

THE HISTORY OF LUCAN SCHOLIA AND GERBERT OF AURILLAC'S COPY OF THE *BELLUM CIVILE* (MS. ERLANGENSIS 389, = E)

By Alessio Mancini

Summary: The importance of the very rich paratext of Lucan's manuscript Erlangensis 389 has so far been greatly underestimated; a new comprehensive analysis of its exegetical materials, along with our updated knowledge of the vicissitudes of the manuscript itself, provides a better understanding of its role in the history of Lucan scholia and allows for several improvements in the text of the *Commenta Bernensia* and the *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*.

If you go to a university library and search for Lucan's primary bibliography, you will probably find – usually at the very end of the shelf, covered by a good finger of dust – a small set of apparently straightforward critical editions of scholia to the *Bellum Civile*: the *Commenta Bernensia*, edited by the great Hermann Usener in 1869;¹ the *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, whose Teubner edition was published by Johann Endt in 1909;² and Giuseppe Angelo Cavajoni's *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*, edited in three volumes between 1979 and 1990.³ At first glance, it would seem to be a clear and reassuring situation: a first commentary (the *Commenta*), clearly distinguished from a second one (the *Adnotationes*), and a third set of scholia with a close connection to the *Adnotationes* (the so-called *Supplementum adnotationum*).

1 Usener 1869.

2 Endt 1909.

3 Cavajoni 1979-90.

Unfortunately, such a reconstruction is, to put it mildly, a dramatic oversimplification of reality, not to say an imposture. The clear distinction between *Commenta* and *Adnotationes* is, to begin with, an illusion, fostered by the exceptionality of their textual transmission and further fueled by their editors:⁴ the two sets of scholia show, in fact, considerable overlap in content, and what is more, they are, in the first part of the manuscript that preserves both, physically mixed with each other.⁵ In addition to this, the *Commenta* and the *Adnotationes* were transmitted both in the form of a continuous commentary and marginal scholia: Usener and Endt were deeply influenced by the exceptional nature of the first form of transmission, and for this reason the two scholars made largely arbitrary use of those materials that had been transmitted together with the text of Lucan. Their critical editions are therefore, though in different ways, both heavily affected by this bias,⁶ and do not accurately represent what was happening around Lucan's text in Carolingian Europe. As for the *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*, it has – despite its name – absolutely nothing to do with the *Adnotationes*, except that it was transmitted by a group of manuscripts that also contain a greatly simplified version of their text, usually referred to as *Adnotationes retractatae*.⁷

With this very short introduction I wanted to point out two facts, which apply to Lucan's case as well as to those of any other classic with a rich exegetical tradition: first, a critical edition of a corpus of scholia is a dangerous tool, since it tries – and sometimes succeeds, irretrievably – to fix a tradition that is by definition elusive; second, the materials selected by each editor are but a drop in the ocean, that is, a small part of a much larger and more complex story.⁸ In Lucan's case, there are several

4 The best discussion of the history of *Commenta Bernensia* and *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, their relationship, and their critical editions, is still that of Werner 1994 (= Werner 1998: 124–49).

5 In the Ms. *Bernensis* 370, containing both the *Commenta* and a significant portion of the *Adnotationes* without the text of Lucan, the two sets of scholia are intermingled from the beginning of the poem up to Lucan. 1.396: see Werner 1998: 129–30.

6 A detailed demonstration can be found in Werner 1998: 134–43.

7 See Endt 1909: IX par. III; Cavajoni 1979: XI.

8 Some important considerations about this topic, with further evidence of the fluidity of labels such as *Commenta* and *Adnotationes*, can be read in Gotoff 1971: 102–7.

paratexts that are sometimes as ancient and noteworthy as the *Commenta* and the *Adnotationes*, but which have never received the attention they would have deserved; and it is to such an example that the following pages are devoted.

The Erlangensis 389 is a tenth-century manuscript⁹ containing both the text of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and a very rich paratext, consisting of Suetonius' *Vita Lucani*, the pseudo-epitaph *Corduba me genuit*, prose summaries of each book of the poem¹⁰ and a flourishing apparatus of marginal and interlinear scholia. Interestingly, this manuscript is by no means unknown: Arnold Genthe dedicated a monograph to it in 1894,¹¹ and Johann Endt used it with the siglum *E* in his edition of the *Adnotationes* to establish the text of the prose *argumenta*. Both Genthe and Endt, however, paid little to no attention to what was around Lucan's text,¹² i.e. a full-blown commentary on the *Bellum Civile*.

Before devoting our attention to the content of this marginal commentary, it will be useful to put to use our knowledge of the manuscript's history, which is significantly deeper than that available at Endt's time. Its place of origin is, to be fair, uncertain: maybe Germany according to Birger Munk Olsen,¹³ France or Belgium in Hoffmann's description.¹⁴ Scholars agree, however, in linking the manuscript to another codex, the Erlangensis 380, which preserves, along with other texts, Cicero's *De Oratore*: in particular, there is widespread consensus that one of the hands

9 Detailed descriptions of the manuscript can be read in Irmischer 1852: 85 (where it is referred to with its old signature, i.e. Erlangensis 304); Fischer 1928: 461–62; Hoffmann 1995: 177. A digital reproduction is available at <https://shorturl.at/exj59> (last seen: 26/04/2023).

10 With the exception of books three and four, where the *argumentum* is missing (see respectively ff. 14r and 27r).

11 Genthe 1894.

12 Endt's ambiguity about the role of the Erlangensis 389 as well as of several other manuscripts in establishing his edition of the *Adnotationes super Lucanum* was already being criticized by Wessner 1921: 223: 'dagegen erwähnt E. im "Siglorum conspectus" noch die Codices Bernensis 45 s. X B, Parisinus 9346 s. XI und 7502 s. X Pa, Monacensis 4610 (s. ?) Q und Erlangensis 304 s. X, ohne in der Vorrede den Benutzer der Ausgabe auch nur mit einem Wörtchen über diese Hss. und ihre Stellung zur übrigen Überlieferung aufzuklären, was ein recht bedauerlicher Mangel ist'.

13 Munk Olsen 1985: 33 [B. 31].

14 Hoffmann 1995: 99 and 177.

annotating Cicero's text is the same as one occasionally found in the margins of the Erlangensis 389, for example on f. 86r.¹⁵ In a series of articles¹⁶ Marina Passalacqua has proposed identifying the author of these interventions on the text of the Erlangensis 380 as Gerbert of Aurillac, *scholasticus* of the cathedral school of Rheims from 973 to 980 and again from 984 to 989 and then pope with the name of Sylvester II from 999 to 1003.¹⁷ This proposed identification has found broad, though not unanimous, consensus,¹⁸ and if accepted it would also have, of course, important implications for the analysis of the Erlangensis 389.

Before giving credit to this hypothesis, however, it seems important to summarize the facts of which we are (relatively) certain. The Erlangensis 380 was copied by the monk Ayrardus of Aurillac at the explicit request of Gerbert, most likely while the latter was abbot of Bobbio, as we can reconstruct from the *subscriptio* of the manuscript itself;¹⁹ from Gerbert's epistolary we learn that at that time Ayrardus must have been in Rheims,²⁰ where Gerbert would return in 984.²¹ This means that in the last decades of the tenth century the Erlangensis 380 was in Rheims, and that in this time frame it was annotated by the hand attributed by Passalacqua to Gerbert, which is contemporary with Ayrardus.²²

15 This is the hand referred to as α by Hoffmann, also found in other coeval manuscripts: see again Hoffmann 1995: 177; Munk Olsen 2014: 399.

16 See Passalacqua 1990; Passalacqua 1994; Passalacqua 1996.

17 The bibliography on Gerbert is virtually endless; for an overview of his intellectual activity and his teaching at Rheims see at least Lake 2013 and Stoppacci 2016: 3-54.

18 It is considered reliable for example by Stoppacci 2016: 20-21, whereas Hoffmann 1995: 27 states that such an identification is hardly 'mehr als eine hübsche Vermutung ... , denn die fraglichen Korrekturen verraten nicht so sehr ungewöhnliche, mathematische Kenntnisse als vielmehr ein antiquarisches Interesse an antiken Massen und Münzen, welches man auch einem anonym bleibenden Gehilfen aus Gerberts Umgebung zutrauen könnte.'

19 At f. 150v we read *venerando abbate Gerberto philosophante suus placens Ayrardus scripsit*; see Passalacqua 1990: 324, who dates the copy of the manuscript between 983 and 991.

20 See Munk Olsen 2014: 399 'Ayrardus a dû se trouver à Reims en tout cas en 983 puisque Gerbert indique, dans la lettre, d'autres manuscrits à copier à Orbais et à St-Basle, localités voisines de cette ville'.

21 Lake 2013: 49 and n. 1 with vast bibliography on the chronology of Gerbert's life.

22 Hoffmann 1995: 177 calls it a 'gleichzeitige Korrekturhand'.

It is clear that this reconstruction makes a strong case for the presence of the Erlangensis 389 as well in Rheims over the same period, along with all the manuscripts in which the activity of that same hand has been detected.²³ Two scenarios open up at this point, one more modest and – so to speak – conservative, the other more ambitious and partially speculative. What we can say with reasonable certainty is that the Erlangensis 389 was part of the library of the cathedral school of Rheims at the end of the tenth century; but if we accept Passalacqua's hypothesis we can go much further, and come to the conclusion that this manuscript is the Lucan on which the great Gerbert based his knowledge of the *Bellum Civile*,²⁴ a text that was part of his syllabus at Rheims.²⁵ If we agree to move onto shaky ground, we can try to go one extra step further: as Fischer pointed out,²⁶ the two Erlangen manuscripts share some physical characteristics, and it cannot be ruled out that they were copied in the

23 See above, n. 15.

24 See the enlightening remarks of Munk Olsen 2014: 400, who also makes a convincing hypothesis about the subsequent history of the manuscript: 'On obtient ainsi un groupe assez homogène de dix manuscrits classiques, qui ont été copiés à Reims ou qui ont dû s'y trouver à l'époque de Gerbert ; ils ont donc pu faire partie de sa bibliothèque. Quelquesuns de ces manuscrits ont été complétés ou corrigés par des mains de Bamberg au xi^e siècle, notamment Bamberg, SB, Class. 35-II et Erlangen, UB, 389. Les deux manuscrits d'Erlangen proviennent de l'abbaye cistercienne de Heilsbronn, fondée en 1132, mais ont dû se trouver à Bamberg au xi^e siècle. Il est donc probable que ces manuscrits, avec plusieurs autres non classiques, ont passé en bloc à Bamberg, soit par l'intermédiaire d'Otton III, qui avait des relations étroites avec Gerbert et dont les livres ont été hérités par Henri II, soit par celui-ci, qui les aurait obtenus après la mort de Gerbert à Rome en 1003, soit d'une autre manière, par exemple, par l'intermédiaire de Léon de Verceil'. See also Hoffmann 1995: 29.

25 See the famous biographical sketch about Gerbert's teaching contained in Richer of Rheims' *Historiae*, 3.47: *poetas igitur adhibuit, quibus assuescendos arbitrabatur. Legit itaque ac docuit Maronem et Statium Terentiumque poetas, Iuvenalem quoque ac Persium Horatiumque satiricos, Lucanum etiam historiographum. Quibus assuefactos, locutionumque modis compositos, ad rhetoricam transduxit*. It would be interesting to search Gerbert's works for traces of materials derived from the scholia contained in the Erlangensis 389; if successful, such a search could indirectly confirm Gerbert's use of the manuscript.

26 See Fischer 1928: 462 'in dieser Hinsicht scheint also der codex im allgemeinen der Ayrardushandschrift 380 näher zu stehen, die um dieselbe Zeit und in der gleichen Weise ergänzt wurde, auch ein ähnliches großes Quartformat hat'.

same *scriptorium*. It is therefore at least conceivable that the Erlangensis 389, like the Erlangensis 380, was commissioned in the same years by Gerbert himself, a tireless seeker of Latin classics;²⁷ and maybe, if the last part of the manuscript were not lost, at the end of the *Bellum Civile* we would read a *subscriptio* similar to that of Ayrardus.²⁸

The Erlangensis 389 was thus in Rheims at the end of the tenth century, and was perhaps employed for the teaching of Latin grammar (*enarratio poetarum*) in the cathedral school. This is already more than we can say about most Lucan manuscripts: but what can we make of this information? Does it help us to place its paratext in the elusive history of Lucanian exegesis? To begin with, the manuscript Bernensis 370, taken by Usener as the foundational basis for his critical edition of the *Commenta Bernensia*, also comes from Rheims.²⁹ We would therefore expect some kind of overlap between the marginal commentary of the Erlangensis 389 and the continuous commentaries preserved by the Bernensis 370; and to be fair Arnold Genthe had already noted, albeit superficially, the proximity of the former to the *Commenta Bernensia*.³⁰

Such proximity, however, does not seem to result from a direct relationship between the two manuscripts. The second witness used by Usener to establish the text of his *Commenta Bernensia* is another Swiss manuscript, the Bernensis 45,³¹ where the scholia are copied in the margins along with Lucan's text. These scholia, however, are not identical to those handed down from the Bernensis 370, and as I anticipated earlier Usener made completely arbitrary use of them.³² What is important to note here is that a significant portion of the scholia in the Erlangensis

27 On this aspect of Gerbert's personality see e.g. Stoppacci 2016: 12-14.

28 See above, n. 19. The Erlangensis 389 breaks off at f. 143v, which ends with Lucan. 10.375; the final section of the poem was added by a fifteenth-century hand.

29 So e.g. Munk Olsen 1985: 78 [Bc. 3]. For its content see above, n. 5.

30 See Genthe 1894: 18: 'scholia saepe cum scholiis a Webero editis, saepius cum commentis Bernensibus, quae Usenerus publici iuris fecit, consentiunt, plerumque autem nova perhibent'.

31 This manuscript is most likely from Fleury and dates to the ninth century, while its scholia (which break off at Lucan. 3.286) were added around the tenth-eleventh century: see Homburger 1962: 99; Gotoff 1971: 15; Munk Olsen 1985: 28 [B. 9].

32 A thorough criticism of Usener's (mis)use of the Bernensis 45 can be read in Werner 1998: 137-41.

389 is indeed close to the *Commenta Bernensia*, but in the form in which they were handed down by the Bernensis 45.³³ Consider the following two (among several) scholia in the Erlangensis 389 (E), the Bernensis 45 (B) and the Bernensis 370 (C):

Ad Lucan. 1.72 *sic cum compage soluta*:

Erlangensis 389 (E, f. 3r)	Bernensis 45 (B, f. 2r)	Bernensis 370 (C, f. 6r)
Hic sequitur Epicureos, qui interiturum mundum suis opinionibus colligunt.	Hic sequitur Epicureos, qui interiturum mundum ex suis opinionibus colligunt.	Secundum opinionem quorundam philosophorum et maxime Epicureorum, qui interiturum mundum ex suis opinionibus colligunt.

Ad Lucan. 1.686 *dubiam super aequora Syrtim*:

Erlangensis 389 (E, f. 14r)	Bernensis 45 (B, f. 6r)	Bernensis 370 (C, f. 20v)
Catonem significat, qui se ipsum interemit in Africa ducens exercitum per desertum Lybiae.	Catonem significat, qui se ipsum interemit in Africa ducens exercitum per desertum Lybiae.	Catonem significat, qui cum in Africa nil valeret, ibi ipse <se> interemit.

The relationship between *E* and *B* is even closer than this. *B* includes significantly more scholia than *C*, and sometimes such ‘extra’ materials overlap with those of other known Lucan scholia.³⁴ In several cases, what we find in *B* ‘against’ *C* happens to be in *E* as well. Two examples:

33 A preliminary remark about the relationship between the Erlangensis 389 and the Bernensis 45: the two manuscripts show a very similar text of Lucan, and even if they do not seem to depend directly on each other, it has been suggested that they may depend on a common subarchetype. See Genthe 1894: 25–26; Francken 1896–97: vol. I, xiii–xiv; Beck 1900: 7.

34 These exegetical materials, discarded by Usener because they were considered unrelated to what he meant by *Commenta Bernensia*, have been published separately by Cavajoni 1975; see also Werner 1998: 137 and n. 25.

Ad Lucan. 1.593 *lustrō*:

Erlangensis 389 (E, f. 12v)	Bernensis 45 (B, f. 5v) ³⁵	Bernensis 370 (C)
Lustrum est quinquennale tempus, quo peracto lustrabant civitatem, id est cum facibus circumdabant. Hanc autem lustrationem in finem mensis februarii agere solebant, in honore scilicet Februi, id est Plutonis, a quo et februarius dicitur, qui lustrationibus potens esse credebatur. Februo enim Graece, purgo Latine dicitur. Sed nos, ne minoris videamur devotionis, hanc lustrationem in sanctae Mariae festivitatem transferimus, quando ecclesiam cum candelis ambimus.	Lustrum quinquennale tempus quo peracto lustrabant civitatem, id est cum facibus circumdabant. Hanc autem lustrationem in finem mensis Februarii agere solebant, in honore scilicet Februi, id est Plutonis, a quo et Febrarius qui lustratione potens esse credebatur. Februo enim Graece, purgo Latine dicitur. Sed nos, ne minoris videamur devotionis, hanc lustrationem in sanctae Mariae quando ecclesiam cum candelis ambimus.	nothing

Ad Lucan. 1.596 *Gabino*:

Erlangensis 389 (E, f. 12v)	Bernensis 45 (B, f. 5v)	Leidensis Vossianus Q.51 (= Supplementum, V)	Bernensis 370 (C)
Sacerdotes Gabinorum cum quodam die nudi hostiarum coria detraherent, repente hostium nuntiatum est adventus; qui vestibus indui non	Sacerdotes Gabinorum cum quodam die nudi hostiarum coria detraherent, repente hostium nuntiatum est adventus. Tunc illi, indui se non	Sacerdotes Gabinorum, cum quodam die nudi hostiarum coria detraherent, repente hostium adventus nuntiatum est; qui vestibus indui non	nothing

³⁵ The transcription of this scholium given by Cavajoni 1975: 85 is, for incomprehensible reasons, incomplete; this is my own transcription.

valentes, togis succincti hostes petierunt atque in fugam verterunt. Inde ab illis decretum est, ut tali habitu semper sacrificia offerrent. Quo habitu diaconi in ecclesia quadagesimali tempore ministrant.	valentes, <to>gis succincti hostes petierunt atque in fugam verterunt. Inde ab illis decretum est ut tali habitu semper sacrificia offerrent. Quo habitu diaconi in ecclesia quadagesimali tempore utuntur.	valentes, togis succincti hostes petierunt atque in fugam verterunt. Inde ab illis decretum est, ut tali habitu semper sacrificia offerrent. Quo habitu diaconi in ecclesia quadagesimali tempore ministrant.	
--	---	--	--

Apparently, then, the presence of the Bernensis 370 in Rheims did not have a direct influence on the materials that merged together in the Erlangensis 389. Yet even the very strong similarity³⁶ between the paratexts of *E* and *B* does not seem to stem from a direct dependence of one on the other, so much as from the use of common sources. For several reasons, the scholia of *E* cannot come from those of *B*: first and foremost, in the latter they break off at Lucan 3.286,³⁷ while in the former they cover almost the entire poem. It could be argued that *E* followed *B* until it was interrupted, and then turned to another source; but if that were the case, it would not explain situations like Lucan 1.623, where *E* lacks something which is found in *B*,³⁸ or Lucan 2.2, where *E* and *C* share a scholium missing in *B*.³⁹ Beyond that, in some cases the text of *E* is superior to

36 Which is, of course, much broader than what I have been able to show here: the two manuscripts also share, for example, hundreds and hundreds of interlinear glosses, often placed in the same position all around and above Lucan's text.

37 See above, n. 31.

38 *Vitalia sunt venae quibus vita continetur, quae cum integrae inveniuntur, salutare sunt* (*E*); *vitalia sunt venae quibus vita continetur, quae cum integrae inveniuntur salutare sunt et maiorem partem intestinorum tabe, ist est marcore dissoluto, prout mollem humorem hia...* (*B*); the last part of the *B* scholium, whose complete form and meaning are uncertain, was not taken into consideration by Usener or Cavajoni, and has no match in *E*.

39 That is the long philosophical note that can be read in Usener 1869: 47-48, which is found in almost identical form in *E* and is missing in *B*; this dynamic is more frequent than the one discussed in the previous note.

that of *B* in a way that is almost impossible to explain by conjectural emendations by the scholiast.⁴⁰ Although it is more difficult to rule out the opposite case – i.e., a direct dependence of *B* on *E* – such a situation, in which the two manuscripts share a large portion of scholia but each preserves exclusive materials, does indeed seem to indicate the use of common sources rather than direct filiation.⁴¹ As far as we can tell, *E* had access to a more plentiful and ‘*Commenta*-like’ set of scholia,⁴² or perhaps *B* effected a more incisive selection of what was in their common source.

The close connection between *E* and *B* and the apparent lack of influence of *C* on the paratext of the former manuscript are, therefore, solid conclusions for further studies; the Erlangensis 389, however, has still much to unveil.

Above we saw that one of the scholia that *E* shares with *B* is also found in *V*, the Leidensis Vossianus Q.51, one of the manuscripts employed by Cavajoni for his edition of the so-called *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*. This manuscript dates back to second half of the tenth century, and its origin is conventionally located in western Germany.⁴³ That was not an isolated case: the overlapping of the exegetical materials of *E* and *V* is a constant feature, which deserves closer scrutiny. Cavajoni detected the activity of four scholiasts operating in the margins of the Leidensis Vossianus, to which he refers with the sigla *V*, *V1*, *V2*, and *V3*; in his reconstruction, *V* and *V1* are chronologically very close, whereas *V2* and *V3*

40 This seems to be the case with the scholium to Lucan. 1.593 as is shown in the table, where *E* has a clearer and fuller text than *B* (see *dicitur* and *festivitatem transferimus*, fundamental for the meaning of the scholium itself and missing in *B*).

41 Which means that, as far as their paratext is concerned, the relationship between *E* and *B* would be similar to that concerning the text of Lucan they handed down: see above, n. 33.

42 This would account at the same time for what we observed above, n. 39 (i.e. cases where *C* and *E* preserve scholia which are absent in *B*), and for the independence of *E* from *C*, since the former shows sometimes a better and/or fuller text than the latter; to this point we will return later.

43 Detailed description are found in de Meyier 1975: vol. II, 126–28; Cavajoni 1979: XXXVI–XXXVII; Munk Olsen 1985: 42 [B. 64]. *V* is one of the most important witnesses for the *constitutio textus* of the *Bellum Civile*: see Hosius 1913: V–VI; Housman 1927: VII–VIII; Gotoff 1971: 21.

are later.⁴⁴ It is very interesting to observe that *E* scholia are matched by those of all these four hands; consider the following examples:⁴⁵

Ad Lucan. 5.609 *Aeolii*:

Eoliae VIII sunt insule, quarum rex Eolus fuit, qui deus ventorum dicitur (*E*)

Aeoliae novem sunt insulae quarum rex Aeolus fuit, qui deus ventorum dicitur (*V*)

Ad Lucan. 5.355 *amolitur onus*:

moliri dicimus conari, hinc amoliri subtrahere vel auferre (*E*)

moliri dicimus conari; hinc 'amoliri' subtrahere vel auferre (*V1*)

Ad Lucan. 4.523 *Ursae*:

Duae ursae sunt in polo septentrionali, una maior et altera minor, Erix videlicet et Cinosura, quae numquam occidunt sed in semet revolvuntur (*E*)

Duae ursae sunt in polo septentrionali, una maior et altera minor, Elice videlicet et Cinosura, quae numquam occidunt, sed in semet ipsas revolvuntur (*V2*)

Ad Lucan. 7.104 *signa petunt*:

In desperationem. Nimirum, inquit, si ipsa bella petunt, quia iam fame peribunt (*E*)⁴⁶

In desperationem; non mirum, inquit, si ipsi bella petunt, quod iam fame peribunt (*V3*)

Quite obviously, such a correspondence is by no means a coincidence, and it prompts us to question once again the direction of the relationship between *E* and another known manuscript, in this case *V*. A first hypothesis is that *E*'s notes depend on *V*'s knowledge at a time when the Leiden

44 See Cavajoni 1979: XXXVII; de Meyier 1975: vol. II, 127 considered them 'eiusdem temporis, ut videtur'.

45 All *V* scholia are quoted according to Cavajoni's text.

46 Here *E*'s note is split between the interlineum (*in desperationem*) and the margin (the rest of the note).

manuscript had already been annotated by all its scholiasts; this does not seem to be the case, because sometimes *E*'s text is much better preserved than *V*'s. Consider the scholium to Lucan 5.366 as it is printed by Cavajoni:⁴⁷

Privati dicebantur qui † a dignitatibus suis rebus administrabant (*V3*)

In his apparatus criticus *ad loc.* Cavajoni suggested emending the text to *a<bsque> dignitatibus suas res*; but a much simpler and perfectly readable solution is found in *E*'s scholium, which says:

Privati dicebantur qui dignitatibus alienati suis tantum rebus amministrabant (*E*)

Another clear example is the scholium to Lucan 6.635, which is printed by Cavajoni as such:

Lex est Erebi, ut quem semel receperit numquam postea reddat; sed tunc cessit * * ad vocem illius magae <et> mortuum quem tenebat remisit (*V1*)

Cavajoni therefore was not able to read what was in *V* after *cessit*, and at the same time integrated an *et* after *magae*. He was not far from the truth in the first case⁴⁸ and definitely wrong in the second, because in *E* we read:

Lex est Erebi ut quem semel receperit nunquam postea reddat; sed tunc cessit quia ad vocem illius magae mortuum quem tenebat remisit (*E*)

It seems safe to conclude, then, that the Erlangensis 389 does not owe a substantial part of its paratext to a direct knowledge of the Leidensis

47 See Cavajoni 1979: 314.

48 See Cavajoni 1984: 56 *ad loc.*, who writes in the apparatus criticus: '*inter* 3 cessit et ad vocem: uia tantum legitur'. Now we know that *uia* in *V* was nothing but the end of the *quia* we read in the Erlangensis 389.

Vossianus Q.51, and that their frequent overlap must have another explanation. An opposite scenario – i.e., that *V* remained physically in contact with *E*'s paratext long enough for all the scholiasts of the former to have access to the latter⁴⁹ – is more seductive, but does not come without problems. First, if *V*'s annotators had access to *E*, it is unclear why they decided to use it only in part, omitting many of its more 'valuable' materials, such as those that match the *Commenta Bernensia*. Moreover, it would seem that this selection process was repeated for each of the four hands of *V*, and each time with slightly different (not to say erratic) criteria, which is even more puzzling. In addition to this, there are cases where scholia from *V* have a better text than those from *E*, although these examples are more nuanced than the ones we have just analyzed above. Consider the case of the notes to Lucan 7.104 transcribed above: except for the alternation between *nimirum* (*E*) and *non mirum* (*V*3), which could well have a merely paleographical cause, the text of the latter, with *ipsi bella petunt* instead of *ipsa bella petunt*, seems way superior, and it is not that easy to imagine a tenth-century scholiast correcting *ipsa* into *ipsi* just for the sake of good Latin. Lastly, if *E* was one of the sources of *V*'s annotators, it certainly was not the only one: in fact, in many cases the Leidensis Vossianus Q.51 presents exegetical materials not found in the Erlangensis 389.⁵⁰

In the present state of our knowledge, therefore, before irrefutable data emerges on this issue,⁵¹ we must again limit ourselves to expressing the undoubted relationship between the paratexts of *E* and *V*, without venturing into the real nature of this relationship: once the dependence of *E* on *V* is ruled out, both the dependence of *V* on *E* and the use of common sources remain conceivable.

The latter hypothesis – i.e., that of a common source for *E* and *V* – is perhaps reinforced by the intricate relationship of the Erlangensis 389 to

49 Maybe in Bamberg, where according to Munk Olsen (quoted above, n. 24) the Erlangensis 389 was transferred after Gerbert's death; but this is nothing more than a sheer conjecture.

50 So e.g. at Lucan. 8.137, where *V* shows a scholium missing in *E*; but this is just one example among many.

51 Such as, for example, textual issues in *V* that directly reflect a material damage in *E*; I haven't found anything like that yet.

the other corpus of scholia edited as a well-defined commentary to Lucan, namely the *Adnotationes super Lucanum*. Next to the *Commenta Bernensia* and the scholia of V, in fact, in many cases the materials transmitted by E coincide with those of the *Adnotationes*; more often, however, E follows the textual configuration of the so-called *Adnotationes retractatae*,⁵² also handed down by V, and not that of our best manuscripts. Here are some significant examples (among hundreds):

Ad Lucan. 6.132 *quod solum valuit virtus*:

Prima virtus est acceptum locum tueri, secunda in ipso loco mori (E)
Prima virtus est acceptum locum tueri, secundum (sic) in ipso loco mori quo stabant (V)

Prima virtus est acceptum locum tueri, secunda eundem locum etiam corpore possidere prostrato, ut ait Salustius milites laudans ‘quem quisque locum vivus pugnando ceperat, eum amissa anima corpore tegebat’. Isti ergo hoc solum fortiter fecerunt, quod in eodem loco ceciderunt, ubi stare debuerant; hoc est, quod fugati non sunt (*Adnotationes super Lucanum*, see Endt 1909: 207)

Ad Lucan. 6.181 *admovere solo*:

Postquam talis cumulus excrevit cadaverum ut altitudine iunctus ad muros eosdem cum solo aequaret (E)

Postquam talis cumulus excrevit cadaverum ut altitudine iunctus ad muros eosdem cum solo aequaret (V)

Hoc est: postquam talis cadaverum cumulus excrevit, ut altitudine iunctus ad muros eosdem cum solo aequaret et sterneret (*Adnotationes super Lucanum*, see Endt 1909: 210)

The relationship of the Erlangensis 389 to the text of the *Adnotationes*, however, is much more complex than these examples reveal and calls into question the very nature of the text published by Endt: what can be considered *Adnotationes* and what cannot? What level of reworking transforms a note into a new text, rather than a different version of the same text? Consider the following example:

52 See above p. 118 and n. 7.

Ad Lucan. 6.258 *si tibi durus Hiber*:

Id est si adversus externos, non contra cives, ista gessisses (E)

Id est si adversus externos hostes ita fecisses (*Adnotationes super Lucanum*, see Endt 1909: 213)

The E scholium is not to be found in the *Adnotationes retractatae*,⁵³ and even if it is clearly related to the *Adnotationes*, they don't seem to be the same note. Something very similar happens a few lines later:

Ad Lucan. 6.318 *hortatu, patrias sedes atque hoste carentem*:

Cum, inquit, Pompeius Cesarem insequi praepararet, hortati sunt eum milites ut potius Romam peteret (E)

Cum enim Pompeius fugientem Caesarem semper insequi praepararet, temptaverunt ei milites sui persuadere, ut Romam potius contenderet (*Adnotationes super Lucanum*, see Endt 1909: 216)

We do not find anything similar in V. Once again, the two scholia are clearly and strictly related, but it is almost impossible to say exactly how: it looks like E had, among its sources, a text similar to the so-called *Adnotationes retractatae*, very close to – but not identical with, and in general we would be inclined to say more complete than – that of V. The mismatch between E and V regarding their respective relationship with the *Adnotationes* appears to be an important clue in favor of the hypothesis of the use of common sources rather than that of a direct dependence of the latter on the former.

Before attempting an overall interpretation of the data collected so far, we need to further complicate the picture. The manuscripts that make up the so-called *Supplementum adnotationum* often agree in transmitting the same materials, but it also happens that each of them singularly passes on scholia not transmitted by the others; and from time to time, these 'exclusive' scholia are matched in the Erlangensis 389 alone. Two examples:

53 Neither in V nor – as far as I can tell – in any other manuscript containing them.

Ad Lucan. 1.38 *hac mercede placent*:

Tale est illud quod in cerei benedictione adulatorie legitur, o felix culpa (E)

Tale est illud quod in cerei benedictione adulatoria legitur 'o felix culpa' (Berolinensis Lat. fol. 35 = *Supplementum D*)⁵⁴

Ad Lucan. 9.718 *et torrida dipsas* (= 9.738 *dipsas calcata momordit*):⁵⁵

Dipsas serpens tante exiguitatis fertur ut cum calcatur non videatur, cuius venenum ante extinguit quam sentiatur, ut facies praeventa morte nec tristitiam inducat morituri (E)

Serpens tantae exiguitatis fertur ut cum calcetur non videatur; huius venenum ante extinguit quam sentiatur, ut facies praeventa morte nec tristitiam inducat morituro. De quo poeta 'signiferum iuvenem Tirreni sanguinis Aulum / torto capite retro dipsas<s> calcata momordit: / vix dolor aut sensus dentis fuit' (Monacensis 14505 = *Supplementum R*)⁵⁶

Up to now we have seen how the commentary that occupies the margins of the Erlangensis 389 overlaps, with varying frequency, with virtually all the corpora of edited scholia to Lucan's *Bellum Civile*: the *Commenta Bernensia*, the *Adnotationes super Lucanum*, the *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*, and other poorly or partially edited sets of notes.⁵⁷ In addition to these already known materials, however, the manuscript also presents hundreds and hundreds of scholia that find no correspondence

54 See Cavajoni 1979: XXXIII-XXXIV.

55 The snake called *dipsas* is mentioned twice by Lucan, at 9.718 and 9.738; therefore in E and R the two scholia, though almost identical, refer to different passages of the *Bellum Civile*. See also the following note.

56 See Cavajoni 1979: XXXIV-XXXV; here R shows a quote from Lucan himself (Lucan. 9.737-38) missing from E, most probably because the scholium in E refers directly to the quoted passage (see the previous note).

57 For the sake of brevity, I decided not to include here episodic examples of overlap between E and the dozens of manuscripts included in Weber 1831 (a jumble of Lucan scholia from very different ages and environments) as well as with the Montepessulanus H113 (= M), whose scholia were edited by Genthe 1868 and (though not systematically) compared to E already by Endt 1906. On the Montepessulanus H113, Hosius' *codex optimus*, see at least Housman 1927: x-xiii; Gotoff 1971: 14.

whatsoever with any others. These are notes of a very diverse length, nature and subject matter: interlinear glosses, lexicographical scholia, mythological or historical digressions, geographical clarifications, quotations from other authors – in short, *E*’s original contribution to the understanding of Lucan’s text in the Middle Ages touches on all the aspects that a complex and successful poem such as the *Bellum Civile* calls into question.

These materials are still unpublished, and theoretically speaking they are as valuable and noteworthy as any other set of scholia from the same period. Of course, this is not the place to offer a complete edition of them: I plan to publish separately a selection of notes of particular interest in the future. However, it seems to me to be of absolute interest to give a few particularly significant examples.

Ad Lucan. 3.658 *eiectat saniem permixtus viscera sanguis*:

viscera **ZMG** *et ut vid.* **E^{p.c.}** : viscere **PUV** *et ut vid.* **E^{a.c.}**, Serv. Georg. 1.139, edd. plerique

Permixtus viscera: gaudebant antiqui nominibus praepositionem detrahare et verbis addere

(*E*, f. 39r)

I am not going to discuss in detail the text of Lucan’s verse and the syntactical implications of the choice between *viscera* (*E*’s reading *post correctionem* and in the lemma of its scholium)⁵⁸ and *viscere*, which is considered superior and widely accepted by modern editors;⁵⁹ more interesting here is the marginal annotation of the Erlangensis 389, which by resorting to an expression peculiar to the *Sondersprache* of Latin grammarians⁶⁰ provides an original explanation of *permixtus viscera sanguis* as *mixtus per viscera sanguis*, not found elsewhere.

58 *E*’s scholia do have from time to time a lemma repeating the portion of Lucan’s text they are commenting on; while in other cases it seems quite evident that the presence of the lemma reproduces the appearance of the scholiast’s source, here it is likely that the repetition of *permixtus viscera* is intended to clarify the annotator’s favorite text, even in the face of the ambiguity of the manuscript, which oscillates between *viscere* and *viscera*.

59 See e.g. Housman 1927: 85 *ad loc.*

60 On the meaning and implications of *antiqui* and *antiquitas* in Latin grammarians see e.g. De Nonno 2017.

Ad Lucan. 3.755 *navalia*:

Navalia sunt loca in mari, id est itineraria per quae naves currunt; nam nautae timore cautium quasdam sibi vias eligunt in mare
(E, f. 40v)

E's sources certainly included a good glossary, which often provides meanings and etymologies that are already known or whose origin is easy to recognize (Servius, Isidore of Seville etc.); in some cases, however, these lexicographical scholia seem to preserve definitions otherwise unknown. This explanation of *navale* is in my opinion the most fascinating of such 'new' glosses: although the term is found in several edited glossaries, *navale* is commonly interpreted as 'dockyard', 'shipyard',⁶¹ whereas this definition as 'safe maritime route' appears to be unparalleled.

Ad Lucan. 7.855 *omnia maiorum vertamus busta licebit*:

Licebit pro quanquam accipitur hic, ut dicit Priscianus in coniunctione
(E, f. 101r)

Another grammatical note, this time devoted to the correct interpretation of the somewhat exotic future *licebit*, employed by Lucan instead of the more common *licet*.⁶² The interpretation of the verbal form as *quamquam* is not surprising, and in fact coincides with the gloss *quamvis* in some of the manuscripts of the *Supplementum*;⁶³ but the reference to Priscian's treatment of conjunctions⁶⁴ is unparalleled, and one might

61 See e.g. Isid. *Etym.* 14.8.38 *navalia sunt loca ubi naves fabricantur*; Theander-Inguanez-Fordyce 1965: vol. v, 90 *navalia: loca in qua naves educuntur*.

62 See Lanzarone 2016: 517 *ad loc.*

63 i.e. *a* (Guelferbytanus 41, 1 Aug. 2°), *D* (Berolinensis lat. fol. 35), and *R* (Monacensis 14505).

64 The scholiast is certainly referring to Prisc. *Gramm.* III, 16.96.14-22 *invenitur tamen etiam verbum pro adversativa coniunctione cum adverbio, ut 'quamvis' pro 'quamquam' et pro 'etsi', quomodo et 'licet' et 'licebit'*. Virgilius in XI: *dicam equidem, licet arma mihi mortemque minetur, pro 'quamquam minetur'*. Lucanus in VII: *omnia maiorum vertamus busta licebit, / et stantes tumulos et qui radice vetusta / effudere suas victis conpagibus urnas, / plus cinerum Haemoniae sulcis telluris aratur*.

wonder whether it depends on the grammarian's knowledge in Rheims' cultural environment.⁶⁵

Ad Lucan. 9.626 *squalebant late Phorcynidos arva Medusae*:

Porcus rex tres filias habuit, Stenno, Euriale et Medusae, quae adeo dicebantur fuisse maleficiis plenae ut omnia animalia quae aspexerint in lapides verterent. Re autem vera meretrices fuerunt tantae pulchritudinis ut homines in amentiam verterent. Sed patri mortuo Medusa successit in regnum. Haec autem tantam pulchritudinem habebat et maxime in capillis ut homines se aspicientes in lapides vertere diceretur. Cum qua Neptunus postea concubuit in templo Palladis, sed Pallas, ne eos concubentes videret, egida, id est pelle capre, oculos suos operuit, et capillos in quibus eius maxima pulchritudo constabat, sicut Ovidius in libro *Metamorphoseon* narrat, in angues convertit. Liber autem *Metamorphoseon* dicitur, id est transformationum, eo quod in eo narretur qualiter homines in lapides sive in serpentes versi sunt. (E, f. 128v)

Mythological digressions, relatively common in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, are certainly among the passages of the poem that arouse the most interest from medieval commentators; this is also the case with the reference to the myth of Medusa in the ninth book, which explains this lengthy scholium. What appears most relevant here is that this note, not otherwise attested,⁶⁶ makes explicit use of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* to explain the myth, and is not so different in structure from that of the only known exegetical support for Ovid's epic poem in the early medieval period, i.e.

65 From a different perspective, Porro 1986 discusses some points of contact (among which Lucan. 7.855 does not appear) between Priscian and the *Supplementum* manuscripts.

66 The note does show several similarities, both in structure and content, with mythological and exegetical texts dealing with the story of Medusa (see Serv. *Aen.* 2.616 and especially 6.289; Fulg. *Myth.* 1.59-62; Mythogr. 1.127-28; 2.135), but it also has unique features, such as the definition of Porcus' daughters as *meretrices* and the digression on the meaning of the title *liber Metamorphoseon*, on which see also below, n. 68.

the *Narrationes fabularum Ovidianarum* attributed to Lactantius Placidus.⁶⁷ One might wonder, then, whether the scholiast of the Erlangensis 389 had access to some kind of commentary on Ovid other than the *Narrationes*,⁶⁸ and whether the mythological notes of the manuscript that find no parallels elsewhere and overlap in content with episodes narrated by Ovid might depend on this hypothetical exegetical source. Whether such a source really existed or not, the use of Ovid to explain Lucan in the tenth century remains of absolute interest in any case.

It is finally time to draw some conclusions. The analysis of one among hundreds of paratexts accompanying Lucan's poem in our medieval manuscripts reveals an uncomfortable truth: we do not really know what happened 'around' the classics. In Lucan's case, as I said at the outset, the existence of a few 'extraordinary' witnesses and the weighty precedent of Usener's edition have *de facto* forever conditioned scholarly judgment on marginal scholarship to the *Bellum Civile*. As I have tried to show, such a situation is, to some extent, an accident of history: if Usener had moved to the University of Erlangen-Nürnberg instead of Bern, where he came into contact with the famous Bernensis 370, he might have published, instead of his *Commenta Bernensia*, a set of *Scholia Erlangensia in Lucanum*, and the entire history of the medieval exegesis to the *Bellum Civile* would have taken a different course. Jokes aside, it is precisely the success of labels such as *Commenta Bernensia*, *Adnotationes super Lucanum* and *Supplementum adnotationum* that makes the paratext of the Erlangensis 389 appear to us as an 'impossible crossroads': if we try to apply these labels to the manuscript, it is impossible to give a coherent and all-encompassing interpretation to the materials it contains.

67 This is Medusa's history in the twentieth (and last) *fabula* from the fourth book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*: *Medusa Gorgo cum propter pulchritudinem a pluribus peteretur, coniugium Neptuni effugere non potuit, quae quod in templo Minervae cum eo concubuit, propter religionem loci, quam obtriverat, crines eius in serpentes ab eadem dea sunt mutati, ut, quae petita initio a plurimis procis esset, obiecta deformitate obvios in fugam verteret* (I quote the text of the *Narrationes* from Magnus 1914: vol. II, 652).

68 One possible clue lies in the fact that the final sentence of the scholium (*liber autem Metamorphoseon dicitur, id est transformationum, eoquod in eo narretur qualiter homines in lapides sive in serpentes versi sunt*) seems to be completely unrelated to Lucan's verse and is instead quite close to the *titulus* section of medieval *accessus ad auctores*, on which see at least Quain 1945, Spallone 1990 and Wheeler 2015: 1-24.

It is clear instead that each manuscript of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, especially at this stage of its textual history, represents a unique moment that should be considered as such; and for this reason it seems more fruitful to investigate the vicissitudes of each individual manuscript, trying to connect it to the environments with which it came into contact, rather than misunderstanding – or worse, ignoring – witnesses of great interest such as the Erlangensis 389. This is what I have tried to do in these pages, with some success and – to be fair – much frustration: but if these attempts were multiplied, it is to be hoped that one step at a time a map of Lucan paratexts in medieval Europe would be drawn in front of us, with great advantages for our understanding of the reception of the *Bellum Civile*. On the other hand, in terms of wanting to understand the evolution of Lucan's interpretation in pre- and post-Carolingian Europe, we should perhaps imagine a history not of entire scholiastic corpora but of specific annotations: in the face of the overwhelming data of the tradition as a whole, the impression is that reconstructing the events involving single widespread scholia can often yield happier results.

So far so good. From my point of view, one fundamental question remains: what should we do with a manuscript like the Erlangensis 389? I think the answer to this question is the direct consequence of the conclusions I have just made. A solid *desideratum* is, indeed, a comprehensive and thorough edition of the exegetic materials that find place in the margins and the interlineum of the manuscript, accompanied by a meticulous *apparatus fontium et locorum parallelorum* indicating the overlaps with other known scholiastic traditions as well as with glossaries, grammatical treatises and other erudite works. Such an edition would finally restore the manuscript to its full complexity and historical dimension, and would be an important precedent for other similar efforts. In addition to this, the Erlangensis 389 also clarifies the textual arrangement of a large number of already edited scholia, and in this way it often allows their text to be improved; and this is certainly one of the main contributions

it can make to us.⁶⁹ We have already seen this happening for two corrupted annotations from the *Supplementum adnotationum*;⁷⁰ I want to focus now on some cases where the Erlangensis 389 allows to amend Usener's edition of the *Commenta Bernensia*.

We mentioned earlier a long annotation that the Erlangensis 389 (E) and the Bernensis 370 (C) share, at the very beginning of the second book of the *Bellum Civile*.⁷¹ This is the transcription of the two manuscripts:

Ad Lucan. 2.2:

Erlangensis 389 (f. 14r)	<i>Commenta Bernensia</i> ⁷²
Vetustiores phylosophy mundum et semper fuisse et sine fine aeternum affirmant esse. Plato autem adfirmat causam creandi mundum dei bonitatem esse; alii dicunt confusione quadam mundum esse generatum ac duo regna confirmant, illud superius magni dei plenum quietis et luminis in quo divine atque innumere potestates lucem habitant, ad quam anime post resolutionem corporis perveniunt purgate primum lune aquis, post solis igne. Vnde Virgilius: infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni. Hoc vero regnum quod habitamus inferius malignis plenum esse virtutibus, quae bella quae cedes et has ceteras rerum varietates peragunt. Inter has inferiores virtutes et superiores mundum quem habitamus	SIGNA DEDIT MVNDVS vetustiores philosophi mundum semper et fuisse et esse et futurum esse adfirmant, in quo nec futuri terminus et sine fine aeternitas sit. Plato autem adfirmat causam creandi mundum dei bonitatem esse, ut nostrum munus effecerit quod singulus possidebat. Alii dicunt <e> confusione quadam mundum esse generatum ac duo regna confirmant, illud superius magni dei plenum quietis et luminis in quo divin<a>e atque innumer<a>e potestates lucem habitant, ad quam anim<a>e post resolutionem corporis perveniunt purgatae primum lunae aquis post solis igni, ut ait Virgilius 'infectum eluitur scelus aut exuritur igni', hoc vero regnum quod habitamus inferius malignis poenam esse virtutibus

69 Shirley Werner, criticizing Usener's edition of the *Commenta Bernensia*, had already well understood that the best way to use the Bernensis 45 (B) was to employ it to correct the manifest errors in the Bernensis 370 (C); see above, n. 32, and Werner 1998: 141 'only one of the ways in which Usener used B was unquestionably valid, and that was in the emendation of nonsense words and lacunae, in passages where the text of B is otherwise similar to that of C'.

70 See above p. 128 and nn. 47 and 48.

71 See above p. 125 and n. 39.

72 See Usener 1869: 47-48, whose interventions on the text of C I reproduce; one should remember that B (Bernensis 45, the second witness of the *Commenta* used by Usener) does not preserve this scholium.

quadam contentione vacari, quod antiquissimus poeta adfirmat dicens natura naturam vincit et dii deos.	qu<a>e bella c<a>edes et has ceteras rerum varietates <adferant>, adfirmantes i<n>ter has inferiores virtutes et superiores mundum <in> quo habitamus quadam contentione vagari. Quod antiquissimus poeta adfirmat dicens 'natura naturam vincit et dii deos'.
--	--

The two annotations are clearly the same, even if there are a few textual discrepancies (in particular, *E* seems to show a slightly simplified structure). The point is that, from the perspective of a future editor of the *Commenta Bernensia*, the “new” testimony of *E* allows Usener’s text to be surpassed on several points: so, for example, *confusione quadam* is probably good enough to live with, without the addition of <e>; Bernays’ emendation *malignis plenum esse virtutibus* for *C*’s senseless *poenum* finds a solid base against Usener’s own correction *poenam*;⁷³ *C*’s text *mundum quod habitamus* should most probably be restored looking at *E*’s *quem* instead of following Usener’s solution *in quo*;⁷⁴ and, above all, the integration *adferant* after *ceteras rerum varietates* is greatly weakened in the face of *peragunt* of the *Erlangensis* 389.⁷⁵

Precisely because of the fluidity of these materials, however, and because of the difficulty of determining what can be considered *Commenta Bernensia* and what cannot, it is not easy to decide to what extent we can use *E* to heal the failures or implement the text of *C*. Here are two tricky examples:

73 Bernays conjectured *plenum* (and we can say, now, rightly so) on the basis of the parallel expression *plenum quietis et luminis* (see Usener 1869: 47 *ad loc.*).

74 Consider, a few lines earlier, *regnum quod habitamus* (with transitive *habito*), which is probably the reason of *C*’s error as well: in the manuscript the two *quod* are both at the end of a line, the first two lines above the second, and it is most likely that the former deceived the eye of the scribe by prompting him to change *quem* to *quod*.

75 I say ‘greatly weakened’ and not ‘overcome once and for all’ because, since *E* is missing *adfirmantes* after *peragunt*, we don’t know what the scribe was copying and therefore we cannot rule out that Usener was eventually right: theoretically speaking, it is possible that, while *C* lost *adferant* before *adfirmantes* because of homeoarchon (this is probably what Usener was thinking about by integrating *adferant*), *E* lost both because of a slip of the eye, and *peragunt* is nothing but the scribe’s guess to give back a verb to the sentence.

Ad Lucan. 8.53 *Quid perdis tempora luctus? Cum possis iam flere, times:*
 Timor de incerto est, luctus de certo, ille de futuro, hic de praeterito
 (E, f. 102v)

Timor de incerto est, luctus de certo
 (*Commenta Bernensia*, see Usener 1869: 257)

Ad Lucan. 8.90 *me pronuba ducit Erinys:*
 Infaustis nuptiis iungit Herinem, cum Lucina praesit felicibus
 (E, f. 103r)

Infaustis nubtiis iungit
 (*Commenta Bernensia*, see Usener 1869: 259)

It is clear that the two manuscripts hand down the same scholia, and in both cases the textual overlap is, in their opening section, perfect. But what is the original version of the two annotations? Is it C that preserved the older form, which E contaminated by adding heterogeneous material, or is the fuller version the genuine one, which was shortened by the Bernensis 370? I do not think there is only one answer to this question. While in these two cases the strong syntactic consistency of the longer versions seems to suggest that E represents an older stage in their textual history, at the same time before choosing a new editor of the *Commenta Bernensia* should preliminarily decide which text they are editing. A 'conservative' idea of the textual arrangement of the *Commenta Bernensia*, limited perhaps to the Bernensis 370 alone, as I would personally suggest, would greatly limit the effective use of a witness such as Erlangensis 389; but there is absolutely no question that any future editor of medieval scholia to Lucan will have to give the utmost consideration to what was, perhaps, the manuscript on which Pope Sylvester II based his Rheims lectures on the *Bellum Civile*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Beck, F. 1900. *Untersuchungen zu den Handschriften Lucans*. München.
- Cavajoni, G.A. 1975. 'Scholia inediti a Lucano del Codex Bernensis litt. 45 saec. X' *ACME* 28, 79-114.
- Cavajoni, G.A. (ed.) 1979-90. *Supplementum adnotationum super Lucanum*, 3 vols. Milano-Amsterdam.
- de Meyier, K.A. 1975. *Codices Vossiani Latini*, 2 vols. Leiden.
- De Nonno, M. 2017. 'Vetustas e antiquitas, veteres e antiqui nei grammatici latini' in S. Rocchi & C. Mussini (eds.) *Imagines Antiquitatis: Representations, Concepts, Receptions of the Past in Roman Antiquity and the Early Italian Renaissance*. Berlin & Boston, 213-47.
- Endt, J. 1906. 'Zur Überlieferung der Adnotationes super Lucanum' *Zweihunddreßigster Jahresbericht des k. k. deutschen Staatsgymnasiums in Smichow, veröffentlicht am Schlusse des Schuljahres 1905-1906*, Smichow.
- Endt, J. (ed.) 1909. *Adnotationes super Lucanum*. Stuttgart.
- Fischer, H. 1928. *Katalog der Handschriften der Universitätsbibliothek Erlangen. I. Band: die lateinischen Pergamenthandschriften*. Erlangen.
- Francken, C.M. (ed.) 1896-97. *M. Annaei Lucani Pharsalia*. 2 vols. Lugduni Batavorum.
- Genthe, H. (ed.) 1868. *Scholia vetera in M. Annaei Lucani bellum civile, Hermannus Genthius e codice Montepessulano H. 113 edidit emendavit commentario instruxit*. Berolini.
- Genthe, A. 1894. *De Lucani codice Erlangensi*. Ienae.
- Gotoff, H.C. 1971. *The Transmission of the Text of Lucan in the Ninth Century*. Cambridge, MA.
- Hoffmann, H. 1995. *Bamberger Handschriften des 10. und des 11. Jahrhunderts*. Hannover.
- Homburger, O. 1962. *Die illustrierten Handschriften der Burgerbibliothek Bern*. Vol. I. Bern.
- Hosius, C. (ed.) 1913. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem*, 3rd ed. Lipsiae.
- Housman, A.E. (ed.) 1927. *M. Annaei Lucani Belli civilis libri decem*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Irmischer, J.C. 1852. *Handschriften-Katalog der königlichen Universitäts-Bibliothek zu Erlangen*. Frankfurt a.M. & Erlangen.

- Lake, J. 2013. 'Gerbert of Aurillac and the Study of Rhetoric in Tenth-Century Rheims' *The Journal of Medieval Latin* 23, 49-85.
- Munk Olsen, B. 1985. *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, vol. II: *Catalogue des manuscrits classiques latins copies du IXe au XIIe siècle: Livius - Vitruvius, Florileges - Essais de plume*. Paris.
- Munk Olsen, B. 2014. *L'étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XIe et XIIe siècles*, vol. IV.2: *La réception de la littérature classique. Manuscrits et textes*. Paris.
- Passalacqua, M. 1990. 'Gerberto di Reims e il codice Erlangen, Universitätsbibliothek 380' in *Dicti studiosus: Scritti di filologia offerti a Scevola Mariotti dai suoi allievi*. Urbino, 323-27.
- Passalacqua, M. 1994. 'Un papa e tre codici (Silvestro II ed Erlangen, Universitätsbibl., 380; Bamberg, Staatsbibl., Misc. Class. 25; Bamberg, Staatsbibl., Hist. 5)' *Scriptorium* 48, 147-52.
- Passalacqua, M. 1996. 'Lupo di Ferrières, Gerberto di Aurillac e il De oratore' *Materiali e discussioni per l'analisi dei testi classici* 36, 225-28.
- Porro, A. 1986. 'Prisciano e le "Adnotationes super Lucanum"' *Aevum* 60, 193-97.
- Quain, E.A. 1945. 'The Medieval accessus ad auctores' *Traditio* 3, 215-64.
- Spallone, M. 1990. 'I percorsi medievali del testo: accessus, commentari, florilegi' in G. Cavallo, P. Fedeli & A. Giardina (eds.) *Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica*. Vol. III. Roma, 387-471.
- Stoppacci, P. 2016. *Clavis Gerbertiana. Gerbertus Aureliacensis*. Firenze.
- Theander, C., M. Inguanez & C.J. Fordyce (eds.) 1965. *Glossaria Latina iussu Academiae Britannicae edita*. Vol. V: *Abba, Aa*. Hildesheim.
- Usener, H. (ed.) 1869. *Scholia in Lucani Bellum Ciuile: Pars prior: Commenta Bernensia*. Leipzig.
- Weber, C.F. (ed.) 1831. *Marci Annaei Lucani Pharsalia, volumen tertium. Continens scholiastas*. Leipzig.
- Werner, S. 1994. 'On the History of the Commenta Bernensia and Adnotationes super Lucanum' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 96, 343-68.
- Werner, S. 1998. *The Transmission and Scholia to Lucan's Bellum Ciuile*. Münster.
- Wessner P. 1921. 'Bericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der lateinischen Grammatiker mit Einschluß der Scholienliteratur und

Glossographie für 1901-1907' *Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft* 188, 34-254.

Wheeler, S.M. (ed.) 2015. *Accessus ad Auctores: Medieval Introductions to the Authors (Codex latinus monacensis 19475)*. Kalamazoo.