CrossMark

The Classical Quarterly 70.2 774–783 © The Author(s), 2021. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association.
doi:10.1017/S000983882100001X

NOTE TO LUCAN, *BELLVM CIVILE* 1.599–604

The *Bellum ciuile* has been the subject of three major editions in the past thirty years, attributable to D.R. Shackleton Bailey, R. Badalì and G. Luck.[1] The existence of these three works highlights the resurgence of sustained interest surrounding Lucan as of the 1970s, with the publication of two significant works, *Lucan: An Introduction* by F. Ahl[2] and the collective volume of *Entretiens à la fondation Hardt*,[3] yet it also demonstrates the difficulty in establishing the text of the *Pharsalia*.

From a methodological perspective, the focus of our study is not limited to the contributions of the three most recent editors cited in the previous paragraph: all editions of Lucan's text produced since the *editio princeps* by G.A. Bussi have been consulted, and the elements that are useful for the discussion have been retained.

The passage studied in this paper is found towards the end of the first book. In this passage, the poet describes a procession being held as part of the *procuratio prodigiorum*. This ceremony is by no means ordinary: the circumstances are dramatic. The scene occurs after crossing the Rubicon in 49 B.C.; Rome is in a state of panic. Dark omens accumulate, announcing a disaster: comets, lightning, a solar eclipse, the eruption of Etna, altars divided by flames, sinister birds, ghosts, etc. Dark oracles delivered by the Cumaean Sibyl and predictions from the Galli announce the wrath of the gods (1.564–5). Terrified by this accumulation of dark omens, the Romans call upon the Etruscan soothsayer Arruns not only to have a better understanding of the cause of this divine anger but also to assuage it. The procession leads citizens and priests around the town. Line 1.593 states that the procession served as a means of purification, clearly indicated by the phrase *festo lustro*, which literally means 'by a solemn lustration'. As such, all the main priestly colleges of Rome were present.

The Latin text reads as follows:

> tum, qui fata deum secretaque carmina seruant
> et lotam paruo reuocant Almone Cybeben,
> et doctus uolucres augur seruare sinistras
> septemuirque epulis festus Titiique sodales
> et Salius laeto portans ancilia collo
> et tollens apicem generoso uertice flamen.[4]

599 tum: tunc *MZY* || **600** reuocant: referunt SG^{v} || Cybeben: -belen $PGUVM^{2}Z^{2}$ || **602** festus: festis *codd. recentiores* || **603** laeto: lento D^{2}

[1] D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *M. Annaei Lucani De bello civili libri X* (Stuttgart, 1988); R. Badalì, *Lucani opera* (Rome, 1992); and G. Luck, *Lukan. De bello civili. Der Bürgerkrieg* (Stuttgart, 2009).

[2] F. Ahl, *Lucan: An Introduction* (London, 1976).

[3] M. Durry, *Lucain: sept exposés, suivis de discussions* (Geneva, 1968).

[4] The Latin text is from the edition by Shackleton Bailey (n. 1), generally considered as the standard-reference edition. The critical apparatus is my own. Abbreviations used for the manuscripts are those of C. Hosius, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civili libri decem* (Leipzig, 1913[3]), adhered to by more recent editors. Use of the letter *v* in superscript followed by an abbreviation indicates, in the manuscript in question, that the reading is presented as a variant, most frequently introduced by *uel*, whilst the number 2 in superscript signifies a correction, designed to replace the reading of the first hand. The *siglum S* refers to manuscript Sankt Gallen, Stiftsbibliothek, 863.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Study of this passage leads us to focus on three aspects where the text is uncertain: the meaning of the verb *reuocant* at line 600, the variant readings *festus* and *festis* at line 602 and the use of the epithet *laeto* at line 603.

1. *LOTAM ... REVOCANT ... CYBEBEN* (600)

At line 600, Van Jever[5] has noted that the expression *lotam ... reuocant ... Cybeben* poses difficulty owing to the redundant character of *lotam* associated with *reuocant* or *renouant*, verbs that evoke the bathing of the goddess. In order to overturn Van Jever's claim that the participle *lotam* is redundant, *lotam* could simply be considered as a reinforcer, a structure that is not unique to Latin poetry.[6] Another approach was put forward by the medieval commentator Arnulf d'Orléans and finalized by Hudson-Williams:[7] *lotam ... Cybeben* must be understood in terms of *lauationem Cybebes*, a usage in which the participle is equivalent to a verbal substantive.[8] The verb *reuocare* would therefore mean 'to remember', 'to re-enact'. This latest interpretation is the interpretation to which Shackleton Bailey returns in the critical apparatus of his edition, which supports the fact that the *quindecimuiri* re-enact the bathing of Cybele. In fact, the verb *reuocant* seems more appropriate than the reading *referunt* which appears in MSS S and G. *referunt* seems to be a gloss inserted into the text alluding to the return of Cybele in the city after the *lauatio*. However, the *quindecimuiri* are referred to as the keepers of ancient religious traditions in lines 599–600, whether with regard to the Sibylline books or to the *lauatio* ritual. It is, therefore, more plausible that the verb at line 600 emphasizes the *lauatio* strictly speaking,[9] rather than solely the route taken by Cybele's chariot during the ceremony. The same argument can be made against Bentley's *reuehunt*, adopted by G. Luck in his recent edition,[10] as well as against interpretations looking to attribute this meaning to the verb *reuocare*.[11] Furthermore, it seems unlikely that the role of the *quindecimuiri* was to return the statue of Cybele to the city of Rome. Since the *lauatio* is intended to symbolize the arrival of the *Magna Mater* in Rome, it may well contain clues as to the unfolding of the ceremony within recitations on the initial transportation of the statue in Rome. Livy certainly

[5] E. Clercq Van Jever, *Specimen selectarum obseruationum in M. Annaei Lucani Pharsaliam* (Amsterdam, 1772), 46.

[6] See Luc. 2.577 *exactum ... conderet orbem*, Juv. 8.145 *tempora ... uelas adoperta* or Stat. *Silu.* 1.2.77 *edomui uictum* (see note by G. Liberman, *Stace, Silves* [Paris, 2010], ad loc.).

[7] B. Marti, *Arnulfi Aurelianensis glosule super Lucanum* (Rome, 1958), 75: *REVOCANT id est representant singulis annis quomodo in Almone fuit prius lota* and A. Hudson-Williams, 'Notes on some passages of Lucan', *CQ* 34 (1984), 452–63, at 454. The most recent critics to have discussed the passage, Hudson-Williams included, seem to overlook the note by Arnulf d'Orléans; yet the former supports this interpretation, which is largely accepted today.

[8] See Luc. 2.227–8 *maxima merces | Roma recepta fuit*; Cic. *Att.* 7.11.4 *fugiens denique Pompeius mirabiliter homines mouet*; Caes. *BCiu.* 1.26.2 *ea res saepe temptata ... tardabat*.

[9] It is this part of Cybele's cult that is described by most ancient authors. See H. Graillot, *Le culte de Cybèle mère des dieux à Rome et dans l'empire romain* (Paris, 1912), 137–8.

[10] R. Cumberland, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia* (Strawberry Hill, 1760), 57 and Luck (n. 1), ad loc.

[11] K.F. Weber, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*, vol. 2 (Leipzig, 1821), 410–11 and Graillot (n. 9), 140 n. 3. Graillot, referring solely to Lucan's text and to the *Commenta Bernensia*, makes the assumption that the role of the *quindecimuiri* was to deliver 'an oration, requesting the Great Mother to return the town'. This hypothesis is founded entirely on the verb *reuocare*, which creates difficulty. However, it is important to highlight that, whilst line 600 concerns transportation of the statue, the proper term to describe this action would be *reuehunt*, as proposed by Bentley, rather than *reuocant*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

mentions the *decemuiri de sacris faciundis* in this regard: they are responsible for considering the way in which the statue can be taken to Rome.[12] However, the focus here is not on the transportation of the statue from Italy but rather on the journey from Pessinus to Italy. Once the statue reached Italian soil, the *decemuiri* delegated the responsibility for its transport to the Roman matrons.[13] All sources mention the role of Claudia Quinta on this occasion, whether to say that she was the person who enabled the statue to be moved,[14] or to say that she was merely one of the women to whom the statue of Cybele was entrusted.[15] Further to this, Ovid emphasizes the hopeless efforts of men to move the statue.[16] As such, it seems unlikely that the *quindecimuiri* would have been responsible for transporting the statue, since they did not play this role during the arrival of the statue of Cybele re-enacted by the *lauatio.* Furthermore, diverse descriptions of Cybele's return procession to Rome during the *lauatio* refer to a festive and popular ceremony, accompanied by pantomimes,[17] which, again, does not seem to correspond to a role befitting the *quindecimuiri*. For these reasons, we can conclude that the verbal action at line 600, attributed to the *quindecimuiri,* does not refer in all probability to the transportation of the statue of Cybele.

Nevertheless, understanding the possible meaning of *reuocant* remains complex: the interpretation proposed by Hudson-Williams seems ingenious, but, in our opinion, encounters several difficulties. First, parallels conveyed by the critic in order to underpin 'resurrect' as the meaning of *reuocant* are not fully relevant: it concerns the restoration of ancient laws, both in Livy[18] and in Juvenal.[19] As such, the verb *reuocare* concerns general rules we should like to see brought back as opposed to a specific action as implied by the regime *lotam ... Cybeben* in our text. The parallel drawn with Seneca the Younger[20] appears more relevant, since it concerns religious celebrations (*sacrum*). However, once again, the object of *reuocare* is a general term rather than a specific ritual.[21] Furthermore, Hudson-Williams's interpretation presupposes that the object of the verb is not the action represented by the *lauatio* but rather the noun *Cybeben*, completed by the participle *lotam*, which would represent a substantive.[22] The structure poses difficulty owing to the absence of corresponding structures with the verb *reuocare* in Latin literature, which suggests that the proposition should not be adopted and that a different meaning should be found for line 600.

An alternative interpretation proposed for this passage by a number of editors and commentators consists of understanding the verbal action of line 600 as a reference to a purification ritual.[23] It is for this reason that Burman and Withof propose the

[12] Livy 29.10.8.
[13] Livy 29.14.10. Publius Cornelius Scipio had to move the statue from the boat to land, whilst the women were responsible for transporting the statue on land.
[14] Ov. *Fast.* 4.305–45 and [Aur. Vict.] *De uir. ill.* 46.
[15] Livy 29.14.12.
[16] Ov. *Fast.* 4.297.
[17] See Lucr. 2.618–23 and Graillot (n. 9), 140.
[18] Livy 39.41.4 *priscos mores*.
[19] Juv. 2.30 *amaras leges*.
[20] Sen. *HF* 841 *quinta cum sacrum reuocauit aestas*.
[21] The difficulty in illustrating such a meaning for *reuocare* is evinced by the fact that Hudson-Williams ended up providing examples using the verbs *referre* and *repetere* (Hudson-Williams [n. 7], 454).
[22] See n. 7 above.
[23] Martial 3.47.1–2 implies that the purpose of the *lauatio* was to clean the blood spilled on various objects used in Cybele's cult by the Galli.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

conjectures *renouant* and *curant* for *reuocant*[24] respectively, whilst Getty, following Heitland, suggests interpreting *reuocant* to mean 'restor[e] to her original purity'.[25] However, parallels suggested in a bid to confirm this meaning for the verb *reuocare* are not wholly convincing. If we consider examples taken from Virgil (*G.* 4.282; *Aen.* 1.214, 1.235), the verb *reuocare* is not used in any form of sacred context to invoke purification. Conversely, it appears to us, whether via conjecture or via interpretation, that these scholars have correctly understood the intended meaning of line 600. Lucan must be alluding here to purification using water. In fact, this is the actual purpose of the *lauatio* ceremony,[26] and the reminder of this concept of purification is particularly relevant within the context of the *festo lustro* (593), included in our passage. The equivalent by Silius Italicus, *quique ostia Tusci | amnis amant tepidoque fouent Almone Cybelen*,[27] where the poet uses the verb *fouere* to mean 'reinvigorate, purify', appears to coincide with the meaning proposed by Burman, *renouant*. The verb *renouare* with its derivatives is the appropriate Latin word to invoke purification, restoring to an original state:[28] an example of this can be found in Livy's works on the subject of ritual ceremonies[29] and in Cicero's works in relation to a temple,[30] the world,[31] or even a painting (in the literal sense) and the Republic (in the figurative sense).[32] Whilst Withof's conjecture, *curant*, is close in meaning, it must be noted that it is not credible in terms of palaeography: on the other hand, variation between *renouare* and *reuocare* is not uncommon in Lucan's manuscripts. It appears again at 4.204 (where MSS F and L contain the readings *reuocata* and *renouata* remaining from the tradition) as well as at 10.311 (where MS G is the only manuscript to contain the reading *renouat*).

Lastly, in order to defend our proposed correction, it seems necessary to address the argument we had made against the reading *reuocant*: is it possible to attribute such an action to the *quindecimuiri* within the context of the *lauatio?* Whilst the verb *renouare* refers to the purification of the statue of Cybele by bathing it, this does not necessarily imply that the *quindecimuiri* were the ones to bathe the statue in the water. The identity of the officiants of the *lauatio* is uncertain: Ovid's text[33] appears to indicate that it is the *archigallus*, but we cannot eliminate participation of the *quindecimuiri* in the bathing process. However, such a hypothesis is not required in order to adopt the conjecture *renouant*. In fact, the role of the *quindecimuiri* is to monitor good practice of various

[24] P. Burman, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia cum commentario Petri Burmanni* (Leiden, 1740), ad loc. (the conjecture is also attributed to Schrader in the edition by C.M. Francken, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia cum commentario critico* [Amsterdam, 1896–7], ad loc.) and J.-H. Withof, *Encaenia critica, siue Lucanus, Arrianus et Maximianus integrati restituti* (Wesel, 1741), 29.

[25] R.J. Getty, *M. Annaei Lucani De bello ciuili liber I* (Cambridge, 1940), 111. See W.E. Heitland, 'Francken's edition of Lucan', *CR* 11 (1897), 35–43, at 41.

[26] Graillot (n. 9), 136–7.

[27] Sil. *Pun.* 8.362–3.

[28] The concept concerning the change in the state of Cybele after the *lauatio* also appeared in Valerius Flaccus 8.240 *laetaque iam Cybele*. See Stat. *Silu.* 5.1.223–4 containing the concept that Cybele is set free from lamentation.

[29] Livy 5.52.9: *instauratio sacrorum auspiciorumque renouatio*.

[30] Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.61: *uides Virtutis templum, uides Honoris a M. Marcello renouatum*.

[31] Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.118 *ignem, a quo … renouatio mundi fieret.*

[32] Cic. *Rep.* 5.2: *nostra uero aetas cum rem publicam sicut picturam accepisset egregiam, sed iam euanescentem uetustate, non modo eam coloribus isdem quibus fuerat renouare neglexit.*

[33] Ov. *Fast.* 4.339–40.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

public rituals, notably in connection with the *Magna Mater*.[34] As such, since the *quindecimuiri* advocate and monitor, at the very least, smooth running of the *lauatio*, this suggests that they were responsible for restoring the Goddess to her original purity. The traditional reading *reuocant*, whose meaning is not satisfactory, should therefore be replaced by Burman's conjecture, *renouant*.

2. *FESTVS* OR *FESTIS* (602)?

At line 602, manuscripts and editors swing between the readings *festus* and *festis*. *festus*, which features in all the primary manuscripts as well as in the quotation by the *Regulae Aurelii Augustini*,[35] is adopted by Housman, Bourgery, Shackleton Bailey and Luck. *festis*, a reading which appears in later manuscripts referred to by Grotius,[36] is preserved in the text by Hosius, Lejay and Badalì. The phrase *septemuirque epulis festus* or *festis* clearly refers to the priestly college of the *septemuiri epulones*, responsible for announcing and organizing sacred banquets, notably the *epulum Iouis*. The singular-number noun which was often used to refer to a member of the college is *septemuir epulonum*.[37] As a dative describing *epulis*, *festis* would mean 'the *septemuir* in charge of ritual banquets'. Housman[38] considers that the construction is abrupt and that a verbal adjective such as *curandis* would be expected to complete the phrase, modelled on other titles such as *quindecimuir sacris faciundis* or *duumuir iure dicendo*.[39] Furthermore, whilst the juxtaposition of *epulis festis* that occurs is not unique,[40] most Latin poets in dactylic poetry avoid the homeoteleuton of placing a noun and an adjective agreeing with it next to each other.[41]

None the less, the uniqueness of this homeoteleuton in Shackleton Bailey's study primarily originates from the number of categories of homeoteleuton he distinguishes. In fact, *epulis festis* is the only example of a homeoteleuton consisting of a noun followed by an adjective agreeing with it, but comparable examples can be found in Lucan, such as *suos cunctos*,[42] *uindictam quantam*,[43] or *animos quantos*.[44] The argument concerning scarce use of homeoteleuton is, therefore, not an incontestable one.

[34] F. Prescendi, '*Quindecimviri sacris faciundis populi Romani*', *ThesCRA* 5 (Los Angeles, 2005), 80–2, at 81.

[35] *Gramm. Lat.* 5.524.33 Keil: *unde Lucanus: septemuirque epulis festus*.

[36] H. Grotius, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia siue de bello ciuili Caesaris et Pompeii libri X* (Antwerp, 1614), ad loc. See Bersman's note in Oudendorp's edition (F. Oudendorp, *M. Annaei Lucani Cordubensis Pharsalia. Siue Belli ciuilis libri decem* [Leiden, 1728], ad loc.).

[37] See *AE* 1990, 126; 1995, 194; *CIL* 6.1511, 6.1533, 6.1553, etc. and also Plin. *Ep.* 2.11.12. The term *septemuir* is also found. See S. Estienne, '*Septemviri epulones*', *ThesCRA* 5 (Los Angeles, 2005), 83–4, at 83.

[38] A.E. Housman, *M. Annaei Lucani Belli ciuilis libri decem* (Oxford, 1926), 26.

[39] For *quindecimuiri sacris faciundis*, see above. For *duumuir iure dicendo*, see *AE* 1912, 00238; *AE* 1913, 00086; *AE* 1951, 00157d.

[40] See Tac. *Ann.* 1.65 *cum barbari festis epulis … saltus complerent*; cf. Hor. *Epod.* 9.1 *ad festas dapes*.

[41] D.R. Shackleton Bailey, *Homoeoteleuton in Latin Dactylic Verse* (Stuttgart, 1994), 37 (see D.R. Shackleton Bailey, 'Lucan revisited', *PCPhS* 33 [1987], 74–91, at 88–9). Lucan does not use this form of homeoteleuton, with the exception of 5.110, if we were to construct *sterilis* with *telluris*, which is altogether unclear.

[42] Luc. 2.194.

[43] Luc. 7.456.

[44] Luc. 5.43.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

As for the construction of *epulis festis* understood as a dative, it seems wholly excessive to criticize it: usage of the adnominal dative is very much substantiated.[45] In addition, traces that could mark the use of the adnominal dative in order to invoke the responsibilities of certain magistrates can be found in epigraphic sources. As such, the *duumuiri uiis aedibus sacris publicis procurandis*[46] are occasionally referred to simply as *duumuiri uiis aedibus sacris publicis*.[47] The reading *festis*, therefore, seems perfectly admissible. On the other hand, *festus* is trickier: Housman[48] suggests interpreting *epulis* as an ablative, since the phrase *epulis festus* is the equivalent of *epulo*. Cortius suggests interpreting the phrase *septemuirque epulis festus* as an hypallage, which he describes as being a frequently used poetic technique.[49] This reading remains rare: the adjective *festus* is most often used to describe a moment,[50] or inanimate realities linked to rituals.[51] This adjective most frequently refers to participation in a ritualistic event and to the joy that can result from it when it is used to describe people[52] and never to the organizers or officiants of a ritual, whether in literary or in epigraphical sources. Lastly, looking beyond the difficulties in construction concerning the reading *festus*, it is important to highlight that the variant *festis* seems more appropriate as it attributes a qualifier to *epulis* intended to refer to banquet rituals.[53] Therefore, contrary to choices made by Housman, Bourgery, Shackleton Bailey and Luck, the reading *festis* should be accepted.

3. *LAETO ... COLLO* (603)

At line 603, the adjective *laeto*, which describes the neck of a member of the Salii, has met with varied responses from editors. The majority of editors kept *laeto*, with the notable[54] exceptions of Bentley, who was unsure whether to use the variant *lento*,[55] and

[45] J.B. Hoffmann and A. Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stylistik* (Munich, 1972), 99 refers to the phrase *receptui signum* (Livy 9.14.12, 23.37.7, etc.). For this process in Indo-European languages, see K. Brugmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*, vol. 2 (Strasbourg, 1906–17), 561–2 and K. Brugmann, *Die Syntax des einfachen Satzes im Indogermanischen* (Berlin, 1925), 105.

[46] *CIL* 4.7436, 4.7863.

[47] *CIL* 4.7132, 4.7913 (see *CIL* 4.7692). This is, of course, the way in which V.A.S.P. abbreviations are articulated in which the second P is missing (see, *contra*, *AE* 1912, 234; *CIL* 4.7963a, 4.9898). It seems more logical to omit the last term, *procurandis*, since it is obvious that the magistrates would be required to manage roads, temples and celebrations, whilst the adjective *publicis* characterizes the exact type of celebration in question (see Cic. *Har. resp.* 12), which therefore suggests that it is more vital. The title referred to in *CIL* 4.9898 is simply *Iluirum uiis aedibus sacris*, which, once again, suggests that omitting *procurandis* is a possibility. All these examples are voter registrations from Pompeii, and so do not necessarily retain full titles, as a poet may wish to do.

[48] Housman (n. 38), 27.

[49] *perpetua autem consuetudo poetarum est, adiecta ubi duo adsunt nomina, illi aptare, cui ex uulgari modo loquendi non debebant.* K.F. Weber, *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia ... editionem morte Cortii interruptam …* (Leipzig, 1828–9), ad loc.

[50] *TLL* 6.630.13–34.

[51] *TLL* 6.630.62–631.9.

[52] Hor. *Carm.* 3.18.12; Sen. *Ag.* 311, 643–5, 780. See Claud. *Get*. 206 *festae doleant ne tristibus aures*.

[53] K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (Munich, 1960), 251 and 398–9. See n. 40 above.

[54] Barth's conjecture (*lato*; see Weber [n. 49], ad loc.) will not be discussed in detail here. Oudendorp's rebuttal of this (Oudendorp [n. 36], ad loc.), which points out that parallels drawn by Barth are completely unconnected to the role of the Salii, seems sufficient.

[55] Cumberland (n. 10), 58. *lento,* put forward by a second source, appears as a variant in MS Berlin, Staatsbibliothek Preussicher Kulturbesitz, lat. 2° 35.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Luck, who, in the most recent edition of *Bellum ciuile*, used Jahnke's conjecture, *laeuo*.[56] First, the variant *lento* is not an obvious choice: Bentley questions whether the adjective would be a better fit, since it refers to a *lustratio* ceremony to attempt to repel civil war. However, descriptions of the priests have not been adapted to this particular event in the passage as a whole. On the contrary, they are all described in several words to identify them through their traditional roles or attributes (*palladium* for the Vestal Virgin, Sibylline books and *lauatio* for the *quindecimuiri*, banquets for the *septemuiri epulones*, etc.). In addition, the very term *lentus* would not provide a satisfactory meaning: *lentus* meaning 'flexible, supple' could refer to youth, this being the Salii. However, since the sacred shields they were required to carry were particularly heavy,[57] it would be surprising for such a quality to be attributed to the necks of the Salii in action. Lastly, *lento* most likely originates from an alteration to the reading *laeto*: in MS P (Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, lat. 7502), *laeto* is noted as *leto* with the normal diphthong marked as a cedilla under the *e* omitted, as can sometimes occur in manuscripts. The following sequence can be adopted: *laeto* > *leto* > *lento*. The variant *lento* must therefore be dismissed.

Following Burman's theory, Housman[58] defended the reading *laeto* and noted that the adjective could very well be applied to parts of the body. He also compared Lucan's phrase to *gaudentibus umeris* in Valerius Flaccus[59] and suggested that this argument should have drawn a line under other interpretations and conjectural propositions.[60] We nevertheless feel it necessary to reopen the discussion concerning the reading *laeto.* Neither Burman nor Housman nor any of the editors to come after them discussed the relevance of using an adjective in this context, and all of them were satisfied with the conclusion that *laetus* alluded to moves performed by the Salii as part of their *tripudium* dance.[61]

The adjective *laetus* and its synonyms can undoubtedly be linked to dance[62] and more specifically to the *tripudium*: Accius[63] and Quintus Curtius[64] connect joy to the *tripudium* but never in relation to the Salii. Conversely, the dance of the *sacerdotes* appears to be characterized by movements which emphasize the warlike strength and power of Rome, characteristics conveyed by the *tripudium*.[65] In fact, the description of dances linked to weapons in Rome does not relate to the *laetitia* of the dancers. When Seneca the Younger referred to the *tripudium* as a dance also intended for

[56] R. Jahnke, *Comoediae Horatianae tres* (Leipzig, 1891), 30; Luck (n. 1), ad loc. No justification for this conjecture or for its incorporation in Lucan's text can be found in any of the passages.

[57] Juv. 2.125–6: *arcano qui sacra ferens nutantia loro* | ***sudauit*** *clipeis ancilibus.*

[58] Housman (n. 38), ad loc., which follows Burman (n. 24), ad loc.

[59] Valerius Flaccus 1.109. Further uses of adjectives referring to emotion in relation to body parts can be found in the following: Catull. 46.8 *iam laeti studio pedes uigescunt*; Ov. *Am.* 1.6.67 *non laetis detracta corona capillis*; Ov. *Ars am.* 1.320 *et tenuit laeta paelicis exta manu*.

[60] *nec tamen effecit ut prauae interpretationes coniecturaeque proferri desinerent.*

[61] See in particular Oudendorp (n. 36), ad loc. or the comment made by Cortius on line 603 in Weber (n. 49), ad loc.

[62] Apul. *Met.* 10.34: *Venus uero faudens et hilaris laetitiam suam saltando toto cum choro professa est*.

[63] Accius, *Bacchae* frr. 213–14 Warmington = 249 Ribbeck: *laetum in Parnaso inter pinos tripudiantem in circulis* | *ludere.*

[64] Curt. 7.10.4: *qui ubi per interpretem cognouerunt iussu regis ipsos ad supplicium trahi, carmen laetantium modo canere tripudiisque et lasciuiori corporis motu gaudium quoddam animi ostentare coeperunt.*

[65] W. Helbig, 'Sur les attributs des Saliens', *Mémoires de l'Institut national de France* 37 (1906), 205–76, at 266 and 276.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Rome's enemies, he expressly emphasized that it was not composed of spineless movements but rather of movements considered *uiriles*.[66] It is therefore hardly plausible that Lucan wanted to highlight a certain *laetitia* regarding the Salii, who were supposed to embody the power of Rome.[67] Furthermore, the adjective *laetus* is the only one here to allude to dancing: the line by Lucan is focussed on a different activity typical of this sodality, the activity of transporting sacred shields, *ancilia*, during festivities to honour Mars.[68] The shields were attached to bars and were carried over the shoulders of the Salii or of their servants in order to transport them.[69] In Lucan's text, the Salii carried the *ancilia* themselves.[70] As such, it seems impossible that the poet would describe the Salii as dancing in line 603, since they were carrying bars on their shoulders to transport the shields. In addition, since this epithet is in no way characteristic of the Salii, nor of any other *sacerdos* in Rome,[71] it should be assumed that the text is corrupt.

In order to correct this passage, the conjecture *laeuo* proposed by Jahnke and adopted by Luck is a possibility which needs more elaboration, which neither Jahnke nor Luck has offered. First, the confusion between the adjectives *laeuus* and *laetus* is not limited to Lucan's manuscripts: examples of this can be found in Pacuvius'[72] and Persius'[73] textual traditions. Furthermore, reference to the sacred shield being positioned on the left could be inspired by Virgil, who depicts Picus carrying the shield in his left hand.[74] Moreover, both representations of the transport of the sacred shields on ancient stones[75] specifically depict characters carrying bars on their left shoulders with shields attached. As such, this suggests that the clarification provided by the adjective *laeuus* could therefore correspond to the scene described by Lucan at line 603. In addition, the use of *laeuus* to denote the left side of a body part is not limited to Latin literature.[76] Nevertheless, the conjecture *laeuo* should probably not be accepted. Reference made to the left does not seem to be of importance in terms of the transportation of the sacred shields. In fact, the transportation of the sacred shields using a bar placed on either the left or the right shoulder seems completely irrelevant. As proof of this, a third representation exists on a *sella curulis*[77] depicting the Salii or their servants carrying

[66] Sen. *Tranq*. 17.4: *non molliter se infringens … ut antiqui illi uiri solebant inter lusum ac festa tempora uirilem in modum tripudiare, non facturi detrimentum etiam si ab hostibus suis spectarentur*.

[67] Livy (1.20.4) indicates that the dance of the Salii is of a solemn nature (*cum tripudiis sollemnique saltatu*).

[68] The plural of *ancilia* and the use of the verb *portare* indicate that the Salii are carrying several shields, in the way that luggage or loads are carried, as opposed to a singular piece of equipment.

[69] This factor explains the rotational movement of the *ancilia* referred to by Juv. 2.125–6: *arcano qui sacra ferens* ***nutantia*** *loro | sudauit clipeis ancilibus*. The bars are clearly depicted on two engraved stones: sard (A. Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen* [Leipzig, 1900], Pl. XXII, 64; Helbig [n. 65], 208, Fig. 1) and carnelian (Furtwängler [this note], Pl. XXII, 62; Helbig [n. 66], 206, Fig. 3).

[70] The same concept can also be found further on at Luc. 9.477–9 as well as in Val. Max. 1.1.9 and Juv. 2.125–6. Nevertheless, it is plausible that the sacred shields were more often carried by servants, as is the case in Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 2.71 and in two old iconographic representations (Helbig [n. 65], 221–2).

[71] No member of a sodality, pontiff, *flamen* or *sacerdos* is described as *laetus* in Latin literature. It could be argued that this epithet does not correspond with the sanctity of their role.

[72] Pacuvius, fr. 231 Warmington = 218 Ribbeck.

[73] Pers. 2.53.

[74] Verg. *Aen.* 7.188: *laeuaque ancile gerebat*.

[75] See note 70. If the bar seemed to be placed on the right shoulder on the sard stone, this is in actual fact due to it being a stamp, and therefore the image we see is inverted.

[76] Stat. *Theb.* 8.747 *spirantem laeuaque super ceruice reportat*; *Silu*. 4.8.48 *uolucrem laeua ceruice sedentem*; Pers. 2.53–4 *sudes et pectore laeuo | excutiat guttas laetari praetrepidum cor*.

[77] Preserved at the Museo Gregoriano Profano (item 9534; see reproduction in T. Schäfer and

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

the shields on a bar, which appears to show a man resting the bar on his right shoulder.[78] This suggests that nothing prevented the Salii from carrying the *ancilia* on their left shoulder. Therefore, it seems unlikely that Lucan would have written *laeuo ... collo* if this element was not ritualistic, which means that Jahnke's conjecture should be dismissed.

What other possible solutions could be envisaged for line 603? We suggest two possible corrections for this line, in order of plausibility. The first conjecture proposed is *lecto ... collo*. Other than the fact that the words *laetus* and *lectus* are frequently confused in manuscripts,[79] use of the participle *lectus* is suggested to us in Lucan 9.478–9: *quae lecta iuuentus | patricia ceruice mouet*. As such, the use of hypallage indicates that a Salian must be patrician and is particularly honoured, as a priest.[80] Furthermore, this proposition would form a favourable parallel with the line that follows, where the head of the *flamen* is described as *generoso uertice*.[81] The poet would therefore be placing emphasis on the nobility of the Salian and the *flamen* by using an adjective to describe a part of their body containing a distinctive attribute.[82] Nevertheless, the use of *lectus* here concerning a part of the body would be unprecedented, whereas the two phrases *lecta iuuentus* (in Book 9) and *generoso uertice* (at 1.604) are customary.

The second conjecture proposed is *laeso ... collo*. This correction is inspired by another poetic passage, this time found in Juvenal's text (2.125–6): *arcano qui sacra ferens nutantia loro | **sudauit** clipeis ancilibus*, which concerns carrying *ancilia* by means of bars. In Juvenal's text, carrying the sacred shields is described as a tiring activity, with the Salii praised for their endurance in this regard. Similarly, the epithet *laeso* could allude to the arduous task of carrying the shields by describing the impact this task has on the necks of the Salii. Confusion between *laetus* and *laesus* is not uncommon in manuscripts: an example of this can be found in Valerius Maximus.[83] Nevertheless, it could be objected that the epithet is not particularly common, whilst the other characters are all given relatively customary descriptions. Since the conjectures fail to garner sufficient support here, we prefer to print *laeto* with *obeli* in order to signal difficulty to the reader.

To conclude this paper, we first wish to emphasize that we do not seek to close the debate on these lines in Lucan's text. On the contrary, we hope that this paper, along with consultation of all the proposals concerning Lucan's text from Late Antiquity, will serve to renew consideration of both this passage and more broadly the passages of the *Bellum ciuile* which have not always been discussed by recent editors. The number of errors presumed to have been found in the six lines discussed here should not be surprising for two reasons: first, a corrupt passage is more likely to contain errors.

J. Ganzert, 'Zur Ikonographie der Salier', *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 95 [1980], 365–8, at 365, Pls. 22–3).

[78] A man can be seen carrying a bar on his shoulder with the shields attached to it in the preserved fragment. Whilst the bar itself is visible, the movement made with his left arm is reminiscent of what can be seen on the two stones mentioned above: it is crossed over his torso in order to hold the bar placed on the opposite shoulder, which is therefore the right shoulder.

[79] See *TLL* 7.2.883.75.

[80] See S. Estienne, 'Saliens (*Salii Palatini, Salii Collini*)', *ThesCRA* 5 (Los Angeles, 2005), 85–7, at 85.

[81] Luc. 1.604.

[82] *ancilia* for the Salian, *apex* for the *flamen*.

[83] Val. Max. 2.7.7. G. Wakefield, *T. Lucreti Cari De rerum natura libri sex* (Glasgow, 1813), 262 notes another example where confusion occurs between *laetus* and *laesus* in his conjectural rendering of Sen. *QNat.* 3.7.25.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press

Second, the *realia* to which this short extract refers were no doubt very exotic for late antique or even medieval copyists, so much so that standard terms may have replaced words specifically describing religious practices in ancient Rome.

We propose three changes to the text edited by Shackleton Bailey: the first (*renouant*) is a conjecture which was not adopted by editors in the twentieth century; the second consists of choosing an alternative reading to the traditional reading (*festis*); and the third consists of using *obeli* to signify probable corruption of the text concerning the adjective *laeto.* We also propose two conjectures in the apparatus criticus, which could constitute progress in terms of the transmitted text. In addition to their intrinsic value, we hope that these corrections will be of diagnostic value, attracting the attention of commentators on Lucan's work in terms of the often-neglected difficulties posed by these lines. As such, our proposed text of lines 1.599–604 is as follows:[84]

> tum, qui fata deum secretaque carmina seruant
> et lotam paruo re**nouant** Almone Cybeben, 600
> et doctus uolucres augur seruare sinistras
> septemuirque epulis fest**is** Titiique sodales
> et Salius †**laeto**† portans ancilia collo
> et tollens apicem generoso uertice flamen.

599 tum: tunc *MZY* || **600** renouant *Burman*: reuocant *O* referunt SG^{v} || Cybeben: -belen $PGUVM^{2}Z^{2}$ || **602** festis: festus *O* || **603** laeto *O*: lento D^{2} *an* lecto *uel* laeso?

> Thereafter come those who guard prophecies of the gods and oracles closely
> and those who bathe Cybele in Almo's brook and restore her purity,
> then the Augurs, skilled to observe bird-flight to their left,
> the *septemuir* in charge of festal banquets, the Titian brotherhood,
> the Salii who bear the sacred shields on their †glad† necks
> and the *flamen* who places his pointed cap upon his noble head.

Université Grenoble Alpes FLORIAN BARRIÈRE
florian.barriere@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

[84] Changes made to the edition by Shackleton Bailey appear in bold. The abbreviation *O* indicates agreement of all non-cited manuscripts, incidentally in critical unity.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983882100001X Published online by Cambridge University Press