



---

---

# 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

<b>Preface</b>	<b>iii</b>
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
<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>xlvi</b>
Manuscripts . . . . .	xlvii

Early Editions . . . . .	1
Modern Editions . . . . .	li
Other Sources . . . . .	lvi
List of People Cited by Name . . . . .	lxv
Abbreviations and Other Notations . . . . .	lxviii
<b>Conspectus Editionum</b>	<b>lxix</b>
<b>Bellum Alexandrinum</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Appendix critica</b>	<b>91</b>
<b>Translation</b>	<b>124</b>
<b>Studies on the Text</b>	<b>200</b>
2.5 . . . . .	200
7.2–3 . . . . .	207
12.1–2 . . . . .	216
13.5 . . . . .	226
17.1–3 . . . . .	233
22.1–2 . . . . .	245
26.1–2 . . . . .	258
27.5 . . . . .	276
31.3 . . . . .	288
35.3 . . . . .	292

36.4–5 . . . . .	300
40.2 . . . . .	309
46.1 . . . . .	319
47.2 . . . . .	323
49.1 . . . . .	326
49.2–3 . . . . .	332
60.2 . . . . .	343
63.5 . . . . .	352
66.3–4 . . . . .	359
67.1 . . . . .	369
68.1 . . . . .	380
72.2–3 . . . . .	384
74.4 . . . . .	395



# ***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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>OUP 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.<sup>3</sup> In fifty-three places we print the archetype (or a possibly archetypal reading) where other editors emend it.<sup>4</sup> We print thirteen new emendations and

---

<sup>3</sup>42.2 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).

<sup>4</sup>1.5 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.<sup>5</sup> We also revive fourteen.<sup>6</sup> 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<sup>2</sup>, 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.

<sup>5</sup>11.2 ⟨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*.

<sup>6</sup>2.1 ⟨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).<sup>7</sup> None of Caesar's officers is known to have

---

<sup>7</sup>The 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.<sup>8</sup> 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.

---

<sup>8</sup>The 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.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> Accordingly, we used the same bipartite stemma.

### B. The witnesses

---

<sup>9</sup>For 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.

<sup>10</sup>As 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.

<sup>10</sup>More 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**).<sup>11</sup> Disagreement among our manuscript witnesses

---

<sup>11</sup>Possible instances can be found throughout the apparatus, but the clearest examples are these: 9.3 dediticiis  $U^eSV$  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  $V^e$ ; 26.2 ibi suum  $UST$  et  $M^{mr}$  : suum ibi  $MV$ ; 32.3 precari  $MT^eV$  : precare  $UST^{ac}$ ; 45.1 cum Vatinium  $MUV$  : 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 crebat  $UST$  : credebat  $MV$ ; 57.3 ex  $USV$  : et  $MT$ ; 58.3 inscriptum  $UST$  : scriptum  $MV$ ; 60.4 esse  $U^{ac}STV$  : eum  $MU^e$ ; 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.<sup>12</sup>

## 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.<sup>13</sup>

**a. p** Numerous innovations common to **M** and **U** are consistent with descent from a hyparchetype, **p**. 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].

<sup>12</sup>Variants: 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<sup>ac</sup>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].

<sup>13</sup>The 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<sup>mr</sup>*
- 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 quem<sup>1</sup> *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  **$\pi$**  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<sup>c</sup> et uocibus perpere diuisis U* : consules  
sed *M<sup>ac</sup>* : consules se *S* : consules *TV non male*
- 70.5 se *MUS* : *om. TV*
- 76.1 in *MUS* : *om. TV*<sup>14</sup>

The relative number of words omitted in these two lists suggests that **π** is a more faithful copy of **ν** than **S** is; this is borne out by other sorts of singular readings, which are vastly more numerous in **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 **T** and **V** and separate them from the rest of the tradition, more than 50 for the *Bellum Alexandrinum*; the traditional

---

<sup>14</sup>Textual variation between **π** and **μ** in some of the many passages omitted by **S** make it unlikely that these omissions were filled by contamination from the **μ** branch. There are also some small discrepancies between **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  $\pi$ .<sup>15</sup> 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<sup>ac</sup>* : pugna occupatum animum haberet *M<sup>c</sup>*
- 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*)

---

<sup>15</sup>Hering (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.<sup>16</sup> The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 133v-143r. **M** offers some uniquely successful or meritorious innovations (those

---

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

marked with an asterisk are particularly impressive<sup>17</sup>; 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*

---

<sup>17</sup>Also 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.<sup>18</sup> 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.<sup>19</sup> The uniquely successful innovations in **U** are few and mostly cautious<sup>20</sup> (there are of course other spots

---

<sup>18</sup>Microfilm images are available online: [https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS\\_Vat.lat.3324](https://digi.vatlib.it/view/MSS_Vat.lat.3324).

<sup>19</sup>In 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.

<sup>20</sup>Also 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<sup>mr</sup>* : ibi tuasius *MTV* : ibit uasius *S*
- 73.1 munituras *U* : munitura *M* : muniturus *ST et V<sup>x</sup> ut uidetur* : munitur *V<sup>ac</sup>*

**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 innovator<sup>21</sup> 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 <sup>22</sup>):

---

<sup>21</sup>On 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.

<sup>22</sup>Also noteworthy in **S**: 8.4 *aduersos* (*sc.* *impetus*) *ex munitionibus sustineri MUTV* : *aduersos* (*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<sup>e</sup>UTV*
  - \*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.<sup>23</sup> The *Bellum Alexandrinum* occupies ff. 122va-136ra. For the *Bellum Alexandrinum* **T** only offers one successful innovation<sup>24</sup> (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<sup>c</sup> et M<sup>mr</sup> : diuturnitates confirmarentur MUST<sup>ac</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>24</sup>Another noteworthy correction in **T**: 12.3 *non tamen MU : tamen ST<sup>ac</sup> V : non post cogitationem suppleuit T<sup>c</sup>*.

**V** in the *Bellum Alexandrinum* is much lower than would have been expected based the evidence of the *Bellum ciuile*<sup>25</sup> (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 **μ** in a good reading):

- 59.1 esse<sup>1</sup> *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,

---

<sup>25</sup>Also noteworthy in **V**: 27.5 Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS* et *T supra lineam* : mithridates magna cum potentia *S<sup>ac</sup>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.<sup>26</sup> 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

---

<sup>26</sup>See 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.<sup>27</sup> But

---

<sup>27</sup>Since 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  $\mu$  and  $\nu$ :  $\mu\mathbf{S} \neq \pi$ ,  $\mathbf{U} \neq \mathbf{M}\nu$ , 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  $\nu$ . The same is true, but to a much lesser extent, about  $\mu$ , 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.<sup>28</sup>

- 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.<sup>29</sup>
- 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

---

<sup>28</sup>In 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.

<sup>29</sup>For 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.<sup>30</sup> 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.

---

<sup>30</sup>The **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.<sup>31</sup> 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

---

<sup>31</sup>Or 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.<sup>32</sup>

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.

---

<sup>32</sup>For 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 *vide* [*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.<sup>33</sup>

### C. Appendix critica

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

---

<sup>33</sup>In 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<sup>ac</sup>** (or **M<sup>c</sup>**) implies that **M<sup>c</sup>** (or **M<sup>ac</sup>**) 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<sup>mr</sup>**.

## 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](http://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

[ $\omega$ ] Common source of

[ $\mu$ ] Common source of M and U

[ $\nu$ ] Common source of S and  $\pi$

## Descendants of $\mu$

[M] Florence, BML Plut. lat 68.8 (s. xii<sup>4</sup> or xiii<sup>1</sup>)  
[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<sup>ac</sup>] The uncorrected reading in M. Equivalent to M.

[M<sup>c</sup>] Corrections by the original scribe, who usually recovers the reading of the exemplar.

[M<sup>mr</sup>] 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<sup>mr</sup>.

[U] Vatican, BAV Vat. lat. 3324 (s. xi<sup>4</sup> or xii<sup>1</sup>)

### Hands in U

[U<sup>ac</sup>] The uncorrected reading in U. Equivalent to U.

[U<sup>c</sup>] Corrections by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

### Descendants of v

[S] Florence, BML Ashburnham 33 (s. x<sup>2-3</sup>)

### Hands in S

[S<sup>ac</sup>] The uncorrected reading in S, Equivalent to S.



[S<sup>c</sup>] Corrections made by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

[π] Common source of T and V.

[T] Paris, BNF lat. 5764 (s. xi<sup>3-4</sup>). <http://gallica.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/btv1b10542010c>

### Hands in T

[T<sup>ac</sup>] The uncorrected reading in T, Equivalent to T.

[T<sup>c</sup>] Corrections made by the original scribe or a close contemporary.

[V] Vienna, ÖN 95 (s. xii)

### Hands in V

[V<sup>ac</sup>] The uncorrected reading in V. Equivalent to V.

[V<sup>c</sup>] 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 (1<sup>st</sup> 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](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=6BYsAQAAAJ&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](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. Pinaudi, 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](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	auxiliarias	auxiliares
62.2	Marcellum fouebant	Marcello fauebant
64.2	uenit	⟨uenit⟩
64.3	in	⟨in⟩
64.3	in dērectum	dērectam
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 &lt;regnum&gt;

quod



# BELLUM ALEXANDRINUM

1<sup>1</sup> 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. 2<sup>2</sup> Interim munitiones cotidie operibus augentur atque  
omnes oppidi partes quae minus esse firmae uidentur 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. 3<sup>3</sup> 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 seclussit *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. <sup>4</sup>Caesar maxime studebat ut, quam angustissimam partem oppidi palus a meridie interiecta efficiebat, hanc operibus uineisque agendis ab reliqua parte urbis excluderet, <sup>5</sup>illud 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

<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup>Neque 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. <sup>2</sup>Nec minus in urbe maximae armorum erant institutae officinae. Seruos praeterea puberes armauerant, 15

---

<sup>4</sup> expectans *MUSTV* (cf. *BC* 3.43.3 et u. *Damon* 2015b 116 n.32) | spectans *Vascosanus* (cf. *BC* 3.85.2) || <sup>5</sup> urbs *U* | ubrs *M* | urbis *STV* non male (cf. *BG* 6.43.4 et u. *TLL* 5.1.1596–1597.25) || <sup>8–9</sup> alterius rei copiam exiguam, alterius *MUTV* | alterius *S*, qui uerba 4 omisit || <sup>16</sup> 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. <sup>3</sup>Hac 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. <sup>4</sup>Omnibus 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. <sup>5</sup>Praeterea alias ambulatorias totidem tabulorum confixerant subiectisque eas rotis funibus iumentisque †obiectis† directis plateis in quamcumque erat uisum partem mouebant.

3 <sup>1</sup>Vrbs 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<sup>mv</sup> | 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. <sup>2</sup>Atque haec principes in consiliis contionibusque agitabant: populum Romanum paulatim in consuetudinem eius regni occupandi uenire; <sup>3</sup>paucis 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; <sup>4</sup>quem si non expulissent futuram ex regno prouinciam, idque agendum mature; 10 namque eum interclusum tempestatibus propter anni tempus recipere transmarina auxilia non posse.

**4** <sup>1</sup>Interim 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. <sup>2</sup>Hoc occiso sine ullo socio et cus-

---

5 eius *MUSTV*, quod suspicatur Larsen ('expectes certe illius') 6 ante A. Gabinium *Schneider* | antea gabinium *MUST<sup>r</sup>V<sup>ac</sup>* uel ante agabinium | ante gabinium *T<sup>ac</sup>V<sup>r</sup>* || **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** <sup>1</sup>Alexandria est fere tota suffossa specusque habet ad Nilum pertinentes quibus aqua in priuatas domos inducitur, quae paulatim spatio temporis liquescit ac subsidit. <sup>2</sup>Hac 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. <sup>3</sup>Quo 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** <sup>1</sup>Hoc 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<sup>f</sup>STV* uel soffossa | soffosa *U<sup>ac</sup>* ut uidetur | fossossa *M<sup>ac</sup>* | fossosa *M<sup>f</sup>* || 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. <sup>2</sup>Quam 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. <sup>3</sup>Paruo uero temporis spatio haec propior bibi omnino non poterat, illa inferior corruptior iam salsiorque reperiebatur.

<sup>7</sup> <sup>1</sup>Quo 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 <sup>2</sup>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 ab-  
10 sumeretur. <sup>3</sup>Cum uero uno tempore et natio eorum et natura cognoscatur aptissimum esse hoc genus ad proditionem dubitare nemo potest.

8 <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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* | apparenda *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. <sup>2</sup>Quod 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. <sup>3</sup>Fugae uero nullum esse consilium non solum  
 iis qui primam dignitatem haberent sed ne iis quidem qui  
 nihil praeterquam de uita cogitarent. <sup>4</sup>Magno negotio im-  
 petus hostium aduersos ex munitionibus sustineri. Quibus 10  
 relictis nec loco nec numero pares esse posse. <sup>5</sup>Magnam  
 autem moram et difficultatem ascensum in naues habere  
 praesertim ex scaphis. Summam esse contra in Alexandri-  
 nis uelocitatem locorumque et aedificiorum notitiam. <sup>6</sup>Hos  
 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 <sup>1</sup>Hac 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. <sup>2</sup>Quo 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. <sup>3</sup>Eo 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. <sup>4</sup>Hae 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 <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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<sup>x</sup>SV et M<sup>mr</sup>* | dediciis *MU<sup>nc</sup>T uel* deditiis || 14 Hae *UTV* | haec *M* | haec *S*, quod defendit Landgraf 1891a ||

paulo discederet munitiones nudare nolebat. <sup>2</sup>Cumque  
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. <sup>3</sup>Ex his 5  
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. <sup>4</sup>Itaque naues omnes quas paratas habuerant  
ad nauigandum propugnatoribus instruxerunt Caesarique 10  
redeunti cum classe occurrerunt. <sup>5</sup>Qui 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- 15  
ium defuturum quod nulla satis idonea esset hortatio quae  
neque uirtutem posset notare neque inertiam. <sup>6</sup>Quibus 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 <sup>1</sup>Erat 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. <sup>2</sup>Cui coactus est Caesar ferre subsidium ne turpem in conspectu ⟨suorum⟩ contumeliam acciperet. Quamquam si quid grauius illis accidisset merito casurum iudicabat. <sup>3</sup>Proelium 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. <sup>4</sup>Ita proelium secundissimum est factum. Capta est una  
 15 hostium quadriremis, depressa est altera, duae omnibus

---

2 successuros *MUS* | successoros *M<sup>ac</sup>* | succensures *T<sup>c</sup>V* uel succensores | succensuros *T<sup>ac</sup>* || 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<sup>c</sup>* | alteraque pertur deinde *S<sup>ac</sup>* | 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. <sup>5</sup>Quod nisi nox proelium diremisset tota classe hostium Caesar potitus esset. <sup>6</sup>Hac calamitate perterritis hostibus aduerso uento leniter flante naues onerarias Caesar remulco uictricibus 5 suis nauibus Alexandriam deducit.

**12** <sup>1</sup>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 10 ad terram uerebantur. <sup>2</sup>Idem, posteaquam Ganymedes in concilio confirmauit sese et eas quae essent amissae resti-

---

**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. <sup>3</sup>Ac tametsi amplius CX nauibus longis in portu naualibusque miserant non tamen reparandae classis cogitationem deposuerunt. <sup>4</sup>Videbant 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** <sup>1</sup>Erant 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. <sup>2</sup>Deerant remi. Porticus gymnasia publica aedificia delegebant, asseres remorum usum obtinebant. Aliud natu-

---

**1** adaucturum *M<sup>f</sup>US* | adacturum *M<sup>ac</sup>TV* || **3** CX *Manutius* | ex *MUSTV* || **4** miserant *MUSTV* (*simplex post compositum*) | amiserant *Manutius* || non tamen *MU* | tamen *ST<sup>ac</sup>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. <sup>3</sup>Postremo non longam nauigationem parabant sed praesentis temporis necessitati seruebant et in ipso portu conflagendum uidebant. <sup>4</sup>Itaque 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. <sup>5</sup>Caesar 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. <sup>6</sup>Tamen uirtute militum confisus cognitis hostium copiis se ad dimicandum parabat.

**14** <sup>1</sup>Postquam 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. <sup>2</sup>Post hunc ordinem reliquas naues subsidio dis-  
 tribuit. Quae quamque earum sequatur et cui subueniat  
 5 constituit atque imperat. <sup>3</sup>Non dubitanter Alexandrini  
 classem producunt atque instruunt. In fronte collocant  
 XXII, reliquas subsidiarias in secundo ordine constituunt.  
<sup>4</sup>Magnum praeterea numerum minorum nauigiorum et  
 scapharum producunt cum malleolis ignibusque, si quid  
 10 ipsa multitudo et clamor et flamma nostris terroris adferre  
 possent. <sup>5</sup>Erant 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 <sup>1</sup>Rhodiis nauibus praecerat 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. <sup>2</sup>Hic ob notissimam scientiam  
 atque animi magnitudinem delectus est ab Rhodiis qui  
 imperium classis obtineret. <sup>3</sup>Qui 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. <sup>4</sup>Nos proelium sustinebimus—neque tuum iudicium  
 fallemus—dum reliqui subsequantur. Hos quidem diutius  
 in nostro conspectu gloriari magno nobis et dedecori et do-  
 lori est.’ <sup>5</sup>Caesar illum adhortatus atque omnibus laudibus 10  
 persecutus dat signum pugnae. Progressis ultra uadum  
 IIII, Rhodias naues circumsistunt Alexandrini atque in eas  
 impetum faciunt. <sup>6</sup>Sustinent 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<sup>c</sup>* (cf. BG 7.62.2) | pugna *UST<sup>ac</sup> V<sup>ac</sup>*  
 | pugnandi *V<sup>c</sup>* (cf. 45.3) || Progressis ultra uadum IIII, Rhodias  
*UST<sup>ac</sup> V* | progressas ultra uadum IIII Rhodias *MT<sup>c</sup>* | *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<sup>ac</sup> V* | rate solertiaque  
 se *T<sup>c</sup>* || **16.15–17.1** remi detergerentur *MUT<sup>ac</sup> V* (cf. BC 1.58.1) |  
 remi detergerentur *T<sup>c</sup>* | remi detererentur *Hedicke teste scholio* | rem’  
 detergerent *S* ||

tur, sed semper uenientibus aduersae occurrerent. <sup>7</sup>Interim sunt reliquae subsecutae. Tum necessario discessum ab arte est propter angustias loci, atque omne certamen in uirtute constitit. <sup>8</sup>Neque 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.

**16** <sup>1</sup>Minime 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<sup>ac</sup>* | pugna occupatum animum haberet *M<sup>f</sup>* | 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<sup>f</sup>V* (u. *TLL 10.2.2206.27–41* et cf. *Liu. 23.47.3*) | prospectu locum spectaculoque *T<sup>ac</sup>* | prospectaculo cum spectaculo *M* (*deest S*) | prospectaculo spectaculum *M<sup>tr</sup>* | prospectu illorum (sc. pugnantium) spectacula *Larsen* || **10** par erat *MUT<sup>f</sup>* (*inter par et at non legitur T<sup>ac</sup>*) | 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. <sup>2</sup>Simul illud graue ac miserum uidebatur perpaucos de summa ⟨exercitus⟩ ac de salute omnium decertare. Quorum si qui aut animo aut uirtute cessisset reliquis etiam esset cauendum, quibus pro se pugnandi facultas non fuisset. <sup>3</sup>Haec superioribus diebus saepenumero Caesar suis exposuerat ut hoc maiore animo contenderent quod omnium salutem sibi commendatam uiderent. <sup>4</sup>Eadem suum quisque contubernalem amicum notum prosequens erat obtestatus: ne suam atque omnium falleret opinionem, quorum iudicio delectus ad pugnam proficisceretur. <sup>5</sup>Itaque hoc animo est decertatum ut neque maritimis nauticisque sollertia atque ars praesidium ferret neque numero nauium praestantibus multitudo

---

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<sup>r</sup>TV* | superioribus *U<sup>ac</sup>S* ||

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

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

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

---

<sup>1</sup> electi *Ciacconius* (cf. *BHisp* 15.2 et u. 13.4 idoneos) | flecti *MUSTV*  
| flexi 5 teste *Andrieu* || <sup>2</sup> uirtuti *USTV* | uirtute *T<sup>ac</sup>* | uirtutis *M*  
|| adaequare *MUS* | adaequarent *TV* || <sup>12</sup> ◇ <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) || <sup>14</sup>  
quosque *Lipsius* (cf. *BC* 3.103.1) | quos *MUSTV*, quod defendit *Andrieu*  
*coll.* 77.2 || <sup>15</sup> 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. <sup>4</sup>Ac 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. <sup>5</sup>Sed 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.  
<sup>6</sup>His 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<sup>ac</sup>* | contractis *V<sup>x</sup>* || **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** <sup>1</sup>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, neque nostri  
 5 aut scalis aut cratibus aut reliquis rebus parati uenerant ad oppugnandum. <sup>2</sup>Sed terror hominibus mentem consiliumque eripit et membra debilitat. Vt tum accidit. <sup>3</sup>Qui 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. <sup>4</sup>Multi tamen ex his capti interfectique sunt, sed numerus captiuorum omnino fuit VI milium.

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

---

**1** diutius ea munitione *Dauisius 1706 (cf. BG 2.30.2) | diutius ex munitione MU<sup>U</sup>STV | ex munitionibus diutius U<sup>U</sup> || 3* maioribus *MU | minoribus STV || 5* aut cratibus aut *MUST | aut V, qui uerba 2 omisit || 11* DCCC *M<sup>U</sup>STV | DCCCC M<sup>ac</sup>, 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. <sup>3</sup>Iamque 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.) <sup>4</sup>Quo facto imperat pontem aduersus hostem praeuallari et qua exitus nauibus erat fornice extructo quo pons sustinebatur lapidibus oppleri atque obstrui. <sup>5</sup>Quorum 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<sup>sc</sup>* | sublato *U<sup>e</sup>* || 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. <sup>6</sup>Pugnabatur a nobis ex ponte ex mole, ab illis ex area quae erat aduersus pontem et ex nauibus contra molem.

5 **20** <sup>1</sup>In his rebus occupato Caesare militesque hortante remigum magnus numerus et classiariorum ex longis nauibus nostris in molem se eiecit. <sup>2</sup>Pars 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. <sup>3</sup>Sed 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. <sup>4</sup>Quorum 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.

<sup>5</sup>Quibus 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.

<sup>6</sup>Quorum 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** <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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. <sup>2</sup>Quo 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. <sup>3</sup>Hinc suis laborantibus subsidio scaphas mittens nonnullos conseruauit. Nauigium quidem eius multitudine depressum militum una cum hominibus interiit. <sup>4</sup>Hoc proelio desiderati sunt ex numero legionariorum militum circiter  
 10 CCCC et paulo <ultra> eum numerum classarii et remiges. <sup>5</sup>Alexandrini eo loco castellum magnis munitionibus multisque tormentis confirmarunt atque egestis ex mari lapidibus libere sunt usi postea ad mittenda nauigia.

15 **22** <sup>1</sup>Hoc detrimento milites nostri tantum afuerunt ut perturbarentur ut incensi atque incitati magnas accessiones fecerint in operibus hostium expugnandis. <sup>2</sup>In 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** <sup>1</sup>Alexandrini 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: <sup>2</sup>paratam 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** <sup>1</sup>Caesar etsi fallacem gentem semperque alia cogitantem alia simulantem bene cognitam habebat tamen pe-

---

**1** †multum† *scripsimus* | multum *MUTV* | *an* munitionum (*cf.* 1.2)? *nisi* *maius* *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. <sup>2</sup>Itaque 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. <sup>3</sup>At 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<sup>e</sup>UT* | bellum esset *M<sup>ac</sup>* | 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. <sup>4</sup>Compressis pueri lacrimis Caesar ipse comotus celeriter, si illa sentiret, fore eum secum adfirmans ad suos dimisit. <sup>5</sup>Ille, ut ex carceribus in liberum cursum emissus, adeo contra Caesarem acriter bellum gerere coepit ut lacrimas quas in colloquio proiecerat gaudio uideretur 5  
profudisse. <sup>6</sup>Accidisse 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** <sup>1</sup>Cum 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. <sup>2</sup>Itaque 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<sup>mr</sup>* | 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†. <sup>3</sup>Quod 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. <sup>4</sup>At fortuna, quae plerumque  
 eos quos plurimis beneficiis ornauit ad duriorem casum  
 reseruat, superiorum temporum dissimilis Euphranorem  
 15 prosequabatur. <sup>5</sup>Nam 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. <sup>6</sup>Cui 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** <sup>1</sup>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—<sup>2</sup>Pelusium adducit. Idque oppidum firmo praesidio occupatum Achillae propter op-

10

---

**1** circumuentus *MUSTV* (cf. 55.3) | circumuentus est *M<sup>mr</sup>* (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. <sup>3</sup>Inde 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** <sup>1</sup>Locus 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. <sup>2</sup>Cui 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<sup>mr</sup>* | suum ibi *MV* || **10** pacarat *ς* teste *Oudendorp* (cf. *BG* 3.11.5) | placarat *MUSTV* (cf. *BG* 6.16.3) | placaret *T<sup>ac</sup>* || **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. <sup>3</sup>Quem ad modum autem optabat eum uinci, sic satis habebat interclusum a Caesare a se retineri. <sup>5</sup>Quae primae copiae flumen a Delta transire et Mithridati occurrere potuerunt proelium commiserunt festinantes praeripere subsequentibus uictoriae societatem. <sup>5</sup>Quorum 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) <sup>5</sup> interclusum a Caesare a se *MUST* | interclusum a caesare se *V* | [interclusum a Caesare a se] *Ciacconius*, qui tamen a se interclusum [a Caesare] *malit*, et *Jurinius ut dittographia* ('cum rex ipse cum iis copiis non esset') || <sup>9</sup> ◇ Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS<sup>c</sup>* et *T supra lineam* | mithridates magna cum potentia *S<sup>ac</sup>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 Ciacconio* | constantiaque uirtutis tum Alexandrinorum imprudentia *Madvig qui magna supra secluserit* | constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia *Klotz post facta transposuerit* || <sup>11</sup> incaute *MU* (cf. *Liu.* 7.15.9) | caute *STV* ||

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

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

**28** <sup>1</sup>Mittitur 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. <sup>2</sup>Celeriore 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. <sup>3</sup>Considerat 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** <sup>1</sup>Inter castra et Caesaris iter flumen intercedebat angustum altissimis ripis, quod in Nilum influebat. Aberat autem ab regis castris milia passuum circiter VII. <sup>2</sup>Rex 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. <sup>3</sup>Quae res incendit dolore milites equitesque nostros quod tam diu pari proelio cum Alexandrinis certaretur. <sup>4</sup>Itaque 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  $\varsigma$  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  $\varsigma$  teste Andrieu (cf. Liu. 2.56.15) | certarentur *MUSTV* | certarent  $\varsigma$  teste Klotz (cf. Liu. 5.41.4) || **15** [fluminum] Dübner (cf. BG 2.9.4) | fluminum *MUSTV* | fluminis  $\varsigma$  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. <sup>5</sup>Quorum 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** <sup>1</sup>Caesar re praeclarissime gesta cum subitum aduen-  
tum suum iudicaret magnum terrorem Alexandrinis iniec-  
turum protinus uictor ad castra regis pertendit. <sup>2</sup>Haec 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. <sup>3</sup>Postero 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. <sup>4</sup>Itaque eo cursu quo refugientes  
 Alexandrinos ex castello in castra sunt milites insecuti munitionibus  
 successerunt acerrimeque eminus proeliari 5  
 coeperunt. <sup>5</sup>Duabus ex partibus aditus oppugnationis nostris  
 dabatur: una, quam liberum accessum habere demonstraui,  
 altera, quae mediocre interuallum inter castra et flumen Nilum  
 habebat. <sup>6</sup>Maxima 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** <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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. <sup>2</sup>Quo 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. <sup>3</sup>Quorum 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. <sup>4</sup>Quod periculum plerique Alexandrini fugientes aceruatim se de uallo praecipitarunt in eam partem quae flumini erat adiuncta. <sup>5</sup>Horum primis in ipsa  
 15 fossa munitionis magna ruina oppressis ceteri faciliorem fugam habuerunt. <sup>6</sup>Constat 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<sup>mr</sup> (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** <sup>1</sup>Re 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. <sup>2</sup>Neque eum consilium suum fefellit quin hostes eo proelio audito nihil iam de bello essent cogitaturi. <sup>3</sup>Dignum 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. <sup>4</sup>Caesar 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<sup>c</sup>V* | precare *UST<sup>ac</sup>* ||



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

5 **33** <sup>1</sup>Caesar Aegypto atque Alexandria potitus reges constituit [ut] quos Ptolomaeus testamento scripserat atque  
 obtestatus erat populum Romanum ne mutarentur. <sup>2</sup>Nam  
 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. <sup>3</sup>Legiones ibi ueterana  
 sexta secum reducta ceteras reliquit quo firmitus 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<sup>mr</sup>* (cf. *BG 5.54.2*) | ut *MUSTV* || **6** maiore ex duobus pueris, rege *MUT<sup>c</sup>* | maiorem ex duobus pueris regem *ST<sup>ac</sup>V* | maiore ex duobus pueris [rege] *Krafft* || **11** diuturnitate confirmarentur *T<sup>c</sup>* et *M<sup>mr</sup>* (cf. 53.5 et *u. TLL 4.224.45–79*) | diuturnitates confirmarentur *MUST<sup>ac</sup>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<sup>mr</sup>* || **12** Legiones ibi *5 teste Klotz* | legione ibi *MU* | legiones sibi *S* | legione sibi *TV* || ueterana *MUT<sup>c</sup>* (cf. 69.1, 76.1) | ueteranas *ST<sup>ac</sup>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. <sup>4</sup>Simul 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** <sup>1</sup>Dum 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 <sup>2</sup>Domitius, 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<sup>mr</sup>* | 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. <sup>3</sup>Hanc 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.) <sup>4</sup>Adiungit Cn. Domitius legioni tricesimae sextae duas ab Deiotaro, quas ille disciplina atque armatura nostra complures annos constitutas habebat, equitesque C, totidemque ab Ariobarzane sumit. <sup>5</sup>Mittit 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** <sup>1</sup>Interim 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. <sup>2</sup>[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. <sup>3</sup>His 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 <sup>1</sup>Complures interim legationes Pharnaces ad  
 Domitium mittit quae de pace agerent regiaque munera  
 Domitio ferrent. <sup>2</sup>Ea constanter omnia aspernabatur nec  
 sibi quicquam fore antiquius quam dignitatem populi  
 10 Romani et regna sociorum recipere legatis respondebat.  
<sup>3</sup>Magnis 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. <sup>4</sup>Quibus 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 <sup>5</sup>ut, 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** <sup>1</sup>Haec cum administraret numquam tamen intermit- 10  
 tebat legatos de pace atque amicitia mittere ad Domitium,  
 cum hoc ipso crederet facilius eum decipi posse. <sup>2</sup>At 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. <sup>3</sup>Domitius postero die propius Nicopolim accessit castraque oppido contulit [rex]. Quae dum muniunt nostri Pharnaces aciem instruxit suo more atque instituto. <sup>4</sup>In fronte enim simplici directa acie cornua trinis firmabantur subsidiis. Eadem ratione haec media collocabantur acie, duobus dextra sinistraque interuallis simplicibus ordinibus instructis. <sup>5</sup>Perfecit inceptum castrorum opus Domitius parte copiarum pro uallo constituta.

**38** <sup>1</sup>Proxima 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. <sup>2</sup>Qua cognita re Pharnaces uictoriae loco ducebat si trahere tempus posset, cum discedendum Domitio celeriter putaret. <sup>3</sup>Itaque 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. <sup>4</sup>Inter 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** <sup>1</sup>Domitius 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.  
<sup>2</sup>Tricesimam 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** <sup>1</sup>Signo 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. <sup>2</sup>At  
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. <sup>3</sup>Ita 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.

<sup>4</sup>Ita Pontica legione paene tota amissa, magna parte Deio-  
tari militum interfecta, tricesima sexta (legio) in loca se su-  
periora contulit non amplius CCL desideratis. <sup>5</sup>Ceciderunt  
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** <sup>1</sup>Pharnaces rebus secundis elatus, cum de Caesare ea quae optabat speraret, Pontum omnibus copiis occupavit. Ibique et uictor et crudelissimus rex, cum sibi fortunam 5 paternam feliciore euentu destinaret, multa oppida expugnauit, bona ciuium Romanorum Ponticorumque diripuit, <sup>2</sup>supplicia 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** <sup>1</sup>Sub idem tempus in Illyrico est incommodum acceptum. Quae prouincia superioribus mensibus retenta non tantum sine ignominia sed etiam cum laude erat. <sup>2</sup>Namque 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<sup>ac</sup>* | detendente *TV<sup>x</sup>* || **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. <sup>3</sup>Namque 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. <sup>4</sup>Cum 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<sup>mr</sup>* (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. <sup>5</sup>Omnem enim illam partem regionemque uiuo Cn. Pompeio bellum instauraturam esse credebat.

**43** <sup>1</sup>Gabinus, 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. <sup>2</sup>Ita 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. <sup>3</sup>Quo proelio duobus milibus militum amplius

---

**6** qua *MUSTV* (u. *TLL* 10.1.1449.39–51) | quo *U<sup>re</sup>* 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 <sup>1</sup>Vatinius 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 ualetudine adfectus uix corporis uiribus animum sequebatur, tamen uirtute uicit incommodum naturae difficultatesque et hiemis et subitae praeparationis. <sup>2</sup>Nam cum ipse paucas in portu naues longas haberet litteras in Achaia ad Q. Calenum misit uti sibi classem mitteret. <sup>3</sup>Quod 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<sup>ac</sup>* || 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. <sup>4</sup>Has 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. <sup>5</sup>Hunc oppugnantem Epidaurum terra marique, ubi nostrum erat praesidium, aduentu suo discedere ab oppugnatione coegit praesidiumque nostrum recepit.

**45** <sup>1</sup>Octavius 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. <sup>2</sup>Cum 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. <sup>3</sup>Quod ubi conspexit celeriter uela subduci demittique antemnas iubet et milites armari et uexillo sublato, quo pugnandi dabat signum, quae primae naues subsequerantur idem ut facerent significabat. <sup>4</sup>Parabant se Vatiniani repente oppressi. Parati deinceps Octauiani ex portu procedebant. Instruitur utrimque acies, ordine disposita magis Octauiana, paratior militum animis Vatiniana.

**46** <sup>1</sup>Vatinus 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. <sup>2</sup>Celerrime fortissimeque contra illo remigante naues aduersae rostris concurrerunt adeo uehementer ut naus Octauiana rostro discusso ligno contineretur. <sup>3</sup>Committitur acriter reliquis locis proelium, concurriturque ad duces maxime. Nam cum suo quisque auxilium ferret, magnum comminus in angusto mari proelium factum est. <sup>4</sup>Quantoque 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. <sup>5</sup>Deprimitur 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 genitio 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. <sup>6</sup>Ipse Octavius se in scapham confert. In quam plures cum confugerent depressa scapha, uulneratus tamen adnatat ad suum myoparonem. <sup>7</sup>Eo receptus cum proelium nox dirimeret tempestate magna uelis profugit. Sequuntur hunc suae naues nonnullae, quas casus ab illo periculo uindicarat.

**47** <sup>1</sup>At Vatinius re bene gesta receptui cecinit suisque omnibus incolumibus in eum se portum uictor recepit quo ex portu classis Octaui ad dimicandum processerat. <sup>2</sup>Capit 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. <sup>3</sup>Erat in ea nobilissimum regionum earum oppidum coniunctissimumque Octauio. <sup>4</sup>Quo 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. <sup>5</sup>Ita 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** <sup>1</sup>Iis 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. <sup>2</sup>Itaque

---

**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.  
<sup>3</sup>Multa praeterea et magna praemia singulis concedebat, quae speciosum reddebant praesentem exercitus amorem. Paulatim tamen et occulte militarem disciplinam seueritatemque minuebat.

**49** <sup>1</sup>Cassius 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<sup>ac</sup> compendiis indicatis | conduxit se R C T<sup>c</sup> | conduxisset romanus cassius V || 2* post, cum *Vasconius | postquam MUSTV, quod defendit Landgraf 1889 coll. BAfr 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. <sup>2</sup>Pecuniae 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. <sup>3</sup>Nemo 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** <sup>1</sup>Quibus de causis accidit ut cum Longinus imperator eadem faceret quae fecerat quaestor similia rursus de morte eius prouinciales consilia inirent. <sup>2</sup>Horum odium confirmabant nonnulli familiares eius, qui cum in illa so-  
 15 cietate uersarentur rapinarum nihilo minus oderant eum cuius nomine peccabant sibi 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* | quaestus *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. <sup>3</sup>Quintam 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** <sup>1</sup>Interim 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. <sup>2</sup>Quibus litteris ac-  
ceptis insolenti uoluntate efferebatur quod sibi nouarum  
10    prouinciarum et fertilissimi regni tanta oblata esset facul-  
tas. <sup>3</sup>Itaque 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<sup>ac</sup>* | nouam conscribit *T<sup>c</sup>* || **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 *5* 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 *5* teste *Dübner* ||

ione. <sup>4</sup>Non enim labor aut uigilantia cupienti praesertim aliquid Cassio deerat.

**52** <sup>1</sup>Exercitu 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. <sup>2</sup>Ex 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. <sup>3</sup>Clamore sublato fit a coniuratis impetus uniuersis. Munatius Flaccus proximum gladio traicit lictorem. Hoc interfecto Q. Cassium legatum uulnerat. <sup>4</sup>Ibi 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<sup>f</sup>US* | tradidit *M<sup>w</sup>TV* || **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<sup>w</sup>* | 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 leuibus sauciat plagis.

53 <sup>1</sup>Concurritur ad Cassium defendendum. Semper enim Berones compluresque euocatos cum telis secum  
 5 habere consuerat. <sup>2</sup>A quibus ceteri intercluduntur qui ad caedem faciendam subsequebantur. Quo in numero fuit Calpurnius Saluianus, et Manilius Tuscus. <sup>3</sup>Minucius 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. <sup>4</sup>Laterensis 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 <sup>5</sup>Nemo 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<sup>UT</sup>* | ad idsum longinum l licinius squillus inuolat *M<sup>ac</sup>* | 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<sup>ac</sup>* || **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<sup>m</sup>* (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** <sup>1</sup>Interim nuntiatur Laterensi uiuere Cassium. Quo nuntio dolore magis permotus quam animo perturbatus reficit se celeriter et ad Cassium uisendum proficiscitur. <sup>2</sup>Re cognita tricesima legio signa Cordubam infert ad auxilium ferendum imperatori suo. Facit hoc idem unetuicesima. Subsequitur has quinta. <sup>3</sup>Cum 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** <sup>1</sup>Cassius eos qui nominati erant conscii caedis iubet comprehendendi. 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. <sup>2</sup>Indicio Minuci cognoscit L. Racilium et L. Laterensem et Annium Scapulam, maximae dignitatis et gratiae prouincialem hominem sibique tam familiarem quam Laterensem et Racilium, in eadem fuisse coniuratione, nec diu moratur dolorem suum quin eos interfici iubeat. <sup>3</sup>Minucium 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. <sup>4</sup>Squillus nominat plures. Quos Cassius interfici iubet exceptis eis qui se pecunia redemerunt. <sup>5</sup>Nam 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 <sup>1</sup>Aliquot 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. <sup>2</sup>Qua 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  
<sup>3</sup>Sanatis uulneribus arcessit omnes qui sibi pecunias expen-  
 sas tulerant acceptasque eas iubet referri. Quibus parum  
 uidebatur imposuisse oneris ampliorem pecuniam imperat.  
<sup>4</sup>Equitum 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.  
<sup>5</sup>His 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<sup>ac</sup>* | ad auxilium *T<sup>c</sup>* | ad auxilia *V* ||

<sup>6</sup>Ipse 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** <sup>1</sup>Interim 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. <sup>2</sup>Cognita re noctu cum V cohortibus unetuicesimanorum egreditur. Mane peruenit †noctu†. Ibi eum diem ut quid ageretur perspiceret moratus Carmonem contendit. <sup>3</sup>Hic 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<sup>ac</sup>* 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. <sup>4</sup>Celeriter habito consilio Marcellum quaestorem Cordubam ut eam in potestate retineret, Q. Cassium legatum Hispalim mittit. <sup>5</sup>Paucis 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. <sup>6</sup>Cassius 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 <sup>1</sup>Interim Torius ad Cordubam ueteres legiones adducit. Ac ne dissensionis initium natum seditiosa militum suaque natura uideretur, simul ut contra Q. Cassium—qui Caesaris nomine maioribus uiribus uti uidebatur—aeque  
 5 potentem opponeret dignitatem, Cn. Pompeio se prouinciam recipere uelle palam dictitabat. <sup>2</sup>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  
 10 hoc prae se Torius ferebat. <sup>3</sup>Milites adeo fatebantur ut Cn. Pompei nomen in scutis inscriptum haberent. <sup>4</sup>Frequens legionibus conuentus obuam prodiit—neque tantum uiro-  
 rum sed etiam matrum familias ac praetextatorum—depre-

---

**1** Torius    *§ teste Dübner* | thorius *MUSTV* ||    ueteres *MU* (*cf. BC 3.101.5*) | ueterem *STV* | ueteranas *JSimons (u. 53.5 et cf. 61.1)* ||  
**6–10** 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* **9** erat    *MUSTV* | erit *Madvig coll. Liu. 4.20.8* | est *Schneider coll. Liu. 23.47.8* | alii alia || **10** Torius    *§ teste Andrieu* | thorius *MUSTV* ||  
**11** inscriptum    *UST (u. D.C. 42.15.5 et cf. BHis 13.3)* | scriptum *MV* ||  
 Frequens legionibus conuentus obuam prodiit—neque tantum uiro-  
 rum 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* || **67.13–68.1**  
 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.

59 <sup>1</sup>Tantae multitudinis precibus et lacrimis exercitus commotus cum uideret ad Cassium persequendum nihil 5 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 10 profitebatur, ducem asciuerunt praetoremque appellarunt et conuentum sibi adiunxerunt castraque ad Cordubam posuerunt. <sup>2</sup>Cassius eo biduo circiter IIII milia passuum a Corduba citra flumen Baetim in oppidi conspectu loco excelso facit castra. Litteras ad regem Bogudem in Mau- 15 retaniam et M. Lepidum proconsulem in Hispaniam citeriorem mittit: subsidio sibi prouinciaeque Caesaris causa

---

6 esse *V* | esset *MUST* || tamque *MU* | ta(m/n)quam *STV*  
 || 9–10 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* | deteruerunt *Menge coll. D.C. 42.15.5 ἀπήλειψεν* ||  
 17 prouinciaque *MU* | prouinciaque *STV* ||

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

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

---

2 uastat *MU* (cf. *BG* 3.29.3 etc.) | uastata *STV* || 4–5 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) || 6 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 || 9 ◇ uictoris *MU* | uictores *STV* || 11 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 || 13 (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. <sup>5</sup>Cum hoc detrimento quid transitus fluminis uitii difficultatisque haberet cognitum esset, Marcellus castra Baetim transfert. Crebroque uterque 5 legiones in aciem educit, neque tamen confligitur propter locorum difficultates.

**61** <sup>1</sup>Erat copiis pedestribus multo firmior Marcellus. Habebat enim ueteranas multisque proeliis expertas legiones. Cassius fidei magis quam uirtuti legionum confidebat. <sup>2</sup>Itaque 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 sibique infestis, 15 noctu silentio ex castris proficiscitur celerique itinere Vliam contendit quod sibi fidele esse oppidum credebat. <sup>3</sup>Ibi

---

**1** infirmum *MTV* | infirmem *US* (*de formis tertii ordinis u. TLL 7.1.1441.14–40*) || esse *U<sup>ac</sup>STV* | eum *MU<sup>r</sup>* || **3** quid *MST* | qui *U* | quod *V* || **4** uitii | uitii *S* (*cf. BG 7.45.9 incommodi*) | uti *UTV* | usus *M* || difficultatisque *M* (*cf. Sen. Ben. 3.8.1*) | difficultatesque *USTV* || **6** educit *MUT* | educunt *S* (*cf. BC 3.30.3*) | ducit *V* || **11** 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*) || **15** 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. <sup>4</sup>Hunc 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 <sup>5</sup>Castellis idoneis locis collocatis operibusque in circuitu  
oppidi continuatis Vliam Cassiumque munitionibus clausit.  
<sup>6</sup>Quae 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** <sup>1</sup>Paucis diebus Q. Cassi litteris acceptis rex Bogus cum copiis uenit adiungitque ei legioni quam secum adduxerat complures cohortes auxiliares Hispanorum. <sup>2</sup>Namque 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** <sup>1</sup>Interim 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. <sup>2</sup>Huic

---

**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<sup>sc</sup> | transferentem U<sup>mc</sup> 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. <sup>3</sup>Ponit ad Vliam castra Lepidus neque habet a Marcello quicquam diuisi. Ne pugnetur interdicat. Ad exeundum Cassium inuitat fidemque suam in re omni interponit. <sup>4</sup>Cum 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. <sup>5</sup>Non 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*) ||

<sup>6</sup>Quod nisi celeriter indignatione et auxilio Lepidi proelium esset diremptum maior calamitas esset accepta.

**64** <sup>1</sup>Cum iter Cassio patefactum esset castra Marcellus cum Lepido coniungit. Lepidus eodem tempore Marcellusque Cordubam, cum suis Cassius proficiscitur Carmonem. <sup>2</sup>Sub 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. <sup>3</sup>Progressus 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** <sup>1</sup>Cum 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  $\varsigma$  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  $\varsigma$  teste *Nipperdey* (cf. *BG* 7.63.8) ||

<sup>2</sup>Haec in Syria Cilicia Asia celeriter se confecturum sperabat quod eae prouinciae nullo bello premebantur. In Bithynia ac Ponto plus oneris uidebat sibi impendere. <sup>3</sup>Non excessisse enim Ponto Pharnacen audiebat neque excessurum putabat cum secundo proelio uehementer esset inflatus quod contra Domitium Caluinum fecerat. <sup>4</sup>Commoratus 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** <sup>1</sup>Paucis diebus in ea prouincia consumptis Sextum Caesarem amicum et necessarium suum legionibus Syriaeque praefecit. Ipse eadem classe qua uenerat proficiscitur in Ciliciam. <sup>2</sup>Cuius 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. BG* 2.21.5 || **10** finitimos *Oudendorp coll. BG* 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. BG* 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<sup>ac</sup>UTV* | praeficit *M<sup>s</sup>S non male* ||

cat Tarsum, quod oppidum fere totius Ciliciae nobilissimum fortissimumque est. <sup>3</sup>Ibi 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. <sup>4</sup>Id 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<sup>c</sup>V* | cappado cum genere *S* | cappadociae cum genere *T<sup>ac</sup>* || 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.

<sup>5</sup>Fatri autem Ariobarzani 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** <sup>1</sup>Cum 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<sup>f</sup> V ex 68.1* tetrarcharum? (*u. et infra*) | tetriarches *T* | tetharces *M<sup>u</sup>U*  
| thetarces *S* || Gallograeciae ] | gallogr(a)e(c)/t)iae *MU<sup>r</sup>TV* |  
gallogecie *U<sup>u</sup>c* | gallograe *S* || **10** tetrarchae *MTV uel* tethrarchae (*u.*  
*et supra*) | tetharc(a)e *M<sup>u</sup>US* || **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; <sup>2</sup>neque enim se debuisse iudicem esse controuersiarum populi Romani sed parere praesentibus imperiis.

- 5 **68** <sup>1</sup>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,  
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<sup>sc</sup>STV* | *om. U<sup>ac</sup>* || **2** se debuisse iudicem *M<sup>sc</sup>UT* | se buisse iudicem *M<sup>ac</sup>* | se iudicem debuisset *S* | se diebus se iudicem *V* || **3** controuersiarum populi Romani *UST per compendia* | controuersiarum *M* | controuersiarum publicarum rerum *V* || **7** ◇ defensionem eius<sup>1</sup> *MU<sup>sc</sup>STV* | defensonem eius *U<sup>ac</sup>* | defectionem eius *5 teste Dübner* (cf. *BG* 7.67.7) | [defensionem eius] *Dausius* 1727 *ut glossema ad excusationem* (u. *et infra*), *sed cf. de pleonasmō Cic. Rab. Post. 27 Rufum necessitatis excusatio defendet* || posse *MUSTV* | posse ⟨se⟩ *Dausius* 1727 (u. *supra et cf. Sen. Ben. 7.16.3*) || eius<sup>2</sup> *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. <sup>2</sup>Legionem autem eam quam ex genere ciuium suorum Deiotarus natura disciplinaque nostra constitutam habebat equitatumque omnem ad bellum gerendum adducere iussit.

**69** <sup>1</sup>Cum 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*<sup>f</sup> | quis deinde post l lentulum c marcellum consules sed *M*<sup>ac</sup> | 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*<sup>r</sup> | concucurrissent *U*<sup>ac</sup> || **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*<sup>r</sup> | abduxerant *V*<sup>ac</sup> | 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. <sup>2</sup>Legati a Pharnace missi Caesarem ade-  
 5 unt atque imprimis deprecantur ne eius aduentus hostilis  
 esset: facturum enim omnia Pharnacen quae imperata es-  
 sent. <sup>3</sup>Maximeque commemorabant nulla Pharnacen aux-  
 ilia contra Caesarem Pompeio dare uoluisse cum Deiotarus,  
 qui dedisset, tamen ei satisfecisset.

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

---

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

quam sibi, cui di immortales uictoriam tribuissent; <sup>5</sup>itaque se magnas et graues iniurias ciuium Romanorum qui in Ponto negotiati essent, quoniam in integrum restituere non posset, concedere Pharnaci; <sup>6</sup>nam neque interfectis amis-  
sam uitam neque exsectis uirilitatem restituere posse, quod 5  
quidem supplicium grauius morte ciues Romani subissent;  
<sup>7</sup>Ponto uero decederet confestim familiasque publicanorum remitteret ceteraque restitueret sociis ciuibusque Romanis quae penes eum essent; <sup>8</sup>si 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** <sup>1</sup>At 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 παροδευόν αὐτήν* [*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. <sup>2</sup>Caesar cognita calliditate hominis, quod aliis temporibus natura facere consueuerat tunc necessitate fecit adductus, ut celerius omnium opinione manum consereret.

- 5      **72** <sup>1</sup>Zela est oppidum in Ponto positum, ipsum ut in plano loco satis munitum. Tumulus enim naturalis uelut manu factus excelsiore undique fastigio sustinet murum. <sup>2</sup>Circumpositi 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* ||

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

**73** <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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. <sup>2</sup>Quo 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. <sup>3</sup>Hoc 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*<sup>c</sup> ut uidetur | munitur *V*<sup>ac</sup> || 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) | gererent *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 <sup>1</sup>Pharnaces, 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 fiducia, ne munitione magis quam manu defendere locum Pharnaces uideretur. <sup>2</sup>Itaque deterritus  
 10 non est quominus prima acie pro uallo instructa reliqua pars exercitus opus faceret. <sup>3</sup>At 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 conflxisse

---

**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.

<sup>4</sup>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.

**75** <sup>1</sup>Caesar 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. <sup>2</sup>Nondum 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. <sup>3</sup>Insequitur 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** <sup>1</sup>Magno 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. <sup>2</sup>Quae 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<sup>c</sup>* | ueterata religio *S<sup>ac</sup>* || **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*) | 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. <sup>3</sup>Defendentibus 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. <sup>4</sup>Cui nisi castrorum oppugnatio facultatem attulisset liberius profugiendi, uiuus in Caesaris potestatem adductus esset.

**77** <sup>1</sup>Tali 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. <sup>2</sup>Ponto 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 <sup>1</sup>Ita per Gallograeciam Bithyniamque in Asiam iter facit omniumque earum prouinciarum de controuersiis cognoscit et statuit. Iura in tetrarchas, reges, ciuitates distribuit. <sup>2</sup>Mithridaten 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. <sup>3</sup>Eidem tetrarchian [legibus] Gallograecorum iure gentis et cognationis adiudicauit occupatam et possessam paucis ante annis Deiotaro. <sup>4</sup>Neque tamen usquam diutius moratus est quam necessitas urbanarum seditionum pati uidebatur. <sup>5</sup>Rebus 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<sup>mr</sup>**
- 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<sup>\*</sup>**
- 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 2.2 urbe] hurbe **S**  
 2.2 armauerant] -uerunt **M** *per compendium*  
 2.2 locupletiores] lucu- **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 2.4 erant] habebat e- **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>c</sup>**  
 3.1 homines] om- **S**  
 3.1 imitati] -ari **M**  
 3.1 et<sup>4</sup> *om.* **S**  
 3.3 annis] animis **S**

- 
- 3.3 Caesarem] ac cessarem **S**  
 3.4 non] on **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
 3.4 ex *om.* **V**  
 3.4 namque] nam **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 3.4 tempestatibus] tempestabit **S<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur*  
 3.4 propter *om.* **S**  
 4.1 dissensione] descensione **T<sup>ac</sup>** : discensione **T<sup>c</sup>**  
 4.1 exercitui] -u **V**  
 4.1 praeerat et] praeerat praeet **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 4.1 Arsinoen] asrnoen **U**  
 4.1 summam] sumam **S**  
 4.1 obtinere] optinere **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
 4.1 praeoccupat] praeocupat **S**  
 4.1 eunuchum] eudum **S<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur* : eunidum **S<sup>c</sup>**  
 4.1 Achillan<sup>2</sup>] -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<sup>ac</sup>**
- 5.3 uicatum] uacatum **T<sup>ac</sup>** : uacati **T<sup>c</sup>**
- 5.3 priuatis aedificiis] a- p- **V**
- 5.3 priuatis] primiuatis **S**
- 5.3 ac] a **S**
- 5.3 extracta] ex castra **U<sup>ac</sup>**
- 5.3 utebantur] -batur **M**
- 6.1 mari] mare **V**
- 6.1 ac<sup>2</sup> *om.* **V**
- 6.2 causam salsior] acussam fal- **S**
- 6.2 paulo praeter consuetudinem aqua] a- pa- pr- c- **M<sup>ac</sup>**
- 6.2 admirationem praebebat] exhibebat admirationem **V**
- 6.2 nec] ne **S**
- 6.2 different] differret **S<sup>ac</sup>**
- 6.3 uero *om.* **U**
- 6.3 propior] proprior **S**
- 7.1 quo] qua **M<sup>ac</sup>**
- 7.1 incessit] iniessit **S**



- 
- 7.1 casum<sup>2</sup>] cassum **S**  
 7.1 cum tam paruo] commitam paruos **S<sup>c</sup>** : comintam  
 paruos **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
 7.2 quam domiciliis] quan domiciliis **S**  
 7.2 mouerat] nouerat **T**  
 7.3 et natura cognoscatur] c- et n- **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 7.3 hoc genus ad prodicionem] ad p- h- g- **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 7.3 ad] a **S**  
 8.1 suorum] suor **M**  
 8.1 consolatione] conlationem **T<sup>ac</sup>** : conlatione **T<sup>c</sup>**  
 8.1 ratione] -em **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
8.5 scaphis] caphis **S**  
8.5 aedificiorum] aedificatorum **T** *ut uidetur*  
8.6 hos] hoc **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
11.2 coactus] coatus **S**  
11.2 turpem] -piter **V**  
11.2 casurum] caesarum **S**  
11.3 scientia] scia **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
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 et<sup>3</sup> *om.* **S**  
12.3 deposuerunt] -suerant **T**  
12.4 ac] et **M**  
12.4 classem] cala- **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>\*</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>** : cirtumuehitur **S<sup>c</sup>**

- 
- 14.1 hos] his **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 14.1 spatium] ispatium **T**  
 14.1 esse] esset **S**  
 14.2 distribuit] sdistribuit **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 14.2 quamque] quamcumque **V**  
 14.3 instruunt] instituunt **V**  
 14.4 ipsa] -am **S**  
 14.4 terroris] -ores **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 14.5 transitu] -um **S**  
 14.5 sic ... Africae *om.* **M** (*uerba 8*)  
 14.5 utris] utrisque **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 14.5 transeundi] transecundi **S**  
 14.5 transeundi fieret] f- t- **T**  
 15.1 Rhodiis] Rodius **V**  
 15.2 ob notissimam] obtatissimam **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 15.2 est *om.* **S**  
 15.3 mihi *om.* **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**

15.6 aduersae] ac se **M<sup>ac</sup>**

15.7 reliquae] reliquae **S<sup>ac</sup>** : reliquiae **S<sup>c</sup>**

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<sup>ac</sup>** : ab diis **T<sup>c</sup>**

16.1 autem] enim **M**

16.1 periclitarentur] peritarentur **V<sup>ac</sup>**

16.2 simul] simulli **S**

16.2 ac<sup>1</sup>] a **S**

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

**T**

16.2 aut<sup>1</sup> *om.* **U<sup>ac</sup>**

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<sup>ac</sup>**

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] proprus **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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 19.4 aduersus hostem] h- a- **V**  
 19.5 altero] -ra **S**  
 19.5 effecto] efecto **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 19.5 ut *om.* **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
23.2 multitudini] -ne **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
24.1 etsi] si **T**  
24.1 esse statuit] constituit e- **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
24.1 gerundum] gesturum **V**  
24.2 cum ipse tantum ei crederet] cum i- t- ei cr- cum ipse  
tantum ei crederet **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
24.3 sibi *om.* **V**  
24.4 compressis] compressisque **M**  
24.5 ex] e **M**  
25.1 firmiores] infirm- **S**  
25.1 animaduerterent] adu- **T**  
25.1 aetatem] aetate **S**  
25.2 dispositis] dispotis **V**  
25.3 Neronem] Nerorem **S**  
25.4 quae *om.* **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
25.4 plurimis] -mos **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
25.4 prosequabatur] pers- **V**  
25.5 cum *om.* **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
25.6 sibi] sic **M**

- 26.1 Caesaris *om.* **M**  
 26.1 propensissima] impen- **M**  
 26.2 Aegyptus maritimo] -tos maritimo **U<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur* : -tus  
 maritima **U<sup>c</sup>**  
 26.2 maritimo] maritimos **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 26.2 claustris] castr- **S**  
 26.2 magnis circumdatum] c- m- **V**  
 26.2 pertinaciter] pertinentiter **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 26.3 contendit] conditendit **M<sup>ac</sup>** : tetendit **M<sup>c</sup>** *ut uidetur* :  
 contendit **M<sup>mr</sup>**  
 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 a<sup>2</sup> *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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 28.2 is] his **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 29.2 equitatum] -atem **T**  
 29.2 prohiberent] -beret **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 29.2 eminus] minus **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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 magno<sup>2</sup>] -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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 31.1 uirum *om.* **S**  
 31.3 adeo *om.* **V**  
 31.3 incitati] incitata **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**

33.2 impotenter Ganymeden] g- i- **M<sup>ac</sup>**

33.2 rursus *om.* **V**

33.3 quo] quod **T**

33.3 esset eorum] eorum esset **V**

33.4 eos nostris] nostros eos **M<sup>ac</sup>**

33.4 essent] -et **T**

33.4 coerceri] ceteri **M<sup>\*</sup>**

34.1 ad] a **U**

34.1 suum *om.* **V**

34.1 regnum<sup>2</sup> *om.* **V**

34.1 posse] possem **T<sup>ac</sup>**

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

34.2 esse statueret] statueret esse **M<sup>\*</sup>**

34.2 cappadociaque] captadociaque **U<sup>ac</sup>**

34.2 ciuilis] uiuilis **U<sup>ac</sup>**

- 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
35.1 regni causa] causa regni **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
35.3 quo] qua **M**

- 
- 36.1 Pharnaces] Pharnacis **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
38.3 facillimum] fallamum **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
38.3 d(i/e)rectas] rectas **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
38.4 equitatum] notatum **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
38.4 aliter] alter **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
41.2 se *om.* **S**  
42.1 sub] nub **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
42.1 retenta *om.* **V**  
42.2 Q] Quintus **V<sup>c</sup>** *supra lineam*  
42.3 namque] nam **M**  
42.3 praesertim] praesertim cum **V**  
42.3 constiterat] constituerat **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
42.3 posset *om.* **V**  
42.3 captiuis nauibus] nauibus **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
42.4 Cornificio] corfinio **M**  
42.4 magnis copiis] copiis magnis **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
42.5 instauraturam] instauratur in **S**  
43.1 scientia sua] scientia **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
43.1 periclitatus] periclitatur **M**  
43.2 crebro] crebra **M**



- 
- 43.3 duobus milibus \*om. **U<sup>ac</sup>\***
- 43.4 Cornificii] corfinii **M**
- 43.4 uersari passa non est] passa non est uersari **M<sup>ac</sup>**
- 44.1 Brundisi] brundusium **M**
- 44.1 ferendum] inferendum **V<sup>ac</sup>**
- 44.1 Octauium] octauianum **V**
- 44.2 misit *om.* **M**
- 44.3 periculum] periculi **T<sup>ac</sup>**
- 44.4 militibus] milibus **T<sup>ac</sup>**
- 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<sup>ac</sup>**
- 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<sup>ac</sup>**
- 47.1 Vatinius] uitius **T<sup>ac</sup>** : uatius **T<sup>c</sup>**
- 47.1 portu] portis **T<sup>ac</sup>**

- 47.2 proelio] periculo **U** *ut uidetur*  
47.2 triremes] trirenes **T**  
47.2 in insulam Issam] in insulas issas **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
47.2 quod] quo **M**  
47.2 ex fuga credebatur Octavius] credebatur Octavius ex fuga **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
47.3 earum oppidum] oppidum earum **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
47.4 Vatinio] uatino **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
47.4 Octavius] octavianos **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
47.5 breui] breuissimo **T**  
47.4 Siciliam] saciliam **U**  
47.5 Cornificio] corfinio **M**  
47.5 ex illo] ex illa **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
48.1 periculi] periculo **M**  
48.1 siue] sine **M**  
48.1 difficulter odia] difficultate rodia **S**  
48.3 praemia] dona **T<sup>ac</sup>** *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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur*  
 51.4 aliquid] aliquod **M**  
 52.2 contione] conditione **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 52.2 se cordubam] cordubam se **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
53.1 secum] et **S**  
53.1 consuerat] consueuerat **M**  
53.3 saxa] sexa **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
53.3 iacebant] iaciebant **S**  
53.3 se domum familiaris sui] domum familiaris sui se **V**  
53.4 sui] suis **M<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur*  
53.5 prouincia] prouicia **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
53.5 consenserat] conserat **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
53.5 Italia] italiam **V**  
53.5 scriptas] sciptas **T**  
53.5 quinta] quanta **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
53.5 ibi erat] erat ibi **T**  
54.1 interim *om.* **V**  
54.1 magis] modis **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
54.1 permotus] per **S**  
54.1 reficit] refecit **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
56.3 expensas] pensas *post spatium trium litterarum* **V**  
56.4 coloniisque] colonisque **S**  
56.4 sacramenti] sacramenta **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
56.6 edictum] editum **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
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 -que<sup>1</sup> *om.* **V**  
57.3 equitatus] aequitatus **S**  
57.3 Obuculam] obuculum **T**  
57.3 peruenisse] peruenisset **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>c</sup>**  
 58.3 milites adeo fatebantur *om.* **M**  
 58.3 Pompei] pompeio **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 59.1 commotus] commeatus **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 59.1 ad<sup>1</sup> *om.* **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 59.1 posse ... causam *om.* **V** (*uerba 12*)  
 59.1 causam<sup>2</sup>] causa **U**  
 59.1 ascuerunt] adscuerant **V**  
 59.1 et<sup>3</sup> *om.* **V**  
 59.2 milia passuum] menses pompeium **V**  
 59.2 subsidio] subsidia **V**  
 60.1 indignitate] indignitatem **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 60.1 Marcellum sibi ducem] sibi ducem Marcellum **M<sup>\*</sup>**  
 60.1 concurrerunt] cucurrerunt **M**  
 60.1 possessiones] potestates a **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 61.1 Marcellus *om.* **M**  
 61.1 legionum] legionem **S**  
 61.2 quodam] quoddam **T**

- 61.2 clauderetur] cluderetur **T<sup>c</sup>***ut uidetur*  
61.2 infestis] infectis **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
61.2 silentio ex] ex silencio **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
62.2 plures] complures **M**  
62.2 accedit] accidit **T**  
62.2 munitiones] munitionis **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>***ut uidetur*  
63.4 sibi *om.* **V**



- 
- 63.4 Lepido] lipodo **T**  
 63.4 credendum] credeudum **S<sup>ac</sup>** *ut uidetur*  
 63.4 ullum] ullam **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 64.1 Marcellus] metellus **M**  
 64.1 Cassius *om.* **S**  
 64.1 proficiscitur] profisciscitur **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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 ne<sup>2</sup>] neque **U**  
 64.2 magna pars] pars magna **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 64.2 infinitis] infinitimis **T**  
 64.2 rapinis confecta] confecta rapinis **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>ac</sup>**  
 65.1 uenisset] ueniret **M**  
 65.1 praeferendum] praefendum **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 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<sup>c</sup>** (*ut uidetur*) *in margine*  
 65.4 in] in \ | in **M**  
 66.1 magnisque] magnique **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
 66.2 fere] est fere **T**  
 66.3 eius *om.* **V**  
 66.4 homini] homine **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
 66.4 ortus] ortis **S**  
 66.5 Ariarathi] amarathi **S**  
 67.1 Pontum] pontem **T<sup>ac</sup>**  
 67.1 quod ei] quo din **S** *per compendia*  
 67.1 legibus neque moribus] moribus neque legibus **M<sup>ac</sup>**  
 67.1 esse] esset **S**  
 67.1 ab] a **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 67.1 parte *om.* **V**  
 67.1 in<sup>2</sup> *om.* **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
 67.1 castris] crasstris **S<sup>ac</sup>**: crastris **S<sup>c</sup>**  
 67.2 populi Romani *per compendia om.* **M**  
 67.2 sed *om.* **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
 68.1 esset<sup>1</sup>] etsset **T<sup>ac</sup>**

- 68.1 post *om.* **S**  
68.1 C.] quintum **V**  
68.1 se<sup>1</sup> *om.* **S**  
68.1 tetrarcharum] tetharcarum **S**  
68.1 esse *om.* **V**  
68.2 ex] e **S<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
70.5 non *om.* **V<sup>ac</sup>**  
70.6 exsectis] etectis **S**  
70.6 uirilitatem] uirilitate **U**

- 70.6 posse] non posse **U<sup>c</sup>** : non posset **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
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<sup>ac</sup>**  
72.2 unus *om.* **S**  
72.2 Triari] traiari **V**  
72.2 oppido] oppida **U<sup>ac</sup>**  
72.2 ab *om.* **V**  
73.1 castra<sup>3</sup>] 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<sup>ac</sup>**

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

# TRANSLATION

*This is a rendering by many hands, so it is stylistically uneven.  
The objective was to convey the meaning of the Latin syntax.*

**1** <sup>1</sup>With the kindling of the Alexandrian War Caesar summoned his whole fleet from Rhodes and from Syria and Cilicia. He called up archers from Crete, cavalry from Malchus, king of the Nabataeans. He ordered siege engines to be collected from everywhere, grain to be sent, and reinforcements to be brought. <sup>2</sup>In the meantime his fortifications were being strengthened every day with defensive works, and every part of the town that seemed to be less secure was being furnished with overhead shelters and covered galleries. Battering rams were carried from buildings into neighboring buildings through holes, and the fortifications were extended into all of the territory that was either cast down in ruins or taken by force. <sup>3</sup>For Alexandria is mostly safe from fire, since the buildings lack wooden flooring and are held together by masonry and vaulted structures and covered with rubble and tiles. <sup>4</sup>Caesar was particularly eager to close off part of the town—the part that a marsh

5  
10  
15

coming in from the south made very narrow—from the rest of the city by employing defensive works and screens. <sup>5</sup>His first expectation was that although the city had been divided into two parts his army would be managed according to one plan and authority, and then that it would be possible for support to be provided for his troops when they were struggling and for aid to be brought from the other part of the town, but especially that he would have an abundance of water and fodder. (He had a scanty supply of one of the two (sc. water), and no access at all to the other (sc. fodder).) As to which the marsh could bountifully supply each.

2 <sup>1</sup>As for the Alexandrians, however, they were subject to no hesitation or delay in conducting their business. For they had sent envoys and recruiting officers into every district—throughout the territory of Egypt and the kingdom—for conducting a levy, and they had brought a large number of weapons and siege engines into the town and had gathered a huge multitude. <sup>2</sup>Plus, massive workshops of arms were set up in the city. In addition, they had armed the slaves of military age, and the wealthier masters provided these with sustenance and daily pay. <sup>3</sup>The fortifications of the outlying parts of the town were guarded by an arrangement of this large force. They kept the veteran cohorts available in the most frequented areas of the city so that they could be de-

ployed for bringing aid with fresh strength in whichever area there was fighting. <sup>4</sup>They had blocked off all the roads and alleyways with a triple wall—it was built with square stones and was at least forty feet high—and fortified the lower parts of the city with very tall towers, each with ten stories. <sup>5</sup>In addition, they had cobbled together moveable towers with the same number of stories. 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.

**3** <sup>1</sup>The city, extremely abundant and well supplied, furnished all manner of provisions. The men themselves, clever and extremely keen, replicated with such ingenuity things they had seen made by us that our men seemed to have imitated their works, and they were discovering many things of their own accord and simultaneously attacking our fortifications and defending their own. <sup>2</sup>Plus, their leaders kept pushing these points in councils and assemblies: that the Roman people gradually were coming into the habit of occupying the kingdom; that a few years prior Aulus Gabinius had been in Egypt with an army; that Pompey had withdrawn there in his flight; that Caesar had come with his troops, but that nothing had been accomplished by Pompey's death to deter Caesar from staying there; <sup>4</sup>that if



they did not drive him out, a province would come into being out of the kingdom, and that this must be done quickly. For Caesar, they said, shut off by storms because of the time of year, could not receive support from across the sea.

5     **4** <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile a dispute had arisen between Achilles, who was in charge of the veteran army, and Arsinoe, the younger daughter of king Ptolemy, as was indicated above. Although each was plotting against the other and wanting to possess overall control, Arsinoe struck first through the  
10     eunuch Ganymede, her tutor, and killed Achilles. <sup>2</sup>With him dead she began to take complete control without any partner or guardian. The army was handed over to Ganymedes. When he took up the office he increased the  
15     bounty for soldiers and managed the remaining tasks with equal diligence.

5     **5** <sup>1</sup>Almost all of Alexandria has channels bored out beneath it, and it has conduits extending to the Nile (i.e., the Nile canal) through which water is led into private houses. And this (sc. water) gradually in an interval of time becomes  
20     clear and settles. <sup>2</sup>It is this that owners of buildings and their households are accustomed to use. For that which is carried by the Nile River is so muddy and thick that it causes many different diseases. But the common people and the masses are necessarily content with it, since there are no

fountains in the entire city. Nevertheless, the watercourse was in the part of the city controlled by the Alexandrians.

<sup>3</sup>Ganymedes was reminded by this fact that our men could be cut off from their water supply. These, distributed throughout the neighborhoods for the purpose of protecting the fortifications, were using water from private buildings drawn from conduits and wells. 5

6 <sup>1</sup>When this plan was approved he set about a great and difficult task. After having blocked all the conduits and closed off all the areas of the city that were occupied by him he strove to draw a huge amount of water from the sea with wheeled mechanisms. This (sc. water) he constantly poured from higher locations (i.e., from locations in the now blocked pipes that were below the blockage but above the private buildings' cisterns) into Caesar's territory. <sup>2</sup>For this reason the water drawn from the closest buildings (i.e., those closest to the place(s) where sea water was injected into the system) was a little saltier than usual, and why this occurred was a source of great puzzlement for people. They did not really trust themselves, since people lower down said that they were using water of the same kind and flavor as they were accustomed to before, and they began making comparisons amongst themselves in public. And by tasting the waters they recognized how much the waters differed. 10 15 20

<sup>3</sup>But shortly thereafter the water that was closer (sc. to the place(s) where sea water was coming in) was wholly undrinkable and the lower water (i.e., the water in recipients that were further away) was now found to be more spoiled and saltier.

7 <sup>1</sup>And when, with this development, uncertainty was removed, so great a fear invaded that all felt themselves to have been brought to the brink of danger and some said that Caesar was delaying giving (i.e., was in no hurry to give) the order to embark, and others were much more seriously alarmed about their plight because, as they thought, it was not going to be possible to keep the Alexandrians ignorant while making preparations for a withdrawal, since they were separated from themselves by so little distance, nor was taking refuge on the ships going to be an option with the Alexandrians nearby and in pursuit. <sup>2</sup>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. <sup>3</sup>But when their community and

character are considered simultaneously, no one can doubt that this race is perfectly prepared for treachery.

8 <sup>1</sup>Caesar alleviated the fear of his men with reasoning and encouragement. He declared that if wells were dug fresh water could be found, as all shores naturally possess veins of fresh water. <sup>2</sup>Even if the nature of the Egyptian shore was different from all the rest, he said, since they had freedom of movement on the sea and the enemy did not have a fleet, they could not be prevented from going after water with their ships daily, from either the left, from Paratonium, or the right, from the island, routes that, being different, were not going to be shut down by adverse winds at one and the same time. <sup>3</sup>Retreat was certainly not in the plans, not only for those who considered their dignity of prime importance but not even for those who thought of nothing other than their own lives. <sup>4</sup>Only with great difficulty were the enemy's frontal attacks being sustained from the fortifications. Once the fortifications were abandoned, they could not equal the enemy in position or number. <sup>5</sup>Moreover, boarding the ships involved a long delay and great difficulty, especially from skiffs. The Alexandrians, by contrast, were possessed of the greatest mobility and knowledge of the positions and the buildings. <sup>6</sup>These people, particularly insolent in the face of victory, would

run ahead and gain possession of both the higher ground and the buildings. Thus they would prevent our men from fleeing in the ships. Accordingly, they should forget the idea and consider that they must win, whatever the cost.

- 5     **9** <sup>1</sup>When he had made this speech to his men and everyone's spirits were roused he gave his centurions the assignment that pausing their work elsewhere they should concentrate on digging wells and not pause for any portion of the night. <sup>2</sup>Once this assignment was taken in hand and  
10 the spirits of all were spurred on to exertion, in a single night a great quantity of fresh water was discovered. In this way the Alexandrians' laborious schemes and huge efforts were counteracted by a brief exertion. <sup>3</sup>Two days later the thirty-seventh legion, made up of Pompeian troops who had sur-  
15 rendered, having been put onto ships by Domitius Calvinus with grain, arms, projectiles, and catapults, was conveyed to the shore of Africa somewhat beyond Alexandria. <sup>4</sup>These ships were prevented from reaching the harbor by the East wind, which blew continuously for many days. However,  
20 locations throughout that region are excellent for holding anchors. Since they were detained in that place for a long time and oppressed by a shortage of water they made Caesar aware of their plight by means of a swift ship.

**10** <sup>1</sup>In order to take consideration in person as to what seemed best to be done, Caesar boarded a ship and ordered the whole fleet to follow him—without, however, putting any of our soldiers on board, since, as he was going away for a rather long time, he did not want to leave the fortifications exposed. <sup>2</sup>When they had approached the place that is called Chersonensus and had set the oarsmen on shore in order to fetch water, some of these, when they had advanced too far from the ships for the sake of plunder, were captured by the enemy cavalry. <sup>3</sup>From these men they (i.e., the enemy) learned that Caesar himself had come with his fleet and that he did not have any soldiers on his ships. Once aware of this they came to believe that Fortune had bestowed upon them an opportunity for accomplishing a great success. <sup>4</sup>Thus they equipped all the seaworthy ships they possessed with soldiers and fell in with Caesar as he was returning with his fleet. <sup>5</sup>Caesar did not want to fight on that day for two reasons: first, he had no soldiers on his ships and then, the action itself was taking place after the tenth hour of the day. The night, however, would bring greater assurance to the enemy, it seemed, who trusted in their knowledge of the land. Furthermore, he would be bereft of the benefit of encouraging his troops, since no exhortation that could comment upon neither courage nor

5  
10  
15  
20

slackness would be sufficient to the purpose. <sup>6</sup>For these reasons Caesar led back towards the land those ships that he could, to a place where he did not anticipate they would be followed.

- 5     **11** <sup>1</sup>There was one Rhodian ship on Caesar's right wing in a position far from the rest. When the enemies saw this ship they did not restrain themselves, and with a concerted attack four decked and several open ships advanced against it. <sup>2</sup>Caesar was compelled to give aid to the ship so as to  
10    avoid incurring a shameful insult in the sight of his own men. And yet he judged that if things ended rather badly for the (ship's) men the outcome would be deserved. <sup>3</sup>The battle was waged with great exertion on the part of the Rhodians who, although they excelled in both skill and courage in  
15    every engagement, did not shrink from bearing the entire burden especially on that occasion to prevent people from thinking that any harm had been suffered by the fault of their men. <sup>4</sup>Hence the battle turned into a great success. One of the enemy's quadriremes was captured, another was  
20    sunk, two were stripped of all their marines. Furthermore, a great multitude of soldiers in the remaining ships were slain. <sup>5</sup>Had night not split up the battle, Caesar would have become master of the entire enemy fleet. <sup>6</sup>While the enemies were thoroughly frightened by this injury, Caesar

towed the transport ships to Alexandria against a gentle wind, with his own ships as victors.

**12** <sup>1</sup>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. <sup>2</sup>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. <sup>3</sup>And although they had lost more than a hundred and ten warships in the port and docks, nevertheless they did not discard the thought of repairing the fleet. <sup>4</sup>For they saw that Caesar's reinforcements could not be brought (sc. to him), nor supplies, if they themselves prevailed with their fleet. In addition, as seafaring men belonging to a maritime city and region and trained in daily practice from boyhood, they wanted to take refuge in that natural and familiar advantage and perceived how much they had accomplished with very small vessels. And so they took to preparing the fleet with all zeal.



13 <sup>1</sup>Guards had been set up at all the mouths of the Nile for the sake of collecting customs fees and there were old ships in the hidden docks of the court, which they had not used for sailing for many years. The latter they restored, 5 the former they recalled to Alexandria. <sup>2</sup>Oars were lacking. They took the roofs off porticos, gymnasia, and public buildings and made use of the beams as oars. Their natural resourcefulness supplied one thing, the abundance of the city another. <sup>3</sup>Finally, they were not preparing for a long 10 voyage but serving the need of the present time and saw that the fighting would have to be done in the port itself. <sup>4</sup>And so in a few days, contrary to everyone's opinion, they made twenty-two quadriremes and five quinqueremes. To these they added many smaller open boats, and after testing what 15 each of them could do in the harbor by way of rowing they embarked suitable soldiers and outfitted them completely for fighting. <sup>5</sup>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 ships, and 20 twelve from Asia. Of these ten were quinqueremes and quadriremes, the rest were smaller than this size and many of them open. <sup>6</sup>Nevertheless, convinced of the courage of his soldiers and knowing the forces of the enemy he prepared to do battle.

**14** <sup>1</sup>When it reached the point that each had confidence in his side, Caesar sailed around Pharos with his fleet and set his ships opposite the enemy. On the right wing he placed the men of Rhodes, on the left the men of Pontus. Between them he left a space of four hundred paces, which seemed to be enough for deploying up the ships. <sup>2</sup>Behind this line he arranged the remaining ships as a reserve. He determined which should follow which and which should come to the aid of which, and gave the orders. <sup>3</sup>Without hesitation the Alexandrians brought out and arranged their fleet for battle. In the front they placed 22 ships; they set up the rest as reserves in a second line. <sup>4</sup>They also brought out a great number of smaller ships and skiffs with fire-darts (lit. with darts and fires), in case the multitude itself and the noise and flame could bring anything of terror to our men. <sup>5</sup>Between the two fleets were shallows with a narrow passage. These extend toward the region of Africa. (For this is what they say, that half of Alexandria is part of Asia.). On both sides there was a rather long wait to see by which of the two the crossing would be initiated, since it seemed that those who entered, if the situation turned out worse for them, would be more impeded from deploying their ships and from retreating.

**15** <sup>1</sup>Euphranor was in charge of the Rhodian ships, a man to be compared in his greatness of heart and his virtue

more with our men than with the Greeks. <sup>2</sup>He, on account of his very conspicuous knowledge and greatness of heart, was selected by the Rhodians to be in charge of the fleet. <sup>3</sup>When he noticed the Caesar's <delay> he said, "You seem  
5 to me, Caesar, to be afraid that if you enter the shallows with your boats first, you will be forced to fight before you can deploy the rest of the fleet. Entrust the matter to us. <sup>4</sup>We will endure the brunt of the battle — we will not disappoint your trust — until the others can follow us. For them to boast  
10 for any longer in our sight is a source of great disgrace and pain for us." <sup>5</sup>Encouraging him and presenting him with all manner of praise Caesar gave the signal for battle. When four (sc. ships) had moved forward beyond the shallows, the Alexandrians surrounded the Rhodian ships and made  
15 an attack on them. <sup>6</sup>They (sc. the Rhodians) stood firm and deployed themselves with skill and cunning. And their training was so effective that although the numbers were unequal no ship was exposed sideways to the enemy, no ship's oars were stripped off; in fact they (i.e., the Rhodians  
20 or the Rhodian ships) continually confronted those coming against them. <sup>7</sup>Meanwhile the others followed. Then they necessarily departed from skill on account of the narrowness of the place and the whole struggle stood on virtue. <sup>8</sup>Indeed there was no one in Alexandria, of our men or of

the townspeople, <except> those concentrating on work or combat, who did not seek the highest roofs and from every viewpoint take a place for the spectacle and demand victory for their own side from the immortal gods with prayers and offerings.

5

**16** <sup>1</sup>The issue of contention, however, was not at all equal in the battle. For our men, once beaten back, had no escape route either by land or sea if defeated, and if they were victorious everything would remain unresolved. The enemy, if they had the advantage with their ships, would have power over everything, but if they proved weaker, would have other ways to try their luck (lit. would test the fortune that remained). <sup>2</sup>At the same time it seemed distressing and miserable that a very few men were involved in a decisive fight about the bulk <of the army> and about the safety of everyone. If any one of them fell short in spirit or courage, the rest, who had had no opportunity of fighting for themselves, would have to look out. <sup>3</sup>In the previous days Caesar had explained these things to his men repeatedly, so that they would fight with greater spirit because they saw that the safety of all had been entrusted to them. <sup>4</sup>By the same argument each man, accompanying a messmate, friend, or companion, implored him not to disappoint his own opinion and that of everyone

10

15

20

else, since their judgement was responsible for his being chosen and setting out to fight. <sup>5</sup>And so they fought in such a frame of mind that skill and cunning brought no help to the Alexandrians, though they were sailors and seafarers, and the large number did not benefit those with a greater number of ships, and men chosen for their virtue from so great a multitude of men could not equal the virtue of our men. <sup>6</sup>One quinquereme was taken in this battle and a bireme, with their fighters and rowers, and three were sunk, while all of ours were unharmed. <sup>7</sup>The rest took flight to the nearby town. The (townspeople) protected them from the ramparts and overhanging buildings and prevented our men from going closer.

**17** <sup>1</sup>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. <sup>2</sup>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. <sup>3</sup>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 the Gallic horsemen he deemed suitable. On one side of the island <e.g., he landed his footsoldiers, on the other side> he attacked with decked

ships in order to divide the (sc. enemy) forces, with great rewards offered to whoever seized the island first. <sup>4</sup>At first, equally matched, they withstood the attack of our men, for at the same moment they were both fighting back from the roofs of the buildings and mounting an armed defense of the shore—where on account of the difficulty of the location an easy approach was not given to our men—and nimbly and skillfully patrolling the position's narrows with their skiffs and five warships. <sup>5</sup>But as soon as few of our men set foot on the shore, after getting to know the terrain and testing the shallows, and others followed these, and they made a resolute attack upon those who had taken a position on the level shore, all the men of Pharos turned their backs. <sup>6</sup>With these men beaten back, \* \* \* and with the guard of the port abandoned, they steered the ships toward the shore and the village and rushed forth from the ships to defend the buildings.

**18** <sup>1</sup>But they were unable to hold themselves within this defensive position for very long, even though the type of buildings was not dissimilar to those in Alexandria (to compare smaller things to greater), and lofty connecting tower blocks took the place of a wall, nor had our men come prepared with ladders or brushwood bundles or the remaining materials for making an assault. <sup>2</sup>But fear seizes

the mind and judgment from men and weakens their limbs. So it happened then. <sup>3</sup>The same men who were confident that on a fair and level plain they were our equals, terrified by the flight of their men and the death of a few, did not dare make a stand in buildings with a height of 30 feet, and they threw themselves into the sea along the jetty and they swam the 800-pace distance to the town. <sup>4</sup>Many of these men were nonetheless captured and killed, but the number of captives was 6,000 altogether.

**19** <sup>1</sup>Letting the soldiers take the plunder, Caesar commanded that the buildings be ransacked and he fortified a stronghold near the bridge closer to Pharos and placed a garrison there. <sup>2</sup>In their flight the men of Pharos had abandoned this bridge; as for the one that was more secure and closer to the city, the Alexandrians were guarding it. But on the next day Caesar attacked it for a similar reason, because he saw that, with these two under his control, naval sorties and sudden raids would be utterly out of the question. <sup>3</sup>And using catapults and arrows from his ships he had already expelled those who were holding the place under their protection, driven them back into the town, and landed the equivalent of three cohorts. (For the tight quarters permitted no more to get themselves into position. The rest of his troops remained at their posts on the ships.)

<sup>4</sup>After accomplishing this he commanded that the bridge be fortified against the enemy and that where the ships had a way out—an arch had been built and the bridge was supported by it—the area be filled with rocks and blocked.

<sup>5</sup>With the one of these tasks completed, such that no skiff at all was able to get out, and with the other task begun, all of the Alexandrians' forces flung themselves out of the city and took a position in the wider area up against our bridge fortifications. At the same time they positioned the vessels that they had been in the habit of sending out through the bridges to burn our transports near the jetty. <sup>6</sup>We were fighting from the bridge and jetty; they were fighting from the flat area facing the bridge and the ships alongside the jetty. 5 10

**20** <sup>1</sup>With Caesar occupied in these matters and exhorting the troops, a great number of oarsmen and marines launched themselves from our warships onto the jetty. <sup>2</sup>A portion of them were carried by an eagerness to watch, a portion even by a desire to fight. At first these repelled the enemy vessels from the jetty with stones and slings, and they seemed to be accomplishing much with the quantity of projectiles. <sup>3</sup>But after a few Alexandrians dared to disembark from their ships beyond that point, on their open flank, our men, just as they had advanced without standards and 15 20



fixed ranks, without order, in like manner they began to retreat rashly into the ships. <sup>4</sup>More Alexandrians, spurred on by their flight, were disembarking from the ships and pursuing our men, whose dismay had intensified (OR, with Landgraf's emendation: starting a more aggressive pursuit of our men, who had been thrown into confusion). At the same time, those who had remained in the warships were hurrying to pull in the ladders and push the ships away from the shore to prevent the enemy from capturing the ships.

<sup>5</sup>Thrown into confusion by all of these events, our troops of the three cohorts that had been stationed on the bridge and the first part of the jetty, when they heard the clamor behind them, saw the flight of their own men, and faced a huge number of incoming projectiles, fearing lest they be surrounded in the rear and entirely cut off from retreat by the departure of the ships, abandoned the defenses begun on the bridge and with a great rush headed in agitation towards the ships. <sup>6</sup>A portion of them, after reaching the nearest ships, were sunk by the multitude of men and their weight, a portion, pausing and hesitating over what plan should be taken, were killed by the Alexandrians. Some with a more fortunate outcome reached the unencumbered ships at anchor and escaped unharmed; a few, raising their

shields and relying on an enterprising spirit, swam to nearby vessels.

**21** <sup>1</sup>As long as Caesar was able by exhortation to keep his men at the bridge and defenses, he stayed on, sharing their danger (lit. was involved in the same danger). After he noticed that everyone was retreating, he withdrew himself into his own vessel. <sup>2</sup>And when a great number of men following him there swarmed in, and no opportunity either of maneuvering or pushing back from the shore was given, suspecting that what did happen would happen he launched himself from the vessel and swam to the ships that were stationed further out. <sup>3</sup>From there, sending skiffs to assist his struggling men, he saved some. As for his vessel, weighed down by the great number of men it perished together with the men. <sup>4</sup>In this battle around 400 were lost from the number of the legionary troops and a slightly greater number of oarsmen and marines. <sup>5</sup>The Alexandrians fortified a stronghold in that spot with substantial defenses and many siege engines, and after removing the rocks from the water they used the place freely afterwards for sending out vessels.

**22** <sup>1</sup>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. <sup>2</sup>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'  
 5 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.

23 <sup>1</sup>The Alexandrians, since they saw that the Romans  
 were both steadied by successes and spurred on by reverses,  
 10 and since they did not know any third outcome of war by  
 which they could become steadier themselves, as we are able  
 to comprehend by conjecture, either having been advised  
 by friends of the king who were inside Caesar's defenses,  
 or with their own previously-made plan having been made  
 15 acceptable to the king through secret messengers, they sent  
 envoys to Caesar (saying that) he should release the king and  
 allow him to cross over to his own people. <sup>2</sup>For the whole  
 multitude, they said, fed up with the girl's offensiveness,  
 with a regent as ruler, and with Ganymedes' extremely  
 20 cruel dominion, was prepared to do what the king ordered;  
 and if they came into Caesar's trust and friendship by his  
 authority, there would be no fear of any danger preventing  
 the multitude from surrendering.

**24** <sup>1</sup>Caesar, although he knew well that the people were deceitful and always thinking something other than what they were pretending, nevertheless decided that there was utility in giving an indulgence to the petitioners. For he believed that the king would remain loyal after he was released if their feelings somehow accorded with what they were asking for, but that if they wanted to have the king as a leader for waging war (which was a better fit with their nature), it would be more splendid and honorable undertaking for him to wage war against a king rather than against a band of refugees and fugitives. <sup>2</sup>Therefore, after urging the king to consider the interests of his ancestral kingdom, to spare [even] his most outstanding country, which had been disfigured by shameful conflagrations and demolitions, to recall his citizens to sanity and then preserve them, and to display his loyalty to the Roman people and to himself, since he (Caesar) believed in him so much that he sent him to armed enemies, grasping his right hand in his own right hand he began to dismiss the boy already an adult in age. <sup>3</sup>But the royal spirit, educated in the most deceitful disciplines—and so that he would not fall short of the customs of his race—in tears began to beg Caesar instead not to send him away, saying that to him his very kingdom was not more pleasing than the sight of Caesar. <sup>4</sup>After the boy's tears were

5  
10  
15  
20

suppressed an emotional Caesar, himself affirming that he (Ptolemy) would quickly be with him (Caesar) if he felt that way, dismissed him to his own people. <sup>5</sup>As if released from the starting gate onto an open track, Ptolemy began to wage so vigorous a war against Caesar that he seemed to have shed from joy the tears that he had produced in their meeting. <sup>6</sup>Many legates, friends, officers, and soldiers of Caesar were glad that this had happened, because, as they thought, his excessive benevolence had been cheated by the deceits of a boy. As if in truth Caesar had done it led by generosity alone and not with a most prudent plan.

**25** <sup>1</sup>When the Alexandrians, after acquiring a leader, observed that they became no stronger nor did the Romans become more sluggish, and when, with the soldiers mocking the king's age and weakness, they took great offence and saw that they were not accomplishing anything, and when rumors arose that Caesar's substantial garrisons were being brought along the land route from Syria and Cilicia (a thing that had not yet been heard by Caesar), they decided to intercept the provisions that were being shipped for our men by sea. <sup>2</sup>And so, with unencumbered vessels placed on duty in suitable places near Canopus, they began to lie in wait for our ships †supplies?†. <sup>3</sup>When this was announced to Caesar, he commanded his whole fleet to be unencumbered and

deployed. He placed Tiberius Nero in command of it (sc. the fleet). The Rhodian ships set out in this fleet, among them Euphranor, without whom no naval battle had ever—or even with inadequate success—been accomplished. <sup>4</sup>But Fortune, who for the most part keeps those whom she has adorned with many favors for a harsher fall, pursued Euphranor unlike the Fortune of earlier occasions. <sup>5</sup>For after they reached Canopus and the fleet deployed on each side had come to grips, and Euphranor, by his own custom, had been the first to engage and pierced through and sunk an enemy quadrireme, he, pursuing the next ship too far—since the rest were not following quickly enough—was surrounded by the Alexandrians. <sup>6</sup>No one carried aid to him, either because they thought that there was enough protection for him because of his valor and luck or because they were afraid for their lives. So out of all in that battle the one man who conducted the affair well was the only one who perished, along with his victorious quadrireme.

**26** <sup>1</sup>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), <sup>2</sup>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), Mithridates, having surrounded it suddenly with a great number of troops, although the multifarious garrison was fighting back stubbornly, 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. <sup>3</sup>Therefore, with this matter carried off well, he headed toward Alexandria, toward Caesar. And he had pacified all the areas through which he was making his way by the authority that is usually at hand for the victor, and had brought them into friendship with Caesar.

**27** <sup>1</sup>There is a place not far from Alexandria, the most famous place of those regions, which is called the Delta. It took this name from its resemblance to the letter. For a certain portion of the Nile river, after a diversion, connects with the sea in two branches, gradually leaving a space in

the middle between them, the branches being very far apart at the shore. <sup>2</sup>Since the king learned that Mithridates was approaching this place and knew he must cross the river, he sent a large force against him, by which he believed Mithridates could be conquered or wiped out, or certainly 5 detained. <sup>3</sup>Although he desired that Mithridates be conquered, the king considered it sufficient that Mithridates be detained by him, cut off from Caesar. <sup>4</sup>The first troops able to cross the river from the Delta and meet Mithridates started a battle, eager to deprive those who were following 10 behind of a share of the victory. <sup>5</sup>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 15 immoderately, he made sallies from every side and killed a great number of their men. <sup>6</sup>If the rest had not hidden themselves, using their familiarity with the territory, and in part withdrawn into the ships they had used to cross the river, they would have been completely wiped out. <sup>7</sup>When 20 these men had revived themselves a little from that scare, they joined themselves to those who were following and began to attack Mithridates again.



28 <sup>1</sup>A messenger was sent from Mithridates to Caesar in order to relate his success. The king learned about these same events from his own men. <sup>2</sup>Thus at nearly the same time the king set out to crush Mithridates and Caesar to relieve him. The king used the quicker route by boat via the Nile river, in which he had a large fleet in readiness. Caesar was unwilling to use the same route, so as to avoid fighting a naval battle in the river, but taking a roundabout route by the sea that is said to belong to a part of Africa, as I explained above, he nonetheless fell in with the king's forces before the king could attack Mithridates, and welcomed a victorious Mithridates with his army intact. <sup>3</sup>The king had encamped with his troops in a place with natural fortification, as it was in itself higher than the plain that lay beneath it on all sides. On three sides, moreover, it was protected by fortifications of different sorts: one side had been situated adjacent to the Nile river, another laid out in an extremely lofty position so that the position would constitute part of the stronghold, and the third was hemmed in by a swamp.

29 <sup>1</sup>Between the stronghold and Caesar's route passed a narrow river with extremely high banks, which flowed into the Nile. It was about seven miles distant from the king's stronghold. <sup>2</sup>When the king learned that Caesar

was coming by that route, he sent his entire cavalry and select light infantry to that river; they were to prevent Caesar from crossing and engage from the banks in a lop-sided long-range battle: for courage made no headway and cowardice met with no danger. <sup>3</sup>This situation inflamed 5 our soldiers and cavalry with resentment that the contest with the Alexandrians was lasting so long in an indecisive battle. <sup>4</sup>Thus, at the same moment a portion of the German cavalry, after scattering in search of fords, swam across the river where the banks were rather low, and the legions, 10 after cutting down huge trees that were long enough to touch both banks, toppling them forward and piling on a makeshift roadbed, crossed the river. <sup>5</sup>The enemy was so utterly terrified of their attack that they set their hopes of safety on flight. Yet this was in vain, for a few from that flight 15 made it back to the king, while all the remaining multitude was slain.

**30** <sup>1</sup>After this most notable success Caesar, since he thought that his sudden approach would strike great terror into the Alexandrians, immediately pushed forward as a 20 victor to the king's camp. <sup>2</sup>But when he observed that this (camp) was surrounded by a substantial fortification and protected by the nature of its position, and saw the dense mass of armed men stationed on the rampart, he was unwill-

ing to have his soldiers, weary with marching and fighting, move up to attack the camp. Therefore, he pitched camp, leaving no great distance (between it and) the enemy. <sup>3</sup>On the following day, Caesar attacked and took the fort that the king had built in the nearest village not far distant from his own stronghold and joined to the its fortification by means of outworks so as to hold onto the village. Caesar used all of his forces, not because he thought it would be difficult to accomplish this by using a smaller number of soldiers, but so that, with the Alexandrians thoroughly unnerved by that victory, he could attack the king's stronghold directly. <sup>4</sup>And so the soldiers pursued the Alexandrians retreating from the fort into the stronghold at a run, and without stopping moved up to the fortifications and began to fight an extremely fierce long-range battle. <sup>5</sup>Our men had an approach for attack from two areas: one, which I explained had an unencumbered approach, the other, which had a moderate-sized space between the stronghold and the river Nile. <sup>6</sup>The largest and most carefully picked contingent of the Alexandrians was defending the area that afforded the easiest approach, but the men who were fighting near the river Nile were having the most success in repelling and wounding our men. For our men were being pierced by projectiles from different directions, from the front by

projectiles coming from the stronghold's rampart, from the rear by projectiles coming from the river, on which many ships manned with slingers and archers were attacking our men.

**31** <sup>1</sup>When Caesar saw that his soldiers could fight 5  
no more vigorously, and yet that little headway was being made owing to the difficulty of their positions, and when he noticed that the Alexandrians had neglected their stronghold's most elevated position both because it provided its own defense and because, in their eagerness in 10  
some cases to fight, in others to look on, the men had rushed down to the position in which there was fighting, he ordered three cohorts to encircle the stronghold and to attack the most elevated position, and he put Carfulenus in command of them, a man outstanding in both greatness of 15  
spirit and knowledge of military affairs. <sup>2</sup>Upon their arrival, with a small number defending the fortifications while our men fought with extreme vigor, the Alexandrians, terrified by the noise and the fighting in a new location, began to scatter in a panic into every part of the stronghold. <sup>3</sup>The 20  
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. Running down from that point our men killed a great mul-

titude of the enemy in the stronghold. <sup>4</sup>Many Alexandrians fleeing this danger hurled themselves en masse from the rampart into the area that was joined to the river. <sup>5</sup>The first of these were crushed in a great heap right in the fortification's trench, and then the rest had an easier escape. <sup>6</sup>It is agreed that the king himself fled from the camp and then, after being received aboard ship, perished when the vessel was sunk by the large number of men who were swimming to the nearest ships.

10     **32** <sup>1</sup>This affair was conducted with the utmost success and rapidity, and thereafter Caesar, with the confidence arising from a great victory hastened with his cavalry to Alexandria by the nearest overland route and entered as victor through the quarter of the town that was in the  
15 hands of the enemy garrison. <sup>2</sup>His plan proved completely correct: after hearing about the battle the enemy was no longer going to contemplate war. <sup>3</sup>Upon arrival he gained a fitting return for valour and magnanimity, for the entire population of townsfolk threw down their weapons and  
20 abandoned their fortifications. Then, after donning the attire in which suppliants customarily placate rulers with prayers and bringing out all the sacred emblems by whose sanctity they were accustomed to entreat the offended and angry hearts of their kings, they hastened to Caesar as

he arrived and surrendered themselves to him. <sup>4</sup>Caesar took them under his protection and consoled them, then went through the enemy fortifications into his own part of the town greatly cheered by his own men, who were happy about the good fortune not only of the war itself and the fighting but also of the way he arrived (in Alexandria). [According to Orosius, 6.16.1, there were 12,000 prisoners of war and 70 captured ships.] 5

**33** <sup>1</sup>Having made himself master of Egypt and Alexandria, Caesar appointed as rulers those whom Ptolemaeus had written down in his will and entreated the Roman people that they not be changed. <sup>2</sup>For since the elder of the two boys, the king, was gone, Caesar handed over the kingdom to the younger one and to the elder of the two daughters, Cleopatra, who had remained under his protection and within his defenses; the younger daughter, Arsinoe—I showed earlier that Ganymedes long ruled immoderately in her name—he decided to remove from the realm, lest some new dissension arise again at the instigation of turbulent men, before the dominion of the rulers was consolidated by the passage of time. <sup>3</sup>As for the legions, taking the veteran Sixth taken away with him he left the rest there, so that the dominion of these rulers would be more stable, rulers who could enjoy neither the affection of their people, because 15 20

they had remained faithfully in the friendship of Caesar, nor the authority of a long-established reign, having been in place as rulers for a small number days. <sup>4</sup>At the same time he deemed it relevant to the dignity of our empire and to public expediency that, if the rulers remained loyal, they be protected by our garrisons; if they were ungrateful, they could be held in check by those same garrisons. Thus with all these things completed and put in place, he (Caesar) himself set out by way of land into Syria.

**34** <sup>1</sup>While these events took place in Egypt, King Deiotarus came to Domitius Calvinus, to whom Caesar had given Asia and the nearby provinces to be governed, to beg him not to allow Lesser Armenia, his own kingdom, or Cappadocia, the kingdom of Ariobarzanes, to be possessed and destroyed by Pharnaces, (saying that) unless they (i.e., the kings) were freed from this evil, they were unable to do what had been ordered and to pay the money promised to Caesar. <sup>2</sup>Domitius, since he not only deemed that money was necessary for settling military expenses but also determined that it was a shameful thing for the Roman people and for victorious C. Caesar and a disreputable thing for himself that the kingdoms of allies and friends be occupied by a foreign king, immediately sent messengers to Pharnaces, (ordering him) to withdraw from Armenia and Cappadocia

and not to test the strength of the right and majesty of the Roman people in the circumstance of civil war. <sup>3</sup>Since he thought that this warning was going to have greater force if he approached those regions more closely with his army, having set out to the legions he led one of three, the 5 Thirty-Sixth, with him, sent to Caesar in Egypt the two summoned in Caesar's letters. (One of these did not arrive in the Alexandrian war, because it had been sent by a terrestrial route through Syria.) <sup>4</sup>Cn. Domitius added to the 10 Thirty-Sixth legion two from Deiotarus that he had built up with our discipline and armament for many years, plus 100 horsemen, and took the same number from Ariobarzanes. <sup>5</sup>He sent P. Sestius to the quaestor C. Plaetorius, (ordering him) to lead the legion that had been formed out of hastily 15 raised soldiers in Pontus, and Quintus Patisius to Cilicia for the purpose of summoning reinforcements. All these forces quickly assembled in Comana (i.e., Comana Pontica) by the order of Domitius.

**35** <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile the ambassadors brought back replies from Pharnaces: that he had withdrawn from Cappadocia 20 but retaken Lesser Armenia, which he ought to possess by right, on his father's account. Finally, the matter of that kingdom should be preserved untouched for Caesar. For he (Pharnaces) was ready to do what he (Caesar) had



decided. <sup>2</sup>Since [P.] Domitius noted that Pharnaces had withdrawn from Cappadocia motivated not by free choice but by necessity, because he was able (he believed) to defend Armenia, adjacent to his own kingdom, more easily than  
5 the more remote Cappadocia, and because he had thought that Domitius was going to bring along all three legions, and had remained quite audaciously in Armenia once he (Pharnaces) realized that two of these had been sent to Caesar, he (Domitius) began to insist that he (Pharnaces)  
10 withdraw from that kingdom, too. For his right to Cappadocia, Domitius said, was no different than his right to Armenia, nor was there justification for his demand that the matter be left untouched for the arrival of Caesar, for something was "untouched" if it was the same as it had  
15 been. <sup>3</sup>With these replies having been given, Domitius set out into Armenia with the forces that I recorded above, and he began to make a journey via higher ground. (For leaving Pontus by way of Comana <there is> an elevated, wooded ridge stretching into Lesser Armenia, and this ridge forms  
20 the boundary separating Cappadocia from Armenia.) 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, adja-

cent to these ridges, was going to supply a great abundance of provision(s).

**36** <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile Pharnaces sent several embassies to Domitius to negotiate about peace and bear the king's gifts to Domitius. <sup>2</sup>He (sc. Domitius) kept rejecting all these things firmly and responding to the ambassadors that nothing was going to be more important to him than recovering the dignity of the Roman people and the kingdoms of the allies. <sup>3</sup>With long and uninterrupted marches having been completed, when he arrived at Nicopolis—this town located in Lesser Armenia was itself in a level place, but with high mountains as barriers on two sides at a significant remove from the town—he pitched his camp around 7 miles away from Nicopolis. <sup>4</sup>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, <sup>5</sup>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.

37 <sup>1</sup>Although he was conducting these operations, Pharnaces nevertheless continued to send legates to Domitius concerning peace and friendship, because he believed that by this very strategy Domitius could be more easily deceived. <sup>2</sup>Conversely, the hope of peace gave Domitius cause for delaying in the same camp (i.e., for staying where he was, about 7 miles from Nicopolis). Thus Pharnaces, once the opportunity of the most recent moment had been lost, because he feared that his ambush might be made known, recalled his men into the camp. <sup>3</sup>On the following day Domitius approached nearer to Nicopolis and set up camp near town. While our troops strengthened this camp, Pharnaces arrayed his battle line according to his custom and habit. <sup>4</sup>For with the battle line drawn as a single straight line in the front, the wings were strengthened by three reserves each. Following the same rationale these (i.e., three-fold reserves) were positioned in the middle of his battle line, with single lines arrayed in the two intervals to the right and left (sc. of the middle of the line). <sup>5</sup>Domitius finished the work that had been started on the camp, with part of his troops having been stationed in front of the rampart.

**38** <sup>1</sup>The next night Pharnaces, with messengers having been intercepted who were carrying letters to Domitius concerning the affairs of Alexandria, learned that Caesar was situated in great danger and that it was being demanded of Domitius that he send reinforcements to Caesar as soon as possible and that he himself advance closer to Alexandria through Syria. <sup>2</sup>With this having been learned, Pharnaces reckoned it to be tantamount to victory if he was able to drag out the time, because he thought that it was necessary for Domitius to decamp quickly. <sup>3</sup>Thus where he thought there was the easiest approach from the town and most advantageous location for our men for waging battle, he extended two straight trenches, four feet in depth, with a not particularly large space having been left between them, to the place beyond which he had determined not to extend his line. <sup>4</sup>He always drew up his battle line between these trenches; he stationed his entire cavalry, however, beyond the trench on the sides. They were going to be able to be useful in no other way and surpassed our cavalry by a great number.

**39** <sup>1</sup>Domitius, however, because he was disturbed more by Caesar's danger than his own and judged that he would not safely break camp if he sought again the terms that he had rejected or departed without cause, led the army out of

the nearby camp and into battle formation. <sup>2</sup>He stationed the thirty-sixth legion on the right wing, the Pontic legion on the left. He moved the legions of Deiotarus together into the middle of the line—but he nevertheless left them a very narrow section of the front—with the remaining cohorts positioned as reserves. With the battle line on both sides having been drawn up thus there was an advance for the purpose of fighting.

**40** <sup>1</sup>With the signal having been given on both sides at the same time there was a charge. The fighting was fierce and various. For the thirty-sixth legion, after it made an attack beyond the trench against the cavalry of the king, waged so successful a battle as to come under the walls of the town, cross the trench, and attack the enemy from behind. <sup>2</sup>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. The legions of Deiotarus, however, barely withstood the attack. <sup>3</sup>Thus the royal forces, victorious on his right wing and in the middle of the line, turned themselves toward the thirty-sixth legion. This nevertheless withstood the attack of the victors bravely. Surrounded by a great mass of foes, fighting

with great resolution, (the legion) drew itself into a circle near the base of the mountains, where Pharnaces did not wish to follow owing to the location's unfavorable nature.

<sup>4</sup>Thus with the Pontic legion having been almost completely lost, and with a great part of Deiotarus' soldiers having been killed, the thirty-sixth legion took themselves to a higher location with no more than two hundred and fifty having been lost. <sup>5</sup>Some distinguished and illustrious men died in this battle, Romans of equestrian status. After incurring such a setback Domitius nevertheless gathered the remains of (his) scattered army and withdrew them into Asia through Cappadocia by safe roads. 5 10

**41** <sup>1</sup>Pharnaces, carried away by his successes, since he was hoping that what he wanted concerning Caesar (would occur), occupied Pontus with all his forces. And there, acting as both a conqueror and an exceptionally cruel king, since he was set on (having) his paternal holdings with a more prosperous outcome, he laid waste to many towns, plundered the goods of both Roman and Pontic citizens, <sup>2</sup>established tortures in regards to those who had something commendable of beauty and age, those (tortures) that were more pitiable than death. And since no one defended Pontum, he began to hold it, boasting that he had retaken his paternal kingdom. 15 20

42 <sup>1</sup>Around that same time a setback occurred in Illyricum. This province had been held in the preceding months not only without disgrace but even with praise.

<sup>2</sup>Moreover, Quintus Cornificius, a quaestor of Caesar's

5 with *propraetorian* powers, having been sent to this province in the summer with two legions, even though the province was minimally stocked for sustaining armies and had been exhausted and laid waste by the nearby war and rebellions, nevertheless with his foresight and attentiveness—since he took great care that he not advance rashly anywhere—both reclaimed and defended [it]. <sup>3</sup>For

10 instance, he stormed numerous strongholds positioned in elevated locales, the advantageousness of which kept encouraging the stronghold commanders to execute raids and undertake military campaigns, and presented his soldiers with the booty (which, even if meagre, was nevertheless appreciated, so great was the desperation of the province, especially since the booty had been acquired through valor). And when Octavius, after the flight that

20 followed the battle of Pharsalus, arrived in that area with a great fleet, Cornificius had gained possession of Octavius' scattered ships using a few ships of the *Iadertini*, a people whose singular service to the state had remained firm. The result was that, with these ships added to those of his

allies, he was able to contend in battle with something akin to a fleet. <sup>4</sup>When, Caesar, the victor, was pursuing Cn. Pompeius in the most extreme opposite part of the earth and heard that numerous adversaries, after collecting those left after the flight, had arrived in Illyricum, owing to its proximity to Macedonia, he sent a message to Gabinius, [bidding him] that he set out with his legions of recruits, which had been conscripted just recently, for Illyricum. After joining his forces with Q. Cornificus, he was to dispel any danger inflicted on the province; if, however, the province could not be secured with forces that were not large, he was to lead his legions into Macedonia. <sup>5</sup>For Caesar believed that the entire area and region would revive the war, so long as Cn. Pompeius was alive.

**43** <sup>1</sup>When Gabinius came to Illyricum during the wintry and difficult time of the year, whether thinking that the province was more fully stocked, or attributing a great deal to the luck of the victorious Caesar, or confident in his own courage and expertise (having often taken risks with this in his wars, he had executed great successes under his own leadership and auspices), he neither derived support from the resources of the province, which had become desolate in some parts, unreliable in others, nor had the ability to convey provisions, the sea being closed to ships by storms,



and under the constraint of great difficulties he waged the war not as he wished, but as was necessary. <sup>2</sup>Thus, when he was forced to raid towns or strongholds in the most extreme weather on account of his shortage of supplies, he repeatedly suffered misfortunes and was regarded by the locals with such contempt that, while retreating to the coastal town, Salona, whose inhabitants were exceptionally brave and loyal Roman citizens, he was forced to engage in battle on the march. <sup>3</sup>After losing more than two thousand infantrymen, thirty-eight centurions, five tribunes in this battle, he retreated with the rest of his forces to Salona and, under pressure from extreme difficulty in everything, within a few months passed away there from illness. And both his ill-luck while alive and his sudden death gave Octavius much hope of acquiring the province. As for him, however, both luck, a most potent factor in wars—along with the diligence of Cornificius—and the bravery of Vatinius did not allow him a very long involvement in success.

**44** <sup>1</sup>When Vatinius was in Brundisium, after having learned of the things that took place in Illyricum, since he was being summoned by Cornificius' frequent letters to provide aid to the province, and since he was hearing that Marcus Octavius had made pacts with the barbarians and in many places was attacking the garrisons of our soldiers

partly in person with a fleet, partly with infantry forces through the agency of barbarians, and although, being affected by poor health, in bodily strength he could barely keep up with his spirit, he nevertheless overcame with his courage the disadvantage of nature and the difficulties of both the winter and the hasty preparation. <sup>2</sup>For since he had few warships in the harbor, he sent a letter to Achaia to Quintus Calenus asking that he send a fleet to him. <sup>3</sup>Since this was happening later than the danger in which our men found themselves demanded—they were not able to fend off the attack of Octavius—he mounted beaks on the swift ships, whose number was quite large but whose bulk was by no means appropriate enough for fighting. <sup>4</sup>He added these to the warships and, having increased the fleet's numerical strength by putting veteran soldiers on board (he had a great number of these from all the legions, who had been left behind among the sick in Brundisium when his army was being transported to Greece), he set out to Illyricum. [There] he took back a few coastal towns that had revolted and surrendered themselves to Octavius, and others, which remained adamant in their decision, he sailed past, and he did not bring upon himself a delay and exigency for any reason that might prevent him from pursuing Octavius himself as quickly as possible. <sup>5</sup>With his arrival he forced

Octavius, who was attacking Epidaurus, where a garrison of ours was, by land and sea, to disengage the attack, and he took back our garrison.

45 <sup>1</sup>When Octavius learned that Vatinius had a navy  
5 largely composed from small ships built for speed, being  
confident in his own navy he stopped at the island of Tauris.  
Vatinius, in pursuit, was sailing in this area, not because he  
knew that Octavius had stopped there, but rather because  
he had decided to follow him after Octavius had gone some  
10 distance ahead. <sup>2</sup>When Vatinius came closer to Tauris  
(keeping his ships at a distance from one another since  
the weather was stormy and there was no suspicion of the  
enemy) he all of a sudden spotted a ship sailing his way,  
with the yards lowered to mid-mast and equipped with  
15 soldiers. <sup>3</sup>When he noticed this, he quickly ordered that the  
sails be reefed, the yards be lowered, and that the soldiers  
arm themselves. Having raised the banner with which he  
was accustomed to give the battle-sign, he started signaling  
that the ships that were right behind him do the same  
20 thing. <sup>4</sup>Vatinius' soldiers began preparing themselves under  
sudden pressure. Octavius' soldiers, already prepared, set  
forth from the harbor one after another. A battle line  
forms on both sides: that of Octavius with a more orderly

arrangement, that of Vatinius better equipped in terms of soldiers' morale.

**46** <sup>1</sup>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. 5  
Thus, he attacked first, driving his quinquereme against the quadrireme of Octavius himself. <sup>2</sup>As Octavius was rowing against him with utmost speed and bravery, the opposing ships rushed together with their beaks clashing so furiously that the ship of Octavius, her beak shattered, was trapped 10  
in the timber. <sup>3</sup>The battle was going on fiercely elsewhere as well, and there was a rush towards the leaders especially. Since everyone was coming to his own leader's aid, a large battle developed at close quarters in the narrow strait of the sea. 15  
<sup>4</sup>The more opportunity for combat was given, once the ships had come together, the greater the superiority of Vatinius' soldiers. With admirable boldness they were not hesitating to jump over from their vessels onto enemy ships, and, once the engagement was brought to equal terms, being by far superior in bravery, they began to fight with success. 20  
<sup>5</sup>The quadrireme of Octavius himself sank, while many other ships were captured or sunk after being punctured by beaks. The soldiers of Octavius were partly slaughtered on the ships, partly toppled into the sea. <sup>6</sup>Octavius himself

boarded a skiff. And when many boarded it in flight—the skiff having sunk—Octavius, although wounded, managed to swim to his little pirate vessel. <sup>7</sup>Being taken in there, when the night had dispersed the battle, he escaped by sail in a large storm. A few of his ships that chance had spared from the disaster followed him.

**47** <sup>1</sup>But Vatinius, with the affair having been carried off well, sounded a retreat and, as victor, withdrew himself with all of his men uninjured into the port from which Octavius' fleet had gone forward for the purpose of fighting. <sup>2</sup>From that battle he gained possession of one penteris, two triremes, eight two-banked galleys, and several of Octavius' oarsmen. And after spending the following day there while repairing his own and the captured ships, two days later he hastened to the island of Issa, because he believed that Octavius had withdrawn himself there in flight. <sup>3</sup>On the island there was a town, the most famous of those regions and thoroughly tied to Octavius. <sup>4</sup>And when Vatinius arrived there the townsfolk gave themselves up as suppliants to Vatinius, and he learned that Octavius himself, the wind being favorable, had made for the region of Greece with a few small ships, so that from there he might head for Sicily and then Africa. <sup>5</sup>Thus, in a short space, with the affair having been conducted most brilliantly, with the province

having been regained and returned to Cornificius, with the fleet of the enemy having been expelled from that entire zone, he, as victor, withdrew himself to Brundisium with his army and fleet uninjured.

**48** <sup>1</sup>However, at the times in which Caesar was besieging Pompey at Dyrrachium and was conducting things successfully at Palaepharsalus and was fighting at Alexandria not only with great danger but also with a greater rumor of danger, Quintus Cassius Longinus, having been left behind in Spain as the *propraetor* for the sake of holding the further province, owing either to the habit of his nature or to the animosity towards that province that he had adopted as a *quaestor* after he was wounded there in an ambush, had created significant additions of animosity against himself—and he could have learned of it either from self-awareness, since he believed the province’s feelings about him to be reciprocal, or from the many indications and testimonies of those who had difficulty disguising their hatred—and desired to counterbalance the hatred of the province with the affection of the army. <sup>2</sup>Accordingly, as soon as he assembled the army into one place, he promised one hundred sesterces each to the soldiers, and not long after, when in Lusitania he had captured the town of Medubriga and Mount Herminius, to which the Medubrigensians had fled,

and he was addressed as imperator there, he presented the soldiers with one hundred sesterces each. <sup>3</sup>Moreover, he granted many and great rewards to individuals, which put on display his love of the army at present. However, little  
5 by little and secretly he was diminishing military discipline and strictness.

**49** <sup>1</sup>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  
10 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. <sup>2</sup>Funds were requisitioned from the wealthy, and Longinus  
15 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  
20 the commander's residence and tribunal were uninvolved with it. <sup>3</sup>No one who could make at least some outlay was not either constrained by a guarantee or listed among the accused. Thus great anxiety about personal peril, too, was added to expenses and damage to family fortunes.

50 <sup>1</sup>For these reasons it happened that, when Longinus did the same thing as commander that he had done as quaestor, the provincials again initiated similar plans about killing him. <sup>2</sup>Several members of his inner circle intensified the provincials' hatred. These, although they were involved in that notorious partnership in theft, nevertheless hated the man in whose name they were committing crimes, and 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. <sup>3</sup>He enrolled a new fifth legion. The hatred grew from the conscription itself and from the expense of the additional legion. A contingent of three thousand cavalymen was filled and equipped at very great expense. And the province was given no repose.

51 <sup>1</sup>In the meantime, he received a letter from Caesar, saying that he should transfer his army to Africa and should go through Mauretania to the borders of Numidia because it was thought that Iuba had sent substantial reinforcements for Gnaeus Pompeius and was about to send more. <sup>2</sup>After he had received the letter he was animated by uncharacteristic readiness because, as he saw it, so great an opportunity—in the form of new provinces and an extremely fertile kingdom—had been offered to him. <sup>3</sup>Because of this, he himself left for Lusitania in order to summon legions and



to gather auxiliary troops. To certain people he gave the task that grain and a hundred ships should be prepared and that monetary contributions should be defined and requisitioned so that nothing would be delayed when he returned. <sup>4</sup>For neither effort nor watchfulness were missing in Cassius, especially when he wanted something.

52 <sup>1</sup>After the army was collected in a single place and the camp had been set up near Cordoba, he explained in front of the assembly of soldiers what things he was obliged to carry out on Caesar's command, and he promised them, when he had transferred them to Mauretania, to give each 100 sesterces. The fifth legion, he said, would stay in Spain. <sup>2</sup>After the assembly he returned to Cordoba and on the very same day in the afternoon, when he was going to the basilica, a certain Minucius Silon, a client of Lucius Racilius, gave him a petition, as if he was demanding something from him in the manner of a soldier. Then, when Silon had insinuated himself behind Racilius (for he covered one side of Cassius) as if he was seeking an answer—room had quickly been made for him—he grabbed Cassius, who was facing away from him, with his left hand and with his right struck him twice with a dagger. <sup>3</sup>As a clamor arose there was an attack by all of the conspirators. Munatius Flaccus stabbed the nearest attendant with his sword. After

this one was killed, he injured the officer Quintus Cassius.

<sup>4</sup>At that point Titus Vasius and Marcus Mercello with similar audacity helped their townsman Flaccus. For they were all from Italica. But Lucius Licinius Squillus rushed up to Longinus himself and wounded him lying there with light blows. 5

**53** <sup>1</sup>People rushed together to defend Cassius. For he was always accustomed to have an armed escort of Berones and numerous veterans. <sup>2</sup>By those the rest of the people who were following to participate in the massacre were excluded. In this group were Calpurnius Salvianus and Manilius Tuscus. <sup>3</sup>Minucius was overpowered while fleeing among the outcrops on the route, and after Cassius had been carried back to his house he was taken to him. Racilius moved to the adjacent house of a friend until he could learn with certainty that Cassius had been finished off. <sup>4</sup>Laterensis hurried to the camp happy, since he had no doubt about it, and congratulated soldiers of the indigenous and second legions, whom he knew to be particularly hostile to Cassius. He was raised up onto the tribunal by the crowd and declared praetor. <sup>5</sup>For nobody either born in the province, like the soldiers of the indigenous legion, or effectively provincial from their long stay (in this number was the second legion), did not agree with the entire province in 15 20

their hatred for Cassius. As for the 30th and 21st legions, Caesar had assigned them to Longinus after enrollment in Italy a few months earlier. The fifth legion had recently been assembled there (sc. in Spain).

5     **54** <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile, notice was brought to Laterensis that Cassius was alive. Laterensis, being more moved by sorrow than unsettled at this news, revived himself quickly and set out to visit Cassius. <sup>2</sup>Upon learning about this matter the 10     30th legion took its standards to Corduba to bring help to its commander. The 21st did the same. The 5th followed them. <sup>3</sup>When two legions were left in the camp, the soldiers of the second legion, fearing lest they be left solitary and lest it become evident from that what their feelings (sc. about the matter) were, followed the lead of the previous ones. 15     The indigenous legion remained steadfast in its opinion and was not moved from its position by any fear.

20     **55** <sup>1</sup>Cassius ordered those who were named as accomplices to the murder to be seized. Keeping 30 cohorts, he sent the fifth legion back to camp. <sup>2</sup>From Minucius' evidence he learned that Lucius Racilius, Lucius Laterensis, and Annius Scapula, a provincial of the highest standing and influence and as closely connected to himself as Laterensis and Racilius, had taken part in the same conspiracy (sc. as Minucius), and he did not detain his sorrow for long

before he ordered them to be killed. <sup>3</sup>He handed over Minucius to his freedmen to be tortured, likewise Calpurnius Salvianus, who gave evidence and increased the number of conspirators—truthfully, as some think, but as others protest, under compulsion. Lucius Mercello was subjected to the same tortures. <sup>4</sup>Squillus named many. And Cassius ordered them to be killed, except those who redeemed themselves with a fine. <sup>5</sup>For he openly agreed upon six million sesterces with Calpurnius and five million with Quintus Sestius, men who, although extremely guilty, were fined. Nevertheless, the fact that the danger to his life and the pain of his wounds had been discharged for a fine signified that his cruelty had contended with his greed. 5 10

**56** <sup>1</sup>A few days later he (sc. Cassius) received a letter sent by Caesar from which he learned that Pompey, defeated in battle and having lost his troops, had fled. <sup>2</sup>Upon learning this he experienced pleasure mixed with resentment. The news of victory elicited joy [or? In announcing the victory he expressed joy?], but the conclusion of the war put an end to the lax discipline of the times. So uncertain was his mind as to whether it preferred to fear nothing or to be permitted everything. <sup>3</sup>Once his wounds had healed he summoned everyone who had provided him with funds and ordered the funds to be recorded as having been received (sc. by 15 20

them as loans from him). Whenever he seemed to have imposed too small a burden on anyone, he requisitioned more money. <sup>4</sup>He instituted a levy of men of equestrian rank. His practice was invite these men, drafted from every community and colony and thoroughly cowed by (sc. the prospect of) military service overseas, to purchase an exemption from the military oath. This was a great source of revenue but nevertheless began to create greater hatred. <sup>5</sup>After finishing this business he purified the entire army. The legions and auxiliary troops that he was going to take to Africa he sent to the crossing point. <sup>6</sup>He himself went to Seville to inspect the fleet that he was preparing. He lingered there because he had put forth an edict throughout his province ordering into his presence those from whom he had requisitioned funds and who had not yet made their contributions. This summons disturbed everyone greatly.

**57** <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile, Lucius Titius, who at the time was serving as military tribune in the indigenous legion, reported that it had parted company with the 30th legion (which the legate Quintus Cassius was leading simultaneously) when he was encamped at the town Leptis—a mutiny had occurred and some centurions (who were not permitting the removal of the standards) had been killed—and marched in the direction of the second legion. This was being led to the

strait by another route. <sup>2</sup>Upon learning of this, he (sc. Cassius Longinus) left by night with 5 cohorts of men from the 21st legion, and early in the morning he arrived at †noctu† (or (sc. at Leptis?)). Having delayed there for one day, to get a clear view of what was happening, he marched to Carmo. <sup>5</sup>  
<sup>3</sup>When the 30th legion, the 21st legion, 4 cohorts from the 5th legion, and all the cavalry had assembled there, he heard that 4 cohorts (sc. of the 5th legion), overpowered by soldiers of the indigenous legion near Obucula, had reached the second (sc. legion) along with them, and that they had <sup>10</sup>all joined forces there and chosen †in† Torius from Italica as leader. <sup>4</sup>Having quickly held a council, he (sc. Cassius) sent his quaestor Marcellus to Corduba so as to secure that town in his possession, and he sent his legate Quintus Cassius to Seville. <sup>15</sup>  
<sup>5</sup>After a few days news was brought to him that the Corduban assembly had defected from him, and that Marcellus, motivated either by his own volition or by necessity (for reports about this vary), was acting in accord with the Cordubans, and that 2 cohorts from the 5th legion (which had been in the garrison at Corduba) were doing <sup>20</sup>the same. <sup>6</sup>Enraged by these developments, Cassius packed up camp and came to Segovia on the Singiliensen river the next day. Holding an assembly, he tested the morale of the soldiers. He discovered that these were extremely loyal

to him not for his own sake but for the absent Caesar's, and that they would refuse no danger provided that the province was restored to Caesar through their agency.

58 <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile, Torius led the veteran legions to Corduba. And lest it appear that the beginning of dissension had arisen in a mutinous disposition that he or his soldiers possessed, and at the same time to counter Quintus Cassius (who in Caesar's name seemed to have more substantial resources at his disposal) with an equally powerful authority, he kept saying openly that he wanted to recover the province for Pompey. <sup>2</sup>Perhaps he did this, too, from hatred for Caesar and love of Pompey, whose name carried much power among those legions that had been under the control of M. Varro. His intentions in (sc. doing) it were a matter of widespread conjecture. But this is certainly the pretext he used. <sup>3</sup>The soldiers' declarations were so explicit that they had the name of Gnaeus Pompey engraved on their shields. <sup>4</sup>The citizen community in large numbers—not only of men but also of matrons and youths in citizen dress—came out to meet the legions and pleaded with them not to plunder Corduba with a hostile attack: for they agreed with everyone against Cassius, they said, and begged that they not be compelled to act against Caesar.

59 <sup>1</sup>The army, moved by the entreaties and tears of such a great multitude, when it saw that the name and memory of Gnaeus Pompey was not necessary for taking punitive action against Cassius, and that Longinus was hated as much by all Caesarians as by all Pompeians, and that they themselves were unable to lead the citizen community or Marcus Marcellus against Caesar's cause, removed the name of Pompey from their shields, accepted Marcellus, who began declaring himself a defender of Caesar's cause, as their leader, named him praetor, joined themselves to the citizen community, and established their camp at Corduba. 5  
<sup>2</sup>Cassius made his camp two days later about four miles from Corduba on the other side of the river Baetis in a high place within sight of the town. He sent letters to King Bogud in Mauretania and to Marcus Lepidus, the proconsul in nearer Spain, that he should come with assistance for him and the province as soon as possible, for the cause of Caesar. He himself, in a hostile manner, devastated the fields of Corduba and burned the buildings. 10 15

60 <sup>1</sup>Because of the heinous and base character of this action, the legions that had taken Marcellus as their leader ran to him: they should be led out into battle, and there should be a chance for them to fight before, so humiliatingly, the finest and most beloved possessions of the Cordubans 20



were consumed in their own sight by plunder, sword, and fire. <sup>2</sup>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. <sup>3</sup>When he noticed that Cassius had drawn up his line opposite, in front of his own camp and on higher ground, having given the explanation that he [Cassius] was not descending onto level ground, Marcellus persuaded his soldiers to withdraw into the camp. Thus he began to bring back his troops. <sup>4</sup>Cassius, having attacked the retreating legions with cavalry, in which resource he was strong and knew Marcellus was weak, killed many of those in the rear on the river banks. <sup>5</sup>Since it had become known from this loss what problem and difficulty the river crossing posed, Marcellus moved his camp across the Baetis. And both men frequently led out their legions into the battle line, but they did not fight because of the difficulties of the location.

**61** <sup>1</sup>Marcellus was much stronger in infantry forces. For he had veteran legions, experienced in many battles. Cassius was more confident of the loyalty than of the valor of his legions. <sup>2</sup>Thus, when camp had been moved near camp and Marcellus had occupied a suitable place for a

stronghold from which to be able to keep Cassius' forces from water, Longinus, afraid lest he be enclosed by some kind of siege in regions that were unfamiliar and unfriendly to him, set out from camp in silence at night and made for Ulia with a swift journey, because he believed the town was faithful to him. <sup>3</sup>There he placed his camp so closely conjoined to the walls that he was protected on all sides from an attack by both the nature of the site (for Ulia is placed on a high mountain) and the city's very fortification. <sup>4</sup>Marcellus followed him, and moved his camp near to Cassius' camp, as close to Ulia as possible. And when the nature of the place was known to him, he was led by necessity to the point to which he very much wanted to bring matters, namely, not to fight (for if there was a possibility of conflict, he was not going to be able to resist his eager troops) and not to allow Cassius to wander too far, lest more peoples suffer those things that the Cordubans had suffered. <sup>5</sup>With his strongholds placed in suitable locations and his earthworks making a continuous circuit of the town, he closed in Ulia and Cassius with fortifications. <sup>6</sup>But before these could be finished Longinus sent out his entire cavalry. He believed that this would be useful to him if it did not allow Marcellus to forage and collect provisions, but that it would be a great

disadvantage if, shut in by the siege and useless, it consumed necessary provisions.

62 <sup>1</sup>In a few days King Bogus, having received Quintus Cassius' letter, came with his forces, and he joined to the  
5 legion which he had brought with him several auxiliary cohorts of Spanish men. <sup>2</sup>For as is customary to happen in civil conflicts, at that time in Spain several communities were supporting the affairs of Cassius, more were favorable toward Marcellus. <sup>3</sup>Bogus approached with his forces to  
10 Marcellus' outer fortifications. There was fierce fighting on both sides, and this happened frequently, with Fortune frequently shifting victory to each side; nevertheless, Marcellus was never driven away from his earthworks.

63 <sup>1</sup>Meanwhile, Lepidus came to Ulia from the nearer  
15 province with thirty-five legionary cohorts and a great number of cavalry and his remaining auxiliary troops, with the intention of resolving without any prejudice the conflicts of Cassius and Marcellus. <sup>2</sup>Marcellus entrusted and offered himself without any hesitation to this man when he came.  
20 Cassius, however, remained within his defenses, either because he thought that he was due more authority than Marcellus or because he was concerned lest Lepidus' mind had been won over beforehand by his adversary's compliance. <sup>3</sup>Lepidus made camp at Ulia and shared everything with

Marcellus. He ordered that there be no fighting. He invited Cassius to come out and gave his word for everything. <sup>4</sup>When Cassius had hesitated for a long time as to what he should do and how much trust he should place in Lepidus, and discovered no outcome for his plan if he persisted in his opinion, he demanded that the fortifications be broken up and that a free exit be given to him. <sup>5</sup>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. <sup>6</sup>And had the battle not been quickly broken up by the righteous anger and help of Lepidus, a greater disaster would have been sustained.

**64** <sup>1</sup>When a way had been made open for Cassius, Marcellus joined his camp to Lepidus. Lepidus and Marcellus (sc. set out) simultaneously for Corduba, Cassius set out with his forces for Carmo. <sup>2</sup>Around the same time Trebonius the proconsul came to take control of the province. When Cassius learned about his arrival he placed the legions that he had had with him, as well as the cavalry,

into their winter quarters. After quickly gathering all of his possessions he hastened to Malaca and embarked there even though the season was unfavorable for sailing, so that he might not have to entrust himself to Lepidus, Trebonius, and Marcellus, as he himself declared, so that he might not make a journey with lesser dignity through that province of which a great part had abandoned him, as his friends kept saying, and so that the cash collected from boundless pillaging might not come into anyone's power, as others thought. <sup>3</sup>When he, having made progress in weather that was favorable for winter, had put into the Ebro river to avoid the night, setting out thence, despite the storm growing a little more violent, believing that he would sail no more dangerously than before, with the incoming waves blocking the river mouth he perished right in the narrow outlet after his ship sank since he could neither maneuver his ship because of the river's force nor keep it straight in such great waves.

**65** <sup>1</sup>When Caesar had come to Syria from Egypt and learned from those who had come to him from Rome (and found out from letters from the city) that many things at Rome were being administrated badly and inefficiently, and that no part of the Republic was being run well enough, because, so they said, both pernicious seditions were arising

from in-fighting among (sc. plebeian) tribunes and, owing to favor-seeking and carelessness on the part of the military tribunes and (sc. of those) who were in charge of the legions, many things were being done contrary to military custom and practice, things that tended to relax discipline and severity, and when Caesar saw that all these things demanded his presence, he still thought it preferable to leave those provinces and regions into which he had come composed in such a way that they would be free from internal dissension, accept rights and laws, and dispense with their fear of foreign enemies. <sup>2</sup>He hoped to fix these things quickly in Syria, Cilicia, and Asia because these provinces were not being threatened with war. In Bithynia and Pontus he saw that a greater burden hung over him. <sup>3</sup>For he heard that Pharnaces had not left Pontus, and he didn't think he would, since he had become very arrogant from the favorable battle that he had fought against Domitius Calvinus. <sup>4</sup>Spending time in almost every city of significant importance (sc. in Syria), Caesar allocated rewards, both man by man and publicly, to those who deserved well of him, held hearings about and settled long-standing legal questions, (sc. and) after receiving into his trust kings, tyrants, and rulers neighboring the province—who had all flocked to him—on the condition that they guard and defend the province,

sent them away as very good friends to both himself and the Roman people.

66 <sup>1</sup>After spending a few days in that province, he left his friend and kinsman Sextus Caesar in charge of the  
5 legions and Syria. He himself set out to Cilicia in the same fleet in which he had come. <sup>2</sup>He called all the cities of this province to Tarsus, which was practically the noblest and strongest town in all Cilicia. <sup>3</sup>When all the affairs of the province and the neighboring cities were settled there,  
10 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  
15 goddess is considered second to the king by the consent of that people in majesty, command, and power. <sup>4</sup>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  
20 doubt but nevertheless long discontinued on account of the adverse circumstances of his ancestors and a change in the royal line. <sup>5</sup>Caesar handed over to Ariarathes, the brother of Ariobarzanes, because both of them deserved well of the Republic, so that the inheritance of the kingdom might not

tempt Ariarathes, and so that an heir to the kingdom might not threaten \*\*\* to Ariobarzanes to be under his power and command. Caesar began to complete with similar haste the journey he had begun.

**67** <sup>1</sup>When he (sc. Caesar) had arrived near Pontus and the territory of Gallograecia, Deiotarus, tetrarch of almost all of Gallograecia at that time—a title that the other tetrarchs kept asserting was granted neither by laws nor by custom, yet a man without doubt named king of Lesser Armenia by the senate—with his royal emblems put aside, and not only in ordinary clothing but even in the garb of the accused, came as a suppliant to Caesar in order to beseech (sc. Caesar) to forgive him 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. <sup>2</sup>For (sc. he said that) his obligation was not to be a judge of the disputes of the Roman people but to obey orders on the spot.

**68** <sup>1</sup>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, where the senate and Roman people were, where the state was, plus who was consul after Lucius Lentulus and Gaius Marcellus, nevertheless he said that he was pardoned this deed because of his own earlier services, his long-standing hospitality and friendship, the man's status and age, and the requests of those numerous hosts and friends who had assembled to beg for mercy towards Deiotarus; (sc. he said) that he would examine the disputes of the tetrarchs later. He restored the royal clothing to him. <sup>2</sup>As for the legion drawn from the stock of his fellow citizens that Deiotarus had built up with our nature and training, he ordered (sc. him) to bring it and his entire cavalry along to wage war.

**69** <sup>1</sup>When he had come to Pontus and had collected into on place all of his forces, which were middling in number and experience in war—for, with the sixth legion excepted, which he had brought with him from Alexandria, a veteran (sc. legion) formerly engaged in many hardships and dangers and smaller by a large number of soldiers, partly from the difficulty of the marches and voyages and partly owing to the frequency of combat, to such a degree that there were fewer than a thousand men in it—there were three legions remaining, one belonging to Deiotarus, two that had been in the battle that we wrote Gnaeus Domitius had

with Pharnaces. <sup>2</sup>Envoys sent by Pharnaces approached Caesar and pleaded especially that his arrival not be hostile: for Pharnaces, (sc. they said), would do everything that had been ordered. <sup>3</sup>And they pointed out most of all that Pharnaces had been willing to give no auxiliary forces to Pompey against Caesar, whereas Deiotarus, who had given (sc. auxiliary forces to Pompey), had nevertheless made amends to him (i.e., Caesar). 5

**70** <sup>1</sup>Caesar answered that he would be very fair to Pharnaces, if he (sc. Pharnaces) was going to do what he was promising. <sup>2</sup>He did, however, warn the envoys in mild terms, as he was accustomed, that they should not criticize Deiotarus to him or boast excessively about this service, namely, that they had not sent auxiliary troops to Pompey. <sup>3</sup>For (sc. he said) both that he did nothing more gladly than forgive suppliants and that he was unable to pardon the public abuse of provinces for those who had been dutiful towards himself. <sup>4</sup>And yet as for the very service they were pointing out, (sc. he said) that it had been more advantageous for Pharnaces, who had made provisions so as not to be defeated, than for himself, to whom the immortal gods had granted victory. <sup>5</sup>And so (sc. he said) that he pardoned Pharnaces for the great and serious abuse of the Roman citizens who had been trading in Pontus, since he was not 10 15 20

able to make them whole again. <sup>6</sup>For (sc. he said) that he was not able to restore their lost life to the slaughtered nor their manhood to the castrated; and Roman citizens had indeed endured this punishment, more heavy-handed than death. <sup>7</sup>But (sc. he said that) he (sc. Pharnaces) should leave Pontus immediately and return the staff of the publicani and restore to Roman allies and citizens the remaining things that were under his control. <sup>8</sup>(Sc. Caesar said that) if he (sc. Pharnaces) had acted, he should at that point send to him (sc. Caesar) the tributes and gifts that commanders were accustomed to receive from friends after successes. For Pharnaces had sent him a golden crown. After returning these answers, he sent the envoys back.

**71** <sup>1</sup>But Pharnaces, having promised everything generously since he was hoping that Caesar, hastening and en route, would even trust his promises more freely than the situation allowed, so that he (sc. Caesar) might set out sooner and more honorably for more important matters—for everybody knew that Caesar was being called back to the city for many reasons—began acting more slowly, demanding a later day for departure, interposing contractual agreements, in short, obstructing. <sup>2</sup>Caesar, since he recognized the man's craftiness, was compelled to do by necessity what,

at other times, he had been accustomed to do by nature, namely, to do battle more quickly than anyone expected.

**72** <sup>1</sup>Zela is a town that lies in Pontus, (sc. the town) itself suitably fortified given that it stands on open ground. For a hill, natural but like one made by hand, supports a wall at a rather elevated height on all sides. <sup>2</sup>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—<sup>3</sup> this location Pharnaces occupied with all of his troops after the old earthworks of the camp that was lucky for his father were repaired.

**73** <sup>1</sup>Caesar, when he had placed camp five miles away from the enemy and saw that the valleys by which the royal camp was fortified would fortify his own camp by the same interval, at any rate if the enemy had not seized these locations previously—they were much closer to the royal camp—, ordered that material for a rampart be brought inside the defenses. <sup>2</sup>After this was done quickly, with all the legions readied for action the next night at the fourth watch and the baggage left behind in camp, at dawn, with

the enemy unaware, he (sc. Caesar) seized that very spot where Mithridates had fought a successful battle against Triarius. <sup>3</sup>To this spot he then ordered the slaves to convey from the camp all the collected material, so that no soldier  
 5 would leave the defensive work, since it was by a space of no more than a mile that an interceding valley divided the enemy's camp from the preliminary defensive work of Caesar's camp.

**74** <sup>1</sup>Pharnaces, when he suddenly noticed this at dawn,  
 10 drew up all of his troops in front of his camp. Given the locations' large intervening height differential (i.e., between the camps of Caesar and Pharnaces), Caesar thought that these troops were drawn up in accordance with a common military custom, either in order to slow down his fortifica-  
 15 tion work, so that more men might be held at arms, or for the sake of showing royal confidence, lest Pharnaces seem to defend his location more by fortification than by hand. <sup>2</sup>Thus Caesar was not deterred from having the remaining part of his army constructed the defensive work  
 20 while the front line was drawn up in front of the trench. <sup>3</sup>But Pharnaces—whether compelled by the good fortune of his location, or induced by omens and religious scruples, which we later heard that he had obeyed, or after discovering how few of our troops were at arms, since he had believed that

the great multitude of slaves that was carrying the material for a rampart in the manner of everyday fortification work was a great multitude of soldiers, or even out of confidence in his veteran army, which his officers boasted had fought in 22 pitched battles and won each time, along with contempt for our army, which he knew had been beaten by himself when Domitius was commander—after the decision to fight was entered into, began to descend via the precipitous valley. <sup>4</sup>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. 5 10

**75** <sup>1</sup>Caesar, shaken by Pharnaces' unbelievable recklessness or confidence, caught unaware and unprepared, recalled his soldiers from the earthworks, ordered them to take up arms, brought forward his legions, and drew up his line. The sudden agitation produced by this state of affairs brought significant fear to our men. <sup>2</sup>When the lines were not yet drawn up the king's chariots, armed with scythes, dismayed the disorganized soldiers. But the chariots were quickly overwhelmed by a large number of missiles. <sup>3</sup>The enemy line followed the chariots. And after raising a shout 15 20

the forces clashed, with the nature of the place providing much help to Caesar's forces, but the most help was provided by the benevolence of the immortal gods, who are present in all happenings of war, particularly those in which nothing was able to be effected by reason.

**76** <sup>1</sup>After a great and bitter battle fought at close quarters, the beginning of victory appeared on the right flank, where the veteran sixth legion had been placed. As the enemy forces were being forced away downhill on that side, on the left flank and in the middle of the line, much more slowly but nevertheless with the same gods assisting, all the king's troops were overwhelmed. <sup>2</sup>And having been driven from their position as quickly as they had come up the slope easily, they were under pressure from the disadvantage of the terrain. And so after many of the soldiers had been killed, many others overwhelmed by their comrades falling, those who managed to flee using their speed—but still, having thrown away their weapons—being unarmed, were unable to accomplish anything from higher ground once they had crossed the valley. But our men, carried away by their victory, did not hesitate to move onto unfavorable ground and assault the fortifications. <sup>3</sup>With the troops that Pharnaces left as a guard attempting to defend the camp, our men quickly gained possession of the enemy camp. As

the entire multitude of his men had been killed or captured, Pharnaces fled with a few of his cavalry. <sup>4</sup>If our assault on his camp had not granted him the opportunity to flee more freely, he would have been brought alive into Caesar's power.

5

**77** <sup>1</sup>Caesar, so many times a conqueror, was in a state of incredible happiness at such a victory, since he had brought about the end of a very great war with such speed, and he was happier still upon reflecting on the sudden danger, because an easy victory had been arisen out of difficult circumstances. <sup>2</sup>On the day after he had retaken Pontus and distributed all of the royal spoils among the soldiers Caesar set out with unencumbered cavalry. He ordered the sixth legion to leave for Italy to receive prizes and honors, sent Deiotarus' auxiliary forces back home, (sc. and) left two legions in Pontus with Caelius Vinicianus.

10

15

**78** <sup>1</sup>Thus he made his way through Gallograecia and Bithynia into Asia and investigated the disputes in all of these provinces and made judgements upon them; he allocated jurisdictions to the tetrarchs, kings, and states. <sup>2</sup>As for Mithridates of Pergamum, by whom the situation in Egypt, which I have written about above, was brought to completion auspiciously and quickly, since he was born from a royal bloodline and even educated royally (for Mithridates,

20



king of all Asia, had carried the child off from Pergamum into the camps with him, and kept him there for many years), Caesar made him king of Bosphorus, which had been under Pharnaces' control, and, by placing a most  
5 friendly king between them, defended the Roman provinces from barbarian and hostile kings. <sup>3</sup>He also granted Mithridates the tetrarchy over the people of Gallograecia (which had been occupied and held in Deiotarus' possession a few years earlier) by the right of his people and blood-  
10 line. <sup>5</sup>Nevertheless, he did not delay anywhere longer than the exigency of the sedition in the cities seemed to permit. When these matters were handled most happily and efficiently, he came to Italy more quickly than everyone's expectation.

# 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.<sup>34</sup>

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* | *seclussit 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)

---

<sup>34</sup>“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*.<sup>35</sup> 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

---

<sup>35</sup>Similar 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 Dauisius, 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*).<sup>36</sup>

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-

---

<sup>36</sup>He 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.<sup>37</sup> 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*.<sup>38</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>The 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.).

<sup>38</sup>There 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>“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 possum<sup>7</sup>*) | [ut ... (7.3) potest] *Gruterus ut glossema teste Oudendorp* | ut mihi *MUSTV* | at mihi <si> *Madvig* | ut mihi <si> *Klotz* || neque<sup>1</sup> *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.<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>See, 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.

<sup>3</sup>Thus 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.<sup>4</sup>

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.<sup>5</sup> 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

<sup>4</sup>See Damon 2015a, 172–74.

<sup>5</sup>Thus 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 reperiō.”

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

... descuiſſe 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:

... descuiſſe 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 *descuiſſe 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.<sup>6</sup> 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⟩

---

<sup>6</sup>Vielhaber 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.<sup>7</sup>

Nipperdey addressed the *quod*-clause problem by substituting *esse* for *essent*<sup>2</sup>:

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

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

---

<sup>7</sup>The 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.

<sup>8</sup>Klotz 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*.<sup>9</sup> 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.

---

<sup>9</sup>Cf. *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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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<sup>supra lineam</sup>* | 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* || et<sup>1</sup> *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*.<sup>2</sup> The idea is that the Alexandrians' elevated positions provided them with assistance against attackers coming from the Roman fleet. Incertus

---

<sup>2</sup>Rhellicanus' 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*.<sup>3</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup>Many 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*.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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*

---

<sup>4</sup>At 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.

<sup>5</sup>Unless 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.<sup>6</sup> 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 ...*

---

<sup>6</sup>The 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).<sup>7</sup> At a minimum we need an explanation of the mysterious *materia cuncta*.

---

<sup>7</sup>Andrieu (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.<sup>1</sup>

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>1-  
Larsen *coll. BG* 5.57.3 | *c-* [1-] *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,

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>If 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”).<sup>3</sup> 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*.<sup>4</sup> 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 Dauisius 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

---

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

<sup>4</sup>R. 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*.<sup>5</sup> Rice Holmes suspected that Hirtius' (*sic*) text at 1.1 was simply "a mistake."<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> This

---

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

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

<sup>7</sup>J. 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."<sup>8</sup> 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.

<sup>8</sup>Townend, 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.<sup>9</sup>

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.

---

<sup>9</sup>*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. Pinaudi, 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 <\*\*\*> distinquendae manus causa constrictis nauibus aggreditur praemiis magnis propositis qui primus insulam cepisset.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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<sup>mc</sup>* | *contractis V<sup>r</sup>* || *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.<sup>2</sup> 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:

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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.<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> The best one can do is point to 24.4 *si illa sentiret*, where the antecedent of *illa* is vague, and

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.”

<sup>4</sup> 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*.<sup>5</sup>

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

---

<sup>5</sup>As 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*.

<sup>6</sup>Krafft’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.<sup>7</sup>

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

---

<sup>7</sup>The 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.<sup>8</sup> 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*.<sup>9</sup> Given the military objective announced at the

---

<sup>8</sup>Larsen'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*.

<sup>9</sup>And 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).<sup>10</sup>

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

---

<sup>10</sup>Schiller 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.<sup>11</sup>

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

---

<sup>11</sup>Vascosanus' 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*.<sup>12</sup>

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

---

<sup>12</sup>Similarly 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup>

Stephanus proposed putting a lacuna before *manum*:

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

---

<sup>2</sup>Thus 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.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> 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:

---

<sup>3</sup>Klotz 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).

<sup>4</sup>Adverbial *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*).<sup>5</sup>

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*).<sup>6</sup>

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.

---

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

<sup>6</sup>In 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*).<sup>7</sup> 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

---

<sup>7</sup>The 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*<sup>8</sup>); 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*

---

<sup>8</sup>The 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.<sup>9</sup>

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

---

<sup>9</sup>For 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.<sup>10</sup> 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

---

<sup>10</sup>For *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.<sup>1</sup>

missus *MU* | missis *STV* | | cum magnis copiis *MUSTV* | magnas copias *Vascosanus* | [cum] magnis copiis *Hoffmann 1890* (*u. et infra*) | | Pelusium adducit *MUSTV* (*de anacolutio 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*

---

<sup>1</sup>“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 MUSTV* (*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?* || *multiplici 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*) | [*multiplici praesidio*] ... *propugnantibus Gemoll* || *ibi suum UST et M<sup>tr</sup>* | *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 *multiplici 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>It 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 transitive<sup>3</sup>; 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 proposed<sup>4</sup>, but attempts to repair the syntax have

---

<sup>3</sup>Present 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).

<sup>4</sup>Fleischer provides an effective overview of suggestions predating the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> 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 Dausius 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 Dausius 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 Dausius 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*.<sup>5</sup> Furthermore, the fact that *aduenio*

---

<sup>5</sup>Despite 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,<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</sup>A *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.<sup>1</sup>

Mithridates magna cum prudentia *MUS* et *T supra lineam* | mithridates magna cum potentia *S<sup>ac</sup>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-

---

<sup>1</sup>“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  $\varsigma$  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.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup>On variants in the archetype see Damon 2015b, 58–59. They are usually visible in the *nu* 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*).<sup>3</sup> 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-*.<sup>4</sup> 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*

<sup>3</sup>The 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.

<sup>4</sup>On 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.<sup>5</sup> 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*.<sup>6</sup>

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

---

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

<sup>6</sup>The 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.”<sup>7</sup>

It is clear that the tradition’s archetype contained glosses of both the one-or-two word variety<sup>8</sup> and longer phrases, which are generally self-contained units.<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> However, in none of the other long glosses in this tradition

---

<sup>7</sup>Klotz 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.

<sup>8</sup>See, 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*].

<sup>9</sup>See, 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.

<sup>10</sup>Klotz 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.<sup>11</sup> 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*.<sup>12</sup> 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.

<sup>11</sup>The 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.

<sup>12</sup>See, 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?<sup>13</sup> We have one in *prudentia*, 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 prudentia*. If the original gloss was in the nominative (*magna prudentia constantiaque uirtutum et Alexandrinorum imprudentia*) it would resemble others in this tradition,<sup>14</sup> and *cum* could have been added when the phrase was integrated into the text.<sup>15</sup> 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-

<sup>13</sup>Andrieu dubs *constantiaque ... imprudentia* “un énoncé énigmatique” (1954, LXVII).

<sup>14</sup>One 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).

<sup>15</sup>This 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.*<sup>16</sup> 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*,

<sup>16</sup>Furthermore, 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*).<sup>17</sup>

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.

---

<sup>17</sup>On 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.<sup>1</sup>

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*

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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-

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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: *celiorem fluminis Nili navigationem rex est usus .... Caesar ... circumuectus eo mari quod Africae partis esse dicitur, sicuti supra demonstraui, prius tamen regis copiis 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).<sup>3</sup> 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.*).<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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*

---

<sup>3</sup>However, 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.

<sup>4</sup>On 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.

<sup>5</sup>See Gaertner-Hausburg (2013) 36 nn. 31–32.

---

*sunt* (cf. Hirt. 8.8.3 *omnium impedimentorum agmen, quod tamen erat mediocre*).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>On 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>“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)<sup>2</sup>

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.<sup>3</sup> 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,

---

<sup>2</sup>Although *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.

<sup>3</sup>Cf. 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 <sup>4</sup> or the mood<sup>5</sup> 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:

---

<sup>4</sup>The deictic *his* in the second *quod* clause works normally, referring to the terrain under discussion in the narrative.

<sup>5</sup>Cf. 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.<sup>6</sup>

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*.<sup>7</sup> Scaliger might object that *certa opportunitas* is not quite the right expression for the first “advantage” mentioned in our passage, namely, the

<sup>6</sup>Andrieu 2002 [1954] ad loc. incorrectly reports Landgraf’s proposal as *has est consecutus opportunitates*.

<sup>7</sup>Cf. *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*<sup>8</sup> *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. 3<sup>9</sup>), we supply *<constat>*:

cuius itineris has esse certas *<constat>* opportunitates

---

<sup>8</sup>In 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.

<sup>9</sup>Dübner (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.<sup>10</sup> 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*,<sup>11</sup> 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*.<sup>12</sup> In any case, the supplement *<constat>*, which is

<sup>10</sup>Caesar 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*.

<sup>11</sup>Cf., 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.

<sup>12</sup>We 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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 transmitted<sup>2</sup>—36.4 is simply given as context here—both possibilities are

<sup>2</sup>The 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.<sup>3</sup>

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:

---

<sup>3</sup>Square 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 ...*

---

<sup>4</sup>See, 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."

<sup>5</sup>The 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup>As 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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2</sup>) *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

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>Larsen (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*<sup>3</sup> *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*).<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>3</sup>According 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).

<sup>4</sup>Andrieu 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 5<sup>5</sup>). 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

---

<sup>5</sup>Dausius 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*).<sup>6</sup>

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

---

<sup>6</sup>“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.<sup>7</sup>

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

---

<sup>7</sup>Variations 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.<sup>1</sup>

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'

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup>

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*

---

<sup>2</sup>One 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 (70x, 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.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>See 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>“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).<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>*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/quadriremis/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*).<sup>3</sup> 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).

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>"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).<sup>2</sup> 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*.<sup>3</sup>

A variety of substitutes for the offending demonstrative have been suggested.

Jurinius (1742, ad loc.) supplied an adjective:

---

<sup>2</sup>He 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.

<sup>3</sup>Corduba 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)<sup>4</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup>This 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,<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> There is a more extreme prolepsis at 12.2, where *eas* points to *naues*, 14 words later:

---

<sup>5</sup>In 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.

<sup>6</sup>See 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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?<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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.<sup>3</sup> 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,<sup>4</sup> unless we are to assume that his profit-hungry

<sup>3</sup>However, Schneider (1888, ad loc.) views the accounting language in 49.2, too, as used loosely, such that *expensum ferre* simply means "pay."

<sup>4</sup>As 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*.<sup>5</sup>

*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 substantial *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.”

---

<sup>5</sup>Andrieu (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 sense<sup>6</sup> 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.”<sup>7</sup>
- 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.

---

<sup>6</sup>As 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*.

<sup>7</sup>“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).<sup>8</sup> 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.<sup>9</sup>

*Simultatium* is still a problem, however, indeed a worse problem than it was with *causa*. The awkwardness of its

---

<sup>8</sup>Cf. *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.

<sup>9</sup>Cassius 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 16<sup>th</sup>-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*<sup>10</sup>; *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)*.

---

<sup>10</sup>The 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.<sup>1</sup>

uictoris *MU* | uictores *STV* | | esset<sup>2</sup> *MUSTV* | esse  $\zeta$  *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

---

<sup>1</sup>“Marcellus, although he thought that combat was utterly wretched, because the loss for both the victor and the defeated would similarly rebound 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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>See, 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.<sup>3</sup>

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,

---

<sup>3</sup>This 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.<sup>4</sup>

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

---

<sup>4</sup>Kübler 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.<sup>5</sup>

As a supplement one could imagine, say, a second *quod* clause explaining the second verb in the *cum* clause: e.g.,

---

<sup>5</sup>Klotz (1927, ad loc.) and Andrieu (1954, ad loc.) oddly print the *recentiores*’ *esse* and Larsen’s lacuna.

⟨*quod belli imperium non obtineret*⟩.<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>6</sup>For *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.<sup>1</sup>

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>

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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*:

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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*.<sup>3</sup> 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*]

---

<sup>3</sup>A Ciceronian usage (e.g., Sull. 52 *condicio ... constituta est*, Ver. 2.5.157 *te praetore est consitituta 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*).<sup>4</sup> 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*<sup>5</sup>), *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).<sup>6</sup> 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

---

<sup>4</sup>*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*.

<sup>5</sup>The 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.

<sup>6</sup>The 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.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>"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  $\varsigma$  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 mauis 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<sup>c</sup>V* | Cappadociae cum genere *T<sup>ac</sup>* || 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.<sup>2</sup> 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,

---

<sup>2</sup>Bibliography 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.<sup>3</sup> 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

<sup>3</sup>From 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.<sup>1</sup>

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<sup>s</sup>STV* | imperiisque *U<sup>nc</sup>*

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

---

<sup>1</sup> "... 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  
imperiiis in Cn. Pompei castris fuisse

... 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.<sup>2</sup> 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:

---

<sup>2</sup>U'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 *aduersariorum* before Hoffmann 1890's *coactus*:

... quod, in ea parte positus terrarum quae nulla praesidia <in> Caesaris habuisset exercitibus, imperiisque <aduersariorum 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.<sup>3</sup> 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*

---

<sup>3</sup>Where 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 ...<sup>1</sup>

defensionem (defensonem *U<sup>ac</sup>*) eius *MU<sup>f</sup>STV* | 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*) || eius<sup>2</sup> *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

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup> 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-*

<sup>2</sup>The charge of defection does occur in Dio's account of these negotiations, where Caesar blames *Pharnaces* for deserting his benefactor Pompey (42.47.4): ἐπεκάλεσεν αὐτῷ ... ὅτι τὸν Πομπήιον τὸν εὐεργέτην ἐγκατέλιπεν.

<sup>3</sup>The 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.<sup>1</sup>

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*) |

---

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> The themes introduced

<sup>2</sup>On 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.<sup>3</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>In 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*).<sup>5</sup> 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

---

<sup>5</sup>See 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*.<sup>6</sup>

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.

---

<sup>6</sup>Klotz (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.<sup>7</sup>

Klotz (1927, ad loc.), pronouncing the passage a “locus nondum probabiliter emendatus,” obelizes *superioribus* ... *oppido*, as does Andrieu (1954, ad loc.).<sup>8</sup> But as was mentioned earlier, none of the words is obviously corrupt,

<sup>7</sup>Kübler 1896b discusses this emendation briefly in his 1896 *Philologus* article “Recisamenta critica,” on pp. 154–155.

<sup>8</sup>In 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.<sup>1</sup>

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:

<sup>1</sup>“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.<sup>2</sup> 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

---

<sup>2</sup>We 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  $\mu$  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*.<sup>3</sup> Be that as it may, what one wants to know is whether *praeruptam* reached  $\mu$  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

---

<sup>3</sup>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.