, a ready-made example of Fulgentius’s approach to epic, though he does not refer to it. Fulgentius may have found some precedent for what he does to Virgil in the allegorical defenses of Homer, such works as the Quaestiones of the later Heraclitus, or in the latent Christianity attributed to Virgil himself, of which he was well aware (see par. 23), or in such passages as the personification of evils in Aeneid 6, eagerly seized upon and elaborated in paragraph 22.

Fulgentius’s Latin is what one would expect of a decadent period, close to the Asianic extravagances of Martianus Capella, strained, pompous, full of tortuous elaborations, infected with Gorgian antithesis, occasionally descending to colloquialism, at times reading like a parody of Ciceronian periods—in sum, what George Saintsbury called “a most detestable style, a tis-
Quite a parade of learning and authorities is presented, and Comparetti roundly accuses Fulgentius of inventing. If not invented, the learning is certainly suspect of being secondhand. Many of the traceable quotations used are either slightly inaccurate, as if from memory or a compendium, or are taken from the opening sentences of a work. Otherwise unknown titles by Carneades, Petronius, and Tiberianus are cited; in paragraph 1, Virgil’s *Eclogue* 9 is quoted but called *Eclogue* 1, and Virgil is allowed to mention Petronius, Porfyrius, and Tiberianus, who, in fact, postdated him by many years. Fulgentius claims not to be interested in the deeper things of Virgil, whereupon he gives a lengthy list of writers whom he does not intend to emulate, including some who look suspiciously like fictitious or secondhand authorities (par. 3; see supplementary note 1). In paragraphs 22–24, the Epicurean school seems to be equated with the Academic; and toward the end, where invention begins to flag, Latona is mistaken for her daughter Diana as the moon goddess and the father of Latinus, whom Virgil called Faunus, is named Caunus by Fulgentius. To any dispassionate view, the total performance is frequently near travesty.

What Fulgentius does know at first hand includes the techniques of traditional rhetoric and dialectic; witness the lengthy argument of paragraphs 6–10 (see supplementary note 2), even incorporating a detail of *ars dictaminis*, or formal letter-writing. Some acquaintance with the Greek language must be added to the list of his abilities; but to judge by the etymologies, his knowledge of Greek need not have gone far beyond the use of a glossary or word list.13

As to the central allegory, the short imitative text *On the Thebaid*, ascribed to a Fulgentius but one almost certainly later than ours, begins with a significant statement (see the version below) of the author’s uncompromising attitude to pagan poetry: the hidden moral is everything; the fiction, a mere husk or shell of a nut. For our Fulgentius, the *Aeneid* was a popular and not difficult nut to crack. He does not have to defend its interest for a Christian audience: Virgil alone, of the pagan authors, could assume without discomfort the pose of both sage and bishop that he is given in paragraph 6. And its popularity as a curriculum text, as Augustine’s *Confessions* showed, was second to none. Virgil’s work had attracted, by the age of Fulgentius, a considerable body of interpretative commentary, in which allegory of one kind or another had some place; certain passages of the poem indeed—in particular, the descent of Aeneas in book six—could be said to invite and encourage an allegorical or symbolic approach.14 What original-
ity may be attributed to Fulgentius lies in the persistence with which he applies philosophical allegory to the whole Aeneid. He was not the first to hold the general notion or to apply it to particular passages. He is merely attempting to do for a popular text, at least partly acceptable to Christian readers, what had long before, with perhaps greater justification, been done for Homer. The allegorical approach to literature had been already adumbrated to some extent by Homer himself as well as by Hesiod, and allegorical interpretation of heroic narrative in terms of moral philosophy—heroic deeds as exemplary of the virtuous life—had its roots in the same remote antiquity. Fulgentius had more than one model for his approach to Virgil. The life of the poet by Aelius Donatus, the teacher of Jerome, and Donatus’s imperfectly preserved commentary give some place to hidden philosophical meanings; witness the famous explanation of the order of the Virgilian works. The popular commentary of Servius, both the shorter scholia and the augmented exposition, mingles with literal explanations some allegorical material of this kind, emphasizing Virgil’s mastery of doctrina or erudition and making much of the profundities in book six. Only Tiberius Donatus, writing later in the fourth century than his namesake, produced a less colorful commentary, rhetorically orientated and showing little interest in explanation along philosophical lines. To Macrobius, at the end of the century, Fulgentius probably owed most. The Neoplatonic symposium called the Saturnalia gave him a model for dialogue and perhaps a taste for greater profundities in Virgil than the schoolroom treatments might offer. Virgil in Macrobius emerges as an infallible sage of enormous and deep learning, exactly the character he is given at the start of Fulgentius’s Content, and Fulgentius goes on to cite authorities with a generosity very reminiscent of Macrobius; regrettably the philosophical parts of the Saturnalia are lost, or the parallel might well be made closer. From Macrobius’s Commentary on the Dream of Scipio Fulgentius may well have taken the hint for his visionlike manifestation of Calliope in the Mythologies and of Virgil himself in the Content.

More in general, the allegorical approach of Fulgentius, in both the Mythologies—which universalizes the mythical figures of antiquity in the same allegorical fashion and explains them with copious etymology as symbols of virtues and vices—and the Content—which applies the technique to one major work of antiquity—may be characterized as Stoic. Cicero’s dialogue On the Nature of the Gods, the doorway to much lost Greek speculative and philosophical literature, favored the Stoic association of mythology and
ethics, and, with its freedom from the more dogmatic and theoretical aspects of Stoicism, may have served Fulgentius with some inspiration. This was the type of allegorical approach which came to a new and abundant flowering among Renaissance humanists. What Sir Philip Sidney said in his *Apology for Poetry*—"No philosopher’s precepts can sooner make you an honest man than the reading of Virgil," and "But even in the most excellent determination of goodness, what philosopher’s counsel can so readily direct . . . a virtuous man in all fortunes, as Aeneas in Virgil"—describes concisely the broad end of the current in which Fulgentius long before had dabbled. With other branches of medieval allegory, some of them evident from classical times (such as interpretation of details in terms of the topical or historical, physical or cosmological) and some more specifically Christian (in their allegories, symbolism, and typology), Fulgentius has little or nothing to do.

Aside from the central fantasy, Fulgentius’s *Content* touches on many commonplace notions and techniques current in the late classical period and recurrent throughout the Middle Ages. A representative list would include praise of one’s patron; the author’s affected modesty; the *occupatio* or *occultatio*, pretended avoidance of difficult themes; the gold and the river of eloquence; the poet’s divine frenzy or furo; respect for authors of the past; anger as an epic motif; etymology as a category of thought; number symbolism; the deadly sins; the tower of pride; and the wheel of fortune. Some of these are discussed and illustrated briefly in the notes to the translation, below. Something has already been said on the traditionalism of the dialogue form, the invocation of the Muses, the deliberate flamboyance of the Latin, the allegorical and philosophical approaches, and the arbitrary etymologizing. One or two other incidental features both traditional and capable of later proliferation may be mentioned. Virgil is represented as a kind of supernat...
sance writing, they do not, of course, rank as specific instances of Fulgentius's personal influence: he is only one catchment in a large network of waterways.

Something of the general influence of Fulgentian notions on medieval and Renaissance allegory, literary criticism, and treatment of mythology has already been indicated; and the persistent influence of the *Mythologies* has been outlined in the introduction to that work, above. What follows is confined to the specific later influence of the *Content of Virgil*. The orthodox, if not the representative, attitude of mistrust towards pagan literature is explicitly stated by the rigorist Paschasius Radbertus in the preface to his commentary on St. Matthew; but the passage is explicit also in its testimony to the Carolingian popularity of Fulgentius's *Content* and to the writer's own acquaintance with it: 17

\[\text{We do not treat of Virgil's "arms and a man," finding our condiment in the Greek salt of fables, but from the fountain of the Holy Spirit . . . we desire to expound for the ears of our people what we understand in the Scriptures. It is not with tragic dutifulness [the *pietas* of Aeneas] that we soothe the reader. . . . Hence, even if some of our friends take pleasure in Virgil's lines, because, as they say, he would wish to signify by "arms" virtue and by "man" wisdom, and so on for all that follows, they should find even greater delight in the matter which we are setting ourselves to handle.} \]

A more liberal general comment, which also precisely echoes the Fulgentian rationalization of pagan legends, is that in a poem by Paschasius's contemporary, Theodulf of Orleans: "Poets provide false stories; philosophers often turn these falsehoods into truth." 18

From the eleventh century comes the admiring tribute to both the *Mythologies* and the *Content*, in the *Liber de scriptoribus ecclesiasticis*, by the Belgian chronicler Sigebert of Gembloux (died 1112), who was cited in connection with the influence of the *Mythologies*. From the earlier twelfth century, another allusion seems to reveal itself in the remark, by Conrad of Hirsau, that if all three major works of Virgil are considered, "a shrewd reader might perceive that this preeminent poet had covered the full range of liberal studies"—the very point Fulgentius illustrates in detail in the opening of the *Content*. 19 In the middle of the same century was produced a thoroughgoing imitation of the *Content*, the *Commentum super sex libros Aeneidos Vergilii*, by Bernard Sylvestris of Tours, a work of some popularity, still known to Dante in the *De vulgari eloquentia* and the *Vita Nuova*. 20 Bernard's interest with the *Aeneid* lay in its moral and philosophical implications—"Virgil insofar as he is a philosopher writes on the nature of hu-
The Exposition of the Content of Virgil

man life"—the poetry and story providing an integumentum or wrapper for Aeneas as enos (compare  ἐναῖος, "inhabit") and demas (δῆμας, "body"), that is, inhabitant of the body, the human spirit in its temporal corporeal captivity. Much is drawn from Macrobius and Servius, and the detailed interpretations are bolstered by fanciful etymologies modeled on, and often duplicating, those of Fulgentius, for "etymology reveals divine truths and rules human ones." The linking of Virgil's Grove of Hecate or Trivia with the trivium of the schools is a typical piece of ingenuity that Fulgentius might well have envied. The framework, too, is Fulgentian, the stages of man's growth, somewhat more thoroughgoing and systematized: from infancy in book one of the Aeneid through boyhood (2), adolescence (3), youth (4), to manhood (virilis aetas, 5), the contents of each book are summarized in prose. The treatment of book six, as with Servius and Fulgentius, is more profound than that of the earlier books, with supplementary details drawn from William of Conches on Boethius; with six, Bernard lays aside his announced plan to cover all twelve books of the epic. The descent of Aeneas to the lower world becomes a fourfold descent to this world, the descent to birth which is common to all men, that to reflection by the wise, that to vice in which the common herd partake, and that by way of necromancy. While details and plan differ in their degree of elaboration, the allegorizing methods of Fulgentius with Virgil are everywhere apparent.

Later in the same twelfth century we find similar notions on Virgil entertained in the work of John of Salisbury (died 1180), a writer more evidently associated with the new scholasticism and its fascination with detail. John was acquainted at first hand with Bernard Sylvestris and the school of Chartres, with which Bernard was distantly connected. In the Polycraticus 8. 24-25, John reproduces the etymology for Aeneas as ἐναῖος, "the indweller," the soul in the human body; earlier (2.15), "Virgil in his book probes into the secrets (rimatur arcana) of all philosophy"; and in 6.22 a quotation from Aeneid 6 is introduced by "Recall the lines of the Mantuan poet, who under the guise of fables (sub imagine fabularum) expresses the truth of all philosophy."

Perhaps to the same century, or a little earlier, may be assigned another imitation of Fulgentius's Content, the short work On the Thebaid which applies his methods to the epic of Statius. A version of this text is given below, with some introductory comment.

There follows the age of Dante, himself guided by Virgil in the Divina Commedia, and owing, he says elsewhere, all his knowledge of rhetoric to
Virgil's example. In the fourth treatise of the Convivio, the incomplete work written as he approached the age of 25, Dante divides human life into four ages: youth and adolescence to 25, manhood the age of achievement from 25 to 45, old age from 45 to the Biblical term of 70, and decrepitude from 70 to 81. For manhood his model is Virgil's Aeneas, and he speaks of "the account which Virgil gives in the Aeneid of the changing progress of the ages." Aeneas descended to the lower world, "whereby it appears how in manhood it behoves us for our perfection (perfezione) to be temperate and brave (temperati e forti). And this is what goodness of nature accomplishes and shines forth." Whether or not his direct influence is to be accepted here, the general notion and the terms used resemble Fulgentius, with his perfectio for mature manhood and his virtus et sapientia formula for manly qualities.

In his Comment on the Divine Comedy, Boccaccio associates Fulgentius's invocation of the Muses (par. 2) with Dante's in Inferno 2.7. In his compendium of mythology, the Genealogy of the Gentile Gods 14.13, Boccaccio gives the thoroughly Fulgentian view that "Virgil's second purpose, concealed within the poetic veil, was to show with what passions human frailty is infested, and the strength with which a steady man subdues them." Petrarch's allegorical view of Virgil—as it emerges from his Coronation Oration 2, his Latin verses on the Aeneid, and his letter De quibusdam fictionibus Virgillii—has a strong Fulgentian ring. Around 1475-80 Cristoforo Landini in his Disputationes Camaldulenses, books 3 and 4, put out an allegorical exegesis of the Aeneid still reminiscent of Fulgentius's Content.

At least one manuscript of the work was made in the sixteenth century, and the Content reached print in or before the 1520s. In the seventeenth-and eighteenth-century collections of mythology and editions of Virgil, Fulgentius's text still holds its place. By the nineteenth century the more typical comment on the work ran as follows:

The absurdity of this piece is so glaring, that, had it been composed in a different age, we should have at once pronounced it to be a tedious and exaggerated burlesque.

The tide is not likely to ebb again in Fulgentius's favor, but the current of his influence was long lasting and widely signaled.

The translation which follows is divided, unlike Helm's edition of the original, into numbered sections or paragraphs for convenience of reference. The text and its allusions call for fairly extended annotation; this is
given in explanatory notes after each paragraph and, for three topics requiring fuller treatment, in supplementary notes at the conclusion.
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2. The phrase occurs in Sat. 3.2.7; see Curtius (1953), pp. 443–45.
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5. The full history of an author's persona or character assumed when he obtrudes in his own compositions, a subject so intriguing with Dante and Chaucer, has still to be written. Some points towards it are made by S. Battaglia, *Mitografia del Personaggio e Esemplarità e Antagonismo nel Pensiero di Dante*, both published in Naples, 1966.
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7. D. Comparetti, transl. E. F. M. Benecke, *Vergil in the Middle Ages* (London, 1895), p. 112. For a comment on Fulgentius's extensive use of etymology as a tool of allegory, see the introduction to the *Mythologies*, above.


9. From the letter to Sir Walter Raleigh which appeared with books 1–3 of the *Faerie Queene* in 1590. In par. 10, Fulgentius uses *princeps*, prince or ruler capable of exercising judgment, in the same sense as Spenser's "governor." The Fulgentian *virtus*, not a theological term but the path to material prosperity, recalls not only ancient sophist and Roman concepts of manly qualities, but the Renaissance *virtu*, as much virtuosity as virtue.


12. Saintsbury (1900), 1:393–94. For the contemporary cult of ornate mannerism, see Curtius (1953), pp. 273–301.


15. See the studies of Comparetti, et al., in the bibliographical note above, including Hughes (1929), pp. 399–406, on attitudes to Virgil taken by Renaissance authors such as Petrarch, J. C. Scaliger (*Poetices* 3), Tasso, and Cristoforo Landini.

16. For the ramifications of classical and medieval allegory, see the studies of Lewis, et al., listed above, and the useful bibliography given by Miller (1968).


