
BELLUM ALEXANDRINUM

Edited By
Cynthia Damon, et al.

Society for Classical Studies

Library of Digital Latin Texts

Samuel J. Huskey, General Editor

Volume 1

2022



Digital **Latin** Library

The Digital Latin Library

650 Parrington Oval, Carnegie Building 101, Norman,
OK 73071, USA

The Digital Latin Library publishes the *Library of Digital Latin Texts* under the authority of The University of Oklahoma. Individual volumes are reviewed and sponsored by the Society for Classical Studies, the Medieval Academy of America, or the Renaissance Society of America, depending on the era of the text(s).

Volumes are published under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International Licence (CC BY-SA 4.0):
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/legalcode>.

© Cynthia Damon, et al., 2022.

Acknowledgments

- TEI XML encoding: Samuel J. Huskey.
- Programming for automatic generation of TEI XML: Virginia K. Felkner.
- Coauthor of content related to section 2.5: Dallas Simons.
- Coauthor of content related to sections 12.1–2 and 13.5: Tom Vozar.
- Coauthor of content related to section 26.1–2: Marcie Persyn.
- Coauthor of content related to sections 35.3 and 36.4–5: Maria Kovalchuk.
- Coauthor of content related to sections 47.2, 49.1, and 49.2–3: Tim Warnock.
- Coauthor of content related to section 60.2: Isabella Reinhardt.
- Coauthor of content related to sections 63.5 and 66.3–4: Brian Credo.

- Coauthor of content related to sections 67.1 and 68.1: Amelia Bensch-Schaus.
- Coauthor of content related to sections 72.2–3 and 74.4: Wes Hanson.

Contents

Preface	iii
Why a new edition of the <i>Bellum Alexandrinum</i> ? . . .	iv
What is New?	v
I. The <i>Bellum Alexandrinum</i>	viii
II. Constituting the text	x
A. The stemma	x
B. The witnesses	x
III. Using this edition	xxvii
A. Text	xxviii
B. Critical apparatus	xxxii
C. Appendix critica	xxxix
Additional materials in the LDLT edition:	xl
Studies on the Text of the <i>Bellum Alexan-</i> <i>drinum</i>	xl
Transcriptions of the manuscript witnesses (MUSTV)	xli
Translation	xlii
Conspectus editionum	xlii
Acknowledgements	xliii
Bibliography	xlvi
Manuscripts	xlvii

Early Editions	1
Modern Editions	li
Other Sources	lvi
List of People Cited by Name	lxv
Abbreviations and Other Notations	lxviii
 Conspectus Editionum	 lxix
 Bellum Alexandrinum	 1
 Appendix critica	 91
 Studies on the Text	 124
2.5	124
7.2–3	131
12.1–2	140
13.5	150
17.1–3	157
22.1–2	169
26.1–2	182
27.5	200
31.3	212
35.3	216
36.4–5	224
40.2	233

46.1	243
47.2	247
49.1	250
49.2–3	256
60.2	267
63.5	276
66.3–4	283
67.1	293
68.1	304
72.2–3	308
74.4	319

Bellum Alexandrinum

Cynthia Damon, et al.

P R E F A C E

This edition of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, a text of unknown authorship belonging to the *Corpus Caesarianum*, is the product of collaborations involving nearly 100 people. The text and critical apparatus were prepared under Cynthia Damon's direction by students at the University of Pennsylvania between 2014 and 2019, as were the supplementary materials included in this edition: detailed textual notes on difficult passages (*Studies on the Text of the Bellum Alexandrinum*), an appendix of singular readings (the Appendix critica), folio-by-folio transcriptions of the five manuscript witnesses used in the constitution of the text, and a translation. Damon converted the apparatus into a spreadsheet, and the LDLT team led by Sam Huskey at the University of Oklahoma converted both the text and the apparatus into the machine-readable form that underlies the version you are reading, either at the interactive LDLT website or as an on-demand .pdf. Damon and Huskey wrote this preface.¹

¹The processes summarized here have been the subject of several talks at the annual meeting of the Society for Classical Studies and will be described more fully in Damon and Huskey (in preparation).

Why a new edition of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*?

There are two answers to that question. The traditional answer is that the discoveries that underpin Damon's recent critical edition of Caesar's *Civil War* (Oxford, 2015) should also be used to reassess the text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, which rests on the same manuscript witnesses.² But the real answer is that in the digital era we urgently need new editors, and that creating an edition such as this is an excellent way to expose students to the editing process. The next generation of critical editions, *digital* critical editions, can improve significantly on past editions, but only if there is a next generation of editors who possess the skills required for bringing them to fruition. That is why students, both graduate and undergraduate, have been involved in every step of this edition's preparation, from collating manuscripts to encoding the edition's data in XML according to the LDLT's guidelines. Their training has blended the methods of traditional textual criticism with digital humanities approaches

²OUP site: <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/ciuli-caesaris-commentarii-de-bello-civili-bellum-civile-or-civil-war-9780199659746?cc=us&lang=en&>.

to texts as data. The goal has been to prepare the next generation of editors to work on a digital paradigm.

What is New?

The text and apparatus:

As can be seen from the Conspectus editionum, our text differs from that of Andrieu 1954, which we used as our base text, in nearly 100 places. Eleven of these changes are a consequence of the new stemma, in which the manuscript that differs the most from the rest, S, is treated as a witness to the hyparchetype nu rather than as an independent witness to the archetype.³ In fifty-three places we print the archetype (or a possibly archetypal reading) where other editors emend it.⁴ We print thirteen new emendations and

³42.2 exercitus alendos, 49.2 causae, 57.3 †in†, 60.1 educerentur, 60.3 animaduenteret, 61.6 sibi usui, 62.1 auxiliares, 62.2 Marcello fauebant, 64.3 drectam, 66.1 praefecit, 66.5 inceptum. See further the lists in Damon 2015b, 46 (note 93) and 48 (note 99).

⁴1.5 expectans, 7.2 casum, 7.2 ut ... absumeretur, 8.2 Paratonio, 10.2 accessissent, 10.2 exposuissent, 12.3 miserant, 12.4 Caesaris, 13.5 Lycias, 13.5 et, 14.1 Rhodios, 14.1 Ponticos, 14.1 hos, 16.1 uictis, 19.2 certiozem, 20.4 perturbatos, 26.2 adducit, 26.2 multiplici praesidio, 27.5 constantiaque, 27.7 adiuncti his, 31.3 partibus, 32.1 magnae, 33.5 itinere terrestri, 36.5 siue amicus siue inimicus, 40.2 aperto, 42.3 Iaderti-

propose a number of others.⁵ We also revive fourteen.⁶ In the process of our work we silently corrected dozens of errors in the apparatus of Andrieu 1954 and Klotz 1927. More broadly, we hope to have improved the apparatus everywhere by making the arguments relevant to the consti-

norum, 48.3 minuebat, 49.1 in ea, 51.2 uoluntate, 51.3 describerentur, 53.4 Laterensis, 54.3 indicaretur, 55.1 cohortibus, 55.5 Q. Sestio, 56.2 temporum, 56.2 animus, 57.1 Leptim, 59.1 detraxerunt, 60.1 educerentur, 60.2 esset ², 60.5 educit, 61.6 sibi usui, 64.3 drectam, 66.1 legionibus, 66.1 praefecit, 66.5 inceptum, 67.1 Caesaris, 68.1 defensionem, 68.2 natura, 70.8 si, 72.2 superioribus ... oppido, 75.1 operibus, 78.2 quod.

⁵11.2 ⟨suorum⟩ *Khan*, 15.3 ⟨moram⟩ *Lewis*, 16.2 ⟨exercitus⟩ *scripsimus*, 17.2 ⟨et hanc⟩ et illam [urbem] *scripsimus*, 35.3 ⟨constat⟩ *scripsimus*, 44.4 has adiunxit *scripsimus*, 60.3 animaduverteret causa *Reinhardt*, 61.4 adductus *scripsimus*, 62.1 auxiliares *scripsimus*, 67.1 ⟨et coactus⟩ *Bensch-Schaus*, 73.3 aggerere tum *scripsimus*, 74.3 contemptione *scripsimus*, 75.1 operibus reuocat *Naqvi*. Emendations proposed but not printed: 20.3 ⟨et⟩ sine ratione *Callaghan*, 26.2 ⟨gap⟩ adducit *Persyn*, 27.5 Mithridates [magna cum prudentia] *D. Simons*, 57.1 adducebatur *J. Simons*, 58.1 ueteranas *J. Simons*. There are also more than 40 new suggestions introduced at the end of apparatus notes with the formulas *an ... ?* or *nisi mauis*.

⁶2.1 ⟨armatorum⟩ *Fischer*, 7.2 esse *Nipperdey*, 15.8 ⟨nisi⟩ qui *Fleischer*, 17.3 quosque *Lipsius*, 25.1 Caesaris praesidia *ed. pr.*, 36.5 aduentu sin *Hoffmann*, 40.2 circumire ac transcendere *Nipperdey*, 42.2 exercitus alendos *M.*, 45.2 distentis *Hoffmann*, 49.2 simul et *Latinius*, 55.1 legionem quintam in castra remittit *ed. pr.*, 58.1 Torius ζ, 70.4 quamquam *Dinter*, 74.4 in procliuem *Nipperdey*.

tution of the text more salient and more explicit (see further below for our policy on apparatus notes).

The machine-readable form:

From the layout of the page to the typographical conventions used to represent manuscripts and other details about the text, traditional critical editions in print rely on complex visual cues to communicate information to readers who understand how to read and interpret those cues. For the most part, that information is inaccessible to a different type of reader: machines that can process and visualize information. If that information is presented in a way that both humans and machines can read and interpret, we can leverage the computational power of machines to open up new ways of exploring texts.

This is the first “born digital” edition of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*. It is encoded in Extensible Markup Language (XML) according to the guidelines of the LDLT. That means that the typographical conventions familiar to readers of traditional editions will still be rendered on screen or paper in their familiar form, but machines can also recognize them as more than just strings of characters. Rather, what a human reads as a crux (†), a machine can read in

its own language. That is why this edition can be read in an online viewing platform, visualized with any number of data visualization tools, queried like a database, or rendered in a traditional form as a print-ready PDF.

I. The *Bellum Alexandrinum*

The work now known as the *Bellum Alexandrinum* or *War in Alexandria* was completed after the assassination of Caesar in 44 BCE, probably in connection with an attempt by Caesar's supporters to produce an edition of texts narrating Caesar's military achievements (see the Letter to Balbus prefaced to *Gallic War* 8, written by Aulus Hirtius). The title is misleading, since only the first of the five campaigns described in the work occurred in Alexandria. The Caesarian commanders and theaters of war are as follows: Caesar in Alexandria (chh. 1-33; September 48 -February 47), Domitius Calvinus in Pontus (34-41; September-October 48), Cornificius, Gabinius, and Vatinius in Illyricum (42-47; October 48 - January 47), Q. Cassius in Spain (48-64; May-December 48), Caesar in Pontus (65-78; March-May 47).⁷ None of Caesar's officers is known to have

⁷The dates (Julian) are taken from Raaflaub and Ramsey 2017.

participated in all of these overlapping campaigns. As a result, the narrative, like Caesar's own commentaries, must rest on sources written by various hands. The identity of the person who compiled these reports and turned them into a coherent narrative is unknown now and was unclear already in antiquity (Suetonius, *Jul.* 56.1). Between the copy from which Suetonius draws several excerpts and the nearly 200 medieval manuscripts that survive the history of the text is hard to discern, but it is clear that all of the surviving witnesses ultimately rest on a single copy of the text that was produced during the Carolingian period: they share significant errors that must go back to a single source. For the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, a work of just under 11,000 words, they number about 150.⁸ The most striking are the gaps (12.1, 17.3, 17.6, 22.2) and the insoluble problems (2.5 †obiectis†, 22.2 †multum†, 57.2 †noctu†, 57.3 †in†). But almost every page of the critical apparatus shows one or more spots where the reading of the archetype is not the reading in the text.

⁸The word count used by Gaertner and Hausburg is 10513 (see, e.g., 2013, 286).

II. Constituting the text

A. The stemma

The foundations of the present edition are Damon 2015a and Damon 2015b.⁹ The *Bellum Alexandrinum* rests on the same five independent manuscript witnesses as Caesar's *Bellum ciuile*. We looked for evidence that would challenge the stemma proposed for the *Bellum ciuile*, but found nothing conclusive.¹⁰ Accordingly, we used the same bipartite stemma.

B. The witnesses

⁹For a fuller discussion of the history of the text and of editorial work on the Caesarian corpus see the Preface to Damon 2015a and the first chapter of Damon 2015b.

¹⁰As was the case for the *Bellum ciuile*, the “good readings” in **S**, which have traditionally been taken as evidence of agreement in error by the hyparchetypes mu and pi and proof that they have a common ancestor, can be explained as scribal emendations. Examples are given in the description of **S** below.

¹⁰More detailed versions of the following paragraphs are given in Damon 2015a, xxii-xxvi and 2015b, 55-61.

1. The archetype

The stemma allowed us to reconstruct the text of the archetype of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* in most of the hundreds of places where the manuscripts disagree, but as was mentioned earlier, that archetype has to be emended in roughly 140 spots. Regular sources of error in the archetype include abbreviations, *scriptura continua*, and inversions. Some of the archetype's original readings seem to have been altered in such a way that both the original reading and the correction (or "correction") were visible to the scribes of the two hyparchetypes, **mu** (the common source of **M** and **U**) and **nu** (the common source of **S** and **pi**, the common source of **T** and **V**).¹¹ Disagreement among our manuscript witnesses

¹¹Possible instances can be found throughout the apparatus, but the clearest examples are these: 9.3 dediticiis *U^sSV et M^{mr}* : dedi(c/t)iis *MU^{ac}T*; 10.6 successuros *M^eUS* : successoros *M^{ac}* : succens(u/o)res *T^eV* : succensuros *T^{ac}*; 15.5 pugnae *MT^e* : pugna *UST^{ac}V^{ac}* : pugnandi *V^s*; 26.2 ibi suum *UST et M^{mr}* : suum ibi *MV*; 32.3 precari *MT^eV* : precare *UST^{ac}*; 45.1 cum Vatinius *MUV* : eum uatinium *T* : eum uatinium cum *S*; 46.2 contra illo remigante *M* (cf. *BG 7.28.1 contra ueniretur*) : contra illum remigantem *SV* : contra illo remigantem *UT*; 56.4 creabat *UST* : credebat *MV*; 57.3 ex *USV* : et *MT*; 58.3 inscriptum *UST* : scriptum *MV*; 60.4 esse *U^{ac}STV* : eum *MU^s*; 73.2 triarium *MS* : traiarium *UTV*; 74.4 in procliuem *Nipperdey* : in proelium *ST* : in bellum *V* : praeruptam in proelium *U* : in praeruptam *M*. Other examples of innovations in the

also arises from other features of the archetype, such as variant readings and glosses.¹²

2. The hyparchetypes

The hyparchetypes that transmitted the archetype's text to the extant manuscripts are hard to discern in this tradition; our work on the *Bellum Alexandrinum* turned up no new and conclusive evidence for them.¹³

a. μ Numerous innovations common to **M** and **U** are consistent with descent from a hyparchetype, **μ** . In the *BAlex* the most telling are these, where the reading in **v** is likely to be archetypal:

- 4.2 militem *STV* : milites *MU*

archetype that aim to repair the text include: 27.1 [a]; 29.3 [fluminum]; 70.3 [non]; 78.3 [legibus].

¹²Variants: 12.1 classiariorum *USTV et M supra lineam* : nauigatorum *M*; 24.1 statuit *UTV et M supra lineam* : constituit *M* (*deest S*); 27.5 prudentia *MUS V et T supra lineam* : potentia *S^{ac}T*; 34.1 prouincias *USTV et M supra lineam* : regiones *M*; 46.4 dubitabant *USTV et M supra lineam* : dubitarent *M*; 73.3 discederet *USTV et M supra lineam* : cessaret *M*. Glosses: 17.2 [urbem]; 27.5 [uirtutum ... imprudentia]; 37.3 [rex]; 46.1 [fortuna].

¹³The most suggestive evidence from the *Bellum Alexandrinum* is discussed at Damon 2015b, 34-36.

- 7.1 Alexandrini *STV*: Alexandrinis *MU*
- 16.2 qui *STV*: quis *MU*
- 19.2 certiolem *STV*: fortiolem *MU*
- 27.7 adiuncti his *STV*: adiunctis (h)iiis *MU*
- 33.2 imperia *ST*: imperio *MU*: imperiam *V*: imperium *M^{mr}*
- 37.2 cum uereretur *S*: uereretur *TV*: ueritus *MU*
- 55.3 adfectus *STV*: a(d/f)fecit *MU*
- 56.2 dolore *STV*: dolori *MU*
- 74.3 quem¹ *STV*: quem cum legione *M*: cum legione quem *U*
- 75.1 oppressus *STV*: oppressos *MU*

Significant innovations unique to **M** or **U** show that neither is descended from the other. Innovations of the sort that could not be corrected by conjecture, for example, include the following:

- 1.2 operibus *om.* **M**

- 1.2 uidentur *om.* **M**
- 2.3 in ... locis *om.* **M** (*uerba 4*)
- 9.1 negotium *om.* **M**
- 14.5 sic ... Africae *om.* **M** (*uerba 8*)
- 16.4 falleret *om.* **M**
- 17.1 ad insulam *om.* **M**
- 26.1 Caesaris *om.* **M**
- 27.5 undique *om.* **M**
- 37.5 pro uallo *om.* **M**
- 40.4 non amplius *om.* **M**
- 44.2 misit *om.* **M**
- 45.2 aduersam *om.* **M**
- 57.6 prouincia *om.* **M**
- 58.2 Pompei *om.* **M**
- 58.3 milites adeo fatebantur *om.* **M**

- 61.1 Marcellus *om.* **M**
- 63.2 Marcellus *om.* **M**
- 67.2 populi Romani *per compendia om.* **M**
- 76.1 acri *om.* **M**
- 6.3 uero *om.* **U**
- 18.4 ex his *om.* **U**
- 30.3 numero *om.* **U**
- 50.1 faceret quae *om.* **U**

As was the case in the *Bellum ciuile*, the relative lengths of these two lists suggests that **U** is a more faithful copy of **μ** than **M** is; this is borne out by other sorts of singular readings, which are far more numerous in **M** than in **U**, as can be seen in the Appendix critica.

Where **μ** and **ν** diverge, as they do more than 60 times in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, **μ** more often offers a good reading, either by conjecture or by preserving the archetype.

b. v Innovations common to **S** and **π** are consistent with descent from a hyparchetype, **v**. In the *Bellum Alexandrinum* the most telling are these, where the reading in **μ** is likely to be archetypal:

- 19.2 quod *MU* : *om. STV*
- 25.1 commeatum *MU* : commeatumque *STV*
- 44.3 non *MU* : *om. STV*
- 44.3 iusta ad *MU* : iuxta ad *STV*
- 48.2 esset *MU* : *om. STV*
- 49.2 causae *MU* : causa *STV*
- 5.3 isdem *MU* : idem *STV*
- 56.6 ut *MU* : *om. STV*
- 59.1 tamque *MU* : ta(m/n)quam *STV*
- 61.4 configeret *MU* : configere *STV*
- 68.1 frequentes *MUT* : frequenter *SV*
- 70.8 ei *MU* : *om. STV*

- 71.1 proficisceretur *STV*: proficisceretur existimabat *MU*

Significant innovations unique to **S** or **π** show that neither is descended from the other. Omissions of the sort that could not be corrected by conjecture, for example, include the following:

- 1.5 rei ... alterius *om.* **S** (*uerba* 4)
- 2.1 magnumque ... adduxerant *om.* **S** (*uerba* 12)
- 15.8 atque ... exposceret *om.* **S** (*uerba* 16)
- 17.5 constiterunt ... litore *om.* **S** (*uerba* 12)
- 19.6 pugnabatur ... (24.2) ut ad *om.* **S**
- 27.5 constantiaque ... imprudentia *om.* **S** (*uerba* 5)
- 31.1 uirum *om.* **S**
- 57.5 namque *om.* **S**
- 74.4 inanem *om.* **S**
- 8.3 qui *MUS*: *om.* **T**
- 14.1 eorum *MUS*: *om.* **TV**

- 46.4 erant *MUS* : *om. TV*
- 68.1 consul esset *M^c et uocibus perpere diuisis U* : consules
sed *M^{ac}* : consules se *S* : consules *TV non male*
- 70.5 se *MUS* : *om. TV*
- 76.1 in *MUS* : *om. TV*¹⁴

The relative number of words omitted in these two lists suggests that π is a more faithful copy of ν than \mathbf{S} is; this is borne out by other sorts of singular readings, which are vastly more numerous in \mathbf{S} than in π .

Where ν and μ diverge, ν is more often in error than μ is, either by preserving a corrupt archetype or by innovating.

c. π A large number of shared innovations both link \mathbf{T} and \mathbf{V} and separate them from the rest of the tradition, more than 50 for the *Bellum Alexandrinum*; the traditional

¹⁴Textual variation between π and μ in some of the many passages omitted by \mathbf{S} make it unlikely that these omissions were filled by contamination from the μ branch. There are also some small discrepancies between \mathbf{S} and μ in text omitted by π (see above on 68.1). It is therefore likely that in all of the passages listed above ν 's text was complete and transmitted to one of its two descendants.

siglum for the source of these innovations is π .¹⁵ The separative innovations in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* also include a handful of brief omissions (see above), and an inversion, another variety of innovation that, once made, tends to persist in an uncontaminated tradition: 35.2 suo regno *MUS* : regno suo *TV*. Finally, among the innovations unique to these two manuscripts in the *BAlex* are some two dozen that repair the corrupt archetype and, once made, are unlikely to have been removed except by accident:

- 15.8 in pugna occupatum animum habent *TV* : in pugnatioccupatum animum habent *S* : in pugna occupatum animum haberet *U* : pugna haberet occupatum animum *M^{ac}* : pugna occupatum animum haberet *M^c*
- 19.1 propior *TV* : prior *MUS*
- 22.1 accessiones *TV* : accensiones *MU* (*deest S*)
- 24.1 postulant *TV* : postulare (*sc. rex*) *MU uix recte* (*deest S*)

¹⁵Hering (1963, 40) lists six substantial omissions common to **T** and **V** in the *BG*. There is another at *BHisp* 40.2. (The relationship between **T** and **V** is the same for all fourteen books of the Caesarian corpus.)

- 66.4 sacerdotium *TV*: sacerdotum *S*: sacerdotio *MU*

For the hyparchetypes discussed above, **μ** and **ν**, it was a simple matter to show the independence of the two earliest descendants of each (**M** and **U**; **S** and **π**). This is not the case for **π**. A detailed discussion of the relationship between **T** and **V** is presented in Damon 2015b. Our work on the *Bellum Alexandrinum* turned up no new and conclusive evidence. We report the readings of T and V throughout.

3. *The extant manuscripts*

For detailed descriptions of the five manuscripts used to constitute the text see Damon 2015a, xxxiv-lxi. Here we indicate the folio numbers in each for the text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and the noteworthy innovations. Full transcriptions are available online at the LDLT website (see further below).

a. M **M** is a manuscript in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence, shelf mark Plut. lat. 68.8.¹⁶ The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 133v-143r. **M** offers some uniquely successful or meritorious innovations (those

¹⁶High quality page images of **M** can be viewed at <https://bit.ly/3HCkcSG>.

marked with an asterisk are particularly impressive¹⁷; there are of course other spots where **M** has been joined by one or another manuscript in a successful innovation):

- 11.1 *tenuerunt M : tenurunt U : terunt ST : terter V*
- 12.4 *naturale M : naturalem USTV*
- 14.5 *impeditiores M : expeditiores USTV*
- 23.1 *quo M : qui UTV (deest S)*
- 24.2 *parceret M : parceret et UTV (deest S)*
- 42.2 *exercitus alendos M : exercitum alendos UTV : exercitum alendum S*
- 43.3 *quo M : quod USTV*
- *46.2 *contra illo remigante M : contra illum remigantem SV : contra illo remigantem UT*
- *47.3 *ea M : eum USTV*
- 48.1 *animaduertere M : animum auertere USTV*

¹⁷Also noteworthy in **M**: 11.2 *conspectu (suorum) Khan : conspectu hostium M : conspectu USTV:an conspectu (omnium)?*; 48.1 *multis UTV : mutis M : mutus S*.

- 60.5 difficultatisque: difficultatesque *USTV*
- 61.4 passi *M*: pass(a)e *USTV*
- 72.2 huic *M*: hoc *USTV*

b. U **U** is a manuscript in the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana in the Vatican, shelf mark Vaticanus lat. 3324.¹⁸ The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 85r-95r. These folios contain, besides the text, a small number of brief marginal comments on content, either factual (e.g., “situs Alexandriae” 85v, “epibatis” 86v, “berones” 92r, “dinastas” “tarsus” 93v) or moral (e.g., “laus euphranoris” 87r, “mors euphranoris” 87v), along with the familiar “quaere” and “nota bene” symbols. The singular readings in **U** are far fewer than those of **M**, **S**, **T**, or **V**, as can be seen in the Appendix critica.¹⁹ The uniquely successful innovations in **U** are few and mostly cautious²⁰ (there are of course other spots

¹⁸Microfilm images are available online: https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3324.

¹⁹In the *Bellum Alexandrinum* **U** has roughly 80 singular readings listed in the Appendix critica; the approximate figures for the other manuscripts are as follows: **M** 170, **S** 260, **T** 130, **V** 165. Orthographical variants are not included in these figures.

²⁰Also noteworthy in **U**: 10.1 nudare *MSTV*: nudari *U non male*; 28.3 rex *S*: L ex *MTV*: ex *U*; 44.3 magnitudo nequaquam *Larsen* (cf. *BC*

where **U** has been joined by one or another manuscript in a successful innovation):

- 1.5 urbs *U* : ubrs *M* : urbis *STV non male*
- 20.3 refugere coeperunt *U* : receperunt *M* : fugere coeperunt *T* : profugere coeperunt *V (deest S)*
- 35.2 adductum *U* : abductum *MSTV*
- 36.3 castra *U* : sex castra *M* : et castra *S* : ex castra *TV*
- 49.1 hiberna *U* : hibernia *MTV* : ibernia *S*
- 52.4 ibi T. Vasius *U et M^{mr}* : ibi tuasius *MTV* : ibit uasius *S*
- 73.1 munituras *U* : munitura *M* : muniturus *ST et V^x ut uidetur* : munitur *V^{ac}*

c. S **S** is a manuscript in the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana in Florence, shelf mark Ashburnhamensis 33. The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 121r-134v. The manuscript has lost some folios between 124v and 125r covering *BAl**ex*

3.109.2) : magnitudine quam non *M* : magnitudine quamquam non *U* : magnitudine quaquam *S* : magnitudine quamquam *TV*

19.6 *pugnabatur*-24.2 *ad*; there are also some shorter gaps (see above). Thirteen of **S**'s singular readings make it into the text in this edition, a lower number than that in previous editions (see above). But the philological acumen of the innovator²¹ whose legacy reaches us through **S** is as evident here as it was in the *Bellum ciuile* (the innovations marked with an asterisk are particularly impressive ²²):

²¹On the innovator see further Damon 2015a, li-liii. The innovations in **S**, here as in the *Bellum ciuile*, include supplements to apparent omissions, omissions of superfluous material, alterations of inflexional endings to repair the syntax, corrections to misreadings of letters, and repairs based on material elsewhere in the text. There are also a large number of obvious mistakes, and some possible misreadings of corrections: see the apparatus for 11.3 *contentione Rhodiorum*, 26.2 *idque*, 28.2 *circumuectus*, 61.6 *sibi usui*. ... The most interesting of these can be seen in the apparatus for 11.4 *altera duae*, where the nonsensical *que pertur* and *que peritur* in **Sac** and **Sc** respectively may contain the kernel of *apertae un-* in Kübler's emendation.

²²Also noteworthy in **S**: 8.4 *adueros* (*sc.* *impetus*) *ex munitionibus sustineri MUTV* : *adueros* (*sc.* *nostros*) *ex munitionibus sustinere S fortasse recte*; 11.6 *suis nauibus MUTV* : *suis S non male*; 17.4 *quo MUTV* : *qua S fortasse recte*; 26.2 *idque MUTV* (*cf.* 3.4) : *idque quod S* : *quod Landgraf*; 45.4 *parati deinceps MUTV* : *deinceps S* : *paratis* (*sc.* *Vatinianis*) *deinceps Klotz dubitanter*; 48.1 *Q Cassius MU* : *quae cassius TV* : *cassius S*; 48.2 *sestertiis centenīs ζ teste Oudendorp* : *ihs c MUT compendio indicato* : *Iterum ihs c S compendio indicato* : *ihc cesar V compendio indicato*; 72.2 *unus*

-
- 7.2 domiciliis *S* : domicilius *V* et *MT* per compendia :
domicius *U* per compendium
 - *11.3 contentione Rhodiorum *scripsimus* (cf. *BC 1.1.1*)
: contentio nerhodiorum *S* : contentio r(h)odiorum
MUTV
 - *28.3 rex *S* : L ex *MTV* : ex *U*
 - 37.2 cum uereretur *S* : uereretur *TV* : ueritus *MU*
 - *37.3 contulit *S* : contulit rex *MUTV*
 - 44.1 classe *S* : classem *MUTV*
 - 45.1 classem magna *S* : classem magnam *M* : classe
magna *UTV*
 - *49.3 quin *S* : qui *MUTV*
 - 52.4 at *S* : ad *M^eUTV*
 - *60.5 uitii *S* : uti *UTV* : usus *M*
 - 62.1 paucis diebus q *S* : paucis diebusque *MU* : pau-
cisque diebus *T* : paucis diebus *V*

qui *MUTV* : qui *S* non male; 78.3 Deiotaro *MUTV* : a deiotaro *S* fortasse recte.
See also the immediately previous note.

- 64.2 *obtinendam uenit S : obtinendam MUTV : obtinendam mittitur Damon exempli gratia*
- 64.3 *nihilo S (cf. 25.1) : ni(c)hil MUTV*

d. T **T** is a manuscript preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, shelf mark lat. 5764.²³ The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 122va-136ra. For the *Bellum Alexandrinum* **T** only offers one successful innovation²⁴ (there are of course other spots where **T** has been joined by one or another manuscript in a successful innovation):

- 33.2 *diuturnitate confirmarentur T^c et M^{mr} : diuturnitates confirmarentur MUST^{ac} V*

e. V **V** is a manuscript preserved in the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek in Vienna, shelf mark 95.

The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 137vb-153rb. **V** is unique in presenting the three non-Caesarian *Bella* under the title *Bellum Alexandrinum* and numbering the *Bellum Africum* and the *Bellum Hispaniense* as Books III-IV of that work. The number of uniquely successful innovations in

²³Page images of **T** may be viewed at <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b90668596>.

²⁴Another noteworthy correction in **T**: 12.3 *non tamen MU : tamen ST^{ac} V : non post cogitationem suppleuit T^c*.

V in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* is much lower than would have been expected based the evidence of the *Bellum ciuile*²⁵ (there are of course other spots where **V** has been joined by one or another manuscript in a successful innovation, or where **V** seems to have joined **p** in a good reading):

- 59.1 esse¹ *V*: esset *MUST*

III. Using this edition

The *Bellum Alexandrinum* has come down to us in a very imperfect state. The ongoing process of rendering it readable and at least arguably authentic has resulted in a text that differs in hundreds of spots from that transmitted by the manuscripts. The critical apparatus of this edition is designed to facilitate scrutiny of these textual repairs. We hope that readers will accept repairs not because they are there but because they are persuasive, or better than others,

²⁵Also noteworthy in **V**: 27.5 Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS* et *T supra lineam* : mithridates magna cum potentia *S^{ac}T* : magna cum prudentia mithridates *V feliciter*; 62.1 paucis diebus q *S* : paucis diebusque *MU* : paucisque diebus *T* : paucis diebus *V non male*. Perhaps the scribe devoted less attention to this work than to those written by Caesar himself.

or better than nothing. Some of the damage incurred in the text's transmission seems irreparable: where text has been lost, for example, or where rival repairs are equally (im)plausible. These spots are marked with *** and †† respectively. But the vast majority of the problem spots are amenable to emendation, and the apparatus presents the evidence and (in brief) the arguments for the repairs adopted or proposed.

A. Text

In general terms the text of this edition aims to reproduce the text of the archetype of our tradition, as emended where it seems possible to restore a text closer to the original. However, several expedients adopted to improve the legibility of the text constitute exceptions to this policy.

The spelling of names and common Latin words and forms is silently regularized where the manuscript variants are not relevant to understanding the text or its transmission. The lemmata in the critical apparatus match the reading in the text (except in capitalization) and therefore do not necessarily represent the spelling in the manuscripts cited.

Abbreviations and symbols are silently spelled out where

there is no ambiguity about the full form of the word. (For the special case of numbers see below.) Roman praenomina are an exception to this general rule, since we use the standard abbreviations (C. for Gaius, Cn. for Gnaeus, L. for Lucius, and so on), regardless of what is in the text. The phrase *per compendium* in the apparatus indicates that a manuscript contains an abbreviation when this information is helpful for understanding the transmission of the text. But the absence of such an indication should not be taken to imply that the text is written in full. All of the manuscripts cited here use abbreviations to a greater (**U**) or lesser (**TV**) or variable (**MS**) degree. The phrase *compendio indicato* indicates that a word is presented as an abbreviation in the manuscript but that the significance of the abbreviation is unclear.

We have silently regularized the manuscripts' inconsistent and discrepant representations of cardinal and ordinal numbers. For one, two, and three we use the inflected forms, and for most cardinal numbers higher than three we use Roman numerals, since the inflected forms of large numerical adjectives and adverbs are cumbersome in Latin and less perspicuous than their symbolic counterparts. However, we do spell out *mille* and the inflected forms of *milia*. Ordinal numbers are spelled out; this is particularly

useful in connection with legions, where the difference between, say, “five legions” and “the fifth legion” is significant. Distributive numbers, which are infrequent in this text, are also spelled out.

We used modern punctuation in the text since the punctuation in the manuscripts is neither consistent nor reliable. The terminal punctuation for main clauses is generally a full stop. Where a series of actions seems to gain from presentation as a series, on the other hand, we use commas instead of full stops. But in many instances there was rather little to tip the balance. In extended passages of indirect statement we use semicolons to indicate sentence breaks. Commas are used to articulate the text where clause structure and word order are not sufficient (see further below). We occasionally use paired dashes to indicate a gap between the narrative and an embedded utterance such as an editorializing comment by the author, an afterthought, or a “snippet” of indirect statement, where commas don’t suffice.²⁶ Where such utterances extend for a sentence or more and full stops don’t suffice we use parentheses rather than dashes. Single dashes precede instances of anacoluthon. Pointed and square brackets indicate additions to ⟨⟩ and excisions from

²⁶See Damon (2020) on such parentheses.

([]) the text that involve complete words. Where syllables or individual letters are added or excised the change is not signaled in the text but the relevant information can be found in the apparatus. In general Incertus' prose requires more punctuation than Caesar's. For passages where the periodic style consists of a heavily punctuated accumulation of clauses see, e.g., 1.4-5 (*Caesar ... poterat*), 14.5 (*Erant ... uidebantur*), 24.1-2 (*Caesar ... puerum*), 35.2 (*Domitius ... fuisset*), 42.2-3 (*Namque ... sociorum*), 43.1 (*Gabinus ... gerebat*), 44.1 (*Vatinius ... praeparationis*), 44.3-4 (*Quod ... persequeretur*), 48.1 (*Iis ... cupiebat*).

Paragraphs are generally those established by Jungermann's 1606 edition, which serve as the basis for the modern citation system. Units within the paragraphs are numbered as in Andrieu 1954.

The features of the text described so far are available in both online and print versions of the LDLT edition.²⁷ But

²⁷Since the edition itself is an XML file, it is important to note that "online and print versions" refer to visualizations of the data in that file. The LDLT's official online reading application is based on the CETEIcean application developed by Hugh Cayless and Raffaele Viglianti. This edition can be viewed in the LDLT's online reading application at The print version is available as a PDF in the code repository for this edition.

the LDLT's official online version has one important feature that cannot be reproduced on paper: dynamic swapping. Unlike traditional editions, in which variant readings are collected in a critical apparatus at the bottom of each page, the LDLT's online reading application not only places the critical apparatus in the margin where the variation occurs, but also allows readers to swap variant readings into the text so that they can be evaluated *in situ*. Every attempt has been made to eliminate the possibility of introducing novel readings into the text. This is a hazard when variants in two places are related to each other: If a reader swaps one of the variants into the text, the one related to it elsewhere should be swapped, too. Otherwise, this dynamic swapping feature could create a version of the text that never existed previously. This is why we opted not to encode certain combinations of variants to enable the swapping feature, since the application, at least at the time this was written, was not able to render them reliably.

B. Critical apparatus

There is an entry in the apparatus criticus if any of the following circumstances applies for a word or phrase in the text:

- 1 If the reading of the archetype is uncertain: $\mu \neq \nu$, or $\mathbf{MS} \neq \mathbf{U}\pi$, etc. In choices between equally authoritative variants we have put in the text the one that offers the best sense and style. Or, if these criteria fail, the *lectio difficilior*. If no other criterion suffices, we follow \mathbf{U} , which is the least deviant manuscript. In some places these criteria pull in different directions.
- 2 If there may be a disagreement between μ and ν : $\mu\mathbf{S} \neq \pi$, $\mathbf{U} \neq \mathbf{M}\nu$, etc. We list this category separately from (1) because it is often difficult, owing to the waywardness of \mathbf{S} , to determine the reading of ν . The same is true, but to a much lesser extent, about μ , owing to \mathbf{M} 's propensity to stray.
- 3 If the manuscript evidence warrants display for some other reason. Readings unique to a particular manuscript—*lectiones singulares* or singular readings—are generally recorded in the Appendix critica if the text is not in doubt, but multi-word omissions are also reported in the apparatus since they provide crucial information about the shape of hyparchetype families. When other sorts of singular readings are reported in the apparatus, they are mentioned for their value as emendations. Where two manuscripts

have different singular readings at the same spot we generally record this in the apparatus.²⁸

- 4 If the syntax is faulty, showing omissions, problems of agreement, etc. The problem is fixed in the text if possible, even if the solution adopted is only one of several possible solutions. But sometimes a lacuna (indicated by * * *) is indicated instead.²⁹
- 5 If the usage is or appears to be problematic. In this situation, the problem is usually fixed in the text, unless it can be attributed to the author himself. This large category is subject to some limitations.
 - a We rarely make notes involving the regularization of acceptable syntax. A very common type of emendation involves verb forms. E.g., where in a series of historical present tense verbs one finds a perfect. These generally require trivial

²⁸In some cases the Appendix critica seemed the more appropriate home for the information, especially when unrelated errors were typical of their manuscripts or where one of the two errors has been corrected by the scribe.

²⁹For the more difficult examples of categories (4)–(7) there are notes explaining our reasoning in *Studies on the Text of the Bellum Alexandrinum*. These are signaled by a diamond (◊) in the apparatus note.

textual intervention. But readers can spot these discrepancies for themselves and decide about the suitability of the preserved reading and the repairs available. The fact that someone before them has also queried the text is unlikely to help resolve the problem, and such notes, which would be very very numerous, would clog the apparatus.³⁰ Emendations of this sort (and of those discussed below) can be seen in the *Conspectus editionum*. However, where such emendations remove a contradiction within the text they are usually either accepted or at least reported. Similarly if they help address an otherwise problematic passage or draw attention to a notable feature of the text such as a *constructio ad sensum*. (This logic and these exceptions also apply to the following two categories.)

- b We rarely make notes involving the addition or excision or interchange of verb prefixes.

³⁰The **α** and **β** branches of the tradition of the *BG* frequently differ over verb tenses, which leads one to suspect that in our tradition, which is limited to the **β** branch, tense errors will be numerous (see further Damon 2015b, 100-104).

- c We rarely make notes involving the addition or excision of the connectives *et* and *-que*, or the interchange of *-que* and *-ue*. A glance at the apparatus will show that these words are frequently overlooked or added by our manuscripts.
- d We rarely make notes involving diction. Unlike categories (a)–(c), such notes sometimes involve substantial changes to the text, and the presumed innovations have to be explained as substitutions (deliberate or unconscious) by the scribe.³¹ Spotting this sort of problem is an almost infinite task, as there are many words in the text for which one could think of a more apt, a more common, or at least a different expression. The fact that in the *BG* tradition there are numerous synonym-variants between the **α** and **β** branches (see Damon 2015b, 100–104) almost guarantees that some of the expressions in our text were not those originally chosen by the author, and one advantage of notes on diction would be to call attention to anomalies, but at

³¹Or additions. We also refrain from making notes about possible intrusive glosses, as long as they don't interfere with the comprehension of the text.

the cost of suggesting, even if only gently, that dictional anomalies need to be fixed. Readers who are sensitive enough to diction to look to the apparatus when an expression seems odd already have what they need to analyse the situation. This is obviously a matter for editorial judgment, and “rarely” does not mean “never.”

6 If the sense is or appears to be problematic on grounds of either history or logic. Such a problem is fixed in the text unless it can be attributed to the author himself. A number of these passages involve names.³²

7 If the text is or appears to be suspect on other grounds. Numbers are responsible for most of this category. Sometimes no solution can be proposed but it still seems worth marking the problem.

³²For example, we printed the transmitted spelling, even though epigraphic evidence suggests that it is wrong, at 42.3 *Iadertinorum* and 48.2 *Medobrigam*. Incertus might not have known the local or accepted spelling of these rather out of the way toponyms. Like Caesar, Incertus is inconsistent in his use of the *tria nomina*, both at an individual's introduction, where he sometimes supplies the *praenomen* and sometimes doesn't, and subsequently. Q. Cassius Longinus, for example, is sometimes called Cassius, sometimes Longinus.

Parallel passages are often cited in the apparatus to defend the text, a variant, or an emendation, but only when the available parallels are rare; regular usage speaks for itself. In directing the reader to parallels we use *uide* [*u.*] for passages illustrating the matter, *confer* [*cf.*] for passages illustrating the expression. If a parallel from the Caesarian corpus is given, it is the best one, and often the only one, unless “etc.” follows, in which case there are up to five or so pertinent parallels. If parallels are given for distinct aspects of the phrase in question, *et* is interposed between citations. If a parallel is given from outside of the Caesarian corpus, no adequate parallel exists within the corpus. Where the cited parallel nevertheless provides only indifferent support for the reading it defends, the reading can be assessed accordingly.

In this edition the readings of all of the principal manuscripts are stated for every lemma. This makes it easy for the reader to follow the behavior and affiliations of the manuscripts over large stretches of text. It also facilitates the task of assessing the arguments about readings in the text, since the lemmata and the evidence for them are listed alongside the conflicting evidence.

Orthographical variants and the related category of abbreviations abound in this tradition (see Damon 2015a,

xxiii). They are generally ignored in the apparatus, unless a variant helps explain subsequent innovations, as is sometimes the case for abbreviations in particular.

Citations for works of classical literature are given in the abbreviated forms standardized by the *OLD* and Liddell-Scott-Jones. (With space-saving exceptions for the six works in the *corpus Caesarianum*, which appear as *BG*, *Hirt.*, *BC*, *BAlex*, *BAfr*, *BHisp*.) Citations without titles refer to the *Bellum Alexandrinum*.

Scholars are cited by name only, or by name and date if it is necessary to distinguish among their works. Full bibliographic information is given in the List of works cited.³³

C. Appendix critica

In the Appendix critica we record the singular readings of the principal manuscripts in passages where the text is

³³In the long history of work on the text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* some emendations have lost their source. Where other editors ascribe a reading to “*edd.*,” we have named the earliest source we can find. We use **ς** if we can verify that a reading is in a manuscript other than those used here to constitute the text. (This usually means that the reading is in **L** or **N** or **R**.) Otherwise we give the earliest edition in which it appears. Emendations credited to the first edition (“*ed. pr.*”) are presumably drawn from a manuscript source.

not in doubt. (Where a singular reading is useful for the constitution of the text it is recorded in the critical apparatus.) This collection of readings illustrates the character of the witnesses to the text, allowing the reader to see both the frequency and the types of errors in each. Lemmata are provided to show the nature of the error. The spelling of the lemma is that of the printed text. Orthographical variants are not registered in the Appendix. An erroneous reading ascribed to **M^{ac}** (or **M^c**) implies that **M^c** (or **M^{ac}**) has the reading of the lemma. All singular omissions are listed. Omissions notable for length or content are also reported in the apparatus criticus. An asterisk marks errors in **M** that prompted a correction—not necessarily a successful one—by **M^{mr}**.

Additional materials in the LDLT edition:

Studies on the Text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*

Twenty-three notes on difficult spots in the text by members of the Latin 540 classes in 2015 and 2017. These present in depth the arguments that underlie the various remedies suggested in the edition's critical apparatus. They

are signaled in the relevant apparatus note by a diamond (◊) before the lemma.

Transcriptions of the manuscript witnesses (MUSTV)

The five manuscript witnesses used to constitute the text were transcribed by members of the Postbac Latin seminars in 2014 and 2016, and by highschool volunteers in the summer of 2016. The transcriptions were checked and doublechecked by the transcribing teams, by other class members, and by the Latin 540 students who used the transcriptions to generate the critical apparatus. Machine-collation was used to locate discrepancies that needed verification; we used the collation tool at juxtacommons.org. (For the process see Damon and Huskey, forthcoming.) Errors certainly remain, and many features of the original are not reflected in these simple documents, but they are helpful maps for finding a particular bit of text in a manuscript book or a page image. Abbreviations are filled out unless obscure (as is sometimes the case with monetary amounts, for example), punctuation is ignored, and capitalization is reproduced rather erratically. Where a manuscript contains a correction the transcription records the corrected form, not

the original reading; the original readings were recorded elsewhere and are taken account of in the apparatus and Appendix critica.

Translation

The students in the two Latin 540 classes produced a translation of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* in the course of their work on the text. It is a work of many hands and makes no claim to stylistic merit or even consistency. It is designed to communicate our interpretation of the text, particularly where we have emended it.

Conspectus editionum

A list of the 98 places where the reading of the LDLT *Bellum Alexandrinum* differs from that of Andrieu 1954, which we used as our base text. (Differences of orthography and punctuation are not reported.)

Acknowledgements

As we said at the outset, this edition rests on the work of many contributors. It couldn't have been done without them, or without the financial and other forms of support for research provided by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and our two home institutions, the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Oklahoma. Our largest debts are recorded below, but the process has been a long one and we are grateful to all who kept us company along the way, even on the "paths not (or not yet) taken" that are an inevitable part of a project as complex as this one proved to be. Information on the collaborations and support that resulted in the platform and protocols that host and govern this edition can be found at the Digital Latin Library and the Library of Digital Latin Texts.

Students at the University of Pennsylvania transcribed and collated the manuscript witnesses and produced the text, critical apparatus, appendix critica, and translation. The contributors were undergraduates, students in the Postbac program, and graduate students in Classical Studies and Ancient History, along with some Philadelphia-area high school students: Adrienne Atkins, Katie Becker, Amelia Bensch-Schaus, Jacob Bickford, Nicholas Bolig, Vic-

toria Burmeister, Sean Carpenter, Greg Callaghan, Brian Credo, Maxwell Dietrich, Alexis Frankel, Kathleen Garland, Nikola Golubovic, Wesley Hanson, Zachary Herberster, Xinyi Huang, Molly Hutt, Johanna Kaiser, Elizabeth Keyser, Scheherazade Khan, Peter Kotiuga, Maria Kovalchuk, Shenda Kuang, Amy Lewis, Scotland Long, Nicole Love, Daniel Mackey, Kate Murphy, Addie McKenzie, Theodora Naqvi, Jeffrey Nolte, Kristen Patterson, Marcie Persyn, Harrison Powell, Isaac Rand, Annamaria Rapsomanikis, Rudolf Rauk, Isabella Reinhardt, Joshua Renfro, Janelle Sadarananda, Jessica Shaw, Dallas Simons, Julia Simons, Brandon Stark, Benjamin Turnbull, Tom Vozar, Tim Warnock, Joseph Watkins, Duo Xu, Yingchao Zhu. You will find the names of some of these students in the edition itself as the sources of emendations to the text and authors of notes on difficult spots in the text. Special mention goes to: Sean Carpenter, who with the support of a grant from Penn's Undergraduate Research Mentoring Program developed a transcription protocol compatible with automatic collation and produced directories of manuscript abbreviations; Dallas Simons, who helped edit the apparatus notes and prepared page images from early editions for Optical Character Recognition (one of those paths not yet taken, for which we also received help and advice from

Greg Crane, Uwe Springmann, and Katie Rawson); Amy Lewis, who helped edit the apparatus notes and appendix critica; and Zachary Elliott, who along with his wife Molly Cowan tested approaches to automating the conversion of traditional apparatus notes into spreadsheet form. Support both financial and technical was provided by Penn's Price Lab for Digital Humanities.

We owe a debt of gratitude to many people at the University of Oklahoma. Virginia K. Felkner perfected the scripts used to reduce the amount of manual encoding we had to do. Mark Laufersweiler and Tyler Pearson of the Data Analytics, Visualization, and Informatics Syndicate provided invaluable advice on that and other aspects of the project. Tara Carlisle, Director of the Digital Scholarship Laboratory, facilitated meetings and made many helpful suggestions. Logan Cox made important contributions to the DLL's digital infrastructure. The Office of the Vice President for Research supported this and other DLL projects by providing physical and virtual spaces for them.

Several people beyond the walls of the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Oklahoma deserve special mention. Hugh Cayless (Duke University), co-author of the "Guidelines for Encoding Critical Editions for the Library of Digital Latin Texts" and architect of the application for

reading this edition online, has been instrumental in all aspects of this project. Tom Elliott (New York University) and Alex Ward provided advice on scholarly and technical matters. Finally, this project could not have come to fruition without the support of the leadership of the Society for Classical Studies, particularly former Executive Director Adam Blistein and current Executive Director Helen Cullyer and those who have served as Vice President of Publications and Research during our work: Michael Gagarin, Donald Mastronarde, Kathryn Gutzwiller, and Colin Whiting.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Manuscripts

[ω] Common source of

[μ] Common source of M and U

[ν] Common source of S and π

Descendants of μ

[M] Florence, BML Plut. lat 68.8 (s. xii⁴ or xiii¹)
[http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/
ImageViewer?idr=TECA0000807118#page/1/
mode/lup](http://teca.bmlonline.it/ImageViewer/servlet/ImageViewer?idr=TECA0000807118#page/1/mode/lup)

Hands in M

[M^{ac}] The uncorrected reading in M. Equivalent to M.

[M^c] Corrections by the original scribe, who usually recovers the reading of the exemplar.

[M^{mr}] Corrections by one or more later hands (*manus recentior*), sometimes recovering the exemplar, sometimes not.

[M*] An asterisk marks readings in M that prompted a correction—not necessarily a successful one—by M^{mr}.

[U] Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 3324 (s. xi⁴ or xii¹)

Hands in U

[U^{ac}] The uncorrected reading in U. Equivalent to U.

[U^c] Corrections by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

Descendants of v

[S] Florence, BML Ashburnham 33 (s. x²⁻³)

Hands in S

[S^{ac}] The uncorrected reading in S, Equivalent to S.

[S^c] Corrections made by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

[π] Common source of T and V.

[T] Paris, BNF lat. 5764 (s. xi³⁻⁴). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10542010c>

Hands in T

[T^{ac}] The uncorrected reading in T, Equivalent to T.

[T^c] Corrections made by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

[V] Vienna, ÖN 95 (s. xii)

Hands in V

[V^{ac}] The uncorrected reading in V. Equivalent to V.

[V^c] Corrections made by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

Occasionally cited

[N] Naples, BN IV.C.11 (s. xi), cited where S is lacunose.

[5] A reading found in one or more later manuscripts.

Early Editions

[ed. pr.] G. Bussi, ed. Romae: In domo Petri de Maximis
[= Sweynheym and Pannartz]. 12 May 1469. URL:
[http://daten.digital-e-sammlungen.de/~db/0006/
bsb00064880/images/](http://daten.digital-e-sammlungen.de/~db/0006/bsb00064880/images/)

[Aldus] G. Giocondo, ed. Venice. 1513. URL:
[http://digital.onb.ac.at/OnbViewer/viewer.faces?
doc=ABO_%2BZ221957000](http://digital.onb.ac.at/OnbViewer/viewer.faces?doc=ABO_%2BZ221957000)

[Beroaldus] P. Beroaldus, ed. *Caii Iulii Caesaris
commentarios Belli Gallici, Ciuilis Pompeiani, Alexandrini,
Africi, ac Hispaniensis*. Bologna. 1504. URL:
[http://reader.digital-e-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/
object/display/bsb10140427_00001.html](http://reader.digital-e-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10140427_00001.html)

Modern Editions

- [Andrieu] J. Andrieu, ed. *Pseudo-César, Guerre d'Alexandrie*. Paris. 1954.
- [Bentley] T. Bentley, ed. *Caii Julii Caesaris de bello gallico et ciuili nec non A. Hirtii aliorumque de bellis Alexandrino, Africano, et Hispaniensi commentarii. Notas et animaduersiones addidit Tho. Bentleius. Accessere conjecturae et emendationes Jacobi Jurini*. London. 1742.
- [Cellarius] C. Cellarius, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris Commentarii de bello gallico et ciuili. Cum utriusque supplementis ab A. Hirtio vel Oppio adiectis*. Leipzig. 1705.
- [Clarke] S. Clarke, ed. *C. Julii Caesaris quae extant, accuratissime cum libris editis et mss optimis collata, recognita et correctae. Accesserunt annotationes Samuelis Clarke*. London. 1720 (1st ed. 1712).
- [Dauisius 1706] J. Davies, ed. *C. Julii Caesaris quae exstant omnia ... cum eiusdem animadversionibus ac notis Pet. Ciacconii, Fr. Hotomanni, Joan. Brantii, Dionys. Vossii et aliorum*. Cambridge. 1706. URL: http://reader.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/fs1/object/display/bsb10217527_00001.html

- [Dausius 1727] J. Davies, ed. *C. Julii Caesaris et Auli Hirtii quae exstant omnia recensuit ac selectis ... aliorum notis suas addidit Joannes Dausius; accedunt ejusdem secundae curae necnon metaphrasis graeca librorum VII de bello gallico*. Cambridge. 1727.
- [Dinter] B. Dinter, ed. *C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii cum A. Hirti aliorumque supplementis . III: C. Iuli Caesaris commentarii commentarii de bello Alexandrino, Africano, Hispaniensi. Caesaris Hirtiique fragmenta*. Leipzig. 1887. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=luswAQAAMAAJ&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- [Dübner] F. Dübner, ed. *C. Julii Caesaris commentarii de bellis Gallico et civili, aliorum, de bellis Alexandrino, Africano et Hispaniensi. Tomus secundus*. Paris. 1867. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112023932624>
- [Du Pontet] R. Du Pontet, ed. *C. Iuli Caesaris Commentariorum. Pars 2*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1900.
- [Hoffmann 1857] E. Hoffmann, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum. Volumen alterum*. Vienna. 1857

- [Hoffmann 1890] E. Hoffmann, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum. Vol. II: Commentarii de bello ciuili. Accedunt commentarii de bello Alexandrino, Africano, Hispaniensi*. New edition. Vienna. 1890. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112099806678>.
- [Jungermann] G. Jungermann, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris quae exstant ... praeterea ... notae, adnotationes, commentarii Rhellicani, Glareani, Glandorpüi, Camerarii, Bruti, Manutii, Sambuci, Vrsini, Ciacconiü, Hotmani, Brantii*. Frankfurt. 1606. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31822038197299>.
- [Klotz] A. Klotz, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii. Vol. III: Bellum Alexandrinum, Bellum Africum, Bellum Hispaniense, Fragmenta*. Leipzig. 1927.
- [Kraner] F. Kraner, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum*. Editio stereotypa. Leipzig. 1861. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.c070407321>.
- [Kübler 1896a] B. Kübler, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii. Vol. III, pars prior, commentarius de bello Alexandrino*. Editio maior. Leipzig: Teubner, 1896. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/osu.32435027192681>

- [Lipsius] J. Lipsius, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii ... eiusdem ... fragmenta*. Antwerp. 1586.
URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=6BYsAQAAMAAJ&pg=PP1#v=onepage&q&f=false>.
See also Oudendorp.
- [Manutius] Aldus Manutius, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii ab Aldo Manutio Paulli filio Aldi nepote emendati et scholiis illustrati*. Venice. 1597. (First edition 1571.) URL: <http://mdz-nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:bvb:12-bsb10171445-1>.
- [Morus] S. F. N. Morus, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii de bello Gallico et civili; accedunt libri de bello Alexandrino Africano et Hispaniensi e recensione Francisci Oudendorpii; curavit editionem Sam. Fr. Nathan. Morus*. Leipzig. 1780. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015022638830>.
- [Nipperdey] K. Nipperdey, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii*. Leipzig. 1847. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015063012838>.
- [Oehler] F. Oehler, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii cum supplementis A. Hirtii et aliorum*. Leipzig. 1852. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015007036885>.

- [Oudendorp] F. Oudendorp, ed., *C. Iulii Caesaris De bellis gallico et civili pompejano; nec non A. Hirtii aliorumque de bellis Alexandrino, Africano et Hispaniensi commentarii ad MSSorum fidem expressi, cum integris notis Dionysii Vossii, Joannis Davisii et Samuelis Clarkii cura et studio Francisci Oudendorpii qui suas animadversiones ac varias lectiones adjecit*. Leiden. 1737. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101066876309>.
- [Scaliger] J. Scaliger, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris quae extant*. Amsterdam. 1661. (First edition 1635.) URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31175035195554>.
- [Schneider] R. Schneider, ed. *Bellum Alexandrinum*. Berlin. 1888. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015039572113>.
- [Stephanus] R. Estienne, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris rerum ab se gestarum comentarii*. Paris. 1544. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=CtcPAAAAQAAJ>.
- [Strada] J. Strada, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris rerum gestarum commentarii XIV*. Frankfurt. 1575. URL: <https://books.google.com/books?id=ZSqXfrpOspMC>

[Ursinus] F. Orsini, ed. *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii novis emendationibus illustrati ... ejusdem fragmenta ... ex bibliotheca Fulvii Ursini*. Antwerp. 1595. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/ucm.5327351141>.

[Vascosanus] M. Vascosanus, ed. Paris. 1543.

Other Sources

[Baehrens] Baehrens, W. A. *Beitraege Zur Lateinischen Syntax*. Leipzig. 1912.

[Barwick] Barwick, K. *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*. Leipzig. 1938.

[Broughton] Broughton, T. Robert S. *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*. 2 vols. Cleveland. 1968.

[Brown] Brown, Virginia. *The Textual Transmission of Caesar's Civil War*. Leiden. 1972.

[Carter] Carter, J. M., trans. *Julius Caesar, The Civil War*. Oxford. 1997.

-
- [Castiglioni] Castiglioni, L. ‘Intorno a Cesare ed ai suoi continuatori (Bellum Civile, Africanum, Alexandrinum)’. *Athenaeum* n.s. 11 (1924): 229–40.
- [Ciaffi-Griffa] Ciaffi, Raffaele and Ludovico Griffa, eds. *Gaio Giulio Cesare, Opere*. Turin. 2008. (First editions 1952 and 1973.)
- [Cornelissen] Cornelissen, J. J. ‘Adversaria critica’. *Mnemosyne* 17 (1889): 44–55.
- [Damon 2015a] Damon, C., ed. *C. Iuli Caesaris commentariorum: Libri III de bello civili*. Oxford. 2015.
- [Damon 2015b] Damon, Cynthia. *Studies on the text of Caesar’s Bellum civile*. Oxford. 2015.
- [Damon 2020] Damon, Cynthia. ‘On (authorial and other) parentheses in Caesar’s commentarii.’ In L. Curtis and I. Peirano Garrison, eds. *The lives of Latin texts*. Cambridge, MA. 55–89. 2020.
- [Domaszewski] A. von Domaszewski. ‘Die Heere der Bürgerkriege in den Jahren 49 bis 42 vor Christus’. *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbücher* 4 (1894): 157–188.

- [Fischer] Fischer, Eduard. *Das achte Buch vom Gallischem Kriege und das Bellum Alexandrinum: Eine Studie*. Passau. 1880. URL: [https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.\protect\char"0024\relaxb62477](https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.\protect\char)
- [Fleischer] Fleischer, Curt. 'Zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern'. *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* 119 (1879): 849–67. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3013858?urlappend=%3Bseq=899>.
- [Forchhammer] Forchhammer, J. N. G. *Quaestiones criticae de vera commentarios de bellis civili, Alexandrino, Africano, Hispaniensi emendandi ratione*. Copenhagen. 1852. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101065205849>.
- [Gaertner-Hausburg] Gaertner, J. F., and B. Hausburg. *Caesar and the Bellum Alexandrinum: An analysis of style, narrative technique, and the reception of Greek historiography. Hypomnemata* 192. Göttingen. 2013.
- [Gemoll] Gemoll, W. 'Zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern'. *Jahrbücher für klassische Philologie* 119 (1879): 267–70. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.b3013858?urlappend=%3Bseq=317>.
- [Graindor] Graindor, P. *La guerre d'Alexandrie*. Cairo. 1931.

-
- [Hedicke] Hedicke, Edmundus. ‘Scholia in Caesarem et Sallustium (Varia II)’. *Programm des königlichen Gymnasiums zu Quedlinburg* (1879): 9–18.
- [Hering] Hering, Wolfgang. *Die Recensio der Caesarhandschriften*. Berlin. 1963.
- [Hübner] Emil Hübner, ed. *Inscriptiones Hispanie Latinae. Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum. Vol. II*. Berlin: G. Reimerum. 1869–92. URL: <http://arachne.uni-koeln.de/books/CILvII1869>.
- [Kraffert] Kraffert, Hermann. *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung lateinischer Autoren*. Aurich. 1882.
- [Kübler 1896b] Kübler, B.. ‘Recisamenta critica’. *Philologus* 55 (1896): 154–59. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015029918151?urlappend=%3Bseq=214>.
- [Landgraf 1888] Landgraf, G. *Untersuchungen zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern insbesondere über Autorschaft und Komposition des Bellum Alexandrinum und Africanum*. Erlangen. 1888. URL: <https://archive.org/details/untersuchungenzu00landuoft>.

- [Landgraf 1889] Landgraf, G. *Der Bericht des C. Asinius Pollio über die spanischen Unruhen des Jahres 48 v. Chr. (Bellum Alexandrinum 48–64) auf Grund des codex Ashburnhamensis*. Erlangen et Leipzig. 1889. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044085186245>.
- [Landgraf 1891a] Landgraf, G. ‘Zum Bellum Alexandrinum’. In *Commentationes Woelfflinianae*. Leipzig. 1891. 15–21. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015022622206?urlappend=%3Bseq=25>.
- [Landgraf 1891b] Landgraf, G. ‘Das Bellum Alexandrinum und der codex Ashburnhamensis’. *Programm des Kgl. Wilhelmsgymnasiums in München für das Studienjahr 1890/91*. Munich. 1891. 1–23.
- [Larsen] Larsen, Sophus C. *Studia in libellum incerti auctoris de bello Alexandrino*. Copenhagen. 1886. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc2.ark:/13960/t3cz4fm0n>.
- [Latinius] Latinius, Latinus. *Bibliotheca sacra et profana: Sive, Observationes, correctiones, coniecturae, & variae lectiones in sacros et profanos scriptores, e marginalibus notis codicum eiusdem a Dominico Macro ... collectae et nunc primum ... editae*. 2 vols. Rome. 1677. URL: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101076454485>.

-
- [Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr] Leumann, Manu et al. *Lateinische Grammatik*. 3 vols. Munich. 1965-79.
- [Löfstedt] Löfstedt, Einar. ‘Vermischte Beiträge zur lateinische Sprachkunde’. *Eranos* 8 (1908): 86–87.
- [Madvig] Madvig, J. N. “Capitulum III: Caesar, Salustius.” In *Adversaria critica ad scriptores graecos et latinos*. Vol. 2 : *Emendationes latinae*. Copenhagen. 1873. 281–85. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/coo.31924021596675>.
- [Markland] Markland, Jeremiah. *Epistola critica ad eruditissimum virum Franciscum Hare ... in qua Horatii loca aliquot et aliorum veterum emendantur*. Cambridge. 1723. https://books.google.com/books?id=7_JWAAAACAAJ&pg=PP3#v=onepage&q&f=false.
- [Menge] Menge, R. ‘Bellum Alexandrinum: Erklärt von Rud. Schneider’. *Neue philologische Rundschau* 8 . 1889. 120–27. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044098630197?urlappend=%3Bseq=154>.
- [Mitchell] Mitchell, S. “‘The treaty between Rome and Lycia of 46 BC (MS2070).’” In R. Pinaud, ed., *Papyri*

graecae Schøyen (P. Schøyen I). Florence. 2005. 161–259.

[Müller] Müller, H. J. Footnote to a Nachtrag on Schneider (1888). *Jahresberichte des philologischen Vereins zu Berlin* 14 (1888): 348. <https://books.google.com/books?id=9uToXfcovpwC&pg=PA348#v=onepage&q&f=false>.

[Pinkster] Pinkster, Harm. *The Oxford Latin Syntax. Volume 1, The Simple Clause*. Oxford. 2015.

[Preuss] Preuss, Siegmund. *Vollständiges Lexicon zu den pseudo-casarianischen Schriftwerken*. Erlangen. 1884. https://books.google.com/books?id=QIEIAAAAQAAJ&newbks=1&newbks_redir=0&pg=PA1#v=onepage&q&f=false.

[Raaflaub] Raaflaub, Kurt A., ed. *The Landmark Julius Caesar: The complete works: Gallic War, Civil War, Alexandrian War, African War, and Spanish War*. New York. 2017.

[Rice Holmes] Rice Holmes, T. *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire Vol. 3*. Oxford. 1923.

[Schambach 1879–1882] Schambach, Otfried. ‘Zu Caesar und seinen Fortsetzern’. *Jahrbücher für klassische*

Philologie 119 (1879): 867–70 <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/iau.31858020803346?urlappend=%3Bseq=883> and 125 (1882): 215–24 <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/iau.31858020803403?urlappend=%3Bseq=233>.

[Schambach 1881] Schambach, Otfried. ‘Die Reiterei bei Caesar’. Mühlhausen in Thüringen. 1881. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044080867435>.

[Schiller 1883] Schiller, Heinrich. ‘Zu Caesar Bell. Civ. III, 112, 2 und Hirtius Bell. Alex. 8, 2’. *Philologus* 42 (1883): 773–77. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101076472131?urlappend=%3Bseq=785>.

[Schiller 1889] Schiller, Heinrich. Review of Schneider. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 9 (1889): 306–10. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/inu.30000006512101?urlappend=%3Bseq=169>.

[Schiller 1890a] Schiller, Heinrich. ‘Vom Ursprung des Bellum Alexandrinum’. *Blätter für das Bayerische Gymnasialschulwesen* 26 (1890): 242–51, 393–400, 511–23. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101073027086?urlappend=%3Bseq=256>.

- [Schiller 1890b] Schiller, Heinrich. Review of Hoffmann 1890. *Blätter für das Bayerische Gymnasialschulwesen* 26 (1890): 535–43. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/njp.32101073027086?urlappend=%3Bseq=549>.
- [Stadler] Stadler, O. ‘Zu lateinischen Schriftstellern’. *Berliner philologische Wochenschrift* 27.35 (1907): 1119. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112023962035?urlappend=%3Bseq=578>.
- [Stark] Stark, Rudolf. ‘*Bellum Alexandrinum* 19, 1’. *Maia* 16 (1964): 239–42.
- [Stoffel] Stoffel, E. *Histoire de Jules César, Guerre civile*. 2 vols. Paris. 1887. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001193303>.
- [Talbert] Talbert, R.J.A., ed. *Barrington atlas of the Greek and Roman world*. Princeton. 2000.
- [Townend] Townend, G. *Caesar’s War in Alexandria*. Bristol. 1988.
- [Turnebus] Turnèbe, Adrien. *Adriani Turnebi adversariorum tomus secundus duodecim libros continens*. Paris. 1565. 36. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/ucm.5317950051?urlappend=%3Bseq=87>.

- [Vielhaber 1864] Vielhaber, Leopold. *Beiträge zur Kritik des Cäsarianischen Bellum ciuile und der Fortsetzungen desselben*. Vienna. 1864.
- [Vielhaber 1869] Vielhaber, Leopold. Review of Dübner. *Zeitschrift für die österreichischen Gymnasien* 20 (1869): 541–76. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044098632391?urlappend=%3Bseq=649>.

List of People Cited by Name

- [Atkins] Adrienne Atkins. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).
- [Bensch-Schaus] Amelia Bensch-Schaus. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).
- [Brutus] Brutus. See Jungermann.
- [Callaghan] Greg Callaghan. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).
- [Ciacconius] Petrus Ciacconius. See Jungermann and Dausius 1706.

[Credo] Brian Credo. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).

[Cuiacius] Cuiacius. See Nipperdey.

[Damon] Cynthia Damon. Editor of this edition and instructor of Latin 540 (University of Pennsylvania) in 2015 and 2017.

[Faernus] Faerno, Gabriello. See Klotz.

[Gertz] M. C. Gertz. See Klotz.

[Glandorp] Glandorp, Johann. See Jungermann.

[Gruterus] Janus Gruterus. See Oudendorp.

[Hanson] Wes Hanson. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).

[Haupt] Moriz Haupt. See Nipperdey.

[Jurinius] Jurinius. See Bentley.

[Keil] Heinrich Keil. See Klotz.

[Khan] Scheherazade Khan. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).

-
- [Kovalchuk] Maria Kovalchuk. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).
- [Lewis] Amy Lewis. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).
- [Naqvi] Theodora Naqvi. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).
- [Persyn] Marcie Persyn. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).
- [Reinhardt] Isabella Reinhardt. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).
- [Rhellicanus] Rhellicanus. See Jungermann
- [Rossetus] Joannes Rossetus. See Gaertner-Hausburg.
- [Siesbye] Oskar Siesbye. See Larsen.
- [D. Simons] Dallas Simons. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).
- [J. Simons] Julia Simons. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).

[Vozar] Tom Vozar. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2015).

[Warnock] Tim Warnock. Member of the Latin 540 class (spring 2017).

[Wölfflin] Eduard Wölfflin. See Klotz.

Abbreviations and Other Notations

- scripsimus = denotes changes made collectively by Damon and members of the Latin 540 classes taught at the University of Pennsylvania.

CONSPECTUS EDITIONUM

<i>BAlex</i>	Budé	LDLT
1.5	spectans	expectans
2.1	adduxerant	⟨armatorum⟩ adduxerant
7.2	[casum]	casum
7.2	†ut ... essent ... absumere- tur†	ut ... esse ... absumere- tur
8.2	Paraetonio	Paratonio
10.2	accessisset	accessissent
10.2	exposuisset	exposuissent
11.2	⟨hostium⟩	⟨suorum⟩
12.1	quibus *** et	quibus et ***
12.3	amiserant	miserant
12.4	Caesari	Caesaris
13.5	⟨Syrias***, Ci⟩licias	Lycias
13.5	†et†	et
14.1	Rhodias	Rhodos
14.1	Ponticas	Ponticos
14.1	has	hos
15.3	⟨cunctationem⟩	⟨moram⟩
15.5	, IIII	IIII,
15.8	qui	⟨nisi⟩ qui

16.1	[uictis]	uictis
16.3	⟨rerum⟩	⟨exercitus⟩
17.2	et illa et urbem	⟨et hanc⟩ et illam [urbem]
17.3	quos	quosque
17.3	et alteram insulae partem distinendae	in alteram insulae partem *** distinendae
17.3	praemiis[que]	praemiis
19.2	fortiorem	certiorem
20.4	perturbantes	perturbatos
22.2	*** comprehendi multum operibus *** et	*** comprehendi †mul- tum† operibus et
24.2	parceret	parceret [et]
25.1	Caesari	Caesaris
26.2	Pelusium aduenit	—Pelusium adducit
26.2	[multiplici praesidio]	multiplici praesidio
27.5	[constantiaque]	constantiaque
27.7	adiunctis	adiuncti
31.3	partibus ***,	partibus,
32.1	magna	magnae
33.4	[itinere terrestri]	itinere terrestri
35.1	opportunitates ⟨cognouerat⟩	⟨constat⟩ opportunitates
36.3	castra	[ex] castra
36.5	si[ue] amicus [siue inimi- cus]	siue amicus siue inimicus
36.5	si	sin
37.3	contulit	contulit [rex]

40.2	circumire acies secunda	circumire ac transcen- dere
40.2	⟨ab⟩ aperto	aperto
42.2	exercitum alendum	exercitus alendos
42.3	Iadestinorum	Iadertinorum
44.4	His adiunctis	Has adiunxit
45.2	distensis	distentis
48.3	minuebant	minuebat
49.1	antea	in ea
49.2	simultatium causa	simul et causae
51.2	uoluptate	uoluntate
51.3	discriberentur	describerentur
52.4	Ad	At
53.4	⟨L.⟩ Laterensis	Laterensis
54.3	iudicaretur	indicaretur
55.1	legiones	legionem quintam
55.1	V cohortibus	cohortibus
55.5	Squillo	Q. Sestio
56.2	⟨superiorum⟩ temporum	temporum
56.2	animi	animus
57.1	Ilipam	Leptim
57.2	Naeuam	†noctu†
57.3	T. Thorium	†in† Torium
58.1	Thorius	Torius
59.1	deterserunt	detraxerunt
60.1	educerentur ⟨orant⟩	educerentur
60.2	esse ***	esset
60.3	uideret	animaduerneret
60.4	infirmem	infirmum

60.5	educunt	educit
61.4	deductus	adductus
61.6	magno sibi usu	sibi usui
62.1	complures[que]	complures
62.1	auxiliaris	auxiliares
62.2	Marcellum fouebant	Marcello fauebant
64.2	uenit	⟨uenit⟩
64.3	in	⟨in⟩
64.3	in directum	directam
65.1	re	rei
65.2	hae	eae
66.1	legioni	legionibus
66.1	praeficit	praefecit
66.5	coeptum	inceptum
67.1	⟨in⟩ Caesaris	Caesaris
67.1	habuisset	habuisset ⟨et coactus⟩
67.1	imperiisque ⟨aduersariorum coactus⟩	imperiisque
68.1	defectionem	defensionem
68.2	armatura	natura
70.4	quin	quamquam
70.8	⟨Id⟩ si	si
72.2	†superioribus ... oppido† superioribus ... oppido	
73.3	iussit	tum iussit
74.3	contemptu	contemptione
74.4	praeruptam	procliuem
75.1	opere	operibus
75.3	eis	iis ⟨in⟩

78.2

quod <regnum>

quod

BELLUM ALEXANDRINUM

1¹ Bello Alexandrino conflato Caesar Rhodo atque ex Syria
Ciliciaque omnem classem arcessit. Creta sagittarios, equi-
tes ab rege Nabataeorum Malcho euocat. Tormenta
undique conquiri et frumentum mitti auxilia adduci iu-
bet. 2² Interim munitiones cotidie operibus augentur atque
omnes oppidi partes quae minus esse firmae videntur testu-
dinibus ac musculis aptantur. Ex aedificiis autem per forami-
na in proxima aedificia arietes immittuntur, quantumque
aut ruinis deicitur aut per uim recipitur loci in tantum muni-
tiones proferuntur. 3³ Nam <ab> incendio fere tuta est Alexan-
dria quod sine contignatione ac materia sunt aedificia et
structuris ac fornicibus continentur tectaque sunt rudere aut

5 cotidie operibus *USTV* | cotidie *M* (cf. *BC* 3.112.9) | nouis cotidie
operibus *Castiglioni* (cf. *Tac. Hist.* 2.76.4) || 7 aptantur *MUSTV* (*u.*
BC 3.112.7–9 et cf. *Virg. Aen.* 3.472) | temptantur *Nipperdey* (cf. *BC*
3.40.1) | alii alia (*u. Gaertner-Hausburg* 48 n.87) || per foramina *MU*
| foramina *STV*, quos secutus foramina seclusit *Vielhaber ut glossema* || 9 in
MUSTV | [in] *Schneider coll. Hirt.* 8.27.4 || 10 <ab> incendio *Müller* (cf.
61.3) | incendio *MUSTV* || 11–12 et structuris *USTV* | structuris
M || 12 ac *MTV* | et *U* | a *S* ||

pauimentis. ⁴Caesar maxime studebat ut, quam angustissimam partem oppidi palus a meridie interiecta efficiebat, hanc operibus uineisque agendis ab reliqua parte urbis excluderet, ⁵illud expectans primum ut, cum in duas partes esset urbs diuisa, acies uno consilio atque imperio administraretur, deinde ut laborantibus succurri atque ex altera oppidi parte auxilium ferri posset, in primis uero ut aqua pabuloque abundaret. (Quarum alterius rei copiam exiguam, alterius nullam omnino facultatem habebat.) Quod utrumque large palus praebere poterat. 5 10

² ¹Neque uero Alexandrinis in gerendis negotiis cunctatio ulla aut mora inferebatur. Nam in omnes partes per quas fines Aegypti regnumque pertinet legatos conquisitoresque dilectus habendi causa miserant magnumque numerum in oppidum telorum atque tormentorum conuexerant et innumerabilem multitudinem ⟨armatorum⟩ adduxerant. ²Nec minus in urbe maximae armorum erant institutae officinae. Seruos praeterea puberes armauerant, 15

⁴ expectans *MUSTV* (cf. *BC* 3.43.3 et u. *Damon* 2015b 116 n.32) | spectans *Vascosanus* (cf. *BC* 3.85.2) || ⁵ urbs *U* | ubrs *M* | urbis *STV* non male (cf. *BG* 6.43.4 et u. *TLL* 5.1.1596–1597.25) || ^{8–9} alterius rei copiam exiguam, alterius *MUTV* | alterius *S*, qui uerba 4 omisit || ¹⁶ multitudinem ⟨armatorum⟩ *Fischer* (cf. 30.2 de militibus Alexandrinis) | multitudinem *MUSTV* | ⟨militum⟩ multitudinem *Dauisius* 1727 (cf. 21.3 etc.) ||

quibus domini locupletiores uictum cotidianum stipendiumque praebebant. ³Hac multitudine disposita munitiones semotarum partium tuebantur. Veteranas cohortes uacuas in celeberrimis urbis locis habebant ut quacumque regione
 5 pugnaretur integris uiribus ad auxilium ferendum opponi possent. ⁴Omnibus uiis atque angiporis triplicem uallum obduxerant—erat autem quadrato exstructus saxo neque minus XL pedes altitudinis habebat—quaeque partes urbis inferiores erant has altissimis turribus denorum tabula-
 10 torum munierant. ⁵Praeterea alias ambulatorias totidem tabulorum confixerant subiectisque eas rotis funibus iumentisque †obiectis† directis plateis in quamcumque erat uisum partem mouebant.

3 ¹Vrbs fertilissima et copiosissima omnium rerum apparatus suggerebat. Ipsi homines ingeniosi atque acutissimi quae a nobis fieri uiderant ea sollertia efficiebant ut

2 Hac UTV | huc M | ha S || 3 semotarum M^{mv} | semotorum MUSTV || uacuas in celeberrimis urbis locis USTV | uacuas M, qui uerba 4 omisit || 11 ◇ confixerant MUSTV (cf. BG 3.13.4) | confecerant 5 teste Oudendorp (cf. 13.4) | confinxerant Dauisius 1706 coll. Plin. Nat. 10.93 | an contexerant (cf. BC 2.10.5)? || 12 †obiectis† scripsimus | obiectis MUSTV | [obiectis] Scaliger (cf. Prop. 4.11.51) | subiunctis Cornelissen coll. Col. 6.2.8 | adiectis Castiglioni (cf. 28.3) | obiectis Klotz dubitanter (cf. BC 3.19.7) | nisi mauis iunctis (cf. Vitr. 10.2.14) uel adiunctis || 15 ingeniosi MUSTV | ingeniosissimi Wölfflin teste Klotz || 16 nobis MUSTV (cf. 19.6) | nostris Nipperdey ||

nostri illorum opera imitati uiderentur et sua sponte multa reperiabant unoque tempore et nostras munitiones infestabant et suas defendebant. ²Atque haec principes in consiliis contionibusque agitabant: populum Romanum paulatim in consuetudinem eius regni occupandi uenire; ³paucis annis 5 ante A. Gabinium cum exercitu fuisse in Aegypto; Pompeium se ex fuga eodem recepisse; Caesarem uenisse cum copiis, neque morte Pompei quicquam profectum quominus apud se Caesar commoraretur; ⁴quem si non expulissent futuram ex regno prouinciam, idque agendum mature; 10 namque eum interclusum tempestatibus propter anni tempus recipere transmarina auxilia non posse.

4 ¹Interim dissensione orta inter Achillan, qui ueterano exercitui praeerat, et Arsinoen, regis Ptolomaei minorem filiam, ut supra demonstratum est, cum uterque utrique 15 insidiaretur et summam imperi ipse obtinere uellet, praecipuat Arsinoe per Ganymeden eunuchum, nutricium suum, atque Achillan interficit. ²Hoc occiso sine ullo socio et cus-

5 eius *MUSTV*, quod suspicatur Larsen ('expectes certe illius') 6 ante A. Gabinium *Schneider* | antea gabinium *MUST^rV^{ac}* uel ante agabinium | ante gabinium *T^{ac}V^r* || **16–18** praecipuat Arsinoe per Ganymeden eunuchum, nutricium suum, atque Achillan *MUSTV* (de usu absoluto u. *TLL* 10.2.743.7–20) | praecipuat Arsinoe per Ganymeden eunuchum, nutricium suum, Achillan atque *Fleischer* || **18** interficit *USV* | interfecit *MT* ||

tode ipsa omne imperium obtinebat. Exercitus Ganymedi traditur. Is suscepto officio largitionem in militem auget, reliqua pari diligentia administrat.

5 **5** ¹Alexandria est fere tota suffossa specusque habet ad Nilum pertinentes quibus aqua in priuatas domos inducitur, quae paulatim spatio temporis liquescit ac subsidit. ²Hac uti domini aedificiorum atque eorum familiae consuerunt. Nam quae flumine Nilo fertur adeo est limosa ac turbida ut multos uariosque morbos efficiat. Sed ea plebes ac multi-
10 tudo contenta est necessario, quod fons urbe tota nullus est. Hoc tamen flumen in ea parte erat urbis quae ab Alexandrinis tenebatur. ³Quo facto est admonitus Ganymedes posse nostros aqua intercludi. Qui distributi munitionum tuendarum causa uicatim ex priuatis aedificiis—specibus ac
15 puteis extracta—aqua utebantur.

6 ¹Hoc probato consilio magnum ac difficile opus aggre-
ditur. Intersaeptis enim specibus atque omnibus urbis

2 Is *MUV* | his *T* | hic *S* || militem *STV* (cf. *Cic. Man.* 39) | milites *MU* (cf. *BC* 3.112.11) || **3** reliqua *MS* (cf. *BC* 2.39.2 etc.) | et reliqua *UTV* || **4** suffossa *U^fSTV* uel soffossa | soffosa *U^{ac}* ut uidetur | fossossa *M^{ac}* | fossosa *M^f* || ad Nilum *MU* (cf. 14.5 et *BG* 1.1.6 etc., u. *TLL* 10.1.1809.73–1810.38) | a Nilo *STV* || **6** spatio temporis *MUSTV* | [spatio temporis] *Landgraf 1891a* ut glossema de 6.3 sumptum || **11** tamen *MUSTV*, quod suspicatur *Larsen* (‘fortasse ortum est dittographia ex flumen’) **13** munitionum *MUS* | munitionem *T* | muni *V* ||

partibus exclusis quae ab ipso tenebantur, aquae magnam uim ex mari rotis ac machinationibus exprimere contendit. Hanc locis superioribus fundere in partem Caesaris non intermittebat. ²Quam ob causam salsior paulo praeter consuetudinem aqua trahebatur ex proximis aedificiis magnamque hominibus admirationem praebat quam ob rem id accidisset. Nec satis sibi ipsi credebant, cum se inferiores eiusdem generis ac saporis aqua dicerent uti atque ante consuessent, uulgoque inter se conferebant. Et degustando quantum inter se differrent aquae cognoscebant. ³Paruo uero temporis spatio haec propior bibi omnino non poterat, illa inferior corruptior iam salsiorque reperiebatur.

⁷ ¹Quo facto dubitatione sublata tantus incessit timor ut ad extremum casum periculi omnes deducti uiderentur atque alii morari Caesarem dicerent quin naues conscen-

3 Hanc locis *MUSTV* (cf. *Hirt. 8.9.1 et Virg. Aen. 7.792*) | hanc ⟨e⟩ (uel ⟨ex⟩) locis *Larsen* || **4** intermittebat *USTV* (cf. *37.1*) | intermittebant (sc. Alexandrini) *M* || **14** casum periculi *MUSTV* (cf. *Hirt. 8.34.1 et u. TLL 3.582.56–71*) | casum *ς* teste *Oudendorp* (cf. *BG 3.5.1*) | nisi *mauis* casum secludere (cf. *Liu. 21.34.8 et u. infra*) || **15** morari Caesarem *MUSTV* (cf. *BAfr 26.4*) | ⟨non⟩ morari Caesarem *Landgraf 1888 coll. 55.2 sensu repugnante* | morari Caesarem ⟨rem⟩ *Siesbye teste Larsen coll. Liu. 40.40.4* ||

dere iuberet, alii multo grauius extimescerent casum quod neque celari Alexandrini possent in apparanda fuga, cum tam paruo spatio distarent ab ipsis, neque illis imminetibus atque insequentibus ullus in naues receptus daretur.

5 ²Erat autem magna multitudo oppidanorum in parte Caesaris, quam domiciliis ipsorum non mouerat quod ea se fidelem palam nostris esse simulabat et descuiisse a suis uidebatur, ut mihi defendendi essent Alexandrini—neque fallaces esse neque temerarii—multaque oratio frustra ab-
10 sumeretur. ³Cum uero uno tempore et natio eorum et natura cognoscatur aptissimum esse hoc genus ad proditionem dubitare nemo potest.

8 ¹Caesar suorum timorem consolatione et ratione minuebat. Nam puteis fossis aquam dulcem reperiri posse
15 adfirmabat. Omnia enim litora naturaliter aquae dulcis

1 iuberet *MU* | iuberent *STV* || grauius extimescerent casum *MUSTV* (cf. *Cic. Att. 4.3.5*) | grauiorem extimescerent casum *Aldus* (cf. *Cic. Ph. 1.13*) | grauius extimescerent [casum] *Haupt teste Nipperdey* (cf. *BG 1.16.6 et u. supra*) | grauius extimescerent casurum *Kraffert coll. 11.2* || **2** Alexandrini *STV* | Alexandrinis *MU* || possent *MUV* | possint *ST* || apparanda *MUS* | apparenada *TV* || **3** illis *MU* | illi *STV* || **6** ◇ domiciliis *S* | domicilium *V et MT per compendia* | domicius *U per compendium* || **7** esse *Nipperdey* | essent *MUSTV* || **8** ut mihi *MUSTV* | at mihi ⟨si⟩ *Madvig* | ut mihi ⟨si⟩ *Klotz* || neque *MUSTV* | ⟨quod⟩ neque *ed. pr.* (cf. *Liu. 42.41.13*) || **9** multaque *MUSTV* | multa *ed. pr.* || **13** ratione *MUSTV* | hortatione *Schneider coll. BG 5.4.2 (u. et 9.1)* ||

uenas habere. ²Quod si alia esset litoris Aegypti natura
 atque omnium reliquorum, tamen quoniam mare libere
 tenerent, neque hostes classem haberent, prohiberi sese non
 posse quominus cotidie nauibus aquam peterent uel a sin-
 istra parte a Paratonio uel dextra ab insula, quae diuersae 5
 nauigationes numquam uno tempore aduersis uentis prae-
 cluderentur. ³Fugae uero nullum esse consilium non solum
 iis qui primam dignitatem haberent sed ne iis quidem qui
 nihil praeterquam de uita cogitarent. ⁴Magno negotio im-
 petus hostium aduersos ex munitionibus sustineri. Quibus 10
 relictis nec loco nec numero pares esse posse. ⁵Magnam
 autem moram et difficultatem ascensum in naues habere
 praesertim ex scaphis. Summam esse contra in Alexandri-
 nis uelocitatem locorumque et aedificiorum notitiam. ⁶Hos
 praecipue in uictoria insolentes praecursuros et loca ex- 15
 celsiora atque aedificia occupaturos. Ita fuga nauibusque

3 prohiberi *5 teste Dübner* | prohibere *MUSTV* || **4** posse *ed. pr.* |
 possent *MUSTV* || peterent *MU* | petere *STV* || **5** Paratonio
MUSTV | Paraetonio *Beroaldus fortasse recte (u. Gaertner-Hausburg 78–79*
n.16) | promunturio (*sc. Chersonenso*) *Schiller 1883* || uel *MUSTV*
 | uel a *5 teste Andrieu (cf. 74.1)* || **8** quidem qui *MUS* | quidem *TV* ||
10 aduersos ex munitionibus sustineri *MUTV (sc. impetus; cf. 45.2)*
 | aduersos ex munitionibus sustinere *S (sc. nostros; fortasse recte, cf. 20.5)*
 || **15–16** praecursuros et loca excelsiora atque aedificia occupaturos
USTV | praecursuros *M, qui uerba 6 omisit* || **16** fuga *MS* | fugam
UV | tamen fugam *T* ||

nostros prohibituos. Proinde eius consilii obliuiscerentur atque omni ratione esse uincendum cogitarent.

9 ¹Hac oratione apud suos habita atque omnium mentibus excitatis dat centurionibus negotium ut reliquis
5 operibus intermissis ad fodiendos puteos animum conferant neque quam partem nocturni temporis intermittant. ²Quo suscepto negotio atque omnium animis ad laborem incitatis magna una nocte uis aquae dulcis inuenta est. Ita operosis Alexandrinorum machinationibus maximisque
10 conatibus non longi temporis labore occursum est. ³Eo biduo legio tricensima septima ex dediticiis Pompeianis militibus cum frumento, armis, telis, tormentis imposita in naues a Domitio Caluino ad litora Africae paulo supra Alexandriam delata est. ⁴Hae naues Euro, qui multos dies
15 continenter flabat, portum capere prohibebantur. Sed loca sunt egregia omni illa regione ad tenendas ancoras. Hi cum diu retinerentur atque aquae inopia premerentur nauigio actuario Caesarem faciunt certiore.

10 ¹Caesar ut per se consilium caperet quid faciendum uideretur nauem conscendit atque omnem classem se sequi iussit nullis nostris militibus impositis quod cum longius

11 dediticiis *U^xSV et M^{mr}* | dediciis *MU^{nc}T uel* deditiis || 14 Hae *UTV* | haec *M* | haec *S*, *quod defendit Landgraf 1891a* ||

paulo discederet munitiones nudare nolebat. ²Cumque
ad eum locum accessissent qui appellatur Chersonensus
aquandique causa remiges in terram exposuissent, non-
nulli ex eo numero cum longius a nauibus praedatum
processissent ab equitibus hostium sunt excepti. ³Ex his
cognouerunt Caesarem ipsum in classe uenisse nec ullos
milites in nauibus habere. Qua re comperta magnam
sibi facultatem fortunam obtulisse bene gerendae rei cre-
diderunt. ⁴Itaque naues omnes quas paratas habuerant
ad nauigandum propugnatoribus instruxerunt Caesarique
redeunti cum classe occurrerunt. ⁵Qui duabus de causis
eo die dimicare nolebat, quod et nullos milites in nauibus
habebat et post horam decimam diei res agebatur. Nox
autem allatura uidebatur maiorem fiduciam illis, qui lo-
corum notitia confidebant: sibi etiam hortandi suos auxil-
ium defuturum quod nulla satis idonea esset hortatio quae
neque uirtutem posset notare neque inertiam. ⁶Quibus de

1 nudare *MSTV* | nudari *U non male* (cf. *BG* 2.23.4) || **2** accessissent
MUSTV (sc. nostri; cf. *BG* 7.78.4 et u. ad 6.1) | accessisset *Aldus* (et hic
et infra fortasse recte) || **3** exposuissent *MUSTV* | exposuisset *Aldus* ||
11 occurrerunt *MU* | occurrerant *STV* || **13** habebat et *MU* |
habebat *STV* || **16** quod *MUS* | quo *TV* ||

causis naues quas potuit Caesar ad terram detrahit, quem in locum illos successuros non existimabat.

- 11 ¹Erat una nauis Rhodia in dextro Caesaris cornu longe ab reliquis collocata. Hanc conspicati hostes non
 5 tenuerunt sese, magnoque impetu IIII ad eam constratae naues et complures apertae contenderunt. ²Cui coactus est Caesar ferre subsidium ne turpem in conspectu ⟨suorum⟩ contumeliam acciperet. Quamquam si quid grauius illis accidisset merito casurum iudicabat. ³Proelium commis-
 10 sum est magna contentione Rhodiorum. Qui cum in omnibus dimicationibus et scientia et uirtute praestitissent tum maxime illo tempore totum onus sustinere non recusabant ne quod suorum culpa detrimentum acceptum uideretur. ⁴Ita proelium secundissimum est factum. Capta est una
 15 hostium quadriremis, depressa est altera, duae omnibus

2 successuros *M^fUS* | successoros *M^{ac}* | succensures *T^cV uel*
 succensores | succensuros *T^{ac}* || existimabat *UT* | estimabat
MV | exstimabat *S* || 5 tenuerunt *M* | tenurunt *U* | terunt *ST* |
 terter *V* || 7 turpem *MU* | turpe *ST* | turpiter *V* || conspectu
 ⟨suorum⟩ *Khan* (cf. *de re BC* 1.71.1, *de locutione Sen. Dial.* 2.11.2) |
 conspectu hostium *M* (cf. *BG* 1.51.1) | conspectu *USTV* | an conspectu
 ⟨omnium⟩ (cf. *BG* 7.80.5)? || 10 contentione Rhodiorum *scripsimus*
 (cf. *BC* 1.1.1) | contentio nerhodiorum *S* | contentio rodiorum *MUTV*
uel rhodiorum || 15 altera, duae *Turnebus* | altera deinde *MUTV* |
 alteraque peritur deinde *S^c* | alteraque pertur deinde *S^{ac}* | altera dein
 duae *Dausius* 1706 | altera apertae undecim *Kübler* 1896a dubitanter (*u.*
11.1) ||

epibatis nudatae. Magna praeterea multitudo in reliquis nauibus propugnatorum est interfecta. ⁵Quod nisi nox proelium diremisset tota classe hostium Caesar potitus esset. ⁶Hac calamitate perterritis hostibus aduerso uento leniter flante naues onerarias Caesar remulco uictricibus suis nauibus Alexandriam deducit. 5

12 ¹Eo 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. ²Idem, posteaquam Ganymedes in concilio confirmauit sese et eas quae essent amissae resti- 10

1 Magna *MUS* | magnae *TV* || **6** suis nauibus *MUTV* | suis *S non male* (cf. *Liu.* 37.24.6) || **8** ◇ classiariorum *USTV et M supra lineam* | nauigatorum *M* || **9–10** quibus et <***> superioribus locis subleuabantur, ut ex aedificiis defendi possent *scripsimus* | quibus et superioribus locis subleuabantur, ut ex aedificiis defendi possent *MUSTV* | ut uix ex aedificiis defendi posse se confiderent, quibus et superioribus locis subleuabantur *Dinter* || quibus *MUSTV* | a quibus *Rhellicanus* | qui (sc. Alexandrini) *Cellarius, qui Manutium infra sequitur* || et <***> *scripsimus* | et *MUSTV* | *lacunam post uiderent Dauisius 1706, post* quibus *Nipperdey* || locis *MUSTV* | temporibus *Kübler 1896a dubitanter* (cf. *BG* 7.14.3) || **10** ex *MUSTV* | uix *Manutius* (u. 18.1 et cf. *BHisp* 12.5) | uix ex *Dinter* (cf. 17.4 et u. *infra*) || **13** confirmauit *MUS* | firmauit *TV* || et *MU* | ut *STV* || amissae *MUSTV* | amissae <naues> *Müller* || restitutum *MSV* | restitutum *UT* ||

tuturum et numerum adaucturum, magna spe et fiducia ueteres reficere naues accuratiusque huic rei studere atque inseruire instituerunt. ³Ac tametsi amplius CX nauibus longis in portu naualibusque miserant non tamen reparandae classis cogitationem deposuerunt. ⁴Videbant enim non auxilia Caesaris, non commeatus supportari posse si classe ipsi ualerent. Praeterea nautici homines urbis et regionis maritimae cotidianoque usu a pueris exercitati ad naturale ac domesticum bonum refugere cupiebant et quantum paruulis nauigiis profecissent sentiebant. Itaque omni studio ad parandam classem incubuerunt.

13 ¹Erant omnibus ostiis Nili custodiae exigendi portorii causa dispositae, naues ueteres erant in occultis regiae naualibus, quibus multis annis ad nauigandum non erant usi. Has reficiebant, illas Alexandriam reuocabant. ²Deerant remi. Porticus gymnasia publica aedificia delegebant, asseres remorum usum obtinebant. Aliud natu-

1 adaucturum *M^fUS* | adacturum *M^{ac}TV* || **3** CX *Manutius* | ex *MUSTV* || **4** miserant *MUSTV* (*simplex post compositum*) | amiserant *Manutius* || non tamen *MU* | tamen *ST^{ac}V* (*non post cogitationem suppleuit T'*) || **6** Caesaris *MUSTV* (*cf. BC 3.23.2*) | Caesari *Stephanus* || **7** nautici *MUSTV* (*cf. 16.5*) | [nautici] *Morus ut glossema* || regionis *MTV* | religiones *US uel religionis* || **8** maritimae *MUSTV* | maritimae <periti> *Klotz dubitanter* (*cf. BC 1.48.7*) || naturale *M* | naturalem *USTV* ||

ralis sollertia, aliud urbis copia sumministrabat. ³Postremo non longam nauigationem parabant sed praesentis temporis necessitati seruebant et in ipso portu conflagendum uidebant. ⁴Itaque paucis diebus contra omnium opinionem quadriremes XXII, quinqueres V confecerunt. Ad has minores apertasque complures adiecerunt et in portu periclitati remigio quid quaeque earum efficere posset idoneos milites imposuerunt seque ad conflagendum omnibus rebus parauerunt. ⁵Caesar Rhodias naues VIII habebat—nam X missis una in cursu litore Aegypto defecerat—Ponticas VIII, Lycias V, ex Asia XII. Ex his erant quinqueres et quadriremes X, reliquae infra hanc magnitudinem et pleraeque apertae. ⁶Tamen uirtute militum confisus cognitis hostium copiis se ad dimicandum parabat.

14 ¹Postquam eo uentum est ut sibi uterque eorum confideret Caesar Pharon classe circumuehitur aduersasque naues hostibus constituit. In dextro cornu Rhodios col-

10 ◇ X *MUSTV* (i.e., *decem*) | <de> X *Larsen dubitanter* (u. *TLL* 5.1.58.74-59.28) || cursu litore *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 4.23.6) | cursu <sub> litore *Larsen coll.* *BG* 5.57.3 | [cursu litore] *Nipperdey* || defecerat *MUSTV* (cf. *Verg. Aen.* 6.354 et *BC* 3.2.3) | decesserat *Ciacconius coll.* *BC* 3.112.3 (sed u. *Dauisium*) | desederat *Siesbye teste Larsen* (cf. *Sen. Nat.* 6.6.4) || **11** Lycias *MUSTV* (u. *Mitchell* 234-37) | <Syrias *** Ci>licias *Schneider coll.* 1.1 || et *MUSTV* | VI *Schneider* | *numeros alios alii* || **15** uterque eorum *MUS* | uterque *TV* || **17** Rhodios *MUSTV* (sc. e.g. classarios; u. et ad 15.6 infra) | Rhodias *ed. pr.* ||

locat, in sinistro Ponticos. Inter hos spatium CCCC pas-
 suum relinquit, quod satis esse ad explicandas naues uide-
 batur. ²Post hunc ordinem reliquas naues subsidio dis-
 tribuit. Quae quamque earum sequatur et cui subueniat
 5 constituit atque imperat. ³Non dubitanter Alexandrini
 classem producunt atque instruunt. In fronte collocant
 XXII, reliquas subsidiarias in secundo ordine constituunt.
⁴Magnum praeterea numerum minorum nauigiorum et
 scapharum producunt cum malleolis ignibusque, si quid
 10 ipsa multitudo et clamor et flamma nostris terroris adferre
 possent. ⁵Erant inter duas classes uada transitu angusto,
 quae pertinent ad regionem Africae. (Sic enim praedicant,
 partem esse Alexandriae dimidiam Africae.) Satisque diu
 inter ipsos est expectatum ab utris transeundi fieret initium,
 15 propterea quod ii qui intrassent et ad explicandam classem
 et ad receptum, si durior accidisset casus, impeditiores fore
 uidebantur.

15 ¹Rhodiis nauibus praeerat Euphranor, animi mag-
 nitudine ac uirtute magis cum nostris hominibus quam

1 Ponticos *MUSTV* | Ponticas *ed. pr.* || hos *MUSTV* | has *ed. pr.* || 2 relinquit *MUV* | reliquit *ST* || 12–13 Africae. (Sic enim praedicant, partem esse Alexandriae dimidiam Africae.) | Africae *M*, qui uerba 8 omisit || 15 ii *scripsimus* | ei *UST* | eis *M* | et *V* || 16 impeditiores *M* | expeditiores *USTV* ||

cum Graecis comparandus. ²Hic ob notissimam scientiam
 atque animi magnitudinem delectus est ab Rhodiis qui
 imperium classis obtineret. ³Qui ubi Caesaris <moram>
 animaduertit ‘Videris mihi,’ inquit ‘Caesar, uereri si haec
 uada primis nauibus intraris ne prius dimicare cogaris 5
 quam reliquam classem potueris explicare. Nobis rem com-
 mitte. ⁴Nos proelium sustinebimus—neque tuum iudicium
 fallemus—dum reliqui subsequantur. Hos quidem diutius
 in nostro conspectu gloriari magno nobis et dedecori et do-
 lori est.’ ⁵Caesar illum adhortatus atque omnibus laudibus 10
 prosecutus dat signum pugnae. Progressis ultra uadum
 IIII, Rhodias naues circumsistunt Alexandrini atque in eas
 impetum faciunt. ⁶Sustinent illi atque arte sollertiaque se
 explicant. Ac tantum doctrina potuit ut in dispari numero
 nulla transuersa hosti obiceretur, nullius remi detergeren- 15

3 Caesaris <moram> *Lewis* (cf. 2.1) | Caesaris <dubitationem> *aut*
 <dubitare> *Caesarem Forchhammer* (cf. 7.1 et BG 1.41.3) | Caesaris
 <cunctationem> *Landgraf 1888 coll. BG 3.18.6, 3.24.5* | Caesaris
 <consilium> *Andrieu dubitanter* (cf. BC 3.78.5) | cessari *Kraner feliciter* (cf.
Liu. 31.12.1) || **11** pugnae *MT^c* (cf. BG 7.62.2) | pugna *UST^{ac} V^{ac}*
 | pugnandi *V^c* (cf. 45.3) || Progressis ultra uadum IIII, Rhodias
UST^{ac} V | progressas ultra uadum IIII Rhodias *MT^c* | *an* progressis
 ultra uadum Rhodiis, IIII (cf. 14.1 et illi *infra*)? || **13** illi *MUSTV*
 (*u. et ad 14.1*) | illae *Klotz dubitanter* || arte sollertiaque se *MU* |
 artes sollertia quaesse *S* | rate solertia quae se *T^{ac} V* | rate solertiaque
 se *T^c* || **16.15–17.1** remi detergerentur *MUT^{ac} V* (cf. BC 1.58.1) |
 remi detergerentur *T^c* | remi detererentur *Hedicke teste scholio* | rem’
 detergerent *S* ||

tur, sed semper uenientibus aduersae occurrerent. ⁷Interim sunt reliquae subsecutae. Tum necessario discessum ab arte est propter angustias loci, atque omne certamen in uirtute constitit. ⁸Neque uero Alexandriae fuit quisquam aut nostrorum aut oppidanorum ⟨nisi⟩ qui aut in opere aut in pugna occupatum animum haberent quin altissima tecta peteret atque ex omni prospectu locum spectaculo caperet precibusque et uotis uictoriam suis ab dis immortalibus exposceret.

10 **16** ¹Minime autem par erat proeli certamen. Nostris enim pulsus neque terra neque mari effugium dabatur uic-

5 ⟨nisi⟩ qui *Fleischer coll. BG 1.30.5* | qui *MUSTV* | ⟨praeter eos⟩ qui *Gaertner-Hausburg 129 coll. BC 3.81.2* || **6** in pugna occupatum animum haberent *TV* (cf. *Cic. Inu. 1.31*) | in pugnatioccupatum animum haberent *S* | in pugna occupatum animum haberet *U* | pugna haberet occupatum animum *M^{ac}* | pugna occupatum animum haberet *M^f* | oppugnatione occupatum animum haberent *Landgraf 1891a coll. 12.1* || quin *MUT* | qui in *SV* || **7–9** peteret atque ex omni prospectu locum spectaculo caperet precibusque et uotis uictoriam suis ab dis immortalibus exposceret *MUTV* | peteret *S*, qui uerba *16* omisit || prospectu locum spectaculo *UT^fV* (u. *TLL 10.2.2206.27–41* et cf. *Liu. 23.47.3*) | prospectu locum spectaculoque *T^{ac}* | prospectaculo cum spectaculo *M* (*deest S*) | prospectaculo spectaculum *M^{tr}* | prospectu illorum (sc. pugnantium) spectacula *Larsen* || **10** par erat *MUT^f* (*inter par et at non legitur T^{ac}*) | pareat *S* | appareat *V* || **11** pulsus *MUSTV* (cf. *BG 1.46.3*) | [pulsis] *Nipperdey uoce uictis infra seruata* | paucis *Landgraf 1888* (u. *16.2*) | prorsus *Stephanus* (cf. *Quint. 12.9.9*) || dabatur uictis *MUSTV* (cf. *17.4* et *60.2*) | [dabatur uictis] *Gruterus teste Oudendorp uoce pulsus supra seruata* | dabatur ullum *Strada* ||

tis, omniaque uictoribus erant futura in incerto. Illi si superassent nauibus omnia tenerent, si inferiores fuissent reliquam tamen fortunam periclitarentur. ²Simul illud graue ac miserum uidebatur perpaucos de summa <exercitus> ac de salute omnium decertare. Quorum si qui aut animo 5 aut uirtute cessisset reliquis etiam esset cauendum, quibus pro se pugnandi facultas non fuisset. ³Haec superioribus diebus saepenumero Caesar suis exposuerat ut hoc maiore animo contenderent quod omnium salutem sibi commendatam uiderent. ⁴Eadem suum quisque contubernalem 10 amicum notum prosequens erat obtestatus: ne suam atque omnium falleret opinionem, quorum iudicio delectus ad pugnam proficisceretur. ⁵Itaque hoc animo est decertatum ut neque maritimis nauticisque sollertia atque ars praesidium ferret neque numero nauium praestantibus multitudo 15

1-2 Illi si superassent nauibus omnia tenerent *MUSTV* (cf. *Hirt. 8.33.1 possent, 8.39.4 uererentur, BC 3.111.4 haberent et u. ad 16.2 esset*) | <cum> illi si superassent nauibus omnia tenerent *Clarke* (cf. 69.3) ||
 4 summa <exercitus> *scripsimus* (cf. *BG 6.34.3, BC 1.67.5*) | summa *MUSTV* | summa rerum *5 teste Klotz* (cf. *BC 2.30.1*) | summa re *Ciacconius* (cf. *Quint. Decl. min. 343.9*) || 5 qui *STV* | quis *MU* ||
 6 cessisset *MUSTV* | cecidisset *Oudendorp Manutium infra sequens coll. Cic. Fam. 6.1.4* || esset *MUSTV* (*u. ad 16.1*) | esse *Lewis* ||
 cauendum *MUSTV* | cedendum *Rossetus testibus Gaertner-Hausburg 126 n.198* | cadendum *Manutius* || 7-8 superioribus diebus *MU^rTV* | superioribus *U^{ac}S* ||

prodesset neque electi ad uirtutem e tanta multitudine uiri
uirtuti nostrorum possent adaequare. ⁶Capitur hoc proe-
lio quinquere mis una et biremis cum defensoribus remi-
gibusque, et deprimuntur tres nostris incolumibus omnibus.

⁷Reliquae propinquam fugam ad oppidum capiunt. Quas
protexerunt ex molibus atque aedificiis imminetibus et nos-
tros adire propius prohibuerunt.

¹⁷ ¹Hoc ne sibi saepius accidere posset, omni ratione
Caesar contendendum existimauit ut insulam molemque
ad insulam pertinentem in suam redigeret potestatem.
²Perfectis enim magna ex parte munitionibus in oppido,
<et hanc> et illam [urbe(m)] uno tempore temptari posse
confidebat. ³Quo capto consilio cohortes X et leuis armat-
urae electos quosque idoneos ex equitibus Gallis arbitra-
batur in nauigia minora scaphasque imponit. In alteram

1 electi *Ciacconius* (cf. *BHisp* 15.2 et u. 13.4 idoneos) | flecti *MUSTV*
| flexi 5 teste *Andrieu* || **2** uirtuti *USTV* | uirtute *T^{ac}* | uirtutis *M*
|| adaequare *MUS* | adaequarent *TV* || **12** ◇ <et hanc> et illam
[urbe(m)] *scripsimus* | et illa in urbe *MU* | et illa in urbem *STV* | et
illam (sc. insulam) et urbem *Aldus* (u. *BC* 3.112.6) | et insulam et urbem
Jurinius | etiam illa (sc. mole) urbem *Nipperdey* | et illa (sc. insulam
molemque) et urbem *Gertz* teste *Klotz* (cf. 24.4 illa et *BG* 1.27.4 ea) || **14**
quosque *Lipsius* (cf. *BC* 3.103.1) | quos *MUSTV*, quod defendit *Andrieu*
coll. 77.2 || **15** In alteram *MUSTV* | alteram *Aldus* | alteramque
Vascosanus (u. et *infra*) | et alteram *Castiglioni* ||

insulae partem <***> distinendae manus causa constratis
 nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis propositis qui primus
 insulam cepisset. ⁴Ac primo impetum nostrorum pariter
 sustinuerunt. Vno enim tempore et ex tectis aedificiorum
 propugnabant et litora armati defendebant, quo propter
 asperitatem loci non facilis nostris aditus dabatur, et scaphis
 nauibusque longis V mobiliter et scienter angustias loci tue-
 bantur. ⁵Sed ubi primum locis cognitis uadisque pertemp-
 tatis pauci nostri in litore constiterunt atque hos sunt alii
 subsecuti constanterque in eos qui in litore aequo instit-
 erant impetum fecerunt omnes Pharitae terga uerterunt.
⁶His pulsus <***> custodia portus relicta naues ad litora
 et uicum applicarunt seque ex nauibus ad tuenda aedificia
 eiecerunt.

1 partem <***> *scripsimus, quam lacunam e.g.* (pedestres copias exponit, alteram partem) *suppleuerimus* | partem *MUSTV* || constratis *MUS* | contractis *TV^{ac}* | contractis *V^x* || **2** praemiis *ed. pr. (u. et supra)* | praemiisque *MUSTV* || **3** pariter *MUSTV* (*sc. in litore et angustii;* *cf. BC 3.52.1*) | Pharitae *Schneider* || **5** quo *MUTV* (*cf. BG 2.16.5*) | qua *S* fortasse recte (*cf. 19.4*) || **7** V *MUSTV* | [V] *Vielhaber 1869 coll. 13.4 et 16.7* | utrinque *Fleischer 1879 coll. 17.3* | an Alexandrini (*u. et infra*)? || **9–10** litore constiterunt atque hos sunt alii subsecuti constanterque in eos qui in litore *MUTV* | litore *S*, qui uerba 12 omisit || **10** constanterque *5 teste Klotz (cf. 36.2)* | constantemque *MUTV* (*deest S*) || **12** His pulsus <***> *Schneider quam lacunam Larsen* (nautae) uel (milites) *suppleuerit* | his pulsus *USTV* | hii pulsi *M* | nisi mauis his pulsus (Alexandrini) (*cf. 15.5 et u. supra*) uel his pulsus (illi) (*cf. Sen. Contr. 1.8.11*) ||

18 ¹Neque uero diutius ea munitione se continere potuerunt etsi erat non dissimile atque Alexandriae genus aedificiorum, ut minora maioribus conferantur, turresque editae et coniunctae muri locum obtinebant, neque nostri
 5 aut scalis aut cratibus aut reliquis rebus parati uenerant ad oppugnandum. ²Sed terror hominibus mentem consiliumque eripit et membra debilitat. Vt tum accidit.
³Qui se in aequo loco ac plano pares esse confidebant idem
 10 altitudine in aedificiis consistere ausi non sunt seque per molem in mare praecipitauerunt et DCCC passuum interuallum ad oppidum enatauerunt. ⁴Multi tamen ex his capti interfectique sunt, sed numerus captiuorum omnino fuit VI milium.

15 **19** ¹Caesar praeda militibus concessa aedificia diripi iussit castellumque ad pontem qui propior erat Pharo comuniuit atque ibi praesidium posuit. ²Hunc fuga Pharitae

1 diutius ea munitione *Dauisius 1706 (cf. BG 2.30.2) | diutius ex munitione MU^USTV | ex munitionibus diutius U^U || 3* maioribus *MU | minoribus STV || 5* aut cratibus aut *MUST | aut V, qui uerba 2 omisit || 11* DCCC *M^USTV | DCCCC M^{ac}, quem numerum defendit Schiller 1890a coll. BC 3.112.2 || 12–14* oppidum enatauerunt. Multi tamen ex his capti interfectique sunt, sed numerus captiuorum omnino fuit VI milium *MUST uocibus hic et illic leuiter mutatis; ex his omisit U | oppidum V, qui uerba 15 omisit || 16* propior *TV (cf. 73.1) | prior MUS ||*

reliquerant, certiore[m] illum propiore[m]que oppido Alexandrini tuebantur. Sed eum postero die simili ratione aggreditur quod his obtentis duobus omnem nauigiorum excursus et repentina latrocinia sublatum iri uidebat. ³Iamque eos qui praesidio eum locum tenebant tormentis ex nauibus sagittisque depulerat atque in oppidum redegerat et cohortium trium instar in terram exposuerat. (Non enim plures consistere angustiae loci patiebantur. Reliquae copiae in nauibus stationem obtinebant.) ⁴Quo facto imperat pontem aduersus hostem praeuallari et qua exitus nauibus erat fornice extructo quo pons sustinebatur lapidibus oppleri atque obstrui. ⁵Quorum altero opere effecto, ut nulla omnino scapha egredi posset, altero instituto omnes Alexandrinorum copiae ex oppido se eiecerunt et contra munitiones pontis latiore loco constiterunt. Eodemque tempore quae consueuerant nauigia per pontes ad incendia oner-

1 certiore[m] *STV* (cf. *Fron. Ag.* 2 et u. *TLL* 3.924.52–68) | fortiorem *MU*, quod defendit *Fleischer coll.* 66.2 | artiore[m] *Vielhaber 1869 coll.* 19.3 angustiae loci | inferiore[m] *Stark* (cf. 6.2) | ulteriore[m] *Schambach 1879–1882* (cf. *BC* 1.40.3) || **2–3** simili ratione aggreditur quod his *MU* (cf. *BG* 1.28.4) | simili ratione aggreditur his *STV* (cf. *BG* 7.4.1) || **3** omnem nauigiorum excursus *MUSTV* | omnes nauigiorum excursus *Landgraf 1888* (u. et infra) || **4** sublatum *MTV* | sublato *S* | sublato *U^{sc}* | sublato *U^e* || uidebat *Bentley* (cf. *BG* 7.27.1) | uidebatur *MU* (cf. *BC* 1.69.1 et 2.13.4) | uidebantur *STV*, quod defendit *Landgraf 1888* (u. et supra) ||

ariarum emittere ad molem constituerunt. ⁶Pugnabatur a nobis ex ponte ex mole, ab illis ex area quae erat aduersus pontem et ex nauibus contra molem.

5 **20** ¹In his rebus occupato Caesare militesque hortante remigum magnus numerus et classiariorum ex longis nauibus nostris in molem se eiecit. ²Pars eorum studio spectandi ferebatur, pars etiam cupiditate pugnandi. Hi primum nauigia hostium lapidibus ac fundis a mole repellebant ac multum proficere multitudine telorum
10 uidebantur. ³Sed postquam ultra eum locum ab latere eorum aperto ausi sunt egredi ex nauibus Alexandrini pauci, ut sine signis certisque ordinibus sine ratione prodierant sic temere in naues refugere coeperunt. ⁴Quorum fuga
15 nostrosque acrius perturbatos insequiebantur. Simul qui

1 constituerunt. Pugnabatur *MUTV* | constituerunt *S* (*deest S* 19.6 pugnabatur – 24.2 ad) || **2** nobis *MUTV* (*cf.* 3.1) | nostris *Aldus* || ex mole *MUTV* (*de anaphora cf.* 20.3) | <et> ex mole *Müller* (*cf.* *BC* 3.6.1) | et mole *Schneider* || **12** sine ratione *MUTV* (*de anaphora cf.* 19.6) | <et> sine ratione *Callaghan* (*cf.* *BG* 7.52.2) | [sine ratione] *Forchhammer ut glossema ad temere pertinens* || **13** refugere coeperunt *U* | receperunt *M* | fugere coeperunt *T* | profugere coeperunt *V* || **15** acrius perturbatos insequiebantur *MU* (*cf.* *Liu.* 8.8.13 *et, de aduerbio, Hirt.* 8.35.5) | acrius perturbantes insequiebantur *TV* (*cf.* 75.2 *et, de aduerbio, Tac. Ann.* 4.67.3) (*deest S*) | perturbatos acrius insequiebantur *Landgraf* 1888 *fortasse recte* (*cf.* *Hirt.* 8.10.2) | nisi *mauis* [perturbatos] *ut glossema de 20.5 sumptum* ||

in nauibus longis remanserant scalas rapere nauesque a terra repellere properabant ne hostes nauibus potirentur.

⁵Quibus omnibus rebus perturbati milites nostri cohortium trium quae in ponte ac prima mole constiterant, cum post se clamorem exaudirent, fugam suorum uiderent, magnam uim telorum aduersi sustinerent, ueriti ne ab tergo circumuenirentur et discessu nauium omnino reditu intercluderentur munitionem in ponte institutam reliquerunt et magno cursu incitati ad naues contenderunt.

⁶Quorum pars proximas nacta naues multitudine hominum atque onere depressa est, pars resistens et dubitans quid esset capiendum consili ab Alexandrinis interfecta est. Nonnulli feliciore exitu expeditas ad ancoram naues consecuti incolumes discesserunt, pauci alleuatis scutis et animo ad conandum nisi ad proxima nauigia adnatarunt.

21 ¹Caesar quoad potuit cohortando suos ad pontem

8 ponte 5 teste Oudendorp (cf. 2.2) | pontem *MUTV* || **10–11** multitudine hominum atque onere *MUTV* (an secludendum ut glossema de *BC* 2.43.4 *sumptum*?) **14–15** alleuatis scutis et animo ad conandum nisi *MUTV* uocibus hic et illic leuiter mutatis (u. *infra*) | [alleuatis scutis et animo ad conandum nisi] *Fleischer* 1879 ('romanhafte') || alleuatis *UTV* | alleuati *M*, quod defendit *Madvig* 'alleuati ipsi scutis ligneis homines'; u. *Amm.* 24.6.7, cf. *Curt.* 9.9.22 et, de uerborum ordine, *BC* 1.45.2) || **15** animo ad conandum nisi *MUTV* (cf. *Quint. Decl. min.* 266.9) | an animo ad conandum incumbentes (cf. 12.4)? ||

ac munitiones continere eodem in periculo uersatus est. Postquam uniuersos cedere animaduertit in suum nauigium se recepit. ²Quo multitudo hominum insecuta cum irumperet neque administrandi neque repellendi a terra
 5 facultas daretur, fore quod accidit suspicatus sese ex nauigio eiecit atque ad eas quae longius constiterant naues adnatauit. ³Hinc suis laborantibus subsidio scaphas mittens nonnullos conseruauit. Nauigium quidem eius multitudine depressum militum una cum hominibus interiit. ⁴Hoc proelio desiderati sunt ex numero legionariorum militum circiter
 10 CCCC et paulo <ultra> eum numerum classarii et remiges. ⁵Alexandrini eo loco castellum magnis munitionibus multisque tormentis confirmarunt atque egestis ex mari lapidibus libere sunt usi postea ad mittenda nauigia.

15 22 ¹Hoc detrimento milites nostri tantum afuerunt ut perturbarentur ut incensi atque incitati magnas accessiones fecerint in operibus hostium expugnandis. ²In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus Alexandrinis, manum <***> comprehendi

1 continere *Lipsius* (cf. *BC* 3.58.1) | contendere *MUTV* || 11 paulo <ultra> *Beroaldus* (cf. *BC* 3.66.4) | paulo *MUTV* || 15 afuerunt *MU* uel affuerunt | fuerunt *TV* | afuit *Vielhaber* 1869 (cf. *Suet. Tib.* 50.1) || 16 accessiones *TV* | accensiones *MU* || 19 ◇ manum <***> *Nipperdey*, qui lacunam alteram ante et statuit | manum *MUTV* | <***> manum *Stephanus* ||

†multum† operibus et ardentibus studiis militum. Nec diuulgata Caesaris hortatio subsequi legionum aut laborem aut pugnandi poterat cupiditatem, ut magis deterrendi et continendi a periculosissimis essent dimicationibus quam incitandi ad pugnandum.

5

23 ¹Alexandrini cum Romanos et secundis rebus confirmari et aduersis incitari uiderent neque ullum belli tertium casum nossent quo possent esse firmiores, ut coniectura consequi possumus, aut admoniti a regis amicis qui in Caesaris erant praesidiis aut suo priore consilio per occultos nuntios regi probato legatos ad Caesarem miserunt ut dimitteret regem transireque ad suos pateretur: ²paratam enim omnem multitudinem esse, confectam taedio puellae, fiducia-rio regno, dominatione crudelissima Ganymedis, facere id quod rex imperasset; quo si auctore in Caesaris fidem amicitiamque uenturi essent nullius periculi timorem multitudini fore impedimento quo minus se dederent.

10

15

24 ¹Caesar etsi fallacem gentem semperque alia cogitantem alia simulantem bene cognitam habebat tamen pe-

1 †multum† *scripsimus* | multum *MUTV* | *an* munitionum (*cf.* 1.2)? *nisi mauis lacunam alteram ante operibus statuere* || **7** tertium *MUTV* (*cf.* *Lucr.* 1.445–46) | [tertium] *Kraffert* || **8** quo *M* | qui *UTV* || **11** regi *Ursinus* (*cf.* *Hirt.* 8.21.1 *etc.*) | regis *MUTV* ||

tentibus dare ueniam utile esse statuit quod, si quo pacto sentirent ea quae postularent, mansurum in fide dimissum regem credebat, sin, id quod magis illorum naturae conueniebat, ducem ad bellum gerendum regem habere uellent, splendidius atque honestius se contra regem quam
 5 contra conuenarum ac fugitiuorum manum bellum esse gesturum. ²Itaque regem cohortatus ut consuleret regno paterno, parceret [et] praeclarissimae patriae, quae turpibus incendiis et ruinis esset deformata, ciues suos primum ad
 10 sanitatem reuocaret, deinde conseruaret, fidem populo Romano sibi prae-staret, cum ipse tantum ei crederet ut ad hostes armatos eum mitteret, dextra dextram tenens dimittere coepit adulta iam aetate puerum. ³At regius animus disciplinis fallacissimis eruditus, ne a gentis suae moribus
 15 degeneraret, flens orare contra Caesarem coepit ne se dimitteret: non enim sibi regnum ipsum conspectu Caesaris esse

1 statuit *UTV et M supra lineam* | constituit *M* || quo pacto sentirent *Manutius* (cf. *Cic. Att. 1.12.2*; de numero u. *infra*) | quo facto sentiret *MUTV* | profecto sentirent *Fleischer 1879 coll. Hirt. 8.21.2* || **2** postularent *TV* (u. *23.1 miserunt*) | postularet (sc. rex) *MU* || **6** bellum esse *M^eUT* | bellum esset *M^{ac}* | bellum *V* || **8** parceret *M* | parceret et *UTV* || **11–12** ad hostes *MUTV* | hostes *redit S u. ad 19.6* || **13** adulta iam aetate puerum *MUSTV an secludendum ut glossema* (u. *BC 3.104.1, 108.1, App. BC 2.354 et ad 7.2*)? **15** contra Caesarem *MUSTV* (cf. *37.2 etc.*) | [contra Caesarem] *Dinter* (ex *24.5*? cf. *BG 5.27.7*) | an Caesarem contra (cf. *60.3*)? ||

iucundius. ⁴Compressis pueri lacrimis Caesar ipse comotus celeriter, si illa sentiret, fore eum secum adfirmans ad suos dimisit. ⁵Ille, ut ex carceribus in liberum cursum emissus, adeo contra Caesarem acriter bellum gerere coepit ut lacrimas quas in colloquio proiecerat gaudio uideretur 5
profudisse. ⁶Accidisse hoc complures Caesaris legati, amici, centuriones militesque laetabantur quod nimia bonitas eius fallaciis pueri elusa esset. Quasi uero id Caesar bonitate tantum adductus ac non prudentissimo consilio fecisset.

25 ¹Cum duce assumpto Alexandrini nihilo se firmiores 10
factos aut languidiores Romanos animaduenterent eludentibusque militibus regis aetatem atque infirmitatem magnum dolorem acciperent neque se quicquam proficere uiderent, rumoresque existerent magna Caesaris praesidia terrestri itinere <ex> Syria Ciliciaque adduci—quod non- 15
dum auditum Caesari erat—, commeatum qui mari nostris supportabatur intercipere statuerunt. ²Itaque expedi-

2 illa *MUSTV* (cf. 24.1) | ita *Schneider coll. Cic. Luc. 63* || **3-4** ut ex carceribus in liberum cursum emissus *MUSTV* (cf. *Cic. Amic. 101*) | ut <equus> ex carceribus in liberum cursum emissus *Fleischer* || **14** Caesaris praesidia *ed. pr. (cf. 23.1)* | Caesar praesidia *MUSTV* | Caesari praesidia *M^{mr}* | an Caesaris auxilia (*u. 1.1*)? || **15** itinere <ex> *Stephanus (cf. BC 3.107.1)* | itinere *MUSTV* || Ciliciaque *MUV* | Ciliaque *ST uel Cyliaque* || **16** commeatum *MU* | commeatumque *STV* | <audendum aliquid> commeatumque *Vielhaber 1869 dubitanter (cf. Liu. 41.19.7)* ||

5 tis nauigiis locis idoneis ad Canopum in statione dispositis
 nauibus insidiabantur nostris †commeatu†. ³Quod ubi Cae-
 sari nuntiatum est uniuersam classem iubet expediri atque
 instrui. Praeficit huic Tiberium Neronem. Proficiscuntur
 10 in ea classe Rhodiae naues atque in iis Euphranor, sine quo
 nulla umquam dimicatio maritima—nulla etiam parum
 feliciter—confecta erat. ⁴At fortuna, quae plerumque
 eos quos plurimis beneficiis ornauit ad duriorem casum
 reseruat, superiorum temporum dissimilis Euphranorem
 15 prosequabatur. ⁵Nam cum ad Canopum uentum esset in-
 structaque utrimque classis conflixisset et sua consuetudine
 Euphranor primus proelium commisisset et quadriremem
 hostium perforasset ac demersisset, proximam longius inse-

2 †commeatu† *USTV* (cf. *BC* 2.32.12) | commeatum *M* |
 commeatibus *Oudendorp* (cf. *BG* 3.23.6) | commeatuque *Nipperdey*
 (de casu datiuo u. *Gel.* 4.16.8) | [commeatu] *Müller* | commeatu (onustis)
Kübler 1896a (cf. *BC* 3.23.2) | <et Caesarem prohibebant> commeatu
Andrieu coll. *BC* 3.111.4 | <nostra> signa (uel <nostros> ignes) imitati
Vielhaber 1869 coll. *Dio* 42.40.6 | alii alia || **3** uniuersam *Fleischer* 1879
ex compendio (cf. *BAfr* 62.5) | unam *MUTV* | nam *S* | suam *Nipperdey* (cf.
 45.1) || **4** Praeficit *STV* | praefecit *MU* || **6** maritima *MUSTV*
 (cf. 46.1 et *Cic. Ver.* 2.5.136) | mari inita *Cornelissen* (cf. *Sempronius Asellio*
FRHist F2) | maritima <***> *Kübler* 1896a || parum *MUSTV* |
 <impar> (sc. dimicatio) parum *Larsen* || **11** conflixisset *MUTV* | esset
 conflixisset *S* | constitisset *Fischer* 15 coll. 21.2 || **12** quadriremem
Dübner (de corruptela u. ad 31.1 et *BC* 3.111.3) | illi triremem *MUSTV*, quod
 defendit *Madvig* ('significatur: et illico triremem') sed u. *TLL* 7.1.368.9–22
 | illic triremem *Oudendorp* || **13** perforasset ac demersisset *5 teste*
Oudendorp (sc. Euphranor) | perforassent ac demersissent *MUSTV* (sc.
 illi; u. *supra*) ||

cutus parum celeriter insequentibus reliquis circumuentus ab Alexandrinis. ⁶Cui subsidium nemo tulit siue quod in ipso satis praesidi pro uirtute ac felicitate eius putarent esse siue quod ipsi sibi timebant. Ita qui unus ex omnibus eo proelio bene rem gessit solus cum sua quadriremi uictrice perit.

5

26 ¹Sub idem tempus Mithridates Pergamenus, magnae nobilitatis domi scientiaeque in bello et uirtutis, fidei dignitatisque in amicitia Caesaris, missus in Syriam Ciliciamque initio belli Alexandrini ad auxilia arcessenda, cum magnis copiis, quas celeriter et propensissima ciuitatum uoluntate et sua diligentia confecerat, itinere pedestri, quo coniungitur Aegyptus Syriae—²Pelusium adducit. Idque oppidum firmo praesidio occupatum Achillae propter op-

10

1 circumuentus *MUSTV* (cf. 55.3) | circumuentus est *M^{mr}* (cf. 28.2) || **4** Ita qui *Haupt teste Nipperdey* (cf. *Cic. Tusc. 1.13*) | itaque *MUSTV* | itaque qui *Gruterus teste Oudendorp* (cf. *Cic. Ver. 2.3.85*) || **9** missus *MU* | missis *STV* || **10–11** cum magnis copiis *MUSTV* | magnas copias *Vascosanus* | [cum] magnis copiis *Hoffmann 1890* (u. et infra) || **13** Pelusium adducit *MUSTV* (de anacolutho u. *Landgraf 1891b, 8; de tempore* cf. 61.4) | Pelusium adduxit *Aldus* (cf. 43.4) | Pelusium aduenit *Dausius 1727* (cf. *Liu. 42.56.3*) | ad Pelusium uēnit *Vielhaber 1869* (cf. 57.6) | Pelusium accedit *Fleischer coll. 56.6* | Pelusium adductis *Hoffmann 1890* (u. et supra) | <***> adducit *Persyn, quae uel* <tres legiones> (u. *BC 3.107.1* et cf. 3.4.3) uel <eas> *suppleuerit* | alii alia || Idque *MUTV* (cf. 3.4) | idque quod *S* | quod *Landgraf 1891b 8 coll. 36.3* || **14** Achillae scripsimus | achillae *MSV* uel acchillae | achillae *UT* | an secludendum ut glossema? ||

portunitatem loci (namque tota Aegyptus maritimo accessu Pharo, pedestri Pelusio uelut claustris munita existimatur), repente magnis circumdatum copiis, multiplici praesidio pertinaciter propugnantibus, et copiarum magnitudine, quas integras uulneratis defessisque subiciebat, et
 5 perseuerantia constantiaque oppugnandi quo die est aggressus in suam redegit potestatem praesidiumque ibi suum collocauit. ³Inde re bene gesta Alexandriam ad Caesarem contendit. Omnesque eas regiones per quas iter faciebat
 10 auctoritate ea quae plerumque adest uictori pacarat atque in amicitiam Caesaris redegerat.

27 ¹Locus est fere regionum illarum nobilissimus non ita longe ab Alexandria, qui nominatur Delta. Quod nomen a similitudine litterae cepit. Nam pars quaedam
 15 fluminis Nili deriuata [inter se] duobus itineribus paulatim medium inter se spatium relinquens diuersissimo ad litus interuallo [a] mari coniungitur. ²Cui loco cum ap-

3–4 multiplici praesidio pertinaciter propugnantibus *MUSTV* (cf. *Ciris* 85 et u. *TLL* 8.1592.48–60 ‘spectat ad quantitatem’; de constructione ad sensum u. *Landgraf* 1888 et ad *BC* 3.78.4) **7** ibi suum *UST* et *M^{mr}* | suum ibi *MV* || **10** pacarat *ς* teste *Oudendorp* (cf. *BG* 3.11.5) | placarat *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 6.16.3) | placaret *T^{ac}* || **15** [inter se] *Dübner* | inter se *MUSTV* || paulatim medium *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 3.19.1) | paulatim ⟨latius⟩ medium *Larsen* (cf. *BG* 7.73.5 et u. *TLL* 10.1.8.63–77) | ⟨maius⟩ paulatim [medium] *Müller* (cf. *Curt.* 8.1.30) ||

propinquare Mithridaten rex cognouisset et transeundum ei flumen sciret magnas aduersus eum copias misit, quibus uel superari delerique Mithridaten uel sine dubio retineri posse credebat. ³Quem ad modum autem optabat eum uinci, sic satis habebat interclusum a Caesare a se retineri. ⁵Quae primae copiae flumen a Delta transire et Mithridati occurrere potuerunt proelium commiserunt festinantes praeripere subsequentibus uictoriae societatem. ⁵Quorum impetum Mithridates magna cum prudentia constantiaque [uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine nostra castris uallatis sustinuit. Cum uero incaute atque

2 flumen *MUSTV* (sc. Nilum prope Memphin? u. 27.4–6 et *Jos. BJ* 1.187–92, cuius tamen narratio ualde differt; sc. illud angustum? u. 29.1 et *Graindor*, qui confert *Jos. AJ* 14.133; sc. ad ostium Pelusiacum fluens? *Stoffel* 2.63–64) 5 interclusum a Caesare a se *MUST* | interclusum a caesare se *V* | [interclusum a Caesare a se] *Ciaconius*, qui tamen a se interclusum [a Caesare] *malit*, et *Jurinius ut dittographia* ('cum rex ipse cum iis copiis non esset') || 9 ◇ Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS^c* et *T supra lineam* | mithridates magna cum potentia *S^{ac}T* | magna cum prudentia mithridates *V feliciter* | Mithridates [magna cum prudentia] *DSimons*, qui et constantiaque et Alexandrinorum imprudentia *secluserit ut glossema* || constantiaque [uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine *Dübner dubitanter* | constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia consuetudine *MUTV* | consuetudine *S qui uerba 5 omisit* | [constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine *ed. pr.* | constantiaque militum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia consuetudine *5 teste Ciaconio* | constantiaque uirtutis tum Alexandrinorum imprudentia *Madvig qui magna supra secluserit* | constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia *Klotz post facta transposuerit* || 11 incaute *MU* (cf. *Liu.* 7.15.9) | caute *STV* ||

insolenter succedere eos munitionibus uideret eruptione undique facta magnum numerum eorum interfecit. ⁶Quod nisi locorum notitia reliqui se texissent partimque in naues quibus flumen transierant recepissent funditus deleti essent.

⁷Qui ut paulum ab illo timore se recrearunt adiuncti iis qui subsequebantur rursus oppugnare Mithridaten coeperunt.

28 ¹Mittitur a Mithridate nuntius Caesari qui rem gestam perferret. Cognoscit ex suis eadem haec accidisse rex. Ita paene sub idem tempus et rex ad opprimendum Mithridaten proficiscitur et Caesar ad recipiendum. ²Celeriore fluminis Nili nauigatione rex est usus, in quo magnam et paratam classem habebat. Caesar eodem itinere uti noluit ne nauibus in flumine dimicaret, sed circumuectus eo mari quod Africae partis esse dicitur, sicuti supra demonstraui-
mus, prius tamen regis copiis occurrit quam is Mithridaten aggredi posset eumque ad se uictorem incolumi exercitu recepit. ³Considerat cum copiis rex loco natura munito, quod erat ipse excelsior planitie ex omnibus

5 adiuncti iis] | adiuncti his *STV* (cf. *BC* 2.6.3) | adiunctis (h)iis *MU* (cf. 42.3 etc.) || **11** quo 5 teste *Oudendorp* | qua *MUSTV* || **13–14** circumuectus *MUV* | circum euectus *S* | circumuectus est *T* || **17** rex *S* | *L* ex *MTV* | ex *U* ||

partibus subiecta. Tribus autem ex lateribus uariis generum munitionibus tegebatur. Vnum latus erat adiectum flumini Nilo, alterum editissimo loco ductum ut partem castrorum obtineret, tertium palude cingebatur.

29 ¹Inter castra et Caesaris iter flumen intercedebat angustum altissimis ripis, quod in Nilum influebat. Aberat autem ab regis castris milia passuum circiter VII. ²Rex cum hoc itinere uenire Caesarem comperisset equitatum omnem expeditosque delectos pedites ad id flumen misit qui transitu Caesarem prohiberent et eminus ex ripis proelium impar inirent. Nullum enim processum uirtus habebat aut periculum ignauia subibat. ³Quae res incendit dolore milites equitesque nostros quod tam diu pari proelio cum Alexandrinis certaretur. ⁴Itaque eodem tempore equites Germani dispersi uada [fluminum] quaerentes partim demissioribus ripis flumen tranarunt, et legionarii magnis ar-

1 uariis generum *MUSTV*, quod defendit Löfstedt (cf. Cic. Font. 13 uarietate generum) | uariis genere ς teste Andrieu (cf. BC 3.110.12 et Liu. 22.36.1) | uarii generis Oehler (cf. BC 2.36.1) | an uariis (multorumque) generum (cf. Cic. De orat. 3.177)? || **14** certaretur ς teste Andrieu (cf. Liu. 2.56.15) | certarentur *MUSTV* | certarent ς teste Klotz (cf. Liu. 5.41.4) || **15** [fluminum] Dübner (cf. BG 2.9.4) | fluminum *MUSTV* | fluminis ς teste Klotz (cf. BG 1.8.4, Hirt. 8.13.1) ||

boribus excisis quae longitudine utramque ripam con-
tingerent, proiectis repentinoque aggere iniecto flumen tran-
sierunt. ⁵Quorum impetum adeo pertimuerunt hostes ut
in fuga spem salutis collocarent. Sed id frustra. Namque
5 ex ea fuga pauci ad regem refugerunt paene omni reliqua
multitudine interfecta.

30 ¹Caesar re praeclarissime gesta cum subitum aduen-
tum suum iudicaret magnum terrorem Alexandrinis iniec-
turum protinus uictor ad castra regis pertendit. ²Haec cum
10 et opere magno uallata et loci natura munita animaduert-
eret confertamque armatorum multitudinem collocatam in
uallo uideret lassos itinere ac proeliando milites ad oppug-
nanda castra succedere noluit. Itaque non magno interu-
allo relicto ab hoste castra posuit. ³Postero die castellum
15 quod rex in proximo uico non longe a suis castris mu-
nierat brachiisque cum opere castrorum coniunxerat uici
obtinendi causa Caesar aggressus omnibus copiis expugnat,

1–2 excisis quae longitudine utramque ripam con-tingerent, proiectis
repentinoque *MUSTV* | excisis quae longitudine utramque ripam
con-tingerent et proiectis repentinoque 5 | [excisis] quae longitudine
utramque ripam con-tingerent proiectis repentinoque *Ciacconius* |
excisis quae longitudine utramque ripam con-tingerent proiectis
<iis> repentinoque *Nipperdey* | excisis quae longitudine utramque
ri-
pam con-tingerent proiectisque repentino (*cf.* 44.4)? || **9** pertendit
MUSTV (*cf.* *Fron. Str.* 1.4.6) | contendit 5 *teste Andrieu* ||

non quo id minore numero militum consequi difficile factu
 putaret sed ut ab ea uictoria perterritis Alexandrinis protinus
 castra regis oppugnaret. ⁴Itaque eo cursu quo refugientes
 Alexandrinos ex castello in castra sunt milites insecuti munitionibus
 successerunt acerrimeque eminus proeliari 5
 coeperunt. ⁵Duabus ex partibus aditus oppugnationis nostris
 dabatur: una, quam liberum accessum habere demonstraui,
 altera, quae mediocre interuallum inter castra et flumen Nilum
 habebat. ⁶Maxima et electissima multitudo Alexandrinorum
 defendebat eam partem quae facillimum 10
 aditum habebat. Plurimum proficiebant in repellendis uulneran-
 disque nostris qui regione fluminis Nili propugnabant. Diuersis
 enim telis nostri figebantur, aduersi ex uallo castrorum,
 auersi ex flumine, in quo multae naues instructae funditoribus
 et sagittariis nostros impugnabant. 15

31 ¹Caesar cum uideret milites acrius proeliari non posse
 nec tamen multum profici propter locorum difficultatem cumque
 animaduerneret excelsissimum locum castrorum relictum esse
 ab Alexandrinis quod et per se munitus esset et studio partim
 pugnandi partim spectandi decucur- 20

3 castra regis *UST* | in castra regis *M* | regis castra *V* || eo
MUSTV (cf. *BG* 1.27.2) | eodem *Schneider* (cf. 74.4) || **11** habebat
MUSTV | habebat. At *Larsen coll.* 25.4 etc. || **14** auersi 5 teste *Klotz*
 (cf. *Cic. De orat.* 2.256) | mersi *MUSTV* ||

rissent in eum locum in quo pugnabatur, cohortes tres circumire castra et summum locum aggredi iussit iisque Carfulenum praefecit, et animi magnitudine et rei militaris scientia uirum praestantem. ²Quo ut uentum est, pau-
 5 cis defendentibus munitionem, nostris contra militibus acerrime pugnantibus, diuerso clamore et proelio perterriti Alexandrini trepidantes in omnes partes castrorum discurrere coeperunt. ³Quorum perturbatione nostrorum animi adeo sunt incitati ut paene eodem tempore ex omnibus
 10 partibus, primi tamen editissimum castrorum locum caperent. Ex quo decurrentes magnam multitudinem hostium in castris interfecerunt. ⁴Quod periculum plerique Alexandrini fugientes aceruatim se de uallo praecipitarunt in eam partem quae flumini erat adiuncta. ⁵Horum primis in ipsa
 15 fossa munitionis magna ruina oppressis ceteri faciliorem fugam habuerunt. ⁶Constat fugisse ex castris regem ipsum

1 tres *Faernus teste Ciacconius (i.e., III; de corruptela u. ad 25.5) | illo MUSTV || 10* ◇ partibus *MUSTV (sc. loca caperent nostri; cf. Hirt. 8.36.4 et, de figura apo koinou, BC 1.19.5) | partibus (impetus fieret) Kübler 1896a (cf. BG 1.22.3) | partibus (inrumperent) Schneider (cf. BG 4.14.3) || castrorum locum STV et M^{mr} (cf. BG 2.23.5) | locum castrorum MU (cf. 31.1) || 13–14* in eam partem *MUSTV (sc. loci; u. 28.3, 30.5 et cf. Hirt. 8.46.1) | ea parte Larsen (sc. montis; cf. 32.1) ||*

receptumque in nauem multitudine eorum qui ad proximas naues adnabant demerso nauigio perisse.

32 ¹Re felicissime celerrimeque gesta Caesar magnae uictoriae fiducia proximo terrestri itinere Alexandriam cum equitibus contendit atque ea parte oppidi uictor introiit 5
 quae praesidio hostium tenebatur. ²Neque eum consilium suum fefellit quin hostes eo proelio audito nihil iam de bello essent cogitaturi. ³Dignum adueniens fructum uirtutis et animi magnitudinis tulit: omnis enim multitudo oppidanorum armis proiectis munitionibusque suis relictis, ueste ea 10
 sumpta qua supplices dominantes deprecari consuerunt sacrisque omnibus prolatis quorum religione precari offensos iratosque animos regum erant soliti, aduenienti Caesari occurrerunt seque ei dediderunt. ⁴Caesar in fidem receptos consolatus per hostium munitiones in suam partem oppidi 15
 magna gratulatione uenit suorum, qui non tantum bellum

1–2 ad proximas naues *MUSTV* | [ad proximas naues] *Vielhaber 1869 ut glossema ineptum* || **3–4** magnae uictoriae *MUSTV* (cf. *Liu. 31.22.1*) | magna uictoriae *Ciacconius* (cf. *BAfr 31.5*) | magna e uictoria *Madvig* (cf. *Liu. 28.43.19*) || **6–7** consilium suum fefellit *MUV* | consilium suum refellit *ST* | [consilium suum fefellit] *Ciacconius coll. BC 3.94.3* || **12** precari *MT^cV* | precare *UST^{ac}* ||

ipsum ac dimicationem sed etiam talem aduentum eius felicem fuisse laetabantur.

5 **33** ¹Caesar Aegypto atque Alexandria potitus reges constituit [ut] quos Ptolomaeus testamento scripserat atque
 obtestatus erat populum Romanum ne mutarentur. ²Nam
 maiore ex duobus pueris, rege, amisso minori tradidit regnum
 maiorique ex duabus filiis, Cleopatrae, quae manserat
 in fide praesidiisque eius. Minorem, Arsinoem, cuius
 10 nomine diu regnasse impotenter Ganymeden docuimus,
 deducere ex regno statuit ne qua rursus noua dissensio,
 priusquam diuturnitate confirmarentur regum imperia, per
 homines seditiosos nasceretur. ³Legiones ibi ueterana
 sexta secum reducta ceteras reliquit quo firmius esset eo-

1–2 sed etiam talem aduentum eius felicem *MUSTV* (cf. *Plin. Nat. 11.174*) | sed etiam talem aduentum eius [felicem] *Madvig* (cf. 77.1) | sed etiam [talem] aduentum eius talem *Morus* | felicem sed etiam talem aduentum eius *Vielhaber 1869 dubitanter* | *nisi mauis* sed etiam [talem] aduentum eius felicem (*u. 32.1*) || **4** [ut] *M^{mr}* (cf. *BG 5.54.2*) | ut *MUSTV* || **6** maiore ex duobus pueris, rege *MUT^c* | maiorem ex duobus pueris regem *ST^{ac}V* | maiore ex duobus pueris [rege] *Krafft* || **11** diuturnitate confirmarentur *T^c* et *M^{mr}* (cf. 53.5 et *u. TLL 4.224.45–79*) | diuturnitates confirmarentur *MUST^{ac}V* || regum *Stephanus* (cf. 33.3) | regis *MU* | regi *STV* | regibus *Kraner* (*u. TLL 4.224.80–225.13*) || imperia *ST* | imperio *MU* | imperiam *V* | imperium *M^{mr}* || **12** Legiones ibi *5 teste Klotz* | legione ibi *MU* | legiones sibi *S* | legione sibi *TV* || ueterana *MUT^c* (cf. 69.1, 76.1) | ueteranas *ST^{ac}V* || **13** reducta *MUSTV* (*sc. in Asiam?* *u. BC 3.106.1 et cf. BG 1.49.5; sc. in Syriam?* *u. 33.5*) | deducta *5 teste Oudendorp* (cf. *Liu. 40.35.14*) | *an ducta* (cf. *BG 5.5.4*)? ||

rum regum imperium qui neque amorem suorum habere poterant, quod fideliter permanserant in Caesaris amicitia, neque uetustatis auctoritatem, paucis diebus reges constituti. ⁴Simul ad imperi nostri dignitatem utilitatemque publicam pertinere existimabat, si permanerent in fide reges, 5 praesidiis eos nostris esse tutos; si essent ingrati, posse iisdem praesidiis coerceri. Sic rebus omnibus confectis et collocatis ipse itinere terrestri profectus est in Syriam.

34 ¹Dum haec in Aegypto geruntur rex Deiotarus ad Domitium Caluinum, cui Caesar Asiam finitimasque 10 prouincias administrandas tradiderat, uenit oratum ne Armeniam minorem, regnum suum, neue Cappadociam, regnum Ariobarzanis, possideri uastarique pateretur a Pharnace: quo malo nisi liberarentur imperata se facere pecuniamque promissam Caesari non posse persolvere. 15 ²Domitius, non tantum ad explicandos sumptus rei militaris cum pecuniam necessariam esse iudicaret sed etiam turpe populo Romano et C. Caesari uictori sibi infame esse

1 regum *MUV* | regnum *ST* | regnum et *5* teste *Andrieu* (cf. *Liu.* 42.50.5) || **2** permanserant *UTV* | permanerent *M* ex 33.4? | permanserunt *S* || **6** esse tutos *M^{ur}* | esse ut hos *MU* | esset ut hos *STV* || **8** itinere terrestri *USTV* (cf. 34.3 etc.) | itinere pedestri *M* ex 26.1? | [itinere terrestri] *Nipperdey* (u. 66.1 et *Jos. AJ* 14.137) || **11** prouincias *USTV* et *M* supra lineam | regiones *M* || **17** turpe *MU* (cf. *BAfr* 31.9) | turpem *STV* ||

statueret regna sociorum atque amicorum ab externo rege occupari, nuntios confestim ad Pharnacem misit: Armenia Cappadociaque decederet neue occupatione belli ciuilis populi Romani ius maiestatemque temptaret. ³Hanc denuntiationem cum maiorem uim habituram existimaret si propius eas regiones cum exercitu accessisset, ad legiones profectus unam ex tribus tricesimam sextam secum ducit, duas in Aegyptum ad Caesarem mittit litteris eius euocatas. (Quarum altera in bello Alexandrino non occurrit quod itinere terrestri per Syriam erat missa.) ⁴Adiungit Cn. Domitius legioni tricesimae sextae duas ab Deiotaro, quas ille disciplina atque armatura nostra complures annos constitutas habebat, equitesque C, totidemque ab Ariobarzane sumit. ⁵Mittit P. Sestium ad C. Plaetorium quaestorem ut legionem adduceret quae ex tumultuariis militibus in Ponto confecta erat Quintumque Patisium in Ciliciam ad auxilia arcessenda. Quae copiae celeriter omnes iussu Domiti Comana conuenerunt.

35 ¹Interim legati a Pharnace responsa referunt: Cappadocia se decessisse, Armeniam minorem recepissee, quam

11 legioni *ed. pr.* | leg *MUST* | legiones *V* || **13** C *MUSTV* (*u. 38.4 et cf. Liu. 43.22.4*) | D *Schambach 1881 13–14 n. 6 (cf. BC 3.4.3)* | DC *Klotz dubitanter (cf. BC 3.4.3)* || **17** Ciliciam *UT* | ciliam *MS* | siciliam *V* ||

paterno nomine iure obtinere deberet; denique eius regni causa integra Caesari seruaretur; paratum enim se facere quod is statuisset. ²[P.] Domitius cum animaduerneret eum Cappadocia decessisse non uoluntate adductum sed necessitate, quod facilius Armeniam defendere posset subiectam suo regno quam Cappadociam longius remotam quodque omnes tres legiones adducturum Domitium putasset, ex quibus cum duas ad Caesarem missas audisset audacius in Armenia substitisse, perseuerare coepit ut eo quoque regno decederet: neque enim aliud ius esse Cappadociae atque Armeniae, nec iuste eum postulare ut in Caesaris aduentum res integra differretur; id enim esse integrum quod ita esset ut fuisset. ³His responsis datis cum iis copiis quas supra scripsi profectus est in Armeniam locisque superioribus iter facere instituit. (Nam ex Ponto a Comanis iugum editum siluestre <est> pertinens in Armeniam minorem, quo Cap-

3 [P.] 5 teste *Oudendorp* | P. *MUSTV* | Cn. *Beroaldus* || **4** Cappadocia 5 teste *Nipperdey* | cappado(t/c)i(a)e *MUSTV* || adductum *U* (cf. 71.2 et *Cic. Ver. 2.1.29*) | abductum *MSTV* (*de corruptela u. ad 57.5*) || **6** suo regno *MUS* | regno suo *TV* || **9** substitisse *Bentley* | substitisset *MU* | substitisset et *STV* || **16** siluestre <est> pertinens *Aldus* (cf. *BC 2.24.3*) | siluestrem pertinens *MUSTV* | ac siluestre pertinet *Schneider* (cf. *BG 8.14.4*) | siluestre <est et perpetuum> pertinens (cf. *Curt. 5.4.9*)? ||

padocia finitur ab Armenia.) Cuius itineris has esse certas
 <constat> opportunitates, quod in locis superioribus nullus
 impetus repentinus accidere hostium poterat et quod Cap-
 padocia his iugis subiecta magnam commeatus copiam erat
 5 subministratura.

36 ¹Complures interim legationes Pharnaces ad
 Domitium mittit quae de pace agerent regiaque munera
 Domitio ferrent. ²Ea constanter omnia aspernabatur nec
 sibi quicquam fore antiquius quam dignitatem populi
 10 Romani et regna sociorum recipere legatis respondebat.
³Magnis et continuis itineribus confectis cum aduentaret
 ad Nicopolim—quod oppidum positum in Armenia
 minore est plano ipsum loco, montibus tamen altis ab
 duobus lateribus obiectis, satis magno interuallo ab oppido
 15 remotis—[ex] castra posuit longe a Nicopoli circiter milia
 passuum VII. ⁴Quibus ex castris cum locus angustus atque

1–2 ◇ has esse certas <constat> opportunitates *scripsimus* (cf. 31.6), *nisi*
maius cum ζ teste Oudendorp post opportunitates <constat> supplere | has esse
 certas opportunitates *MUSTV* | hae erant certae opportunitates *ς teste*
Oudendorp | has esse [certas] opportunitates *Scaliger* | has esse certas
 opportunitates (cognouerat) *Klotz* | has esse cernebat opportunitates
Vielhaber 1869 | has est secutus opportunitates *Larsen coll. BC 1.1.3 et Cic.*
Off. 1.35 | duas est consecutus opportunitates *Landgraf 1891b coll. BC*
1.39.4 || 3 hostium *MUSTV* | an secludendum ut glossema? 15 castra
U | sex castra *M* | et castra *S* | ex castra *TV* || 16 passuum *MUT*
per compendia | passus *SV per compendia* ||

impeditus esset transeundus, Pharnaces in insidiis delectos
 pedites omnesque paene disposuit equites, magnam autem
 multitudinem pecoris intra eas fauces dissipari iussit
 paganosque et oppidanos in his locis obuersari ⁵ut, siue
 amicus siue inimicus Domitius eas angustias transiret, nihil 5
 de insidiis suspicaretur cum in agris et pecora et homines
 animaduerneret uersari tamquam amicorum aduentu,
 sin ut in hostium fines ueniret, praeda diripienda milites
 dissiparentur dispersique caederentur.

37 ¹Haec cum administraret numquam tamen intermit- 10
 tebat legatos de pace atque amicitia mittere ad Domitium,
 cum hoc ipso crederet facilius eum decipi posse. ²At contra
 spes pacis Domitio in isdem castris morandi attulit causam.
 Ita Pharnaces amissa proximi temporis occasione, cum
 uereretur ne cognoscerentur insidiae, suos in castra reuo- 15

2 equites *MUS* | equiter *TV* || **4** obuersari *MUS* (cf. *Liu.* 38.1.8)
 | obseruari *TV* (cf. *Liu.* 3.22.6) || ◇ siue amicus siue inimicus
MUSTV, quam lectionem defendit *Hoffmann* 1890, *LIV* (cf. 74.3 et u. infra)
 | si amicus [siue inimicus] *Aldus* | siue amicus [siue inimicus] *Nipperdey*
 (u. et infra) || **7–8** aduentu, sin *Hoffmann* 1857 (cf. 24.1) | aduentus
MUSTV | aduentu sin uero 5 teste *Oudendorp* | aduentu siue inimicus
Nipperdey coll. *Cic. Phil.* 14.13, *Fin.* 1.3 (u. et supra) | aduentu siue
Forchhammer, 92 *Nipperdey* supra secutus | aduentu si *Andrieu* (de coniunctione
 iterata cf. *BC* 3.78.3) || **10** numquam tamen *MU* | numquam tamen
 non *STV* ('vix de vulgari negationum cumulatione cogitare licet' *Klotz*) || **14–15**
 cum uereretur *S* (cf. *Hirt.* 8.44.1) | uereretur *TV* | ueritus *MU* ||

cauit. ³Domitius postero die propius Nicopolim accessit castraque oppido contulit [rex]. Quae dum muniunt nostri Pharnaces aciem instruxit suo more atque instituto. ⁴In fronte enim simplici directa acie cornua trinis firmabantur subsidiis. Eadem ratione haec media collocabantur acie, duobus dextra sinistraque interuallis simplicibus ordinibus instructis. ⁵Perfecit inceptum castrorum opus Domitius parte copiarum pro uallo constituta.

38 ¹Proxima nocte Pharnaces, interceptis tabellariis qui de Alexandrinis rebus litteras ad Domitium ferebant, cognoscit Caesarem magno in periculo uersari flagitariusque ab Domitio ut quam primum Caesari subsidia mitteret propiusque ipse Alexandriam per Syriam accederet. ²Qua cognita re Pharnaces uictoriae loco ducebat si trahere tempus posset, cum discedendum Domitio celeriter putaret. ³Itaque ab oppido, qua facillimum accessum et aequissimum ad dimicandum ⟨locum⟩ nostris uidebat, fossas duas directas non ita magno medio interuallo relicto IV pedum altitudinis in eum locum deduxit quo longius constituerat

2 contulit S | contulit rex MUTV || nostri MUS | nostris TV || **8** constituta Nipperdey (cf. BG 7.70.5) | instituta MUSTV (cf. BG 3.24.1) || **15** Domitio UST | domitium M | domino V || **17** ⟨locum⟩ nostris Schneider (cf. Nep. Mil. 5) | nostris MUSTV (cf. BC 3.45.3) ||

suam non producere aciem. ⁴Inter has fossas aciem semper instruebat. Equitatum autem omnem ab lateribus extra fossam collocabat, qui neque aliter utilis esse poterat et multum numero anteibat nostrum equitatum.

39 ¹Domitius autem, cum Caesaris magis periculo quam 5
suo commoueretur neque se tuto discessurum arbitraretur
si conditiones quas reiecerat rursus appeteret aut sine causa
discederet, ex propinquis castris in aciem exercitum eduxit.
²Tricesimam sextam legionem in dextro cornu collocavit,
Ponticam in sinistro. Deiotari legiones in mediam aciem 10
contulit—quibus tamen angustissimum interuallum fron-
tis reliquit—reliquis cohortibus in subsidiis collocatis. Sic
utrimque acie instructa processum est ad dimicandum.

40 ¹Signo sub idem tempus ab utroque dato concur-
ritur. Acriter uarieque pugnatur. Nam tricesima sexta legio 15
cum extra fossam in equites regis impetum fecisset adeo
secundum proelium fecit ut moenibus oppidi succederet
fossamque transiret auersosque hostes aggrediretur. ²At
Pontica ex altera parte legio, cum paulum aduersa hostibus

7–8 sine causa discederet *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 4.27.5) | si negatis
discederet *Hoffmann 1890* | si recusatis cederet *Kraner* (cf. *Liu.* 30.16.14
et *BG* 6.23.2) || **12** in subsidiis *5 teste Oudendorp* (cf. *BC* 1.83.1 et *Fron.*
Str. 2.3.21) | in insidiis *MUS* | insidiis *TV* || **19** ◇ aduersa *Madvig* (cf.
20.5 et u. *infra*) | auersa *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 2.1323.63–66 ‘de fugientibus’) ||

cessisset, fossam autem circumire ac transcendere conata
esset ut aperto latere aggrederetur hostem, in ipso transitu
fossae confixa et oppressa est. Deiotari uero legiones uix
impetum sustinuerunt. ³Ita uictrices regiae copiae cornu
suo dextro mediaque acie conuerterunt se ad tricesimam
sextam legionem. Quae tamen fortiter uincientium impe-
tum sustinuit. Magnis copiis hostium circumdata, praesen-
tissimo animo pugnans in orbem se recepit ad radices mon-
tium, quo Pharnaces insequi propter iniquitatem loci noluit.

⁴Ita Pontica legione paene tota amissa, magna parte Deio-
tari militum interfecta, tricesima sexta (legio) in loca se su-
periora contulit non amplius CCL desideratis. ⁵Ceciderunt
eo proelio splendidi atque illustres uiri nonnulli equites Ro-
mani. Quo tamen incommodo Domitius accepto reliquias

1 circumire ac transcendere *Nipperdey* (cf. *BC* 3.46.3) | circumire acies secundo *MUSTV* | circumire acies secunda *Lipsius teste Oudendorp, sensu et uerborum ordine repugnante* | circumire acie secunda *Madvig* (u. *TLL* 1.409.41–81 ‘i. q. proelium’ et *supra*) | circumire [acies] secundo *Gruterus* (sc. post recessum?) | circumire [acies secundo] *Dauisius* 1727 ut *glossema ineptum ad 40.1* (u. et *infra*) | transire ut secunda acies *Ciacconius dubitanter* | alii alia || **2** aperto *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 1.25.6) | ab aperto *Landgraf* 1888 (cf. *BC* 3.86.3) || transitu *MUSTV* | circuitu *Dauisius* 1727 (u. et *supra*) || **3** uix *MUSTV* | uix primum *Dinter* (cf. *BG* 6.37.3) || **7** sustinuit. Magnis *MUSTV* | sustinuit (et) magnis *Madvig* || **11** tricesima sexta (legio) *5 teste Dübner* | XXXVI *MUSTV* ||

exercitus dissipati collegit itineribusque tutis per Cappadociam se in Asiam recepit.

41 ¹Pharnaces rebus secundis elatus, cum de Caesare ea quae optabat speraret, Pontum omnibus copiis occupauit. Ibique et uictor et crudelissimus rex, cum sibi fortunam 5 paternam feliciore euentu destinaret, multa oppida expugnauit, bona ciuium Romanorum Ponticorumque diripuit, ²supplicia constituit in eos qui aliquam formae atque aetatis commendationem habebant ea quae morte essent miseriora. Pontumque nullo defendente paternum regnum glori- 10 ans se recepisce obtinebat.

42 ¹Sub idem tempus in Illyrico est incommodum acceptum. Quae prouincia superioribus mensibus retenta non tantum sine ignominia sed etiam cum laude erat. ²Namque 15 eo missus aestate cum duabus legionibus Q. Cornificius, Caesaris quaestor pro praetore, quamquam erat prouincia minime copiosa ad exercitus alendos, et finitimo bello ac dissensionibus confecta et uastata, tamen prudentia ac diligentia sua—quod magnam curam suscipiebat ne quo

6 destinaret *MUSTV*, quod defendit Klotz coll. Cic. Fam. 7.23.3 | spe destinaret *Larsen* coll. Liu. 29.20.2 || **10** defendente *MUSV^{ac}* | detendente *TV^x* || **17** exercitus alendos *M* (cf. 67.1 et Liu. 23.48.7) | exercitum alendos *UTV* | exercitum alendum *S* (cf. Liu. 22.32.3) || **19** ne quo *MUS* | neque uero *TV* ||

temere progredere—et recepit et defendit. ³Namque et castella complura locis editis posita, quorum opportunitas castellanos impellebat ad decursiones faciendas et bellum inferendum, expugnauit eaque praeda milites donauit—
 5 quae etsi erat tenuis tamen in tanta prouinciae desperatione erat grata, praesertim uirtute parta—et cum Octauius ex fuga Pharsalici proeli magna classe in illum se sinum contulisset paucis nauibus Iadertinorum, quorum semper in rem publicam singulare constiterat officium, dispersis
 10 Octauianis nauibus erat potitus, ut uel classe dimicare posset adiunctis captiuis nauibus sociorum. ⁴Cum diuersissima parte orbis terrarum Cn. Pompeium Caesar uictor sequeretur compluresque aduersarios in Illyricum propter Macedoniae propinquitatem se reliquiis ex fuga collectis
 15 contulisse audiret litteras ad Gabinium mittit uti cum legionibus tironum quae nuper erant conscriptae proficisceretur in Illyricum coniunctisque copiis cum Q. Cornificio si quod periculum prouinciae inferretur depelleret, sin ea non magnis copiis tuta esse posset, in Macedoniam legiones

6 parta *M^{mr}* (cf. *Cic. Leg. agr. 1.5*) | parte *MUSTV* || 7 illum *MUSTV* | Illyricum *Schneider coll. 47.5* || 8 Iadertinorum *MUSTV* | Iadestinorum *Klotz coll. CIL III 2919 etc.* || 14 reliquiis *Aldus 1574* (cf. *40.5*) | reliquis *MUSTV* || 15 contulisse 5 teste *Oudendorp* | compulisse *MUSTV* ||

adduceret. ⁵Omnem enim illam partem regionemque uiuo Cn. Pompeio bellum instauraturam esse credebat.

43 ¹Gabinus, ut in Illyricum uenit hiberno tempore anni ac difficili, siue copiosiorem prouinciam existimans siue multum fortunae uictoris Caesaris tribuens siue uirtute et 5 scientia sua confisus, qua saepe in bellis periclitatus magnas res et secundas ductu auspicioque suo gesserat, neque prouinciae facultatibus subleuabatur, quae partim erat exinanita partim infidelis, neque nauibus intercluso mari tempestatibus commeatus supportare poterat, magnisque difficultatibus coactus non ut uolebat sed ut necesse erat bellum gerebat. ²Ita cum durissimis tempestatibus propter inopiam castella aut oppida expugnare cogeretur crebro incommoda accipiebat adeoque est a barbaris contemptus ut Salonam se recipiens—in oppidum maritimum, quod ciues Romani 15 fortissimi fidelissimique incolebant—in agmine dimicare sit coactus. ³Quo proelio duobus milibus militum amplius

6 qua *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 10.1.1449.39–51) | quo *U^{re}* ut uidetur | que *S* | quam *Schneider* (u. *TLL* 10.1.1447.16–27) || **7** auspicioque *Lipsius teste Oudendorp* (cf. *Liu.* 5.46.6) | ausuque *MUS* (u. *TLL* 2.1563.67–1564.4, et cf. 1563.35 ‘ab ineunte saeculo IV’) | ausioque *TV* | an secludendum ut glossema (cf. *BC* 1.7.7)? || **10** supportare *Nipperdey* | su(b/p)portari *MUSTV* || **13** cogeretur *MUSTV* | conaretur *Larsen* ‘castella oppugnare non expugnare propter inopiam potuit’ (cf. *BC* 3.40.5) || **17** Quo *M* | quod *USTV* ||

amissis, centurionibus XXXVIII, tribunis IIII, cum reliquis copiis Salonam se recepit summaque ibi difficultate rerum omnium pressus paucis mensibus morbo periit. Cuius et infelicitas uiui et subita mors in magnam spem Octauium adduxit prouinciae potiendae. Quem tamen diutius in rebus secundis et fortuna, quae plurimum in bellis potest, diligentiaque Cornifici et uirtus Vatini uersari passa non est.

44 ¹Vatinius Brundisi cum esset, cognitis rebus quae gestae erant in Illyrico, cum crebris litteris Cornifici ad auxilium prouinciae ferendum euocaretur, et M. Octauium audiret cum barbaris foedera percussisse compluribusque locis nostrorum militum oppugnare praesidia partim classe per se partim pedestribus copiis per barbaros, etsi graui uoletudine adfectus uix corporis uiribus animum sequebatur, tamen uirtute uicit incommodum naturae difficultatesque et hiemis et subitae praeparationis. ²Nam cum ipse paucas in portu naues longas haberet litteras in Achaïam ad Q. Calenum misit uti sibi classem mitteret. ³Quod cum tardius fieret quam periculum nostro-

2 Salonam *MUS* | Salonem *TV* || se recepit *ed. pr.* | se receperit *UTV per compendia* | rse receperit *M* | receperit *S* (*sed u. 43.2*) || 3
 pressus paucis *MUS* | passus paucis *TV* | paucis passus *V^{ac}* || 9
 Illyrico, cum *Stephanus* | Illyricum cum *MUSTV* || 12 classe *S* (*cf. Cic. Ph. 10.12 exercitu*) | classem *MUTV* || 18 ad Q. *MTV* (*u. BC 3.55.1-4*) | atque *US* ||

rum flagitabat, qui sustinere impetum Octaui non poterant, nauibus actuariis—quarum numerus erat satis magnus, magnitudo nequaquam satis iusta ad proeliandum—rostra imposuit. ⁴Has adiunxit nauibus longis et, numero classis aucto militibus ueteranis impositis—quorum magnam copiam habebat ex omnibus legionibus, qui numero aegrorum relictis erant Brundisi cum exercitus in Graeciam transportaretur—profectus est in Illyricum maritimasque nonnullas ciuitates, quae defecerant Octauioque se tradiderant, partim recipiebat, partim remanentes in suo consilio praeteruehebatur, nec sibi ullius rei moram necessitatemque iniungebat quin quam celerrime posset ipsum Octauium persequeretur. ⁵Hunc oppugnantem Epidaurum terra marique, ubi nostrum erat praesidium, aduentu suo discedere ab oppugnatione coegit praesidiumque nostrum recepit.

45 ¹Octavius cum Vatinius classem magna ex parte confectam ex nauiculis actuariis habere cognosset, confisus

3 magnitudo nequaquam *Larsen* (cf. *BC* 3.109.2) | magnitudine quam non *M* | magnitudine quamquam non *U* | magnitudine quaquam *S* | magnitudine quamquam *TV* || iusta ad *MU* (cf. *Cic. Att.* 9.15.3) | iuxta ad *STV* || **4** Has adiunxit *scripsimus* (cf. *BC* 3.89.1) | has adiunctas *M* | has adiunctas *USTV* | his adiunctis *Vascosanus* (*de usu* cf. 34.4) || **17** cum Vatinius *MUV* | eum uatinius *T* | eum uatinius cum *S* || classem magna *S* | classem magnam *M* | classe magna *UTV* ||

sua classe substitit ad insulam Tauridem. Qua regione Vatinus insequens nauigabat, non quo Octauium ibi restitisse sciret sed quod eum longius progressum insequi decreuerat. ²Cum propius Tauridem accessisset distentis suis nauibus, quod et tempestas erat turbulenta et nulla suspicio hostis, repente aduersam ad se uenientem nauem antennis ad medium malum demissis, instructam propugnatoribus animaduertit. ³Quod ubi conspexit celeriter uela subduci demittique antemnas iubet et milites armari et uexillo sublato, quo pugnandi dabat signum, quae primae naues subsequebantur idem ut facerent significabat. ⁴Parabant se Vatiniani repente oppressi. Parati deinceps Octauiani ex portu procedebant. Instruitur utrimque acies, ordine disposita magis Octauiana, paratior militum animis Vatiniana.

46 ¹Vatinus cum animaduerneret neque nauium

2 non quo *STV* (cf. 30.3) | non quod *MU* || Octauium ibi *UST* | actium ibi *M* | ibi octauium *V* || **4** distentis *Hoffmann 1857 1857* (cf. 17.3) | distensis *MUS* | distersis *TV* | dispersis *Nipperdey* (cf. 42.3) || **9** demittique *Vascosanus* (cf. 45.2) | dimittique *MUSTV* || **10** quo pugnandi dabat signum *MUSTV* (cf. *BC* 3.89.5) | [quo pugnandi dabat signum] *Kübler 1896a ut glossema* || **11** significabat *MU* | significabant *STV* || **12** Parati deinceps *MUTV* | deinceps *S* | paratis deinceps *Klotz* ||

se magnitudine neque numero parem esse, fortuitae dimicationi [fortunae] rem committere maluit. Itaque primus sua quinqueremi in quadriremem ipsius Octavi impetum fecit. ²Celerrime fortissimeque contra illo remigante naues aduersae rostris concurrerunt adeo uehementer ut naus Octauiana rostro discusso ligno contineretur. ³Committitur acriter reliquis locis proelium, concurriturque ad duces maxime. Nam cum suo quisque auxilium ferret, magnum comminus in angusto mari proelium factum est. ⁴Quantoque coniunctis magis nauibus configendi potestas dabatur, tanto superiores erant Vatiniani, qui admiranda uirtute ex suis nauibus in hostium naues transilire non dubitabant et dimicatione aequata longe superiores uirtute rem feliciter gerebant. ⁵Deprimitur ipsius Octavi quadriremis, multae praeterea

1–2 ◇ fortuitae dimicationi [fortunae] rem committere maluit *Klotz auctore Hoffmann 1857 (cf. Liu. 25.12.5 impetu fortuito), qui et post fortuitae (tamen) suppleuit* | fortuitae dimicationi fortunae rem committere maluit *MUSV* | fortunae rem committere noluit *T (cf. Liu. 9.12.11)* | futurae dimicationi fortunae rem committere maluit *5 teste Oudendorp (de genituo u. TLL 5.1.1197.21–34, et de adiectiuo cf. BC 1.52.1)* | futurae dimicationi fortunae (tamen quam fugae) rem committere maluit *Kübler 1896a (sed cf. BC 1.72.3 et u. TLL 8.201.78–202.8)* || 4–5 contra illo remigante *M (cf. BG 7.28.1 contra ueniretur)* | contra illum remigantem *SV* | contra illo remigantem *UT* || 8 Nam cum *MUS* | nautum *TV* || 12 erant Vatiniani *MUS* | Vatiniani *TV* || 13 dubitabant *USTV et M supra lineam* | dubitarent *M* ||

capiuntur aut rostris perforatae merguntur. Propugnatores Octauiani partim in nauibus iugulantur partim in mare praecipitantur. ⁶Ipse Octavius se in scapham confert. In quam plures cum confugerent depressa scapha, uulneratus tamen adnatat ad suum myoparonem. ⁷Eo receptus cum proelium nox dirimeret tempestate magna uelis profugit. Sequuntur hunc suae naues nonnullae, quas casus ab illo periculo uindicarat.

47 ¹At Vatinius re bene gesta receptui cecinit suisque omnibus incolumibus in eum se portum uictor recepit quo ex portu classis Octaui ad dimicandum processerat. ²Capit ex eo proelio penterem unam triremes duas dicrotas VIII compluresque remiges Octauianos. Posteroque ibi die dum suas captiuasque naues reficeret <consumpto>, post diem tertium contendit in insulam Issam quod eo se recepissee ex fuga credebat Octauium. ³Erat in ea nobilissimum regionum earum oppidum coniunctissimumque Octauio. ⁴Quo ut uenit oppidani supplices se Vatinio dediderunt,

12 ◇ ex *MUSTV* (cf. *BAfr* 40.5) | [ex] *Schneider coll.* 16.6 ||
 penterem *Stephanus* (cf. *BAfr* 62.5) | penteremem *MUSTV* || **13**
 remiges Octauianos *MUSTV* (cf. 16.6) | celoces Octauianas *Stadler*
 (cf. *Liu.* 21.17.5) || die *MUSTV* | die fuit *ed. pr.* (cf. *BAfr* 89.3) ||
14 <consumpto>, post] | consumpto post 5 *teste Oudendorp* (cf. 66.1) |
 post *MUSTV* || **16** ea *M* | eum *USTV* ||

comperitque ipsum Octauium paruis paucisque nauigiis uento secundo regionem Graeciae petisse inde ut Siciliam, deinde Africam caperet. ⁵Ita breui spatio re praeclarissime gesta—prouincia recepta et Cornificio reddita, classe aduersariorum ex illo toto sinu expulsa—uictor se Brundisium incolumi exercitu et classe recepit. 5

48 ¹Iis autem temporibus quibus Caesar ad Dyrrachium Pompeium obsidebat et Palaepharsali rem feliciter gerebat Alexandriaeque cum periculo magno tum etiam maiore periculi fama dimicabat, Q. Cassius Longinus, in Hispania 10 pro praetore prouinciae ulterioris obtinendae causa relictus, siue consuetudine naturae suae siue odio quod in illam prouinciam susceperat quaestor ex insidiis ibi uulneratus, magnas odi sui fecerat accessiones—quod uel ex conscientia sua cum de se mutuo sentire prouinciam crederet 15 uel multis signis et testimoniis eorum qui difficulter odia dissimulabant animaduertere poterat—et compensare offensionem prouinciae exercitus amore cupiebat. ²Itaque

10 Q. Cassius *MU* (*u. BC 2.21.4*) | quae cassius *TV* | cassius *S* ||
14 quod uel *ed. pr. (sc. odium)* | quo uel *MUSTV* || **16** multis *UTV* (*cf. Cic. Caec. 104*) | mutis *M feliciter (u. TLL 8.1735.23–62 ‘tacent res ... inanimae’)* | mutus *S* || **17** dissimulabant *5 teste Clarke* | dissimulant *MUSTV*, quod defendit *Dübner* (*‘de genere hominum loquitur’*) | an dissimularent ? || animaduertere *M* | animum auertere *USTV* ||

cum primum in unum locum exercitum conduxit sestertios centenos militibus est pollicitus nec multo post, cum in Lusitania Medobrigam oppidum montemque Herminium expugnasset, quo Medobrigenses confugerant, ibique imperator esset appellatus, sestertiis centenis milites donauit. ³Multa praeterea et magna praemia singulis concedebat, quae speciosum reddebant praesentem exercitus amorem. Paulatim tamen et occulte militarem disciplinam seueritatemque minuebat.

49 ¹Cassius legionibus in hiberna dispositis ad ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contractumque in ea aes alienum grauissimis oneribus prouinciae constituit exsoluere. Et,

1–2 conduxit sestertios centenos *Jungermann compendio HS indicato (cf. Hirt. 8.4.1 et u. infra) | conduxit sestertios centum MU ut uidetur per compendia | conduxit seste R C ST^{ac} compendiis indicatis | conduxit se R C T^c | conduxisset romanus cassius V || 2* post, cum *Vasconius | postquam MUSTV, quod defendit Landgraf 1889 coll. B Afr 40.5, 50.3, 91.3 || in Lusitania Medobrigam Ciacconius (u. infra) | in lusitania medobregam MUS | illisit aniamedo brigam TV | an in Lusitania Medubrigam (cf. CIL II.760 et Plin. Nat. 4.118)? || 4* Medobrigenses *MUSTV | an Medubrigenses (u. supra)? 5* esset appellatus *MU | appellatus STV || sestertiis centenis 5 teste Oudendorp (de corruptela u. supra et ad 55.5) | ihs c MUT compendio indicato | Iterum ihs c S compendio indicato | ihs cesar V compendio indicato || 9* minuebat *MUSTV (sc. Cassius; cf. 8.1) | minuebant ed. pr. (sc. praemia; cf. BG 7.30.3) || 10* \diamond hiberna *U (cf. BC I.14.3) | hibernia MTV | ibernia S || 11* in ea *MUSTV (sc. prouincia; de prolepsi cf. 12.2 eas) | antea Madvig (uel alea; cf. Cic. Rab. Post. 4 et, de ablatiuo, u. TLL 4.762.81-763.1) | ingens Furinius ('magnum ... fuisse patet ex duobus donatiis'; cf. Sal. Cat. 16.4) | interea Menge (i.e., inter ius dicendum) ||*

ut largitionis postulat consuetudo, per causam liberalitatis speciosam plura largitori quaerebantur. ²Pecuniae locupletibus imperabantur, quas Longinus sibi expensas ferri non tantum patiebatur sed etiam cogebat. In gregem locupletium simul et causae tenues coniciebantur, neque ullum
 5 genus quaestus aut magni et euidentis aut minimi et sordidi praetermittebatur quo domus et tribunal imperatoris uacaret. ³Nemo erat qui modo aliquam iacturam facere posset quin aut uadimonio teneretur aut in reos referretur. Ita magna etiam sollicitudo periculorum ad iacturas et detri-
 10 menta rei familiaris adiungebatur.

50 ¹Quibus de causis accidit ut cum Longinus imperator eadem faceret quae fecerat quaestor similia rursus de morte eius prouinciales consilia inirent. ²Horum odium confirmabant nonnulli familiares eius, qui cum in illa so-
 15 cietate uersarentur rapinarum nihilo minus oderant eum cuius nomine peccabant sibique quod rapuerant acceptum referebant, quod interciderat aut erat interpellatum Cassio

5 ◇ simul et *Latinius* (cf. *Liu.* 2.6.10) | simultatium *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 5.44.2) | simulationis *Schneider*, qui causa legit *infra* (cf. *Cic. Att.* 12.20.1 *dissimulationis*) || causae *MU* (cf. *Cic. Orat.* 124) | causa *STV* (*u. et supra et infra*) || coniciebantur *MUSTV* (cf. *XII Tab. apud Gell.* 17.2.10) | coniciebantur *Landgraf 1888* || **6** quaestus *MUS* | quaestius *TV* | quaestuis *Klotz* || **9** quin *S* (cf. 15.8) | qui *MUTV* || **18** referebant *MUTV* | ferebant *S*, quod defendit *Klotz coll. Sen. Ep.* 78.3 ||

assignabant. ³Quintam legionem nouam conscribit. Auge-
tur odium et ex ipso dilectu et sumptu additae legionis.
Complentur equitum tria milia maximisque ornantur im-
pensis. Nec prouinciae datur ulla requies.

- 5 **51** ¹Interim litteras accepit a Caesare ut in Africam ex-
ercitum traiceret perque Mauretaniam ad fines Numidiae
perueniret quod magna Cn. Pompeio Iuba miserat aux-
ilia maioraque missurus existimabatur. ²Quibus litteris ac-
ceptis insolenti uoluntate efferebatur quod sibi nouarum
10 prouinciarum et fertilissimi regni tanta oblata esset facul-
tas. ³Itaque ipse in Lusitaniam proficiscitur ad legiones
arcessendas auxiliaque adducenda. Certis hominibus dat
negotium ut frumentum nauesque C praepararentur, pecu-
niaeque describerentur atque imperarentur, ne qua res cum
15 redisset moraretur. Reditus eius fuit celerior omnium opin-

1 nouam conscribit *MUS* | nouam scribit *V* | adscribit nouam
T^{ac} | nouam conscribit *T^c* || **2** legionis *MUS* | legiones *TV* || **8**
maioraque *MU* (cf. 56.4 et BC 2.17.4) | maturaque *STV* (cf. *Fron.*
Aq. 117.2) || **9** uoluntate *MUSTV* (u. 51.4 et *TLL* 7.1.1929.23–34
'de eis quae non solent esse uel reperiri') | uoluptate *Manutius* (cf. *Suet. Cal.*
54.1 et *Curt.* 4.6.26) || **11** Lusitaniam *ς* teste *Oudendorp* | lusitania
MUSTV || **13–14** pecuniaeque describerentur atque imperarentur, ne
MUST | ne *V*, qui uerba 4 omisit || **14** describerentur *MUST* (deest *V*;
de orthographia u. *TLL* 5.1.663.39–46) | discriberentur *ς* teste *Dübner* ||

ione. ⁴Non enim labor aut uigilantia cupienti praesertim aliquid Cassio deerat.

52 ¹Exercitu coacto in unum locum, castris ad Cordubam positis, pro contione militibus exponit quas res Caesaris iussu gerere deberet polliceturque iis cum in Mauretania traiecisset sestertios <centenos> se daturum; quintam fore in Hispania legionem. ²Ex contione se Cordubam recepit eoque ipso die tempore postmeridiano cum in basilicam iret quidam Minucius Silo, cliens L. Racili, libellum quasi aliquid ab eo postulare ut miles ei tradit, deinde, post Racilium—nam is latus Cassi tegebat—quasi responsum peteret celeriter dato loco cum se insinuasset, sinistra corripit auersum dextraque bis ferit pugione. ³Clamore sublato fit a coniuratis impetus uniuersis. Munatius Flaccus proximum gladio traicit lictorem. Hoc interfecto Q. Cassium legatum uulnerat. ⁴Ibi T. Vasius et L. Mercello simili confidentia Flaccum municipem suum adiuuant. Erant

2 deerat *MU* | de ea *STV* || **6** sestertios <centenos> *Oudendorp coll. 48.2* | sestertios *MUSV* | sestertior *T* || **7** Hispania *5 teste Oudendorp* | hispaniam *MUSTV* || **10** tradit *M^fUS* | tradidit *M^wTV* || **13** auersum *Oudendorp (sc. Cassium) uel conuersum (cf. Nep. Dat. 11 uel Apul. Met. 2.13)* | uersum *ST* | usum *V* | uerso *MU* || **14** uniuersis *MUS* | uniuersus *TV* || **16** Ibi T. Vasius *U et M^w* | ibi tuasius *MTV* | ibit uasius *S* || Mercello *Hübner coll. CIL II.2226 (u. et ad 55.3)* | mergelio *S* | mergilio *MUTV* ||

enim omnes Italicenses. At ipsum Longinum L. Licinius Squillus inuolat iacentemque leuibis sauciat plagis.

53 ¹Concurritur ad Cassium defendendum. Semper enim Berones compluresque euocatos cum telis secum
 5 habere consuerat. ²A quibus ceteri intercluduntur qui ad caedem faciendam subsequebantur. Quo in numero fuit Calpurnius Saluianus, et Manilius Tuscus. ³Minucius inter saxa quae iacebant in itinere fugiens opprimitur et relato domum Cassio ad eum deducitur. Racilius in proximam
 10 se domum familiaris sui confert dum certum cognosceret confectusne Cassius esset. ⁴Laterensis cum id non dubitaret accurrit laetus in castra [a] militibusque uernaculis et secundae legionis, quibus odio sciebat praecipue Cassium esse, gratulatur. Tollitur a multitudine in tribunal, praetor appellatur.
 15 ⁵Nemo enim aut in prouincia natus, ut uernaculae

1–2 At ipsum Longinum L. Licinius Squillus inuolat *S* (cf. *Apul. Met.* 2.32) | ad ipsum longinum l licinius squillus inuolat *M^{UT}* | ad idsum longinum l licinius squillus inuolat *M^{ac}* | ad longinum l lucinius quibus inuolat *V* | *nisi mauis* ad ipsum Longinum L. Licinius Squillus aduolat (cf. *BG* 5.17.2) || **4** Berones *MUSTV* (cf. *Str.* 3.4.12) | centuriones *Fleischer* 1879 coll. *Sal. Cat.* 59.3 (u. et 53.5 omni prouincia) || **5** ceteri *MUV* | ceteris *STV^{ac}* || **7** Tuscus *MUT* | tiscus *S* | tuculus *V* || **8** itinere fugiens *MUS* | itinere refugiens *TV* || **11** Laterensis *MUSTV* (de nomenclatura cf. 31.1 *Carfulenum* et 57.4 *Marcellum*) | <L.> Laterensis *5* teste *Klotz*, fortasse recte (u. 55.2) || **12** militibusque *M^m* (cf. *BC* 1.18.3) | a militibusque *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 6.2.2252.37–43 ‘gratulo’) || **15** ut *Nipperdey* | aut *MUSTV* ||

legionis milites, aut diuturnitate iam factus prouincialis, quo in numero erat secunda legio, non cum omni prouincia consenserat in odio Cassi. Nam legionem tricesimam et unetuicesimam, paucis mensibus in Italia scriptas, Caesar attribuerat Longino. Quinta legio nuper ibi erat confecta.

54 ¹Interim nuntiatur Laterensi uiuere Cassium. Quo nuntio dolore magis permotus quam animo perturbatus reficit se celeriter et ad Cassium uisendum proficiscitur. ²Re cognita tricesima legio signa Cordubam infert ad auxilium ferendum imperatori suo. Facit hoc idem unetuicesima. Subsequitur has quinta. ³Cum duae legiones reliquae essent in castris secundani, ueriti ne soli relinquerentur atque ex eo quid sensissent indicaretur, secuti sunt factum superiorum. Permansit in sententia legio uernacula nec ullo timore de gradu deiecta est.

55 ¹Cassius eos qui nominati erant conscii caedis iubet comprehendi. Legionem quintam in castra remittit cohort-

1 legionis *MS* | legiones *UTV* || **3** legionem *MUSV* | legiones *T* || **13** indicaretur *MUTV* (*u. TLL 7.1.1156.9–17*) | indicaret *S* | indicaretur *5 teste Oudendorp fortasse recte (cf. Hirt. 8.13.4)* || **17** Legionem quintam in castra remittit *ed. pr.* | legiones *V* in castra remittit *MUSTV* | legiones *[V]* in castra remittit *[V]* *Kübler 1896a dubitanter coll. 57.2* | *nisi mauis legiones [V] in castra remittit (u. et infra)* || cohortibus *XXX MUSTV (sc. legionum tricesimae, unetuicesimae, et secundae)* | cohortibus tricesimae (*sc. legionis; u. 54.2 et cf. BG 7.87.1, et u. supra*)? ||

ibus XXX retentis. ²Indicio Minuci cognoscit L. Racilium et L. Laterensem et Annium Scapulam, maximae dignitatis et gratiae prouincialem hominem sibi que tam familiarem quam Laterensem et Racilium, in eadem fuisse coniuratione, nec diu moratur dolorem suum quin eos interfici iubeat. ³Minucium libertis tradit excrucians, item Calpurnium Saluianum, qui profitetur indicium coniuratorumque numerum auget—uere, ut quidam existimant, ut nonnulli queruntur, coactus. Isdem cruciatibus adfectus L. Mercello. ⁴Squillus nominat plures. Quos Cassius interfici iubet exceptis eis qui se pecunia redemerunt. ⁵Nam palam sestertium sexagiens cum Calpurnio paciscitur et cum Q. Sestio quinquagiens. Qui si maxime nocentes sunt multati, tamen periculum uitae dolorque uulnerum pecuniae remis-

56 ¹Aliquot post diebus litteras a Caesare missas ac-

1 Minuci *US uel* Minucii (*u.* 53.3) | munitii *M* | minici *TV* || **6** Minucium *5 teste Nipperdey* | municium *MUSV* | minitium *T* || **7** indicium *ed. pr. (cf. Sal. Jug. 35.6)* | indictum *MUSTV* || **9** Isdem *MU* | idem *STV* || adfectus *STV* | adfecit *MU uel* affecit || **10** Mercello *Hübner coll. CIL II.2226 (u. et ad 52.4)* | Mercelio *S* | Mercellio *MUTV* || **11–12** Nam palam sestertium sexagiens cum] | nam palam *HS LX* cum *Glandorpius coll. V. Max. 9.4.2 sexagies* | nam palam *shi X* cum *MUST compendiis indicatis* | nam palam *** cum *V relicto inter palam et cum spatio septem litterarum* || **12–13** Q. Sestio *MUTV* | quae sensio *S per compendium* | Squillo *Klotz ex 55.4 fortasse recte* || **13** Qui si *MUSTV* | quod si *Schneider coll. 8.2* ||

cipit quibus cognoscit Pompeium in acie uictum amissis
 copiis fugisse. ²Qua re cognita mixtam dolore uoluptatem
 capiebat. Victoriae nuntius laetitiam exprimebat, confec-
 tum bellum licentiam temporum intercludebat. Sic erat
 dubius animus utrum nihil timere an omnia licere mallet. 5
³Sanatis uulneribus arcessit omnes qui sibi pecunias expen-
 sas tulerant acceptasque eas iubet referri. Quibus parum
 uidebatur imposuisse oneris ampliorem pecuniam imperat.
⁴Equitum autem Romanorum dilectum instituit. Quos ex
 omnibus conuentibus coloniisque conscriptos, transmarina 10
 militia perterritos, ad sacramenti redemptionem uocabat.
 Magnum hoc fuit uectigal, maius tamen creabat odium.
⁵His rebus confectis totum exercitum lustrat. Legiones
 quas in Africam ducturus erat et auxilia mittit ad traiectum.

2 dolore *STV* (cf. *Cic. Rep. 2.1 grauitate*) | dolori *MU* (cf. *Vell. 2.5.3 timori*) || 4 temporum *MUSTV* (cf. *BC 3.20.3*) | <superiorum> temporum *Fleischer 1878 coll. BC 1.51.3* | imperiorum *Schneider coll. BC 3.32.4* || 5 animus *MUSV* (cf. *BC 2.34.6*) | animis *T* | animi *Scaliger* (cf. *Curt. 4.13.3*) || timere 5 teste *Nipperdey* (cf. *Liu. 38.28.5*) | timeret *MUSTV* || 9 Equitum autem Romanorum 5 teste *Clarke* (cf. *BC 1.30.4*) | aequae autem romae *MUSV* | aequae autem romi *T* | quem autem Romae *ed. pr.* | quem autem Romanorum *Clarke* | aequa autem ratione *Scaliger* (u. uectigal *infra*) | alii alia || 10 conscriptos *MUSTV* | conscriptos <habebat> 5 teste *Clarke* (cf. 34.4) || 12 creabat *UST* | credebat *MV* || 13 totum *ed. pr.* | notum *MUSTV* | nouum *Ursinus* (cf. *Cic. Fam. 11.7.3*) || 14 in Africam *Aldus 1574* (u. 51.1 et cf. *BG 4.38.3 in ... fines*) | in Africa *MUSTV* || auxilia *MUS* | auxilium *T^{ac}* | ad auxilium *T^c* | ad auxilia *V* ||

⁶Ipse classem quam parabat ut inspiceret, Hispalim accedit ibique moratur propterea quod edictum tota prouincia proposuerat ut quibus pecunias imperasset neque contulissent se adirent. Quae euocatio uehementer omnes turbauit.

5 **57** ¹Interim L. Titius, qui eo tempore tribunus militum in legione uernacula fuerat, nuntiat eam a legione tricesima, quam Q. Cassius legatus simul ducebat, cum
10 ad oppidum Leptim castra haberet, seditione facta, centurionibus aliquot occisis qui signa tolli non patiebantur, discessisse et ad secundam contendisse, quae ad fretum alio itinere ducebatur. ²Cognita re noctu cum V cohortibus unetuicesimanorum egreditur. Mane peruenit †noctu†. Ibi eum diem ut quid ageretur perspiceret moratus Carmonem contendit. ³Hic cum legio tricesima et

3 ut quibus *MU* (cf. *BC* 3.102.2) | quibus *STV* || **6** eam a *Jurinius* | fama *MUSTV* (cf. *Cic. Fam.* 12.4.2) || **7** quam Q. Cassius *MUV* | quamque cassius *S* | quintus cassius *V^{ac}* et *T* per compendium ||
8 Leptim *MUSTV* (u. *Talbert* 2000) | Ilipam *Glandorpius* coll. *Str.* 3.2.2 | alii alia || **10** secundam *MUTV* | secundam legionem *S* non male || **11** ducebatur *MUS* (cf. *BC* 1.68.1) | deducebatur *TV* (cf. *Hirt.* 8.46.4) | adducebatur *JSimons* (cf. 25.1 et 58.1) || **12** unetuicesimanorum *Lipsius* (u. 53.5, 54.2, 57.3 et cf. *Tac. Ann.* 1.31.3) | undeui(n)ce(n)simanorum *MUSTV* || **13** †noctu† *scripsimus*, ut uerbum iteratum ex 57.2 supra (de uerborum ordine cf. *BC* 3.22.3) | noctu *MUSTV* | [noctu] *ed. pr.* (de usu absoluto cf. *BC* 3.67.4) | Naeuam *Schneider* (cf. *Plin. Nat.* 3.11) || **14** Carmonem *Nipperdey* (Carmonam iam *Rhellicanus*; u. *Str.* 3.2.2 et ad 64.1) | carbonem *MUSTV* || legio *MUTV* | legiones *S* ||

unetuicesima et cohortes III ex quinta legione totusque conuenisset equitatus, audit III cohortes a uernaculis oppressas ad Obuculam cum iis ad secundam peruenisse legionem, omnesque ibi se coniunxisse et †in† Torium Italicensem ducem delegisse. ⁴Celeriter habito consilio Marcellum quaestorem Cordubam ut eam in potestate retineret, Q. Cassium legatum Hispalim mittit. ⁵Paucis ei diebus adfertur: conuentum Cordubensem ab eo defecisse Marcellumque aut uoluntate aut necessitate adductum—namque id uarie nuntiabatur—consentire cum Cordubensibus; duas cohortes legionis quintae—quae fuerant Cordubae—in praesidio idem facere. ⁶Cassius his rebus incensus mouet castra et postero die Segouiam ad flumen Singiliense uenit. Ibi habita contione militum temptat animos. Quos cognoscit non sua sed Caesaris absentis causa sibi fidissimos esse nullumque periculum deprecaturus dum per eos Caesari prouincia restitueretur.

1 ex *USV* | et *MT* || 3 ad secundam *MUSTV* | ad secundam (ad Vliam) *Schneider dubitanter* || 4 †in† Torium *scripsimus (de orthographia u. CIL II.3270 et ad 58.1)* | intorium *MUTV* | Titum Torium *S per compendium* | M. Torium *5 teste Nipperdey* || 5 Italicensem *MUS* | italicensum *TV* || 6 Marcellum quaestorem *Forchhammer, qui et (M.) ante Marcellum suppleuit coll. D.C. 42.15.5 (u. 59.1, sed de nomenclatura u. et ad 53.4)* | Marcellumque *MUSTV ex 57.5?* || 9–10 adductum *Oudendorp (u. ad 35.2)* | abductum *MUSTV* || 14 Singiliense *Nipperdey (cf. Plin. Nat. 3.12 Singilis fluius)* | Siciliense *MUST* | Siciliensem *V* ||

58 ¹Interim Torius ad Cordubam ueteres legiones ad-
 5 suaque natura uideretur, simul ut contra Q. Cassium—qui
 Caesaris nomine maioribus uiribus uti uidebatur—aeque
 potentem opponeret dignitatem, Cn. Pompeio se prouin-
 10 ciam recipere uelle palam dictitabat. ²Et forsitan etiam
 hoc fecerit odio Caesaris et amore Pompei, cuius nomen
 multum poterat apud eas legiones quas M. Varro obtin-
 uerat, sed id qua mente communis erat coniectura. Certe
 hoc prae se Torius ferebat. ³Milites adeo fatebantur ut Cn.
 Pompei nomen in scutis inscriptum haberent. ⁴Frequens
 legionibus conuentus obuam prodiit—neque tantum uiro-
 rum sed etiam matrum familias ac praetextatorum—depre-

3 Torius *§ teste Dübner* | thorius *MUSTV* || ueteres *MU* (*cf. BC 3.101.5*) | ueterem *STV* | ueteranas *JSimons (u. 53.5 et cf. 61.1)* ||
 8–12 dictitabat. Et forsitan etiam hoc fecerit odio Caesaris et amore
 Pompei, cuius nomen multum poterat apud eas legiones quas M. Varro
 obtinuerat, sed id qua mente communis erat coniectura. Certe hoc
 prae se Torius ferebat *MUSTV* | sed ... coniectura *post* dictitabat
transposuit Landgraf 1889; sed ... ferebat *post* dictitabat *transposuit Klotz 'ut*
uerba milites adeo fatebantur (sc. amorem Pompei) suam habeant uim' *sed cf.*
57.6 11 erat *MUSTV* | erit *Madvig coll. Liu. 4.20.8* | est *Schneider coll.*
Liu. 23.47.8 | alii alia || 12 Torius *§ teste Andrieu* | thorius *MUSTV* ||
 13 inscriptum *UST (u. D.C. 42.15.5 et cf. BHisp 13.3)* | scriptum *MV*
 || Frequens legionibus conuentus obuam prodiit—neque tantum
 uirorum sed etiam matrum familias ac praetextatorum—deprecaturque
 ne hostili aduentu Cordubam diriperent: nam *MUST uocibus hic et illic*
leuiter mutatis (u. infra) | nam *V, qui uerba 20 omisit* || 2–3 deprecaturque
MU | deprecatur quae *T (deest V, u. supra)* | deprecatur *S* ||

caturque ne hostili aduentu Cordubam diriperent: nam se contra Cassium consentire cum omnibus; contra Caesarem ne facere cogerentur orare.

5

59 ¹Tantae multitudinis precibus et lacrimis exercitus commotus cum uideret ad Cassium persequendum nihil opus esse Cn. Pompei nomine et memoria, tamque omnibus Caesarianis quam Pompeianis Longinum esse in odio, neque se conuentum neque M. Marcellum contra Caesaris causam posse perducere, nomen Pompei ex scutis detraxerunt, Marcellum, qui se Caesaris causam defensurum profitebatur, ducem asciuerunt praetoremque appellarunt et conuentum sibi adiunxerunt castraque ad Cordubam posuerunt. ²Cassius eo biduo circiter IIII milia passuum a Corduba citra flumen Baetim in oppidi conspectu loco excelso facit castra. Litteras ad regem Bogudem in Mauritaniam et M. Lepidum proconsulem in Hispaniam citiorem mittit: subsidio sibi prouinciaque Caesaris causa

10

15

8 esse *V* | esset *MUST* || tamque *MU* | ta(m/n)quam *STV*
 || **11–12** posse perducere, nomen Pompei ex scutis detraxerunt,
 Marcellum, qui se Caesaris causam defensurum *MUST* | defensurum
V, qui uerba 12 omisit || detraxerunt *MUST* (deest *V*), quod defendit
Kübler coll. Dig. 3.2.2.2 | deteraserunt *Menge coll. D.C. 42.15.5 ἀπήλειπεν* ||
1 prouinciaque *MU* | prouinciaque *STV* ||

quam primum ueniret. Ipse hostili modo Cordubensium agros uastat, aedificia incendit.

- 60**¹ Cuius rei deformitate atque indignitate legiones quae
 5 Marcellum sibi ducem ceperant ad eum concurrerunt: ut in
 aciem educerentur priusque configendi sibi potestas fieret
 quam cum tanta contumelia nobilissimae carissimaeque
 possessiones Cordubensium in conspectu suo rapinis ferro
 flammaque consumerentur. ²Marcellus cum configere mis-
 10 errimum putaret, quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum
 ad eundem Caesarem esset redundaturum, neque suae
 potestatis esset, legiones Baetim traducit aciemque instruit.
³Cum Cassium contra pro suis castris aciem instruxisse loco
 superiore (animaduverteret), causa interposita quod is in ae-
 15 quum non descenderet, Marcellus militibus persuadet ut se
 recipiant in castra. Itaque copias reducere coepit. ⁴Cassius,

3 uastat *MU* (cf. *BG* 3.29.3 etc.) | uastata *STV* || **5–6** concurrerunt: ut in aciem educerentur *MUTV* (cf. *BC* 1.71.2) | concurrerunt ut in aciem educerentur orant *S* (de uerborum ordine cf. 58.4) | nisi maius concurrerunt. (Orant) ut in aciem educerentur (de asyndeto cf. *BC* 2.12.3) || **7** carissimaeque *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 5.33.6 et u. *TLL* 3.505.60–65) | clarissimaeque *Keil* teste *Klotz* (u. *TLL* 3.502.48) | feracissimaeque *Cornelissen* 52 coll. *BG* 2.4.6 || **10** ◇ uictoris *MU* | uictores *STV* || **12** esset *MUSTV* | esse *S* teste *Oudendorp* (u. *TLL* 10.2.308.24–27 et 10.2.318.13–15) | esset (***) *Larsen* | esset (uetare uel prohibere) *Ciacconius* | esset (receptus) *Reinhardt* *exempli gratia* (cf. *BC* 1.45.6) | alii *alia* || **14** (animaduverteret), causa *Reinhardt* | causa *MUTV* | uideret causa *S* (cf. 30.2 etc.) ||

quo bono ualebat Marcellumque infirmum esse sciebat, aggressus equitatu legionarios se recipientes, complures nouissimos in fluminis ripis interfecit. ⁵Cum hoc detrimento quid transitus fluminis uitii difficultatisque haberet cognitum esset, Marcellus castra Baetim transfert. Crebroque uterque legiones in aciem educit, neque tamen confligitur propter locorum difficultates.

61 ¹Erat copiis pedestribus multo firmior Marcellus. Habebat enim ueteranas multisque proeliis expertas legiones. Cassius fidei magis quam uirtuti legionum confidebat. ²Itaque cum castra castris collata essent et Marcellus locum idoneum castello cepisset quo prohibere aqua Cassianos posset, Longinus, ueritus ne genere quodam obsidionis clauderetur in regionibus alienis sibi infestis, noctu silentio ex castris proficiscitur celerique itinere Vliam contendit quod sibi fidele esse oppidum credebat. ³Ibi

2 infirmum *MTV* | infirmem *US* (*de formis tertii ordinis u. TLL 7.1.1441.14–40*) || esse *U^{ac}STV* | eum *MU^r* || **4** quid *MST* | qui *U* | quod *V* || **5** uitii] | uitii *S* (*cf. BG 7.45.9 incommodi*) | uti *UTV* | usus *M* || difficultatisque *M* (*cf. Sen. Ben. 3.8.1*) | difficultatesque *USTV* || **7** educit *MUT* | educunt *S* (*cf. BC 3.30.3*) | ducit *V* || **12** castris collata *Stephanus* (*cf. 61.4*) | castris co(n/l)locata *MUSTV* (*ex 61.5 collocatis?* *u. et ad BAfr 68.2 conlatis*) | nisi mauis <contra> castris collocata (*cf. BAfr 56.1*) || **16** Vliam *Ciacconius* (*de oppidi nomine u. Plin. Nat. 3.10.2, D.C. 43.32.3–6*) | ullam *MUSTV* ||

adeo coniuncta ponit moenibus castra ut et loci natura—
namque Vlia in edito monte posita est—et ipsa munitione
urbis undique ab oppugnatione tutus esset. ⁴Hunc Marcel-
lus insequitur et quam proxime potest Vliam castra castris
5 confert. Locorumque cognita natura quo maxime rem
deducere uolebat necessitate est adductus, ut neque con-
fligeret—cuius si rei facultas esset resistere incitatis militibus
non poterat—neque uagari Cassium latius pateretur ne
plures ciuitates ea paterentur quae passi erant Cordubenses.
10 ⁵Castellis idoneis locis collocatis operibusque in circuitu
oppidi continuatis Vliam Cassiumque munitionibus clausit.
⁶Quae prius quam perficerentur Longinus omnem suum
equitatum emisit. Quem sibi usui fore credebat si pabu-
lari frumentarique Marcellum non pateretur, magno autem

1–2 ut et loci natura—namque Vlia in edito monte posita est *Manutius*
(cf. BG 7.14.9 et, de coniunctionibus, 5.57.1) | ut est loci natura namque
ulla in edito monte posita est ut *MUST* | ut loci est natura namque
ulla in edito monte posita est ut *V* || 2 Vlia *Ciacconius* (u. supra) |
ulla *MUSTV* || 3 ab oppugnatione *MUS* | ad oppugnatione *T* | ad
oppugnationem *V* || 4 Vliam *Ciacconius* (u. supra) | ullam *MUSTV* ||
6 adductus *scripsimus* (cf. 71.2 et u. ad 35.2 et 57.5) | eductus *STV* |
eductus *MU* | deductus *Nipperdey* (cf. *BHisp* 41.6 necessario) | nisi mauis
coactus (cf. *Hirt*. 8.43.5) || confligeret *MU* | configere *STV* ||
8 latius *USTV* et *M supra lineam* (cf. BG 5.19.2) | longius *M* || 9 passi
M | pass(a)e *USTV* || 11 Vliam *Ciacconius* (u. supra) | ullam *MUSTV*
|| 13 sibi usui *MUTV* (cf. BC 2.15.3) | Marcus (per compendium) sibi
usu *S* | <magno> sibi usui *Oudendorp* fortasse recte (cf. BG 4.20.2 etc. et BC
2.17.4 magna ... magna) ||

fore impedimento si clausus obsidione et inutilis necessarium consumeret frumentum.

62 ¹Paucis diebus Q. Cassi litteris acceptis rex Bogus cum copiis uenit adiungitque ei legioni quam secum adduxerat complures cohortes auxiliares Hispanorum. ²Namque ut in 5
ciuilibus dissensionibus accidere consuevit ita temporibus illis in Hispania nonnullae ciuitates rebus Cassi studebant, plures Marcello fauebant. Accedit cum copiis Bogus ad exteriores Marcelli munitiones. Pugnatur utrimque acriter, crebroque id accidit Fortuna saepe ad utrumque uictoriam 10
transferente, nec tamen umquam ab operibus depellitur Marcellus.

63 ¹Interim Lepidus ex citiore prouincia cum cohortibus legionariis XXXV magnoque numero equitum et reliquorum auxiliorum uenit ea mente Vliam ut sine ullo 15
studio contentiones Cassi Marcellique componeret. ²Huic

3 Paucis diebus Q. *S ex 58.1?* (cf. 66.1) | paucis diebusque MU | paucisque diebus T (cf. Cic. Div. 1.53) | paucis diebus V non male || **4** ei legioni Jurinius (cf. 34.4 et u. infra) | ei legionem MUSTV per compendia, sensu repugnante (u. 62.2) || **5** complures Jurinius (u. supra) | compluresque MUSTV || auxiliares scripsimus (cf. BC 1.63.1) | auxiliariis MUTV | auxiliarias S (cf. Hirt. 8.5.3 auxilios pedites et u. TLL 2.1615.28–42) || **8** Marcello fauebant MU (cf. Cic. Fam. 2.15.3 Curioni) | Marcellum fauebant STV (cf. Tac. Hist. 4.17.5) | an Marcelli (sc. rebus studebant; cf. BC 1.28.1 Caesaris rebus)? || **10** utrumque MU | utrimque STV || **11** transferente MU^{sc} | transferentem U^{mc} STV ||

uenienti sine dubitatione Marcellus se credit atque offert. Cassius contra suis se tenet praesidiis siue eo quod plus sibi iuris deberi quam Marcello existimabat siue eo quod ne praeoccupatus animus Lepidi esset obsequio aduersarii
 5 uerebatur. ³Ponit ad Vliam castra Lepidus neque habet a Marcello quicquam diuisi. Ne pugnetur interdicat. Ad exeundum Cassium inuitat fidemque suam in re omni interponit. ⁴Cum diu dubitasset Cassius quid sibi faciendum quidue Lepido esset credendum neque ullum exitum
 10 consili sui reperiret si permaneret in sententia, postulat uti munitiones disicerentur sibique liber exitus daretur. ⁵Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta opera ⟨cum⟩ complanarent custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis in id castellum Marcelli quod proximum erat
 15 regis castris necopinantibus omnibus—si tamen in omnibus fuit Cassius: nam de huius conscientia dubitabatur—impetum fecerunt compluresque ibi milites oppresserunt.

12 ◇ prope iam *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 3.3.3) | prope etiam *Credo* (cf. *BG* 6.11.2 *paene etiam*) || constituta opera ⟨cum⟩ *Aldus* (u. 61.6 et cf. *BG* 2.12.5 *turribus ... constitutis*) | constituta opera *MUSTV* | ⟨pace⟩ constituta opera ⟨cum⟩ *Nipperdey* (cf. *Cic. Q. fr.* 1.1.25) | constituta ⟨pace cum⟩ opera *Castiglioni* | constituta ⟨die (uel prouincia) cum⟩ opera *Damon exempli gratia* (cf. *BG* 1.4.2 etc., 65.1) || **13** complanarent *MUSTV* (sc. Lepidus Marcellusque; cf. *Sen. Dial.* 1.5.9) | complanarentur *Kübler 1896a dubitanter* (cf. *Cic. Dom.* 101 *domus*) ||

⁶Quod nisi celeriter indignatione et auxilio Lepidi proelium esset diremptum maior calamitas esset accepta.

64 ¹Cum iter Cassio patefactum esset castra Marcellus cum Lepido coniungit. Lepidus eodem tempore Marcellusque Cordubam, cum suis Cassius proficiscitur Carmonem. ²Sub idem tempus Trebonius proconsul ad prouinciam obtinendam ⟨uenit⟩. De cuius aduentu ut cognouit Cassius, legiones quas secum habuerat equitatumque in hiberna distribuit. Ipse omnibus suis rebus celeriter correptis Malacam contendit ibique aduerso tempore nauigandi naues conscendit, ut ipse praedicabat, ne se Lepido et Trebonio et Marcello committeret; ut amici eius dictitabant, ne per eam prouinciam minore cum dignitate iter faceret cuius magna pars ab eo defecerat; ut ceteri existimabant, ne pecunia illa ex infinitis rapinis confecta in potestatem cuiusquam ueniret. ³Progressus secunda ut hiberna tempestate cum ⟨in⟩ Hiberum flumen noctis uitandae causa se contulisset, inde paulo uehementiore tempestate—nihilō

5–6 Carmonem *Hübner* (Carmonam iam Glandorp coll. *Liu.* 33.21.8; *u. et ad* 57.2) | Narbonem *MSV* | Narbonam *UT* || **7** obtinendam ⟨uenit⟩ *S* (cf. 18.2) | obtinendam *MUTV* | obtinendam mittitur *Damon exempli gratia* (cf. *BC* 1.43.4 et 1.85.9) || **11** naues *MUSTV* (*V in rasura*) | nauem *Schneider* coll. 64.3 || **17** cum ⟨in⟩ *ed. pr.* (cf. *BG* 1.8.1) | cum *MUSTV* || **18** nihilō *S* (cf. 25.1) | ni(c)hil *MUTV* ||

periculosius se nauigaturum credens—profectus, aduersis fluctibus occurrentibus ostio fluminis, in ipsis faucibus, cum neque flectere nauem propter uim fluminis neque directam tantis fluctibus tenere posset, demersa naue periit.

- 5 **65** ¹Cum in Syriam Caesar ex Aegypto uenisset atque ab
iis qui Roma uenerant ad eum cognosceret litterisque urbanis animaduerneret multa Romae male et inutiliter administrari, neque ullam partem rei publicae satis commode geri, quod et contentionibus tribuniciiis perniciosae seditiones
10 orirentur et ambitione atque indiligentia tribunorum militum et qui legionibus praeerant multa contra morem consuetudinemque militarem fierent, quae dissoluendae disciplinae seueritatisque essent, eaque omnia flagitare aduentum suum uideret, tamen praefendum existimauit quas
15 in prouincias regionesque uenisset eas ita relinquere constitutas ut domesticis dissensionibus liberarentur, iura legesque acciperent, externorum hostium metum deponerent.

3 directam *MUTV* (cf. *BAfr* 26.4 et u. *TLL* 5.1.1253.3–30 ‘de motu et eis, quae moventur’) | in|directam *S* | in directum ς teste *Oudendorp*, quod defendit *Landgraf* 1889 coll. *Liu.* 22.47.3 || **8** rei *MV* | re *UST* (de orthographia u. *LHS* §361.3) || commode geri *MUS* | commoda egeri *TV* || **10** orirentur *SV* (de formis u. *TLL* 9.2.991.53–992.6) | orerentur *MUT* || indiligentia *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 7.17.3 et 2.32.2 indiligentius) | indulgentia ς teste *Nipperdey* (cf. *BG* 7.63.8) ||

²Haec in Syria Cilicia Asia celeriter se confecturum sperabat quod eae prouinciae nullo bello premebantur. In Bithynia ac Ponto plus oneris uidebat sibi impendere. ³Non excessisse enim Ponto Pharnacen audiebat neque excessurum putabat cum secundo proelio uehementer esset inflatus quod contra Domitium Caluinum fecerat. ⁴Commoratus fere in omnibus ciuitatibus quae maiore sunt dignitate, praemia bene meritis et uiritim et publice tribuit, de controuersiis ueteribus cognoscit ac statuit, reges tyrannos dynastas prouinciae finitimos—qui omnes ad eum concurrerant—receptos in fidem conditionibus impositis prouinciae tuendae ac defendendae dimittit et sibi et populo Romano amicissimos.

66 ¹Paucis diebus in ea prouincia consumptis Sextum Caesarem amicum et necessarium suum legionibus Syriaeque praefecit. Ipse eadem classe qua uenerat proficiscitur in Ciliciam. ²Cuius prouinciae ciuitates omnes euo-

1 Haec] | (h)ae *MUS* | hae *TV* || **8** uiritim *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 7.71.7 et *Hirt.* 8.46.5) | priuatim *Schneider coll.* *BC* 2.21.5 || **10** finitimos *Oudendorp coll.* *BC* 3.3.2 | finitimosque *MUSTV* || concurrerant *UST* | concurrerint *V* | cucurrerant *M* || **12–13** populo Romano *UST per compendia* | rei publicae *M per compendium* | publicae rei *V* || **15** legionibus *MUSTV* (cf. 65.1) | legioni *Domaszewski* 172–173 fortasse recte (u. 34.3, *App.* *BC* 3.312, 4.250 ἐν ... καταλέλοιπει et cf. *BG* 5.47.2) | nisi mauis legioni XXXVIII (cf. *BG* 5.53.6 et u. *Domaszewski loc. cit.*) || **16** praefecit *M^{ac}UTV* | praeficit *M^sS non male* ||

cat Tarsum, quod oppidum fere totius Ciliciae nobilissimum fortissimumque est. ³Ibi rebus omnibus prouinciae et finitimarum ciuitatum constitutis cupiditate proficiscendi ad bellum gerendum non diutius moratur magnisque itineribus per Cappadociam confectis biduum Mazacae comoratus Comana <***> uetustissimum et sanctissimum in Cappadocia Bellonae templum, quod tanta religione colitur ut sacerdos eius deae maiestate imperio potentia secundus a rege consensu gentis illius habeatur. ⁴Id homini nobilissimo Lycomedi Bithyno adiudicauit, qui regio Cappadocum genere ortus propter aduersam fortunam maiorum suorum mutationemque generis iure minime du-

2 fortissimumque *MUSTV* (u. ad 19.2 et *TLL* 6.1.1157.65–1158.58 ‘de soliditate rerum durarum, non mobilium’) | fertilissimumque *Schneider coll.* 3.1 | florentissimumque *Müller* (cf. *BG* 4.3.3 ciuitas ... florens) || 3 cupiditate *MUSTV* (cf. 20.2) | cupiditatem *Schiller 1889 coll.* 55.2 || 6 ♦ Comana <***> *Kübler 1896a dubitanter* (sc. Cappadociae? uel Pontica?; u. *Gaertner-Hausburg* 91 n. 65) | Comana *MUSTV*, quod defendit *Madvig* | <uenit> Comana *5 teste Dübner* | Comana <uenit> *Nipperdey* | Comana <ut confirmarentur et> *Damon exempli gratia* (cf. *BC* 1.29.3 *Hispanias et, de coniunctione postposita*, 45.3 et 56.6) | Comana <cum dissensionibus essent confecta et repeteretur> *Damon exempli gratia* (cf. 42.2 et u., de re, u. 66.4, de coniunctione postposita, *Gaertner-Hausburg* 36–39) || 8 maiestate imperio *ed. pr.* (cf. *BC* 3.106.4 et *Sal. Cat.* 12.1) | magis imperio *MUSTV* | nisi mauis magis imperio <quam> (cf. 15.1 et, de antithesi, *Sen. Cl.* 1.3) || 10 Bithyno *scripsimus* | b(i/y)thino *MUS* | bithinio *TV* (u. *TLL* 2.2019.57–63) || 11 Cappadocum genere *MUT^cV* | cappado cum genere *S* | cappadociae cum genere *T^{ac}* || 77.12–78.1 iure minime dubio, uetustate tamen *MUSTV* | post ortus transposuit *Schiller 1889 coll. Flor. Epit.* 3.13.7

bio, uetustate tamen intermisso, sacerdotium id repetebat.

⁵Fratri autem Ariobarzanis Ariarathi, cum bene meritus
uterque eorum de re publica esset, ne aut regni hereditas
Ariarathen sollicitaret aut heres regni terreret <***> Ario-
barzani attribuit, qui sub eius imperio ac ditione esset. Ipse 5
iter inceptum simili uelocitate conficere coepit.

67 ¹Cum propius Pontum finesque Gallograeciae
accessisset, Deiotarus tetrarches Gallograeciae tum
quidem paene totius—quod ei neque legibus neque
moribus concessum esse ceteri tetrarchae contendebant, 10
sine dubio autem rex Armeniae minoris ab senatu
appellatus—depositis regiis insignibus neque tantum
priuato uestitu sed etiam reorum habitu supplex ad
Caesarem uenit oratum ut sibi ignosceret quod, in ea parte
positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset 15

1 sacerdotium *TV* | sacerdotum *S* | sacerdotio *MU* || **4-5** terreret
<***> Ariobarzani *Nipperdey*, qui Ariobarzanen, partem Armeniae
minoris concessit eumque *suppleuit coll. de re D.C. 41.63.3, 42.48.3 (de*
locutione cf. BG 7.9.6) | terreret Ariobarzani *MUSTV* || **6** inceptum
MUV (cf. BAfr 75.6) | coeptum *ST (cf. BAfr 69.4)* || **8** tetrarches
M^f V ex 68.1 tetrarcharum? (*u. et infra*) | tetriarches *T* | tetharces *M^uU*
| thetarces *S* || Gallograeciae] | gallogr(a)e(c/t)iae *MU^rTV* |
gallogecie *U^{ac}* | gallograe *S* || **10** tetrarchae *MTV uel* tethrarchae (*u.*
et supra) | tetharc(a)e *M^uUS* || **12** regiis *5 teste Dübner (cf. 68.2)* | regis
MUST (cf. Tac. Hist. 2.58.2) | regibus *V* || tantum *5 teste Dübner*
| tanto *MUSTV* || **15** ◇ Caesaris *MUSTV* | (in) Caesaris *Cornelissen*
(*cf. 23.1 et u. infra*) ||

⟨et coactus⟩ exercitibus imperiisque, in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset; ²neque enim se debuisse iudicem esse controuersiarum populi Romani sed parere praesentibus imperiis.

- 5 **68** ¹Contra quem Caesar cum plurima sua commemorasset officia quae consul ei decretis publicis tribuisset cumque defensionem eius nullam posse excusationem eius imprudentiae recipere coarguisset, quod homo tantae prudentiae ac diligentiae scire potuisset quis urbem Italiamque teneret,
10 ubi senatus populusque Romanus, ubi res publica esset,

1 ⟨et coactus⟩ exercitibus imperiisque, *Bensch-Schaus* (cf. 43.1; ⟨coactus⟩ iam *Hoffmann* 1890) | exercitibus imperiisque *MUSTV* | excitusque imperiis *Markland* (cf. *BHisp* 4.4) | excitus imperiis *Kraner* | excitus uerbis imperiisque *Madvig* | excitus precibus imperiisque *Larsen coll. Cic. Deiot. 13* | ⟨coercitus⟩ exercitibus imperiisque *Dinter* (cf. 33.4 et *BC* 1.67.4) | exercitibus imperiisque ⟨aduersariorum coactus⟩ *Klotz, Cornelissen secutus* (u. supra) | nisi *mauis* ⟨et coactus⟩ potestatibus imperiisque (cf. *Cic. Leg. 1.23*) || in *MU^rSTV* | om. *U^{ac}* || **2** se debuisse iudicem *M^rUT* | se buisse iudicem *M^{ac}* | se iudicem debuisset *S* | se diebus se iudicem *V* || **3** controuersiarum populi Romani *UST per compendia* | controuersiarum *M* | controuersiarum publicarum rerum *V* || **7** ◇ defensionem eius¹ *MU^rSTV* | defensonem eius *U^{ac}* | defectionem eius *5 teste Dübner* (cf. *BG* 7.67.7) | [defensionem eius] *Dausius* 1727 ut *glossema ad excusationem* (u. et infra), sed cf. de *pleonasm* *Cic. Rab. Post. 27 Rufum necessitatis excusatio defendet* || posse *MUSTV* | posse ⟨se⟩ *Dausius* 1727 (u. supra et cf. *Sen. Ben. 7.16.3*) || eius² *MUSTV* (de *iteratione* cf. *BG* 1.20.5) | [eius] *Clarke* ||

quis deinde post L. Lentulum C. Marcellum consul esset, tamen se concedere id factum superioribus suis beneficiis, ueteri hospitio atque amicitiae, dignitati aetatique hominis, precibus eorum qui frequentes concurrissent hospites atque amici Deiotari ad deprecandum; de controuersiis tetrarcharum postea se cogniturum esse dixit. Regium uestitum ei restituit. ²Legionem autem eam quam ex genere ciuium suorum Deiotarus natura disciplinaque nostra constitutam habebat equitatumque omnem ad bellum gerendum adducere iussit.

69 ¹Cum in Pontum uenisset copiasque omnes in unum locum coegisset, quae numero atque exercitatione bellorum mediocres erant—excepta enim legione sexta, quam secum abduxerat Alexandria ueteranam multis laboribus periculisque functam multisque militibus partim difficultate itinerum ac nauigationum partim crebritate bellorum

1 quis deinde post L. Lentulum C. Marcellum consul esset *M*^f | quis deinde post l lentulum c marcellum consules sed *M*^{ac} | quis deinde post l lentulum c marcellum consules se *S* | qui deinde post l lentulum c marcellum consules *TV non male* || deinde *MUSTV* | denique *Nipperdey* (cf. *BC* 1.72.2) || **4** frequentes *MUT* | frequenter *SV* || concurrissent *STV* | concucurrissent *MU*^r | concucurrissent *U*^{ac} || **8** natura *MUS* (cf. *Cic. Flac.* 63) | matura *TV* | armatura *Cuiacius teste Nipperdey, fortasse recte* (u. 34.4 et *Cic. Att.* 6.1.14) || **14** abduxerat *MUSV*^r | abduxerant *V*^{ac} | adduxerat *T* ||

adeo deminutam ut minus mille hominibus in ea esset—
 reliquae erant tres legiones: una Deiotari, duae quae in eo
 proelio quod Cn. Domitium fecisse cum Pharnace scrip-
 simus fuerant. ²Legati a Pharnace missi Caesarem ade-
 5 unt atque imprimis deprecantur ne eius aduentus hostilis
 esset: facturum enim omnia Pharnacen quae imperata es-
 sent. ³Maximeque commemorabant nulla Pharnacen aux-
 ilia contra Caesarem Pompeio dare uoluisse cum Deiotarus,
 qui dedisset, tamen ei satisfecisset.

10 **70** ¹Caesar respondit se fore aequissimum Pharnaci si
 quae polliceretur repraesentaturus esset. ²Monuit autem
 ut solebat mitibus uerbis legatos ne aut Deiotarum sibi
 obicerent aut nimis eo gloriarentur beneficio quod auxilia
 Pompeio non misissent; ³nam se neque libentius facere
 15 quicquam quam supplicibus ignoscere neque prouinciarum
 publicas iniurias condonare iis posse qui [non] fuissent in se
 officiosi; ⁴quamquam id ipsum quod commemorarent offi-
 cium fuisse utilius Pharnaci, qui prouidisset ne uinceretur,

1 mille *§ teste Dübner* | cum *MUSTV* de compendio corrupto cf. ad *BC*
 2.35.5 || **2** quae *§ teste Andrieu* | quas *MUSTV* || **4** a Pharnace missi
ST | missi a Pharnace *V* | ab Pharnace missi *M* | ad Pharnacem
 missi *U* || **12** mitibus *MST^cV* | militibus *UT^{ac}* || **13** gloriarentur
MU | glorientur *STV* || **16** [non] *Vascosanus* | non *MUSTV* ||
17 quamquam *Dinter* (cf. 11.2) | quam *MUSTV* | [quam] *§ teste*
Oudendorp | quin *Nipperdey* (cf. *Cic. Att.* 12.43.2) ||

quam sibi, cui di immortales uictoriam tribuissent; ⁵itaque se magnas et graues iniurias ciuium Romanorum qui in Ponto negotiati essent, quoniam in integrum restituere non posset, concedere Pharnaci; ⁶nam neque interfectis amis-
sam uitam neque exsectis uirilitatem restituere posse, quod 5
quidem supplicium grauius morte ciues Romani subissent;
⁷Ponto uero decederet confestim familiasque publicanorum remitteret ceteraque restitueret sociis ciuibusque Romanis quae penes eum essent; ⁸si fecisset, iam tunc sibi mitteret
munera ac dona quae bene rebus gestis imperatores ab 10
amicis accipere consuissent. Miserat enim ei Pharnaces coronam auream. His responsis datis legatos remisit.

71 ¹At Pharnaces liberaliter omnia pollicitus, cum festinantem ac praecurrentem Caesarem speraret libentius
etiam crediturum suis promissis quam res pateretur quo 15
celerius honestiusque ad res magis necessarias proficisceretur—nemini enim erat ignotum plurimis de causis ad urbem Caesarem reuocari—lentius agere, decedendi diem

1–2 itaque se *MUS* | itaque *TV* || **9** si fecisset, iam *MUSTV* | id si fecisset iam *Schneider* | quae si fecisset iam *Klotz* | si fecisset haec *Menge* 125 | *nisi mauis* si fecisset omnia (*u.* 71.1) || **11** enim ei *MU* | enim *STV* || **14** praecurrentem *MUSTV* (*u.* *App. BC* 2.385 *παροδευῶν αὐτὴν* [*sc.* *Ἀσίαν*]) *et, de notione praetercurrendi, TLL* 10.2.519.39–55) | percurrentem *Kraner* || **16–17** proficisceretur *STV* | proficisceretur existimabat *MU* ||

postulare longiorem, pactiones interponere, in summa frustrari coepit. ²Caesar cognita calliditate hominis, quod aliis temporibus natura facere consueuerat tunc necessitate fecit adductus, ut celerius omnium opinione manum consereret.

- 5 **72** ¹Zela est oppidum in Ponto positum, ipsum ut in plano loco satis munitum. Tumulus enim naturalis uelut manu factus excelsiore undique fastigio sustinet murum. ²Circumpositi sunt huic oppido magni multique intercisi uallibus colles, quorum editissimus unus, qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque
10 exercitus nostri, superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido, magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus passuum tribus abest ab Zela—

1 longiorem *STV* (cf. *BG* 1.40.14) | longiores *MU* (sc. pactiones?) ||
6 munitum *MUSTV* | munito *Nipperdey coll.* 28.3 || **8** ◇ huic *M* (cf. *Tac. Ann.* 14.15.2) | hoc *USTV* || multique intercisi *MUSTV* (cf. *Sen. Ep.* 90.18 et *BC* 3.43.1) | multisque intercisi *Schneider* (cf. 61.1 et *Cic. Att.* 4.15.5) | nisi mauis multique intercisis (cf. 73.3) || **9** unus, qui *MUTV* (de *anacotho* u. *Damon* 2015b, 242) | qui *S non male* | nisi mauis unus [qui] uel unus <est> qui || **11–12** superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido *MUSTV* | transposuerunt post unus *Klotz dubitanter*; post nobilitatem *Morus dubitanter*; post Zela *Madvig* 1.48–49 | seclussit ut glossema *Vielhaber* 1869 | alii alia || itineribus *MUSTV* | <commodis> itineribus *Klotz* (cf. *BC* 3.97.3) || coniunctus *MUSTV* | coniunctus <est> *Vielhaber* 1869 *Morum secutus* | coniunctis *Larsen*, qui *Madvig secutus est* || **13** nec *MUSTV* | non *Morus dubitanter* ||

³ hunc locum Pharnaces, ueteribus paternorum feliciū castrorum reffectis operibus, copiis suis omnibus occupauit.

73 ¹Caesar cum ab hoste milia passuum V castra posuisset uideretque eas ualles quibus regia castra munirentur eodem interuallo sua castra munituras si modo ea loca hostes priores (non) cepissent—quae multo erant propiora regis castris—aggerem comportari iubet intra munitiones. ²Quo celeriter collato, proxima nocte uigilia quarta legionibus omnibus expeditis impedimentisque in castris relictis, prima luce necopinantibus hostibus eum ipsum locum cepit in quo Mithridates secundum proelium aduersus Triarium fecerat. ³Hoc omnem comportatum aggerem ex castris seruitia aggerere tum iussit ne quis ab opere miles discederet, cum

5 munituras *U* | munitura *M* | muniturus *ST* et *V^c* ut uidetur | munitur *V^{ac}* || si modo ea loca hostes priores (non) cepissent *M* | si modo ea loca hostes priores cepissent *USTV* | *nisi mauis* nisi modo ea loca hostes priores cepissent (cf. *Hirt.* 8.27.2 et *Pl. Mil.* 1166) || **6** erant *MUV* | erat *ST* || **9–10** prima luce *MUSTV* | (profectus uel egressus) prima luce *Larsen* (cf. *Liu.* 27.42.14, *Juu.* 11.186) | *nisi mauis* [prima luce] (*u.* 74.1) || **11** Triarium *MS* | triarium *UTV* || **12** Hoc *MUS* | huc *TV* || aggerere tum *scripsimus* (aggerere iam *Klotz*; *u.* 74.3 et cf. *BC* 3.49.3) | agerentur *MUSTV* | agerent *Schneider coll. Pl. Men.* 955 (*u.* *TLL* 7.2.580.11–16 et ad *BHisp* 27.4) | gerent *Madvig* || **13** discederet *M* (*supra lineam*) *USTV* | cessaret *M* ||

spatio non amplius passuum ⟨mille⟩ intercisa uallis castra hostium diuideret ab opere incepto Caesaris castrorum.

74 ¹Pharnaces, cum id repente prima luce animaduertisset, copias suas omnes pro castris instruxit. Quas, interposita tanta locorum iniquitate, consuetudine magis perul-
 5 gata militari credebat instrui Caesar uel ad opus suum tardandum, quo plures in armis tenerentur, uel ad ostentationem regiae fiduciae, ne munitione magis quam manu defendere locum Pharnaces uideretur. ²Itaque deterritus
 10 non est quominus prima acie pro uallo instructa reliqua pars exercitus opus faceret. ³At Pharnaces impulsus siue loci felicitate siue auspiciis et religionibus inductus, quibus obtemperasse eum postea audiebamur, siue paucitate nos-
 15 trorum qui in armis erant comperta, cum more operis cotidiani magnam illam seruorum multitudinem, quae aggerem portabat, militum esse credidisset, siue etiam fiducia ueterani exercitus sui, quem bis et uicies in acie conflixisse

1 passuum ⟨mille⟩ *ed. pr. (cf. BAfr 59.5) | passuum MUSTV || intercisa MUSTV (cf. ad 72.2) | intermissa Schneider coll. Hirt. 8.9.2 | nisi mauis intermisso (cf. BG 6.7.4) || **2** incepto *MUS | incerto TV ||* Caesaris castrorum *MUSTV | [Caesaris castrorum] K̄aner ||* **11** impulsus siue *MUSTV | an siue impulsus ? ||* **14** comperta *MUSTV (cf. 10.3) | contempta Fischer coll. BG 3.2.3 et BC 3.111.1 (u. et 74.3) ||* **17** ueterani *Stephanus (cf. 4.1) | ueterana MUSTV | an [ueterani] ? ('propter collocationem veterani exercitus sui haereo' Klotz) ||* quem *STV | quem cum legione M | cum legione quem U ||**

et uicisse legati eius gloriabantur, simul contemptione exercitus nostri, quem pulsum a se, Domitio duce, sciebat, inito consilio dimicandi, descendere praerupta ualle coepit.

⁴Cuius aliquamdiu Caesar irridebat inanem ostentationem et eo loco militum coartationem quem in locum nemo sanus hostis subiturus esset, cum interim Pharnaces eodem gradu quo in procliuem descenderat uallem ascendere aduersus arduum collem instructis copiis coepit.

75 ¹Caesar incredibili eius uel temeritate uel fiducia commotus, necopinans imparatusque oppressus eodem tempore milites ab operibus reuocat, arma capere iubet, legiones opponit aciemque instruit. Cuius rei subita trepidatio magnum terrorem attulit nostris. ²Nondum ordinibus instructis falcatae regiae quadrigae permixtos milites perturbant. Quae tamen celeriter multitudine telorum op-

1 contemptione *scripsimus* (cf. *Hirt. 8.8.2*) | contemptum *MUS* | contemptu *TV* (cf. *BG 2.30.4*) || **3** praerupta ualle *MUSTV* (cf. *Sal. Jug. 50.2 monte*) | ⟨in⟩ praeruptam uallem *Schneider* (u. ad 74.4) || **5** ◇ coartationem *Brutus* (cf. *Liu. 27.46.2*) | cohortationem *MUSTV* || locum *ed. pr.* | loco *MUSTV* || **6** hostis *MUSTV* | [hostis] *Bentley* || **7** in procliuem *Nipperdey* (cf. 76.1 et, de antithesi, *Liu. 5.43.2*) | in proelium *ST* | in bellum *V* | praeruptam in proelium *U* | in praeruptam *M* (u. 74.3 et cf., de antithesi, *Plin. Nat. 2.174*) || **10** oppressus *STV* (cf. 45.4) | oppressos *MU* || **11** operibus reuocat *Naqvi* (reuocat iam *Jurinius*, u. infra; cf. 72.3 et *Hirt. 8.43.2*) | operibus uocat *MUSV* (cf. *Cic. Att. 12.21.5*) | opere uocat *T* | opere reuocat *Jurinius* (cf. *BC 1.82.2*) ||

primuntur. ³Insequitur has acies hostium. Et clamore sublato conflagitur multum adiuuante natura loci plurimum deorum immortalium benignitate, qui cum omnibus casibus belli intersunt tum praecipue iis (in) quibus nihil ratione potuit administrari.

76 ¹Magno atque acri proelio comminus facto, dextro cornu, quo ueterana legio sexta erat collocata, initium uictoriae natum est. Ab ea parte cum in procliui detruderentur hostes, multo tardius sed tamen isdem dis adiuuantibus sinistro cornu mediaque acie totae profligantur copiae regis. ²Quae quam facile subierant iniquum locum tam celeriter gradu pulsae premebantur loci iniquitate. Itaque multis militibus partim interfectis partim suorum ruina oppressis, qui uelocitate effugere poterant, armis tamen proiectis, uallem transgressi nihil ex loco superiore inermi proficere poter-

2 conflagitur *Manutius* (cf. 60.4) | conflagit *MUSTV* || adiuuante natura *MUSTV* (de usu absoluto cf. 76.1) | adiuuante (nostros) natura *Du Pontet* (cf. 52.4) || **4** belli *Klotz coll. BG 5.30.3 et BC 3.72.4* | bellis *MUSTV* | bellicis *Stephanus* (cf. *BG 6.24.3*) || iis (in) quibus *Larsen* (cf. *Cic. Ver. 2.3.193*) | (e/i)is quibus *MS* | eius quibus *U ut uidetur per compendium* | quibus *TV* | nisi mauis in quibus (cf. *BC 3.15.6*) || **7** ueterana legio sexta *UTV* | ueterana sexta legio *M* | ueterana religio *S^c* | ueterata religio *S^{ac}* || **8** in procliui *MUS* (de sensu locali cf. 74.4 et u. *TLL 10.2.1537.42–54*, de sensu translato cf. *BC 1.48.7* et u. *TLL 10.2.1538.52–62*) | in procliui *TV* | in procliue *Scaliger* (cf. *Suet. Cal. 32.2 in mare*) || **14** tamen *MUSTV* (cf. 36.1) | temere *Cornelissen* ||

ant. At nostri uictoria elati subire iniquum locum munitionesque aggredi non dubitarunt. ³Defendentibus autem iis cohortibus castra quas Pharnaces praesidio reliquerat celeriter castris hostium sunt potiti. Interfecta multitudine omni suorum aut capta Pharnaces cum paucis equitibus 5 profugit. ⁴Cui nisi castrorum oppugnatio facultatem attulisset liberius profugiendi, uiuus in Caesaris potestatem adductus esset.

77 ¹Tali uictoria totiens uictor Caesar incredibili est laetitia adfectus, quod maximum bellum tanta celeritate confecerat, eoque subiti periculi recordatione laetior, quod uictoria facilis ex difficillimis rebus acciderat. ²Ponto recepto praeda omni regia militibus condonata, postero die cum expeditis equitibus ipse proficiscitur, legionem sextam decedere ad praemia atque honores accipiendos in Italiam 15 iubet, auxilia Deiotari domum remittit, duas legiones cum Caelio Viniciano in Ponto relinquit.

2 Defendentibus *MUSTV* (cf. *BC* 3.95.3) | deserentibus *Lipsius* (cf. *BAfr* 83.4) || **3** castra quas *MUS* | castris quas *T* | castra quae *V* || **6–7** facultatem attulisset *MUS* | facultatem *T* | facultatem attribuisset *V* || **11** eoque *Kübler 1896a* | miles quoque *Kübler 1896a* (cf. *Cic. Fam.* 10.5.2 uel 24.6) | quodque *MUSTV* (u. et *infra*) || quod uictoria *MUSTV* | [quod uictoria] *Dinter*, quodque *supra retinens* || **14** equitibus *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 5.2.1623.13–26) | equitibusque *Schneider* (cf. 25.2 et u. ad 17.3) || **17** relinquit *MUV* | relinquit *ST* ||

78 ¹Ita per Gallograeciam Bithyniamque in Asiam iter facit omniumque earum prouinciarum de controuersiis cognoscit et statuit. Iura in tetrarchas, reges, ciuitates distribuit. ²Mithridaten Pergamenum, ⟨a⟩ quo rem feliciter celeriterque gestam in Aegypto supra scripsimus, regio genere ortum, disciplinis etiam regiis educatum—nam eum Mithridates, rex Asiae totius propter nobilitatem Pergamo paruulum secum asportauerat in castra multosque retinuerat annos—regem Bosphori constituit, quod sub imperio Pharnacis fuerat, prouinciasque populi Romani a barbaris atque inimicis regibus interposito amicissimo rege muniuit. ³Eidem tetrarchian [legibus] Gallograecorum iure gentis et cognationis adiudicauit occupatam et possessam paucis ante annis Deiotaro. ⁴Neque tamen usquam diutius moratus est quam necessitas urbanarum seditionum pati uidebatur. ⁵Rebus felicissime celerrimeque confectis in Italiam celerius omnium opinione uenit.

4 ⟨a⟩ quo rem *Scaliger* | quo rem *MUTV* | quorum *S* || 9 quod *MUSTV* (*u. Damon 2015b, 111*) | quod ⟨regnum⟩ *Larsen* (*cf. BG 2.29.3*) || 11–12 muniuit *ed. pr.* | munierat *MUSTV* || 12 [legibus] *Ciacconius, ut glossema ex 67.1 legibus?* (*u. et 68.1*) | legibus *MUSTV* || 14 Deiotaro *MUTV* (*de datiuo commodi u. TLL 10.2.116.38–41*) | a deiotaro *S. fortasse recte* (*cf. 34.1*) ||

APPENDIX CRITICA

- 1.1 Rhodo] et ordo **S**
- 1.1 Creta] certa **S**
- 1.2 operibus *om.* **M**
- 1.2 esse] essent **M^{mr}**
- 1.2 uidentur *om.* **M**
- 1.2 arietes] aretes **S**
- 1.3 contignatione] cogitatione **S**
- 1.3 et *om.* **M**
- 1.3 structuris] fruc- **S**
- 1.4 a] ac **V**
- 1.4 reliqua] relili- **S**
- 1.5 esset] esse **S**
- 1.5 altera] ad terra **S**
- 1.5 rei ... alterius *om.* **S** (*uerba 4*)
- 1.5 utrumque] utrique **M^{*}**
- 2.1 cunctatio] contatio **S**
- 2.1 fines] -e **S**
- 2.1 regnumque] ren- **S**
- 2.1 conquisitoresque] in- **M**
- 2.1 magnumque ... adduxerant *om.* **S** (*uerba 12*)

- 2.1 oppidum] -do **U^{ac}**
 2.2 urbe] hurbe **S**
 2.2 armauerant] -uerunt **M** *per compendium*
 2.2 locupletiores] lucu- **M^{*}**
 2.3 ueteranas] ueet- **S** *per compendium*
 2.3 in ... locis *om.* **M** (*uerba 4*)
 2.3 urbis] hubis **S**
 2.4 uiis *om.* **S**
 2.4 triplicem] -e **T**
 2.4 erat] erant **S**
 2.4 partes] pater **S**
 2.4 urbis] ubis **S^{ac}**
 2.4 erant] habebat e- **M^{ac}**
 2.5 subiectisque] -tusque **S**
 2.5 funibus] fin- **S**
 2.5 quamcumque] qua- **S**
 2.5 erat] erant **T**
 2.5-3.1 mouebant Vrbs fertilissima] mouebatur his feralis-
 sima **S**
 3.1 suggerebat] subgerebat **S^c**
 3.1 homines] om- **S**
 3.1 imitati] -ari **M**
 3.1 et⁴ *om.* **S**
 3.3 annis] animis **S**

-
- 3.3 Caesarem] ac cessarem **S**
 3.4 non] on **S^{ac}**
 3.4 ex *om.* **V**
 3.4 namque] nam **T^{ac}**
 3.4 tempestatibus] tempestabit **S^{ac}** *ut uidetur*
 3.4 propter *om.* **S**
 4.1 dissensione] descensione **T^{ac}** : discensione **T^c**
 4.1 exercitui] -u **V**
 4.1 praeerat et] praeerat praeet **T^{ac}**
 4.1 Arsinoen] asrnoen **U**
 4.1 summam] sumam **S**
 4.1 obtinere] optinere **S^{ac}**
 4.1 praeoccupat] praeocupat **S**
 4.1 eunuchum] eudum **S^{ac}** *ut uidetur* : eunidum **S^c**
 4.1 Achillan²] -ani **S**
 4.2 Ganymedi] grani- **S**
 4.2 officio] offio **M**
 4.2 pari] patri **S**
 5.1 pertinentes] pertingentes **M**
 5.1 priuatas] -tos **M**
 5.1 ac] hac **U**
 5.1 subsidit] -det **V**
 5.2 hac] ac **V**
 5.2 domini] -nia **S**

- 5.2 Nilo] nichilo **S**
- 5.2 adeo] aeo **S**
- 5.2 limosa] lunosa **S**
- 5.2 contenta] -emta **S**
- 5.2 parte] pater **S**
- 5.3 facto] -ta **S**
- 5.3 distributi] distribuendi **T^{ac}**
- 5.3 uicatum] uacatum **T^{ac}** : uacati **T^c**
- 5.3 priuatis aedificiis] a- p- **V**
- 5.3 priuatis] primiuatis **S**
- 5.3 ac] a **S**
- 5.3 extracta] ex castra **U^{ac}**
- 5.3 utebantur] -batur **M**
- 6.1 mari] mare **V**
- 6.1 ac² *om.* **V**
- 6.2 causam salsior] acussam fal- **S**
- 6.2 paulo praeter consuetudinem aqua] a- pa- pr- c- **M^{ac}**
- 6.2 admirationem praebebat] exhibebat admirationem **V**
- 6.2 nec] ne **S**
- 6.2 different] differret **S^{ac}**
- 6.3 uero *om.* **U**
- 6.3 propior] proprior **S**
- 7.1 quo] qua **M^{ac}**
- 7.1 incessit] iniessit **S**

-
- 7.1 casum²] cassum **S**
 7.1 cum tam paruo] commitam paruos **S^c** : comintam
 paruos **S^{ac}**
 7.2 quam domiciliis] quan domiciliis **S**
 7.2 mouerat] nouerat **T**
 7.3 et natura cognoscatur] c- et n- **M^{ac}**
 7.3 hoc genus ad prodicionem] ad p- h- g- **M^{*}**
 7.3 ad] a **S**
 8.1 suorum] suor **M**
 8.1 consolatione] conlationem **T^{ac}** : conlatione **T^c**
 8.1 ratione] -em **T^{ac}**
 8.1 puteis] -eus **T**
 8.1 enim *om.* **T**
 8.2 atque] aquae **S**
 8.2 haberent] tener- **T**
 8.2 cottidie nauibus] n- c- **V**
 8.2 uel a] uella **S**
 8.2 praecluderentur] -dentur **M**
 8.3 esse] -et **S**
 8.3 primam] primum **U^{ac}**
 8.3 nihil] nichil **M**
 8.3 praeterquam] praeter quan **S**
 8.4 aduersos] -rsus **T**
 8.4 ex *om.* **T**

- 8.4 pares] paress **S**
8.5 moram] -rem **S**
8.5 ascensum] aes censum **V^{ac}**
8.5 scaphis] caphis **S**
8.5 aedificiorum] aedificatorum **T** *ut uidetur*
8.6 hos] hoc **M^{ac}**
8.6 proinde] dei- **U**
8.6 uincendum] uiue- **S**
9.1 hac] haec **S**
9.1 suos] uos **S**
9.1 atque *om.* **V^{ac}**
9.1 negotium *om.* **M**
9.1 fodiendos] -ndo **S**
9.3 Caluino] caluitio **T**
9.3 supra *om.* **T**
10.2 appellatur] -abatur **M**
10.2 praedatum] praeced- **S**
10.3 crediderunt] crediderunt **S**
10.5 de *om.* **M^{ac}**
10.5 nolebat] ualebant **S**
10.5 nullos] -o **S**
10.5 X] decimam **V**
10.5 allatura] -ram **T**
10.5 notitia] -am **U**

-
- 10.5 idonea esset] e- i- **M**
10.5 quae] quod **U^{ac}**
10.5 inertiam] inhe- **S**
10.6 de causis] deauis **S**
10.6 detrahit] -achit **S**
11.1 nauis] nanauis **S**
11.1 Caesaris cornu] co- Cae- **V**
11.1 longe] longeque **S**
11.1 collocata] collata **M**
11.1 sese] ses **S**
11.1 magnoque] magno **M^{ac}**
11.2 coactus] coatus **S**
11.2 turpem] -piter **V**
11.2 casurum] caesarum **S**
11.3 scientia] scia **M^{ac}**
11.3 culpa] -am **U**
11.4 secundissimum] secumd- **S**
11.4 depressa] deperressa **S**
11.5 classe] chasse **S**
11.5 potitus] porti- **S**
11.5 esset] est **V**
11.6 hac] hanc **S**
11.6 calamitate] cadam- **S**
11.6 flante] -ti **S**

- 11.6 nauibus *om.* **S**
 12.1 se] sed **S**
 12.1 classis] classes **V**
 12.2 eas] eos **U**
 12.2 et³ *om.* **S**
 12.3 deposuerunt] -suerant **T**
 12.4 ac] et **M**
 12.4 classem] cala- **M^{ac}**
 13.1 ostiis] ho- **V**
 13.1 Nili] portorium nuli **S**
 13.1 occultis] -i **S**
 13.1 usi *om.* **V**
 13.2 naturalis] -i **U**
 13.4 diebus *om.* **S**
 13.4 apertasque] apertas **S** : apertasque apertasque **M^{*}**
 13.4 seque] sedque **S**
 13.5 VIII] IX **U** : VIII **T**
 13.5 Ponticas] -ias **S**
 13.5 quadririmes decem] -dririmes et **V**
 13.5 reliquae] -a **S**
 13.6 confisus cognitis] consus cognititas **S**
 13.6 se] sed **S**
 14.1 postquam] postquam **S**
 14.1 circumuehitur] cirtumuettur **S^{ac}** : cirtumuehitur **S^c**

-
- 14.1 hos] his **T^{ac}**
 14.1 spatium] ispatium **T**
 14.1 esse] esset **S**
 14.2 distribuit] sdistribuit **M^{*}**
 14.2 quamque] quamcumque **V**
 14.3 instruunt] instituunt **V**
 14.4 ipsa] -am **S**
 14.4 terroris] -ores **M^{*}**
 14.5 transitu] -um **S**
 14.5 sic ... Africae *om.* **M** (*uerba* *g*)
 14.5 utris] utrisque **M^{*}**
 14.5 transeundi] transecundi **S**
 14.5 transeundi fieret] f- t- **T**
 15.1 Rhodiis] Rodius **V**
 15.2 ob notissimam] obtatissimam **T^{ac}**
 15.2 est *om.* **S**
 15.3 mihi *om.* **U^{ac}**
 15.3 inquit] inquit **S**
 15.3 potueris] putaueris **V**
 15.4 magno] magna **T**
 15.4 dedecori] -r **S**
 15.4 dolori] -is **S**
 15.5 impetum] -unt **S**
 15.6 sustinent] -et **S**

15.6 atque *om.* **M^{ac}**

15.6 aduersae] ac se **M^{ac}**

15.7 reliquae] reliquae **S^{ac}** : reliquiae **S^c**

15.7 constitit] *post* constit **T** *non legitur* (*c. litterae 3*)

15.8 atque ... exposceret *om.* **S** (*uerba* 16)

15.8 caperet] peteret **V**

15.8 ab dis] abditis **T^{ac}** : ab diis **T^c**

16.1 autem] enim **M**

16.1 periclitarentur] peritarentur **V^{ac}**

16.2 simul] simulli **S**

16.2 ac¹] a **S**

16.2 de summa ⟨exercitus⟩ ac de salute] ac de summa salute

T

16.2 aut¹ *om.* **U^{ac}**

16.4 falleret *om.* **M**

16.4 proficisceretur] profisceretur **S**

16.5 maritimis] matrimis **S**

16.5 numero] -rum **U**

16.5 multitudo] ita m- **V**

16.5 prodesset] nauium p- **M**

16.5 e] et **S**

16.6 cum defensoribus] condef- **V^{ac}**

16.6 remigibusque] suis r- **M**

16.6 nostris] ex n- **V**

-
- 16.6 omnibus] omibus **M**
 16.7 propinquam] proprinquam **M**^{*}
 16.7 ex] et **M**
 16.7 atque] et **V**
 16.7 proprius] proprius **M**
 17.1 molemque] molesque **M**
 17.1 ad insulam *om.* **M**
 17.2 magna ex] e- m- **V**
 17.2 tempore *om.* **T**
 17.3 leuis armaturae] leuisarum matura **S**
 17.3 partem] partim **T**
 17.3 magnis] -sque **S**
 17.3 cepisset] cepissent **M**^{ac}
 17.4 primo] -mum **T**
 17.4 pariter sustinuerunt] s- p- **M**^{*}
 17.4 nauibusque longis] nauibus longius **S**
 17.5 constiterunt ... litore *om.* **S** (*uerba 12*)
 17.5 Pharitae] *inter ph et rite* **T** *non legitur*
 18.1 se] sed **S**
 18.1 erat non dissimile] d- n- e- **V**
 18.1 cratibus aut *om.* **V**
 18.3 aequo loco] l- a- **V**
 18.3 enatauerunt ... (18.4) sex milium *om.* **V** (*uerba 15*)
 18.4 ex his *om.* **U**

- 18.4 interfectique] -ctaque **S^{ac}**
19.1 praeda militibus] m- p- **U**
19.1 propior] prior **S**
19.1 communiuit] cumminuit **S**
19.1 ibi praesidium] p- i- **V**
19.2 proprioemque] proprioemque **S**
19.2 sed] si **S** 19.2 optentis] optenas **S**
19.3 depulerat] -ant **V^{ac}**
19.4 aduersus hostem] h- a- **V**
19.5 altero] -ra **S**
19.5 effecto] efecto **M^{ac}**
19.5 ut *om.* **M^{ac}**
19.5 eiecerunt] iec- **S**
19.5 eodemque] eodem **V**
19.6 pugnabatur ... (24.2) ut ad *om.* **S**
20.1 remigum] -gium **T**
20.6 quid] quod **T**
20.6 pauci] -is **U^{ac}**
21.1 uniuersos] u- Cesar **V**
21.2 a terra] aeterna **V**
21.5 mittenda nauigia] n- m- **V**
22.1 in operibus] in o- in **V^{ac}**
22.2 hortatio] exhortacio **V**
23.1 alexandrini] -ri **T**

-
- 23.1 cum *om.* **T**
 23.2 omnem *om.* **T**
 23.2 regno *om.* **T**
 23.2 facere id] i- f- **V**
 23.2 uenturi] -ra **T^{ac}**
 23.2 multitudini] -ne **T^{ac}**
 24.1 etsi] si **T**
 24.1 esse statuit] constituit e- **M^{*}**
 24.1 gerundum] gesturum **V**
 24.2 cum ipse tantum ei crederet] cum i- t- ei cr- cum ipse
 tantum ei crederet **M^{*}**
 24.3 sibi *om.* **V**
 24.4 compressis] compressisque **M**
 24.5 ex] e **M**
 25.1 firmiores] infirm- **S**
 25.1 animaduenterent] adu- **T**
 25.1 aetatem] aetate **S**
 25.2 dispositis] dispotis **V**
 25.3 Neronem] Nerorem **S**
 25.4 quae *om.* **V^{ac}**
 25.4 plurimis] -mos **T^{ac}**
 25.4 prosequabatur] pers- **V**
 25.5 cum *om.* **U^{ac}**
 25.6 sibi] sic **M**

- 26.1 Caesaris *om.* **M**
 26.1 propensissima] impen- **M**
 26.2 Aegyptus maritimo] -tos maritimo **U^{ac}** *ut uidetur* : -tus
 maritima **U^c**
 26.2 maritimo] maritimos **T^{ac}**
 26.2 claustris] castr- **S**
 26.2 magnis circumdatum] c- m- **V**
 26.2 pertinaciter] pertinentiter **M^{*}**
 26.3 contendit] conditendit **M^{ac}** : tetendit **M^c** *ut uidetur* :
 contendit **M^{mr}**
 26.3 ea *om.* **V**
 26.3 uictori] -riae **S**
 27.1 cepit] accepit **T**
 27.1 spatium *om.* **V**
 27.1 relinquens] -quere **S**
 27.2 uel superari delerique] uel s- uel d- **V**
 27.3 autem *om.* **V**
 27.3 interclusum a] interdum suma **S**
 27.3 a² *om.* **V**
 27.4 a Delta] ad Δ delta **V**
 27.4 commiserunt] commiser **T**
 27.5 constantiaque ... imprudentia *om.* **S** (*uerba* 5)
 27.5 atque] et **V**
 27.5 undique *om.* **M**

- 27.5 facta] stata **S**
 27.6 reliqui se texissent] reliquisset exissent **S**
 27.6 essent] -et **M^{ac}**
 28.1 rem] regem **S**
 28.1 eadem haec] h- e- **U**
 28.2 celeriore] -ori **V**
 28.2 fluminis Nili] n- f- **V**
 28.2 ne *om.* **S**
 28.2 quod *om.* **T^{ac}**
 28.2 is] his **M^{ac}**
 28.3 plani(t/c)i(e/a)] -nicies **S**
 28.3 adiectum] abi- **M**
 29.1 influebat] effl- **S**
 29.1 ab] a **M**
 29.1 passuum] passus **S**
 29.2 cum] *om.* **T^{ac}**
 29.2 equitatum] -atem **T**
 29.2 prohiberent] -beret **T^{ac}**
 29.2 eminus] minus **T^{ac}**
 29.3 dolore milites equitesque] -res -te sequentesque **S**
 29.4 itaque *om.* **V**
 29.4 tranarunt] transn- **M**
 29.4 legionarii] -riis **S**
 29.4 excisis] absc- **V**

- 29.4 iniecto] proie- **V**
 29.5 multitudine] multidine **M**
 30.1 re praeclarissime] -issima re **U**
 30.2 confertam] conse- **V**
 30.2 multitudinem] -e **S**
 30.2 magno²] -na **S**
 30.3 postero] p- uero **V**
 30.3 quo id] quod **T**
 30.3 numero *om.* **U**
 30.5 una] -am **S**
 30.5 altera] -am **S**
 30.6 proficiebant] -bat **S**
 30.6 uulnerandisque] -atisque **S**
 30.6 regione] -nem **S**
 31.1 per se] ipse **V**
 31.1 studio partim pugnandi partim] pu- pa- s- pa- **M**
 31.1 Carfulenum] carfunelum **V** : calenum carfulenum
M^{ac}
 31.1 uirum *om.* **S**
 31.3 adeo *om.* **V**
 31.3 incitati] incitata **T^{ac}**
 31.5 ruina] ui **S**
 31.6 nauem] n- et **S**
 32.2 eum] enim **V**

32.2 eo proelio audito nihil] a- e- p- nil **V**

32.2 audito] -tu **U**

32.3 magnitudinis] multitudinis **T**

32.3 religione] releg- **U**

32.4 ac] a **S**

33.1 erat populum Romanum] *post erat uacat* **V** (*uerba* 2)

33.2 maiorique] maiori **S**

33.2 filiis] filiabus **V**

33.2 manserat] -rant **U^{ac}**

33.2 impotenter Ganymeden] g- i- **M^{ac}**

33.2 rursus *om.* **V**

33.3 quo] quod **T**

33.3 esset eorum] eorum esset **V**

33.4 eos nostris] nostros eos **M^{ac}**

33.4 essent] -et **T**

33.4 coerceri] ceteri **M^{*}**

34.1 ad] a **U**

34.1 suum *om.* **V**

34.1 regnum² *om.* **V**

34.1 posse] possem **T^{ac}**

34.2 C. *om.* **S**

34.2 esse statueret] statueret esse **M^{*}**

34.2 cappadociaque] captadociaque **U^{ac}**

34.2 ciuilis] uiuilis **U^{ac}**

- 34.2 maiestatemque] potestatemque **M**
34.3 euocatas] uocatas **S**
34.3 altera in] alteram **S**
34.4 atque] et **M**
34.4 constitutas] constitutos **V**
34.5 mittit] mittitque **T**
34.5 sestium] sextium **U**
34.5 adduceret] abduceret **U**
34.5 Domitii] domii **M***
35.1 a] ad **S**
35.1 referunt] fecerunt **M***
35.1 iure] iuro **M^{ac}**
35.1 regni causa] causa regni **V^{ac}**
35.1 is] his **S**
35.1 statuisset] statuit **M**
35.2 decessisse] discessisse **T**
35.2 quod] quo **S**
35.2 tres legiones] legiones tres **V**
35.2 Domitium] dominum **V**
35.2 putasset] putaret **M**
35.2 Armenia] armeniam **M**
35.2 decederet] deceret **V**
35.3 a] ex **T^{ac}**
35.3 quo] qua **M**

-
- 36.1 Pharnaces] Pharnacis **T^{ac}**
36.2 constanter omnia] omnia constanter **T**
36.3 ipsum] ipso **S**
36.3 obiectis] abiectis **M**
36.3 milia (*per compendia*)] mille **V** *per compendium*
36.4 dissipari] disperari **M**
36.5 eas *om.* **V**
36.5 uersari] aduersari **V**
36.5 dissiparentur dispersique] disparentur dispersisque **M**
37.1 ipso] ipse **V**
37.1 eum *om.* **U^{ac}**
37.4 ratione] rationem **T**
37.5 perfecit] praefecit **M**
37.5 pro uallo *om.* **M**
38.1 proxima nocte] nocte proxima **V**
38.1 magno] magna **S**
38.1 caesari] sibi **M**
38.2 ducebat] ducere **U^{ac}**
38.3 facillimum] fallamum **U^{ac}**
38.3 d(i/e)rectas] rectas **U^{ac}**
38.4 equitatum] notatum **T^{ac}**
38.4 aliter] alter **U^{ac}**
39.2 mediam] media **S**
40.1 tricesima sexta (i.e., XXXVI)] XXVI **V**

- 40.1 equites] aequitates **S**
40.2 oppressa est] oppressae **T**
40.3 ita] et **M**
40.3 pugnans] pugnas **S**
40.4 se superiora] superiora se **V**
40.4 non amplius *om.* **M**
40.5 itineribusque] itineribus **M**
41.1 ibique et] et ibi **V**
41.2 atque *om.* **T^{ac}**
41.2 se *om.* **S**
42.1 sub] nub **S^{ac}**
42.1 retenta *om.* **V**
42.2 Q] Quintus **V^c** *supra lineam*
42.3 namque] nam **M**
42.3 praesertim] praesertim cum **V**
42.3 constiterat] constituerat **M^{ac}**
42.3 posset *om.* **V**
42.3 captiuis nauibus] nauibus **U^{ac}**
42.4 Cornificio] corfinio **M**
42.4 magnis copiis] copiis magnis **M^{ac}**
42.5 instauraturam] instauratur in **S**
43.1 scientia sua] scientia **M^{ac}**
43.1 periclitatus] periclitatur **M**
43.2 crebro] crebra **M**

-
- 43.3 duobus milibus *om. **U^{ac}***
- 43.4 Cornificii] corfinii **M**
- 43.4 uersari passa non est] passa non est uersari **M^{ac}**
- 44.1 Brundisi] brundusium **M**
- 44.1 ferendum] inferendum **V^{ac}**
- 44.1 Octauium] octauianum **V**
- 44.2 misit *om.* **M**
- 44.3 periculum] periculi **T^{ac}**
- 44.4 militibus] milibus **T^{ac}**
- 44.4 Illyricum] illyrico **T**
- 44.4 maritumasque] maritimas **T**
- 45.2 aduersam *om.* **M**
- 45.2 demissis] dimissis **S**
- 45.3 uexillo sublato] sublato uexillo **M^{ac}**
- 45.4 ex] de **V**
- 46.2 celerrime fortissimeque] fortissime celerrimeque **T**
- 46.3 concurrerunt] cucurrerunt **M**
- 46.4 admiranda uirtute] admirandam uirtutem **U**
- 46.4 aequata] aequanta **S**
- 46.5 magis] magnis **S**
- 46.5 Octauiani] octauii **M**
- 46.7 dirimeret] dimeret **V^{ac}**
- 47.1 Vatinius] uitius **T^{ac}** : uatius **T^c**
- 47.1 portu] portis **T^{ac}**

- 47.2 proelio] periculo **U** *ut uidetur*
47.2 triremes] trirenes **T**
47.2 in insulam Issam] in insulas issas **U^{ac}**
47.2 quod] quo **M**
47.2 ex fuga credebatur Octavius] credebatur Octavius ex fuga **M^{ac}**
47.3 earum oppidum] oppidum earum **M^{ac}**
47.4 Vatinio] uatino **T^{ac}**
47.4 Octavius] octavianos **U^{ac}**
47.5 breui] breuissimo **T**
47.4 Siciliam] saciliam **U**
47.5 Cornificio] corfinio **M**
47.5 ex illo] ex illa **T^{ac}**
48.1 periculi] periculo **M**
48.1 siue] sine **M**
48.1 difficulter odia] difficultate rodia **S**
48.3 praemia] dona **T^{ac}** *ut uidetur*
49.1 et ut] ut et **T**
49.2 gregem] grege **U**
49.2 et euidetis] aut euidetis//// **T**
49.2 praetermittebatur] praetermittebant **T**
49.2 et tribunal] at tribunal **T^{ac}**
49.3 modo] domo **S**
49.3 periculorum] pepiculorum **S**

-
- 50.1 imperator *om.* **V**
 50.1 faceret quae *om.* **U**
 50.1 de morte eius prouinciales consilia] de morte eius
 prouintiales de morte consilia **M***
 50.2 eum] cum **S**
 50.2 acceptum] accemptum **T**
 50.3 sumptu] sunt tu **U**
 51.2 esset] esse **V**
 51.3 arcessendas] arcersendas **M**
 51.3 nauesque] naues **M**
 51.3 praepararentur] praeparentur **S**
 51.3 pecuniaeque ... imperarentur *om.* **V** (*uerba 4*)
 51.3 moraretur] morarentur **U^{ac}** *ut uidetur*
 51.4 aliquid] aliquod **M**
 52.2 contione] conditione **U^{ac}**
 52.2 se cordubam] cordubam se **M^{ac}**
 52.2 postmeridiano] post meridianam **T**
 52.2 in *om.* **S**
 52.2 libellum] bellum **V**
 52.2 aliquid ab eo] ab eo aliquid **M**
 52.3 Munatius] munutius **M***
 52.3 interfecto **Q.**] interfectoque **S**
 52.4 Licinius Squillus] lucinius quibus **V**
 53.1 compluresque] complures **V**

- 53.1 euocatos] euocatas **M^{ac}**
53.1 secum] et **S**
53.1 consuerat] consueuerat **M**
53.3 saxa] sexa **S^{ac}**
53.3 iacebant] iaciebant **S**
53.3 se domum familiaris sui] domum familiaris sui se **V**
53.4 sui] suis **M^{ac}** *ut uidetur*
53.5 prouincia] prouicia **V^{ac}**
53.5 consenserat] conserat **M^{*}**
53.5 Italia] italiam **V**
53.5 scriptas] sciptas **T**
53.5 quinta] quanta **S^{ac}**
53.5 ibi erat] erat ibi **T**
54.1 interim *om.* **V**
54.1 magis] modis **T^{ac}**
54.1 permotus] per **S**
54.1 reficit] refecit **S^{ac}**
54.1 celeriter] celiter **S**
54.2 signa] signo **V**
54.2 secundani] secundam **S**
54.3 quid] quod **V**
55.2 indicio] inditicio **M**
55.3 libertis] libertatis **V**
55.3 excrucandum] ad cruciandum **V**

-
- 55.4 redemerunt] redimerunt **M** *per compendium*
56.2 mixtam] mixtum **S**
56.2 licere] liceret **T^{ac}**
56.3 expensas] pensas *post spatium trium litterarum* **V**
56.4 coloniisque] colonisque **S**
56.4 sacramenti] sacramenta **T^{ac}**
56.6 edictum] editum **U^{ac}**
56.6 se] sed **T**
57.1 tempore] tepore **M**
57.1 legatus] legatis **S**
57.1 seditione facta] facta seditione **V**
57.1 non *om.* **T**
57.2 mane] manu **S**
57.2 perspiceret] respiceret **S**
57.2 moratus] moratur **U**
57.3 cohortes] cohortium **T**
57.3 ex] et **M**
57.3 legione] legiones **M**
57.3 -que¹ *om.* **V**
57.3 equitatus] aequitatus **S**
57.3 Obuculam] obuculum **T**
57.3 peruenisse] peruenisset **T^{ac}**
57.3 se *om.* **T**
57.4 eam in potestate] eam in potestatem **U**

- 57.4 Q (uel quintum)] quae **T**
 57.5 affertur] ut fertur **S**
 57.5 namque *om.* **S**
 57.5 id uarie] iduriariae **V**
 57.6 Segouiam] segoniam **T**
 57.6 contione] cotione **U**
 57.6 animos] animo **S**
 57.6 Caesar] acaesari **S**
 57.6 prouincia *om.* **M**
 57.6 restitueretur] restituerunt **V** *per compendium*
 58.1 -que *om.* **V^{ac}**
 58.1 ut *om.* **S**
 58.1 contra] contraque **S**
 58.1 qui] quae **S**
 58.1 opponeret] opponeret et **M**
 58.2 Caesaris] Caesaris nomine maioribus uiribus **S**
 58.2 Pompei *om.* **M**
 58.2 prae] per **V**
 58.2 ferebat] fatebatur **M^c**
 58.3 milites adeo fatebantur *om.* **M**
 58.3 Pompei] pompeio **M^{ac}**
 58.4 frequens ... diriperent *om.* **V** (*uerba 20*)
 58.4 matrum] matrum fidelium **S**
 58.4 facere cogerentur] facerentur **T**

- 59.1 tantae] tantu **T^{ac}**
 59.1 commotus] commeatus **U^{ac}**
 59.1 ad¹ *om.* **U^{ac}**
 59.1 posse ... causam *om.* **V** (*uerba 12*)
 59.1 causam²] causa **U**
 59.1 ascuerunt] adscuerant **V**
 59.1 et³ *om.* **V**
 59.2 milia passuum] menses pompeium **V**
 59.2 subsidio] subsidia **V**
 60.1 indignitate] indignitatem **T^{ac}**
 60.1 Marcellum sibi ducem] sibi ducem Marcellum **M^{*}**
 60.1 concurrerunt] cucurrerunt **M**
 60.1 possessiones] potestates a **T^{ac}**
 60.2 legiones] legionos **S**
 60.3 Cassium] cassius **U**
 60.3 superiore] superiori **V**
 60.3 recipiant] reciperent **T**
 60.3 equitatu] aequitatum **S**
 60.4 ripis *om.* **V**
 60.5 aciem] acie **U**
 61.1 firmior] firmiores **U^{ac}**
 61.1 Marcellus *om.* **M**
 61.1 legionum] legionem **S**
 61.2 quodam] quoddam **T**

- 61.2 clauderetur] cluderetur **T^c***ut uidetur*
61.2 infestis] infectis **T^{ac}**
61.2 silentio ex] ex silencio **U^{ac}**
61.2 fidele esse oppidum] oppidum fidele esse **V**
61.4 incitatis] inciuitatis **M**
61.4 ciuitates ea paterentur] ea paterentur ciuitates **U**
62.1 hispanorum] hispania **U^{ac}**
62.2 plures] complures **M**
62.2 accedit] accidit **T**
62.2 munitiones] munitionis **T^{ac}**
62.3 Bogus] bogas **S**
62.2 Marcelli *om.* **T**
62.2 tamen umquam] umquam tamen **T**
63.1 legionariis] legionaribus **V**
63.2 Marcellus *om.* **M**
63.2 se tenet] se recepit tenetque **T**
63.2 iuris] iuri **V**
63.2 ne] nec **U**
63.2 Lepidi] lipidi **T**
63.2 uerebatur] uidebatur **M**
63.3 ad exeundum] adeundem **V**
63.3 re omni] omni re **M**
63.4 dubitasset] dubisasset **M^{ac}***ut uidetur*
63.4 sibi *om.* **V**

-
- 63.4 Lepido] lipodo **T**
 63.4 credendum] credeudum **S^{ac}** *ut uidetur*
 63.4 ullum] ullam **U^{ac}**
 64.1 Marcellus] metellus **M**
 64.1 Cassius *om.* **S**
 64.1 proficiscitur] profisciscitur **S^{ac}**
 64.2 ad prouinciam obtinendam] ad optinendam prouin-
 tiam **V**
 64.2 cuius] eius **T**
 64.2 et Marcello] marcelloque **V**
 64.2 amici eius] eius amici **V**
 64.2 ne²] neque **U**
 64.2 magna pars] pars magna **U^{ac}**
 64.2 infinitis] infinitimis **T**
 64.2 rapinis confecta] confecta rapinis **U^{ac}**
 64.3 ut *om.* **S**
 64.3 Hiberum] hibernum **M**
 64.3 se contulisset] secum tulisset **M**
 64.4 demersa] dimersa **V**
 65.1 consuetudinemque] consuedinemque **V^{ac}**
 65.1 uenisset] ueniret **M**
 65.1 praeferendum] praefendum **U^{ac}**
 65.1 existimauit] existimabat **S**
 65.1 metum] metu **T**

- 65.2 plus *om.* **T**
 65.2 uidebat sibi] sibi uidebat **M**
 65.3 non] nam **U**
 65.4 Commoratus] commoratur **S**
 65.4 maiore] maiores **S**
 65.4 dynastas] dinastas **U^c** (*ut uidetur*) *in margine*
 65.4 in] in \ | in **M**
 66.1 magnisque] magnique **V^{ac}**
 66.2 fere] est fere **T**
 66.3 eius *om.* **V**
 66.4 homini] homine **S^{ac}**
 66.4 ortus] ortis **S**
 66.5 Ariarathi] amarathi **S**
 67.1 Pontum] pontem **T^{ac}**
 67.1 quod ei] quo din **S** *per compendia*
 67.1 legibus neque moribus] moribus neque legibus **M^{ac}**
 67.1 esse] esset **S**
 67.1 ab] a **U^{ac}**
 67.1 parte *om.* **V**
 67.1 in² *om.* **U^{ac}**
 67.1 castris] crasstris **S^{ac}**: crastris **S^c**
 67.2 populi Romani *per compendia om.* **M**
 67.2 sed *om.* **V^{ac}**
 68.1 esset¹] etsset **T^{ac}**

- 68.1 post *om.* **S**
68.1 C.] quintum **V**
68.1 se¹ *om.* **S**
68.1 tetrarcharum] tetharcarum **S**
68.1 esse *om.* **V**
68.2 ex] e **S^{ac}**
68.2 Deiotarus] deiotarius **T**
68.2 constitutam] constitutum **S**
69.1 legione] legionem **V**
69.1 Alexandria] alexandriam **V**
69.1 laboribus] laboris **S^{ac}**
69.2 eius aduentus] aduentus eius **V**
69.2 uoluisse] uoluisset **T**
69.3 Pompeio] pompeii **V**
70.1 esset *om.* **S**
70.2 monuit] monebat **M**
70.3 quam *om.* **S**
70.4 commemorarent] commemorassent **S**
70.5 magnas et graues iniurias] magnas iniurias et graues
iniurias **S**
70.5 in integrum *om.* **S^{ac}**
70.5 non *om.* **V^{ac}**
70.6 exsectis] etectis **S**
70.6 uirilitem] uirilitem **U**

- 70.6 posse] non posse **U^c** : non posset **U^{ac}**
70.7 ciuibusque] ciuibus **V**
70.8 tunc sibi mitteret] nunc mitteret sibi **V**
70.8 consuessent] consuescent **S**
71.1 at] ac **S**
71.1 liberaliter omnia] omnia legaliter **S**
71.1 enim *om.* **V**
71.1 causis] rebus **V**
71.1 decedendi] decendi **V**
72.1 uelut(i)] sicuti **V**
72.2 uallibus colles] colles uallibus **M^{ac}**
72.2 unus *om.* **S**
72.2 Triari] traiari **V**
72.2 oppido] oppida **U^{ac}**
72.2 ab *om.* **V**
73.1 castra³] causa **S**
73.1 hostes priores] priores hostes **V**
73.2 omnibus] ominibus **S**
73.2 eum] cum **S**
73.3 discederet] cessaret **M** : discederet **M** *supra lineam*
73.3 diuideret] uideret **S**
74.1 tenerentur] tenerentur id fieri credebat **U**
74.2 opus *om.* **V**
74.3 illam] illorum **S**

74.3 XXII] XXXII **V**

74.4 inanem *om.* **S**

74.4 subiturus esset] esset subiturus **V**

74.4 descenderat] descenderat **S**

74.4 descenderat uallem] uallem descenderat **U^{ac}**

75.1 imparatusque] imperatusque **U** *per compendium*

STUDIES ON THE TEXT

2 . 5

Dallas Simons and Cynthia Damon

Praeterea alias ambulatorias totidem tabularum confixerant subiectisque eas rotis funibus iumentisque †obiectis† directis plateis in quamcumque erat uisum partem mouebant.³⁴

confixerant *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 3.13.4) | confecerant 5 teste *Oudendorp* (cf. 13.4) | confinxerant *Dauisius* 1706 coll. *Plin. Nat.* 10.93 | an contexerant (cf. *BC* 2.10.5)? | | †obiectis† scripsimus | obiectis *MUSTV* | secluserit *Scaliger* (cf. *Prop.* 4.11.51) | subiunctis *Cornelissen* coll. *Col.* 6.2.8 | adiectis *Castiglioni* (cf. 28.3) | obiectis dubitanter *Klotz* (cf. *BC* 3.19.7) | nisi mauis iunctis (cf. *Vitr.* 10.2.14) uel adiunctis (cf. *Gel.* 20.1.28)

³⁴“In addition, they had cobbled together moveable towers with the same number of stories (i.e., ten). After mounting these on rollers, with ropes and pack animals †placed opposite†, they would move them on level streets into whichever part (sc. of the city) they wanted.”

This sentence describes the last and most impressive of the defensive measures adopted by the Alexandrians against the newly arrived Caesar, namely, the construction of moveable siege towers. *Obiectis* is the principal problem in this passage: its authenticity has long been questioned, with Scaliger excising it and other critics offering emendations. *Confixerant*, too, has been suspected.

1) As transmitted, the verb used to report the towers' construction is *confixerant*, "had cobbled together." At its one other occurrence in the corpus in the context of construction the presence of an instrumental ablative shows the verb to be used more literally: *BG* 3.13.4 *transtra ex pedalibus in altitudinem trabibus confixa (sc. erant) clavis ferris*.³⁵ Construction-related passages lacking the ablative can be found in, e.g., Vitruvius (10.6.3 *tigna conlocantur in capitibus utraque parte habentia transuersaria confixa*; cf. 10.9.6, 10.15.7; see further *TLL* 4.211.79–212.3 'figendo coniungere'). But nowhere is the reference of the prepositional prefix as vague as it is in our passage: what is being fastened to what? Accordingly, substitutes have been supplied, *confecerant* in

³⁵Similar usages are attested in other authors (*TLL* 4.211.67–79 'figendo instruere'). Elsewhere in the corpus *configere* appears in the context of combat: *BAlex* 40.2 *legio ... confixa et oppressa est*; *BAfr* 59.5 *exercitum ... iaculis configeret*.

the manuscript tradition itself, perhaps based on a later construction passage (13.4 *paucis diebus contra omnium opinionem quadrirems XXII, quinquerems V confecerunt*), *confinxerant* by Dausius, appealing to Pliny for support (*Nat.* 10.93 *eadem materia confingunt nidas* [*sc. hirundines*]). The latter verb, however, does not seem to be used for human construction projects (*TLL* 4.214.60–73), and the former, although apparently apt, does not impose itself: in chapter 13 the prefix denotes completion rather than assembly. A better repair might be *contexerant*, which Caesar uses in describing the protective coverings supplied for his mobile siege “tortoise” both with an instrumental ablative (*BC* 2.10.6 *coria ... centonibus conteguntur*) and absolutely (*BC* 2.10.5 *musculus ut ab igni ... tutus esset contegitur*).³⁶

2) *Obiectis*, which occurs later in the description of these moveable military towers, makes little sense in context: if pack animals are pulling the towers, it is hard to see the relevance of their having been “placed opposite,” “in front of,” or “in the way of” the towers. The parallelism between *funibus* and *iumentis* is also peculiar.

Scaliger addressed both problems by excising *obiectis*, removing the reference to the animals’ position and constru-

³⁶He also uses it in connection with boats that are supplied either with decks (*BC* 2.4.2) or with camouflage (*BC* 3.24.1).

ing *funibus iumentisque* as instrumental ablatives with *mouebant*. With this repair one can perhaps see *obiectis* as a garbled reprise of *subiectis* or a garbled anticipation of *directis*. However, in the Caesarian corpus there is no other instance of an instrumental ablative with *moueo*: nobody ever moves an object by means of something else.³⁷ This is a usage with few parallels in Latin more generally (see *TLL* 8.1540.47–60). In the passive *moueo* can be used with an ablative of manner (cf. Cic. *Phil.* 9.14, something moved *nulla uī*) or absolutely, as when towers are moved forward in sieges (cf. *BG* 2.31.1, Curt. 4.6.9). The best parallel for an active *moueo* with an object and an instrumental ablative — also a rope, as it turns out — comes from Propertius (4.11.51 *tu, quae tardam mouisti fune Cybeben*). Because of the absence of relevant parallels for this usage, it seems prudent to proceed with the assumption that a participle is needed where the text reads *obiectis* in order to form a second ablative absolute with *funibus iumentisque*.³⁸

³⁷The verb *moueo* in Caesar is most often used in the idiom *mouere castra* (*BG* 1.39.7, 2.2.6, etc.) or in similar phrases involving the movement of troops or the changing of location (*BG* 3.15.3, etc.). Often *moueo* is used in the passive voice, when someone is figuratively moved by something (*BG* 7.76.2, *BC* 1.4.2, etc.).

³⁸There is a comparable asyndetic pair of absolutes in a similar string

Castiglioni emended *obiectis* to *adiectis*, assuming a palaeographically plausible innovation. This gives the sense of “fastened upon” or “added to.” Forms of *adicere* occur ten times in the corpus, but it usually means to add on or adjoin something abstract or to describe geographical space (cf., e.g., 28.3 *unum latus [sc. castrorum] erat adiectum flumini Nilo*). Here it would imply that the animals are added on to a larger contraption, which does not yield perfect sense.

Klotz proposed *obtectis* to describe the animals, which would be “covered” or “protected.” Caesar uses *obtectus* to refer to military protection, which would suggest that the pack animals are shielded from opposing attack (cf. *BC* 3.19.7 *quae [sc. tela] ille obtectus armis militum uitauit* and 3.54.1 *uineis eam partem castrorum obtexit*). The context of our sentence does not necessitate this idea, and the necessity of taking *iumentis* in tandem with *funibus* makes it unlikely.

of different sorts of ablatives at *BAlex* 11.6, which is also, incidentally, a passage about towing: *Hac calamitate perterritis hostibus aduerso uento leniter flante naues onerarias Caesar remulco uictricibus suis nauibus Alexandriam deducit*. The expression *naues remulco uictricibus suis nauibus deducit* is a decent structural parallel for Scaliger’s hypothesized *eas ... funibus iumentisque ... mouebant*, but both *remulco* and *nauibus* work reasonably well with *deducit* (cf. *BC* 3.40.1), whereas neither of our ablatives works well with *mouebant*. For other long strings of ablatives see 27.5 and 32.3.

Contexts involving pack animals towing something frequently contain the verb *iungere*. There are two potential problems with an emendation based on *iungere*, however. First, *iunctis* is paleographically further removed from *obiectis* than either *adiectis* or *obtectis*. Second, *iungere* usually refers to joining animals to one another rather than to other objects. However, the verb does occur with the etymologically related *iumentum* (Nepos *Timol.* 4.2, Varro *RR* 1.52.1; cf. Var. *LL* 5.136) and in one passage of Vitruvius a yoked team of oxen pull a rope (Vitr. 10.2.14 *bubus iunctis funem ducebant* [*sc. boues*]). So *iunctis* is worth consideration here, even if *funibus* is a loose end.

Compounds of *iunctis* are also worth considering. Cornelissen suggested *subiunctis*, making the ropes and pack animals “subjoined” to the towers. He cites as parallels a line from Columella in which bullocks are attached to a plow (Col. 6.2.8 *uacuo plostro subiungendi*) and a line from Virgil in which tigers are joined to a chariot (Virg. *Ecl.* 5.29 *curru subiungere tigris*). Neither passage offers a parallel for *funibus*, which sits oddly with the prefix *sub-*, and the verb itself appears nowhere else in the corpus. The form *adiunctis*, from a verb used eight times in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and twenty-five times in the corpus overall, is perhaps a better repair. Aulus Gellius uses *adiunctis*

absolutely with *iumenta* (Gel. 20.1.28 *uectaculum ... quod adiunctis pecoribus trahebatur*), and Horace uses it jokingly to describe yoking mice to a cart (Hor. *Sat.* 2.3.247 *plostello adiungere mures*). However, nowhere in the corpus does *adiungere* describe affixing something to an object.

It therefore seems best to leave *obiectis* in its imperfection with the understanding that the syntax and general sense are clear, even if the original verb is not.

7 . 2 – 3

Cynthia Damon

Erat autem magna multitudo oppidanorum in parte Caesaris, quam domiciliis ipsorum non mouerat quod ea se fidelem palam nostris esse simulabat et descuiisse a suis uidebatur, ut mihi defendendi essent Alexandrini—neque fallaces esse neque temerarii—multaque oratio frustra absumeretur. (3) Cum uero uno tempore et natio eorum et natura cognoscatur aptissimum esse hoc genus ad prodicionem dubitare nemo potest.¹

domiciliis *S* | domicilius *V et MT per compendia* | domicius
U per compendium || ut ... (7.3) potest *MUSTV*, quod defendit
Madvig ('... neque quemadmodum addere in mentem cuiquam

¹“Moreover, there was a large crowd of townspeople in Caesar’s district, whom he had not removed from their homes because they were making an open show of being loyal to our men and seemed to have cut their ties with their own side, so that I would have to defend the Alexandrians, saying that they are neither deceitful nor impetuous, and much verbiage would be spent to no purpose. (3) But when their community and character are considered simultaneously, no one can doubt that this race is perfectly prepared for treachery.”

venerit intelligere possum⁷) | [ut ... (7.3) potest] *Gruterus ut glossema teste Oudendorp* | ut mihi *MUSTV* | at mihi <si> *Madvig* | ut mihi <si> *Klotz* || neque¹ *MUSTV* | <quod> neque *ed.pr.* (cf. *Liu. 42.41.13*) || esse *Nipperdey* | essent *MUSTV* || multaque *MUSTV* | multa *ed.pr.*

In the passage quoted above the string *ut ... absumeretur* is excised by Gruterus (along with the following sentence), emended by many, and daggered by Andrieu. The general problem is the loose logical connection between the Alexandrians' apparent loyalty to the Romans (*uidebatur*) and the idea that they require a defense from the author (*ut mihi defendendi essent*). What we want to be told instead, as Madvig observed (1873, 281), is why the Roman fears expressed in 7.1 (*alii ... extimescerent ... quod neque celari Alexandrini possent in apparanda fuga, ... neque illis imminentibus atque insequentibus ullus in naues receptus daretur*) were justified. A further problem is that the hypothetical defense is contradicted by later critiques centered on Alexandrian deceptiveness (24.1 *Caesar etsi fallacem gentem semperque alia cogitantem, alia simulantem bene cognitam habebat*, 24.3 *regius animus disciplinis fallacissimis eruditus, ne a gentis suae moribus degeneraret*; cf. also 24.6 *fallaciis pueri*).

Editors who accept the basic authenticity of the transmitted text have to contend with a series of problems within

the string itself, the most significant of which lie in the connectives. As transmitted the relevant part of the passage reads as follows:

... descuiſſe a ſuis uidebatur ut mihi defendendi eſſent Alexandrini neque fallaces eſſent neque temerarii multaque oratio fruſtra abſumeretur.

The connectives ſtring together three diſſimilar propoſitions: the opening reference to the neceſſity of a defence ſtands in parallel to *neque fallaces eſſent neque temerarii*, which looks like part of the hypothetical defence and therefore ſeems to warrant ſubordination, and alſo to a declaration that defence would be a waſte of breath, where the apparently adverſative ſenſe needs more than a linking *-que*. The following ſentence compounds the problem by abandoning the idea of defence and inſtead indicting the Alexandrians for their aptitude for treachery. (Here, however, we do get a nice robuſt *uero*.)

Smaller problems include the ſingular pronoun *mihi*, which clashes with the normally plural forms uſed for ſelf reference by the author, and the word *abſumo*, which is uſed nowhere elſe in the corpus and generally avoided by Incer-tus' contemporaries. The punctuation is another variable:

the string *ut ... absumeretur* is sometimes printed as a stand-alone sentence and sometimes integrated with what precedes. The passage also suffers from guilt by association, so to speak, in that criticism of the Alexandrians is associated with textual problems elsewhere in the work.²

Gruterus excision is a drastic response to this assemblage of problems of sense and usage. They look less unacceptable if considered one by one.

1) *Mihi* is indeed a striking move by Incertus, who momentarily turns the reader's attention to himself.³ As was mentioned above, for authorial comments he, like Caesar, usually employs the plural (28.2 *demonstrauimus*, 33.2 *docuimus*, 69.1 and 78.2 *scripsimus*, 74.3 *audiebamus*). However, there are exceptions to this, in Incertus as in Caesar (30.5 *demonstrauī*, 35.3 *scripsi*). Such passages are generally cross references, but he occasionally speaks as a historian at work (23.1 *ut coniectura possumus*: cf. also *nobis* at 3.1 and

²See, e.g., 27.5 [*uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia*], *BC* 3.112.12 [*nutricius pueri et procurator regni, in parte Caesaris*], and the excision suggested at 24.2 (*adulta iam aetate puerum*). Of relevance also, perhaps, is the peculiar repeated omission of the subject *Alexandrini* (16.7, 17.4, 17.6). But none of these has anything like the complicated structure of the present passage.

³Thus Madvig (1873, 281): “mire scriptor suam personam interponit.”

19.6, with textual notes ad locc.). Since the unusual *mihi* here is paralleled by an equally unusual *mihi* in a similar sort of ethnographic reflection at *BG* 6.14.4 (*id mihi duabus de causis instituisse uidentur [sc. Galli]*), it does not in itself warrant suspicion about the authenticity of the passage.

2) *Absumeretur* is the only word in the passage that is alien to the Caesarian corpus and indeed to its time period. One might have expected *consumeretur*, from a synonymous verb that occurs more than 40 times in the corpus (cf. *BC* 1.33.4 *frustra diebus aliquot consumptis*). But the presence of the ‘wrong’ prefix is a very slender cause for suspicion, since altering the prefix is a frequent form of innovation in this tradition and the often abbreviated *con-* is particularly susceptible.⁴

3) The logical problems mentioned above have elicited numerous repairs. Many editors will have felt, with Madvig, a reluctance to excise something whose origin they cannot explain.⁵ In the *editio princeps* the string *ut ... absumeretur* appears with four deviations from what we now know to be the paradosis, and two of these emendations were accepted

⁴See Damon 2015a, 172–74.

⁵Thus Madvig (1873, 281): “eiicere ea non audeo, quod neque, quemadmodum addere in mentem cuiquam venerit, intelligere possum, nec huiusmodi annotationum aliud vestigium in Caesaris codicibus reperi.”

by many subsequent editors, namely, the addition of *quod* after *Alexandrini* and the excision of *-que*.

... descuiisse a suis uidebatur ut tum mihi defendendi essent Alexandrini quod neque fallaces essent neque temerarii: multa oratio frustra absumerent.

The first of these innovations creates the subordination desiderated above, the second improves the logic somewhat but leaves *multa ... absumerent* rather isolated. Neither *tum* nor *absumerent* is essential to the repair and they were quickly dropped when better manuscript evidence became available, as in the edition of Vascosanus, who also retained *-que* and repunctuated:

... descuiisse a suis uidebatur: ut mihi defendendi essent Alexandrini quod neque fallaces essent, neque temerarii, multaque oratio frustra absumeretur.

With this repair *multa ... absumeretur* is now parallel to *defendendi essent* in a clause whose loose syntactic connection to *descuiisse a suis uidebatur* matches the above-mentioned looseness of thought. The *ut*-clause has to be a result clause

of sorts, but the antecedent cause is the unstated implication of *uidebatur*: “they seemed to have cut their ties with their own side (but people feared they had not).” And even with this inference the connection between cause and result is quite loose. Only when we get to following sentence, with its introductory *cum uero*, do we see that the point of our passage is that it would be a waste of time to argue that the fears were misplaced, since the evidence for Alexandrian treacherousness is close to hand.⁶ As Madvig says, Incertus uses “*inutilibus verborum ambagibus*” here (1873, 281). The *quod*-clause, too, is odd. There are no parallels in the Corpus for *defendere quod*; one has to go to Livy for an equivalent (42.41.13 *non sum defensurus ... quod Dolopas armis coercuerim*). Aldus substituted *si* for *ut*, addressing the loose connection by creating an independent conditional sentence, but this repair also requires accepting *multa* for *multaque*. The compound innovation is hard to explain in both Aldus’ version and Madvig’s improvement on it:

... descuiisse a suis uidebatur: at mihi, ⟨si⟩

⁶Vielhaber 1869 suggested that the interpolation excised by Gruterus displaced some original text, the sense of which is perhaps preserved in *aptissimum ... potest* (1869, 555).

defendendi essent Alexandrini ..., multa[que]
oratio frustra absumeretur.⁷

Nipperdey addressed the *quod*-clause problem by substituting *esse* for *essent*²:

... descuiisse a suis uidebatur: ut mihi defendendi essent Alexandrini neque fallaces esse neque temerarii, multaque oratio frustra absumeretur.⁸

The innovation is easy to explain as a “correction” designed to bring *esse* into alignment with the nearby subjunctives *essent* and *absumeretur*. There are comparable snippets of loosely integrated indirect statement in the Corpus, often in connection with verbs denoting emotional intensity, as here

⁷The second ellipsis is present in Madvig’s article, so it is not clear whether or not he accepts Nipperdey’s *esse*. Presumably so. See further Gaertner-Hausburg 2013, 68 n. 185.

⁸Klotz merges Aldus’ conditional with Nipperdey’s indirect statement: ... descuiisse a suis uidebatur: ut mihi, <si> defendendi essent Alexandrini neque fallaces esse neque temerarii, multa[que] oratio frustra absumeretur. But the genesis of the three-fold innovation is hard to explain.

with *defendendi*.⁹ And Incertus gives us another rather loose result clause at 22.2: *Nec diuulgata Caesaris hortatio subsequi legionum aut laborem aut pugnandi poterat cupiditatem, ut magis deterrendi et continendi a periculosissimis essent dimicationibus quam incitandi ad pugnandum*. Here the syntax is similar, if less complex.

On balance it seems best to accept this minimally emended text. The logic is murky and the language awkward indeed, but the very murkiness of the logic is, as Madvig saw, an argument against *ut ... absumeretur* (let alone *ut ... potest*) being an interpolation.

⁹Cf. *BG* 3.6.1 (*cohortati*), 6.41.1 (*questus*); *BC* 1.64.2 (*dolere*), 2.4.3 (*precibus et fletu*), 3.28.4 (*iureiurando*), 3.31.4 (*militum uoces*), 3.82.4 (*implorarent*), and see Damon 2015b, 107 n.8. In the relevant *TLL* examples of *defendere* with acc. + inf. (*TLL* 5.1.298.84–299.4) the equivalent for *Alexandrini* in our passage is a reflexive pronoun (e.g., *Liu.* 32.40.1 *ille ab ipsis Argiuis se defenderet accitum*). The nominative *temerarii* in our passage indicates that the “snippet” is notionally dependent on a verb such as *uiderentur*.

12.1 – 2

Tom Vozar and Cynthia Damon

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. (2) Idem, posteaquam Ganymedes in concilio confirmauit sese et eas quae essent amissae restitutum et numerum adaucturum, magna spe et fiducia ueteres reficere naues accuratiusque huic rei studere atque inseruire instituerunt.¹

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, for whom both *** in/from (?) the higher locations they were being supported, so that (?) they could be defended from the buildings and interposed all the wood as a barrier, because they feared an attack by our fleet even on land. (2) The very same people, after Ganymedes assured them in council that he would both restore those (*sc.* ships) that had been lost and increase their number, began with great hope and confidence to repair the old ships and quite diligently to apply and devote themselves to this matter.”

classiariorum *USTV* et *M^{supra lineam}* | nauigatorum *M* | *post*
et lacunam statuimus, post uiderent Dausius 1706, post quibus
Nipperdey || quibus] a quibus (*sc. classariis*) *Rhellicanus*
(cf. Hirt. 8.9.4) | qui (*sc. Alexandrini*) *Cellarius, qui*
Manutium infra sequitur || ex] uix *Manutius (u. 18.1 et cf.*
BHisp 12.5) | uix ex *Dinter (cf. 17.4 et u. infra)* || locis]
temporibus *dubitanter Kübler (cf. BG 7.14.3)* || quibus ...
possent] ut uix ex aedificiis defendi posse se confiderent,
quibus et superioribus locis subleuabantur *Dinter* || 2
confirmauit *MUS* | firm- *TV* || et¹ *MU* | ut *STV* ||
amissae <naues> *Müller* || restitutum *MSV* | restitutum
UT | adauctum *MUS* | adac- *TV*

The first sentence of this passage, as transmitted, has a number of glaring problems. The most substantial is the incompatibility of the main clause, which is about a loss of morale (*adeo sunt fracti Alexandrini*), and the apparent result clause, which is about defensive capability (*ut ex aedificiis defendi possent*). The antecedent of *quibus* is another puzzle: does the relative pronoun refer to Roman *classarii*, Alexandrians, or something that can function in tandem with *locis*? And then there is the difficulty of making sense of *materiam cunctam* in light of the earlier assertion that Alexandrian buildings contained no *materia* (1.3 <ab> *incendio fere tuta est Alexandria, quod sine contignatione ac materia sunt aedificia et structuris ac fornicibus continentur tectaque sunt rudere aut pauimentis*). These problems are interconnected, which complicates the

task of seeing and explaining solutions, but the context, especially the subsequent sentence (quoted above), provides something of a framework to use in approaching them.

The passage we are concerned with reports the beginning of the aftermath of an unexpected naval defeat suffered by the Alexandrians, who had hoped to catch Caesar in a moment of vulnerability (10.3 *magnam sibi facultatem fortunam obtulisse bene gerendae rei crediderunt*) but barely avoided losing their entire fleet (11.5 *Quod nisi nox proelium diremisset, tota classe hostium Caesar potitus esset*). In the sentence immediately before our passage they return to Alexandria terrified (11.6 *perterritis*). The immediately following sentence, introduced with an emphatic *idem*, shows the resilience of their military commander, Ganymedes (see 4.2), and the revival of hope and confidence in the Alexandrians themselves. Details follow in 12.3–13.4. This is the context into which our problematic sentence needs to fit.

It will be helpful to begin by reviewing the (relatively) secure ground in our sentence. As was mentioned above, it begins with the Alexandrian loss of morale (*adeo sunt fracti Alexandrini*). It ends with a causal clause concerning their fears about a possible fleet-based attack on the city (*quod nostrae classis oppugnationem etiam ad terram uerebantur*). *Verebantur* might be a restatement of *fracti*, but it might also

show that the Alexandrians have overcome their panic and started taking sensible precautions. In the latter scenario, our sentence mirrors the turnaround reported in 12.2. In the former scenario, our sentence stands in contrast to 12.2. The emphatic *idem* is compatible with either scenario (parallel: *BG* 6.13.5, *BAfr* 22.2, 28.2; contrasting: *BAlex* 18.3). According to the *cum*-clause, the morale problem was particularly acute because the Alexandrians had been defeated in the arena where they felt most confident, the sea, and now needed to defend themselves on land, a situation that seems to underlie both *aedificiis defendi possent* and *materiam ... obicerent*.

Early editors left the spot alone, presumably taking the antecedent for *quibus* to be *uirtus* and *scientia* and *quibus* itself as an instrumental ablative parallel to *locis* (cf. *BG* 1.40.6 *quos ... usus ac disciplina ... subleuarent*). The lack of *materia* in Alexandria is perhaps made less worrisome by a later passage about roof beams (13.2 *Porticus gymnasia publica aedificia detegebant, asses remorum usum obtinebant*) that encourages taking 1.3 *sine contignatione ac materia* as a hendiadys, “without wooden decking.” But the larger sense problem eventually attracted attention and a variety of approaches.

Manutius proposed a simple solution to the aforementioned incompatibility, replacing *ex* with the negation *uix*:

the Alexandrians are so dispirited by the naval disaster that they can scarcely feel secure in the city itself. It is easy enough to supposed that *uix* was misread as *ex* before *aedificiis*, and a similar scene plays out later on Pharos Island with an explicit reference to the situation in Alexandria: 18.1 *Neque uero diutius ea munitione se continere potuerunt etsi erat non dissimile atque Alexandriae genus aedificiorum, ut minora maioribus conferantur, turresque editae et coniunctae muri locum obtinebant.*

But neither Manutius' repair, nor Dinter's subsequent suggestion that *uix* fell out before *ex*, sits at all well with *cunctam*. And yet the two subjunctive expressions seem to be aligned in content as well as form.

Rhellicanus took a completely different approach, supplying (or understanding) *a* before *quibus* and specifying that the antecedent is *classiariorum*.² The idea is that the Alexandrians' elevated positions provided them with assistance against attackers coming from the Roman fleet. Incertus

²Rhellicanus' note as quoted by Jungermann is not clear on this point, but it does not seem possible to take *quibus* (without *a*) as a separation ablative in context; Cellarius' paraphrase of Rhellicanus includes the preposition. *Quibus* is construed as an instrumental ablative parallel to *superioribus locis* by Glandorp, taking the antecedent to be *classarii sui*, but the Alexandrian sailors are never called *classarii*.

does use the preposition *ab* in this sense (78.2 *prouincias ... a barbaris atque inimicis regibus ... muniuit*, cf. 61.3 *ab oppugnatione tutus*), and similar usages can be found elsewhere in the corpus (cf. esp. Hirt. 8.9.4 *ut ab hostibus duplici fossa, duplici propugnatorum ordine defenderentur*), but nowhere with a verb like *subleuabantur*, with which *a quibus* would be much more likely to be construed as a personal agent (cf. BG 1.16.6 *grauiter eos accusat quod ... ab iis non subleuetur*). With this repair the point of *et* is also hard to fathom.

Dausius 1706 postulated a lacuna in the text before *quibus*. But thereafter he rather throws up his hands, “cum de locis tam mutilis nihil certo possit definiri.” Nipperdey placed the lacuna after *quibus*, a position preferred by subsequent editors since it allows one to avoid specifying the identity of the antecedent: it could be the Romans or the Alexandrians, or for that matter *uirtus* and *scientia*. Both lacunas leave a space in which the meaning of *materia cuncta* might have been made clear. But we will argue below that the expression *locis subleuabantur* is problematic.

First, however, another approach. Dinter rewrote the passage:

adeo sunt fracti Alexandrini ... ut uix ex aedificiis defendi posse se confiderent, quibus et

superioribus locis subleuabantur, et materiam cunctam obicerent, quod nostrae classis oppugnationem etiam ad terram uerebantur.

The Alexandrians were so shattered ... that they scarcely trusted that it was possible for themselves to be defended from the buildings, from which, as well as from their higher positions, they used to derive support, and interposed all the wood as a barrier, because they feared an attack by our fleet even on land.

The core of this repair is a transposition, but it also involves adding *uix* before *ex* (as was mentioned above) and emending *possent* to *posse se confiderent*.³ It also requires that the negation be taken with only the first of two parallel verbs, with *confiderent* but not *obicerent*. In other words, the syntax is difficult, the necessary sequence of innovations is implausibly complicated, and the mystery of *materia cuncta* is revived.

Kübler 1896b shed welcome light on the problem of *locis* by suggesting that it be emended to *temporibus*, presumably

³Many will share Larsen's reaction (1886, 6): "hac tanta licentia locum sanari non posse, omnes statim intellegent." Further changes are proposed by Fleischer 1879, 860.

by analogy with *BG* 7.14.3 *quod anni tempore subleuentur*. He printed *locis* here but *temporibus* at a later problem spot also involving *locis*.⁴ The argument for *temporibus* here is admittedly weaker since he also accepted Nipperdey's lacuna, which makes it hard to see what *temporibus* might refer to. But *locis* does deserve scrutiny.

One necessary step in wringing sense from the transmitted text is deciding whether *subleuabatur* is to be taken literally ("raised up") or metaphorically ("assisted"), and how *locis* is to be construed with it. The verb is accompanied by simple ablatives in both its literal (*BG* 1.48.7 *iubis equorum subleuati*) and metaphorical senses (e.g., *re ... frumentaria, industria, anni tempore, opibus*). But there are no good parallels for *locis* with either sense of *subleuari*. The expression *superioribus locis* might suggest that literal lifting is appropriate here but the imperfect tense is against it.⁵ The sense of being assisted or even supplied from a place is paralleled in the *Bellum Africum* (41.2 *oppidum ... unde aquari reliquisque rebus subleuari*

⁴At 72.2 Kübler prints *detrimentum ... superioribus <acceptum> temporibus* for the transmitted *detrimentum ... superioribus locis atque itineribus*. For discussion see his note in *Philologus* 55 (1896) 154–55.

⁵Unless the subject of *subleuabantur* is something like *asserēs* (cf. 13.2) and the lost text shows that the imperfect has a sense other than "used to be." This would clarify *materiam cunctam* nicely.

eius exercitus consuerat; cf. *BAlex* 43.1 *neque prouinciae facultatibus subleuabatur*), and the sense of mounting a defense from an elevated place in the *Bellum Hispaniense* (12.5 *oppidani superiore loco defendebantur*, 31.1 *aduersarii loco superiore se defendebant*) but the constructions are different.⁶ It therefore seems unlikely that the ablative is instrumental in our passage. As a local ablative *locis superioribus* appears in the corpus both with and without the preposition *in*. It might also be part of an ablative absolute (cf. *BG* 1.23.3 *superioribus locis occupatis*, Hirt. 8.13.3 *amissis superioribus locis*, 8.36.3 *relictis locis superioribus*) or a separation ablative (e.g., *BG* 4.23.3 *ut ex locis superioribus in litus telum adigi posset*; cf. *BAlex* 17.4 *ex tectis aedificiorum propugnabant*). These three constructions either require or are compatible with a lacuna after *et*.

This leaves us with a relative clause beginning *quibus et*. It probably contained either a laudatory description of the Roman *classiarii* (26.1 *et uoluntate et ... diligentia*, 26.2 *et ...*

⁶The possibility of fighting against Caesar's boats from Alexandria's elevated locations and buildings was in fact mentioned earlier, in Caesar's *contio*: 8.5–6 *Magnam autem moram et difficultatem ascensum in naues habere praesertim ex scaphis. Summam esse contra in Alexandrinis uelocitatem locorumque et aedificiorum notitiam. Hos ... loca excelsiora atque aedificia occupaturos. Ita fuga nauibusque nostros prohibitueros*. But this passage provides no help for the construction of our passage.

magnitudine ... et perseuerantia, 31.1 *et animi magnitudine et ... scientia*, 41.1 *et uictor et ... rex*, 43.4 *et fortuna ... et uirtus*) or an assessment of the Alexandrians' plight (15.4 *et dedecori et dolori*, 43.4 *et infelicitas ... et ... mors*). The *et ... et* construction, which Incertus uses liberally (18x), would fit either scenario. The rest of the material lost in the lacuna would perhaps describe how despite the defeat the Alexandrians began to contemplate a land-based defense as a preliminary to the revival of their naval hopes once Ganymedes promised assistance (12.2).⁷ At a minimum we need an explanation of the mysterious *materia cuncta*.

⁷Andrieu (1954, 12 n. 2) asserts that the missing text “avait sans doute quelque étendue,” perhaps describing the organization of the Eunostos harbor and the fortifications. For other reconstructions of what has been lost see Larsen (1886, 6–7).

13.5

Tom Vozar and Cynthia Damon

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

X (*i.e.*, decem)] <de> X *dubitanter* Larsen (*u. TLL* 5.1.58.74–59.28) || *cursu litore MUSTV* (*cf. BG* 4.23.6) | *cursu* <sub>
l- *Larsen coll. BG* 5.57.3 | *c-* [l-] *Nipperdey* || *defecerat*
MUSTV (*cf. Verg. Aen.* 6.354 *et BC* 3.2.3) | *decesserat*
Ciacconius coll. BC 3.112.3 (*sed u. Davies*) | *desederat Siesbye*
teste Larsen (*cf. Sen. Nat.* 6.6.4) || *Lycias MUSTV* (*u.*
Mitchell 234–37) | <Syrias Ci)licias *Schneider coll. 1.1*

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 *paradosis* has been questioned on both philological and historical grounds.

- 1 The awkward language of the parenthesis introduced by *nam* has drawn the most critical attention. Larsen,

¹“Caesar had nine Rhodian ships—for although ten had been sent one had foundered off the Egyptian coast en route—eight Pontic ships, five Lycian, twelve from Asia.”

feeling that the ablative absolute *decem missis* is intolerably harsh, supplies *de*, producing a well paralleled construction (*u. TLL* 5.1.58.74–59.28). But Incertus uses a similar expression at 15.5 *progressis ultra uadum IIII*, so emendation does not seem necessary.² The string *in cursu litore Aegyptio* has likewise been queried. Nipperdey asserted that *in cursu* and *litore* were contradictory — “cursus enim in littore Aegyptio erat confectus” (1847, 190) — and therefore excised *litore* as a scribal gloss on the unusual expression *in cursu Aegyptio*. It is indeed unusual: the common expression *in cursu* never takes an adjectival toponym. Such adjectives are, however, used with *litus* (cf., e.g., Cic. *Sest.* 140 *in litore Dyrrachino*). Larsen proposed adding *sub* before *litore*, comparing *BG* 5.57.3 *sub castris eius uagabatur*. That after *cursu* the preposition *sub* might be overlooked is obviously possible, but the absence of the expression *sub litore* elsewhere weighs against this emendation. Furthermore, the paradosis is paralleled at *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, in which Caesar’s ships

²If that is how the opening of 15.5 should be construed. See the apparatus notes *ad loc.*

cannot land on the beaches, *litore* does not signify the shore itself but the waters just offshore (for this sense of the word see *TLL s.u. litus* 7.2.1537.52–1538.10 “respicitur litoris pars uda, tam area undis et aestu affecta quam mare terrae uicinum”).³ 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*.⁴ An additional problem with *defecerat* is that in a civil war context it could easily be construed as a reference to defection (see *TLL* 5.1.327.79–328.7), something perhaps better passed over in silence in an account such as ours. So different verbs have been proposed for the spot. Ciacconius’ suggestion of *decesserat*, based on *BC* 3.112.3 *naues ... suo cursu decesserunt*, is rebutted by Dausius 1727 on the grounds that the senses required in the two passages are different (“deviate” in the latter, “perish” in the former); it is also harder to

³Are we perhaps to understand that the Rhodian ship ran aground upon the treacherous *uada Aegyptia* mentioned at Luc. 8.539–40 (*perfida qua tellus Casius excurrit harenis / et uada testantur iunctas Aegyptia Syrtis*)?

⁴R. G. Austin, 1986, *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Sextus*, Oxford, *ad loc.* cites 13.5 as a parallel for the Vergil passage.

take *litore* as a locative ablative with this verb. Siesbye proposed *desederat*, from a verb used of sinking ships at Sen. *Nat.* 6.6.4 *naugia desidunt*. However, in defense of the paradosis one can cite *BC* 3.2.3 *multi [galli] tot bellis defecerant*, “many men had succumbed (or defected) in the numerous wars,” which shares with our passage both the ablative and the possibility of misconstrual.

- 2 There is also a problem of some historical consequence here. 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*. Schneider’s conjecture has since been adopted by Kübler 1896a, 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. Also relevant is Caesar's report at *BC* 3.106.1: *cum ... nauibus longis Rhodiis X et Asiaticis paucis Alexandriam peruenit (sc. Caesar)*. 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*.⁵ Rice Holmes suspected that Hirtius' (*sic*) text at 1.1 was simply "a mistake."⁶ But the parenthesis of the present sentence, an awkward addition, as we have seen, is perhaps to be understood as Incertus' clarification of Caesar's shorthand at *BC* 3.106.1.

Gaertner-Hausburg have recently defended the paradox with the argument that 1.1 refers to reinforcements that had been ordered but had not yet arrived at the time of the battle; *decem missis* at 13.5 thus refers to the ten Rhodian ships said to have come with Caesar at *BC* 3.106.1.⁷ This

⁵K. Barwick, 1938, *Caesars Commentarii und das Corpus Caesarianum*, Leipzig: 180 n. 1.

⁶T. Rice Holmes, 1923, *The Roman Republic and the Founder of the Empire* Vol. 3, Oxford: 484 n. 7.

⁷J. F. Gaertner and B. Hausburg, 2013, *Caesar and the Bellum Alexandrinum*, Göttingen, 51–52, citing also P. Graindor, 1931, *La guerre*

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.

There remains one important question to answer: is there anything inherently implausible in Caesar having a handful of ships from Lycia? Lycia, granted, is mentioned nowhere else 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 if, as Cicero tells us (*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

d'Alexandrie, Cairo: 29–30: 101, and Andrieu (1954, lviii–lix). Andrieu dismantles the argument in favor of the *paradosis* based on 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, suggesting that one can only infer a minimum of 34 ships, as the text does not require a one-to-one correspondence between lines.

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

treaty with the Lycians in 46 BCE, which several historians have interpreted as a reward for the contingent of ships that (according to the pre-Schneider text of the *Bellum Alexandrinum*) Lycia sent to Egypt.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 illuminate the condition of Romano-Lycian relations in the time of Caesar.

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.

17.1–3

Cynthia Damon

Hoc ne sibi saepius accidere posset, omni ratione Caesar contendendum existimavit ut insulam molemque ad insulam pertinentem in suam redigeret potestatem. (2) Perfectis enim magna ex parte munitionibus in oppido, <et hanc> et illam [urbe(m)] uno tempore tempore posse confidebat. (3) Quo capto consilio cohortes X et levis armaturae electos quosque idoneos ex equitibus Gallis arbitrabatur in nauigia minora scaphasque imponit. In alteram insulae partem <***> distindae manus causa constrictis nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis propositis qui primus insulam cepisset.¹

¹“So that this could not happen to him repeatedly, Caesar thought that he ought to strive to bring the island and the jetty extending to the island into his power, whatever the cost. (2) For since he had mostly completed his works in the town, he was confident that an attempt could be made on <both the latter> and the former at the same time. (3) Having adopted this plan, he placed in small vessels and skiffs ten cohorts and the picked men belonging to his light-armed force and whichever of

<et hanc> et illam [urbe(m)] *scripsimus* | et illa in urbe *MU*
 | et illa in urbem *STV* | et illam (*sc.* insulam) et urbem
Aldus (*u.* *BC* 3.112.6) | et insulam et urbem *Jurinius* |
 etiam illa (*sc.* mole) urbem *Nipperdey* | et illa (*sc.* insulam
 molemque) et urbem *Gertz teste Klotz* (*cf.* 24.4 illa et *BG*
 1.27.4 ea) | et illas et urbem *Fleischer 1878* || quosque
Lipsius (*cf.* *BC* 3.103.1 et *u.* *infra ad* 17.3) | quos *MUSTV*
quod defendit Andrieu coll. 77.2 || in alteram] a- *Aldus* |
 alteramque *Vascosanus* (*u.* et *infra*) | et alteram *Castiglioni*
 | *post* partem *lacunam* *indicaui*mus *e.g.* <pedestres copias
 exponit, alteram partem> *supplendam* || *constratis MUS*
 | *contractis TV^{mc}* | *contractis V^r* || *praemiis ed. pr.* (*u.* et
supra) | *praemiisque MUSTV*

Paragraphs 17–22 contain the narrative of a series of
 chaotic episodes that together amount to the *adversa* summa-
 rized at 23.1 (*Alexandrini cum Romanos et secundis rebus confirmari*
et adversis incitari uiderent) and stand in contrast to the *secunda*
 represented by the naval battle of chapters 15–16. Despite
 the clear statement of Caesar’s objective at the outset (17.1
ut insulam molemque ... in suam redigeret potestatem), the sequence
 of events is hard to discern, particularly in paragraphs 17

the Gallic horsemen he deemed suitable. On one side of the island
 <he landed his footsoldiers, on the other side> he attacked with decked
 ships in order to divide the (enemy) forces, with great rewards offered to
 whoever seized the island first.”

and 22.² Crucial bits of information have been omitted or lost from the text, and it is not always easy to decide between omission and loss. The present passage contains two such gaps.

The first gap is easy to see, if not to fix: the phrase *uno tempore* suggests that two or more simultaneous actions are in prospect here, and yet in the sentence as transmitted the only action mentioned is an attack on a vaguely defined *illa*: *perfectis ... munitionibus in oppido et illa in urbe(m) uno tempore temptari posse confidebat* (*sc. Caesar*). This sentence has other problems as well:

²The objective itself is clear but the meaning of *hoc* is hard to discern. It obviously points to the immediately preceding 16.7: *Reliquae propinquam fugam ad oppidum capiunt. Quas protexerunt ex molibus atque aedificiis imminentibus et nostros adire propius prohibuerunt*. But the referent of *oppidum* could be either Alexandria itself (see below for the references) or the *uicus oppidi magnitudine* (BC 3.112.3) on the island. Schiller (1890b, 542) opts for the latter: “er wollte verhindern dass das Feind auf der Insel wieder eine Zuflucht finden könnte,” but the *aedificia imminencia* mentioned at 16.7 underlie the later comparison between the island and the city (18.1 *etsi erat non dissimile atque Alexandriae genus aedificiorum, ut minora maioribus conferantur, turresque editae et coniunctae muri locum obtinebant*) and therefore ought to refer to the city. This would suggest that *hoc* refers to *protexerunt ex molibus atque aedificiis imminentibus et nostros adire propius prohibuerunt*, not to taking refuge.

- a The two branches of the tradition are split between *in urbe* (MU) and *in urbem* (STV). The latter, which makes poor sense with *temptari*, seems likely to have been archetypal, with *in urbe* as an innovation based on *in oppido*.
- b The antecedent of *illa* is obscure. Some editors take it to be the island and the jetty together and replace *in* with *et* to produce the two actions called for by *uno tempore*: Caesar projects simultaneous attacks on the island with its adjoining jetty and the city of Alexandria.³ The *et ... et* construction is well paralleled in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (3.1 *uno ... tempore et nostras munitiones infestabant et suas defendebant*, 7.3 *cum uero uno tempore et natio eorum et natura cognoscatur*, 17.4 *Vno enim tempore et ex tectis aedificiorum propugnabant et litora armati defendebant*), but there are no good parallels in the corpus for a neuter plural pronoun with two feminine antecedents.⁴ The best one can do is point to 24.4 *si illa sentiret*, where the antecedent of *illa* is vague, and

³ Andrieu prints *et illa et urbem* and calls this repair “grammaticalement très satisfaisante” (p. 78) but translates *et illam et urbem*: “il comptait pouvoir se porter contre l’île en même temps que contre la ville.”

⁴ According to Pinkster (2015, 1258), the construction occurs only from Sallust onwards.

BG 1.27.4 *dum ea conquiruntur*, where the antecedent of *ea* is the preceding *obsides arma seruos*. Fleischer fixes the problem with the obvious *illas*, but this form leaves the origin of *in* obscure (1878, 279). Nipperdey takes the antecedent of *illa* to be *molem* and construes the pronoun as an ablative: Caesar projects an attack on Alexandria from the jetty. Nipperdey obtains the two actions required here by emending *et* to *etiam* and excising *in*: *etiam illa urbem uno tempore temptari posse confidebat*. With this reading the possibility of attacking the city is an afterthought to the aforementioned project of attacking the island and jetty, which does not work very well with *uno tempore*.⁵

- c The word *urbem* is awkward since Incertus has just referred to Alexandria with *in oppido*.⁶ It is true that

⁵As Larsen notes, however, this ablative is “nimis audax, nec sine difficultate uerbis *perfectis* ... *oppido* interiectis in *illa* audiri potest *moles*” (1886, 13). Hoffmann 1890 simplifies the construction, if not the transmission history, by adding *ex* before *illa*.

⁶Krafft’s suggestion (1882, 76) that the *urbs* is the settlement on Pharos (see above 2) while *oppidum* is Alexandria seems far-fetched. Oudendorp suggests emending *in urbem* to *in turrem* “*sc. in molem in qua erat turris*,” but a reference to the lighthouse, which Caesar already controls (*BC* 3.112.5), seems unhelpful and the expression is implausibly indirect.

he uses both *urbs* (1.5, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, 3.1, 5.2, 5.3, 6.1, 12.4, 13.2) and *oppidum/oppidani* (1.2, 1.4, 1.5, 2.1, 7.2, 15.8, 18.3, 19.2, 19.3, 19.5, 32.1, 32.3, 32.4) when speaking of Alexandria, sometimes in close proximity (1.5), but the terms are never elsewhere close together in a passage where anything other than Alexandria itself is in view.⁷

Aldus proposed a relatively simple solution to the problem(s) of *illa* and provided the desired doubling:

et illam et urbem uno tempore temptari posse
confidebat.

This repair implies a corruption originating in an easy misreading of *illam* as *illa in*. The expression *in urbe*, parallel to *in oppido*, made the second *et* superfluous, hence its omission. Some qualms remain, however. First, the antecedent of *illam* is still unclear: *insula* or *moles*? (Jurinius proposed emending *illa in* to *insulam* to bring clarity on this point.) More substantially, the idea of attacking the city is irrelevant to the objective announced at the start of the paragraph, which targets the island and jetty. What Incertus says about

⁷The referent of *oppidum* at 16.7 (*reliquae [sc. naues] propinquam fugam ad oppidum capiunt*) is unclear (see note 2).

Alexandria is that Caesar's fortifications there are nearly complete, and the *munitiones* in question serve to protect against attacks, in line with Caesar's overall strategy of keeping his troops safe until reinforcements arrive (*BC* 3.112.5–6, *BAlex* 1.1–2), not to support attacks. And in fact no attacks in or against the city itself are mentioned in the remaining portions of the Alexandrian war.⁸ The fighting in chapters 17–22 is concentrated on the island and the jetty, and the military actions thereafter occur well outside of the city, in Pelusium, at the tip of the Delta, and near the Nile.

Attempts on the problem of *urbem* have been made via emendations to *temptari*: Jurinius for example proposed emending it to *tutari*. But the idea of protection is at odds with both the general context of attack and the expression *uno tempore*.⁹ Given the military objective announced at the

⁸Larsen's explanation, "neque hoc quisquam miretur, cur in iis, quae sequuntur, nullam urbis (i.e. Alexandriae) oppugnationem diserte commemoret Hirtius, assidue enim in urbe pugnabatur, etiamsi aliis locis fortunam experiebantur Romani, idque ex *B. Alex.* XV, 2 apparet" (1886, 14), does not square well with *temptari*.

⁹And anyway *tueri* would be the *mot propre*: (cf., e.g., *BC* 2.10.1, 2.32.3, 3.23.2, 3.111.6, Hirt. 8.34.4). Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 556), starting with Nipperdey's text, altered *temptari* to *intrari* (*etiam illa* [*sc. mole*] *in urbem intrari*), and this text is further modified by Kraffert (*et* [= *etiam*] *in illa* [*sc. insula*] *urbem intrari*).

beginning of the chapter, it seems unwise to tamper with *temptari*. *Tempto* is used with a variety of objects, among them places (*loca*, BG 7.86.4; *Galliam Italianque*, BC 1.29.3) and fortifications (*moenia oppidi*, BC 3.40.1; *opera nostra*, BG 7.73.1, cf. 7.84.2).¹⁰

Another approach would be to assume that the missing parallel for *et illa(m)* was lost in an eye-skip from *et* to *et*. The pronoun's obscurity would be clarified if what was lost was *hac* or *hanc*. Incertus' usage elsewhere suggests that *et ha(n)c* preceded *et illa(m)* (cf. 6.3 *haec propior ... illa inferior*, 13.1 *has ... illas*, 19.2 *hunc ... illum*). As between the accusative and the ablative, the accusative seems preferable given the aforementioned objections to seeing *urbem* as a subject for *temptari*. This leaves the problem of *urbe(m)*: where did it come from? Perhaps it was spawned when the final *m* of *illam* was misread as *in* (as was mentioned above), or perhaps — after the loss of *et hanc* — *urbem* was added as a gloss for the now lonely *illam* based on an antithesis with *in oppido*.

With these repairs the sentence reads:

Perfectis enim magna ex parte munitionibus in

¹⁰Schiller 1890b (1890b, 542) supplies one from a different category in an implausibly elaborate repair: ... *munitionibus [in oppido] et <in> illa (sc. insula) et in urbe uno tempore <fortunam> temptari posse confidebat*.

oppido, ⟨et hanc⟩ et illam [urbem] uno tempore temptari posse confidebat.

For since he had mostly completed his works in the town, he was confident that an attempt could be made on both the latter (*sc.* the jetty) and the former (*sc.* the island) at the same time.

As the narrative continues, Caesar attacks the island (17–18) then the jetty (19–21). This does not square perfectly with *uno tempore*, but the misfit is at least partly a result of the gaps in the narrative in the following sentence and at 17.6.

The second gap pertains to the two-pronged attack itself. In the passage as transmitted we hear that Caesar, hoping to split the enemy force, sent decked ships to attack one part of the island, and that he encouraged the men in his own divided force to compete with one another for the rewards that would be given to whichever group first took control of the island:

In alteram insulae partem distinendae manus
causa constratis nauibus aggreditur praemiis
magnis propositis qui primus insulam cepisset.

The construction *in ... insulae partem ... aggreditur* is problematic — although for a similar anacoluthon see 26.2 — but

the bigger problem here is the absence of any reference to the other part of the island, presumably the part that the large force of men (ten cohorts plus light infantry and select cavalry, presumably on foot) embarked on the smaller vessels and skiffs was to attack. Since this area is the focus of the main battle narrative starting at 17.5, its omission here is odd.

Aldus repaired the smaller problem by excising the unwanted preposition, Oudendorp by converting it into an adverb, *inde*. Vascosanus, who accepted Aldus' emendation, addressed the larger problem by adding a connective before *alteram* and repunctuating so as to join this sentence to its predecessor:

... cohortes X ... in nauigia minora
scaphasque imponit: [in] alteram⟨que⟩
insulae partem destinendae manus causa
constratis nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis
propositis qui primus insulam cepisset.¹¹

Castiglioni combined the two approaches, replacing *in* with *et*:

¹¹Vascosanus' repair presupposes the loss of *-que*, which may be related to the appearance of a surplus *-que* later in the sentence: praemiis *ed. pr.* : praemiisque *MUSTV*

... cohortes X ... in nauigia minora
scaphasque imponit et alteram insulae
partem distinendae manus causa constratis
nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis propositis
qui primus insulam cepisset.

With both repairs the fact that the ten cohorts (etc.) make an attack elsewhere has to be deduced from *alteram*. The innovations implicit in these repairs are not impossible, but they are not particularly plausible, either. Furthermore, there are no good parallels for the elision of the second *alter-* in the corpus. The closest is 1.5 *ex altera oppidi parte auxilia ferri posset*, but there the solo *altera* depends on the preceding *in duas partes esset urbs diuisa*.¹²

Another approach is to assume another eye-skip here resulting in a lacuna that one might fill thus:

... cohortes X ... in nauigia minora
scaphasque imponit. In alteram insulae
partem ⟨pedestres copias exponit, alteram
partem⟩ distinendae manus causa constratis

¹²Similarly 34.3 *legiones ... duas ... quarum altera*. The closest parallel for our passage is probably *BG* 7.44.3–4, but there the reference of the solo *ad alteram oppidi partem* is defined by contrast with Caesar's own position.

nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis propositis
qui primus insulam cepisset.

This supplement makes use of the transmitted preposition *in* and provides a second *alteram*, thereby specifying the attack's two approaches, which the enemies withstand *pariter* in 17.4 (*ac primo impetum nostrorum pariter sustinuerunt*). Its language has acceptable parallels, too, since Incertus uses the expression *copiae pedestres* twice, once in an antithesis with naval forces (44.1 *partim classe per se, partim pedestribus copiis per barbaros*, cf. also 64.1), and mentions troop landings twice (10.2 *remiges in terram ... exposuisset*, 19.3 *cohortium instar in terram exposuerat*). But at least two aspects of the supplement give pause. First, the hypothesized skip goes from *partem* to *partem*, yet the second *partem* is unnecessary and probably unwanted: in comparable constructions Incertus omits the second substantive (1.5 *alterius rei ... alterius*, 11.4 *una hostium triremis ... altera*, 19.5 *altero opere effecto ... alter instituto*, 28.3 *unum latus ... alterum*). However, the pleonasm is paralleled at *BG* 1.2.3 *una ex parte ... altera ex parte* (cf. also *BG* 4.3.3). Second, one misses the connective provided by earlier repairs. So the supplement can only be offered *exempli gratia*.

On balance, however, it seems better to indicate a gap than to apply a superficial repair.

22.1–2

Cynthia Damon

Hoc detrimento milites nostri tantum afuerunt ut perturbarentur ut incensi atque incitati magnas accessiones fecerint in operibus hostium expugnandis. (2) In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus Alexandrinis, manum *** comprehendi †multum† operibus et ardentibus studiis militum. Nec diuulgata Caesaris hortatio subsequi legionum aut laborem aut pugnandi poterat cupiditatem, ut magis deterrendi et continendi a periculosissimis essent dimicationibus quam incitandi ad pugnandum.¹

¹“Our men were so far from being thrown into confusion by this defeat that, roused and provoked, they made extra efforts in attacking the enemy’s fortifications. (2) In the daily battles, whenever a chance had come their way, with the Alexandrians running forward and making sorties, *** combat *** to be checked †greatly† by fortifications and the burning eagerness of the soldiers. Nor was Caesar’s widespread exhortation able to attain the level of the legions’ effort or desire for fighting, so that they had to be deterred and restrained from exceptionally

affuerunt *MU* | fuerunt *TV* (deest *S*) | afuit *Vielhaber* (cf. *Suet. Tib. 50.1*) || accessiones *TV* | accensiones *MU* (deest *S*) || 2 manum *** *Nipperdey*, qui lacunam alteram ante et statuit | manum *MUTV* (deest *S*) | *** manum *Stephanus* || †multum† *scripsimus* : multum *MUTV* (deest *S*) | an munitionum (cf. 1.2)? nisi maior lacunam alteram ante operibus statuere

The personal use of *afuerunt* and the shift from secondary to primary sequence in the first sentence prompted *Vielhaber* 1869 (1869, 558–60) to replace the main verb with an impersonal *afuit* and deal with *fecerint* and the subsequent problem spots by excising *incensi ... ut*. His explanation for the genesis of this long stretch of text is not particularly plausible, however, and the shift of sequence is paralleled at *Suet. Tib. 50.1* (*Iuliae uxori tantum afuit ut relegatae ... officii aut humanitatis aliquid impertiret ut ... commercio hominum frui uetuerit*; cf. also *Suet. Vesp. 14.1*). *Afuerunt* remains anomalous, but it is hard to believe that so strange a usage arose as a gloss or scribal emendation. It is best left alone.

dangerous forms of combat rather than worked up for fighting.” (The two lacunas in the translation reflect a single lacuna in the Latin that contains at a minimum the main clauses of both the sentence to which “combat” belongs and the sentence that ends “by fortifications and the burning eagerness of the soldiers.”)

The principal problem here is obvious: the middle sentence does not have a main clause. Nor can its pieces easily be attached to what precedes or follows. The prior sentence concerns Roman attacks on Alexandrian positions, while the sentence under consideration involves Alexandrian sallies. The following sentence is a general assessment of the situation: Caesar's men were dangerously eager to fight. The lacuna (on which see further below) creates uncertainty about what *quandocumque fors obtulerat* modifies: the closest verbal forms pertain to the Alexandrians (*procurrentibus, erumpentibus*), but the context is about Roman risk-taking, so it seems more likely to modify a verb in the lacuna.²

Stephanus proposed putting a lacuna before *manum*:

In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors
obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus
Alexandrinis, *** manum comprehendi

²Thus Carter 1997: "In the daily encounters, whenever the occasion offered, when the Alexandrians ran forward and made sorties, (our men were passionately keen to take the chance of fighting). Andrieu translates otherwise: "Toutes les fois que dans les combats quotidiens le hasard avait permis aux Alexandrins de s'élancer et de faire une sortie, leur troupe [***] était arrêtée par les travaux [***], par le zèle ardent de nos soldats." He adds, optimistically, "le sens est apparent."

multum operibus et ardentibus studiis
militum.³

What precedes this lacuna is clear enough, but the string of words after it form an implausible ensemble: it is odd to have a band of men enclosed by fortifications (*manum comprehendī ... operibus*), and *multum* is anomalously placed after whatever it modifies.⁴ If *manum* does mean “band” here (see further below), it seems more likely to refer to one of the groups making the sorties. Furthermore, the apparent parallel between fortifications (*operibus*) and emotions (*studiis*) is hard to credit.

To fix the former problem Nipperdey indicated a lacuna between *manum* and *comprehendī*, proposing ⟨*conserentes*⟩ or something similar in the first lacuna to govern *manum*, which now refers to combat, not troops:

³Klotz and Andrieu credit Stephanus with two lacunas and misplace both. The lacunas in their texts are Nipperdey’s: “lacunas ego significavi” ad loc. He explains them in his prefatory “Quaestiones Caesarianae” (1847, 193).

⁴Adverbial *multum* never follows the word it modifies in the Caesarian corpus. It precedes even at 75.3 *multum adiuuante natura loci*, despite the potential for bracketing here. For the adjective, there are a few examples (e.g., *BHisp* 11.2 *ignemque multum miserunt*).

In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors
 obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus
 Alexandrinis, manum *** comprehendi
 multum operibus *** et ardentibus studiis
 militum.

The sense is good, the expression, although more Livian than Caesarian, does occur in the corpus (71.2 *ut celerius omnium opinione manum consereret*, *BC* 1.21.3), and the lacuna can be explained as originating in an eye-skip from *con-* to *com-*. As for the remaining words, Nipperdey suggested that the first three originated in something like *Caesar comprehendi multum operibus noluit*. This required the second lacuna shown above, to separate *operibus* and *studiis*, since the latter makes no sense with *comprehendi*. Nipperdey's text is accepted by subsequent editors, including Klotz and Andrieu. However, his explanation of *comprehendi multum operibus* seems unlikely, in that the most recently mentioned *opera* were protecting the Alexandrians, not Caesar. Furthermore, it would be nice to have one problem spot instead of two. So it is worth trying to come up with a better explanation for the words after Nipperdey's first lacuna.

The expression *quandocumque fors obtulerat*, with its pluperfect verb, suggests that verb in the lacuna will be an

imperfect indicative (cf., e.g., *BAlex* 2.5 *alias ambulatorias (sc. turres) ... in quamcumque erat uisum partem mouebant*, *BC* 2.41.4 *hi quamcumque in partem impetum fecerant, hostes loco cedere cogebant*).⁵

In place of Nipperdey's participle therefore, we might try:

1) *manum <conserere optabant>* (cf. *Hirt.* 8.41.2 *hoc fonte prohiberi posse oppidanos cum optarent reliqui*, from a passage that has much in common with the one under consideration and will be cited again below). Or:

2) *manum <conserendam conclamabant>* (cf. *BG* 3.18.5 *conclamant omnes occasionem negotii bene gerendi amittendam non esse, ad castra iri oportere*)

Neither is quite right in a sentence that begins *In proeliis cotidianis*. Better:

3) *manum <conserere properabant>* (cf. 20.2 *naues ... a terra repellere properabant*).⁶

If the lacuna did originate in an eye-skip, it is difficult to determine its length. But the words that come after the lacuna provide some clues as to its contents.

⁵The Caesarian corpus supplies several parallels for this use of *fors* (*BG* 2.21.1, 7.873, *Hirt.* 8.18.7).

⁶In place of *properabant* one could supply *contendebant*, which also takes a complementary infinitive (e.g., *BG* 3.15.1 *milites ... transcendere in hostium naues contendebant ... barbari ... fuga salutem petere contendebant*, cf. *BC* 1.58.1), but the imperfect is less common in this construction than the perfect.

1) If we make Caesarian soldiers the subject of the verb in the lacuna, we also need something that changes the subject, or at least the focalization, since these eager soldiers are later referred to in the genitive (*ardentibus studiis militum*). In the Hirtius passage just mentioned (8.41.2), which continues *Caesar unus uideret (sc. eos prohiberi posse)*, the focalization shifts from *reliqui* to *Caesar*, as it often does in passages in which Caesar overrules the impetuous desires of his men (e.g., *BC* 1.71–72 *id ... ex omnibus partibus ab eo flagitabatur ... Caesar in eam spem uenerat se sine pugna et sine uulnere suorum rem conficere posse*; cf. *BG* 6.34.7, *BC* 3.74.2–3, *BAfr* 82.2–3 and, with the roles reversed, *BC* 1.64.2–3).

2) The infinitive *comprehendi* needs a subject and something to govern it. For the former, the most likely candidates are people (cf. 55.1, *BG* 4.27.3, etc.) or places (cf. *BC* 3.46.6 *aliis comprehensis collibus*).⁷ When applied to people the verb usually means “round up and put under arrest,” which does not suit the present passage, but *BC* 3.65.2 *cuius aduentus Pompeianos compressit nostrosque firmauit* offers a parallel

⁷The passages in which *comprehendi* is used of things catching fire do not seem to offer any way to use *operibus*, let alone *ardentibus studiis*: *BG* 5.43.2 *hae (sc. casae) celeriter ignem comprehenderunt*, *BC* 3.101.4 *flamma ab utroque cornu comprehensa naues sunt combustae quinque*, Hirt. 8.43.3 *opera flamma comprehensa partim restinguunt, partim interscindunt*.

for the meaning “check,” which might work. However, the verb’s use with places also suits the situation on the ground in Alexandria: Caesar’s objective is not to encircle the Alexandrians with defensive works but to increase the space that he himself controls by building defensive works around it (cf. *BC* 3.112.7 *Caesar loca maxime necessaria complexus noctu praemuniit*⁸); he is trying to keep his men safe until reinforcements arrive (*BC* 3.112.5–6, *BAlex* 1.1–2), as they will do shortly (28.1–2). As for what governs *comprehendi*, the possibilities are obviously numerous.

3) The phrase *operibus atque ardentibus studiis* needs to be made plausible. At present *operibus* most naturally refers to the Alexandrian fortifications just mentioned (*in expugnandis operibus*), which make an awkward pair with the enthusiasm of Roman soldiers. If, however, the *opera* are Roman and parallel to the *studia*, as *laborem aut pugnandi poterat cupiditatem*

⁸The strategy announced here plays out in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, which shows him taking control of the palace area first (1.2–5, esp. *munitiones cotidie operibus augentur*), then Pharos Island and the Heptastadion (17.1–2, 19–21).

in the following sentence suggests, the phrase here is oddly imbalanced.⁹

4) The mysterious *diuulgata* in the following sentence needs a textual anchor; at present it is hard to see anything that it might refer to, since the previously mentioned Caesarian exhortations mentioned occurred in earlier battles, one a success (15.5), one a failure (20.1, 21.1). It ought to point to something that Caesar says in this episode, something that aligns with the resulting *labor* and *pugnandi cupiditas*, and can perhaps be located in the word that governs *comprehendi*.

So one might fill the lacuna thus, *exempli gratia*:

In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus Alexandrinis, manum <conserere properabant omnes, Caesar autem contendebat hostes (or loca illa) posse> comprehendi multum operibus et ardentibus studiis militum. Nec diuulgata Caesaris hortatio subsequi legionum aut laborem aut pugnandi poterat

⁹For the combination of morale and effort cf. Hirt. 8.41.3 *non deterrentur tamen milites nostri vineas proferre et labore atque operibus locorum vincere difficultates*.

cupiditatem, ut magis deterrendi et continendi
a periculosissimis essent dimicationibus quam
incitandi ad pugnandum.

This is a minimalist stopgap; the lacuna might be longer. Caesar's repeated utterance (*contendebat*) is (a gesture towards) *diuulgata hortatio* desiderated above.¹⁰ But there remains (at least) one fly in the ointment: the anomalous position of *multum* (see above, note 4). What we really want is a modifier for *operibus*, both to sever the connection with the Alexandrian *opera* and to balance *ardentibus studiis*. A passage

¹⁰For *contendere* with a dependent accusative/infinite cf. 67.1 *quod ei neque legibus neque moribus concessum esse ceteri tetrarchae contendebant* (also *BG* 1.31.2, 5.6.3, 6.37.7, 6.41.4, etc.). The scenario suggested here is rather implausible as it stands—Caesar and his soldiers do not usually squabble over strategy on the field of battle—but that is perhaps due to its abbreviation. (For a one-time squabble, however, see the peculiar opening of the battle of Thapsus: *BAfr* 82.2–3 *Cum idem a pluribus animaduerti coeptum esset, subito legati euocatique obsecrare Caesarem ne dubitaret signum dare: uictoriam sibi propriam a dis immortalibus portendi. Dubitante Caesare atque eorum studio cupiditatieque resistente sibi que eruptione pugnari non placere clamitante, etiam atque etiam aciem sustentante, subito dextro cornu iniussu Caesaris tubicen a militibus coactus canere coepit.*) In our passage he might have exhorted his men to redouble their efforts to retake the fortifications on the bridge instead of fighting outside the fortifications, and followed this up with the explanation in the text.

just cited, 1.2. *munitiones cotidie operibus augentur*, suggests the following:

... Caesar autem contendebat hostes (or
loca illa) posse> comprehendi munitionum
operibus et ardentibus studiis militum.

The verbal parallel is not perfect but the sense is decent and there is a similar combination of *opus*, *munitio*, and *milites* at *BG* 1.8.4 *operis munitione et militum concursu et telis repulsi* (sc. *Helvetiū*), a parallel that gives a slight edge to *hostes* over *loca* as the subject of *comprehendi*. All of our desiderata have now been met.

This extended discussion has shown that Nipperdey's second lacuna is in the wrong place and may not be necessary. The remaining options seem to be these:

- 1 Place the second lacuna after *multum* to give room for the word it modifies. Or
- 2 Obelize *multum*. The argument for emending it to *munitionum* is a bit wobbly, hence the obelus.

As between these two, our preference goes to the latter as being more likely to stimulate further work on this spot,

which has been untouched since 1847. With our *exempli gratia* supplement it reads as follows:

Hoc detrimento milites nostri tantum afuerunt ut perturbarentur ut incensi atque incitati magnas accessiones fecerint in operibus hostium expugnandis. (2) In proeliis cotidianis, quandocumque fors obtulerat, procurrentibus et erumpentibus Alexandrinis, manum <conserere properabant omnes, Caesar autem contendebat hostes posse> comprehendi †multum† operibus et ardentibus studiis militum. Nec diuulgata Caesaris hortatio subsequi legionum aut laborem aut pugnandi poterat cupiditatem, ut magis deterrendi et continendi a periculosissimis essent dimicationibus quam incitandi ad pugnandum.

Our men were so far from being thrown into confusion by this defeat that, roused and provoked, they made extra efforts in attacking the enemy's fortifications. (2) In the daily battles, whenever a chance had come their way, with

the Alexandrians running forward and making sorties, ⟨they would all would rush into⟩ combat. ⟨Caesar, however, insisted that it was possible for the enemy⟩ to be checked †greatly† by fortifications and the burning eagerness of the soldiers. Nor was Caesar's widespread exhortation able to attain the level of the legions' effort or desire for fighting, so that they had to be deterred and restrained from exceptionally dangerous forms of combat rather than worked up for fighting.

26 . 1 – 2

Marcie Persyn and Cynthia Damon

26 (1) Sub idem tempus Mithridates Pergamenus, magnae nobilitatis domi scientiaeque in bello et uirtutis, fidei dignitatisque in amicitia Caesaris, missus in Syriam Ciliciamque initio belli Alexandrini ad auxilia arcessenda, cum magnis copiis, quas celeriter et propensissima ciuitatum uoluntate et sua diligentia confecerat, itinere pedestri, quo coniungitur Aegyptus Syriae—(2) Pelusium adducit. Idque oppidum firmo praesidio occupatum Achillae propter opportunitatem loci (namque tota Aegyptus maritimo accessu Pharo, pedestri Pelusio uelut claustris munita existimatur), repente magnis circumdatum copiis, multiplici praesidio pertinaciter propugnantibus, et copiarum magnitudine, quas integras uulneratis defessisque subiciebat, et perseuerantia constanti-
aque oppugnandi quo die est aggressus in

suam redegit potestatem praesidiumque ibi suum collocavit.¹

missus *MU* | missis *STV* | | cum magnis copiis *MUSTV* | magnas copias *Vascosanus* | [cum] magnis copiis *Hoffmann 1890* (*u. et infra*) | | Pelusium adducit *MUSTV* (*de anacoluto u. Landgraf 1891b, 8; de tempore cf. 61.4*) | Pelusium adduxit *Aldus* (*cf. 43.4*) | Pelusium aduenit *Dausius 1727* (*cf. Liu. 42.56.3*) | ad Pelusium uenit *Vielhaber 1879* (*cf. 57.6*) | Pelusium accedit *Fleischer 1879 coll. 56.6* | Pelusium adductis *Hoffmann 1890* (*u. et supra*) | ante adducit lacunam statuit *Persyn uel e.g. <tres legiones>* (*u. BC 3.107.1 et*

¹“Around the same time, Mithridates of Pergamum, a man of great prestige in Pergamum and of great wit and valor in war, and loyalty and dignity in his friendship with Caesar, having been sent into Syria and Cilicia at the start of the Alexandrian War for the sake of summoning reinforcements, with a great number of troops (which he had put together quickly thanks to both the most eager desire of the citizens and his own diligence), (2) brought (*sc.* the troops) to Pelusium by a land route, where Egypt is joined with Syria. And as for this town, held by Achilles’ strong garrison because of the location’s convenience (for all Egypt is deemed to be fortified, as if by locks, with respect to naval attack by Pharos, with respect to land attack by Pelusium), it was surrounded suddenly with a great number of troops, and, although the multifarious garrison was fighting back stubbornly, Mithridates brought it under his authority on the very day of the attack and installed his own garrison there, thanks to both the number of his own troops—he kept substituting intact troops for the wounded and the weary—and his perseverance and steadiness for fighting.”

cf. 3.4.3) uel (eas) *supplendam* | *alii alia* || idque *MUTV* (cf. 3.4) | idque quod *S* | quod *Landgraf 1891b, 8 coll. 36.3* || *Achillae*] ac(c)hil(l)ae *MSV* | *achillae UT* | *an secludendum ut glossema?* || *multipli praesidio ... propugnantibus MUSTV* (cf. *Ciris 85 et u. TLL 8.1592.48–60* ‘*spectat ad quantitatem*’; *de constructione ad sensum u. Landgraf 1888 et ad BC 3.78.4*) | [*multipli praesidio*] ... *propugnantibus Gemoll* || *ibi suum UST et M^{tr}* | *suum ibi MV*

1. Paragraph 26 of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* presents four primary difficulties, all indicated by problems of syntax or style rather than by discrepancies in the manuscript tradition: first, the tense of *adducit*, which stands alone as a present-tense verb amid perfect-tense verbs both in the previous section and in the following clauses of paragraph 26; second, the absolute usage of *adducit*, which is found in all the manuscripts but not used absolutely in an active form elsewhere in the Caesarian corpus; third, the strange placement and syntax of *Achillae*, a proper noun that contributes little except a reminder of the identity of the enemy in the passage (and, because of this mnemonic value, may have originated as a helpful gloss provided by a later hand); fourth, the difficult phrase *multipli praesidio*, which must either be understood in a *constructio ad sensum* as an ablative absolute with a plural participle *propugnantibus* or be suspected as a gloss.

The present tense of *adducit*, upon first analysis, appears problematic because of the perfect-tense verbs that both precede and follow the verb and enmesh it within a narrative of perfective aspect; additionally, *adducit* is linked to the subsequent *redegīt* and *collocavit* by the conjunction *-que*, which typically joins balanced or parallel elements.² Aldus, therefore, emended the verb to *adduxit*; one may cite as a parallel *adduxit* at 43.4, where it appears in a nexus of other perfect-tense verbs.

However, a parallel for the mixture of tenses linked by a *-que* is found elsewhere within the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, as for example at 61.4:

Hunc Marcellus insequitur et quam proxime
potest Vliam castra castris confert locorumque
cognita natura, quo maxime rem deducere
uolebat necessitate est deductus, ut neque
confligeret—cuius si rei facultas esset, resistere

²It should be noted that, although the punctuation of this edition of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* separates paragraph 26 into two distinct sentences and includes a full stop after *adducit*, the close connection between the verbs indicated by the *idque* and the desired balance between tenses within the paragraph remains. Other editions, including that of Aldus, have presented this entire passage as a single sentence. On the punctuation policy applied here see Damon 2015a, lxxv–lxxvi.

incitatis militibus non poterat—neque uagari
Cassium latius pateretur, ne plures ciuitates ea
paterentur quae passi erant Cordubenses.

Both *insequitur* and *confert* are present-tense main verbs, and they are linked—after an ablative absolute and a relative clause—by a *-que* with the perfect passive *est deductus*, clearly in secondary sequence as it is followed by imperfect subjunctives.

But why the mixture of tenses? For paragraph 26, the most probable explanation is the vividness of the present tense, which complements the dramatic staging of the introductory phrase *sub idem tempus*. This same opening hook is used five times in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (at 26.1, 28.1, 40.1, 42.1, 64.2), and two of these passages have clear present-tense verbs (28.1 *proficiscitur*, 40.1 *concurritur*), one includes an ambiguous form (64.2 *uenit*), and one a perfect passive (42.1 *acceptum est*). In those cases where *sub idem tempus* introduces a verb of present (or potentially-present) tense, the surrounding sentences include a medley of perfect and imperfect tense verbs, as occurs in paragraph 26. Additionally, *adducit*, being itself a verb of motion, seems to have a kinship with the first three examples of the present/potentially-

present variety, offering the action anticipated by the opening phrase.

There is clearly, then, no problem with the *tense* of *adducit* in this passage, and Aldus' emendation may be set aside, though it remains a helpful diagnostic emendation.

2. The next problem likewise centers upon *adducit*, but is a matter of syntax not tense. The verb *adduco* is inherently transitive³; there are fifteen uses within the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, eight of which are finite and active; all eight of these have their own direct objects (2.2, 34.5, 35.2, 42.4, 43.4, 58.1, 62.1, 68.1). The present sentence lacks a direct object to complete the sense of *adducit*. The ablative of accompaniment *cum magnis copiis* demonstrates that Mithridates was not proceeding towards Egypt alone, but does not fulfill the need of the verb *adducit* for an object. Various repairs have been proposed⁴, but attempts to repair the syntax have

³Present forms of the simplex verb *duco* do occur in Latin literature absolutely with directional constructions, wherein the context is a military general leading his troops (cf. *TLL* 5.1.2142.30–50). Two examples may be provided from Livy: 1.23.5 *ducit quam proxime ad hostem potest*, and 2.39.5 *postremum ad urbem a Peto ducit, et ad fossas Cluilias quinque ab urbe milia passuum castris positīs*). While *adduco* is a compound of this verb, the *TLL* reports only passive forms used absolutely (cf. *TLL* 1.0.602.70–603.5).

⁴Fleischer provides an effective overview of suggestions predating the end of the 19th century, and concludes with Fleischer's own

primarily taken two paths: the first method is to alter the verb *adducit* to a less transitive verb, the second to emend in such a way as to provide the verb with a direct object.

The following four emendations adapt the syntax according to the first method.

a. Dausius 1727, in his second edition of 1727, first suggested that *adducit* be replaced with *aduenit*, an intransitive verb. This suggestion was followed by both Schneider (1888) and Klotz (1927), and is attractive for its simplicity, but it must be noted that *aduenio* is not found as a finite verb in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, and is only found twice in participial form (32.3 *dignum adueniens fructum uirtutis et animi magnitudinis tulit* and, later in the same passage, *aduenienti Caesari occurrerunt seque ei dediderunt*). In neither of these instances is a destination designated, although parallel—albeit, again, participial—forms of *aduenio* with attendant accusatives of place do appear at Liu. 42.56.3 (*M. Lucretius, Chalcidem adueniens ... nuntium, praetoris uerbis qui abscedere eum inde iuberet, misit*) and 44.30.9 (*Carauantium in Cauis Durnium oppidum aduenientem benigne accepit*; see further *TLL* 1.831.40–50). Overall, participial forms are far more common in the Caesarian

well-supported correction to the text. Authors of emendations include Stephanus, Vascosanus, Schneider, Dinter, Vielhaber 1869, and Fleischer himself, as well as Glandorp, Dausius, Landgraf, and Klotz.

corpus (participial forms occurring at *BC* 2.32.12, twice at *BAlex* 32.3, *BAfr* 11.2, 23.2, 74.2, 89.2; only once in a finite form at *BAfr* 7.3). The infrequency of this verb with an accusative of destination, as well as the apparent preference for the verb in its participial form, together justify editors in continuing to search for alternative solutions.

b. Vielhaber 1869's emendation, though made over a century later, closely corresponds with that of Dauisius 1727, and thus should be treated next. He emended the text to read *ad Pelusium uenit*, arguing that there was a transposition of the preposition *ad*, which later led to a misconstrual of the verb: *ad Pelusium uenit* became *Pelusium ad uenit* and, because the verb *uenit* would have been abbreviated as *uēit*, the text would resemble *Pelusium aduēit*, easily (mis)read as "*Pelusium aducit*." Vielhaber 1869 cited 36.3 as a model for this passage (*magnis et continuis itineribus confectis cum aduentaret ad Nicopolim*). His paleographic explanation is appealing, and, like Dauisius 1727, his suggested emendation neatly sidesteps the lack of direct object by replacing it *adducit* with an intransitive verb.

Venit is, additionally, far more common in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* than Dauisius 1727 *aduenit*, and is found in finite and infinitive forms twenty times in the text, and in participial forms three further times. Parallels from elsewhere

in the text that can be used in support of Vielhaber 1869's emendation include 62.1, where the ablative of accompaniment *cum copiis* shares the same function as in this paragraph (*paucis diebus Q. Cassi litteris acceptis rex Bogus cum copiis uenit*), and 25.5, where *uenit* is used with *ad* (*cum ad Canopum uentum esset*).

Vielhaber 1869's emendation does depend on a two-step error and on the superfluous inclusion of the preposition *ad* with *Pelusium*, an unnecessary word despite the parallel at 25.5. Indeed, *uenit* is used with a designated destination without a linking preposition at 63.1: ... *et reliquorum auxiliorum uenit ea mente Vliam ut sine ullo studio contentiones Cassii Marcellique componeret*.⁵ Furthermore, the fact that *aduenio*

⁵Despite the "home-Rome" rule regarding the superfluity of prepositions with proper names of cities with accusatives showing direction (see *AG* 427.2), the *Bellum Alexandrinum* is somewhat inconsistent in this grammatical construction. At 58.1, *adducit* is used with the preposition *ad Cordubam*; at 42.4, *adducit* is used with *in Macedoniam*, reflecting the use of a preposition to advancement within a country (*AG* 428c). Similarly, variations and inconsistencies exist within the Caesarian corpus. *BC* 1.36.4, *BC* 1.36.5, *BC* 1.61.5, and *BC* 3.80.4.2 offer forms of *adduco* with destinations without separate prepositions; *BG* 1.43.3, *BG* 2.1.3, and *BG* 4.18.4, on the other hand, combine forms of *adduco* with an iterated *ad*; whereas *BG* 4.36.2 and *BG* 5.46.3 mix the passive infinitive *adduci* with the preposition *in*).

appears in the Corpus, if only in participial forms, is a deterrent to emending it out of the present passage.

c. Fleischer proposed *Pelusium accedit*, and cited four parallels from the *Bellum Alexandrinum* of *accedo* used with an accusative of destination without a preposition: 37.3 *Domitius postero die propius Nicopolin accessit castraque oppido contulit*, 38.1 *propiusque ipse Alexandriam per Syriam accederet*, 56.6 *ipse classem quam parabat ut inspiceret, Hispalim accedit ibique moratur*, 67.1 *cum propius Pontum finesque Gallograeciae accessisset*. Though the number of parallels seems impressive, Fleischer himself notes that three of his examples include the adverb *propius*, while paragraph 26 does not.

d. A more radical repair to the verb that attempted to emend the problems of tense and syntax was proposed by Hoffmann 1890, who altered *adducit* to *adductis* and excised *cum*, resulting in the following:

Sub idem tempus Mithridates Pergamenus
 ... missus in Syriam Ciliciamque initio belli
 Alexandrini ad auxilia arcessenda, magnis
 copiis, quas celeriter et propensissima
 civitatum uoluntate et sua diligentia
 confecerat, itinere pedestri, quo coniungitur
 Aegyptus Syriae, Pelusium adductis, id

oppidum firmo praesidio occupatum Achillae
propter opportunitatem loci ... in suam
redegit potestatem praesidiumque ibi suum
collocavit.

This is, as is made clear from the text above, a three-part emendation: 1. Hoffmann 1890 deleted the *cum* of *cum magnis copiis*, 2. he emended *adducit* to *adductis* (a reasonable transposition), and 3. he deleted the *-que* of *idque*, reducing the number of finite, indicative verbs in this lengthy sentence to two and the number of *-que*'s to one. The distribution of these emendations, which requires a number of small errors to coordinate throughout the passage, makes his suggestion less likely; the great separation between *magnis copiis* and *propugnantibus*, forty-six words apart from one another, is another reason to doubt Hoffmann's emendation. Yet the repair is worth consideration because, although with each intervention his proposal becomes more unlikely, each individual emendation is plausible and his overall approach to altering the verb is of a completely different character from those that preceded him.

There are also emendations that resolve the difficult syntax of *adducit* without altering the form of the verb, three of which are discussed below.

e. Vascosanus replaced *cum magnis copiis* with *magnas copias*; Stephanus made the same emendation almost simultaneously. The emendation is based upon the overall sense of the passage: the ablative of accompaniment makes it clear that it is (at least in part) the *copiae* that Mithridates led into Asia, so the deletion of *cum* and modification of the cases of *magnis copiis* simplifies this complex sentence. But this emendation, too, requires a two-step corruption, wherein first the accusatives shifted to ablatives, then *cum* was inserted (or the same steps in reverse order); these changes could have occurred accidentally through transcription (though there is no nearby *cum* that could have resulted in dittography), or the distance between the accusative and its transitive verb could have led a particularly intrusive scribe to alter the text to its detriment. Distance alone, however, was little enough cause to prompt such an innovation, as it is unclear why the ablative of accompaniment would have been inserted in place of the accusative.

f. Landgraf in 1891 chose not to alter the *paradosis* at all, but rather to justify the anomalous use of *adducit* by means of *anacoluthon*. Landgraf explains the lack of a direct object for *adducit* as an error original to the text resulting from the ungainly length of the sentence, which resulted either in the author's losing track of the syntax of his sentence

or choosing rather to start again with emphasis—a subtle distinction that either demeans the style of the author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* or underscores its similarity to other prose works incorporating rhetorical figures. This is an attractive solution, as it requires no alteration of the text at all, and can be used to explain the rambling structure of this sentence with logic rather than by assuming random clumsiness of the author and ignorance of all subsequent scribes and readers. Even with anacoluthon, however, the verb *adducit* strongly desires a direct object, even if only a resumptive deictic hearkening back to the ablative of accompaniment.

g. Following upon Landgraf's supposition of anacoluthon, it is additionally possible, and, indeed, my suggested emendation, that there is a lacuna of one or more words before the verb *adducit* that included its original direct object. The grammatical problem of *adducit* is subtle enough that no subsequent scribe would necessarily suspect a lost direct object, or indeed look for or supply a correction. The sheer length of the sentence is a likely cause for such an omission: *adducit* occurs only at the conclusion of the long opening sentence; a lacuna may indeed have arisen precisely because of the string of genitives, participial phrases, and relative

clauses that in the end masks the syntactic trouble with *adducit*.

It is possible that the lacuna included a number of troops, or a military unit such as a legion (cf. the list of troops provided at *BC* 3.4.3–6). Mithridates, although a Pergamene, may have led legions alongside the *copiae* he had rallied together; something similar occurs at 62.1 (*rex Bogus cum copiis uenit adiungitque ei legioni quam secum adduxerat complures cohortes auxilias Hispanorum*). Likewise, commonly abbreviated words, such as *nostros* or deictics such as *eas*, could easily have been lost. A lacuna doesn't fix everything, of course, since anacoluthon is still present.

3. The third problem in this passage is the word *Achillae*, which, in form, could be either a genitive or a dative, and is problematic both in syntax and in its position within the sentence. There are two possible grammatical functions served by this word: either it is a dative of agency with the perfect passive participle *occupatum* (uncommon and therefore unlikely), or it is a possessive genitive depending on *praesidio*. The latter is a more likely reading, but the intervening word *occupatum* makes for an awkward word order.

The name Achillas only occurs two other times in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, and here the word serves only to remind

the reader of the identity of the stronghold's leader. Achilles himself plays no direct role in the action of the passage. The possibility must therefore be entertained that *Achillae* was supplied by a scribe as a gloss on the text. We therefore suggest excision as a possible repair.

4. The final problem involves the unusual phrase *multiplici praesidio*. As with *adducit* above, the issue is not one of confusion within the manuscripts, for *multiplici praesidio* is undisputedly the paradosis. Suspicion arises, however, because of the seeming tautology that arises if *propugnantibus* is construed with *copiis* as a drawn-out ablative absolute with a repetitive phrase contained within it. The phrase *multiplici praesidio* complicates the surrounding ablative phrase without, at first glance, contributing additional information about the fighting—we have already been informed by *magnis ... copiis* that there are a large number of troops fighting. So, if we read *copiis* as the noun of the ablative absolute in agreement with *propugnantibus*, *multiplici praesidio*, whether understood in apposition or as a locative ablative, is superfluous—or, at the very least, the term *multiplici* is. At *BC* 1.69.4 one finds the ablative *praesidio* used as a locative within an ablative absolute (... *atque omnes copiae paucis praesidio relictis cohortibus exeunt rectoque ad Hiberum itinere contendunt*), but *multiplex* occurs nowhere else in the Caesarian corpus.

Gemoll therefore proposed that *multiplici praesidio* should be removed, arguing that it was inserted into the text as a gloss. Gemoll is correct in positing that *multiplici praesidio* provides little additional information: yet the fact that the phrase supplies no necessary data can also be used to rebut the probability of this phrase acting as a gloss in the first place. Glosses are meant to provide helpful information to a reader, not repeat what is already stated in a synonymous phrase; thus no scholarly scribe would find the need or desire to add it in the first place.

But Landgraf (1888) defended the paradosis, retaining the phrase *multiplici praesidio* but construing it, not as a parallel or subordinate detail to *magnis copiis*, but rather as the noun paired with the participle *propugnantibus* in the ablative absolute. Landgraf 1888 cited Liu. 32.32.4 as a parallel for *praesidium* used as a collective singular (*arcem regium tenebat praesidium neque ut decederent inde aut Opuntiorum minui aut auctoritate imperatoris Romani perPELLI potuerunt*). Not only can *praesidium* function collectively, but *multiplex*, too, may do so, and one can complement Landgraf's defense with parallels elsewhere in Latin (see *TLL* 8.1592.48–60 'spectat ad quantitatem,' where this passage is listed along with fourteen others).

This interpretation resolves the matter, too, of the mean-

ing of *propugnantibus*, a *defensive* verb that generally means “to make a sortie” or “to go out to fight,” often explicitly from walls or battlements. This is an action that befits the troops of Achilles but not those of Mithridates, who are storming a well guarded city, and thus we should not expect the *copiae* (who belong to Mithridates) to be the subject of *propugnantibus*. The meaning of the participle, therefore, makes the ablative absolute extending from *magnis* to *propugnantibus* unlikely, and favors instead Landgraf’s explanation of the paradosis. Inserted in a sentence about the operations of Mithridates’ troops, *multiplici praesidio pertinaciter propugnantibus* reminds the careful reader of both sides of the battle and should be understood as an ablative absolute with adversative force.

Furthermore, although *multiplex* is not found elsewhere in the Caesarian corpus, the word itself is not uncommon word in classical Latin,⁶ and is found frequently in historical works by authors such as Sallust and Livy, as well as in the philosophical works of Cicero. The term should not, therefore, be omitted on stylistic grounds. It even echoes nicely the previous description of Achilles’ *praesidium* at

⁶A *Brepolis* search, for example, offers over nine hundred forms of the adjective from authors predating 500 CE, nearly two hundred of which belong to the classical period.

the opening of the sentence, where it is characterized as being “*firmus*,” and the lengthy description at *BC* 3.110.1–6. *Multiplici*, then, is a lynchpin that identifies the *praesidium* as that of the enemy, marks the opening of the concessive ablative absolute, and emphasizes the success of Mithridates in this passage.

27.5

Cynthia Damon

Quorum impetum Mithridates magna cum prudentia constantiaque [uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine nostra castris uallatis sustinuit. Cum uero incaute atque insolenter succedere eos munitionibus uideret eruptione undique facta magnum numerum eorum interfecit.¹

Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS* et *T* *supra lineam* | mithridates magna cum potentia *S^{ac}T* | magna cum prudentia mithridates *V feliciter* | Mithridates [magna cum prudentia] *D. Simons, qui et* constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia *secluserit ut glossema* | | constantiaque [uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine *Dübner dubitanter* | constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia consuetudine *MUTV* | consuetudine *S, qui uerba 5 omisit* | [constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia] consuetudine *ed.pr.* | constantiaque militum et Alexandrino-

¹“Mithridates withstood their attack with great prudence and steadfastness [of his virtues and the imprudence of the Alexandrians], his camp having been fortified according to our custom. But when he saw them approaching the fortifications recklessly and immoderately, he made sallies from every side and killed a great number of their men.”

rum imprudentia consuetudine ς teste Ciacconio | constantiaque uirtutis tum Alexandrinorum imprudentia Madvig, qui magna *supra* secluserit | constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia *post* facta transposuerit Klotz

The ungainly sentence presented by the paradosis here accumulated substantive innovations in the process of transmission and has accordingly been the object of a variety of interventions. As a first step towards establishing a text it will be important to state the textual evidence clearly, since, as will soon become clear, most editors have resorted to excision and consequently shown little interest in the problems raised by the excised text.

As transmitted in *MUTV* the sentence contains a string of five ablative constructions, whereas in *S* there are only three since the phrase *constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia* has been omitted. Another singular variant occurs in *V*, where the first ablative expression is bracketed between the connecting relative and the subject: *Quorum impetum magna cum prudentia Mithridates constantiaque* etc. Finally, the noun in this first ablative expression, *prudentia*, is transmitted in *ST* alongside a variant, *potentia*, that must go back at least

to their common source, *nu*, or perhaps all the way to the archetype.²

The version of the sentence found in *S* appears in editions from the *editio princeps* onwards (the only early exception is the edition of Beroaldus, who prints the *paradosis*). That is, it made its way into the vulgate long before *S* itself was used in the constitution of the text, via *N*, a descendant of *S*; Brown (1972, 48–49) describes the source of the *editio princeps* as a manuscript that contains “a text based on a union of *M* and *N* ... that was the basis of succeeding editions for nearly four hundred years.” So although the phrase *constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia* has been confronting texts that exclude it since the first time the readings of *M* and *N* were joined in a single manuscript, only Beroaldus (1504) admitted it into the text. Nobody wants it. The long string of ablatives is clumsy, and the juxtaposition of moral terms such as *prudentia*, *constantia*, and *imprudentia* with the matter-of-fact *consuetudine nostra castris uallatis* is jarring.

Yet signs of disquiet percolate. Two of the variants mentioned above may originate in purposeful innovations. The transposition in *V* detaches the moralizing ablatives

²On variants in the archetype see Damon 2015b, 58–59. They are usually visible in the *mu* family, not, as here, in descendants of *nu*.

from *uallatis* and applies them to the main clause, where they make better sense: *Quorum impetum magna cum prudentia Mithridates constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia ... sustinuit* (cf. *BG* 7.10.3 *impetum magno animo sustineant*).³ Of course *V* has a habit of transposing words and phrases, and the resulting word order does not always make sense, so one cannot be sure that the transposition here is deliberate; it may have originated in an eye-skip from *m-* to *m-*.⁴ The presence of *potentia* is harder to explain. In a phrase that modifies *uallatis* it works even less well than *prudentia* does, and it works no better with *uirtutum*. Furthermore, it spoils the *prudentia/imprudentia* antithesis. Why is it here? My best guess is that the innovation intended here was *impotentia* in place of *imprudentia*, and that *potentia* attached itself to the wrong *prudentia*. *Alexandrinorum impotentia* would then refer back to the greedy haste of the Alexandrian troops in the preceding sentence (27.4 *Quae primae copiae flumen a Delta transire et Mithridati occurrere potuerunt proelium*

³The frequently occurring expression *impetum sustinere* is accompanied by a variety of modifiers in the *corpus Caesarianum*, but the *BG* passage quoted above is the only other example with a modal ablative, unless *BAlex* 8.4 *Magno negotio impetus hostium aduersos ex munitionibus sustineri* counts as one.

⁴On transpositions in *V* see Damon 2015b, 93 with note 183.

commiserunt festinantes praeripere subsequentibus uictoriae societatem) and prepare the way for *incaute* and *insolenter* in the following one.⁵ The word *impotentia* is not Caesarian, but that is not an obstacle to seeing it as an innovation; it is applied to the behavior of (former) soldiers at Tac. *Ann.* 14.31.3 *impotentiam ueteranorum*.⁶

Early editors were aware of other manuscript variants. Vascosanus notes in his margin that the phrase missing in S and the vulgate is present in “old books” (*in uetustis quibusdam codicibus*). Davies, too, reports the phrase as a manuscript variant—and then condemns it as a gloss. He also, however, reports that Ciacconius knew of a manuscript containing a significantly shorter and different version, *constantiaque militum* (cf. Cic. *Ph.* 3.8 *uirtute ... Caesaris constantiaque militum ueteranorum*). This variant shines a spotlight on the awkwardness of *uirtutum* in the supposed gloss. Good (or even adequate) parallels for the plural and abstract genitive are hard to find. At *BHisp* 17.1 we find the singular *hanc uirtutis constantiam*, at Tac. *Germ.* 8 the concrete *constantia precum* (it is followed by *obiectu pectorum*). The closest conceptual parallel

⁵These troops later remedy their tactical error and join the troops coming up from behind (27.7).

⁶The related adverb is used at *BAlex* 33.2 *regnasse impotenter Ganymeden docuimus*.

is probably the Ciceronian expression *constantia totius uitae* (*Fin.* 3.50, and without *totius* at *Sull.* 73 and a handful of other spots), but it is not particularly close. When Incertus speaks of Mithridates' *constantia oppugnandi* in the preceding paragraph the dependent genitive is quite different: 26.2 *perseuerantia constantiaque oppugnandi quo die est aggressus* (sc. *Pelusium*) *in suam redegit potestatem*. It is easy enough to imagine *constantiaque militum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia* (or *impotentia*) as an indignant addition to a passage in which the commander is given all the credit for a military success. But it is quite hard to believe in an innovation that substitutes the problematic *uirtutum* for the satisfactory *militum*. Oudendorp resists seeing a gloss here but he too balks at *uirtutum*, proposing *uirium* instead, a collocation for which no good parallel exists. Madvig achieves a satisfactory expression by supposing that *uirtutum* originated in *uirtutis tum*, and that the loss of *tum* prompted the addition of *magna* before its correlative *cum* and *et* to supply the necessary connective tissue (*cum prudentia constantiaque uirtutis tum Alexandrinorum imprudentia*), but the string of innovations is implausibly elaborate. Klotz queries the relevance (and therefore likelihood) of the beginning of

the supposed gloss: “quid in faciendis castris constantiae sit non uideo.”⁷

It is clear that the tradition’s archetype contained glosses of both the one-or-two word variety⁸ and longer phrases, which are generally self-contained units.⁹ One might defend printing the text of *S* by saying that the string *constantiaque ... imprudentia* was a gloss in the archetype and that *S* transmits the text of the archetype but not the gloss.¹⁰ However, in none of the other long glosses in this tradition

⁷Klotz tentatively suggests transposing the string to the following sentence, where it can modify *magnum numerum eorum interfecit*. But an innovation that results in the movement of a substantial chunk of authentic text over the seventeen intervening words is hard to credit, and anyway he does not explain what to do with *uirtutum* or how *constantiaque* makes sense when paired with *eruptione undique facta*. On long-distance transpositions proposed for this tradition see Damon 2015b, 131 with note 5.

⁸See, e.g., *BC* 1.1.1 [*a Fabio*], 1.4.3 [*adulatio*], 3.2.2 [*inopia nauium*], 3.11.1 [*Corcyrae*], 3.101.4 [*circiter XL*].

⁹See, e.g., *BC* 1.7.2 [*quae superioribus annis armis esset restituta*] 2.4.4 [*uehementiusque exterreamur*], 3.11.1 [*antequam de mandatis agi inciperet*], 3.48.1 [*Id ad similitudinem panis efficiebant.*], 3.101.4 [*pari atque eadem ratione egerunt*], 3.112.12 [*nutricius pueri et procurator regni, in parte Caesaris*], 3.112.12 [*Haec initia belli Alexandrini fuerunt.*]. See also on 7.2 above for a possible gloss in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*. For further details, see Damon 2015b, 59–60.

¹⁰Klotz and Andrieu, who accept the *S* vs. *beta* stemma, relegate *constantiaque ... imprudentia* to the apparatus and signal no omission in the

does *S* lack the string that editors excise.¹¹ Alternatively, it is possible to follow Landgraf 1891b (1891b, 9) in explaining the text of *S* as the result of an eye-skip from *prudētia* to *imprudētia*. This would be one of many such omissions, perhaps engendered by the simultaneous substitution of *prudētia* for *potētia*.¹² So it seems worth taking another look at this supposed gloss.

The phrase *constantia uirtutum* is both unusual per se and hard to square with the context: what virtues are we sup-

text itself, which suggests that they think the string arose in *beta*, not the archetype. On this reasoning see Damon 2015b, 18 note 48 and 23–29.

¹¹The closest parallel is found at *BC* 1.82.1, where *S* omits two non-adjacent words from a passage where editors make more wholesale excisions.

¹²See, e.g., *BC* 1.6.3, *tota ... refertur om. S* (17 words omitted after a preceding *refertur*); 1.40.5 *5 cuius ... legionibus om. S* (7 words omitted after a preceding *legionibus*); 1.74.4 *interim ... adducunt om. S* (8 words omitted after a preceding *mittunt*); 3.13.2 *simul ... incidit om. S* (8 words omitted after a preceding *contendit*); 3.60.5 *cum ... 61.1 erant om. S* (11 words omitted after a preceding *transierunt*), *BAlex* 2.1 *magnumque ... adduxerant om. S* (12 words omitted after a preceding *miserant*), 15.8 *atque ... exposceret om. S* (16 words omitted after a preceding *peteret*), 17.5 *constiterunt ... litore om. S* (12 words omitted after a preceding *litore*). For another omission by *S* in a passage involving archetypal variants see *BC* 1.6.2.

posed to see here?¹³ We have one in *prudencia*, obviously, but for others we have to reach back to 26.2, *perseuerantia constantiaque*, where it is disconcerting to find *constantia* itself as one of Mithridates's virtues, or 26.1 *magnae nobilitatis domi scientiaeque in bello et uirtutis fidei dignitatisque in amicitia Caesaris*, where *uirtus* is one of his qualities. It is hard to believe that the gloss began with this problematic phrase—the addition of *-que* would have occurred when the gloss moved into the text—so it is perhaps worth considering whether the gloss started earlier, with the first of the ablatives in this string: *magna cum prudencia*. If the original gloss was in the nominative (*magna prudencia constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudencia*) it would resemble others in this tradition,¹⁴ and *cum* could have been added when the phrase was integrated into the text.¹⁵ This hypothetical gloss maps acceptably onto the text, in which the praise of Mithridates in the present sentence is followed by criticism of the Alexandri-

¹³Andrieu dubs *constantiaque ... imprudencia* “un énoncé énigmatique” (1954, LXVII).

¹⁴One might compare the two-part gloss preserved in *m* at *BC* 1.28.2 after *iubet: caesar castrum subit. pompeius ultra mare fugit*. Moral-commentary glosses can be found in *U*, e.g. on 63v *miser cordia in uictore praestantissima*, on 65v *commune uitium* (see Damon 2015a, xlv).

¹⁵This emendation was proposed by Dallas Simons in LATN 540, spring 2015.

ans in the next: *Cum uero incaute atque insolenter succedere eos munitionibus uideret eruptione undique facta magnum numerum eorum interfecit.* On the other hand, *magna* seems oddly fulsome for a gloss.

A different solution was suggested tentatively by Dübner and embraced by Landgraf 1891b, who suggested that *constantiaque* belonged in the text and the rest arose from a marginal gloss of the following form: *uirtutes Mithridatis. Alexandrinorum imprudentia*, a shorter form of the gloss discussed above. Dübner's solution supplies a possible origin for the problematic *uirtutum*, which started life as a nominative plural referring to *prudencia constantiaque* and was converted into a genitive when it was moved into the text. Klotz' point about the apparent irrelevance of *constantia* remains, but the pair *prudencia constantiaque* can perhaps be explained by the antithesis with the following *incaute atque insolenter*, itself an unusual collocation in the corpus.

In general, the presumption of a gloss here is strengthened by the presence of another string of suspect words involving criticism of Alexandrians at *BAlex* 7.2. On the other hand, Incertus does have a reason to "talk up" Mithridates' virtues here, in that this loyal royal ally will receive a kingdom as a reward from Caesar later in the work, in a passage that refers the reader back to chapters 26–27: 78.2

*Mithridaten Pergamenum, <a> quo rem feliciter celeriterque gestam in Aegypto supra scripsimus, regio genere ortum, disciplinis etiam regiis educatum ... regem Bosphori constituit.*¹⁶ He introduces the paragraphs on Mithridates' *res gestae* with a catalogue of qualities (26.1 *magnae nobilitatis domi scientiaeque in bello et uirtutis fidei dignitatisque in amicitia Caesaris*) and works his virtues into the narrative itself (26.2 *perseuerantia constantiaque oppugnandi*, 27.5 *prudentia* and possibly *constantia*). *Constantiaque* in our passage could certainly be a carryover from 26.2, but in favor of its authenticity are both the antithesis with *incaute atque insolenter* and Incertus' penchant for pairing such abstract nouns (11.3 *scientia et uirtute*, 15.1 *scientiam atque animi magnitudinem* (similarly at 31.1), 16.5 *sollertia atque ars*, 42.2 *prudentia ac diligentia*, 43.1 *uirtute et scientia*, 48.3 *disciplinam seueritatemque* (similarly 65.1), 51.4 *labor aut uigilantia*, 55.2 *dignitatis et gratiae*,

¹⁶Furthermore, Mithridates' claims on Caesar seem to have been a matter of dispute. Incertus' account of Mithridates' march to Alexandria differs substantially from the two accounts by Josephus (*Bj* 1.187–92, *Aj* 14.127–39), who provides many more details and credits Antipater, not Mithridates, with the decisive actions. Josephus cites Asinius Pollio and Strabo (*Aj* 14.138–39) and mentions none of Mithridates' qualities. Dio's account (42.41–43), too, has different details but keeps Mithridates in the spotlight.

65.1 *ambitione atque indiligentia*, 68.1 *prudential ac diligentiae*, 68.1 *hospitio atque amicitiae*).¹⁷

On balance it seems that Dübner's emendation best accounts for the features of this problematic passage, particularly the origin of *uirtutum*. The string of ablatives is still awkward, but there is a comparable collection in the preceding paragraph (25.2 *magnis circumdatum copiis multiplici praesidio pertinaciter propugnantibus et copiarum magnitudine ... et perseuerantia constantiaque oppugnandi quo die est aggressus*). The somewhat irrelevant praise of Mithridates can be ascribed to political exigency, and the fact that *S* makes one of its characteristic eye-skips here is coincidental.

¹⁷On such pairings in the *BAlex* see recently Gaertner/Hausburg (2013, 37 with nn. 34, 37).

3 1 . 3

Cynthia Damon

Quorum perturbatione nostrorum animi adeo sunt incitati ut paene eodem tempore ex omnibus partibus, primi tamen editissimum castrorum locum caperent.¹

partibus (*sc.* loca caperent nostri; *cf.* *Hirt. 8.36.4 et, de figura apo koinou, BC 1.19.5*) | p- <impetus fieret> Kübler (*cf.* *BG 1.22.3*) | p- <inrumperent> Schneider (*cf.* *BG 4.14.3*)

The problem here lies in the change of subject at *primi tamen*, which leaves the implicit subject in the first part of the result clause, presumably *nostri*, without a verb. Kübler 1896a accordingly posited a lacuna before *primi* and suggested filling it with *impetus fieret*; the expression is paralleled at *BG 1.22.3: ut undique uno tempore in hostes impetus fieret*. Klotz prints this in preference to Schneider's subsequent suggestion *inrumperent*, imperfectly paralleled at *BG 4.14.3 quorum timor cum ... significaretur, milites nostri ... incitati in castra inruperunt. Inrumperentur*

¹“The spirits of our men were so incited by the enemy’s confusion that they captured positions at nearly the same time from all directions, the stronghold’s highest point, however, first.”

improves on *impetus fieret* by supplying a subject that can stand more easily in antithesis with *primi tamen*, but even Schneider claims no more for this repair than that it suits the sense of the passage (“Hinter *partibus* fehlt ein Verbum von der Bedeutung ‘vorstürmen’ oder ‘einbrechen’; das von mir eingesetzte *inrumperet* genügt dem Sinne nach.”). Andrieu leaves an unfilled lacuna in his text but supplies (l’assaut se produisait) in the translation.

Yet there is no palaeographical motivation for an omission here. Furthermore, these supplements leave the logic of *tamen* unsatisfactory: they require an antithesis between “everyone attacking simultaneously” and “the first group capturing” (*primi tamen caperent*) that is not intuitively obvious.² So either the lacuna is longer than has yet been suspected or a different solution should be sought.

Rather than accept an imperfect or incomplete repair, we print the text as it stands, as an *apo koinou* construction in a moment of narrative excitement. According to Leumann/Hoffmann/Szantyr this construction, while oc-

²The antithesis between *rex* and *Caesar* in a similar construction at 28.2 is much clearer because it hinges on the relative expeditiousness of their respective routes: *celeriores fluminis Nili navigatione rex est usus Caesar ... circumuectus eo mari quod Africae partis esse dicitur, sicuti supra demonstraui, prius tamen regis copias occurrit quam is Mithridaten aggredi posset.*

casionally attested in prose, “bei Caes(ar) ganz fehlt” (LHS 2.834; the anonymous authors of the *corpus Caesarianum* are not mentioned).³ However, it is also the sort of figure of speech that would be emended out of editions of Caesar and his followers, as it has been here, since it has been taken to be (or simulate) a feature of colloquial language (*ibid.*).⁴ Other stylistic features of the clause, including the omission of the subject and the predicate use of *primus*, are in fact characteristic of this text.⁵ For the collocation *ex omnibus partibus loca capere* cf. Hirt. 8.36.4 *repente omnibus ex partibus ... loca superiora capiuntur*. Taking *caperent* as the verb for both halves of the result clause sharpens the antithesis (*eodem tempore* vs. *primi*), and *tamen* introduces a correction to an overstatement, as it often does, for example at 18.4 *perterriti ... ad oppidum enatauerunt. Multi tamen ex his capti interfectique*

³However, they do (2.444) cite a Caesarian example of an *apo koinou* modifier (*BG* 4.24.4 *non eadem alacritate ac studio*); this is obviously much simpler than our passage.

⁴On textual disputes over *apo koinou neque* see LHS 2.517; the topic is discussed at length in Baehrens (1912) *passim*, with Caesarian examples on 266–67 and 300 and passages of comparable complexity to ours on 280–81. On the *figura* as a device used in pursuit of the “Gesetz der wachsende Glieder” see LHS 2.724.

⁵See Gaertner-Hausburg (2013) 36 nn. 31–32.

sunt (cf. Hirt. 8.8.3 *omnium impedimentorum agmen, quod tamen erat mediocre*).⁶

⁶On the relatively high frequency of *tamen* in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, particularly in chapters 22–78, see Gaertner-Hausburg (2013) 67 n.184 (the numbers in their Appendix K, p. 288, are mistaken).

35.3

Maria Kovalchuk and Cynthia Damon

Cuius itineris has esse certas <constat> opportunitates, quod in locis superioribus nullus impetus repentinus accidere hostium poterat et quod Cappadocia his iugis subiecta magnam commeatus copiam erat subministratura.¹

has esse certas <constat> opportunitates *scripsimus* (cf. 31.6), *nisi mauis cum 5 teste Oudendorp post* opportunitates <constat> *supplere* | has esse certas opportunitates *MUSTV* | hae erant certae opportunitates *5 teste Oudendorp* | has esse [certas] opportunitates *Scaliger* | has esse certas opportunitates <cognouerat> *Klotz* | has esse cernebat opportunitates *Vielhaber 1869, 570* (cf. *BC 3.69.4*) | has est secutus opportunitates *Larsen coll. BC 1.1.3 et Cic. Off. 1.35* | duas est consecutus opportunitates *Landgraf 1891b coll. BC 1.39.4* | | hostium *MUSTV* | *an secludendum ut glossema?*

In chapters 34–35 Domitius orders Pharnaces to withdraw from Cappadocia and Lesser Armenia, which had been

¹“And (it is agreed) that these are the indubitable advantages of this route: the fact that on higher ground no sudden attack of enemies could occur, and the fact that Cappadocia, adjacent to these ridges, was going to supply a great abundance of provision(s).”

the kingdoms of Deiotarus and Ariobarzanes, Roman allies. Pharnaces withdraws from Cappadocia but not from Lesser Armenia. Consequently, Domitius marches towards Armenia with troops, traveling W-E along a ridge between Cappadocia (to the south) and Armenia (to the north). In-certus specifies two advantages of this route in a sentence whose syntax is incomplete. The main clause is transmitted as follows:

cuius itineris has esse certas opportunitates

This is printed in many editions, including those of Scaliger and Nipperdey, presumably on the assumption that a *uerbum noscendi* could be understood from *instituit* two sentences earlier. But it is not obvious that *iter facere instituit* will launch a train of thought, and if it does, the thought is immediately interrupted by an eighteen-word topographical parenthesis (*Nam ... Armenia*).

In some *recentiores* and the *editio princeps* the sentence is rewritten thus:

cuius itineris hae erant certae opportunitates 5

A less drastic repair is to supply a finite verb to govern the indirect statement, e.g.:

cuius itineris has esse certas opportunitates
 ⟨uidit⟩ *Forchhammer* (1852, 84)

cuius itineris has esse certas opportunitates
 ⟨cognouerat⟩ *Klotz* (1927, ad loc.)

cuius itineris has esse cernebat opportunitates
Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 570)²

But the absence of a main verb is not the only problem here. The adjective *certas* has been suspected; indeed Scaliger excised it, presumably on stylistic grounds, since it does not affect the syntax.³ In our view none of these solutions is satisfactory, not even the solution adopted in the most recent editions, Klotz ⟨*cognouerat*⟩. Indirect statement, whether by implication or emendation, creates a problem here: the deictic *has*, which is the subject of the indirect statement,

²Although *cernere* usually denotes visual perception rather than realization in the *corpus Caesarianum*, it does govern indirect statement at *BC* 3.69.4 *cum ... Pompeium adesse ... cernerent*. For Vielhaber 1869's argument see note 3.

³Cf. Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 570) "Ähnlich ist vielleicht ... in den wenig passenden *certas* das Verb *cernebat* versteckt," and Larsen (1886, 18): "Verum non modo infinitivus non ferri potest sed etiam 'certas', sub quo sine dubio error aliquis latet."

points to the following *quod* clauses, but the indicative verbs in those clauses set them outside of the indirect statement. So either the deictic ⁴ or the mood⁵ is wrong.

Larsen (1886, 18–19) proposed a different construction:

cuius itineris has est secutus opportunitates

In support of his emendation he cited *BC* 1.1.3 *sin Caesarem respiciant atque eius gratiam sequantur* as a parallel for the abstract object of *sequor* and *Cic. Off.* 1.35 *sed credo aliquid secutor, opportunitatem loci maxime* for the pursuit of opportunity. By replacing *esse certas* with *est secutus* Larsen also addressed the problem of *certas*. However, Larsen's paleographical argument (-us misread as -as) is rather weak.

Landgraf 1891b (1891b, 12–13) developed Larsen's emendation in two ways:

⁴The deictic *his* in the second *quod* clause works normally, referring to the terrain under discussion in the narrative.

⁵Cf. 70.2 *monuit ... ne ... nimis eo gloriarentur beneficio quod auxilio Pompeio non misissent*, where *eo* points forward to the substantive clause *quod ... non misissent*, and similarly 16.3 *Haec ... Caesar suis exposuerat ut hoc maiore animo contenderent quod omnium salutem sibi commendatam uiderent*, where *hoc* in the purpose clause points forward to the substantive clause *quod ... uiderent*. Possibly also 24.6 *hoc ... quod*, although the *quod* clause here may be causal.

cuius itineris duas est consecutus opportunitates

For the main verb he substituted one better paralleled in the *corpus Caesarianum*, and he changed *has* to *duas*, citing in support *BC* 1.39.4: *Quo facto duas res consecutus est*, a particularly apt parallel since it too is followed by two indicative *quod* clauses.⁶

But *certas* does not seem indefensible. The adjective is fairly common in the *corpus Caesarianum*, occurring more than forty times even outside the formulas *certior fio* and *certum est*. It modifies a wide range of nouns: winds, places, routes, people, military units, news, days, quantities, times, military formations, etc. It modifies hoped-for advantages at *BC* 3.110.4 *fugitiuis omnibus nostris certus erat Alexandriae receptus certaue uitae condicio*, where *receptus* and *uitae condicio* are as abstract as *opportunitates*.⁷ Scaliger might object that *certa opportunitas* is not quite the right expression for the first “advantage” mentioned in our passage, namely, the

⁶Andrieu 2002 [1954] ad loc. incorrectly reports Landgraf’s proposal as *has est consecutus opportunitates*.

⁷Cf. *BG* 7.37.3 *certissimam Galliae uictoriam*. Similarly future-oriented abstractions appear in negative formulations such as *BG* 5.29.5 *quis hoc sibi persuaderet sine certa spe Ambiorigem ad eius modi consilium descendisse*, and Hirt. 8.32.1 *nec se sine certa pernicie ... putarent prouinciae fines intrare posse*.

impossibility of a surprise attack on higher ground (*quod in locis superioribus nullus impetus repentinus accidere hostium*⁸ *poterat*): such an attack might be unlikely, but would one guarantee with *certas* that it was impossible? However, it seems unlikely that *certas* arose here by scribal innovation, whether from *secutus* or *consecutus*.

There is also no reason emend *esse*, apart from the above-mentioned difficulty caused by the indirect statement. So we preferred a different approach, supplying a verb that can govern the accusative adjective and the infinitive without creating the expectation that the *quod* clauses pointed to by *has* should have subjunctive verbs. Like one of the manuscripts cited by Oudendorp (1737, 810–811 n. 3⁹), we supply *<constat>*:

cuius itineris has esse certas *<constat>* opportunitates

⁸In the apparatus we suggest the excision of *hostium* as a gloss. Elsewhere in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* and everywhere in the corpus subjective genitives are adjacent to *impetus*, either after it (8.4 *impetus hostium*, 17.4 *impetus nostrorum*, 44.3 *impetum Octavii*) or before it (27.5 and 29.5 *quorum impetum*, 40.3 *uincientium impetum*). It seems superfluous here, and this part of the sentence needs nothing else.

⁹Dübner (1867, 1.xxi) calls it the *Bongarsianus tertius*; Brown was not able to identify it (1972, 5 n. 1).

With *constat* the point of view is in the narrative present, which suits both *has* and the indicative verbs in the substantive clauses.¹⁰ According to Dübner (1867, ad loc.) the scribe supplied it after *opportunitates*, i.e., at the end of its clause. We prefer to place it after *certas*, i.e., between an adjective and the noun it modifies. This unusual word order, which is well attested in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*,¹¹ permits a slightly better (but admittedly weak) palaeographical argument: omission of a word starting with *c* (or perhaps with an abbreviation for *con-*) after another word starting with *c*.¹² In any case, the supplement *<constat>*, which is

¹⁰Caesar uses both *constat* (*BG* 6.25.5) and *constabat* (11x) with indirect statement, Incertus and Hirtius only the present form (31.6, Hirt. 8 pr. 4). All three authors also use *constare* in the subjunctive and with other constructions, but these passages provide no help for ours. In our passage *constabat* might also work, to judge by the (imperfect) parallel at *BG* 7.43.3, with its parenthetical *quod* clause: *constabat inter omnes—quod iam ipse Caesar ... cognouerat—dorsum esse eius iugi prope aequum*.

¹¹Cf., e.g., 17.1 *in suam redigeret potestatem*, 37.4 *triniis firmabantur subsidiis*, 37.4 *media collocabantur acie*, 38.3 *suam non producere aciem*, 48.3 *speciosum reddebant ... amorem*, 52.1 *quintam fore in Hispania legionem*, 52.3 *proximum gladio traicit lictorem*, 52.4 *leuibis sauciat plagis*, 58.1 *potentem opponeret dignitatem*, 61.6 *necessarium consumeret frumentum*. On hyperbaton as a feature of Incertus' style see Gaertner and Hausburg 2013, 36–38 with bibliography.

¹²We also considered the possibility of adding the verb after *cuius itineris*,

not even mentioned in recent editions, seems to us worth considering.

since in two of its three occurrences in the corpus *constat* begins its sentence (31.6, Hirt. 8 pr. 4), and a position after the connecting relative is as close as it can get to the beginning here.

36.4 – 5

Maria Kovalchuk and Cynthia Damon

Quibus ex castris cum locus angustus atque impeditus esset transeundus, Pharnaces in insidiis delectos pedites omnesque paene disposuit equites, magnam autem multitudinem pecoris intra eas fauces dissipari iussit paganosque et oppidanos in his locis obuersari (5) ut, siue amicus siue inimicus Domitius eas angustias transiret, nihil de insidiis suspicaretur cum in agris et pecora et homines animaduerneret uersari tamquam amicorum aduentu, sin ut in hostium fines ueniret, praeda diripienda milites dissiparentur dispersique caederentur.¹

¹“Since a narrow and obstructed place had to be traversed (*sc.* by anyone approaching Nicopolis) from this camp, Pharnaces set selected infantry and almost all his cavalry in an ambush. Moreover, he ordered a large quantity of livestock to be scattered within the pass and the peasants and townsfolk to linger in these places, (5) so that, whether Domitius traversed this narrow spot as friend or enemy, he would have no suspicion of an ambush when he noticed that both livestock and men were moving about in the fields as if at the arrival of friends, or, if he came as if into enemy territory, his soldiers would be scattered in plundering booty and slaughtered piecemeal.”

equites *MUS* | equiter *TV* || obuersari *MUS* (cf. *Liu.* 38.1.8) | obseruari *TV* (cf. *Liu.* 3.22.6) || 36.5 siue amicus siue inimicus *MUSTV*, quam lectionem defendit *Hoffmann 1890, LIV* (cf. 74.3 et u. infra) | si amicus [siue inimicus] *Aldus* | siue amicus [siue inimicus] *Nipperdey* (u. et infra) || aduentu sin *Hoffmann 1857* (cf. 24.1) | aduentus *MUSTV* | aduentu sin uero 5 teste *Oudendorp* | aduentu siue inimicus *Nipperdey coll. Cic. Phil. 14.13, Fin. 1.3* (u. et supra) | aduentu siue *Forchhammer 1886, 92, Nipperdey supra secutus* | aduentu si *Andrieu* (de coniunctione iterata cf. *BC 3.78.3*)

In paragraph 36 Domitius is imagined by Pharnaces as marching from his camp to Nicopolis, seven miles away, through a pass between mountains. Pharnaces set some of his troops in an ambush and ordered livestock and locals to be visible within the pass in order to lure Domitius into the trap. The king's plan seems designed to accommodate either a friendly or a hostile approach by Domitius, who has issued an ultimatum: Pharnaces must withdraw from Lesser Armenia (34.2, 35.2). Pharnaces, for his part, is still hoping for a negotiated solution, especially one that can be deferred (35.1–2, 36.1, 37.1). In the text of 36.5 as transmitted²—36.4 is simply given as context here—both possibilities are

²The vulgate text as represented by the *editio princeps* is unusually far from the text of the archetype, especially in the stretch *tamquam ... ut in*, where it reads *tamquam amicorum aduentu greges. Sin uero ut in*.

mentioned twice, the friendly approach with *siue amicus* and *tamquam amicorum aduentus*, the hostile approach with *siue inimicus* and *ut in hostium fines*:

ut siue amicus siue inimicus Domitius eas angustias transiret nihil de insidiis suspicaretur cum in agris et pecora et homines animaduerteret uersari tamquam amicorum aduentus ut in hostium fines ueniret praeda diripienda milites dissiparentur dispersique caederentur

The sense is fine up to *suspicaretur*, and even up to *aduentus* provided that one supplies *esset* to complete the syntax of the *tamquam* clause. But thereafter things become murky. What kind of *ut* clause comes next? How are *dissiparentur* and *caederentur* connected to the rest of the sentence? And why is *ut in hostium fines* so far from *siue inimicus*?

The friend/enemy antithesis and the *siue* ... *siue* pair have suggested various approaches to repairing the text.

Taking his lead from a reading found in the *editio princeps*, Aldus excised *siue inimicus* and replaced the adjacent *siue* ... *siue* pair with a more distant *si* ... *sin uero* pair:

ut si[ue] amicus [siue inimicus] Domitius eas angustias transiret, nihil de insidiis

suspicaretur, cum in agris, et pecora, et homines animaduerneret uersari, tamquam amicorum aduentu, s(in uero), ut in hostium fines ueniret, praeda diripienda milites dissiparentur, dispersique caederentur.³

He thereby clustered the two references to friendly behavior and the two references to hostile behavior, and simplified the syntax of *tamquam* with *aduentu* as a circumstantial ablative. The resulting sense is good but the repair requires at least three innovations, whose sequence is hard to understand. Did *si amicus* generate *siue inimicus*, which then generated *siue* in place of *si*? Did *uero* fall out before *ut*, and *aduentu* acquire a final *s*, whereupon the orphaned *in* was excised as nonsensical?

The difficulty of tracing a path from the original text to what is found in the manuscripts prompted Nipperdey (1847, 195) to try a different approach. He transposed *siue inimicus* to later in the sentence, simultaneously changing the syntax of *aduentus* by dissolving its final *s* into the transposed phrase:

³Square and pointed brackets are supplied here and below for the sake of clarity. Aldus also omitted the word *greges* that appeared in the editio princeps (see the previous note, 2).

ut siue amicus [siue inimicus] Domitius
 eas angustias transiret, nihil de insidiis
 suspicaretur, cum in agris et pecora et
 homines animaduerneret uersari tamquam
 amicorum aduentu; s(iue inimicus) ut in
 hostium fines ueniret, praeda diripienda
 milites dissiparentur dispersique caederentur.

With this text the puzzling *ut* introduces an elliptical comparison *ut in hostium fines* parallel to *tamquam amicorum aduentu*. The initial *ut* clause expresses Pharnaces' double purpose: that the Romans either fail to suspect the presence of the enemy (*ut ... nihil ... suspicaretur*) or scatter in pursuit of booty and get killed (*ut ... dissiparentur dispersique caederentur*). The two-part purpose is supported by parallel *siue* clauses, *siue amicus ... transiret* and *siue inimicus ... ueniret*, a construction for which Nipperdey cites two Ciceronian parallels (*Phil.* 14.13, *Fin.* 1.3). Clarity, it seems, has been restored, and this is the text printed by Klotz. But the explanation of how clarity was lost is still complicated: *siue inimicus* was omitted, the omission was noticed, a repair was attempted by writing the omitted words elsewhere on the page, and they were then reincorporated into the text at a plausible but incorrect position following *siue amicus*. The alteration of *aduentu* to

aduentus in this scenario is poorly motivated: *siue inimicus* seems to have left its initial letter behind and regenerated it during the course of its travels. Forchhammer (1852, 92) adds that *siue inimicus* contributes nothing when placed in front of *ut in hostium fines*; he prefers to see it as a gloss motivated by the simple *siue* that originally preceded *ut in hostium fines*, but his repair is as complicated as Nipperdey's.

Andrieu adopts a simplified version of the repair proposed by Aldus, with *si* in place of *sin uero*.

ut si[ue] amicus [siue inimicus] Domitius
 eas angustias transiret, nihil de insidiis
 suspicaretur, cum in agris, et pecora, et
 homines animaduerneret uersari, tamquam
 amicorum aduentu, s<i> ut in hostium
 fines ueniret, praeda diripienda milites
 dissiparentur, dispersique caederentur.

The series of innovations is now clearer: *aduentu* acquired a final *s*, the left-over *minim* was omitted, and *si amicus* was expanded into *siue amicus siue inimicus* to make up for the loss of the second *si* clause and apply the friend/enemy antithesis for the verb *transiret*; *ut ... ueniret* would then mean “supposing he came.” But this is still a three-part innovation involving two spots in the text.

In our view the apparent parallelisms in this passage have been pressed too hard.⁴ As was said above, the text as transmitted makes sense up to *aduentu(s)*: Pharnaces' aim is to keep Domitius in ignorance about the ambush.⁵ The text says nothing about any plan for a preemptive attack on Domitius, and Pharnaces later recalls his troops to prevent their being spotted (37.2 *cum uereretur ne cognoscerentur insidiae, suos in castra reuocauit*); their presence seems to have been a precautionary measure that would allow him to respond quickly if there was any overt aggression on Domitius' part. He may not have expected aggression, since he knew that Domitius' army had been weakened by the loss of the two legions that were sent to Caesar (34.3, 35.2), and he was actively seeking a negotiated solution (37.1 *numquam ...*

⁴See, for example, the note in Dausius 1706 arguing for *si amicus [siue inimicus] Domitius*: “nam si inimici antea mentionem fecerat noster, nihil opus erat, ut postea adjiceret *sin uero un in hostium fines ueniret*, quibus ex uerbis luce fit clarius ineptum esse illud additamentum.”

⁵The aim expressed at 35.3 *ut ... nihil ... suspicaretur* is consonant with that expressed at 37.1 *numquam ... intermittebat legatos de pace atque amicitia mittere ad Domitium, cum hoc ipso crederet facilius eum decipi posse*, although the *cum* clause in the latter passage could also be used to argue that Pharnaces planned a preemptive attack. However, it seems more likely to reflect the fact that Domitius did learn about the ambush—or so one presumes from the reference to it in our text. See also note 6.

intermittebat legatos de pace atque amicitia mittere ad Domitium; cf. 37.2 on Domitius' *spes pacis*), but precautions were not unwarranted.⁶ On this reading the two parts of this passage are not parallel (“if friend, do X, if enemy, do Y”) but rather sequential (“deceive Domitius, then react to his actions”). Of the two reactions envisaged, doing nothing and responding to aggression, only the second is mentioned in the present passage; the first is given narrative space later (37.2, quoted above). The implicit contrast here between inaction and action is expressed by the text of Hoffmann 1857:

ut, siue amicus siue inimicus Domitius
eas angustias transiret, nihil de insidiis
suspicaretur, quum in agris et pecora et
homines animaduerneret uersari tamquam
amicorum aduentu; s<in> ut in hostium
fines ueniret, praeda diripienda milites
dissiparentur, dispersique caederentur.

⁶As it happened, Domitius' “hope of peace” kept him in camp for another day (37.2 *spes pacis Domitio in isdem castris morandi attulit causam*), so Pharnaces lost his chance to make a preemptive attack if he did plan one (37.2 *amissa proximi temporis occasione*).

Hoffmann printed the same text in Hoffmann 1890 and argued against Nipperdey's emendation (why move *siue inimicus* out of the first conditional clause if deceiving Domitius would have been even more important if his arrival was hostile? 1890, LIV). The adversative *sin* is used twice elsewhere in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (24.1, 42.4), the sequence *siue ... siue ... sin* in Cicero (*De orat.* 2.292, *Att.* 7.3.2). Hoffmann's repair implies a two-part innovation (*aduentu* => *aduentus*, *in* is omitted) but neither stage is *per se* implausible and the fact that they involve the same spot in the text is a distinct advantage over the repairs discussed so far. Dübner adopted it, and so do we.

40.2

Cynthia Damon

At Pontica ex altera parte legio, cum paulum aduersa hostibus cessisset, fossam autem circumire ac transcendere conata esset ut aperto latere aggrederetur hostem, in ipso transitu fossae confixa et oppressa est.¹

aduersa *Madvig* (cf. 20.5 et u. *infra*) | auersa *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 2.1323.63–66 ‘de fugientibus’) | circumire ac transcendere *Nipperdey* (cf. *BC* 3.46.3) | circumire acies secundo *MUSTV* | circumire acies secunda *Lipsius teste Oudendorp*, sensu et uerborum ordine repugnante | circumire acie secunda *Madvig* (u. *TLL* 1.409.41–81 ‘i. q. proelium’) | circumire [acies] secundo (sc. post recessum.²) *Gruterus* | circumire [acies secundo] *Dauisius* 1727 ut glossema ineptum ad 40.1 (u. et *infra*) | transire ut secunda acies *Ciacconius dubitanter, alii alia* | transitu *MUSTV* | circuitu *Dauisius* 1727 (u. et *supra*) | aperto (cf. *BG* 1.25.6) | ab aperto (cf. *BC* 3.86.3)

When Domitius and Pharnaces finally fought, the Romans were decisively defeated. Three of the four legions involved

¹“But on the other side the Pontic legion, when it had withdrawn a small distance facing the enemies but had tried to circumvent and get across the trench so that it could attack the enemy on its open flank, was stopped and overwhelmed in very act of crossing the trench.”

in the battle suffered catastrophic losses, and Domitius retreated to Asia Minor with the veteran Thirty-sixth and a few other survivors (40.4–5). The battle itself must have been chaotic, but Incertus seems to have been aiming for a narrative as clear as Caesar’s usually are. The battle lines are described in some detail (38.3–4, 39.2), then the events on the Roman right (40.1), then those on the left (40.2), then those in the middle of the line (40.2). After the Roman middle collapses, we return to the right wing (40.3) and finish with the “cost-of-battle” assessment (40.4–5). The framework is clear. But problems in the transmitted text prevent us from seeing exactly what happened on the Roman left:

at Pontica ex altera parte legio cum paulum
auersa hostibus cessisset fossam autem cir-
cumire acies secundo conata esset ut aperto lat-
ere aggrederetur hostem in ipso transitu fossae
confixa et oppressa est.

As Nipperdey says (1847, 197), “Verba ‘*acies secundo*’ quin corrupta essent, recte nemo dubitavit.” But those two words are not the only problems in this passage. Here is a fuller list:

-
- 1 The unqualified reference to an *acies* here is baffling.
 - 2 The adverb *secundo* appears nowhere else in the corpus, and one would expect it to be preceded by *primum* (uel sim.).
 - 3 It is difficult to see which verbs go with which nominative. Word order suggests that *legio* is the subject of *cessisset*, *acies* the subject of the others, but since we learn later that the Pontic legion was almost completely annihilated in this battle (40.4 *Pontica legione paene tota amissa*) it seems likely that *legio* is the subject of *confixa et oppressa est*. However, since it is the *acies*, not the *legio*, that is mentioned in connection with the *fossa*, the relevance of *in ipso transitu* in that scenario is unclear.
 - 4 The term *transitu* is per se a puzzle, since Incertus has described the troop movement as “going around” (*circumire*) not “going across.”
 - 5 The expression *fossam circumire* is not only in conflict with *in transitu* but also hard to reconcile with the battlefield described here, where Pharnaces’ compact battle line is protected on the flanks by 4-foot trenches

(38.3–4) and in the rear, as becomes clear from 40.1, by the walls of Nicopolis. How then could one go around the trench to attack the enemy from the rear? (See further below, under B).

The context provides some parameters for solutions to these problems.

- A According to 39.2, Domitius' battle line consists of a right wing (the Thirty-six legion), a left wing (the "Pontic legion," i.e., the unit newly recruited in Pontus [34.5]), and a *media acies* (two legions contributed to the Roman war effort by the Galatian king Deiotarus [34.4], separated by a narrow gap). Domitius also placed an unspecified number of cohorts in unspecified positions from which they could serve as reinforcements.
- B The phrase *at ... ex altera parte* sets the narrative of events on the left wing in antithesis to that of events on the right wing, where the attack of the Thirty-sixth proceeded as follows: the legion advanced outside the trench (*extra fossam*) on Pharnaces' left, reached the city walls (*moenibus oppidi succederet...*), crossed the trench (*fossamque transiret*), and attacked the enemy

from the rear (*auersosque hostes adgrederentur*). A battlefield success-story, as Incertus says (40.1 *secundum proelium*).

C In 40.2 both *auersa* and *secundo* echo words used in 40.1 (see B above).

Lipsius, according to Oudendorp, addressed problems (1) and (2) as follows:

... fossam autem circumire acies secunda
conata esset ...

With *acies secunda* he created an antithesis for *legio*: the legion fled with its back to the enemy (*legio cum ... auersa cessisset*), and a different unit, the *acies secunda*, boldly attempted to cross the trench and attack the enemy, as the Thirty-sixth legion had done on the right.² But Domitius' legions were not arranged with a second line, so far as we are told, and the only reinforcements we hear about are some

²Larsen (1886, 20) developed Lipsius' emendation by (implausibly) addressing problems (4) and (5): ... *fossam autem circu(itu trans)ire aciessecunda conata esset*.

unlocalized (for us) cohorts (39.2 *reliquis cohortibus in subsidiis*³ *conlocatis*). The expression seems to be a recollection of the Caesarian *acies triplex* or *duplex* (*BG* 1.24.2, 1.49.1, 1.51.2, 3.24.1, 4.14.1; *BC* 1.41.2, 1.64.6, 1.83.1–2, 3.67.4), which often did occasion reference to the *secunda acies* (e.g., *BG* 1.25.7 *prima et secunda acies*, 1.49.2 *primam et secundam aciem*; *BC* 1.41.5 *et prima et secunda acies*).⁴ The only passage in which the *secunda acies* appears without prior reference to the *prima acies* is *BAfr* 60.2 *in secunda autem acie*, but this phrase is preceded by a lacuna. The best parallel for the scenario we have here is *BAfr* 59.2, where Scipio places legions *in fronte*, and behind them, some Numidian troops in *subsidiaria acie*; the arrangement of the Alexandrian fleet at *BAlex* 14.3 is comparable, with 22 ships *in fronte* and the rest as reinforcements *in secundo ordine*. But our passage has no equivalent for *in fronte*, and the word order of *acies secunda* occurs only here. Furthermore, in this scenario *paulum* is puzzling, since it seems to indicate a change of course on

³According to the archetype, they were placed in an ambush (*in insidiis* MUS : *insidiis* TV), but this seems unlikely, since Pharnaces chose the battlefield (38.3).

⁴Andrieu prints Lipsius' emendation, translating *acies secunda* as "sa seconde ligne," i.e., the second line of the Pontic legion.

the part of the *legio* itself: it retreated for a little while, then did something else.

Ciacconius (cited from Jungermann 1606) addressed all five problems as follows:

... fossam autem transire ut secunda acies
conata esset ...

His *secunda acies* is the same unit as the *legio*, but it has experienced a change of heart and now returns to the fray *ut secunda acies*. We don't need to find any new troops or any event prior to what comes *secundo* (problems 1 and 2), the *legio* is the subject of all of the verbs (problems 3 and 4), and it doesn't go around the trench but crosses it (problems 4 and 5⁵). He also makes sense of *paulum*: the legion retreated briefly, but (*autem*) renewed the attack, and restores the standard word order. However, the repetition of *ut* is rather awkward, and *auersa* is a discordant detail: one would like to know what turned the legion back around to face the enemy. In any case, given the complicated series of innovations that would have been required to get from this original to the transmitted text, Ciacconius is appropriately

⁵Dausius 1727 took a different approach to problem 4, proposing *circuitu* in place of *transitu*. But this makes problem 5 worse.

doubtful about the likelihood of his solution, especially since he also rewrote the first part of the sentence (*cum paululum auersus hostis cessisset*).⁶

Madvig (1873, 283–284) created a similar scenario with a simpler repair:

... fossam autem circumire acie secunda
conata esset ...

His *acie secunda* expresses the change of heart without changing the word order or duplicating the *ut*, and he improved the passage further by emending *auersa* to *aduersa*: although under pressure, the legion faced the enemy, as Caesar's troops had done in another chaotic scene at Alexandria (20.5 *magnam uim telorum aduersi sustinerent*). As was noted in (C) above, the prefix of *auersa* may repeat that of *auersos* in 40.1, and in any case the innovation *aduersa* = *auersa* is not implausible. This emendation thus addresses problems (1)–(3). And problems (4) and (5) solve themselves if we see *circumire* and *in transitu* as two stages of an single advance comparable to that described more methodically in

⁶“Nimia est licentia” says Dausius 1727 (1727, ad loc). Klotz (1927, ad loc.) offers a tentative emendation, *acriter secundo <impetu facto>*, that is almost equally drastic and solves fewer problems.

40.1. But *acie secunda* creates its own problems: the unusual word order may prompt the reader to see this *acies* not as a military formation (which would be odd with *legio* as the subject of *conata esset*) but as the more abstract “battle” (*TLL* 1.409.41–81, with no examples from the *corpus Caesarianum*), but in a context where military formations are so prevalent this seems unlikely.⁷

Excision has also been applied to the problems of this passage, without much plausibility since it is unclear what would motivate the addition of words so plainly alien to the context as *acies* and *secundo*.

The efficiency of Nipperdey’s emendation, which like that of Ciacconius deals with all five problems at once, makes up for its lack of palaeographical plausibility:

... fossam autem circumire ac transcendere
conata esset ...

His *ac transcendere* crisply eliminates *acies* and *secundo* and justifies *transitu*. The verb is used of crossing trenches at *BC* 3.46.3 *ut fossas transcenderent*. In our view this is the best

⁷Variations on this approach depart further from the transmitted text: *accessu secundo* Hoffmann 1857; *acie excedendo* Oehler (1852); *consilio secundo* Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 565).

of the available repairs, particularly when combined with Madvig's *aduersa*. If it is right, *acies* and *secundo* may be further persistence errors: forms of the former occur eight times in the preceding three paragraphs, and *secundum*, as was mentioned above, was used in 40.1, where it is preceded by the word *adeo*. But perhaps the problem lies deeper, as Klotz suggests by daggering the passage.

46.1

Cynthia Damon

Vatinius cum animaduerneret neque nauium se magnitudine neque numero parem esse, fortuitae dimicationi [fortunae] rem committere maluit. Itaque primus sua quinqueremi in quadriremem ipsius Octavi impetum fecit.¹

fortuitae dimicationi [fortunae] ... maluit *Klotz auctore Hoffmann 1857* (cf. *Liu.* 25.12.5 *impetu fortuito*), qui et post fortuitae (tamen) *suppleuit* | fortuitae dimicationi fortunae ... maluit *MUSV* | fortunae ... noluit *T* (cf. *Liu.* 9.12.11) | futurae dimicationi fortunae ... maluit *§ teste Oudendorp* (de *genitiuo u.* *TLL* 5.1.1197.21–34, et de *adiectiuo* cf. *BC* 1.52.1) | futurae dimicationi fortunae (tamen quam fugae) ... maluit *Kübler* (sed cf. *BC* 1.72.3 et u. *TLL* 8.201.78–202.8)

Chapter 46 is part of the narrative of Vatinius' *res gestae* after the battle of Pharsalus (43.3–47). This narrative starts and ends in Brundisium, but our passage belongs to Vatinius'

¹“Although Vatinius realized that he was inferior both with regards to the ships' size and their number, he preferred to entrust the matter to a chance engagement. Thus, he attacked first, driving his quinquereme against the quadrireme of Octavius himself.”

naval operations on the coast of Illyricum, where he was vying with the Pompeian fleet commander M. Octavius. Vatinius' "fleet" was a motley collection of a few warships and a larger number of light vessels retrofitted with rostra (44.2–4), and Octavius knew it (45.1). Catching Vatinius off guard in a storm Octavius decided to attack, whereupon Vatinius rapidly prepared his fleet for battle. The general urgency of the task of stopping Octavius' depredations was made clear earlier (44.1–3), but Vatinius' reasoning at this critical moment is given in the following sentence, which contains a puzzling string of nouns, a murky *cum* clause, and an elliptical verb:

Vatinius cum animaduerteret neque nauium
se magnitudine neque numero parem esse for-
tuitae dimicationi fortunae rem committere
maluit.

Vatinius preferred battle—to what? Evasive action, presumably, but Incertus does not specify. If specification is wanted, one could emend *maluit*, as the scribe of T did, or fill in the blank, as Kübler 1896a did:

... dimicationi fortunae ⟨tamen quam fugae⟩
... maluit

But the supplement is superfluous, since *quam* (uel *sim.*) is not obligatory (cf. *BC* 1.72.3 *quibus saluis atque incolumibus rem obtinere malebat* (*sc. quam interfectis*) and see *TLL* 8.201.78–202.8). And T’s *noluit* doesn’t fit the context very well, since in the following sentence (quoted above) we learn that Vatinius attacked Octavius before Octavius could attack him, and the connective *itaque* indicates that the attack was a consequence of Vatinius’ preference.²

Kübler 1896a’s repair also includes *tamen*, which clarifies the concessive nature of the *cum* clause; others had added it elsewhere. But this too, although an improvement, seems unwarranted, since many of Incertus’ *cum* clauses, especially in chapters 34–47, are murky owing to postponed conjunctions and complicated syntax (see, e.g., 34.2, 35.2, 36.3, 39.1, 40.2, 42.3, 44.1, 44.3). The antithesis between calculation (*magnitudine, numero, parem*) and chance (*fortuitae, fortunae*) may suffice to indicate the concession that Incertus intended.

But the expression *fortuitae dimicationi fortunae rem committere*

²One might also take *fortuitae dimicationi* with *parem* (cf. *BG* 1.40.7 *par esse nostro exercitui*) and *fortunae* with *rem committere*, but this makes Vatinius irrational in what is otherwise a highly flattering narrative: “although he realized that he was not equal ... to a chance engagement, he preferred to entrust the matter to chance.”

is distinctly unlovely. *Rem committere* could go with *dimicationi* (cf. *BC* 2.33.2 *proelio rem committere*; 2.38.2, 3.74.2) or *fortuna* (cf. Liu. 9.12.11 *committere rem fortunae*) but not with both, so *fortuna* must be genitive. But if *fortuna* is a subjective genitive dependent on *dimicationi* (for the construction see *TLL* 5.1.1197.21–34), *fortuitae* is tautological. And if *fortuitae* modifies *fortuna*, it is otiose. In short, something has to go. Suspicion has fallen on *fortuitae* owing to the word's scant presence in the *corpus Caesarianum* (*BG* 7.20.2 *omnia fortuito et sine consilio accidere*; cf. *BAfr* 3.5 *fortuitu*). *Fortuna*, of course, is a favorite Caesarian concept (ϳ70x, including recently at 43.1 and 43.3).

Fortuitae was emended to an adjectival *futurae* already in the *recentiores* (cf. *BC* 1.52.1 *futuri temporis timore*). This improves the style but runs counter to the sense, since Vatinius did not wait for a future engagement. The scribe of T omitted *fortuitae dimicationi*, presumably regarding it as an alternative to *fortuna*. Modern scholars, on the other hand, excise *fortuna* as a gloss on the more unusual expression *fortuitae dimicationi*. Their decision seems right. But T may have been right in seeing the two as variants transmitted by the archetype.³

³See Damon 2015a (2015a, xxiv–xxv), pointing to the lists in Hering (1963, 42–43) and Klotz (1927, XII). The present passage is not in either.

47.2

Tim Warnock and Cynthia Damon

Capit ex eo proelio penterem unam triremes
duas dicrotas VIII compluresque remiges Oc-
tauianos.¹

ex *MUSTV* (cf. *BAfr* 40.5) : [ex] *Schneider coll.* 16.6 | pen-
terem *Stephanus* (cf. *BAfr* 62.5) : penteremem *MUSTV*
| remiges Octauianos *MUSTV* (cf. 16.6) : celoces Oc-
tauianas *Stadler* (cf. *Liu.* 21.17.5)

This sentence describes the ships captured by Vatinius after defeating Octavius near the island of Tauris (45–46; mod. Šćedro in Croatia). Three types of ship are mentioned here. The term for the largest ship, as transmitted, is a bizarre bilingual hybrid, *penteremem*. This certainly refers to what is elsewhere called a *quinqueremis* (sc. *navis*; 13.4, 13.5, 16.6, 46.1, etc.). The same hybrid probably stood in the archetype at *BAfr* 62.5 (penteremes *MU* : pentemeres *T* : pentymeres *V* : penteres *S*), whence it was corrected in

¹“From that battle he gained possession of one penteris, two triremes, eight two-banked galleys, and several of Octavius’ oarsmen.”

S to a Latin form, *penteres*, modeled on *trieris* (= τριήρης).² In the present passage *penteremem* was emended to *penterem* by Stephanus in 1544, and the Greek cognate sits comfortably in a sentence that also contains *dicrotas* (sc. *naues* = δίκροτας ναῦς). Although the numerical portion of such compounds may occasionally have been indicated with a Roman numeral in the archetype (*Vremes* appears in M and V at *BC* 3.111.3, for example), it seems unlikely that a scribe expanded *V* to *pente-*. The innovation probably arose under pressure from the other *-remis* compounds in the vicinity, including *triremes* in the same list (cf. 46.1 *quinq̄ueremi* and *quadrirem̄em*, 46.5 *quadrirem̄is*).

Stadler (1907, 1119) proposed adding one more Greek-derived boat term to this list, emending *remiges* to *celoces*. But the capture of rowers with their boats is reported in another

²*Trieris* is correctly transmitted at *BAfr* 44.2 *navis trieris*; it also appears at *Nep. Alc.* 4.3 and at *Sal. H. fr. inc.* 11 Maurenbrecher. A similarly formed word, *hexeris*, occurs three times in Livy (29.9.8, 37.23.5, 37.30.2). Outside of the two occurrences in the Caesarian corpus, *penteris* is only found in *Isid. Orig.* 19.1.23. On the names of Roman warships see recently M. Guérin, “La série des lexies biremis/triremis/quadrيرهmis/quinq̄ueremis navis: Une curiosité morphologique et sémantique,” in: P. Duarte et al., eds., *Histoires de mots: Études de linguistique latine et de linguistique générale offertes en hommage à Michèle Fruyt*. Paris. 135–153.

“cost-of-battle” summary earlier in the text (16.6 *capitur hoc proelio quinqueremis una et biremis cum defensoribus remigibusque*; cf. *BC* 3.24.3 *quadriremem cum remigibus defensoribusque suis ceperunt*, *BAfr* 63.3 *triremem ... onustam remigum epibatarumque cepit*), so the repair seems superfluous.

Schneider’s excision of *ex*, on the model of 16.6 (quoted above), has better justification, but it too seems unnecessary, since Vatinius’ possession of the enemy ships may have arisen “in connection with that battle” or “from that battle,” i.e., during (cf. 46.5) and after it. It is clear from the narrative that Octavius abandoned his fleet to its fate, since in his flight he was only accompanied by a few small ships that “chance had preserved” (46.6–7, esp. *naues nonnullae quas casus ... vindicarat*; 47.4 *paruis paucisque nauigiis*).³ The construction at *BAfr* 40.5 *nonnulli ex Curionis proelio capti* is similar, and refers to noncombatants taken prisoner after a battle in which the commander perished (*BC* 2.44.2).

³ Andrieu prints *ex* but translates “dans cet engagement.”

49.1

Tim Warnock and Cynthia Damon

Cassius legionibus in hiberna dispositis ad
ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contrac-
tumque in ea aes alienum grauissimis oneribus
prouinciae constituit exsoluere. Et, ut largitio-
nis postulat consuetudo, per causam liberali-
tatis speciosam plura largitori quaerebantur.¹

hiberna *U* (cf. *BC* 1.14.3) | hibernia *MTV* | ibernia *S*
| | in ea (sc. prouincia) *MUSTV* (*de prolepsi* cf. 12.2 *eas*) |
antea (*uel* *alea*) *Madvig* (cf. *Cic. Rab. Post.* 4 *et, de ablatiuo, u.*
TLL 4.762.81–763.1) | ingens *Jurinius* (cf. *Sal. Cat.* 16.4)
'magnum ... fuisse patet ex duobus donatiuis' | interea (*i.e.*, inter
ius dicendum) *Menge*

The misdeeds of Caesar's representative in Spain, Q. Cas-
sius, caused serious disturbances, particularly in further
Spain, where Cassius had been quaestor some years earlier

¹"Having established the legions in their various winter quarters, Cassius went to Corduba for the purpose of hearing legal cases, and he decided to pay off debt contracted in the province by means of extremely heavy burdens on the province. And as the custom of largesse demands, the specious pretext of generosity was used, but the intended beneficiary of the majority of the requests was the donor."

(48.1).² The report of his abuse of the civilian population starts in a sentence that has attracted emendations with strikingly different meanings:

Cassius legionibus in hiberna dispositis ad
ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contrac-
tumque in ea aes alienum grauissimis oneribus
prouinciae constituit exsoluere.

The syntax is fine, but the meaning of *in ea* is unclear. The demonstrative seems to point back to Corduba, but if it does, it refers to debts that have not been mentioned. It is possible that they were incurred during his earlier stint in Spain, but the specificity of the reference to Corduba is puzzling, since this is its first occurrence in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*.³

A variety of substitutes for the offending demonstrative have been suggested.

Jurinius (1742, ad loc.) supplied an adjective:

²He was in Spain as *Pompey's* representative in the late 50s BCE (Broughton 1952, 2.236, supplemented at 1986, 3.52), which may be why the narrative here is left rather vague.

³Corduba will later defect from Cassius (57.5, 58.4), but his debts are not mentioned in that connection.

Cassius ... ad ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contractumque ingens aes alienum ... constituit exsoluere.

The “huge debt” mentioned here is, in his view, the result of Cassius’ recent largesse to the soldiers, described immediately above (48.2–3)⁴ and alluded to in the following sentence (quoted above for context). However, *ingens* is used nowhere else by Incertus, and in its infrequent occurrences in Caesar’s *commentarii* it does not modify anything comparable to *aes alienum* (*BG* 1.39.1 and 5.3.4 *magnitudine*, 4.10.4 *insulis*, 5.12.3 *numerus*). For a “vast indebtedness” one has to turn to Sallust (*Cat.* 16.4 *aes alienum per omnis terras ingens erat*; cf. *Liu.* 7.21.8 *uis ingens aeris alieni*).

Madvig (1873, 284), noting that if *in ea* refers to Corduba, the expression ought to be *in ea urbe*, suggested two replacements for it, an ablative noun and a temporal adverb:

Cassius ... ad ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contractumque alea aes alienum ... constituit exsoluere

⁴This meant to win the affection of the army and counterbalance the hostility of the province (48.1 *compensare offensionem prouinciae exercitus amore cupiebat*).

Cassius ... ad ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contractumque antea aes alienum ... constituit exsoluere

Alea has little to recommend it apart from its final two letters, since nothing in the narrative connects the cause of Cassius' indebtedness with the measures he took to remedy it; gambling would be a stray detail. *Antea* is a little better, since Incertus did mention Cassius' earlier office in Spain, and the temporal adverb does not point specifically to Corduba. However, it adds nothing to the sense, since the participle *contractum* itself indicates priority.

Menge (1889, 126) suggested a different temporal adverb:

Cassius ... ad ius dicendum Cordubam se recepit contractumque interea aes alienum ... constituit exsoluere

Interea is closer to the paradosis, and Menge (ibid.) explains it as a reference to the time "während er Recht spricht." But the word order associates it closely with *contractum* and makes it point to an unspecified period of time between Cassius' quaestorship and praetorship and events nowhere mentioned in the *commentarii*.

Since none of the available repairs is significantly less problematic than the transmitted text,⁵ we join the editors who print *in ea*, and explain the demonstrative as proleptic. As we saw above, Madvig objected to the absence of a noun with *ea*. But there is a similar ellipsis at 47.3 *in ea* (sc. *insula*), referring to Issa. In our view, however, the ellided word is not *urbe* but *prouincia*. That is, the demonstrative anticipates a substantive that comes later in the sentence: *contractumque in ea* (sc. *prouincia*) *aes alienum grauissimis oneribus prouinciae constituit exsoluere*. The fact that Cassius was guilty of financial irregularities during previous tenure is mentioned at 50.1 (*cum Longinus imperator eadem faceret quae fecerat quaestor*) and suggested by the assassination attempt mentioned at 48.1 (*ex insidiis ibi uulneratus*), although it is unclear how these irregularities left him in debt.⁶ There is a more extreme prolepsis at 12.2, where *eas* points to *naues*, 14 words later:

⁵In his translation Carter (1997, ad loc.) seems to omit *in ea* and all its replacements and take *contractum* with *grauissimis oneribus*: “He decided to pay off debts of his which had caused great hardship to the province.” He then implies that Cassius’ repayment constituted the largesse mentioned in the following sentence.

⁶See further the discussion of 49.2 *causae tenues*. This train of thought is not convincing.

Idem, posteaquam Ganymedes in concilio confirmavit sese et eas quae essent amissae restitutum et numerum adaucturum, magna spe et fiducia ueteres reficere naues accuratiusque huic rei studere atque inseruire instituerunt.

On this reading, Cassius accumulated this debt during his time in Spain as Pompey's representative, and he used his recent largesse to the soldiers as an excuse for extortion and financial chicanery (described in the following sentences), some of the proceeds of which went to canceling his debt.

49.2 – 3

Tim Warnock and Cynthia Damon

Pecuniae locupletibus imperabantur, quas Longinus sibi expensas ferri non tantum patiebatur sed etiam cogebat. In gregem locupletium simul et causae tenues coniciebantur, neque ullum genus quaestus aut magni et euidentis aut minimi et sordidi praetermittebatur quo domus et tribunal imperatoris uacaret. (3) Nemo erat qui modo aliquam iacturam facere posset quin aut uadimonio teneretur aut in reos referretur. Ita magna etiam sollicitudo periculorum ad iacturas et detrimenta rei familiaris adiungebatur.¹

¹“Funds were requisitioned from the wealthy, and Longinus not only permitted but even forced these to be set down for him (i.e., in his account books) as expenditures. At this same time frivolous lawsuits, too, were launched against the crowd of wealthy men, and no kind of profit, either great and apparent or small and sordid, was neglected, such that the commander’s residence and tribunal were uninvolved with it. (3) No one who could make at least some outlay was not either constrained by a guarantee or listed among the accused. Thus great

simul et *Latinius* (cf. *Liu.* 2.6.10) | simultatium *MUSTV*
 (cf. *BG* 5.44.2) | simulationis *Schneider*, qui causa legit *infra*
 (cf. *Cic. Att.* 12.20.1 *dissimulationis*) || causae *MU* (cf. *Cic.*
Orat. 124) | causa *STV* (u. et *supra* et *infra*) || coiciebantur
MUSTV (cf. *XII Tab.* apud *Gell.* 17.2.10) | conciebantur
Landgraf 1888, qui causa legit *supra*, coll. *Pollione* apud
Cic. Fam. 10.33.4 || quaestus *MUS* | quaestius *TV* |
 quaestuis *Klotz* || quin *S* (cf. 15.8) | qui *MUTV*

Chapter 49 concerns the finances of Caesar's governor in Further Spain, Q. Cassius Longinus, particularly his extortion of money from the Spaniards. The first sentence supplies necessary context: one of Cassius' goals was to reduce his personal debt (49.1 *contractum in ea* [*sc. prouincia*] *aes alienum ... constituit exsoluere*). Incertus devotes four sentences to the governor's procedures, but problems in the transmitted text of the first part of the second sentence obscure the details (the rest of the passage is quoted above for context):

in gregem locupletium simultatium causa(e)
 tenues coniciebantur.

The main problems are (1) uncertainty about the reading of the archetype at *causa(e)*, which creates uncertainty about

anxiety about personal peril, too, was added to expenses and damage to family fortunes.”

the subject of the sentence: is it *causae* or *tenuēs*? (2) The awkwardness of adjacent genitives dependent on different substantives (*locupletium* on *gregem*, *simultatium* on *causa[e]*). And (3) the meaning of *simultatium*: what kinds of disputes does Incertus have in mind?²

All of these problems are rendered more intractable by uncertainty about the bookkeeping procedure specified in *sibi expensas ferri* in the previous sentence. Similar accounting language recurs in the following paragraph in connection with members of Cassius' inner circle, his *familiares*, who "were in the habit of crediting to themselves whatever they had seized and assigning to Cassius whatever sums were due for payment or subject to claims (50.2 *sibi ... quod rapuerant acceptum referebant, quod interciderat aut erat interpellatum Cassio assignabant*), but in 50.2 the technical terms seem less technical than those in the present passage, referring to who got what, not which category (income or expenditure?) a

²The peculiar expression *in gregem locupletium* is queried by Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 568), who notes that Cassius preyed on the wealthy as individuals, via requisition and lawsuit, not as a collective. But *grex* seems compatible with the hyperbole of the passage (*neque ullum genus ... nemo erat ... quin*). See below for an emendation to *coniciebantur*.

sum was assigned to.³ However, the later passage, along with *domus* in 49.2, does suggest that these same *familiares* are envisaged as acting on Cassius' orders in our passage (*cogebat*) and entering sums received as sums paid, i.e., putting those from whom Cassius had extorted money into his debt for the amount they had just paid him, potentially doubling their loss should he try to collect on those "debts," and in any case making it impossible for them to demand restitution in the future. As Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 567–568, n. 47) explains, this would be a precautionary measure adopted in view of future lawsuits, where account books could be entered as evidence. However, it is unclear whose account books are at issue here: his or theirs? In the scenario described here it is assumed that the books are those of Cassius, since after the assassination attempt he convoked those who had paid him money and seems to have ordered them to alter the entries in their account books as well: 56.3 *sanatis uulneribus arcessit omnes qui sibi pecunias expensas tulerant acceptasque eas iubet referri*. But in this scenario *patiebatur* is surprising,⁴ unless we are to assume that his profit-hungry

³However, Schneider (1888, ad loc.) views the accounting language in 49.2, too, as used loosely, such that *expensum ferre* simply means "pay."

⁴As is noted by Vielhaber 1869 (1869, 567–568, n. 47). He suggests that the account books in both 49.2 and 56.3 are those of the provincials,

familiares were pressing this procedure on Cassius. Further confusion arises from Incertus' report that Cassius had operated similarly as quaestor (50.1 *cum Longinus imperator eadem faceret quae fecerat quaestor*), since his earlier tenure resulted in debt and his goal in 48/47 is to clear that debt. But perhaps the point of the present passage is that he changed his bookkeeping procedures so that instead of incurring debt he emerged as his victims' creditor.

Some basic orientation can be derived from the insistent binaries in the passage quoted above: requisition vs. prosecution, large and visible profit vs. small and sordid profit, *domus* vs. *tribunal*, financial risks (*uadimonio ... iacturas ... detrimenta rei familiaris*) vs. criminal charges (*in reos ... periculum*). Incertus' Cassius seems to have applied pressure both directly and indirectly in pursuit of money to pay his debts.

The first of the problems listed above is the most consequential. Should we read *causae* or *causa*? Editors from Nipperdey onwards have read *causa*, Nipperdey (1847, 197) because he considered it the reading of the best manuscript, others on the basis of the then-current stemma, where the agreement of S and TV showed the reading of the

and that Cassius wants to ensure that any expenditures recorded there correspond to subsequent income, indicating that their "loans" had been repaid.

archetype. But with the bifid stemma used in the present edition *causa* and *causae* have equal authority, and either might have turned into the other owing to pressure from the adjacent words, *simultatium* and *tenues*.⁵

Causa, the reading of the nu-branch, is a preposition-like ablative with *simultatium* (cf. Var. L. 5.155 *litium causa*). With this reading the subject of *coniciebantur* is the substantive *tenues*, “people of modest means.” Neither *simultatium causa* nor *tenues coniciebantur* is easy to understand, however. Nipperdey (1847, 197) paraphrases the sentence thus: “homines tenues, quia Longino erant inuisi, eadem passos esse, quae locupletes.” But *simultatium causa* seems like an odd way to communicate Cassius’ hostility, and translations are tellingly disparate. Nipperdey’s interpretation of *causa*, with its causal (“because of”) rather than purposive (“for the sake of”) meaning, is reflected in some translations, e.g.:

- Andrieu (1954): “en cas de démêlés avec lui, le petit peuple était jeté dans la masse des riches.”
- Carter (1997): “Men of modest means were lumped in with the rich because of private quarrels.”

⁵Andrieu (1954, 85) asserts in his note complémentaire on this passage that *causae* “a toute chance d’être une correction,” but *causa* could as easily have arisen from the preceding genitive.

Other translators, however, give *causa* its customary sense⁶ but struggle to understand *simultatium*, e.g.:

- Ciaffi-Griffa (2008 [1953/1972]): “includeva poi le persone di condizione modesta nella massa de ricchi per confondere le cose.”
- Raaflaub (2017): “People of modest means were classed with the rich arbitrarily in order to stir up social tensions.”⁷
- Landgraf 1888: “gegen das Corps der Reichen wurden *simultatium causa* die Armen aufgewiegelt” (see below for the verb translated here).

The difficulty of *simultatium causa* prompted Schneider to emend the genitive:

in gregem locupletium simulationis causa
tenuis coniciebantur.

⁶As in Varro’s similar phrase *L. 5.155 litium causa*, which occurs in the etymology of Comitium, *ab eo quod coibant eo comitiis curiis et litium causa*.

⁷“Classed with the rich” is an effective way of dealing with *in gregem ... coniciebantur* (cf. *BHisp* 22.7 *siqui ex nostris transfugerent in leuem armaturam conici*), but “arbitrarily” has no basis in the text.

Klotz (1927, ad loc.), who prints *simulationis causa*, explains it as follows: “i. in numerum eorum quibus pecuniae imperabantur, etiam pauperes referebantur, ne locupletium divitias peti appareret.” But Incertus’ Cassius is unconcerned about his public image—for another of his flagrant abuses see note 9 in this section—indeed he so provokes the provincials that he is the target of two unsuccessful assassination attempts and a successful defection.

Furthermore, the context makes it problematic to take *tenues* as the subject of *coniciebantur*, since it is clear that Cassius favored wealthy targets: 49.3 *Nemo erat qui modo aliquam iacturam facere posset quin aut uadimonio teneretur aut in reos referretur*. To address this problem Landgraf 1888 (1888, 49) emended the verb:

in gregem locupletium simultatium causa
tenues conciebantur.

With this reading the *tenues* are not Cassius’ targets (real or simulated) but his tools: he arouses them to initiate prosecutions that they will profit from, but intends to profit from their profits himself. Landgraf 1889 (1889, 13) later claimed that the passage should be viewed as “definitiv geheilt.” His repair does permit a logical connection to the preceding sentence about largesse (49.1 *Et, ut largitionis*

postulat consuetudo, per causam liberalitatis speciosam plura largitori quaerebantur): these prosecutions will count as largesse for the tools. But in a context where actual largesse has been mentioned (48.2–3) and will be mentioned again (52.1) the connection seems rather tenuous, and Klotz (1927, ad loc.) deems Landgraf's verb ill-suited to the context.

With the reading of the mu-branch, *causae*, by contrast, the sentence is relatively straightforward. *Causae* is the subject of *coniciebantur*. The metaphorical weaponizing of lawsuits is part of Latin legal language already in the Twelve Tables (cf. *ante meridiem causam coniciunto*, quoted at *Gell.* 17.2.10).⁸ And the expression *causae tenues* is used by Cicero at *Orat.* 124, where it denotes cases that don't allow the orator to use the full range of his power. Here it seems rather to indicate frivolous lawsuits that a defendant with money might pay to be free of.⁹

Simultatium is still a problem, however, indeed a worse problem than it was with *causa*. The awkwardness of its

⁸Cf. *Gell.* 5.10.9 *Et cum ad iudices coniciendae consistendaeque causae gratia uenissent*. For *causae coniectio* as a legal expression see *TLL* 4.311.84–312.4.

⁹Cassius later used a similarly profitable abuse of power in levying troops from the well-off class of *equites Romani*: 56.4 *Quos ex omnibus conuentibus coloniisque conscriptos, transmarina militia perterritos, ad sacramenti redemptionem uocabat. Magnum hoc fuit uectigal, maius tamen creabat odium*.

position next to *locupletium* was mentioned above, and with *causae* the genitive is ambiguous. The other occurrence of *simultates* in the *corpus Caesarianum* refers to the contests between Pullo and Vorenus (*BG* 5.44.2 *summīs simultatibus*), and at *BC* 2.25.4 the singular refers to a dispute involving Curio and Pompey. But “trivial causes of contests (or disputes)” seems to give Cassius’ victims too much agency: why give them reasons to fight him? The term can also denote lawsuits (e.g., *Liu.* 39.5.2 *alienarum uero simultatium tribunum plebis cognitorem fieri turpe ... esse*), but neither “causes of lawsuits” (objective genitive) nor “cases, i.e., lawsuits” (defining genitive) seems likely here.

A long-neglected 16th-century emendation improves the sense significantly:

in gregem locupletium simul et causa tenues
conciebantur.

This was proposed by the humanist Latinus Latinius (1513–1593) and published posthumously in a catalog of Latinius’ emendations (1677, 2.26). *Simul et* links the two modes of extortion used by Cassius in Corduba and is equivalent to

*simul etiam*¹⁰; *et* seems preferable to *etiam* to avoid clashes with *sed etiam* (above) and *magna etiam* (below). The text that results resembles Liv. 2.6.10 in its structure: *simul et cetera equestris pugna coepit, neque ita multo post et pedites superueniunt*. The innovation may have started as a persistence error repetition of the ending of *locupletium*, and been “corrected” by accommodation to *causa(e)*.

¹⁰The usage is Ciceronian (›10x) and Livian (›10x), not Caesarian. *Simul et* does appear in the *corpus Caesarianum*, but only in tandem with a second *et*: e.g., BG 7.48.4 *simul et cursu et spatio pugnae defatigati*.

60.2

Isabella Reinhardt and Cynthia Damon

Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret,
quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum ad eu-
ndem Caesarem esset redundaturum, neque
suae potestatis esset, legiones Baetim traducit
aciemque instruit.¹

uictoris *MU* | uictores *STV* | | esset² *MUSTV* | esse ζ *teste*
Oudendorp (u. *TLL* 10.2.308.24–27 et 10.2.318.13–15) |
esset *** *Larsen* | esset (uetare uel prohibere) *Ciacconius*
| esset (receptus) *Reinhardt exempli gratia* (cf. *BC* 1.45.6) |
alii alia

In chapter 60 the rebellion against Cassius has reached a point where armed conflict seems inevitable. Of the five legions originally controlled by Cassius two and a half have mutinied (57.1–5) and put themselves under the leadership of the quaestor M. Marcellus (59.1). Marcellus' forces are based in Corduba itself, Cassius' are on high ground

¹“Marcellus, although he thought that combat was utterly wretched, because the loss for both the victor and the defeated would similarly redound on Caesar, and it was not within his official capacity, led his legions across the Baetis and drew up his battle line.”

across the Baetis River, about four miles distant (59.1). Cassius has taken the initiative by ravaging Cordoban fields and buildings outside the city (59.2), and Marcellus' troops demand action (60.1). In the present sentence Marcellus does act, but with considerable reluctance, the grounds for which are only partly clear in the text as transmitted, which is printed by Nipperdey and other editors (here with Nipperdey's punctuation):

Marcellus, cum configere miserrimum
putaret, quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum
ad eundem Caesarem esset redundaturum,
neque suae potestatis esset, legiones Baetim
traducit aciemque instruit.

This *cum* clause, like others in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, is complex.² It contains two verbs, *putaret* (governing indirect statement) and *esset*, connected by *neque*, and an inset *quod* clause including an emphatic genitive construction *et uictoris et uicti*. Plus, one has to extract *configere* from the indirect statement dependent on *putaret* to serve as the subject of *esset*. The syntax is perhaps tolerable, although the *variatio* in the modifiers of *configere* is more suited to the style of Tacitus

²See, e.g., 34.2, 35.2, 36.3, 39.1, 40.2, 42.3, 44.1, 44.3, 63.4.

than to that of Incertus. However, the meaning of *suae potestatis esset* is unclear: does it allude to Marcellus' probable inability to control his troops? This would align with the order Cassius gave him earlier, to retain control of Corduba (57.4 *ut eam* [*sc. Cordubam*] *in potestate retineret*) and his own subsequent prediction about the difficulty of controlling the troops (61.4 *necessitate est adductus, ut neque confliget—cuius si rei facultas esset resistere incitatis militibus non poterat—neque uagari Cassium latius pateretur*). But the former passage refers to a civilian population and in the latter passage Incertus specifies that it is resistance to the soldiers' impetuosity that would be impossible, not fighting per se. Plus, it seems odd for him to assert that fighting is not in Marcellus' power when the quaestor is about to take his troops across the river and array them for battle (*legiones Baetim traducit aciemque instruit*). *Potestas* may, however, allude to the fact that Marcellus does not have *imperium*; the mutinous legions call him "praetor" (59.1), as they had done to earlier leaders (53.4, cf. 57.3), but his magistracy is in fact a quaestorship (57.4). *Potestas* does occasionally denote "official capacity" in the *corpus Caesarianum* (*BAfr* 4.1 *potestatem ... agendi*; 33.2 *aedilicia potestate*; 56.3 *regis ... potestatem*; 77.1 *sub dicione et potestate*; for the possessive adjective one may compare *BG* 4.16.5 *cur sui quicquam esse imperii aut* [*sc. suae*] *potestatis trans*

Rhenum postulare). But in all of these passages the meaning of *potestas* is clarified by the presence of other “constitutional” terms. In our passage *potestas* alone would have to denote Marcellus’ authority.

Repairs have been sought, with suspicion focusing on the second occurrence of *esset*. The context establishes two parameters for emendation: (1) the *quod* clause must explain the unusually emotional expression *confligere miserrimum* (*sc. esse*), and (2) the *quod* clause must end before *legiones*, which belongs to the main clause.³

A relatively simple emendation was already available in the *recentiores*:

Marcellus cum confligere miserrimum putaret
... neque suae potestatis esse legiones Baetim
traducit aciemque instruit.

This emendation simplifies the syntax of *confligere* by putting it in a single accusative/infinite clause with both of its predicates, *miserrimum* and *suae potestatis*. But it does not really solve any of the other problems mentioned above,

³This superlative occurs only twice elsewhere in the *corpus Caesarianum*: *BC* 3.96.2 about Caesar’s army at Pharsalus, and *Hirt.* 8.34.1 about the memory of Alesia.

and the present infinitive seems distinctly odd with the second predicate, which is in effect a prediction about a specific future (note *si ... facultas esset* in 61.4) rather than a generalization about conflict.⁴

Another fairly simple repair was suggested by Ciacconius, who added an infinitive after *esset*. Jungermann's report of the repair (1606, 333) does not indicate whether Ciacconius intended the verb to be part of the *cum* clause (with *neque* connecting *putaret* and *esset*) or part of the *quod* clause (with *neque* connecting *esset redundaturum* and *esset*):

Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret,
quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum ad eu-
ndem Caesarem esset redundaturum, neque
suae potestatis *esset* ⟨uetare uel prohibere⟩, le-
giones Baetim traducit aciemque instruit.

or

⁴Kübler 1896a (1896, XIX) suggested a supplement based on 61.4 (quoted above), which he put into the text after the recentiores' *esse*: *Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret ... neque suae potestatis esse (uideret militibus pugnandi cupidissimis resistere), legiones Baetim traducit aciemque instruit*. However, his supplement moves *esse* into a new indirect statement governed by *uideret*. But it is hard to see how this supplement would have fallen out, and why a scribe would alter the perfectly construable *esse* to *esset*.

Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret,
 quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum ad eu-
 ndem Caesarem esset redundaturum neque
 suae potestatis esset *<uetare uel prohibere>*, le-
 giones Baetim traducit aciemque instruit.

In the *cum* clause *esset* requires an awkward shift from concessive sense (“although he thought”) to causal (“since it was not in his power to prevent”). In the *quod* clause it is something of a non sequitur after *configere miserrimum putaret*.

Larsen (1886, 25) left the matter of what was not in Marcellus’ power open, placing a lacuna after *esset*:

Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret,
 quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum ad eu-
 ndem Caesarem esset redundaturum, neque
 suae potestatis esset * * *, legiones Baetim tra-
 ducit aciemque instruit.⁵

As a supplement one could imagine, say, a second *quod* clause explaining the second verb in the *cum* clause: e.g.,

⁵Klotz (1927, ad loc.) and Andrieu (1954, ad loc.) oddly print the *recentiores*’ *esse* and Larsen’s lacuna.

⟨*quod belli imperium non obtineret*⟩.⁶ But this explanation adds very little, especially by comparison with the first *quod* clause, which justifies the striking word *miserrimum*.

Another possibility would be to find a supplement that would place *esset* in the extant *quod* clause, along the lines of Ciacconius' emendation, discussed above. As an *exempli gratia* supplement based on the subsequent course of events we considered:

Marcellus cum configere miserrimum putaret,
quod et uictoris et uicti detrimentum ad eu-
ndem Caesarem esset redundaturum neque
suae potestatis esset ⟨receptus⟩, legiones Bae-
tim traducit.

With this supplement Marcellus would consider combat utterly wretched “because the loss for both the victor and defeated would similarly redound on Caesar and retreat was not in his power.” The phrase *esset receptus* could be misconstrued as a pluperfect verb form, of course, but the

⁶For *belli imperium* cf. BG 2.4.6 *belli imperium sibi postulare*; for *imperium obtinere* cf. 4.2 *omne imperium obtinebat* (sc. *Arsinoe*), 15.2 *imperium classis obtineret* (sc. *Euphranor*); for the connection between *imperium* and *potestas* BG 7.4.6–7 *ad eum* (sc. *Vercingetorigem*) *defertur imperium. qua oblata potestate*, etc.

same is true at *BC* 1.45.6 *Hac nostris erat receptus* and *BC* 3.45.5 *erat per declivē receptus*. However, the difficulties of the terrain are not mentioned until later in the narrative (60.4–5, esp. *cum ... quid transitus fluminis uitii difficultatisque haberet cognitum esset*), and the two explanations for *miserrimum* are both strangely dissimilar and strangely arranged, with the proximate and practical worry about retreat placed after the future and general worry about what the battle would cost Caesar. And even if one solves the latter problem by placing a comma before *neque* and making *esset* <*receptus*> parallel to *putaret*, the fact that we don't know about the difficulties of the terrain gives pause.

In the end we decided that no supplement (and hence no lacuna) is needed here, and that the transmitted text, despite the awkward syntax of *confligere* and the ambiguity of *potestatis*, was acceptable. Marcellus' worry about the limits of his authority aligns well his subsequent decision to withdraw his troops at the first opportunity (60.3) and with Caesar's obiter dictum at *BC* 3.51.4: *aliae ... sunt legati partes atque imperatoris*. Marcellus' loyalty to Caesar is stressed at 59.1, his deference to authority at 63.2 (*huic* [*sc. Lepido*] *uenienti sine dubitatione Marcellus se credit*), and his reluctance to fight is mentioned more forcefully than in the present passage at 61.4 (quoted above). The repairs reported in

the apparatus indicate our lingering dissatisfaction with the paradosis and suggest possible approaches for improving it.

63.5

Brian Credo and Cynthia Damon

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta opera <cum> complanarent custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis in id castellum Marcelli quod proximum erat regis castris necopinantibus omnibus—si tamen in omnibus fuit Cassius: nam de huius conscientia dubitabatur—impetum fecerunt compluresque ibi milites oppresserunt.¹

prope iam *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 3.3.3) | prope etiam *Credo* (cf. *BG* 6.11.2 *paene etiam*) || constituta opera <cum> *Aldus* (u. 61.6 et cf. *BG* 2.12.5 *turribus ... constitutis*) | constituta opera *MUSTV* | <pace> constituta opera <cum> *Nipperdey* (cf. *Cic. Q. fr.* 1.1.25) | constituta <pace cum> opera *Castiglioni* | constituta <die (uel) prouincia> cum>

¹“With not only a truce arranged but when they (*sc.* Lepidus and Marcellus) were leveling their now nearly constructed earthworks and the fortifications’ guards had been removed, the king’s auxiliary troops made an attack against the stronghold of Marcellus that was closest to the king’s camp—when no one was expecting it, if in fact that ‘no one’ included Cassius, for there was doubt concerning his complicity—and overpowered many soldiers there.”

opera *Damon exempli gratia* (cf. BG 1.4.2 etc., 65.1) ||
 complanarent (sc. Lepidus Marcellusque) *MUSTV* (cf.
Sen. Dial. 1.5.9) | complanarentur *Kübler dubitanter* (cf. *Cic.*
Dom. 101 *domus*)

After a tense period in which the two Caesarian armies in Further Spain, one loyal to Caesar's original legate, Q. Cassius Longinus, the other to Caesar himself but not to Cassius, seem likely to fight one another, a truce is finally arranged at Ulia and the leaders negotiate a resolution that involves releasing Cassius from his present encirclement by demolishing some fortifications (63.1–4). The present sentence concerns a surprise attack during the truce by troops commanded by Cassius' ally Bogus, king of Mauretania (cf. 59.2, 62.1–2). The transmitted text has an obvious problem: the subjunctives are inexplicable.² And the unannounced change of subject from singular to plural in *complanarent* is, if not unparalleled in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* (see Gaertner-Hausburg 2013, General Index s.v. “syntax: abrupt changes of subject”), at least odd.

Aldus (1513, ad loc.) made the obvious repair, supplying the conjunction *cum* before *complanarent*:

²The faulty syntax is signaled in U by a “query” symbol in the left margin and a “caret” symbol above the word *impetum*. A similar system of notation appears on the same page in connection with 64.2 (*uenit*).

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam
constituta opera <cum> complanarent
custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae,
auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt.

The postponement of *cum* is a feature of Incertus' style (see Gaertner-Hausburg 2013, 36–39). However, this repair makes the *non tantum ... sed* structure oddly imbalanced, with *non tantum* introducing an ablative absolute and *sed* a subordinate clause.

Nipperdey (1847, 200) addressed the new problem by adding *pace* to create a second ablative absolute with *constituta*:

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam
<pace> constituta opera <cum> complanarent
custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae,
auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt.

The *opera* are now unmodified, but their identity is clear from the preceding narrative (61.5 *operibus in circuiti oppidi continuatis*, 62.2 *munitiones ... ab operibus*); Cassius had demanded their dismantlement (63.4 *postulat uti munitiones disicerentur*). Parallelism has been restored, but it is hard to explain a two-part innovation here: either there were two unrelated

omissions or a scribe tried to repair a text that was nonsensical after *cum* was omitted before *con-*. But in the latter case the excision of *pace* is not the most obvious move.

Castiglioni (1924, 239) suggested that *cum* and *pace* were adjacent when omitted:

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta <pace cum> opera complanarent custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt.

This simplifies the innovation but weakens the paleographical justification for the omission of *cum*. This repair was adopted by Klotz (1927). But the expression *constituta pace* is problematic, since *constituere pacem* appears nowhere in the Caesarian corpus, despite the fact that Caesar refers to many peace negotiations; Caesarian expressions include *pace facta* (*BG* 2.29.5, 3.1.4), *pace confirmata* (*BG* 4.48.1), *pace concilianda* (*BG* 7.55.4, *BC* 1.26.3, 1.85.2), *pace petita* or *petenda* (*BG* 4.13.1, 4.27.4). Of the small number of passages listed in the relevant spot of the *TLL* (4.515.58–61), the best parallel comes from Cicero: *Q. fr. 1.1.25 pacem tota prouincia constitutam*. So we considered two nouns that are used with *constituta*.

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta <die cum> opera complanarent custo-

diaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt.

Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta <provincia cum> opera complanarent custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt.

Each expression can be paralleled in the *corpus Caesarianum*. For *constituere diem* cf. e.g., *BG* 1.4.2 and *BC* 3.33.1 *die constituta*; for *constituere provinciam* cf. 65.1 *praefendum existimavit* (*sc. Caesar*) *quas in provincias regionesque uenisset eas ... relinquere constitutas*.³ But neither omission has any paleographic plausibility.

We therefore follow Andrieu (1954) in reverting to Aldus' repair. It seems to us that *constituta* goes particularly well with *opera*, since the reference here to the works' closeness to completion (*prope iam*) is prepared for by the earlier report that Cassius dismissed his cavalry before his opponents could complete their circuit wall (61.6 *quae* [*sc. munitiones*]

³A Ciceronian usage (e.g., Sull. 52 *condicio ... constituta est*, Ver. 2.5.157 *te praetore est constituta condicio*) suggests another possibility: *Non tantum indutiis factis sed prope iam constituta <condicione cum> opera complanarent custodiaeque munitionum essent deductae, auxilia regis ... impetum fecerunt*.

prius quam perficerentur Longinus omnem suum equitatum emisit).⁴ Furthermore, none of the repairs that couples *constituta* with an ablative suffices to make *non tantum ... sed* in the present sentence match the regular usage of *non/neque tantum* (or *solum*) in the *corpus Caesarianum*, since apart from *BG* 7.54.4, *BC* 3.93.6, and *BHisp* 5.6 (all with *non solum*⁵), *sed* always appears with reinforcements: *etiam* (30x), *paene* (*BG* 1.20.5, *BC* 3.32.2), *paene etiam* (*BG* 6.11.2), *ne ... quidem* (*BAlex* 8.3).⁶ Admittedly, the coupling of a circumstantial ablative and a circumstantial *cum* clause is an even more striking oddity, unique in the *corpus Caesarianum*. Columella uses *non tantum ... sed* to couple an ablative with temporal clause (12.52.14 *non tantum eo tempore curanda sunt [sc. dolia], cum fructus necessitas cogit, sed ubi fuerint ... uacuata*), but the equivalence of *eo tempore* and *ubi* is considerably easier than that in our passage. The

⁴*Prope iam* is used with perfect passive participles at *BG* 3.3.3 *prope iam desperata*, 7.29.6 *prope iam effectum*, *BC* 3.70.1 *prope iam expeditam*.

⁵The pair *non tantum ... sed* (without *etiam*) appears at, e.g., Cic. *Tusc.* 3.75, Sen. *Contr.* 1.pr. 14 and 18, Col. 3.10.18, Quint. 4.1.16, 5.13.29. The omission of *etiam* (and its like) becomes commoner starting with the younger Seneca.

⁶The existence of Incertus' other unique usage at 8.3 persuades us to leave *prope iam* in the text, but we propose *prope etiam* in the apparatus on the model of *BG* 6.11.2 *in Gallia non solum in omnibus ciuitatibus atque in omnibus pagis partibusque, sed paene etiam in singulis domibus factiones sunt*.

repairs reported in the apparatus indicate our distrust of the transmitted text.

As for *complanarent*, a verb that appears nowhere else in the *corpus Caesarianum*, the transmitted active form is hard to construe (no subject) and parallel (the best is Sen. *Dial.* 1.5.9 *quae ... conplanet ipse*). In emending the verb to a passive form Kübler 1896a makes the syntax simpler, but here again the best parallel comes from outside the corpus (Cic. *Dom.* 101 *domus est complanata*), so it is hard to feel confident that he is right. And it seems rash to emend when the subject of *complanarent* could have fallen out with *cum*.

66.3-4

Brian Credo and Cynthia Damon

Ibi rebus omnibus prouinciae et finitimarum ciuitatum constitutis cupiditate proficiscendi ad bellum gerendum non diutius moratur magnisque itineribus per Cappadociam confectis biduum Mazacae commoratus Comana *** uetustissimum et sanctissimum in Cappadocia Bellonae templum, quod tanta religione colitur ut sacerdos eius deae maiestate imperio potentia secundus a rege consensu gentis illius habeatur. (4) Id homini nobilissimo Lycomedi Bithyno adiudicauit, qui regio Cappadocum genere ortus propter aduersam fortunam maiorum suorum mutationemque generis iure minime dubio, uetustate tamen intermisso, sacerdotium id repetebat.¹

¹"When all the affairs of the province and the neighboring cities were settled there, owing to his desire to set out to make war he delayed no longer, and stopping at Mazaca for two days after forced marches through Cappadocia, Comana *** the shrine of Bellona, the oldest and holiest in Cappadocia, which is worshipped with such great fervor that the priest of this goddess is considered second to the king by the

cupiditate *MUSTV* (cf. 20.2) | cupiditatem *Schiller 1889 coll. 55.2* || Comana (sc. Cappadociae? uel Pontica?) *Kübler dubitanter* (u. *Gaertner-Hausburg 91 n. 65*) | Comana *MUSTV*, quod defendit *Madvig* | <uenit> Comana ς teste *Dübner* | Comana <uenit> *Nipperdey* | Comana <ut confirmarentur et> (cf. *BC 1.29.3 Hispanias et, de coniunctione postposita, 45.3 et 56.6*) uel Comana <cum dissensionibus essent confecta et repeteretur> (cf. 42.2 et u., de re, u. 66.4, de coniunctione postposita, *Gaertner-Hausburg 36–39*) *Damon exemplorum gratia* || 66.3 maiestate imperio ed. pr. (cf. *BC 3.106.4 et Sal. Cat. 12.1*) | magis imperio *MUSTV* | nisi maius magis imperio <quam> (cf. 15.1 et, de antithesi, *Sen. Cl. 1.3*) || B(i/y)thino *MUS* (u. *TLL 2.2019.14–31*) | bithinio *TV* (u. *TLL 2.2019.57–63*) || Cappadocum genere [Cappado cum genere *S*] *MUST^cV* | Cappadociae cum genere *T^{ac}* || iure ... tamen *MUSTV* | post ortus transposuit *Schiller 1889 coll. Flor. Epit. 3.13.7* || sacerdotium [sacerdotum *S*] *STV* | sacerdotio *MU*

The problems in this passage about Caesar's journey from Cilicia to Pontus through Cappadocia are both historical and textual. Both center on the word *Comana*.

consent of that people in majesty, command, and power. (4) He awarded it to the very noble Lycomedes, a Bithynian who was born in the royal family of the Cappadocians and was seeking that priesthood again, his right (sc. to it) being not at all in doubt but nevertheless long discontinued on account of the adverse circumstances of his ancestors and a change in the royal line."

The main historical problem is the identity of Comana. There are two cities called Comana in Cappadocia and Cappadocian Pontus, but it is hard to say which is meant here, since the information supplied by the reference to the famous temple of Bellona, which points to the Cappadocian city, conflicts with the route deduced from the prior reference to Mazaca, the capital of Cappadocia: a journey to Comana after two days at Mazaca would have taken Caesar away from Pontus and the coming fight with Pharnaces, towards which, as the passages stresses, he was hastening eagerly (66.3 *cupiditate proficiscendi ad bellum gerendum non diutius moratur*; 66.5 *simili uelocitate*). A secondary problem is the apparently unmotivated two-day stop in Mazaca, which is hard to ignore given the incompatibility of *non diutius moratur* and *commoratus*.

The main textual problem is the absence of a main verb for the second part of the opening compound sentence (*magnisque ... habeatur*). This obscures the syntax of *Comana uetustissimum et sanctissimum in Cappadocia Bellonae templum*. Are *Comana* and *templum* nominative? accusative? in apposition? The secondary textual problems indicated in the apparatus involve the asyndetic list of ablatives of respect (66.3 *maiestate imperio potentia*) and the position of the ablative absolute

(66.4 *iure minime dubio, uetustate tamen intermisso*); neither needs discussion here.

An early repair to the main textual problem, the addition of *uenit* before *Comana*, completed the syntax and made *Comana* and *templum* accusative. But it left the two in uncomfortable apposition. Nipperdey's placement of *uenit* after *Comana* instead of before allows one to explain the verb's omission as a jump from *uen-* to *uet-*. But the apposition is still a problem, and both repairs exacerbate the historical problems by apparently having Caesar detour to Cappadocian Comana after an unproductive stay in Mazaca. Madvig declared the supplement misguided and the text sound, taking *Comana* and *templum* (still in apposition) as objects of *adiudicauit* and explaining the closer object *id* as a resumptive pronoun necessitated by the distance between Comana and its verb (31 words). His analysis of the syntax is not entirely persuasive—why *id*, not *ea*, which would remove the apposition by making *Comana* and *templum* parallel objects in asyndeton?—but on his reading the problem of Caesar's route through Cappadocia disappears (1873, 285): “Mazacae, non Comanis, de templo statuit.” Caesar made his decision about Comana and the temple without going there. The solution is particularly appealing because the following sentence, although somewhat opaque

owing to its lacuna, clearly concerns decisions pertaining to Cappadocian royalty, whose seat was in Mazaca. Madvig's explanation also supplies welcome information about why a hurrying Caesar spent two days in Mazaca: two days for two decisions about the future administration of a powerful priesthood and a kingdom. But syntax of the transmitted text remains unsatisfactory, and subsequent editors, including Klotz and Andrieu, have posited, with Kübler 1896a, a multi-word lacuna between *Comana* and *uetustissimum*.

The possibility that our Comana is in Cappadocian Pontus rather than Cappadocia proper is suggested by Strabo, a native of Pontus adolescent in 47 BCE, who in discussing Comana Pontica in his *Geography* says that it had a temple modeled on the one in Cappadocia and once had a priest named Lycomedes, and echoes the description of the priesthood's importance, which had earlier been held by Strabo's own great-great-grandfather (12.3.32–36). Strabo tells us that the tenure of the priesthood in Comana Pontica had been a bone of contention from Sulla onwards, with the latest recipient being Pompey's beneficiary, so a Caesarian intervention makes sense. But it is difficult to see the Pontic city in a text in which *Comana uenit* is sandwiched between references to the capital and king of Cappadocia. This has led to the assumption that Incertus is unaware of the

distinction between the two cities.² But that assumption is predicated on the emendation *uenit*. So we need to take another look at the lacuna.

Desiderata include (1) a verb, (2) a syntactic differentiation between *Comana* and *templum* that accommodates the demonstrative *id*, and (3) content that keeps Caesar out of Cappadocian Comana, that allows for a reference to Comana Pontica, and that explains Caesar's stop at Mazaca. Here are two possibilities for the missing syntax; the words in each lacuna are supplied *exempli gratia*:

biduum Mazacae commoratus Comana (ut confirmarentur et) uetustissimum et sanctissimum in Cappadocia Bellonae templum, quod tanta religione colitur ut sacerdos eius deae maiestate imperio potentia secundus a rege consensu gentis illius habeatur, id homini nobilissimo Lycomedi Bithyno adiudicauit ...

“stopping at Mazaca for two days in order to consolidate Comana and the shrine of Bellona, the oldest and holiest in Cappadocia,

²Bibliography and discussion in Gaertner-Hausburg (2013, 91 n. 65).

which is worshipped with such great fervor that the priest of this goddess is considered second to the king by the consent of that people in majesty, command, and power, he awarded it (*sc.* the shrine) to the very noble Lycomedes ...”

biduum Mazacae commoratus Comana <cum dissensionibus essent confecta et repeteretur> uetustissimum et sanctissimum in Cappadocia Bellonae templum, quod tanta religione colitur ut sacerdos eius deae maiestate imperio potentia secundus a rege consensu gentis illius habeatur, id homini nobilissimo Lycomedi Bithyno adiudicauit ...

“stopping at Mazaca for two days since Comana was exhausted by disputes and there was a claimant for the shrine of Bellona, the oldest and holiest in Cappadocia, which is worshipped with such great fervor that the priest of this goddess is considered second to the king by the consent of that people in majesty, command, and power, he awarded it (*sc.* the shrine) to the very noble Lycomedes ...”

Both of them make *Comana* the object of a verb in a subordinate clause whose conjunction is postponed and, after repunctuation, use *adiudicavit* as the desired main verb. Incertus postpones *ut* twice (45.3, 56.6) and *cum* frequently (Gaertner-Hausburg [2013] 36–39), so the stylistic oddity passes muster.

In the first version the lacuna contains a verb, *confirmarentur*, that can govern both *Comana* and *templum*, which are connected by *et*. There is a parallel for the double object at *BC* 1.29.3 (*interim ueterem exercitum duas Hispanias confirmari ... nolebat [sc. Caesar]*), and Incertus had earlier used *confirmare* in a passage where Caesar was intent upon settling protracted disputes involving Eastern royalty (33.2 *priusquam diuturnitate confirmarentur regum imperia*). The omission would have originated in a skip from *ut* to *uet-*. With this supplement Caesar's stop in Mazaca is explained by the purpose clause but it is still hard to see *Comana* as anything but the Cappadocian city, given the presence of *in Cappadociae ... templum* and, later, *regio Cappadocum genere ortus*. And the supplement sits somewhat awkwardly with *id*, since the demonstrative points to a resolution of the temple issue but leaves the problem of *Comana* apparently unresolved.

In the second version the supplement contains two verbs and a connective between them. *Comana* and *templum* are

now subjects of their respective verbs, and Caesar's stop in Mazaca is explained by the *cum*-clause. His intention of settling *dissensiones* in the East was announced in the previous paragraph (65.1 *praeferendum existimavit quas in prouincias regionesque uenisset eas ita relinquere constitutas ut domesticis dissensionibus liberarentur*), and the description of a territory troubled by *dissensiones* is paralleled at 42.2 (*prouincia ... finitimo bello ac dissensionibus confecta et uastata*); the verb in this parallel may not be precisely the right one for our passage. The reference to the claimant comes from just below (66. 4 *sacerdotium id repetebat* [*sc. Lycomedes*]), where, however, the object is the priesthood rather than the shrine itself. The omission of this string of words is harder to explain than the omission of the *ut*-clause, but the gap created by the reference to a solution for the temple but nothing about the trouble in Comana is less apparent, since the trouble in Comana might have been centered on control of the temple.³ With this supplement Comana again seems to be the city in Cappadocia.

Both supplements deliver some but not all of the desiderata listed above. Neither acquits Incertus of confusing the two Comanas—assuming that Strabo deserves our credence—but both provide a main verb, keep Caesar out

³From Strabo it appears that Caesar's arrangement involved both the priesthood mentioned here and a gift of land (12.3.35).

of the Cappadocian city, and explain Caesar's stop. The syntax of each repair makes a welcome distinction between the city and the shrine, but in neither version is *id* entirely unproblematic. So neither is good enough to go in the text, and we follow Klotz and Andrieu in indicating a lacuna.

67.1

Amelia Bensch-Schaus and Cynthia Damon

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset <et coactus> exercitibus imperiisque, in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset.¹

Caesaris *MUSTV* | <in> Caesaris *Cornelissen* (cf. 23.1) | | <et coactus> exercitibus imperiisque *Bensch-Schaus* (cf. 43.1; <coactus> *iam Hoffmann 1890*) | exercitibus imperiisque *MUSTV* | excitusque imperiis *Markland* (cf. *BHisp* 4.4) | excitus imperiis *Kraner* | excitus uerbis imperiisque *Madvig* | excitus precibus imperiisque *Larsen coll. Cic. Deiot. 13* | <coercitus> exercitibus imperiisque *Dinter* (cf. 33.4 et *BC* 1.67.4) | exercitibus imperiisque <aduersariorum coactus> *Klotz, Cornelissen secutus (u. supra)* | nisi *mauis* <et coactus> potestatibus imperiisque (cf. *Cic. Leg. 1.23*) | | imperiisque in *MU^rSTV* | imperiisque *U^{re}*

This extract is part of Deiotarus' speech as a suppliant before Caesar. His defense has two parts. Here, he explains that his military support of Pompey was a consequence of the absence of Caesarian troops in his region. In the

¹ "... the fact that, as he was located in a part of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons and was under the compulsion of armies and orders, he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey."

following sentence he adds that he did not think he should be a judge of Roman conflicts. Caesar's response is given in 68.1; he objects mainly to the latter sentence.

The main puzzle in this passage is the syntax of *exercitibus imperiisque*. In the paradosis neither word is obviously connected to any expression in the vicinity, and the plural forms make a peculiar pair:

... quod in ea parte positus terrarum quae
nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset exercitibus
imperiisque in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

Scholars have proposed numerous solutions.

Markland (1723, 129) proposed emending to *excitusque imperiis*, transposing the connective and converting *exercitibus* into a causal participle parallel to *positus*.

... quod in ea parte positus terrarum quae
nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset excitusque
imperiis in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, since he was located in a part
of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons
and summoned by orders, he had been in the
camp of Gnaeus Pompey

The instrumental ablative is a neat and attractive solution to the syntax problem, and one can hypothesize a two-step innovation: first the substitution of the common word *exercitibus* for the rare participle *excitus*, and second the transposition of the connective to connect the two nouns. But *excitus* is indeed rare. In fact the only extant example occurs at *BHisp* 4.4 *itaque Cn. Pompeius ... litteris fratris excitus ... ad Cordubam iter facere coepit*. So this solution is not entirely convincing.

In 1861 Kraner (LVIII) suggested a slight modification to Markland's repair, excising the connective and thereby linking *excitus* more tightly to *fuisse*.

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae
nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset, excitus
imperiis in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world
that had no Caesarian garrisons, having been
summoned by orders he had been in the camp
of Gnaeus Pompey

Here the distinction between the two causal participles is hard to justify.

In 1873 Madvig proposed emending *exercitibus* to *excitus uerbis*, pointing out that *excitus* itself is too short to yield *exercitibus*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae
nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset, excitus
uerbis imperiisque in Cn. Pompei castris
fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world
that had no Caesarian garrisons, having been
summoned by verbal orders he had been in the
camp of Gnaeus Pompey

The connective now links *uerbis* and *imperiis* in a hendiadys. But *uerbis* does not add much to the sense of what is happening, there are no close parallels pairing *uerbis* with *imperiis*, and the separation between *positus* and *excitus* remains hard to justify.

In 1886 Larsen (27) suggested a paleographically and semantically superior version of this repair:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae
nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset, excitus
precibus imperiisque in Cn. Pompei castris
fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons, having been summoned by pleas and orders he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey

Precibus contributes more meaning than *uerbis*, and the scribe of the archetype will have substituted *exercitibus* for a less common expression beginning with *ex-* and ending with *-ibus*. Larsen cites a passage from Cicero's speech for Deiotarus as evidence for the different ways in which the king's behavior could be characterized: Cic. *Deiot.* 13 *uenit (sc. Deiotarus ad Pompeium) uel rogatus ut amicus uel arcessitus ut socius uel euocatus ut is, qui senatui parere didicisset*. With Larsen's reading Deiotarus appears to be covering himself with a similar range of options.

In 1887 Dinter took a new approach to the puzzle, adding *coercitus* before *exercitibus imperiisque* and leaving the noun phrase as in the *paradosis*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset, coercitus exercitibus imperiisque in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons, constrained by armies and orders he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey

Coerceo is not as rare as *excio*, although the perfect passive participle occurs nowhere in the Caesarian corpus. The verb itself is used once elsewhere in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, of rulers who might prove ungrateful to Rome: 33.4 *si essent ingrati, posse isdem praesidiis coerceri*. Similarly, there is an ablative of means with the infinitive at *BC* 1.67.4: *at luce multum per se pudorem omnium oculis, multum etiam tribunorum militum et centurionum praesentiam adferre, quibus rebus coerceri milites et in officio contineri soleant*. On the whole, this suggestion is helpful in preserving the transmitted nouns and in proposing a more common verb, although the absence of any participial forms of this verb is troubling.

In 1889 Cornelissen tried a drastically different approach, inserting *in* before *Caesaris*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia <in> Caesaris habuisset exercitibus imperiisque, in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world that had no defenses in Caesar's armies and orders, he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey

The *praesidia* are now metaphorical and the armies and orders are Caesar's, not Pompey's. There are some parallels for *Caesaris* coming between *in* and its ablative object, particularly in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*, e.g., at 23.1 *ut admoniti a regis amicis qui in Caesaris erant praesidiis*, where as in our passage a verb comes between *Caesaris* and the ablative dependent on *in*. It is possible to explain how *in* fell out in our passage, given the oddity of its placement next to a genitive.² The main difficulty with this suggestion is that all other examples of *in Caesaris praesidiis* or *in Caesaris castris* have a spatial sense that is lacking here, since these armies do not actually exist and so have no spatial location.

The next year Hoffmann 1890, who had printed the paradosis in his first edition, offered his own solution to the problem of *exercitibus imperiisque*, inserting *coactus* after the pair:

²U's omission of *in* before Pompey's name later in the sentence may or may not be relevant.

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset, exercitibus imperiisque <coactus> in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons, under the compulsion of armies and orders, he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey

Cogere is a fairly common word in the Caesarian corpus, and this use of the participle with an ablative of means is paralleled in the *Bellum Alexandrinum*: 43.1 *magnisque difficultatibus coactus*. On the whole, this is a promising suggestion, although critics have felt that the line still needed further work.

In 1927 Klotz, retaining Cornelissen's *in*, added *adversariorum* before Hoffmann 1890's *coactus*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia <in> Caesaris habuisset exercitibus, imperiisque <adversariorum coactus> in Cn. Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, located in a part of the world that had no defenses in the form of Caesar's

armies, and under the compulsion of the orders of Caesar's enemies, he had been in the camp of Gnaeus Pompey

The non-existent armies are now Caesar's and the commands come from Caesar's enemies. Klotz is the first to take *-que* as breaking up two phrases rather than joining two nouns. In doing so, Klotz diagnoses a problem, namely, that the combination of plural forms of *exercitus* and *imperium* is problematic, since it does not occur elsewhere in the Caesarian corpus and is rare elsewhere, even though the two words are individually very common.³ But Klotz' proposal requires emendation in two spots in the same phrase. The hypothesis of independent omissions is not very likely.

Since none of the solutions discussed has been entirely satisfactory, we have adopted a different repair. We follow most editors in inserting a participle to govern the instrumental ablatives; Hoffmann 1890's *coactus* seems the most persuasive suggestion, since it is the most common in Caesarian usage. But we place the participle before *exercitibus*

³Where the plurals do appear in tandem *imperia* generally has a broader sense than is appropriate here: e.g., Cic. *Clu.* 154 *insignia, fasces, exercitus, imperia, prouinciae*.

imperiisque and insert a connective to facilitate the coordination of *positus* and *coactus*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum
 quae nulla praesidia Caesaris habuisset
 <et coactus>exercitibus imperiisque, in Cn.
 Pompei castris fuisset

... the fact that, as he was located in a part
 of the world that had no Caesarian garrisons
 and was under the compulsion of armies and
 orders, he had been in the camp of Gnaeus
 Pompey.

The omission of *et* and the following word might have been prompted by the ending of *habuisset*. We have left *exercitibus imperiisque* intact, since the *exercitibus* of unspecified supporters of Pompey corresponds to the *praesidia* that Caesar has not provided. Admittedly, the unusual combination is problematic. Furthermore, if Deiotarus is claiming that he was forced to join Pompey by Pompeian armies, one might expect Caesar to point out that the king did not actually engage in combat with these armies. Instead, in his reply, Caesar focuses exclusively on Deiotarus' subsequent claim that he did not know whose *imperia* to obey. To keep the

focus on *imperiiis*, we have suggested *potestatibus* as a possible alternative to *exercitibus*, a term that is found in combination with *imperiiis*: cf. Cic. *Leg.* 1.23 *si uero isdem imperiis et potestatibus parent*, and Liu. 4.54.7: *salii flaminesque nusquam ... sine imperiis ac potestatibus relinquuntur*.

68.1

Amelia Bensch-Schaus and Cynthia Damon

Contra quem Caesar cum plurima sua commemorasset officia quae consul ei decretis publicis tribuisset cumque defensionem eius nullam posse excusationem eius imprudentiae recipere coarguisset, quod homo tantae prudentiae ac diligentiae scire potuisset quis urbem Italiamque teneret ...¹

defensionem (defensonem *U^{ac}*) eius *MU^fSTV* | defec-
tionem eius *ς* *teste Dübner* (cf. *BG* 7.67.7) | [defensionem
eius] *seclisit Dauisius 1727 ut glossema ad excusationem (u. et*
infra), sed cf. de pleonasmō Cic. Rab. Post. 27 Rufum necessitatis
excusatio defendet || posse *MUSTV* | posse (se) *Dauisius (u.*
et supra) (cf. *Sen. Ben. 7.16.3*) || eius² *MUSTV* (de iteratione
cf. *BG* 1.20.5) | [eius] *Clarke*

The transmitted text of this passage contains a bold personification and an apparent pleonasm: *recipere* has *defensionem* as

¹“In reply to him, Caesar, after he had recalled his own very numerous services, which he as consul bestowed upon him by public decrees, and after he had argued that his (*sc.* Deiotarus’) defense could not contain any excuse of ignorance on his part, since a man of such great foresight and attentiveness was able to know who held the city and Italy ...”

its subject and *excusationem* as its object. A lesser objection is the fact that *defensio* has a military meaning in its seven other occurrences in the *corpus Caesarianum*.

Madvig condemned the construction in no uncertain terms (1873, 285 n.1 “hae sordes”) and praised the repair found in Clarke’s 1712 edition and in some manuscripts—replacing the objectionable *defensionem* with *defectionem*—on the grounds that “factum recipit aut non recipit defensionem excusationemque imprudentiae” (*ibid.*). However, the textual support for Madvig’s obiter dictum is rather thin. The best parallel for a “factum” as the recipient of an excuse is Cic. *Agr.* 3.5 *inuidiosa lex ... habet excusationem*, where the verb is different. It is in fact clear from the *TLL* entry on *excusatio* that a person is normally the subject of such expressions, as at *BG* 6.4.3 *libenter Caesar petentibus Haeduis dat ueniam excusationemque accipit* (*TLL* 5.2.1299.73–82, with verbs including *accipere*, *adimere*, *dare*, *habere*, *obtendere*, *parare*, *praebere*; there are two examples of *recipere*). The “factum” is normally expressed with a genitive, e.g., *imprudentiae* in the present passage (*TLL* 5.2.1298.55–82).

In 1727 Dausius 1727, who had printed the *paradosis* in Dausius 1706, criticized the emendation that Madvig would later pronounce “certissima” on the grounds of its historical inaccuracy: Deiotarus never defected from Cae-

sar (as Litaucicus, for example, did in *BG* 7) because he was on Pompey's side from the beginning of the civil war.² Instead of changing the noun, Dauisius excised *defensionem eius* as a gloss on *excusationem eius imprudentiae*; he also added ⟨*se*⟩ after *posse* to supply the requisite personal subject. The implicit innovations are plausible enough individually, but the combination is less so.³ And the historical case against *defectionem* depends on a literal interpretation of a highly rhetorical passage.

Klotz suggests in his apparatus that the transmitted text can perhaps be explained as a pleonasm. Cicero uses a similarly pleonastic expression for “defense by excuse” at *Rab. Post.* 27: *Rufum necessitatis excusatio defendet*. The wording is different, but the concept is perhaps sufficiently similar to defend the paradosis, particularly given the problems inherent in the repairs currently on offer. The fact that *defensio* is exclusively military elsewhere in the *corpus Caesar-*

²The charge of defection does occur in Dio's account of these negotiations, where Caesar blames *Pharnaces* for deserting his benefactor Pompey (42.47.4): ἐπεκάλεισεν αὐτῷ ... ὅτι τὸν Πομπήιον τὸν εὐεργέτην ἐγκατέλιπεν.

³The repair printed by Kübler 1896a is even less plausible. He accepted the addition of ⟨*se*⟩ but also transposed *coarguisset* to follow *defensionem eius* and punctuated the sixty-two words from *nullam* to *deprecandum* as a parenthesis.

ianum should not make us reluctant to accept its forensic meaning here, since the context contains other “courtroom” words: 67.1 *reorum habitu*, 67.2 *iudicem esse*, 68.1 *de controuersüs tetrarcharum ... se cogniturum esse*.

7 2 . 2 – 3

Wes Hanson and Cynthia Damon

Circumpositi sunt huic oppido (*sc.* Zelae) magni multique intercisi uallibus colles, quorum editissimus unus, qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri, superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido, magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus passuum tribus abest ab Zela—hunc locum Pharnaces, ueteribus paternorum feliciū castrorum reffectis operibus, copiis suis omnibus occupauit.¹

huic *M* (*cf. Tac. Ann. 14.15.2*) | hoc *USTV* || multique intercisi *MUSTV* (*cf. Sen. Ep. 90.18 et BC 3.43.1*) | multisque intercisi *Schneider* (*cf. 61.1 et Cic. Att. 4.15.5*) |

¹“Many large hills separated by valleys surround this town. And the highest of these, a single hill that on account of Mithridates’ victory and Triarius’ misfortune and the defeat of our army [*sc.* it is] practically connected to the town by relatively high ground and paths) has a great notoriety in those parts and is not much more than three miles away from Zela—(3) this location Pharnaces occupied with all of his troops after the old defenses of the camp that was lucky for his father were repaired.”

nisi mauis multique intercisis (cf. 73.3) || unus qui *MUTV*
 (de *anacolutho* u. *Damon* 2015b, 242) | qui *S non male* |
nisi mauis unus [qui] uel unus <est> qui || superioribus ...
 oppido *transposuerunt post unus Klotz dubitanter, post nobilitatem*
Morus dubitanter, post Zela Madvig 1.48–49 | *seclussit*
ut glossema Vielhaber 1869 | *alii alia* || itineribus *MUSTV* |
 <commodis> itineribus *Klotz* (cf. *BC* 3.97.3) || coniunctus
MUSTV | coniunctus <est> *Vielhaber* 1864 *Morum secutus* |
 coniunctis *Larsen, qui Madvig secutus est* || nec *MUSTV* |
 non *Morus dubitanter*

This description of the famous site of two consequential battles—according to Pliny, Zela was *nobilis clade Triarii et uictoriae C. Caesaris* (*Nat.* 6.10)—is barely legible. Editors have been variously tolerant of its difficulties since none of the words is obviously corrupt and the general picture is clear: Pharnaces established his camp on the prominent hill near Zela on which his formidable father, Mithridates, had established his own camp twenty years earlier and from which Mithridates had inflicted a devastating defeat on Roman troops led by C. Valerius Triarius.² The themes introduced

²On the battle in 67 BCE see Plut. *Luc.* 35.1, App. *Mith.* 88–89.397–408, D.C. 36.12–13. According to Appian the name of the hill was τὸ Σκότιον ὄρος (*Mith.* 120.595). Appian (*Mith.* 89.403–404, 406) and Dio (36.12.4) situate the fighting on level ground.

here—the memory of the earlier battle and the nature of the terrain—are both prominent in the subsequent narrative.³

The main problems in the *paradosis* pertain to the stretch of text *quorum ... Zela*.

quorum editissimus unus qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus passuum tribus abest ab Zela

- 1 The clause introduced by *quorum* lacks a verb.
- 2 The words *superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido*, which pertain to terrain, seem out of place in the middle of a relative clause about the memory of an earlier battle. But the unusual expression (see below) is unlikely to have originated as a gloss. And the severity of this problem depends in part on what one takes to be the point of *coniunctus oppido*: is the

³The earlier battle: 73.2, 74.3; the terrain: 73.1–3 (valleys), 74.1–4 and 76.2 (the disadvantages of the terrain), 76.1 (the slope).

hill's connection to Zela relevant to the tactics of the coming battle, or to the memory of both battles? As it happens, the town *per se* plays no role in either battle: it is nothing more than a place name for battles fought in the vicinity. Accounts of the battle of 67 BCE situate it on level ground (see above, note 2), while Incertus situates Caesar's battle near a *collis* more than three miles from the town.

- 3 The syntax of *superioribus locis* is puzzling: by itself it might be taken as a local ablative (cf. *BC* 1.65.1 *locis superioribus constitit* and possibly 12.1 *superioribus locis subleuabantur*; contra, 35.3 *in locis superioribus*) but with *atque itineribus* it seems to be a rather loose ablative either of route (cf. 35.3 *locisque superioribus iter facere instituit*) or means (cf. 30.3 *castellum ... brachiis ... cum opere castrorum coniunxerat*). Furthermore the adjective is unexpected given the prominence of *editissimus*—which places are higher than the highest hill?—and the expression *superioribus ... itineribus* is unparalleled.⁴

⁴In the apparent parallel at *BC* 1.51.2 *superiorum temporum atque itinerum licentia* the adjective has a temporal sense. Klotz (1927, ad loc.) suggests adding ⟨*commodis*⟩ before *itineribus*.

- 4 The grammatical connection created by *nec* between *habet* and *abest* seems arbitrary, given the divergent referents of the two verbs, reputation for the one, terrain for the other. The latter verb seems better suited to the clause introduced by *quorum editissimus*.
- 5 The adjective *unus* is strangely emphatic. There is another emphatic *unus* at 25.6 *Ita qui unus ex omnibus eo proelio bene rem gessit solus cum sua quadriga uictrix perijt*, but in that passage *unus* prepares the way for *solus*. The adjective in our passage has no comparable role. It is hard to say whether its omission by S is deliberate. Another possibility is that *unus* originated in a misconstrued abbreviation, here possibly for *est* (cf. ad *BC* 3.19.4, where the original might have been *primo*).

Problem 1 is the easiest to solve: as Clarke said in 1712 (543), one can either understand *est* after *unus* or assume an anacoluthon. In the latter scenario the thought initiated by *editissimus unus* is eventually expressed by *hunc locum Pharnaces ... occupauit*. Comparable anacolutha introduced by prominent nominatives occur in both the *BG* (3.22.1–4 *Adiatuanus*) and the *BC* (3.18.3–4 *Vibullius*, 3.19.3–4 *locutus*,

3.44.6 *loca*).⁵ One could also address the problem by adding *<est>* or excising *<qui>*.

Problem 4, too, responds to relatively simple approaches. Oudendorp (1737), for example, uses punctuation:

quorum editissimus unus, qui propter
uictoriam Mithridatis, et infelicitatem Triari,
detrimentumque exercitus nostri, superioribus
locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido,
magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem;
nec multo longius milibus passuum III abest
ab Zela.

Problem 2 has been addressed by a variety of transpositions, all of them serial innovations: omission of the original string of words, addition of the string in the margin *uel sim.*, insertion of the string into the text at an inappropriate spot.

Morus (1780, ad loc.), who prints the paradosis, explains in a note how to address problems 1, 2, and 4 by moving *superioribus ... oppido* to after *nobilitatem*, making the relative clause a parenthesis, and altering *nec* to *non*:

quorum editissimus unus, (qui propter
uictoriam Mithridatis, et infelicitatem

⁵See Damon 2015b, 242.

Triari, detrimentumque exercitus nostri,
[superioribus locis atque itineribus paene
 coniunctus oppido] magnam in illis partibus
 habet nobilitatem, ⟨superioribus locis atque
 itineribus paene coniunctus oppido, non⟩
 multo longius milibus passuum III abest ab
 Zela.

Vielhaber 1864 (25) later varied the response to problem 4 by making the verb for the *quorum*-clause *coniunctus* *⟨est⟩* and placing a period before Morus' *non*.⁶

Quorum editissimus unus, qui propter
 uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem
 Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri
[superioribus locis atque itineribus paene
 coniunctus oppido] magnam in illis partibus
 habet nobilitatem, ⟨superioribus locis atque
 itineribus paene coniunctus est oppido⟩. Non
 multo longius milibus passuum III abest ab
 Zela.

⁶Klotz (1927, ad loc.) comments that the addition of *⟨est⟩* is “praeter necessitatem.”

But later (1869, 574) Vielhaber 1869 abandoned this complicated repair and suggested instead that *superioribus ... oppido* was an incorporated gloss that was subsequently corrupted.

Quorum editissimus unus qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri [superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido] magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus passuum III abest ab Zela.

Madvig (1873, 1.48–49) addressed problem 2 by moving *superioribus ... oppido* to the end of the sentence.

Quorum editissimus (*sc.* est) unus qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri [superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido] magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus passuum III abest ab Zela, <superioribus locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus oppido>.

This creates a useful, if tacit, antithesis between *abest* and *paene coniunctus*, strengthening the topographical significance of *coniunctus*. But as Vielhaber 1869 says (1869, 574) the term is “bei einer Entfernung von mehr als 3/5 Meilen auffällig.” And in this position *superioribus* is oddly lacking in point: how does the close connection on high ground qualify the absolute distance between the hill and the city?

Larsen (1886, 28–29) added a solution for problem 3 to Madvig’s repair by turning the transposed string into a terminal ablative absolute:

quorum editissimus (*sc.* est) unus qui propter
uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari
detrimentumque exercitus nostri [superioribus
locis atque itineribus paene coniunctus
oppido] magnam in illis partibus habet
nobilitatem nec multo longius milibus
passuum III abest ab Zela, (superioribus locis
atque itineribus paene coniunctis oppido).

The resulting text bears a certain resemblance to the description of the terrain at Nicopolis: 36.3 *quod oppidum positum* (*sc.* *Nicopolis*) *in Armenia minore est plano ipsum loco, montibus tamen altis ab duobus lateribus obiectis, satis magno interuallo ab*

oppido remotis. But the presence of *tamen* here makes the point of this terminal ablative much clearer.

Problem 3 is addressed head-on by Kübler 1896a (ad loc.), who rewrites the text thus:

quorum editissimus unus, qui propter uictoriam Mithridatis et infelicitatem Triari detrimentumque exercitus nostri superioribus acceptum temporibus [paene coniunctus oppido] magnam in illis partibus habet nobilitatem, <paene coniunctus est oppido> nec multo longius milibus passuum III abest ab Zela.

The description of the site is now much more legible, but to get from this original to the *paradosis* would have required a minimum of five innovations.⁷

Klotz (1927, ad loc.), pronouncing the passage a “locus nondum probabiliter emendatus,” obelizes *superioribus* ... *oppido*, as does Andrieu (1954, ad loc.).⁸ But as was mentioned earlier, none of the words is obviously corrupt,

⁷Kübler 1896b discusses this emendation briefly in his 1896 *Philologus* article “Recisamenta critica,” on pp. 154–155.

⁸In his apparatus Klotz (1927, ad loc.) proposes yet another transposition, moving *superioribus* ... *oppido* earlier in the sentence, to follow *unus*.

so desperation seems unwarranted. We have used a dash to mark the anacoluthon and assumed that *superioribus ... oppido* was something of an afterthought, added by Incertus to explain why the two battles were remembered as having been fought at Zela, when they weren't. The distance is also minimized later in the sentence with *nec multo longius*, and *superioribus* may have been prompted by *excelsiore ... fastigio* in the description of Zela itself. (We would have punctuated the afterthought as a parenthesis except that the profusion of dashes would have been confusing.) Incertus may have been motivated by the distinction between what was remembered locally (*in illis partibus*, an otherwise surprising qualification), namely, the *collis*, Mt. Scotius, and the place name, Zela, to which his readers will have attached their knowledge of these battles.

(See also note 4 in this section.) The topographical information sits well there, but the arbitrariness of *nec* is even more striking without *paene* in close proximity.

7 4 . 4

Wes Hanson and Cynthia Damon

Cuius aliquamdiu Caesar irridebat inanem ostentationem et eo loco militum coartationem quem in locum nemo sanus hostis subiturus esset, cum interim Pharnaces eodem gradu quo in procliuem descenderat uallem ascendere aduersus arduum collem instructis copiis coepit.¹

coartationem *Brutus* (cf. *Liu.* 27.46.2) | cohortationem *MUSTV* || locum *ed. pr.* | loco *MUSTV* || hostis *MUSTV* | [hostis] *Bentley* || in procliuem *Nipperdey* (cf. 76.1 *et, de antithesi, Liu.* 5.43.2) | in proelium *ST* | in bellum *V* | praeruptam in proelium *U* | in praeruptam *M(u. 74.3 et cf., de antithesi, Plin. Nat. 2.174)*

The transmitted text of a sentence that shows an incredulous Caesar watching Pharnaces lead his army onto unfavorable ground needs repair in at least three spots:

¹“For some time Caesar kept laughing at the empty show and the massing of soldiers in a spot into which no sane enemy would advance, when in the meantime Pharnaces, with the same pace with which he had descended into the downward-sloping valley, began to climb the steep hill opposing him with his troops in battle formation.”

cuius aliquamdiu Caesar irridebat inanem ostentationem et eo loco militum cohortationem quem in loco nemo sanus hostis subiturus esset cum interim Pharnaces eodem gradu quo in proelium/praeruptam descenderat uallem ascendere aduersus arduum collem instructis copiis coepit.

In the first two spots the problems are clear and permit convincing resolutions.² The archetype's reading at the third spot, however, is a puzzle in itself. Since Pharnaces is at this moment moving up a hillside intending to fight a battle, the combination of *in proelium* and the pluperfect *descenderat* makes little sense. However, the presence of the unwanted expression *in proelium* in both branches of the stemma (ST and U) indicates that this reading was in the archetype and in its descendants v and μ. In the v branch V will have substituted the synonymous *in bellum* (for innovations in V see Damon 2015a, lviii-lix). The reading of μ is harder to discern: it must have had *in proelium*, since U has this phrase, but it must also have had

²We also note the excision of *hostis* proposed by Bentley (1742, ad loc.); the term is certainly peculiar in this context, where a more neutral word such as *dux* would be more plausible, if any word at all is needed.

praeruptam, which is in both U and M. It is possible but not demonstrable that these variants reached μ from the archetype (for archetypal variants see Damon 2015a, xxiv-xxv). If so, *praeruptam* was not transmitted to v's descendants, perhaps because the hyperbaton *in praeruptam ... uallem* seemed more immediately problematic than *in proelium*.³ Be that as it may, what one wants to know is whether *praeruptam* reached μ by transmission, in other words, whether it may be an authentic reading.

The fact that the valley into which Pharnaces had descended was described as *praerupta* in the preceding sentence (74.3 *At Pharnaces ... descendere praerupta ualle coepit*) suggests that the adjective may have been supplied here as a convenient repair for the semantic problem discussed above. On the other hand, *eodem gradu* suggests that Incertus wanted the two phrases read together here, and in any case he is not particularly scrupulous about avoiding repetition (see Gaertner-Hausburg 2013, 37 n. 38). But if *in praeruptam* was the original reading, it is hard to see how *in proelium* arose. It cannot have been an unconscious remembrance of a phrase

³ On hyperbata in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* see Gaertner and Hausburg 2013, 36–39. Incertus is particularly fond of clause-ending hyperbata of the form adjective-verb-substantive (see the discussion of 35.3 above, n. 11).

used elsewhere in the *corpus*, since *in proelium descendere* occurs only at Fron. *Strat.* 2.1.10 *ut in proelium cum coniugibus ac liberis descenderent*, and *in proelium* is altogether absent from the *corpus Caesarianum*.

Nipperdey (1847, ad loc.) proposed an emendation that clarifies the origin of *in proelium*:

... cum interim Pharnaces eodem gradu quo
in procliuem descenderat uallem ascendere
aduersus arduum collem instructis copiis co-
epit.

The noun will have arisen as a misreading of *procliuem*, an adjective that appears only three times elsewhere in the *corpus* (76.1 *cum in procliui detruderentur hostes*; *BC* 1.48.8 *quibus erat procliuē tranare flumen*; *BAfr* 10.1 *omnia sibi procliuiā*), in two of which it has its metaphorical meaning “easy.” *Procliuis* is not elsewhere applied to *uallis*, but it is used with topographical substantives such as *pauimentum*, *solum*, *saxum*, *locus*, and *uia* (see *TLL* 10.2.1537.68–1538.13 “de iis quae [qui] positionem uel formam inclinatam habent”). And it is used in antithesis with *arduus* at Liu. 5.43.2 (*in arduum ... per procliuē*) and Sen. *Dial.* 7.25.6 (*in procliui ... aduersus ardua*).

Both *in praeruptam* and *in procliuem* have merits, and it is difficult to choose one over the other. In the end, however,

we decided to print Nipperdey's emendation, to indicate that we think that *in praeruptam* is more likely to be a scribal innovation based on 74.3 *praerupta ualle* than to be authentic text.