

THE TEXT OF BEINECKE MS 673, AN ELEVENTH-CENTURY MANUSCRIPT TO LUCAN

The textual tradition of the numerous ninth- and tenth-century manuscripts to Lucan's *Bellum civile* is so contaminated that it is folly to think of constructing a straightforward stemma. This well-known fact has, since the time of Housman, tempted editors to feel that enough in the way of manuscript investigation has been done¹). Yet despite the absence of an orderly stemma the situation is not as chaotic as Housman thought it was. More than twenty years ago Gotoff convincingly demonstrated that our five earliest complete manuscripts to Lucan, dating from the ninth century, can not only be more precisely defined in relation to each other than had previously been done, but function in many ways as a group²). Four of the five (MZAB) are united by more than 850 errors; the fifth (R) shares with the others some 600 errors. But manuscripts of the tenth and later centuries are of a different sort. Although a process of vulgarization has led to easier readings replacing more abstruse ones, at the same time we find in hundreds of instances a sounder text, along with ancient variants not known to the ninth-century manuscripts³). It is therefore a mistake to assume that, because the text of Lucan was contaminated from an early date, every medieval manuscript must necessarily inherit the

1) A. E. Housman, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem* (Oxford 1926) consequently relied on the third edition of C. Hosius, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem* (Leipzig 1913) for knowledge of the manuscripts. An independent edition of Lucan's poem was published in the same year as Housman's by A. Bourguery and M. Ponchont, *Lucain. La guerre civile (La Pharsale)*, 2 vols. (Paris 1926 and 1929). Yet the most recent editions of Lucan by G. Luck, *Lucan. Der Bürgerkrieg* (Berlin 1985) and D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Libri X* (Stuttgart 1988) depend in large part on Housman's apparatus, supplemented here and there by later work but ultimately relying, like Housman, on Hosius.

2) H. C. Gotoff, *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century* (Harvard 1971). Gotoff gives a hypothetical stemma for these manuscripts on p. 97.

3) This last observation was made by E. Fraenkel (p. 500) in a penetrating and sympathetic review of Housman's edition published in *Gnomon* 2 (1926) 497-532 (= *Kleine Beiträge*, II 267-308).

same textual tradition. Many of the later manuscripts belong to, or at the very least are acquainted with, a strain of tradition different from that of the manuscripts of the ninth century.

Since editors have focused on the ninth- and tenth-century codices, the manuscripts of the eleventh and twelfth centuries have not been adequately investigated⁴). Our study presents, as a step in this direction, a textual description and collation of Beinecke MS 673 (here designated with the siglum J)⁵). The readings of this manuscript, which is not descended from any known extant manuscript of Lucan, have not previously been reported. Script, decoration, and other indications suggest that the codex was produced in Italy and dates from the late eleventh or early twelfth century⁶). J contains the text of the *Bellum civile* from 1.1–5.535 and, after a gap of several quires, 8.358–10.438 (after the last quire a single leaf would have been needed to complete the text; this leaf is now missing⁷). The manuscript also contains marginalia, which will not be discussed here⁸). In our present investigation we shall consider, first the formal, then the textual, relationship of J to other codices of Lucan.

4) It should be noted, however, that the important manuscript G (Brussels 5330–2), long thought to belong to the tenth century, has been redated to the eleventh: cf. A. Boutemy, *Un manuscrit de Gembloux* (1958) 117. Fraenkel (above, n. 3) cited some Laurentian manuscripts of the twelfth century as further evidence for early variants. Gotoff (above, n. 2) 21–24, describes and cites three eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts which had previously been neglected. P. Lejay, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber Primus* (Paris 1894) and R. J. Getty, *M. Annaei Lucani De Bello Civili Liber I* (Cambridge 1940) also consulted later manuscripts, but both of these editions cover only the first book of the poem. R. Badali gives a brief description (including, for each manuscript, selected readings from the first book of the poem) of the Lucan manuscripts in Bologna and Rome in *I codici bolognesi di Lucano*, *RCCM* 16 (1974) 191–213, and *I codici romani di Lucano*, *BPEC* 21 (1973) 3–47; 22 (1974) 3–48; 23 (1975) 15–89.

5) This manuscript was purchased in 1987 by the Beinecke Rare Book and Manuscript Library at Yale University, having previously been in the collection of Sir Thomas Phillipps (no. 9805). Phillipps acquired it from the English book dealer Thomas Thorpe (*Catalogue*, pt. 2 [1836], no. 800).

6) A note on the flyleaf states that the manuscript was bought “in Italy”. On the script, cf. A. Petrucci, *Censimento dei codici dei secoli XI–XII. Istruzioni per la datazione*, *StudMed*, 3 Ser., 9 (1968) 1115–1126. The first folio of the codex is almost entirely covered by a large minuscule B decorated in orange, yellow, green, red, pink, and brown.

7) Verses 3.75–116 should also not be considered a part of the original text of the manuscript; they were written by a thirteenth-century scribe.

8) Cf. S. Werner, *The Scholia to Lucan in Beinecke MS 673*, *Traditio* 45 (1989–90) 347–364.

I. *The formal relationship of J to other manuscripts*

Analysis of the missing, interpolated, and misplaced verses in other witnesses to the text of Lucan reveals no decisive link between J and any other single manuscript. The table of omitted and displaced lines shows the relationship of J to the manuscripts in Shackleton Bailey's 1988 Teubner edition and to the following additional manuscripts⁹).

M	Montpellier 113	s. IX2/4
Z	Paris lat. 10314	s. IX2/4 or mid-ninth
A	Paris n. a. lat. 1626	s. IX2/4
B	Bern 45	s. IX med.-3/4
P	Paris lat. 7502	s. IX/X?
Q	Paris lat. 7900A	s. IX/X
U	Leiden, Voss. Lat. F. 63	s. X
V	Leiden, Voss. Lat. Q. 51	s. X4/4
G	Brussels 5330-32	s. XI
S	Paris lat. 13045	s. XI/XII

Though our discussion concerns only these manuscripts, we may add that a comparison of disrupted verses in a number of manuscripts not listed in the table was similarly inconclusive¹⁰).

J shows noteworthy agreement or near agreement in error with other manuscripts in the following places (since 5.536-8.357 are not extant in J, these verses do not form part of our discussion). 2.598-9 are omitted by QS and J because of homoeoteleuton (*pugnae*). 4.744-5 appear after 741 in V, after 740 in J. The placement of 9.83 is wrong in a number of manuscripts. The verse is genuine, as Housman persuasively demonstrated, but its proper position is after 77 where the *Commenta* have it¹¹). J agrees with PUS in placing it after 79. 9.494 is spurious and interrupts the logic; the verse is preserved in ABG and J and added by M²U²V²Z². 10.122a is an obvious interpolation invented, as Housman believed, to replace a missing verse: the spurious verse is nothing more than a

9) For the dates of MZABQ I have relied on B. Bischoff as reported by Gotoff (above, n. 2); for PV on R. J. Tarrant in *Texts and Transmission: A Survey of the Latin Classics*, ed. L. D. Reynolds (Oxford 1983) 215-18; for GS on B. Munk Olsen, *L'Étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles* (Paris 1985); for U on Gotoff.

10) I have compared microfilms of the following manuscripts: Erlangen 389, Florence, Aedil. 200; Plut. 35.8; 35.10; 35.13; 35.15; 35.17; 35.21; 35.23; S. Marco 249; S. Croce 24 sin. 3; Strozzi 128; 129; Kassel, Poet. 2° 5; Leipzig, Rep. 1. 10a; Montpellier 362; Paris lat. 8039; 8040; 9346; 17901; St. Gall 864; Vatican lat. 3284; and Wolfenbüttel Aug. 4° 52.5.

11) Housman (above, n. 1) xxi and *ad loc.*

dittography of 123. It is found in QVGZ²U² and J. Less noteworthy, because commoner, are the omission from homoearchon of the genuine verses 9.253–4 in J and in MZPQGS (against ABUV and M²Z²G²S²), and the careless omission of 9.615 in MZABP and J. 10.8 may be spurious, but Housman admitted it into his text, and the verse is not as poorly attested as he thought: AB (both of the ninth century) preserve it; J sides with most manuscripts and does not. Other passages may be found in which J agrees with a majority of manuscripts in error; for these the reader may consult the table.

The fact that a manuscript exhibits a genuine verse does not prove that it must have descended from another manuscript exhibiting that verse. The following agreements are therefore inconclusive. 4.78 is almost indispensable, as Housman saw, if the previous verse is not to be confusing; the verse is omitted by most manuscripts but present in GSM²U²V² and J. 9.664 has been condemned by some editors as unnecessary, but neither this verse nor the similarly suspected 661 is entirely superfluous, and it may have dropped out by homoearchon. ABGSZ²V² have the verse, along with J. 9.924 appears to be genuine, though no reason for omission presents itself; the verse is found in ABVGSZ²U² and J, and the *Commenta* knew of it.

J does not admit several instances of probable interpolation, at least one of which is late. The history of 1.436–40 was described by Lejay: 440 is certainly spurious; it was first published by Accorsi in 1521, and is found in no known manuscript. The other verses, 436–9, are not written in any of our manuscripts in the first hand, and probably date to the twelfth century (when M² recorded them)¹². 5.321a is an intrusion which is definitely attested only in U; the fourth-century palimpsest Naples Lat. 2 (formerly Vindob. 16) + iv A 8 also has a verse in this place, but it is not clear whether it is this verse¹³. 4.251 is witnessed only by A²V²G²S²; Luck believed that the verse is a fabrication dating to the eleventh or twelfth century¹⁴.

On the other hand J does admit interpolation at 9.498a–d along with ABM²Z²S². Since these verses are so blatantly spurious that most editors do not report them, let us briefly consider them here.

12) Lejay (above, n. 4) c–cii.

13) G. Luck, Die fehlenden Verse im Lukantext, RhM 112 (1969) 278.

14) Luck (above, n. 13) 282–3.

<i>utque calor soluit quem torserat aera uentus,</i>	498
<i>exarsitque dies, iam mundi spissior ignis,</i>	a
<i>iam plaga, quam nullam superi mortalibus ultra</i>	b
<i>a medio fecere die, calcatur, et umor</i>	c
<i>in Noton omnis abit. manant sudoribus artus,</i>	d
<i>arent ora siti.</i>	500

Of our manuscripts, MP include neither these verses nor the genuine 499, but other manuscripts which do not have 499 admit the interpolation. The interpolation may therefore have been prompted by the loss of the genuine verse. But the interpolator obviously knew about the missing verse and indulged in some deliberate concocting. Lines a–d are a pastiche of three passages in Lucan: the first half of 499, 604–6, and 539 with the second half of 499. The interpolation was recorded by Z² and passed on to AB (descendants of Z), and therefore dates to the ninth century. It was added later by M²S². In J we find it written in the first hand after verse 498, and encircled by a line, perhaps in the same ink¹⁵).

No definite link to any one manuscript emerges from these considerations, but we may at least observe that J displays a slight tendency to agree with GS and with the second hands in some of the other manuscripts.

Omitted and displaced lines.

	Omitted	Extant	Displaced
1.436–40	MZABPQUVGSJ	M ² add. 436–9	
2.416	ZU	MABPQU ¹ VGSJZ ² (Z ² partim)	
2.463–4	MZ	ZBPQUVGSJM ² Z ² (P ² : 464 in marg. inf., supervac.)	
2.598–9	Q SJ	MZABPUVGS ²	
2.655	AB	MZPQUVGSJ,A ² (?)	
3.146	MZ	ABPQUVGSJM ² Z ²	
3.167–8	MZAPU	QVGSJM ² A ² U ²	B (post 165, corr. B ²)
3.211		MBPQUVGSJZ ² A ²	ZAB (post 194)
3.608	MZ	ABPQUVGSJM ² Z ²	

15) The variant *exarsitque dies* in 499 (for *incensusque dies*), which was probably prompted by Martial 3.67.6, is relatively ancient and seems to have arisen independently of the interpolation: cf. Luck (above, n. 13) 268.

4.78	MZABPQUV	GSJM ² U ² V ²	
4.171	MZ	PQUVGSJM ²	ABZ ² (post 177)
4.251	MZABPQUVGSJ	A ² V ² G ² S ²	
4.416–7	A, P (in ras.)	MZBQUVGSJ	
4.677–8	MZPQU om. semperque ... equo	ABVGSJU ² (M ² Z ² corr. 677, om. -8)	
4.744–5			V (post 741), J (post 740)
5.53–4	P	QUVGSJ	MZAB (inversum, corr. M ²)
5.321a	MZABPQVGSJ	U	
9.83	MZABQG	VA ²	PUSJ, M ² ut vid. (post 79); G ² B ² (post 80); VA ² (post 82)
9.87	MZPQU	ABVGSJM ² Z ² U ²	
9.99–100	MPQ (Z. om. 100)	ABUVGSJM ² (Z ² add. l. 100)	
9.159–60			PUV (inversum)
9.253–4	MZPQGSJ (ex punx. V ²)	ABUVM ² Z ² G ² S ²	
9.331			MP (post 341)
9.485–7	MP (om. 488 B, 488 post 484 A, corr. A ²)	ZABQUVGSJM ²	
9.494	MZPQU, V (om. etiam 497) S	ABGM ² Z ² U ² V ²	
9.498a–d	MPQUVG	ABJM ² Z ² S ²	
9.499	MABPJ	ZQUVGS ² (ex punx. Z ²)	
9.615	MZABP, G (vers. in ras.) J	QUVSM ² Z ² A ²	
9.620			MP (post 627)
9.664	MZPQUV	ABGSJZ ² V ² (ante 663 V ²)	
9.805	MPQ	ZUVSJ	G (post 807)
9.849	ZS	MABPQUVGJZ ² S ²	
9.924	MZPQU	ABVGSJZ ² U ²	
10.8	MZPUVGSJ	ABZ ² S ²	Q (ante 7?)
10.122a	MZABUS	QVGJZ ² U ²	
10.296	ZABGS	MQUVJA ² B ² G ²	
10.419	MU (qui in loco v.l. exhibent)	ZABQVGJ	

Lines omitted or displaced only in J.

2.344	om. J
2.693	om. J
3.127	post 127 duo lin. in ras. J
3.140	om. J
3.180-1	invert. J
3.182	om. J
3.499	post 501 J
3.729-30	invert. J
4.96-7	invert. J
5.188	om. J
5.205	om. J
9.8	om. J
9.460	post 462 J
9.544	om. J

II. The textual relationship of J to other manuscripts

Our textual analysis of J will concentrate on the more significant variants in the text of Lucan. To this end the apparatus criticus in the Teubner edition of Shackleton Bailey was used as a guide in the selection of readings. Variants not noted by Shackleton Bailey have sometimes been considered; in these cases manuscript readings are taken from the Budé edition by Bourguery and Ponchont.

J frequently agrees with G or V, and with GV in combination with each other and other manuscripts, when either manuscript would otherwise stand alone in the group ZMPGUV. This agreement (of J with G or V) is especially noteworthy through book 5 up to the lacuna in J. Thus J joins G in error at 1.246 (*alligat*), 1.277 (*sed*), 2.317 (*laborum*), 3.564 (*percussa*que), 3.586 (*lagus* [G in ras.]), 4.183 (*times*), 4.186 (*dent*), 4.232 (*foedera*), 4.246 (*corpora*), 4.299 (*tecti*), 5.91 (*contactus*que [etiam N saec. iv]), 9.1040 (*putans*), 10.167 (*extern*[a]e ... *terrae* [etiam Commenta]), possibly 10.390 (*relictus*); in the true reading at 2.145 (*tum*), 3.670 (*omni* [G ex corr.]), 4.357 (*des fessis*), 9.29 (*sua* [etiam Commenta]), 9.867 (*poli sed*). J joins V in error at 2.162 (*latet*), 3.66 (*plus*), 3.484 (*incensa*), 4.61 (*ab*), 4.219 (*petenda*), 4.490 (*conserta* [cū-]), 4.520 (*extulit*), 4.762 (*illis*), 8.841 (*merebitur*), 10.88 (*restituat*), 10.175 (*lanigerum*), and possibly 4.623 (*fesso gelidus*); in truth at 2.232 (*quo*), 2.587 (*nusquam*), 3.203 (*misia pro myisia*), 9.299 (*de uictis* [J¹ ex corr., Commenta]), and possibly 4.86 (*omnis*). The

relationship continues after the lacuna, but in book 9 and possibly earlier a kinship with Z, when Z would otherwise stand in isolation, also begins. J agrees with Z in error at 3.427 (*priori*), 8.631 (*uitae*), 9.487 ([*h*]arenis), 10.9 (*securus fertur*), 10.14 (*pauores*), 10.75 (*ad uenerum* [*adu-* J] *misit*), 10.171 (*phariis* [*far-* Z] *mari* [-*tis* J]), 10.321 (*tremunt*), twice at 10.329 (*id et mollibus*); in truth at 9.141 (*que*), 9.405 (*turba*), 9.831 (*semel*), 9.956 (*helle*), 10.123 (*fuco*), 10.286 (*qua*). J also shows agreement, against the united testimony of the first hands in ZMPGUV (but in some cases in company with the correctors of these manuscripts, with later manuscripts¹⁶), or with the *Commenta*), with the ninth-century variants in Z collectively designated Z² by Gotoff¹⁷). Thus, J agrees with Z² in error at 4.40 (*librare*), 9.138 (*deformia* [*de f-* J]), 9.331 (*mari est*), 9.459 (*-que posterius om.*), 9.798 (*exultat*), 10.385 (*nobis*), and in truth at 9.332 (*prementem*), 10.312 (*populis*), 10.383 (*populorum et*).

We may find firmer evidence in the eleventh- or twelfth-century manuscript S for the relationship of J to a later textual tradition. S sometimes stands with J when J supports one of the manuscripts ZMPGUV in a reading otherwise unattested: thus GSJ are in error against the others at 4.119 (*dissolue*), 4.274 (*uulnere*); but preserve the truth at 3.279 (*negat*), 10.154 (*optabit*). VSJ are in error at 4.554 (*complerunt*), 4.703 (*miles campum*), and 4.782 (*tenentur*). ZSJ are in error at 9.304 (*terrae pelagi* [-*y* J]), 9.800 (*non iam*), 9.971 (*sedit in*), 10.87 (*expulsa*), and probably 10.130 (*nullas*). But S almost never stands alone with J without the support of these or other manuscripts. A near exception is 9.865, where the more extensive apparatus of Bourgery shows that JS agree with the correctors of VMG in giving *petit* for *ferit*; an exception is evidently 3.656, where *obstrictis* is attested as far as we know only in JS. JS are therefore similar, but not uniquely related.

Let us glance at the other passages where J offers a variant which is either unattested or uncommon when considered only in company with the readings of the first hand in ZMPGUV. J agrees with the *Commenta* in giving *tunc* at 3.143 (for which lection Bourgery also cites a corrector of Z), *sedes* at 5.107, *tumulus* apparently at 9.155, and *spoliatus* at 9.358. J and U²G² erroneously have *effundit* at 2.185. J and M² give the wrong readings *uibrare* at 3.433 and *tum* at 4.746, and are joined by U²G² in reading *coercet*

16) Shackleton Bailey's ζ.

17) On the date of Z², cf. Gotoff (above, n. 2) 13.

at 4.20; J also agrees with M²U² and the ninth-century B in offering the variant *culta* at 2.426. The ninth- or tenth-century Q, along with JG², together have *at* at 3.629. The reading *moriuntur fulgura nimbis* at 4.78 displaces the true text in J and in the eleventh-century manuscripts Vatican lat. 3284 and Florence, S. Croce 24 sin. 3. J joins U in offering the true readings *conspecti* at 4.741 and possibly *tum* at 4.528, along with the variants *se effundere* at 9.808 and *summum . . . honorem* at 5.383 (this is also recorded by M²V² and is possibly the reading of the fourth-century N). At 4.781 J agrees with Servius Aen. 10.432 in reading *constringit*. M and J stand together in preserving *uobis* at 5.43. J, the *Adnotationes*, and Lactantius Placidus Theb. 1.118 give the wrong reading *emicuit* at 5.76. Finally, J wrongly has *superos* at 10.397 in company with other unspecified but probably later manuscripts (ς).

We conclude our survey with a list of passages in which the major manuscripts offer variants and in which J, so far as is known, has a unique if false reading. The variant in J is given first, followed in parentheses by the reading accepted by Shackleton Bailey, and where appropriate by the variants in other manuscripts¹⁸). 2.121 *decepsisse* (*discessi-* c et, ut vid., ZM: *discerpsi-* ω); 2.588 *ten*^{**} (*timent* ZMG: *timet* PUVC); 3.23 *innuxit* [*en-* J²] (*innupsit* Ω : *en nu-* GV); 3.127 *uerunt* [*mo-* J²] (*uouerunt* Ω : *uouere* in Z²); 3.411 *cum* (*tum* PGVC : *tunc* ZMU); 4.102 *aequos* (*aquas* Ω : *equos* US); 4.486 **ci*s* (*ciues* ω : *ciuis* ZM); 4.567 *cruorum* J¹ (*cruorem* ZMP : *-ore* U *-oris* Z²GVJ²); 4.624 *tunc . . . nunc* (*tum . . . tum* U : *tunc . . . tum* Ω *tunc . . . tunc* V); 4.726 *olikus* (*obliquus* Ω : *obliquum* Z² ς *-uat* PU); 8.562 *longae* J¹ (*longe* A corr.: *-ga* ΩJ²); 8.567 *auertere* J¹ (*appellere* vel. *adp-* ZMV : *exp-* G *aduertere* PUJ²); 8.724 *non* J¹ (*tunc* ZUV : *nunc* PGJ², M in ras.); 9.269 *petat* J¹ (*putet* Mω : *putat* ZJ²); 9.290 *florigeri* (*floriferi* UV : *-iperi* MP *-iferae* ZG); 9.420 *terrae* (*terrae est* GU : *-ra est* Ω); 9.574 *facinus* J¹ (*facimus* ΩJ² : *agi-* V); 9.833 *sutaret* J¹ (*putaret* ZUJ² : *putauit* MPGv); 9.1028 *parentis* (*-ti* Ω : *-te* ZG); 9.1061 *perfidae* (*-fide* Ω : *-fida* Z); 10.61 *faciae* (*facie* V : *-es* Ω); 10.326 *qui*

18) An asterisk indicates erasure of a letter in J. When it is necessary to distinguish readings made by different hands, J¹ represents the text of the original hand, while J² indicates text that has been retraced or otherwise corrected; such alterations are not the work of a single hand and are not necessarily contemporary with the writing of J. In addition to the manuscripts listed above, the following sigla used by Shackleton Bailey are adopted here: Ω (consensus ZM cum PGUV vel omnibus vel tribus vel duobus), ω (PGUV), ς (alii codices, praesertim recentiores), c (Commenta Bernensia), C (eorundem lemmata).

(*quod* ZGU : *quo* MV); 10.373 *nocturnis* (*nocturnas* Ω : *-us* G);
10.402 *par* J¹ (*pars* GUVJ² : *pax* ZM); 10.404 *cepit* (*cepit* ζ : *coe-*
ΩC); 10.426 (*a*)*edes* J (*caedes* ZGUV : *-dis* M).

New Brunswick

Shirley Werner