CURTIANA*

The text of Quintus Curtius benefited greatly from Conrad Müller's edition of 1954 (Munich, with translation by H. Schönfeld). In particular, his thorough investigation of Curtius' rhythms enabled him to settle many hitherto doubtful points. Problems remain, unsolved or undetected. In Curtius, as in other prose texts, scribal omissions are a prolific source of corruption, sometimes productive of interpolation. Most of the following notes postulate corruptions of this type.

3. 10. 3 Alexander ante prima signa ibat identidem manu suos inhibens, ne suspensi acrius ob nimiam festinationem concitato spiritu capesserent proelium.

suspensi or suspensi acrius, of soldiers rushing into battle, is grotesque. It is a case for the obelus, but if that is eschewed, as in Müller's text, we might write ne \(\lambda pugnae \) cupidine \(\rangle \) incensi, taking acrius with concitato.

3. 11. 10 Macedonum quoque non quidem multi, sed promptissimi tamen caesi sunt; inter quos Alexandri dextrum femur leviter mucrone perstrictum est.

Read caesi (vel vulnerati) sunt for two reasons: first, because it would be strange to mention the killed without the wounded; second, because Alexander was among the latter.

3. 11. 23 tunc vero impotentis fortunae species conspici potuit, cum ii, qui Dareo tabernaculum exornaverant omni luxu et opulentia instructum, eadem illa Alexandro, quasi veteri domino, reservabant. namque id solum intactum omiserant milites, ita tradito more ut victorem victi regis tabernaculo exciperent.

From this account it would seem that it was the Persians who received Alexander in Darius' tent. Diodorus (17. 36. 5) says it was Alexander's pages $(\pi \alpha i \delta \epsilon_s)$ who did this. Clearly it was not the business of the soldiers. Read tabernaculum exciperet. The verb is used as in Cic. Fam. 4. 6. 2 me...domus excipiebat and elsewhere (Thes. 5. 2. 1251. 41).

3. 12. 25 tu quidem matrem me et reginam vocas, sed ego me tuam famulam esse confiteor. et praeteritae fortunae fastigium *capio* et praesentis iugum pati possum.

Darius' mother is addressing Alexander. capio cannot mean 'ich vermag...zu ermessen' (Schönfeld). Rolfe's rendering in his Loeb edition, 'I both rise to the greatness of my past rank' (i.e. can cope with it) is fair enough, but in the English as in the Latin a present tense is excluded. Read capere.

3. 13. 7 Gangabas Persae vocant humeris onera portantes: ii cum tolerare non possent – quippe et procella subito nivem effuderat et humus rigebat gelu – tum adstrictas vestes, quas cum pecunia portabant, auro et purpura insignes induunt.

The old addition of *frigus* after *cum* is well worth while, certainly preferable to Hedicke's *tempestatis vim*.

L. Castiglioni (Wien. Stud. 70 (1957), 87 f.) rightly objected to the reading and punctuation adopted by Müller metri causa. adstricta (Acidalius) must by all analogy go with gelu. He proposed gelu [tum] adstricta or tum gelu adstricta, but objected to the latter that tum is functionless. But the ground was not frozen all the time.

^{*} I am grateful to Professor F. R. D. Goodyear for helpful comments.

4. 5. 7 leges autem a victoribus dici, accipi a victis: in utro statu ambo essent, si solus ignoraret, quam primum Marte decerneret. se quoque, cum transiret mare, non Ciliciam aut Lydiam...sed Persepolim...ultimique Orientis oram imperio destinasse.

The best way of dealing with quoque is to change it to quidem. Note Schönfeld's translation 'er für sein Teil'.

4. 7. 31 et Macedones...immortalitatem adfectantem contumacius quam aut ipsis expediebat aut regi aversati sunt.

To say that the Macedonians went further in opposition to Alexander's wishes than was expedient for themselves is reasonable; to say that they went further than was expedient for him is fatuous. Curtius probably wrote aut regi (ferendum erat).

5. 1. 36 diutius in hac urbe quam usquam constitit rex, nec *alio loco* disciplinae militari magis nocuit.

Hannibalem ipsum Capua corrupit (Cic. Leg. Agr. 1. 20) – and his army. Curtius evidently had Liv. 23. 18. 10–16 in mind. Though Alexander set a poor example (§ 39), the real culprit was Babylon. The old conjecture ullus locus is to be commended, except that alius locus will do just as well.

5. 1. 43 praetores, qui regioni Babyloniae ac *Ciliciae praeessent*, Menetem et Apollodorum relinquit.

On the historical problem see P. A. Brunt, Arrian (Loeb), i. 278 n. 11. On any showing Curtius' text is unsatisfactory. He would not have combined 'the Babylonian district' with Cilicia as though nothing lay between. Diodorus (17. 64. 5) says: 'Απολλόδωρον δὲ τὸν 'Αμφιπολίτην καὶ Μένητα τὸν Πελλαῖον ἀπέδειξε στρατηγοὺς τῆς τε Βαβυλῶνος καὶ τῶν σατραπειῶν μέχρι Κιλικίας. According to Brunt, Curtius 'gives this with the names in reverse order'. Let him do that: regioni Babyloniae ac Cilici⟨a tenus Mesopotami⟩ae; cf. 5. 1. 15 vicini (amnes) maxime sunt in campis quos incolae Mesopotamiam appellant; mediam namque ab utroque latere cludunt. tandem per Babyloniorum fines in Rubrum mare irrumpunt. For the position of tenus cf. Suet. Iul. 52. 1 paene Aethiopia tenus Aegyptum penetravit.¹

5. 12. 18 Artabazus cum iis qui imperio parebant Graecisque militibus Parthienen petebat omnia tutiora parricidarum contuitu ratus. Persae promissis Bessi onerati, maxime quia nemo alius erat quem sequerentur, coniunxere se Bactrianis

Hedicke's *comitatu* for *contuitu* should be accepted, as it was by Rolfe (who admittedly accepted far too much from this source). Palaeographically it is a very easy change. I had thought of *convictu*, which is even easier, but perhaps less apt.

Artabazus had previously acted as general of the Persians in Darius' following (5. 9. 17). iis qui imperio parebant must refer to Persians (cf. Arrian, 3. 21. 4 $\pi\lambda\dot{\eta}\nu$ 'Αρταβάζου καὶ τῶν 'Αρταβάζου παίδων). The Persians, then, split into two groups. Before Persae read reliqui or ceteri, unless Persae is to be regarded as a gloss which has replaced reliqui (ceteri) in the text.

Perhaps sed has fallen out before maxime.

5. 13. 9 haec agentem Alexandrum adeunt Orsilos et Mithracenes: Bessi parricidium exosi transfugerant nuntiabantque stadia D abesse *Persas*, ipsos brevius iter monstraturos.

Here too *Persas* can hardly be right. Although most of the Persians had rejoined Bessus and his Bactrians, the whole body would not be referred to as 'Persians' but

¹ Professor Goodyear writes: 'It must give us pause to find that Curtius nowhere uses *tenus* (see Therasse, *Index verborum*). One might rather try usque ad, which he does use (e.g. 4. 3. 10, 7. 8. 30, 10. 10. 3). Perhaps Babyloniae ac (Mesopotamiae usque ad fines) Ciliciae'

CURTIANA 177

as 'barbarians', as in §§13 (twice) and 18 below. Omitting *Persas* as a gloss, understand *eum* with *abesse*.

6. 3. 9 et adhuc sic ago, tamquam omnia subacta sint armis quae fuerunt in dicione Darei. Hyrcaniam Nabarzanes occupavit, Bactra non possidet solum parricida Bessus, sed etiam minatur; Sogdiani, Dahae, Massagetae, Sacae, Indi sui iuris sunt. Omnes hi, simul terga nostra viderint, insequentur: illi enim eiusdem nationis sunt, nos alienigenae et externi. suis \quae quis \quae que autem placidius paret, etiam cum is praeest qui magis timeri potest. proinde aut quae cepimus omittenda sunt aut quae non habemus occupanda.

insequentur Heinsius: sinequentur P: sisequentur C.

There can be no question in this context of the still-unconquered nations pursuing the Macedonians as they retreated, and the words *illi enim...externi* discountenance the text they follow. Alexander's point is that the territories already subjugated will not be held unless those still independent are subdued. *insequentur* (also read by Bardon) should be replaced by *illos sequentur* (Jeep; so Hedicke). 'These people' (hi) refers to the conquered Asiatics.

The next sentence too makes no sense as it stands. Schönfeld's translation, 'den Herren eigenen Blutes aber gehorcht ein jeder lieber, auch wenn es jemand ist, der grössere Furcht erweckt', is certainly wrong. Greater than what or whom? Besides, the more formidable a ruler, the more quietly his subjects will obey, other things being equal. pareat would be at least intelligible: subjects would obey a ruler of their own race more quietly, even though their actual ruler (of alien race) inspires greater fear.

6. 7. 31 rex Philota venire in regiam iusso 'Cebalinus' inquit 'ultimum supplicium meritus, si in caput meum praeparatas insidias biduo texit, huius criminis

Philotan reum substituit, ad quem protinus indicium detulisse se adfirmat. Alexander is addressing Philotas (contingis and habes follow immediately). In the next sentence (et ego Cebalino magis quam Philotae id convenire fateor) the reason why he uses Philotas' name instead of the pronoun tibi is obvious. There is no reason for it here. Read (te), Philota; cf. 7. 2. 10 tu, Amynta, ignosce fratri tuo. The Parisinus has philotan for philota above.

6. 7. 33 ad haec Philotas haud sane trepidus... Cebalinum quidem scorti sermonem ad se detulisse, sed ipsum tam levi *auctore* nihil credidisse respondit... cum Dymnus semet interemerit, qualiacumque erant, non fuisse reticenda.

auctore has better manuscript support than auctori, but it is hard to see why Curtius should have written it. For cum Dymnus sqq. Schönfeld has: 'Nun, da Dymnus sich selbst entleibt habe, sehe er ein, man hätte die Dinge, wie es auch um sie gestanden, nicht verschweigen dürfen.' 'Sehe er ein' is missing in the Latin and should be supplied, as by adding nunc intellegere before cum.

6. 9. 7 Nicomachus deinde et Metron et Cebalinus producti quae quisque detulerat exponunt. nullius eorum indicio Philotas ut particeps sceleris destinabatur. itaque indignatione expressa vox [indicum] silentio excepta est.

Alexander's address to the army about the plot against his life was received with loud shouts of indignation against the plotters (§6). But when the three informers were produced, they did not name Philotas. Schönfeld's rendering of the next sentence is impossible: 'Daher hörte man die ihnen unter Empörung abgenötigte Aussage mit Stillschweigen an'. The evidence of the informers was not forced out of them by the indignation of the soldiers; they had given it already. Also the translation does not correspond to Müller's text, for if vox refers to the informers (strange Latin!) there

is no need to bracket *indicum* (Vogel). The meaning is that the outcry which followed Alexander's speech was succeeded (*excepta*) by silence. But *indicum* is a proper and useful word. There are not too many words here but too few: *indicum* \(\lambda testimoniis \) auditis\(\rangle\).

6. 9. 19 haec sunt *et* iam pridem animi alienati a me et invidentis gloriae meae indicia.

et iam Bentlev: etiam codd. The first et would be better away.

6. 11. 9 rex in contionem reversus, sive ut in custodia *quoque* torqueret sive ut diligentius cuncta cognosceret, concilium in posterum diem distulit

'Ob er ihn nun in der Haft noch faltern lassen oder alles genauer untersuchen wollte.' Philotas, however, had not been tortured yet (cf. 6. 10. 29 si certiora oraculis creditis esse tormenta, ne hanc quidem exhibendae veritatis fidem deprecor). Perhaps read (confitentem) quoque, making it clear that on this interpretation of his motive Alexander wanted the torture for its own sake – otherwise there is no proper alternative, since the torture might be only for the purpose of discovering the truth (cuncta cognoscere). In the event Philotas was tortured after confession (§14 Craterus exigere ut quae confiteretur in tormentis quoque diceret), though later it appears, somewhat inconsistently, that the torture was applied to make him implicate his father.

7. 3. 11 obscura caeli verius umbra quam lux *nocti similis* premit terram, vix ut quae prope sunt conspici possint.

nocti similis neither heightens nor clarifies, since night may be anything from total darkness to bright moonlight. Possibly a reader's gloss on obscura...lux.

7. 4. 11 turbida sunt consilia eorum qui sibi suadent. obstat metus, alias cupiditas, nonnumquam naturalis eorum quae excogitaveris amor; nam in te superbia non cadit. expertus es *utique*, quod ipse reppereris, aut solum aut optimum ducere.

Gobares offers good advice to Bessus. utique is Hedicke's substitute for the paradosis utramque. The result is not Latin; and being interpreted 'you have learned by experience to consider as the only or the best plan whatever you yourself have devised' (Rolfe), it is topsy-turvy. Gobares is warning against undue confidence in one's own judgement. This might have several causes which could apply in Bessus' case: fear, eagerness, natural preference for one's own ideas. But at least the arrogance of royalty (superbia) would not apply: expertus es utramque (fortunam, neque debes utique,) quod sqq. Bessus had been a subject like others before he became a king.

7. 4. 22 Alexander Caucasum quidem, ut supra dictum est, transierat, sed inopia frumenti quoque prope ad famem ventum erat.

Rolfe's and Schönfeld's translations ignore *quoque* for an obvious reason. Read \(\lambda tum\rangle\) quoque in allusion to the similar situation which had recently arisen in the country of the Parapanisadae (7. 3. 12, 18). Hedicke (ed. 1) bracketed quoque (Giunta). 7. 6. 27 incolae novae urbi dati captivi, quos reddito pretio dominis liberavit.

7. 6. 27 incolae novae urbi dati captivi, quos reddito pretio dominis liberavit. quorum posteri nunc quoque non apud eos tam longa aetate propter memoriam Alexandri exoleverunt.

As eponymous founder of the city (Alexandria on the Jaxartes) Alexander would be remembered by all its inhabitants. It is idle to say that the descendants of the captives preserved their identity as such because of Alexander's memory. The memory of this particular act of his might indeed have that effect: propter memoriam Alexandri \(beneficii \) (or \(liberalitatis \)).

7. 8. 11 sic quae locutos esse apud regem memoriae proditum est abhorrent forsitan moribus nostris et tempora et ingenia cultiora sortitis. sed ut possit oratio

CURTIANA 179

eorum sperni, tamen fides nostra non debet; quae utcumque sunt tradita incorrupta perferemus.

So Curtius apologizes for the speech which he is about to put into the mouth of the simple Scythian. But his good faith as a historian was hardly liable to be 'scorned' had he omitted it. Something has fallen out before *non debet*, e.g. *certa celare*.² *proferemus* (Bentley) should be accepted.

8. 1. 31 hinc inter iuniores senesque orta contentio est, et rex, velut patienter audiret quis Clitus obterebat laudes eius, ingentem iram conceperat.

Again the sentence is incomplete. vultu non mutato vel sim. has dropped out before velut. Read at for et?

8. 4. 25 ...ut diceret ad stabiliendum regnum pertinere Persas et Macedones conubio iungi; hoc uno modo et pudorem victis et superbiam victoribus detrahi posse. Achillem quoque, a quo genus ipse deduceret, cum captiva coisse. ne inferri nefas arbitrentur, *illam* matrimonii iure velle iungi.

illam Hug: ita codd.: victi Hedicke. This had better run: Achillem...coisse, ne inferri nefas arbitrentur, ita matrimonii iure velle iungi. ita...iungi explains nefas. The argument (poor enough to be sure) is that, if Achilles had lived in concubinage with a captive, the more respectable kind of union now proposed should not be regarded as something unlawful. ita = eo modo = cum captiva.

8. 7. 11 haec ergo sunt Macedonum praemia, quorum ut supervacuo et sordido abuteris sanguine! at tibi XXX milia mulorum captivum aurum vehunt, cum milites nihil domum praeter gratuitas cicatrices relaturi sunt.

The text at this point becomes incoherent. The conspirator Hermolaus is allowed to make a speech denouncing Alexander. He begins with Alexander's Macedonian victims – Philotas, Clitus, and the others. His hearers shout him down, but the king bids them let him have his say and orders him to continue. Hermolaus resumes on a different topic, Callisthenes, whose innocence he proclaims: none of the conspirators had implicated him, even though they knew that the king had long since marked him for death (§10). Since Callisthenes was not a Macedonian, the following words, haec sunt ergo Macedonum praemia, cannot refer to him. Clearly they refer to something which has dropped out and which concerned the Macedonian army generally, not persons executed by Alexander.

8. 8. 12 si habere Asiam, non transire volumus, cum his communicanda est nostra clementia: horum fides stabile et aeternum faciet imperium. et sane plus habemus quam capimus. insatiabilis autem avaritiae est adhuc implere velle quod iam circumfluit. verumtamen eorum (mores) in Macedonas transfundo! in multis enim gentibus esse video quae non erubescamus imitari; nec aliter tantum imperium apte regi potest quam ut quaedam et tradamus illis et ab isdem discamus.

The words et sane...circumfluit are flatly irrelevant to the rest of the passage, which moves perfectly without them. They belong at the end of §9.

8. 13. 8 IIII in latitudinem stadia diffusus profundo alveo et nusquam vada aperiente speciem vasti maris fecerat. nec pro spatio aquarum late stagnantium impetum coercebat, sed quasi in artum coeuntibus ripis torrens et elisus ferebatur, occultaque saxa inesse ostendebant pluribus locis undae repercussae.

The peculiarity of the Hydaspes was that its waters, though very wide, ran rapidly.

² 'Better e.g. accepta: cf. 9. 1. 35 nec adfirmare sustineo de quibus dubito, nec subducere quae accepi. Note memoriae proditum est here' (Goodyear). I agree.

Read stagnantium (modo).³ For the wording here cf. Alexander's simile in 9. 2. 17: nam flumen, quo latius fusum est, hoc placidius stagnat; quippe angustis ripis coercita et in angustiorem alveum elisa torrentes aquas invehunt; contra spatio alvei segnior cursus est.

8. 14. 13 ipse Porus humanae magnitudinis propemodum excesserat formam. *magnitudini Pori* adicere videbatur belua qua vehebatur, tantum inter ceteras eminens quanto aliis ipse praestabat.

No conjecture is worth considering which does not eliminate the repetition and give adicere its direct object; one says *Poro magnitudinem adicere*, not *Pori magnitudini adicere*. I suggest that *molem* dropped out after *formam. magnitudini Pori* is either a stopgap or a marginal note.⁴

9. 5. 26 'quid' inquit 'quodve tempus expectas *et* non quam primum hoc dolore me saltem moriturum *liberas*?

The sentence halts. Read ut...liberes?

10. 7. 5 haud ambigue iuvenem cui regnum destinabatur † inpense probra quae obiecerat magis ipsi odium quam Arrhidaeo contemptum attulerunt.

'Hoc ut expediret adhuc nemini contigit. Multa multi coniecerunt, ut *impugnans*. sed - carpens. sed - incessens. sed' (Müller). No certain restoration is likely to be found, but the following may be worth putting forward: destinabatur $inse\langle ctatus\ est.\ sed\rangle$ probra (i.e. $\langle ctatus\ \tilde{e}\ s; \rangle$).

Following a good example (R. G. M. Nisbet, *Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc.* 24 (1978), 111 f.) I record several conjectures anticipated by earlier scholars but unnoticed in recent editions: 3. 11: 22 castra del. Freinsheim (cf. 3. 13. 10). 5. 2. 2 dimitterent] remitterent (Acidalius, a certain correction, passed over in favour of Frobenius' dimitterent). 7. 5. 33 ut deicerent del. Acidalius. 9. 2. 21 elidunt] elident Freinsheim. 9. 5. 9 non aegre iam] non del. Modius (better than Jeep's non aegre tamen). 10. 7. 21 abrupisse se (Freinsheim).

Harvard University

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

- ³ 'The supplement should be carried further, to (modo patentium), which takes up diffusus and also better explains the omission. Cf. 7. 8. 22 scies quam late pateant' (Goodyear).
- ⁴ 'magnitudini Pori is a gloss which has ousted the dative it explained, and that dative might be moli or arguably something quite colourless, like ei rei' (Goodyear).