



QUOTATIONS OF LUCAN AND THE INDIRECT TRADITION: TEXTUAL NOTES ON THE *BELLVM CIVILE*

ABSTRACT

This article deals with the contribution of the indirect tradition to establishing the text of Lucan's Bellum ciuile. First, the methodological basis for the use of quotations is outlined, and then five passages from the Bellum ciuile are discussed. The variant readings which appear in the indirect tradition constitute important points that have been wrongly neglected by most editors of Lucan's poem.

Keywords: Lucan; philology; quotations; indirect tradition

In this article, I propose to examine some passages of the *Bellum ciuile* for which the examination of evidence from the indirect tradition and, particularly, of quotations from Lucan can enrich the discussion about establishing the text of the poem and can sometimes lead us to adopt a different text from that of the edition by D.R. Shackleton Bailey.¹

As a foreword, it is necessary to clarify a few points of methodology specific to working with indirect tradition and quotations. First, philologists approach the materials of the indirect tradition in different ways. G. Pascucci considers that ‘la tradizione indiretta appare, in generale, meno affidabile di quella diretta’,² while R.J. Tarrant refers to it as ‘a form of evidence that is important for editing classical texts’.³ P. Chiesa defends an intermediate point of view, when he writes that both the indirect and the direct traditions must be used with great caution.⁴ These statements reveal how necessary it is for an editor to take into account the indirect tradition, as I propose to do in order to establish Lucan's text. However, we do need to consider the methodological implications of using quotations with regard to the textual variants they can convey.

The main aspect we have to take into account when studying new readings in quotations is related to the autonomy of the quotations. The quoted passages are, in fact, separated from their context, and this has consequences for the variant readings they contain. The fact that the quotations have been isolated from their original text sometimes leads to the appearance of new readings that are obviously wrong when they are reinserted into Lucan's text. Lactantius Placidus' commentary on Statius' *Thebaid* provides excellent illustrations of such a phenomenon:

Lactant. Plac. *Theb.* 1.479–80: VENTIS VT DECERTATA RESIDVNT AEQVORA parenthesis per similitudinem. Lucanus: ‘sed ut timidus Boreas post flamina uentus rauca gemit’.

¹ D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Marcus Annaeus Lucanus De bello civili libri X* (Stuttgart, 1988). The *sigla* used in this article, however, are taken from the edition of R. Badali, *Lucani opera* (Rome, 1992).

² G. Pascucci, ‘La tradizione indiretta nella trasmissione dei testi antichi’, *Quaderni dell'AICC di Foggia* 1 (1981), 27–36, at 27.

³ R.J. Tarrant, *Texts, Editors and Readers. Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism* (Cambridge, 2016), 7.

⁴ P. Chiesa, *Elementi di critica testuale* (Bologna, 2012³), 105–6.

'WHEN THE SEA OVER WHICH THE WINDS HAVE FOUGHT CALMS DOWN' a parenthesis for comparison. Lucan: 'but as the timid wind Boreas moans after raucous breaths'.

sed, ut tumidus Boreae post flamina pontus
rauca gemit, sic muta leuant suspiria uatem. (Luc. 5.217–18)

But as the sea swells with the raucous breaths of Boreas
and moans, so mute sighs revive the prophetess.

In this example, the quotation from Luc. 5.217–18 contains three variant readings: *timidus/tumidus*, *Boreae/Boreas* and *uentus/pontus*. On the one hand, there is little doubt that the text quoted by Lactantius Placidus is faulty. *Boreas* is never referred to as *timidus* in extant Latin literature. The nominative phrase *Boreas ... uentus* creates an unusual disjunction,⁵ and the syntax of the sentence is slightly flawed since *post* should refer to an external action that causes moaning, which is not the case with the new readings in the quotation. On the other hand, the qualities of the traditional text are obvious. The evocation of a sea swollen (*tumidus ... pontus*) by the wind is common,⁶ and the explicit attachment of the name of the wind to the mention of its breath corresponds to the expected syntax of the sentence. Finally, it is easier to explain the appearance of these variant readings by considering that the traditional text is the original text: *timidus* is a form of trivialization,⁷ which substitutes a common term for a more refined one. *Boreas* has become a nominative by attraction to the case of the adjective that precedes it. *uentus* can be considered as a gloss on *Boreas* that has been inserted in the text instead of *pontus*. All these reasons make it very likely that the quotation in Lactantius Placidus represents an incorrect state of the text. Even if none of the readings in the quotation improves the traditional text, it should be stressed that the quoted passage displays an internal coherence, which, however, is different from that intended by Lucan. The adjective *timidus* can be used to describe a moan,⁸ and the action of the moan linked to the wind resonates with the mention of its hoarse breath.⁹ The display of consistency in a quoted passage can also be seen from a metrical point of view elsewhere in Lactantius Placidus' commentary.¹⁰ Because quoting consists of extracting a fragment from its context, the latter develops a certain form of autonomy. This autonomy is certainly defined in relation to the host text, since the quotation appears as an exogenous text, but the autonomy also develops in relation to the original text. Because the fragment is isolated within a new context, it can evolve and contain new features which give it a more satisfactory internal logic (semantic, syntactical or metrical). For this reason, particular care should be taken when studying the variant readings present in the quotations from Lucan. Studying the initial context of the quotation as well as the context of the host text makes it possible to identify the potential influence of the latter on the fragment and to avoid considering a new element that

⁵ The naming of a wind together with *uentus* is, however, not impossible in Latin (see Plin. *HN* 18.333 *uentumque Aquilonem Borean Graecis dictum*), but it is rather a prosaic expression.

⁶ See e.g. Luc. 2.457.

⁷ This is a translation for the concept used by G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo* (Florence, 1952²), 191.

⁸ See e.g. Sen. *Tro.* 1160–1.

⁹ These two notions are associated elsewhere by Lucan: Luc. 4.756 *pectora rauca gemunt* (see also Sil. *Pun.* 2.245).

¹⁰ See Lactant. Plac. *Theb.* 2.655 quoting Luc. 4.363–4, with the variant reading *uultu menteque serenus*. *mente* is a metrical stopgap used to make the quoted line complete, since the first word of the verse, *dixerat*, is omitted in the quotation.

comes from the manuscript tradition of the quoting author as a traditional element of the *Bellum ciuile*.

To complete our presentation of the characteristics to be taken into account in a study of the new features attested in the indirect tradition of the *Bellum ciuile*, we wish to present a specific case-study which Servius gives us as an example when he quotes Luc. 9.11–12 in two notes, whose text we will compare with the text of the edition by D.R. Shackleton Bailey:

Serv. *Aen.* 4.358: MANIFESTO IN LVMINE aut claro: aut in nimbo, cuius maius est lumen. Sic Lucanus ‘postquam se lumine uero impleuit’.

‘IN THE TRUE LIGHT’ or in the bright light: or in a cloud, whose light is stronger. Thus Lucan: ‘after he was filled with the true light’.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.640: LARGIOR HIC CAMPOS AETHER non nostro largior, sed quam est in cetera inferorum parte. aut re uera largior, si lunarem intellegis circulum: nam, ut supra diximus, campi Elysii aut apud inferos sunt, aut in insulis fortunatis, aut in lunari circulo: Lucanus ‘illic postquam se lumine uero induit’.

‘HERE A MORE GENEROUS AETHER ... THE PLAINS’ not more generous than ours but than the aether which is in the other part of the underworld. Or else it is really more generous if we identify it with the lunar circle, for, as we have said above, the Elysian Fields are either in the underworld or in the Isles of the Blest or in the lunar circle; Lucan: ‘there, after he was clothed with the true light’

... illic postquam se lumine uero
impleuit stellasque uagas miratus et astra
fixa polis, uidit quanta sub nocte iaceret
nostra dies ... (Luc. 9.11–14)

... There, after he filled himself with the true light and after he gazed at the wandering stars and at the stars fixed to the vault of the heavens, he saw the depth of the night that covered our day ...

The text of Lucan quoted by Servius differs in the two notes. In the note on *Aen.* 4.358, Servius quotes the text with the verb *impleuit*, which is the most common reading in Servius’ manuscripts.¹¹ However, when he comments on *Aen.* 6.640, Servius uses the verb *induit*.¹² Thus, in the first case Servius seems to be quoting a text that conforms to the text of the manuscripts of the *Bellum ciuile*, in which the most common reading is *impleuit*,¹³ whereas in the second note a new reading has been integrated in the quotation. How can we interpret this internal disagreement within the Servian comments on Lucan’s text? Should we consider that the presence of the traditional reading in one of the two notes indicates that Servius was aware of this reading and that, consequently, the new reading is nothing more than a variant that appeared during the copying of Servius’ commentaries? The manuscript tradition of the two notes suggests that the existence of different verbs at the end of the Lucan quotation is quite old. Since Virgil’s commentator does not rely on this verbal form in either note, it is impossible for us to know for sure whether Servius was aware of the former reading rather than

¹¹ The reading *miscuit* can be read in MS F, while MSS E and N omit the final verb of the quotation.

¹² This is the reading of MSS F and G; MS C of Servius auctus has the reading *impleuit*.

¹³ The reading *implebit* is in MSS M and Z.

of the latter, or even whether it was he who, through a mistake, was the origin of both readings. Such a case, though rare,¹⁴ has the merit of warning us about the reliability of the variants that can be identified in a quotation.

We therefore propose here a discussion of some passages of the *Bellum ciuile* where the examination of the indirect tradition offers a new perspective on the traditional text.

1. LUC. 1.607

A variant reading in Luc. 1.607 can be found in the *Scholia uestustiora* to Juvenal:

Schol. Iuu. 6.587: FVLGVRA CONDIT condi fulgura dicuntur, quotienscumque pontifex dispersos ignes in unum redi<g>it et quadam tacita ignorata prece locum adgestione consecrat. Sic Lucanus 'et tacito cum murmure condit datque locis nomen'.

'HE BURIES THE LIGHTNING' the lightning is said to be buried, whenever the priest gathers scattered fires into one pile and consecrates, through the act of gathering, a place with some silent and unknown prayer. Thus Lucan: 'and he buries it with a secret whisper and gives the places a name'.

dumque illi effusam longis anfractibus urbem
circumeunt, Arruns dispersos fulminis ignis
colligit et terrae maesto cum murmure condit
datque locis numen. (Luc. 1.605–8)

And as they go round the city, which stretches out in long and winding folds, Arruns collects the scattered fires of lightning, buries them underground with an afflicted whisper, and gives the places sanctity.

We will not discuss at length the reading *nomen* for *numen*, which is also attested in the manuscript tradition of the *Bellum ciuile*,¹⁵ but we will focus on the new reading *tacito*, which is unique to the indirect tradition. Let us just point out, with regard to *nomen*, that in Rome there are names for places struck by lightning (*puteal* or *bidental* if the place is consecrated by the sacrifice of a sheep), but it is not so much the attribution of the name that is important in Lucan's verses as the associated sacred ritual.¹⁶ Conversely, there are literary parallels to the attribution of *numen* to a place as a result of a religious ritual.¹⁷ The reading *numen* is, therefore, preferable to the reading found in the scholia to Juvenal.

The matter is more complex with regard to the reading *tacito*. It appears only in the scholia to Juvenal, whereas the direct tradition of the *Bellum ciuile* unanimously gives the reading *maesto*. Note that the new feature *tacito* is linked to the core of the quotation.

¹⁴ See e.g. Luc. 3.545 quoted by Prisc. *Gramm. Lat.* 2.330.2 Hertz with *puppem* and *Gramm. Lat.* 3.53.20 Hertz with *puppim*.

¹⁵ *nomen* is the reading in MSS G, U, V and B.

¹⁶ See further N. Laubry, 'Les «coups de foudre» de Jupiter et l'exportation de la religion romaine en Gaule', *Gallia* 73 (2016), 123–44, at 134, who demonstrates this on the basis of epigraphic documentation. The defence of the *nomen* variant by R. Schilling, 'IVPPITER FVLGVR: à propos de deux lois archaïques', *Publications de l'École Française de Rome* 22 – *Mélanges de philosophie, de littérature et d'histoire ancienne offerts à Pierre Boyancé* (Rome, 1974), 681–9, at 684 n. 1 is less convincing.

¹⁷ See Ov. *Ars am.* 1.203 *date numen eunti*, Sen. *HO* 1982 *nouumque templis additum numen canam*.

The scholiast explains that the prayer which accompanies the burial of the lightning is *quadam tacita ignorata prece*. This new reading is opposed to the traditional text, which seems to me problematic. P. Roche¹⁸ defends the *textus receptus* by arguing that the expression *maesto cum murmure* is a *uariatio* around a common sequence in epic poetry, which he illustrates with passages where other adjectives are used with *murmur*: *magno* (Verg. *Aen.* 1.55), *uasto* (Verg. *Aen.* 1.245), *nullo* (Ov. *Met.* 7.186), *rauco* (Ov. *Met.* 7.186), etc. However, this list highlights above all that there is no comparable occurrence of the *iunctura* given by the manuscripts of the *Bellum ciuile*.¹⁹ R. Bentley²⁰ suggested correcting the traditional text with the conjecture *magno*. First, let us point out that the adjective *maestus*, when related to a noun evoking speech, is used to describe the pain of the speaker.²¹ However, this notion has no place at this stage of the text. Arruns performs the ritual ceremony of conjuring up prodigies linked to the burial of the lightning.²² It is only after he has performed a sacrifice that he will realize the failure of this ritual and express his emotion.²³ Moreover, the term *murmur* refers here to the prayer the officiant recites to bury the lightning.²⁴ In this very particular ritual, ‘the priest is as if mute for the rest of the Romans’.²⁵ The adjective *tacito* is quite appropriate for *murmur* in this context.²⁶ It allows the poet to describe exactly how the prayer could be perceived by the audience. Such precision seems welcome in a passage where Lucan rigorously recalls the different stages of the ritual of atonement.²⁷ The adjective *tacitus* can also be used to refer to a word in a sacred context,²⁸ and it then takes on the meaning of ‘concealed, secret’.²⁹ Moreover, Lucan uses the word *murmur* twice more in similar contexts, whether to speak of an indistinct sound (*non claro murmure*, ‘an indistinct whisper’, 1.352) or to link the noun *murmur* with the verb *tacere* (*mediusque tacet sine murmure pontus*, ‘the middle of the sea stays silent without a whisper’, 1.260).

¹⁸ P. Roche, *Lucan De Bello Ciuili Book I* (Oxford and New York, 2009), 350.

¹⁹ Valerius Flaccus (1.626) uses the ablative *murmure maesto* to evoke the fear-filled complaint of the Argonauts in the face of a storm. The same is true of Ps.-Seneca’s *Octavia* (923), where the expression *maestum ... murmur* refers to a complaint.

²⁰ E. Hedicke, *Studia Bentleiana. 6.2. Lucanus Bentleianus* (Freienwald, 1911), 7.

²¹ *TLL* 8.0.48.15–30. Moreover, the adjective *maestus* is not appropriate to the description of prayers, unless they take the form of lamentations or complaints: see, for example, Val. Flac. 3.601 *lacrimis maestisque ... uotis*.

²² W. Van Andringa, *Archéologie du geste. Rites et pratiques à Pompéi* (Paris, 2021), 49–51 suggests that *maesto* refers, through the prayer, to the gloomy character of the place in which the lightning is buried.

²³ Luc. 1.616 *palluit ... Arruns* and 1.618 *terrui ipse color uatem*.

²⁴ On silent or whispered prayers, i.e. inaudible to the audience witnessing the ritual, see N. Corre, ‘La prière secrète du pontife ou Silence et murmure, des gestes vocaux signifiants dans la tradition religieuse romaine’, *RBPh* 95 (2017), 39–58. I believe that Laboissière’s hypothesis that *murmur* refers to the noise made by lightning as it enters the earth is erroneous, because both the syntax and the context imply that *murmur* describes the way in which Arruns speaks: J.-L. de Laboissière, ‘Mémoire sur les connaissances des anciens dans l’art d’évoquer et d’absorber la foudre’, *Mémoires de l’Académie de Nîmes* (1822), 304–23, at 313.

²⁵ Corre (n. 24), 46.

²⁶ Moreover, the word *tacito* echoes the secrecy of the place in which the lightning was buried. See Van Andringa (n. 22), 50.

²⁷ The text is thus cited in various modern articles devoted to the rite of burial of lightning: see Schilling (n. 16); B. Rémy and A. Buisson, ‘Les inscriptions commémorant la chute de la foudre dans les provinces romaines de la Gaule. À propos d’un nouveau document découvert à Saint-Geoire-en-Valdaine (Isère)’, *Revue archéologique de Narbonnaise* 25 (1992), 83–104, at 85 n. 5; Corre (n. 24).

²⁸ See Ov. *Met.* 6.203 *tacito uenerantur murmure numen*.

²⁹ *OLD* s.v. 8.

Finally, the appearance of the new reading *maesto* can be explained by the correction of a scribe who did not understand the phrase *tacitum murmur* and replaced it with a plainer term, a word that occurs near *murmur* in Luc. 5.192.³⁰ We therefore suggest adopting the variant *tacito* reported by Juvenal's scholiast.

2. LUC. 3.537

The manuscript tradition of Servius' commentaries contains a noteworthy variant reading in the quotation of Luc. 3.537:

Serv. *Aen.* 10.207: CENTENAQVE ARBORE non ait remis, sed arboribus, ad exprimendam nauis magnitudinem, quae plures habuit remorum ordines: unde ait Lucanus 'et summis longe ferit aequora remis'.

'WITH A HUNDRED TREES' he does not say 'with oars' but 'with trees', to emphasize the size of the boat, which had quite a few rows of oars. This is why Lucan says 'and it strikes the sea far out with the top end of its oars'.

celsior at cunctis Bruti praetoria puppis
uerberibus senis agitur molemque profundo
inuehit et summis longe petit aequora remis. (Luc. 3.535–7)

But the flagship of Brutus, which dominates all of them, is pushed by a set of six rows of oars, it advances its mass out to sea, and reaches far out to sea with the top end of its oars.

All the manuscripts of the *Bellum ciuile* read *petit* at 3.537. Servius' editors, on the contrary, disagree on the text of the quotation. C.E. Murgia prints *petit*, which appears in MS F alone—a version of Servius auctus split into two manuscripts³¹—while H. Hagen and G. Thilo choose the variant reading *ferit*, found in all the witnesses of the Servius text to which the editors refer with the *siglum* Σ.³² For this reason, it seems better to follow, on this point, the text established by H. Hagen and G. Thilo, since it seems closer to the text of Servius. The lexical variant reading in Servius offers an interesting alternative to the traditional reading *petit*. We should note first that the two readings are metrically equivalent and that we must therefore find other approaches in our attempt to evaluate them. On the one hand, the reading *ferit* restores a common image in epic poetry, with the notion of blows given to the waves with regard to the course of a ship.³³ It could be objected that, whenever this image is invoked by a poet, the subject of the verb *ferire* is always animate, whether it be the *socii* in Virgil or Jason (*dux*) in Statius. The example taken from Book 4 of the *Bellum ciuile* nuances

³⁰ Another approach would be to assume that both *maesto* and *tacito* have preserved traces of a lost original reading. *tacito* would preserve the meaning of that lost reading and *maesto* would be palaeographically close to it; this would then lead us to support the conjecture *mutō*, suggested by G. Liberman (EPHE Paris) during a discussion we had. This conjecture (which can be supported by N. Heinsius's note on *Ov. Met.* 1.762, where he suggests the emendation *mutum murmur* for *Ov. Met.* 14.280–1) produces a satisfactory meaning, but does not seem superior to the reading *tacito*.

³¹ Bern, Burgerbibliothek, 172 (*Aeneid* Books 1–5) and Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, lat. 7929 (*Aeneid* Books 6–12).

³² For an extensive list of these witnesses, see R.A. Kaster and C.E. Murgia, *Serviani in Vergili Aeneidos libros IX–XII commentarii* (New York, 2017), 1–2.

³³ See e.g. *Verg. Aen.* 3.290 and 5.778 *certatim socii feriunt mare*; *Luc.* 4.424–5 *aequor ... ferit*; *Stat. Theb.* 5.480 (*primoque ferit dux uerbere pontum*).

this, since it is the term *remigium* that serves as the subject of *ferit*.³⁴ This word is, in fact, ambiguous and can designate either an object, the row of oars, or, by metonymy, the oarsmen.³⁵ On the other hand, the reading *petit* produces a rich meaning for the passage. Indeed, the poet wants to emphasize the impressive size of Brutus' ship, which he has described as *celsior* at 3.535. The size of the ship is evoked by two elements concerning the oars: not only the number of rowers (*uerberibus senis*) but also the length of the oars. The latter is indicated by the adjective *summis*, which implies that only the ends of the oars can touch the water, and by the adverb *longe*, which explicitly refers to the length of the oars. This adverb, which relates to the verbal action, goes better with *petere* than with *ferire*. Both readings thus produce an interesting meaning for Luc. 3.357. However, *ferit*, which uses a more elaborate and rarer image, could be considered as a form of *lectio difficilior* compared to *petit*, which is a minimizing explanation. Moreover, the adverb *longe* is sufficient to emphasize the considerable size of the flagship, without the need for the verb *petit*. Finally, the violence evoked by *ferit* is echoed in the expression *excussis ... tonsis* used by Lucan a few verses later (3.539), concerning the ships taking part in this naval battle. It is, therefore, possible to adopt the reading *ferit* or, at least, to mention it in the apparatus criticus.

3. LUC. 4.133

Servius quotes Luc. 4.133 as follows:

Serv. *Aen.* 4.72: NESCIVS **aut nescius quod ferierit**: **aut** ignoratus **et** latens; non qui ceruam nesciret. et rara sunt uerba, quae per contrarium significant: nam cum 'uector' sit proprie qui uehit, inuenimus etiam eum uectorem dici qui uehitur, ut Lucanus 'uectoris patiens tumidum supernatat amnem'.³⁶

'NOT KNOWING' either not knowing what to strike, or ignored and hiding; and not the kind of person who would not know the hind. And there are very few words which signify both one thing and its opposite. For while *uector* is properly said of someone who transports, we also find that *uector* is called a person who is being transported, as Lucan has: 'capable of carrying a passenger, it floats on the surface of the swollen river'.

utque habuit ripas Sicoris camposque reliquit,
 primum cana salix madefacto uimine paruam
 textitur in puppim caesoque inducta iuueno
 uectoris patiens tumidum superemecat amnem. (Luc. 4.130–3)

And as soon as the Sicoris has taken possession of its banks and abandoned the plains, first, wet and white willow sticks are woven into a small skiff, which, covered with the skin of slaughtered bull and capable of carrying a passenger, springs to the surface of the swollen river.'

Most manuscripts of the *Bellum ciuile* have the reading *superemecat* (written either as one or as two words) at 4.133. Only MSS V and A show the correction *superenatat*, which is also found in the *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*.³⁷ All the

³⁴ 'Il sogetto è, ovviamente, *remigium*': P. Esposito, *Marco Anneo Lucano. Bellum civile (Pharsalia). Libro IV* (Naples, 2009), 215.

³⁵ OLD s.v. 2.

³⁶ I have printed in bold type the text of Servius Danielis.

³⁷ *EMICAT: enatat*, 'LAUNCHES: floats', *Suppl. adn.* 4.133.

witnesses of Servius, on the other hand, give the reading *supernatat*. This reading is obviously wrong: it has a second-paeon metrical form, which is incompatible with the presence of the long final syllable of *tumidum* immediately before. It must therefore be considered that the form *supernatat*, found in Servius, is a deformation of the variant *superenatat*, which fits perfectly into Lucan's hexameter.

The debate on the passage is not new, and we shall begin by recalling the main choices made by editors and their arguments.³⁸ Most recent editors adopt *superemicat*—this is the case of A.E. Housman, D.R. Shackleton Bailey and G. Luck³⁹—or *superemicat* (R. Badali followed by P. Esposito). A. Bourgery, on the other hand, prints *supereminat*, but this is most likely a misprint since there is no indication of the provenance of this reading in the apparatus criticus, which suggests that the printed text is the reading of all the manuscripts. While there seems to be an agreement among editors to support the traditional reading, *superenatat*—which had been adopted by older editors, such as F. Oudendorp, P. Burman and C.M. Francken⁴⁰—was defended by N. Hecquet-Noti in the early 2000s. The latter highlights, first, the rarity of the forms *superemicat* and *superenatat* in extant literary texts and proposes to base her analysis on the relevance of the meaning in Lucan's epic. In contrast to *emicare*, which is never used to describe the behaviour of a boat on the water,⁴¹ *enatare* seems more precise and has parallel uses to the meaning it would have in our passage.⁴² Above all, the existence of a parallel in Avitus of Vienne,⁴³ who was inspired by Lucan, confirms, in the opinion of N. Hecquet-Noti, the superiority of *superenatat*. N. Hecquet-Noti's reasoning is convincing. The following arguments should be added. First, the variant *superenatat*, because it more specifically evokes navigation, provides a better counterpart to the comparison which immediately follows the description of the boats made by Caesar's troops and in which the verb *nauigat* is found.⁴⁴ Finally, P. Asso's rebuttal that *superenatat* is a neologism⁴⁵ does not constitute a sufficient argument.⁴⁶ One can easily accept this linguistic originality in Lucan's poem, knowing that *superenatare* is formed in a way that is completely in accordance with usage, as proven by the attested existence, elsewhere, of the verb *superemicare*.⁴⁷ It, therefore, seems preferable to adopt the reading *superenatat*, a trace of which can be found in the corrupted form *supernatat* reported by Servius in a gloss to the *Aeneid*.⁴⁸

³⁸ Esposito (n. 34), 110–11 presents the terms of the debate with precision and clarity.

³⁹ A.E. Housman, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli ciuilibus libri decem* (Oxford, 1926), ad loc.; Shackleton Bailey (n. 1), ad loc.; G. Luck, *Lucan. De bello civili. Der Bürgerkrieg* (Stuttgart, 2009), ad loc.

⁴⁰ F. Oudendorp, *M. Annaei Lucani Cordubensis Pharsalia. Siue Belli ciuilibus libri decem* (Leiden, 1728), ad loc.; P. Burman, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia cum commentario Petri Burmanni* (Leiden, 1740), ad loc.; C.M. Francken, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia cum commentario critico* (Amsterdam, 1896–7), ad loc.

⁴¹ N. Hecquet-Noti, 'SVPERENATARE: à propos d'une variante dans le 'De bello ciuili' de Lucain (4,133)', *MH* 58 (2001), 93–8, at 94.

⁴² Flor. *Ep.* 2.13.59 or also Ps.-Caes. *BAl*ex. 18.3 (with *adnatare*).

⁴³ *nunc age, congestis crescat fortissima lignis | machina, quae surgens fluctus superenatat omnes*, Avitus 4.239–40.

⁴⁴ Luc. 4.135.

⁴⁵ P. Asso, *A Commentary on Lucan, De Bello Civili IV* (Berlin and New York, 2010), 141.

⁴⁶ Lucan uses other neologisms in his epic. See e.g. *editor* in Luc. 2.423 and the note by F.H.M. van Campen, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili liber II: een commentaar* (Amsterdam, 1991), ad loc.

⁴⁷ The idea that the two-word spellings *super emicat* and *super enatat* are correct and can be an alternative which avoids the neologism criticized by P. Asso must be abandoned. See C.F.W. Müller, *Syntax des Nominativs und Akkusativs im Lateinischen* (Leipzig, 1908), 142–3 and G. Liberman, *Stace, Silves* (Paris, 2010), note on *Silv.* 1.1.33.

⁴⁸ One could, however, argue that the reading *superenatat* is a legacy of Lucan's glosses (especially

4. LUC. 5.428

Isidore of Seville uses a new reading in Luc. 5.428 when he quotes the text of this verse about the *siparum*:

Isid. *Etym.* 19.3.4: *siparum* genus ueli unum pedem habens, quo iuari nauigia solent in nauigatione quotiens uis uenti languescit. de quo Lucanus: ‘summaque tendens sipara uelorum perituras colligit auras’; quod ex separatione existimant nominatum.

The *siparum* (‘topgallant sail’) is a type of sail that is one foot long, by which ships are usually helped to sail whenever the strength of the wind weakens. Lucan says about this: ‘and spreading the high topgallant sails hoisted above the rest of the canopy he gathered the breeze that would have perished’; it is thought that the *siparum* takes its name from the fact that it creates a separation.

sidera prima poli Phoebos labente sub undas
 exierant et luna suas iam fecerat umbras,
 cum pariter soluere ratis totosque rudentes
 laxauerunt sinus et flexo nauita cornu
 obliquat laeuo pede carbasa summaque pandens
 sipara uelorum perituras colligit auras. (Luc. 5.424–9)

Phoebus was sinking beneath the sea, the first stars of the sky had come out and the moon had already created her own shadows when they cast loose the ships all together, and the ropes loosened all the folds of the sails, and the sailor, at the end of the yards, tilted the sails with the left sheet and, unfurling the high topgallant sails hoisted above the rest of the canopy, he gathered the breeze that would have perished.

Isidore of Seville quotes Luc. 5.428 with the participle *tendens*, which is absent from the manuscript tradition of the *Bellum ciuile*. The majority of Lucan’s witnesses have the reading *pandens*, while the first hand of MSS Z and P writes *pendens*. This last reading, obviously wrong because it produces an unsatisfactory meaning, remains interesting because it could be considered as an intermediate stage between the two readings *pandens* and *tendens*, two verbs that are sometimes interchangeable in manuscripts.⁴⁹ The traditional text relies on a common Latin idiom, where *pandere* receives, as an object complement, a noun referring to a sail,⁵⁰ either to designate in the literal sense this action in a ship⁵¹ or to express, in the figurative sense, the simple fact of leaving quickly.⁵² The verb *tendere* also produces a very satisfactory meaning, since it is frequently used to describe sailors’ action on sails, notably in the *Bellum ciuile*.⁵³ If we examine more precisely the verbs used to indicate the action undergone by the *siparum*, we find that it is never associated with either *pandere* or *tendere*. There is,

of the *Supplementum adnotationum* quoted above), inserted in Servius’ commentary. I cannot discard this possibility, but I have to acknowledge that the reading *superenata* is more satisfying concerning navigation.

⁴⁹ See e.g. *Aetna* 245.

⁵⁰ See *TLL* 10.1.194.11–25.

⁵¹ See Plin. *HN* 19.4; Plin. *Ep.* 35.1; Prop. 2.21.13. On the relevant marine vocabulary, see L. Casson, *Ships and Seamanship in the Ancient World* (Princeton, 1971), 241–2. On the *sipara*, see B. Graser, ‘Untersuchungen ueber das Seewesen des Alterthums’, *Philologus* 25 (1867), 136–284, at 220.

⁵² See Ov. *Ars am.* 3.500; Juv. 1.149–50; Plin. *Ep.* 8.4.5.

⁵³ See Luc. 8.185–6 *quo nunc pede carbasa tendi nostra iubes*; 8.254 *tendens carbasa* and 9.45 *tendentis uela carinae*.

however, a passage in Seneca where the author uses *intendere* in relation to the *siparum*.⁵⁴ Similarly, Epictetus writes ἐπαίρεις τοὺς σιφόρους, thus using a turn of phrase which in Latin would be rendered with the verb *intendere*.⁵⁵ Both Lucan's usage, when referring to sails, and these passages from Seneca and Epictetus argue for the form *tendens*. The reading transmitted by Isidore of Seville thus deserves editorial consideration.

5. LUC. 7.362

Priscian uses a new reading that is pertinent to the core of the quotation when he quotes Luc. 7.361–2:

Prisc. *Inst.* 8.40 = *Gramm. Lat.* 2.476.13–477.9 Hertz: in 'eo' i antecedente unum inuenitur, 'cieo'. unde Virgilius in I: 'bella cient primaque uetant consistere terra'. idem in VI: 'aere ciere uiros Martemque accendere cantu'. inuenitur tamen hoc idem etiam in 'io' desinens quartae coniugationis. unde Statius in III Thebaidos: 'suus exciit in arma antiquam Tirynta deus'. Lucanus in II: 'nunc urbes excite feras, date gentibus arma'. Lucretius: 'aurarum cimius ad ortus'. Liuius in CXVIII: 'aduersus interfectores Gaii Caesaris ultoribus manum conparans concibat'. praeteritum eius tam in 'ui' quam in 'ii' desinit, 'cuii' uel 'cii'. Lucanus in VII: 'quantas in proelia numquam conciuere manus'. Vergilius in V: 'famaque finitimos et clari nomen Acestae excierat'.

There is only one verb ending in *eo* preceded by *i*, *cieo*. Hence, Virgil in Book 1: 'they stir up war and forbid us to stop on the first land'; the same author in Book 6: 'agitate men with the trumpet and animate Mars with his song'. However, this same verb is also found with an ending in *io*, of the fourth conjugation. Hence Statius, in Book 4 of the *Thebaid*: 'his god calls to arms ancient Tiryns'. Lucan in Book 2: 'now arouse wild cities, give weapons to the people'. Lucretius: 'we incite the birth of the breeze'. Livy in Book 118: 'he aroused, by getting them together, the troop of avengers against the murderers of Gaius Caesar'. Its perfect tense ends in both *ui* and *ii*, for example *cuii* or *cii*. Lucan in Book 7: 'they mobilized an unprecedented number of troops for the battle'. Virgil in Book 5: 'the news and the name of the illustrious Acestes had attracted the neighbouring people'.

primo gentes oriente coactae
innumeraeque urbes, quantas in proelia numquam,
excuiere manus. (Luc. 7.360–2)

Nations from the far East and countless cities gathered and mobilized so large troops for the battle as were never mobilized before.

Priscian uses the reading *conciuere*, which is found in all the manuscripts used by M. Hertz for his edition of Priscian's *Ars*.⁵⁶ The *Bellum ciuile* manuscripts unanimously transmit the reading *excuiere*. In the examples he gives, Priscian presents both some forms derived from the simple verb and other forms derived from its compounds, yet it is not possible to identify a logic behind the choice of one or the other. We, therefore, have no reason from Priscian's text to question the reading *conciuere* that the grammarian uses in his quotation from the *Bellum ciuile*. The verb *excieo/excio* is the verb Lucan uses

⁵⁴ Sen. *Ep.* 77.1 *solis enim licet siparum intendere, quod in alto omnes habent naues.*

⁵⁵ Arr. *Epict. diss.* 3.2.18.

⁵⁶ He points out, however, that in the apparatus criticus two manuscripts consulted by G. Korte would have presented the reading *excuiere*. See M. Hertz, *Prisciani Grammatici Caesariensis Institutionum grammaticarum libri XVIII* (Leipzig, 1855), 477.

mainly to signify the call to arms,⁵⁷ while the verb *concieo/concio* is more rarely used in such a context by the poet.⁵⁸ The difference between the two verbs, from a semantic point of view, lies in their prefixes: *exciere* emphasizes the emergence of the troops from the cities from which they originate,⁵⁹ while *conciere* focusses on the notion of gathering the soldiers, who are mobilized at the same time.⁶⁰ From this point of view, the reading conveyed by Priscian's quotation may appear preferable in a context where the poet insists on the number of troops engaged in the battle of Pharsalus (*innumerae urbes, quantas ... manus*) and would thus provide a welcome parallel to the first part of the sentence (*gentes ... coactae*). It should be noted, however, that this notion of gathering is not entirely absent from the verb *excio/excio*: thus, Lucan uses it at 3.290–1 when he counts Pompey's allies.⁶¹ In short, the new reading in the quotation cited by Priscian gives a satisfactory meaning and is, in my view, of comparable value to that of the traditional text; therefore, it should, at least, be mentioned in the apparatus criticus of every edition of Lucan's poem.

Univ. Grenoble Alpes,
CNRS, Litt&Arts, 38000 Grenoble, France

FLORIAN BARRIÈRE
florian.barriere@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

⁵⁷ See e.g. Luc. 3.291 and 4.669.

⁵⁸ See, however, Luc. 5.597 where the verb is used to announce the summoning of dangers.

⁵⁹ *TLL* 5.2.1245.82–3.

⁶⁰ *TLL* 4.36.48.

⁶¹ *tot immensae comites missura ruinae | exciuit populos*, '[fortune] mobilized so many people to send them as companions to a tremendous ruin', Luc. 3.290–1.