STUDIES ON THE TEXT OF THE BELLUM ALEXANDRINUM (STBA)

I WILL POST SOMETHING ON THE CRUX IN 7.2 HERE IN DUE COURSE (CD)

WE ALSO NEED NOTES ON THE PROBLEMS AT 17.6, 22.2, 25.2, 26.1(x2), 27.5

**2.4-5 (Dallas Simons; lightly tweaked by CD 11/20/2015)**

Omnibus uiis atque angiportis triplicem uallum obduxerant — erat autem quadrato extructus saxo neque minus XL pedes altitudinis habebat — quaeque partes urbis inferiores erant, has altissimis turribus denorum tabulatorum munierant. (5) Praeterea alias ambulatorias totidem tabulatorum confixerant subiectisque eas rotis funibus iumentisque †obiectis† derectis plateis in quamcumque erat uisum partem mouebant.1

5 confixerant *ω* (*cf. BG 3.13.4*): confinxerant *Davis* *coll. Plin. NH 10.93* : confecerant *Ϛ* *teste Oudendorp* (*cf. 13.4*) **|**  obiectis *secl. Scaliger* : subiunctis *Cornelissen* *coll. Col. 6.2.8* : adiectis *Castiglioni* (*cf. 28.3*): obtectis *dubitanter Klotz* (*cf. BC 3.19.7*): *an* iunctis (*cf. Vitr. 10.2.14*) *uel* adiunctis (*cf. 27.7 et Gel. 20.1.28*)*?*

The word *obiectis* is the central issue of this passage and its authenticity has long been questioned. It appears in the archetype, but Scaliger thought it must be deleted. Others have offered emendations, but none of the suggestions is particularly compelling or well paralleled.

The word occurs in a description of the impressive military towers that the Alexandrians have assembled (or thought up), which can be moved throughout the city. The compound sentence has two main verbs: first the Alexandrians *confixerant* the *ambulatorias*, and then they *mouebant* *eas* (*ambulatorias*) by placing wheels under them and using a system involving ropes and pack animals. The sentence contains a concatenation of ablative phrases: first there is an ablative absolute (*subiectis … rotis*), then either another ablative absolute or an ablative of instrument, and finally an ablative of place (*derectis plateis*).

First, one must consider whether to delete *obiectis* (making *funibus iumentisque* an instrumental ablative, “by means of ropes and pack animals”) or whether there must be a word in that position (making *funibus iumentisque -is* an absolute absolute, “with ropes and pack animals attached”). The verb *moveo* in Caesar is most often used in the idiom *movere castra* (cf. *BG* 1.39.7, 2.2.6, etc.) or in similar phrases involving the movement of troops or the changing of location (cf. *BG* 3.15.3, etc.). Many times *moveo* is used in the passive voice, when someone is figuratively moved by something (cf. *BG* 7.76.2, *BC* 1.4.2, etc.). Caesar otherwise does not use an ablative of instrument with *moveo* – nobody ever “moves” any other object “by means of” something else. This is a usage with few parallels in Latin (more generally, see *TLL* 8.1540.47-60). In the passive *moveo* can be used with an ablative of instrument (cf. Cic. *Phil. 9.14,* something moved *nulla vi*); towers in particular are moved forward in sieges (cf. *BG 2.31.1, Curt. 4.6.9*). The best parallel for an active *moveo* with an object and an ablative of instrument – also with a rope, as it turns out – is from Propertius (cf. Prop. 4.11.51 *tu, quae tardam movisti fune Cybeben*). Because of the lack of good parallels for this usage, it seems prudent to proceed with the assumption that a word is needed where the text reads *obiectis* in order to form a second ablative absolute.

If *obiectis* is not an interpolation, it is easy to see how it crept into the text: the original word was lost in the confusion of the many ablative plurals surrounding it, and the scribe, perhaps inspired by *subiectis* a few words earlier, wrote down the linguistically and paleographically similar *obiectis*. In the first place, *obiectis* is objectionable because it makes little sense given the context. If pack animals are pulling towers by ropes, it wouldn't make sense for the pack animals to have been "placed opposite” the towers, “in front of” the towers, or “in the way of” the towers. It seems likely that the word has an ablative plural ending, and since a verb form is required to make an ablative absolute work here, all of the emendations are ablative plural perfect passive participles.

Castiglioni emends to *adiectis*, and paleographically the switch from *obiectis* to *adiectis* is plausible. This would give the sense of “to fasten upon” or “to add to.” Forms of *adicere* occur nine times in Caesar, but it usually means to add on or adjoin something abstract or to describe geographical space. *adiectis* here would imply that the animals are added on to a larger contraption, which doesn't yield perfect sense. Klotz proposes *obtectis* to describe the animals, which would be “covered” or “protected.” Caesar uses *obtectus* to refer to military protection, and this usage would mean that the pack animals are shielded from opposing attack. The context of this line does not necessitate this idea.

The most frequent parallels in situations where pack animals are towing something contain the uncompounded verb *iungere*. There are two potential problems with an emendation based on *iungere*. First, *iungere* is not a compound form, and it seems less likely that an uncompounded word would be replaced by a compound. *iunctis* has an 'n' and lacks an 'e' and thus is paleographically further removed from *obiectis*. Second, *iungere* more often refers to joining animals to one another rather than to other objects. However, the verb is well paralleled with *iumentum* (cf. Nepos *Timol.* 4.2, cf. Varro *RR* 1.52.1, cf. Servius *Aen.* 3.537) and in one case from Vitruvius oxen are joined to one another and led by a rope (cf. Vitr. 10.2.14 *bubus iunctis funem ducebant*).

It may be paleographically more plausible for the original to have been a compound of *unctis*. Cornelissen proposed *subiunctis*, making the ropes and pack animals affixed or subjoined. He cites as parallels a line from Columella in which bullocks are attached to a plow (Col. 6.2.8 *uacuo plostro subiungendi*)and by a line from Virgil's *Eclogues* in which tigers are joined to a chariot (Virg. *Ecl.* 5.29 *curru subiungere tigres*). *subiungere* clearly means “to yoke,” which isn't an ideal parallel considering the towers that they are moving and the use of ropes. The form *adiunctis* would also give the sense of joining to or yoking, and it is used to refer to yoking cattle, although generally in poetry. Aulus Gellius uses *adiunctis* absolutely with *iumenta* (Gel. 20.1.28 *vectaculum ... quod adiunctis pecoribus trahebatur*) and Horace uses it, jokingly, to describe yoking mice to a cart (Hor. *Sat*. 2.3.247 *plostello adiungere mures*). Forms of *adiungere* appear eight times in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and thirteen times in Caesar (as opposed to none in either for *subiungere* and zero and six, respectively, for *iungere*); in none of the other passages does it describe affixing something to an object. The prevalence of *adiungere* and its compound form make it the most plausible of the emendations based on *iungere*.

The reader is confronted by a sea of ablatives and a bevy of similar compound participles, none of which seems much more elucidating than any other. It seems best to leave *obiectis* in its imperfection with the understanding that the sense at least is clear, even if the verb is not.

1 They had blocked off all the roads and alleyways with a triple wall – it was built with square stones and was at least forty feet high – and they fortified the lowest parts of the city with very tall towers, each with ten stories. In addition, they had erected moveable towers with the same number of stories. These were mounted on wheels and they moved them with ropes and pack animals †attached† on level streets into whichever area of the city they wanted.

**12.1 (Tom Vozar; lightly tweaked 11/22/2015 by CD)**

Eo detrimento adeo sunt fracti Alexandrini, cum iam non uirtute propugnatorum, sed scientia classiariorum se uictos uiderent, †quibus et superioribus locis subleuabantur, ut ex aedificiis defendi possent† et materiam cunctam obicerent, quod nostrae classis oppugnationem etiam ad terram uerebantur.1

*ante* quibus *lacunam statuit Davies, post* quibus *Nipperdey* | ex] uix *Manutius* : uix ex *Dinter* (*u. et infra*)| locis] temporibus *dubitanter Kübler* | quibus ... possent]ut uix ex aed- def- posse se confiderent, qui- et sup- loc- subleu- *transposuit et emendauit Dinter* | possent] posse se confiderent *Dinter* (*u. et supra*)

STATE THE PROBLEM.

For *quibus*, where the sense falls apart, Rhellicanus, for example,apparently understood [*a*?] *classiariis Caesarianis*, which would mean we are to understand that the Alexandrians “were supported by [from?] the Caesarean marines and by their higher positions.” Similarly (FIX), if we take *ut...possent* as the expected result clause following *adeo sunt fracti*, the meaning would be, effectively, that the Alexandrians were made so dispirited by their loss *that they were able to defend themselves*. Manutius’ reading of *vix* for *ex* blunts the absurdity of the latter – the result is then rather that they were “scarcely” able to defend themselves – but the problem with *quibus* remains.

Davies was the first to postulate a lacuna in the text; he located it before *quibus*. Nipperdey put the lacuna after *quibus*, which subsequent editors have preferred. These editors assume that the missing text elaborated on something in the *cum* clause; it seems to me just as likely that *quibus* is parallel to *superioribus locis*.

It is difficult to guess, much less know, the content of the lacuna. Andrieu asserts that the missing text “avait sans doute quelque étendue,” describing the organization of the Eunostos harbor and perhaps their fortifications.2 That is plausible; I would rather appeal however to the *lex parsimoniae*, preferring something like Dinter's conjecture, which is worth spelling out and translating for clarity:

[adeo sunt fracti Alexandrini]...ut vix ex aedificiis defendi posse se confiderent, quibus et superioribus locis sublevabantur...

[The Alexandrians were so shattered...] that they scarcely trusted that they were able to be defended from the buildings, from which, as well as from their higher positions, they derived support...

As Larsen says, “verum hac tanta licentia locum sanari non posse, omnes statim intellegent.” REFERENCE NEEDED Yet what Dinter provides for us here is what Paul Mass called a diagnostic conjecture, "a conjecture which, while no one can feel confident that it is right, serves the purpose of indicating the kind of sense that is really required.”3 Thus while I refrain from adopting Dinter's conjecture in the text, I feel it is essential to report this in the apparatus so as to do exactly that – to indicate to the reader the kind of sense that is really required – and in the text itself, motivated by Dinter, I have daggered the whole section from *quibus* to *possent*, which I think best indicates the possible extent of the corruption.

DISCUSS THE CONTRIBUTION OF KÜBLER'S temporibus.

IT WOULD BE BETTER TO ADOPT A FAUTE DE MIEUX REPAIR. MOST OF THE WORDS HERE ARE FINE, IT'S JUST THAT THAT DON'T COHERE PERFECTLY.

1 “The Alexandrians were so crushed by this defeat, since they now saw themselves conquered not by the courage of the fighters, but by the skill of the mariners, \*by which and by the higher places they were supported, that they could be defended from the buildings\* and throw together all the timber [as a barrier], as they feared the assault of our fleet as well as on land.”

2 Andrieu, 1954, *Guerre d'Alexandrie*, Paris: 12 n. 2.

3 M.L. West, 1973, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique*, Stuttgart: 58.

**13.5 (Tom Vozar; lightly tweaked by CD on 11/22/2015)**

Caesar Rhodias naues VIIII habebat—nam decem missis una in cursu litore Aegyptio defecerat—Ponticas VIII, Lycias V, ex Asia XII.1

<de> decem *dubitanter Larsen* (*u. TLL 5.1.58.74-59.28***) |** litore *ω* (*cf. BG 4.23.6*): <in> l- *Nipperdey* (*cf. 17.5*) : <sub> l- *Larsen coll. BG 5.57.3* : *secl. Dinter* | defecerat *ω* (*cf. Verg. Aen. 6.354*) : decesserat *Ciacconius teste Oudendorp coll. BC 3.112.3* (*sed u. Davies*): desederat *Siesbye teste Larsen* | Lycias] <Syrias \*\*\* Ci>licias *Schneider coll. 1.1 sed u. Mitchell 234-37*

The text enumerates the naval forces that Caesar had under his command at the beginning of the battle in the Eunostos harbor of Alexandria in 47 BCE.

The *nam* clause has drawn the most critical attention, though it is perfectly comprehensible, if somewhat awkward. I see no reason to doubt the transmitted reading *decem missis*; Larsen adds *de* because the ablative absolute seems *durior* to him.

The reading of *in* *cursu litore Aegyptio* is more disputable. Dinter prefers to read *in cursu Aegyptio*; the adjectival demonym with *in cursu* is unparalleled, though not uncommon with *litus* (cf., e.g., Cic. *Sest*. 140 *in litore Dyrrachino*). Nipperdey and Larsen propose adding *in* and *sub* respectively before *litore*, but in defense of the paradosis I would point to Caes. *BG* 4.23.6 *aperto ac plano litore naues constituit,* where the bare ablative has a locative function and, as it appears from the context (Caesar's ships cannot land on the beaches), does not signify the shore itself but the inshore waters.2 (Perhaps we are to understand that the lost Rhodian ship ran aground upon the treacherous *uada Aegyptia* mentioned at 14.5 and Luc. 8.540?) The peculiarity of *deficere* for a ship “foundering” is highlighted by the fact that its nearest parallel is Verg. *Aen*. 6.354, where Palinurus tells Aeneas he fears less for himself than that *tua ...* / *deficeret tantis nauis surgentibus undis* – but it requires no emendation and seems to me an unlikely error.3 [ADD A COMMENT HERE ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY THAT DEFICERE WOULD BE TAKEN TO MEAN "DEFECT"? TLL 5.1.327.79-328.7]

In addition to these points there is also a textual problem of some historical consequence. Scholars were content with the transmitted reading *l(i/y)(c/t)ias = Lycias* until Schneider proposed the emendation *Cilicias*, with the addition of some unknown number after *Syrias*, citing 1.1 as evidence: *Caesar Rhodo atque ex Syria Ciliciaque omnem classem arcessit*. Many editors have found this convincing: Schneider's conjecture has since been adopted by Kübler, Klotz, and Andrieu, among others.

What is immediately clear, and should make us wary of accepting Schneider's conjecture too readily, is that, with or without the conjecture, the list at 1.1 does not correspond to that at 13.5: in the former, the sources for Caesar's fleet are given as Rhodes, Syria, and Cilicia; in the latter, the ships are from Rhodes, Pontus, and Asia, along with whatever the lemma in question represents.

We should take notice of the report at *BC* 3.106.1 that Caesar *cum ... nauibus longis Rhodiis X et Asiaticis paucis Alexandriam peruenit*. If Caesar arrived in Alexandria with these ten Rhodian ships, then summoned more from Rhodes (1.1), at the time of the harbor battle he would have had more than the nine Rhodian ships reported in 13.5. Barwick adduced this discrepancy as evidence against the analytical interpretation of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*;4 Rice Holmes suspected that Hirtius' (*sic*) text at 1.1 was simply “a mistake.”5

A much more plausible reading, however, is to understand 1.1 as referring to reinforcements which had been ordered but had not yet arrived at the time of the battle; the *decem missis* of 13.5 thus refers to the ten Rhodian ships said to have come with Caesar at *BC* 3.106.1.6 This would explain why the forces of 13.5 differ from those of 1.1, and provide grounds for rejecting Schneider's attempt to smooth over these differences.

Some have also defended the paradosis with reference to 14.1-2, where Caesar is said to have positioned the Rhodian ships on his right flank and the Pontic ships on his left, while the rest were set behind them as reserves. The logic is that, reading the paradosis, each of the ships on Caesar's flanks would have exactly one assigned to it as a reserve, with nine Rhodian and eight Pontic ships (=17) supported by five Lycian and twelve Asian ships (=17). “Trop séduisante,” notes Andrieu, but only a minimum of 34 ships is necessary: the text does not require a one-to-one correspondence.7

That argument aside, the case thus far for maintaining the paradosis is a strong one. There remains one important question to answer: is there anything inherently implausible in Caesar having a handful of ships from Lycia? Lycia, granted, is nowhere else mentioned in the Caesarean corpus, and Townend, for one, finds the paradosis objectionable "since Lycia was not a Roman province at this time."8 That however does not preclude the possibility of raising ships from Lycia; according to Cicero *Att*. 9.9.2 Lycia was one of the sources for Pompey's fleet just a few years earlier. Moreover, a recently published Greek inscription on bronze shows that Caesar presided over the negotiation of a generous treaty with the Lycians in 46 BCE, which several historians have interpreted as a reward for the contingent of ships that Lycia sent to Egypt (apparently giving no thought to Schneider's conjecture).9

In sum, it appears that the basis of Schneider's conjecture is unreliable at best, and that the paradosis, far from being historically objectionable, may actually serve to explicate the condition of Roman-Lycian relations in the time of Caesar.

1 “Caesar had nine Rhodian ships – for, ten having been sent, one of them in its passage foundered on the Egyptian coastline – eight Pontic ships, five Lycian, twelve from Asia.”

2 See *TLL* 7.2.1537.52ff.

3 R. G. Austin, 1986, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, Oxford, ad loc. cites 13.5 as a parallel for the Vergil passage.

4 K. Barwick, 1938, *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*, Leipzig: 180 n. 1.

5 T. Rice Holmes, 1923, *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire Vol. 3*, Oxford: 484 n. 7.

6 See J. F. Gaertner and B. Hausburg, 2013, *Caesar and the Bellum Alexandrinum*, Göttingen, 51-52, citing also P. Graindor, 1931, *La guerre d'Alexandrie*, Cairo: 29-30: 101.

7 Andrieu, 1954, *Guerre d'Alexandrie*, Paris: lviii-lix.

8 Townend, 1988, *Caesar's War in Alexandria*, Bristol: 44.

9 *Editio princeps* and discussion in S. Mitchell, 2005, "The Treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS2070)," *Papyri Graecae Schøyen (P. Schøyen I)*, ed. R. Pintaudi, Florence: 161-259, with reference to the position of Lycia and the ships sent to Egypt at 234-37; both P. Sánchez, 2007 "La convention judiciaire dans le traité conclu entre Rome et les Lyciens (P.Schøyen I 25)," *Chiron* 37 363-381 at 364 and Isaías Arrayás Morales, 2010, "Diplomacy in the Greek Poleis of Asia Minor: Mytilene's Embassy to Tarraco," *C&M* 61: 127-149, at 133 n. 19 also point to the Lycian ships in connection with the treaty.